

TOWN OF GREENFIELD
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

April 3, 2018

REGULAR MEETING

A regular meeting of the Town of Greenfield Zoning Board of Appeals is called to order by Denise Eskoff, Chair, at 7:00 p.m. On roll call the following members are present: Denise Eskoff, Laura Sanda, Joe Szpak, Curt Kolakowski, and Neil Toussaint, Alternate. Andrew Wine is absent. N. Toussaint will be a full voting member for the entirety of the meeting because Andrew Wine is absent.

Minutes

March 6, 2018

MOTION: J. Szpak

SECOND: L. Sanda

RESOLVED, The Zoning Board of Appeals waives the reading of and accepts the March 6, 2018 Minutes with minor corrections.

VOTES: Ayes: D. Eskoff, L. Sanda, J. Szpak, and N. Toussaint
Noes: None
Abstain: C. Kolakowski
Absent: A. Wine

Lochner, T. & J. Case# 995
TM# 151.20-1-19.2

Area Variance Application
8 Liberty Drive

Thomas and Jill Lochner are present. D. Eskoff states this is an Area Variance request at 8 Liberty Drive. The Applicant is looking to convert a Garage Apartment to an In-Law Apartment. D. Eskoff opens the Public Hearing at 7:02. There is no correspondence and no one else asking to speak. The Applicant has submitted an aerial picture to the ZBA. There was an Area Variance approved for this property along with some other lots in 2006. The Applicant, T. Lochner, built a Garage Apartment but it is essentially a small home. It is taxed as a single family home. He wants to make the Garage Apartment an In-Law Apartment. D. Eskoff states that G. McKenna has been out office ill and she was unable to review this further with him prior to tonight's meeting for further clarification. D. Eskoff states that the Board has the house plans to review. She asks the Applicant if there one (1) bedroom in the Garage Apartment? T. Lochner states yes and an office and the laundry room is down stairs. T. Lochner states that his understanding is that why we are here is that we have 150' frontage and need 200' with an In-Law Apartment and says they built what exists there now. It was an owner's build no one gives

you financing for that, that is why we are doing this in two (2) phases. This is going to be fully integrated into the garage. They are going to cut into the side of the garage, build a mud room in between connect the basement foundation up to the roof line. D. Eskoff reads the Code definition of "In-Law Apartment" that for *an In-Law Apartment shall be accessory to the single family dwelling and only one In-Law Apartment shall be created in a single family dwelling. An In-Law Apartment shall be contained inside an existing single family dwelling.* It does go down to being contained inside. No visible separate entrance from the exterior. The problem is the containing is generally looked as flowing from within the building. There can be some question when a house has a mudroom or a covered breezeway or some area that is enclosed. Where someone can come into an entrance and they can go left or right upstairs to what could be used by someone as a rentable unit. That is a concern. The Town Code does not allow for other accessory apartments. The Town does have two (2) family structures but they have much stronger requirements as far as acreage or frontage. As presented, the Board has to determine if this is a one (1) family with a Garage Apartment, one (1) family with In-Law Apartment or is it a two (2) family. The Board has struggled with these definitions in the past. Right now, T. Lochner has a Garage Apartment and if you built a house separate from that you would have to have a separate septic. Once it is attached the definition may change but can see why T. & J. Lochner wants to keep it somewhat of a separate entity. T. Lochner states this is something that goes all the way back to 2014. The Applicant states that they have spoken at length with G. McKenna about what they want to do for long term. This has been discussed for years if it was an In-Law Apartment or a Garage Apartment. The Code isn't very clear. D. Eskoff agrees. T. Lochner states that G. McKenna wrote the Code and they discussed some of the reasons and it probably could have been made clearer. D. Eskoff states that the Code is a little bit ambiguous in this area still, but, the Town also follows Building Code and other things that help determine what a dwelling is and what a dwelling unit is. The Board needs to look at the overall picture and make a variance determination. In the past, the ZBA has had some concerns regarding separate entrances from inside going up over the garage. Simply because someone could do whatever they want to do or may do whatever they want after anyway. The ZBA's job is to make the best determination based on our Code. J. Szpak asks if the ZBA asked G. McKenna to make a determination to characterize this application. D. Eskoff states not in so many words. D. Eskoff states that she has spoken to him generally and G. McKenna felt there were some issues. J. Szpak states that technically G. McKenna needs to provide the ZBA with his judgement of what is the characterization of this apartment situation. J. Szpak states that he needs to know from G. McKenna what he characterizes this project as and does he recommend it to the ZBA for approval. D. Eskoff states at this point G. McKenna outlined the case for the ZBA based on need for the request. D. Eskoff states that she also spoke with Robert Gizzi (the Assistant Building Inspector) a bit and went to the definitions and agrees with J. Szpak that we need more to go on. J. Szpak states that the Code is so vague and the ZBA has to rely on G. McKenna's judgement as to what the characterization is. D. Eskoff states the ZBA does not want people building a Garage Apartment then build a house to attach it as a way to get around to Code whereby putting in a rental unit that the Town does not know is a rental unit. That is a concern. L. Sanda asks if there is multiple point access or just one (1) staircase up from the door. T. Lochner states yes. D. Eskoff asks the stairs are going to stay? T. Lochner states yes. D. Eskoff states that someone can technically access the apartment from the garage then. This is where it becomes an issue to whether it's a Garage Apartment. L. Sanda states that the ZBA is not saying the Applicant is looking to do it, but if you sell the house two (2) years from now and someone could lock this door and they have a perfectly useful

Garage Apartment they can rent without anyone knowing. The ZBA is trying to make sure they have everything covered. If the ZBA grants a variance it will be for the correct thing so the ZBA knows what they are dealing with going forward. D. Eskoff questions that obviously there are bedrooms, bathrooms or living space over garages, when does it get to a separate livable unit. J. Szpak asks, based on the plans, how would the ZBA characterize this? D. Eskoff states that she is struggling with it, even though the ZBA knows the Applicant's intent is not to do a rental. It comes off to her that it could be a rental if the Applicant leaves the stairs and keeps an access. J. Szpak asks would it be an above Garage Apartment. D. Eskoff states doesn't think it can be a Garage Apartment by definition because the apartment won't be detached, septic etc. and the Applicant wants to build onto it as part of their house. Either it is an In-Law Apartment or a two (2) family then? L. Sanda states even though the roof is going to be attached to the house, it is essentially a Garage Apartment. It is free standing over the garage. It has its own entrance from outside the garage. It has a second entrance from the house. You can access it from multiple points not just the house. D. Eskoff states that is not the definition of a true In-Law Apartment. L. Sanda states no it sounds like a Garage Apartment because the In-Law could come in the mudroom but no division between someone coming into the home vs. going into the apartment. D. Eskoff states that it is difficult because the Applicant is starting with a prebuilt section. If it does not fit the definition of a Garage Apartment, which it basically doesn't because it is not going to be detached with septic, then is it a two (2) family? This makes it more difficult because that would be a twelve (12) acre variance in MDR-1 and would the Applicant wants a two (2) family because then they would be taxed as a two (2) family. There are more requirements for a two (2) family also. T. Lochner states that he spoke with G. McKenna about this about whether it was a Garage Apartment or an In-Law Apartment, he was with the agreement that it would be an In-Law Apartment and believes his wife had the same conversation with G. McKenna on a separate occasion yes In-Law Apartment because it is not detached. D. Eskoff states that the ZBA needs to hear that formally from G. McKenna, the ZBA has to make the variance determination. L. Sanda states that back in 2014 G. McKenna wrote on the Applicant's plans Garage Apartment and to ask for a Special Use Permit and doesn't know if he spoke to the Applicant before or after. L. Sanda feels that it would make sense to wait and talk to G. McKenna and get it right. J. Szpak states that the ZBA is just trying to make sure they are characterizing it correct so that the Applicant asks for the right variance. D. Eskoff states that the one thing that has been done in the past is to remove the kitchen or remove the cooking surface. That can help take it away from making it an apartment beyond eating and sleeping. The indication that it is a kitchen is the cooking surface. A refrigerator or microwave are often put other places. She thinks the kitchen makes it more of an apartment, a separate living, dwelling unit. The Building Code goes around the definition dwelling down to dwelling unit. If it was just space with a bedroom and a bathroom not something the Applicant could be renting out on a full time basis it would be easier. J. Szpak asks what that would be called. D. Eskoff states she thinks that it would just be part of the house if it flows from within it would be living space if done like a regular house. The ZBA had a prior case with connected Garage Apartment type issues but the ZBA never made a decision on it they never got that far with it. It is totally different but the ZBA can look back to see what the issues were. The ZBA does not want that issue raising itself again. D. Eskoff states that the Applicant has invested a lot and asks him if there is a reason for the second kitchen situation or is it just living space for the Applicant's family they really want. T. Lochner states that there is six (6) of them. D. Eskoff asks the Applicant if they need two (2) kitchens. T. Lochner states yes, it is for his parents. J. Lochner states that are why it is nice for her in-laws come through their house. D. Eskoff states

that the way the Town's Code is written an In-Law Apartment flows from within the house. It does not flow separately from the house. The purpose of that is to prevent a rental situation. Some of them have tiny kitchens and some just have living space. L. Sanda asks what the square footage of the garage is right now - the gross living space. T. Locher states 968 or 986 whatever 25x35 is. L. Sanda asks if it is a Garage Apartment then the Applicant would be looking at a Special Use Permit. The Code reads in a dwelling unit within a private garage is an accessory to a one (1) or two (2) family. It qualifies as being independent in accessory to. It is physically connected by siding and a roof. L. Sanda feels that it falls under Garage Apartment. T. Lochner states that obviously the ZBA has to hear it from G. McKenna but he spoke to G. McKenna specifically about that and the reason that distinction was made was because there has been properties within the Town where someone has a house they have a small septic system from years back and now they want to convert an old barn into a rental property. The issue is the small septic. That is the reason G. McKenna made that distinction to make sure that people are not over taxing an aging septic system and causing a sewage leak. D. Eskoff states yes, a Garage Apartment in this Town is separate from the main house because it has its own septic. T. Lochner states that is one of the reasons when he spoke with G. McKenna that he said it was an In-Law Apartment. Everything is built for compliance to support the size of the structure the number of bathrooms, it's fully attached. J. Szpak states that it doesn't fall clearly in either of the Town's Codes. D. Eskoff agrees. J. Szpak states if G. McKenna had stated that this was his interpretation and this is why it would be something J. Szpak would entertain a variance for an In-Law Apartment. The problem is G. McKenna has not done that yet. D. Eskoff states that she did show G. McKenna the definitions and it was discussed briefly because of the timing of G. McKenna being out of town at training and unfortunately now being ill she was not able to follow-up with him earlier tonight. J. Szpak asks has G. McKenna evaluated and come to a conclusion and the ZBA does not know it or does he recognize the ZBA is waiting for him to come to a conclusion so the ZBA can act on this case. D. Eskoff states that she does not know. D. Eskoff states that she feels G. McKenna wanted the ZBA to look at all the variables; he agreed there were some clarity issues with this when it was previously discussed. G. McKenna has basically outlined it for the ZBA but at this point she is not sure if G. McKenna has made the determination one way or the other on apartment status based on what's been submitted to Building. J. Szpak states that the ZBA has looked at the variables now and it is not clear in either case. What the ZBA needs is a recommendation from G. McKenna. There being additional information needed, no correspondence and no one coming forward to speak, D. Eskoff tables the matter before the Board at 7:22 PM and adjourns the Public Hearing at this time; the Board will reconvene the Public Hearing on this case at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the ZBA on May 1, 2018. The ZBA will request a more affirmative interpretation from G. McKenna. J. Szpak states that it does not fit in with either part of Code. D. Eskoff states that is why it is difficult. It is not coming across as an In-Law Apartment as the ZBA would like to see it. If the ZBA members are agreeable with that request the Board will get that information. T. Lochner states that short of G. McKenna's guidance the primary issue is a 50' variance is that not being able to be decided. D. Eskoff states no because it depends on what this ends up actually being. L. Sanda states that if it is an In-Law Apartment it is a permitted use. If the ZBA grants the variance your pretty much good to go. The Applicant can get the building permit for the house. There is no Special Use Permit. If there is a Garage Apartment then there are other steps that need to be taken. T. Lochner asks if he has to go for a Special Use Permit. D. Eskoff states yes if it is a Garage Apartment but this is a unique difficult situation. J. Szpak states that the ZBA does not know what to act on. Is G. McKenna

calling it a Garage Apartment and he is recommending a variance for a Garage Apartment or is he calling it an In-Law Apartment and recommending a variance for an In-Law Apartment. The ZBA can't make that determination. D. Eskoff states the Applicant is asking for a variance on an In-Law Apartment and we need to know whether or not this fits the In-Law Apartment definition before the ZBA votes on it. J. Szpak states that if you are telling me that based on G. McKenna's conversation he has made a judgement that this is an In-Law Apartment G. McKenna is recommending an Area Variance. D. Eskoff states no G. McKenna has not said that G. McKenna has said the Applicant is looking to make an In-Law Apartment. J. Szpak states that is very different. D. Eskoff states exactly. J. Szpak states that if G. McKenna had said it's an In-Law Apartment and he is recommending the ZBA act on a variance for that then let's act on this now. D. Eskoff states that the ZBA does not have that. L. Sanda reminds the Board that in G. McKenna's notes from 2014 he wrote Garage Apartment Special Use Permit required. D. Eskoff states it ended up being a Garage Apartment that is really a single family house and she can understand that as taxed but if G. McKenna considered it a separate Garage Apartment it would need two (2) septic's and the Applicant would need a Special Use Permit. J. Szpak states the ZBA is not in a position to act on it the ZBA needs to be clear on what they ask from G. McKenna so the ZBA can act on it. D. Eskoff states to the Applicant that G. McKenna does not normally come to the ZBA meetings but was scheduled to be here for another reason. T. Lochner states he understands that. T. Lochner states they are staying with one (1) septic on the plan with (1) In-Law Apartment and that it is the same since 2014. N. Toussaint states that in the beginning the Applicant said the septic is oversized and ask the Applicant if that is correct? T. Lochner states yes. C. Kolakowski asks if there was a Public Hearing last month. D. Eskoff states no this month. D. Eskoff will speak to G. McKenna regarding the Boards requests, questions and concerns. The case and Public Hearing will reconvene at next month's meeting.

Lally, Andrew Case# 990
TM# 126.-1-20.111

Area Variance
50 Ure Way

Andrew and Leigh Lally are present. D. Eskoff opens the Public Hearing at 7:28 p.m. and asks if there anyone present for or against the Lally case? Dan Maloney, resident from Greene Road, is present and states that he is in favor of the variance being granted. He states that actually whatever the Lally's do no one would even notice because of their location. D. Eskoff asks if there is any correspondence for this case. K. McMahon states no. D. Eskoff states that there being no one else here for or against and there being no correspondence regarding this case, closes the Public Hearing at 7:29 p.m. D. Eskoff states this case has been going on for a while the Applicants have been through the ZBA, the Planning Board, and the Town Board and now back to the ZBA. A. Lally states that they have an existing log home that they currently live in on the property and they want to subdivide ten (10) acres with the current log home and build a new family home on the rest of the land. D. Eskoff states that the Applicants need 250' of frontage because this a land-locked Open Development case. A. Lally states they are not quite land locked they have 50' of road frontage. D. Eskoff explains to the Applicants that the proposed new lot requires the variance because it is presently landlocked, it is a keyhole lot situation so it's more complicated. They need 250' frontage for the proposed lot and it is land-locked from the description of the Applicants needing to have the frontage to get a building permit. The existing house lot has 51.66' of road frontage while the proposed lot does

not have any. It is the second lot that needs the 250'. The Open Development Permit was granted by the Town Board on February 8, 2018. The ZBA is looking at the lot that is to be made. That lot will have no frontage at all because it will be behind. There will be some form of easement language needed when the Applicants go for a permit or to the Planning Board. L. Sanda asks if the shared driveway language will be handled by the Planning Board. D. Eskoff states that she assumes that the Town Attorney will review any language prior to the Building Department issuing a building permit. A. Lally states that they have discussed it with the Building Department. There is a land locked lot (the Barber's lot) that has an easement to the driveway. D. Eskoff states that even though it is not on a Town road, State road, or County road, the access is there and it is not disturbing something else. The keyhole to the proposed new lot is through their own property. C. Kolakowski asks if the Barber lot is the next lot down. A. Lally states yes it is the one closer to Greene Road. L. Sanda asks if the Applicants will be building the furthest on the road. D. Eskoff asks if the property is 66 acres. A. Lally states 64. D. Eskoff states that it comes up on the Tax Map as Greene Road Rear is that the actual address of the property. A. Lally states there are two (2) addresses for the property. The mailing address is 50 Ure Way and the Town also has 489 Greene Road Rear. A. Lally states that the Applicants have not talked about anything further for the property address. It may be another year away. D. Eskoff states that the main priority for the ZBA with any Open Development Permit is pretty much what the Town Board has looked at it which is safety. In the Applicants case, the Planning Board recommended that the bridge be reviewed by an engineer especially because of the keyhole lot provision. Joe Szpak reviews the area variance criteria five factors with the Board for this case. The ZBA reiterates the Town Boards findings including the Planning Boards recommendations. The Applicant will still have to look at all the safety provisions, truck passage and weight, etc. so there are no impediments as the Applicant moves forward with the process.

RESOLUTION: Lally A. & L. – Area Variance – Case #990

MOTION: J. Szpak

SECOND: L. Sanda

RESOLVED, that the Zoning Board of Appeals hereby grants an Area Variance for 250' of frontage for property located at TM#126-1-20.111, 50 Ure Way, that lacks frontage on any Town, County or State road or highway. This approval by the Zoning Board of Appeals does not grant any right of access to this property or expand any access rights to this property that might exist.

This approval by the Zoning Board of Appeals for an Area Variance is based on the following criteria:

- The request is substantial but is the minimum necessary, the property has no frontage
- The benefit cannot be achieved by other means, the property has no frontage
- There is no undesirable change to the neighborhood or character of nearby properties
- There are no adverse physical or environmental impacts
- This is not a self-created hardship given the location of the property

The Zoning Board of Appeals, by its approval, requires the Applicant, Andrew Lally, or future owner/purchaser, to obtain a Building Permit from the Town of Greenfield and meet all the

requirements thereof in order to construct a house or other appropriate building on this property and that any driveway to this property will also need to meet all applicable requirements as set forth by the Town as well as in the New York State Fire & Building Codes for access by heavy vehicles, including fire trucks and other emergency vehicles.

Further, this approval by the Zoning Board of Appeals for an Area Variance is subject to the requirements of the Greenfield Town Board's approval for Open Development made on February, 8, 2018 for this property which included a recommendation and a Resolution by the Greenfield Planning Board made on January 8, 2018 where the Planning Board referred this case back to the Town Board with the contingency that the bridge be certified by an Engineer as required by the Keyhole Lot Law Section §105-137 (C) of Town Code (which states that *(a)all driveways to keyhole lots must be accessible to and able to hold a fifty-thousand-pound, thirty-foot-long vehicle, as determined by a licensed engineer, with facilities for turning around to be available within 100 feet of any structure*) and whereby the Town Board accepted the Open Development Application of Andrew Lally, 50 Ure Way, contingent upon the Planning Board's recommendation for certification by an Engineer for the bridge and referred the application to the Zoning Board of Appeals for their review and recommendation for road frontage. (Town Board Minutes, February, 2018, Planning Board Minutes January 9, 2018).

VOTES: Ayes: D. Eskoff, C. Kolakowski, L. Sanda, J. Szpak, and N. Toussaint
 Noes: None
 Abstain: None
 Absent: A. Wine

Goertzen, A. & MacDonald, S. Case #996
TM# 111.-2-18.13

Area Variance
107 Allen Road

Aaron Goertzen and Stacy MacDonald are present. D. Eskoff opens the Public Hearing at 7:40 p.m. There being no one present in favor or against this case or further correspondence on this case, D. Eskoff closes the Public Hearing for this case at 7:40 p.m. D. Eskoff asks to review previously received correspondence. K. McMahon states it was in the Board member's mailings. D. Eskoff refers to a letter of support from the Applicant's neighbor, Nicole Griffiths, at 105 Allen Rd. D. Eskoff states Ms. Griffiths also contacted D. Eskoff by phone prior to sending the letter so they could receive additional information on the case which was then provided. D. Eskoff states that the request is for a small Stable per our Code charts for two (2) horses in LDR on Allen Rd. The Applicants have more than sufficient acreage but lack 81' of frontage due to the lot shape. The Applicant has supplied many photos, maps and a property layout location for the proposed barn. D. Eskoff asks if the house and barn sit on a hill. The Applicant states yes. The Board reviews the maps and photos and feels there are no issues with it and that the property, barn size and area are appropriate for a small Stable of horses.

RESOLUTION: Goertzen, A. & MacDonald, S. – Area Variance –Case #996

MOTION: J. Szpak
 SECOND: L. Sanda

RESOLVED, That the Zoning Board of Appeals hereby grants an Area Variance for 81' of frontage for property located at TM# 111.-2-18.13, 107 Allen Road, for a small Stable for two (2) horses.

- The benefit cannot be achieved by any other means feasible to the Applicant
- No undesirable changes to the character or detriment to the nearby properties it fits the neighborhood
- The request is not substantial
- The request will have adverse physical or environmental affects
- It is not self-created

VOTES: Ayes: D. Eskoff, C. Kolakowski, L. Sanda, J. Szpak, and N. Toussaint
 Noes: None
 Abstain: None
 Absent: A. Wine

**355 Grange Road, LLC Case # 994
 TM# 151.-2-58.1**

**Area Variance
 355 Grange Road**

No one is present for the Application. D. Eskoff states that there is a Public Hearing scheduled for this case and opens the Public Hearing at 7:47 p.m. There is no correspondence and no one else is present for or against this case. Because the Applicant is not present and there is additional outstanding information needed, D. Eskoff tables the matter before the Board and adjourns the Public Hearing at 7:47; the Board will reconvene the Public Hearing on this case at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the ZBA on May 1, 2018. J. Szpak asks if the ZBA has to table the Public Hearing because no one from the public is present. D. Eskoff states yes because G. McKenna is still getting information together that was requested and we do not have. He is unable to be here tonight due to illness and expects to have it for the ZBA by or at the next meeting. D. Eskoff asks the ZBA if they still would like to do a site visit. The ZBA concurs. The Board sets a tentative site visit date of April 14, 2018 at 10:00 a.m. pending the Applicant's approval. D. Eskoff states they can discuss general needs and requests for this case and states that the criteria for a Use Variance are far more difficult to achieve than for an Area Variance and suggests Board members may want review materials they may have on these type of variances. C. Kolakowski states this property is mostly bedrock. N. Toussaint states and wetlands. D. Eskoff states this since this is a Use Variance, and like the last storage facility case that was in front of this Board, the Applicants are trying to make improvements that will fit in the area. D. Eskoff reviews some of the information they have about the case including that there was a lot line adjustment last year. J. Szpak asks if it is still original owner (other than the Applicant/Agent). D. Eskoff states yes, and he owns both lots though the lot size expansion does not mean there can be any more mobile homes added to the other lot. J. Szpak states that he is struggling with this. If the original owner purchased it and his intent was to make it commercial property. D. Eskoff states she is not sure, the Board needs more information. C. Kolakowski states that they have used the property as it was intended. D. Eskoff states which was allowed. L. Sanda asks what the lot line change history is. C. Kolakowski asks if this is self-created or are they making adjustments. D. Eskoff questions what part is bedrock and what is wetlands. L. Sanda would like that distinction before the site visit. D. Eskoff states that the

area is residential with some mixed use within - there is a Winery and the Mobile Home Park along with several private residences. J. Szpak reviews the criteria that the ZBA goes through when deciding a Use Variance and states that not all the ZBA have to agree on all the same. D. Eskoff asks if there is any additional information the Board would like from the Applicant in reviewing this case. J. Szpak requests the Applicant provide a cost comparison to the ZBA of a home built with a suitable septic on the property vs. what the Applicant is asking for. C. Kolakowski asks if the original owner made this self-created. D. Eskoff states that she does not know all of the parameters there is more buffering which may be a positive thing. J. Szpak questions if this was self-created too. D. Eskoff states the Board will be reviewing those questions as part of the criteria and that the Board would like to receive the financial and other information requested from the Applicant prior to the next meeting. This case and Public Hearing will reconvene at the May 1, 2018 ZBA meeting.

DISCUSSION

J. Szpak feels there is less information being provided to the ZBA than in the past to make variance decisions. He would like more information. L. Sanda concurs and that more information was helpful. J. Szpak would like to know more about denials and asks how the ZBA is getting cases. D. Eskoff states the ZBA gets variance cases because the Building Department has in some way denied the Applicant and a variance is required. The Board discusses the process in which they receive variance requests and would like to receive more detailed information about cases from the Codes Enforcer. D. Eskoff states she will discuss the request with G. McKenna.

Meeting adjourned at 8:17 p.m. All members in favor.

Respectfully submitted by,

Kimberley McMahon
ZBA Secretary