

**MINUTES OF THE YORKTOWN ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
OCTOBER 15TH, 2020**

The regular monthly meeting was held for the Zoning Board of Appeals via Zoom, October 15th, 2020. The meeting began at 6:30 p.m.

The following members of the board were present:

Robert Fahey
Gordon Fine
William Gregory
John Meisterich

Also present is Robyn Steinberg, Town Planner/Host. Adam Rodriguez, Special Counsel, and Ed Lachterman, Town Board Liaison. The meeting was aired on Channel 20 Cablevision and Channel 33 Verizon Fios.

It was announced that the next public hearing would be held December 17th, 2020. Mailings are to be sent from November 23rd to December 2nd, 2020.

NEW BUSINESS

FAIVRE #33/20 This is an application for a special use permit for the renewal of an accessory apartment.
Property Address:
1420 Trout Brook Dr.
Section 48.14, Block 1, Lot 44

Upon motion by Fine, seconded by Fahey and unanimously voted in favor by Fahey, Fine, Gregory, and Meisterich, this item will be handled administratively, a Public Hearing on December 17th, 2020, and referred to the Building Inspector.

GROTE #32/20 This is an application for a proposed addition with a front yard setback of 25.76' where a minimum of 40' is required, a combined side yard setback of 37.31' where a minimum of 40 is required and a building coverage of 21.90% where a maximum of 20% is allowed. All per section 300-21 and Appendix A of the Town Zoning Code.
Property Address:
3414 North Shelly St.
Section 16.13, Block 2, Lot 53

Upon motion by Fine, seconded by Fahey and unanimously voted in favor by Fahey, Fine, Gregory, and Meisterich, this item was scheduled for a Public Hearing on December 17th, 2020, and referred to the Building Inspector. Site Visits will be done by the Board members separately.

FRAGETTE #34/20 This is an application for an existing carport with a front yard setback of 24.6' where a minimum of 40' is required, a side yard setback of 1.85' where a minimum of 15' is required and a combined side yard setback of 25.35' where a minimum of 40 is required. An existing deck in the rear yard has a side yard setback of 8.4' where a minimum of 10' is required. All per section 300-21 and Appendix A of the Town Zoning Code.
Property Address:
3281 Elk Ct.
Section 17.14, Block 3, Lot 32

Upon motion by Fine, seconded by Fahey and unanimously voted in favor by Fahey, Fine, Gregory, and Meisterich, this item was scheduled for a Public Hearing on December 17th, 2020, and referred to the Building Inspector. Site Visits will be done by the Board members separately.

GALVIN #35/20 This is an application to allow a shed with a side yard setback of .6' where a minimum of 15' is required and a deck with a rear yard setback of 7.5' where a minimum of 10' is required as per 300-21 and Appendix A of the Town Zoning Code.
Property Address:
2864 Hedwig Dr.
Section 27.10, Block 2, Lot 25
Upon motion by Fine, seconded by Fahey and unanimously voted in favor by Fahey, Fine, Gregory, and Meisterich, this item was scheduled for a Public Hearing on December 17th, 2020, and referred to the Building Inspector. Site Visits will be done by the Board members separately.

GOLIO #36/20 This is an application to allow an existing deck and an expansion of this deck with a combined side yard setback of 39.20' where a minimum of 40' is required as per 300-21 and Appendix A of the Town Zoning Code.
Property Address:
2936 South Deerfield Ave.
Section 36.12, Block 3, Lot 2
Upon motion by Fine, seconded by Fahey and unanimously voted in favor by Fahey, Fine, Gregory, and Meisterich, this item was scheduled for a Public Hearing on December 17th, 2020, and referred to the Building Inspector. Site Visits will be done by the Board members separately.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

SARLO #29/19 This applicant is requesting a special use permit for having a contractor's yard and parking commercial vehicles.
Property Address:
675 Saw Mill River Rd.
Section 59.14, Block 1, Lot 20, 21, 22

Michael Grace, Attorney, representing the applicant.

Mailings not sent out.

Upon motion by Fine, seconded by Fahey and unanimously voted in favor by Fahey, Fine, Gregory, and Meisterich, this item was adjourned and referred to Conservation, DEP, DEC, Planning Board, County Planning Board and Town Board.

MANNING #18/20 This is an application to allow 2 existing sheds: a 12x16 shed with a side yard setback of 6'1" and a shed under 100 s.f. with setbacks of .66' and 1.66' where a minimum of 10' is required as per 300-21 and Appendix A of the Town Zoning Code
Property Address:
304 Alden Rd.
Section 27.10, Block 1, Lot 13

Mailings and sign certification in order.

Jim Manning present for the meeting. Mr. Manning said they are 2 existing sheds, 12x17, a little over 6ft. from the side lot and a rear shed about 100 sq.ft. about 1½ ft. off one side, a less than 1ft. on the other. 1 shed has been there for 10-12 years and the other 5 years.

Memo from the Assistant Building Inspector date, October 6, 2020 states: I have inspected the property on October 2, 2020 and have no objections in granting relief. The applicant will need a building permit and a Certificate of Compliance for the larder shed.

The Board discussed the application and applied the statutory factors.

Upon motion by Fine, seconded by Fahey and unanimously voted in favor by Fahey, Fine, Gregory, and Meisterich, the application for a variance was granted to allow 2 existing sheds: a 12x16 shed with a side yard setback of 6'1" and a shed under 100 s.f. with setbacks of .66' and 1.66' where a minimum of 10' is required as per 300-21 and Appendix A of the Town Zoning Code. With the stipulation it pertains only to the requested variance and not the remainder of the property line.

MAZZELLA #20/20 This is an application to allow a building lot with an area of 10,000 s.f. where a minimum of 20,000 s.f. is required as per 300-21 and Appendix A of the Town Zoning Code. This property is located in a R1-10 zone.

Chairman Fine said when we last left off, the applicant was going to submit the stormwater plans to the Engineering Department. He asked Mr. Barile and Mr. Panny if it was done.

Mr. Barile said it was sent October 7 to Mike Quinn.

Chairman Fine said as of the afternoon the Board still had not received anything from the Town Engineer.

Letter from John Karell dated, October 7, 2020 states:

1. The SEAF has been revised.
2. The design of the infiltrations practice has been revised in accordance with DEC requirements to treat the increase in runoff from a 100 year storm or 9.1 inches. It is noted that the witnessed soil percolation rate was less than 1 minute per inch. Design was calculated at 1 minute per inch. It is noted further that the calculated design required three units however five units are provided.
3. The portion of the pipe on this property will be removed.
4. The retaining wall detail shows gravel with perforated pipe to collect stormwater and discharge to the rear of the property in a rip rap end section and level spreader.
5. The driveway slope is revised to 10% by raising the elevation of the house.

Chairman Fine asked if plans for the house were submitted.

Mr. Barile said he sent a copy.

Mr. Barile showed the plans to the Board.

Chairman Fine asked if the garage will be facing Allan Avenue?

Mr. Panny said yes.

Chairman Fine said it says you're increasing the elevation, so the house is still going to be situated below Allan Avenue, just not as steep.

Mr. Panny said yes.

Chairman Fine asked if it is 10% grade?

Mr. Panny said yes.

Chairman Fine asked if they are making provisions to have any parking on the street, cut out or something for parking area or not?

Mr. Panny said no.

Chairman Fine asked if it is strictly parking on the driveway?

Mr. Panny said yes.

Mr. Fahey asked if they are changing the grade from 13% to 10% in order to accommodate, does that affect the height of the house, the ridge lines or any of that. How do you accomplish that, how do you change the grade?

Mr. Panny said the elevation of the property.

Mr. Fahey asked do you change the height of the house in order to accommodate?

Mr. Panny house went up 1ft..

Mr. Fahey asked what is the height of the ridge now?

Mr. Panny said the ridge stays the same. Nothing is change on the blueprint just that they lifted everything, the foundation 1ft..

Chairman Fine asked how does the highest peak of the house match the neighboring houses height wise?

Mr. Panny said the house next door, the ridge on this house would probably be about 3ft. higher than the new house next door.

Chairman Fine asked what about the older homes?

Mr. Panny said no. A lot of the homes are down deeper because they have really steep driveways.

Chairman Fine asked if there were any comments from anyone?

Michael Epting said he still has not seen the number of cubic yards of fill that are coming in, the

plans for the stormwater infiltration system.

Chairman Fine said the stormwater plans they said have been submitted, which it has been, we have not received any comments from the engineer yet. We cannot do anything until the engineer reviews everything.

Mr. Fahey said as far as the proposed water mitigation, would like to see a comparison by town engineering if the proposed system is compatible with the system that was approved the last time so they are not contradictory to each other.

Chairman Fine said that is what Mike Quinn is going to be doing, making sure the system is adequate and not interfere with anything else.

Mr. Fahey said normally we take things on an individual basis but because of the topography and the fact that we have a system that we approved, want to make sure they are both compatible and one is not working against the other.

Upon motion by Fine, seconded by Fahey and unanimously voted in favor by Fahey, Fine, Gregory, and Meisterich, this item was adjourned so engineering can review the plans submitted and submit comments to the Board.

NEW PUBLIC HEARING

KATT #23/20 This is an application for a special use permit for an accessory apartment.
Property Address:
3528 Gomer St.

Section 17.10, Block 2, Lot 97

Mailings and sign certification in order.

Memo from the Building Department dated, October 8, 2020 states: We have no objection to the granting of this application as long as the applicant is made aware that they have to come to the Building Department and be issued a Certificate of Occupancy for the accessory apartment.

Upon motion by Fine, seconded by Fahey and unanimously voted in favor by Fahey, Fine, Gregory, and Meisterich, the application for a special use permit for an accessory apartment was granted for a period of three (3) years.

FIORITO #24/20 This is an application for a special use permit for a new accessory apartment.
Property Address:
1625 Central Ave.

Section 48.07, Block 2, Lot 28

Mailings and sign certification in order.

Martin Henning, Architect, representing the applicant.

Chairman Fine asked if it was built already or in the process.

Mr. Henning said it is an existing house that they are looking to finish the basement for an accessory apartment.

Memo from the Assistant Building Inspector dated, October 6th, 2020 states: I have inspected the property on October 6, 2020 and have no objections in granting relief. The applicant will need a building permit and Certificate of Occupancy for this work.

Chairman Fine asked if he submitted a parking plan with the application?

Mr. Henning said not to his knowledge. There is an existing parking pad outside. They did not submit a plan but there is an existing garage on the property and a pad for 2-3 cars.

Chairman Fine said part of the permitting process for accessories requires that a parking plan be submitted.

Mr. Henning said Steve Gifford was the one who submitted the application.

Mr. Gifford said he was unaware of that and one was not submitted.

Upon motion by Fine, seconded by Fahey and unanimously voted in favor by Fahey, Fine, Gregory,

and Meisterich, this item was adjourned to allow the applicant to submit the parking plan.

HAIGHT #25/20 This is an application for the new owner applying for a special use permit for an accessory apartment with 906.5 s.f. where a maximum is 800 s.f. is allowed.

Property Address:
1228 E Main St.
Section 16.10, Block 2, Lot 76

Mailings and sign certification in order.

Jeffrey Haight present for the meeting.

Chairman Fine informed the applicant that the Building Department was not able to do an inspection. Memo from the Assistant Building Inspector dated, October 15, 2020 states: I have not been able to inspect the property.

Upon motion by Fine, seconded by Fahey and unanimously voted in favor by Fahey, Fine, Gregory, and Meisterich, this item was adjourned so the Building Department can inspect and send a memo to the Board.

GREEN #26/20 This is an application for an existing porch with a new roof where a front yard setback of 34' is provided but a minimum of 40' is required.

Property Address:
127 California Rd.
Section 48.11, Block 2, Lot 13

Mailings and sign certification in order.

Kevin Green present for the meeting.

Chairman Fine asked if the porch has been built yet?

Mr. Green said the porch was not built yet.

Memo from the Building Department dated, October 8, 2020 restating the application.

The Board discussed the application and applied the statutory factors.

Upon motion by Fine, seconded by Fahey and unanimously voted in favor by Fahey, Fine, Gregory, and Meisterich, the application for a variance was granted for a porch with a new roof where a front yard setback of 34' is provided but a minimum of 40' is required. With the stipulation it pertains only to the requested variance and not the remainder of the property line, and the porch be built in substantial conformity to the plans submitted.

DIULIO #27/20 This is an application for renewal of a special use permit for an accessory apartment.

Property Address:

1587 Cross Rd.
Section 15.08, Block 1, Lot 52

Mailings and sign certification in order.

Wanda Diulio present for the meeting.

Memo from the Assistant Building Inspector dated, October 13, 2020 states: I inspected the premises on October 9, 2020 and found conditions basically the same as at the time of the previous granting. We have no objection to the granting of this application for renewal as long as the applicant is made aware that they have to come to the Building Department and be issued a new Certificate of Occupancy for the accessory apartment.

Upon motion by Fine, seconded by Fahey and unanimously voted in favor by Fahey, Fine, Gregory, and Meisterich, the application for renewal of a special use permit for an accessory apartment was granted for a period of three (3) years.

FETZER #28/20 This is an application for a proposed addition with a rear yard setback of 24' where a minimum of 30' is required as per 300-21, 300-9 and Appendix A of the Town Zoning Code.

Property Address:
133 Dorchester Dr.
Section 48.07, Block 3, Lot 84

Mailings and sign certification in order.

Adam Fetzer and Michael Piccirillo, Architect, present for the meeting.

Memo from the Assistant Building Inspector dated, October 6, 2020 states: I inspected the premises on October 6, 2020 and have no objections in granting relief. The applicant will need a building permit and certificate of occupancy for this work.

Mr. Piccirillo said it is a single family home, 1½ story historic home, has a rear yard setback of 17ft. on Hanover where 30ft. is required. Seeking relief from that to do a 1½ story master bedroom addition. The dog leg shape is because of the existing pool and looking for proposed setback of 24ft. where 30ft. is required.

Memo dated August 3rd, 2020 from Linda Briggs of the Yorktown Heritage Preservation Commission submitted to the file.

The Board discussed the application and applied the statutory factors.

Upon motion by Fine, seconded by Fahey and unanimously voted in favor by Fahey, Fine, Gregory, and Meisterich, the application for a variance was granted for a proposed addition with a rear yard setback of 24' where a minimum of 30' is required as per 300-21, 300-9 and Appendix A of the Town Zoning Code. With the stipulation it pertains only to the requested variance and not the remainder of the property line, and the addition be built in substantial conformity to the plans submitted.

COLOMBINI #29/20 This is an application to allow the partial reconstruction and addition of a house on an existing non-conforming lot of 87,584.21 s.f. where a minimum of 200,000 s.f. is required. The addition will have a side yard setback of 25' where a minimum of 30' is required as per 300-21 and Appendix A of the Town Zoning Code.
Property Address:
1450 Spring Valley Rd.
Section 69.15, Block 1, Lot 3

Mailings and sign certification in order.

Danielle Colombini and Christina Griffin, Architect, present for the meeting.

Memo from the Assistant Building Assistant dated, October 8, 2020 states: I have inspected the property. There is a fence on the property that appears to be higher than the allowable 4.5' in the front and side yard. This will need to be addressed. I have no objections in granting relief for this work.

The Board and the applicant discussed the issue of the fence and how to handle it.

The Applicant amended to include the fence.

Ms. Griffin showed the Board the plans. She said the existing house is about 2200 sq.ft, adding 1100 sq.ft to enlarge the house to 3300 sq.ft including the basement. The house is way over on one side and is already non-conforming, goes into the required setback of 25ft. Would like to add a new garage, it is taking the place of the detached garage. Planning to remove 3 sheds.

Ms. Griffin discussed the layoff of the property and the new addition.

Mr. Gregory asked is there any indication they will have to modify the existing septic system?

Ms. Griffin said they are in the process of doing that.

Mr. Gregory asked where would the septic system be, would it be moved or change in any way?

Mr. Colombini said the septic system will be in an entirely new location.

The Board discussed the application and applied the statutory factors.

Upon motion by Fine, seconded by Fahey and unanimously voted in favor by Fahey, Fine, Gregory, and Meisterich, the application for a variance was granted to to allow the partial reconstruction and addition of a house on an existing non-conforming lot of 87,584.21 s.f. where a minimum of 200,000 s.f. is required. The addition will have a side yard setback of 25' where a minimum of 30' is required as per 300-21 and Appendix A of the Town Zoning Code. With the stipulation it pertains only to the requested variance and not the remainder of the property line, and the addition be built in substantial conformity to the plans submitted. The applicant must bring the fence in question into conformity.

CHRISTENSEN #30/20 This is an application to allow an existing 8x10 shed with a rear yard setback of 5' where a minimum of 10' is required as per 300-
Property Address:

708 Garth Court

21 and Appendix A of the Town Zoning Code.

Section 26.12, Block 3, Lot 37

Mailings and sign certification in order.

John Christensen present for the meeting.

Chairman Fine asked if it is an existing shed?

Mr. Christensen said yes.

Chairman Fine asked how many sheds are on the property?

Mr. Christensen said including this one, two.

Chairman Fine asked if he received a violation for the shed.?

Mr. Christensen said yes he did, and was told he have to get a variance.

Memo from the Assistant Building Inspector dated, October 8, 2020 states: In researching this property I found 2 previous decisions by the ZBA. The 1st was from 2001 for a shed in a rear yard that calls the front yard Heathercrest. The last variance was for an addition in the front yard calling the front yard Garth Court. I believe that in the later decision, either a mistake was made or it was misrepresented. Calling the front yard Garth Court makes the yards non-conforming, beside the fact that a fence would also be non-conforming. If it is possible to call the front yard Heathercrest, the variance should read "a shed in a side yard with a side yard setback of 5' where a minimum of 15' is required and a combined side yard setback of 38' where a minimum of 40' is required as per 300-21, 300-13G and Appendix A of the Town Zoning code.

Mr. Christensen said he agree with the statement. In 2004 when he did the addition, he had a professional architect help him and relied on whatever he told him and did not realize the working was slightly wrong.

Mr. Gregory said what Joe is indicating is correct, even if you look at the standpoint of the original survey, Heathercrest Drive should have been the front yard, making Garth Court a side yard equal to a front yard and therefore the shed that we are talking about really is in the side yard and not in the rear yard.

Mr. Gregory said when he did the site inspection there was also clear they put up a 6ft. fence along the Garth Court property line, that is commensurate with having Garth Court as the side/rear yard.

Mr. Christensen said what he wanted was the part that is fenced in with the white fence, that should be his back yard.

Mr. Gregory asked if the shed was previously located someplace else on the property?

Mr. Christensen said yes, before he did the addition in 2004 it was right behind the house. In 2005 it was moved to the current location.

Chairman Fine asked what does he keep in the shed?

Mr. Christensen said it varies over the years. Currently they have beach equipment, play kitchen set, and during the winter he put the patio furniture in there.

Chairman Fine said the reason why he asked is because there is an email from a neighbor, Melody Aubrey, which Chairman Fine read and submitted to file.

Mr. Christensen address the email regarding the smell coming from the shed. He said the shed does not smell; his house is right there. Take great pride in his property and neither one of the 2 sheds smell. Don't keep anything that is smelly except for a small container of gasoline for the warmer in the other shed. This all came up recently, put the pergola up and it replace the pergola that was broken, the vines were there since the house was purchased in 1996. The prior structure fell down during the winter and he replaced it. It is reasonable the shed has been there, none of the other neighbors have complained.

Chairman Fine asked if he store any fertilizer or anything like that in the shed?

Mr. Christensen said no.

Mr. Fahey asked where does he keep the garbage cans?

Mr. Christensen said the garbage cans are in the front of the house by the driveway.

Ms. Aubrey called into the meeting. She said things have changed and the reasoning that Mr. Christensen is giving as to why now of all times she is making this an issue. The fact that her

lifestyle has changed, now home full time with a medical condition. Part of her health regiment is to be outside. Due to the fact she has a lot of time at home, she started to make gardens and there is a narrow passageway between the properties where he has a 4ft. fence, where he has the shed that moved closer, have a front yard garden as well which is close to the shed as well. Noticed while spending time outdoor that there has been periodic smell emanating from the shed area, but cannot definitively say exactly what was but can say is has aggravated her respiratory condition. Smell like garden pesticides or some type of gardening thing of that sort. There is an odor coming from that area, it is chronic and has been going on and off over the summer. His other project, the pergola, yes they had a structure there but that is a separate issue. Felt uncomfortable about Mr. Christensen encroaching closer and closer with some many things against her property line. He approached her for one shed in the past, it was reasonable so said sure you can have a shed there, then he had the variance for his building project in the back yard, did not contest that, but then when we give him the paperwork for one shed, he put two sheds up. Thought that was disrespectful. Want to be on good terms with my neighbor, so did not say anything because it was not affecting her at the time. Now that her lifestyle has change, felt that she needs to think about what was in her best interest. Love her home, love her neighborhood, want to be able to have the ability to have some space like the code is there for and want to be able to respectfully enjoy her home in a safe and healthy manner. Not trying to make any trouble for anybody.

Chairman Fine asked Ms. Aubrey what make her think the odor is coming from the shed?

Ms. Aubrey said every time she is in the area where the shed is, she smells it. There is no other structure around it.

Chairman Fine asked Mr. Gregory if the pergola needs a certificate of occupancy?

Mr. Gregory said he does not know.

Mr. Gregory asked Mr. Christensen how big is the structure?

Mr. Christensen said it is 10x10.

Mr. Gregory asked in the discussion with the building department, did they indicate he needed to do anything for it.

Mr. Christensen told Chairman Fine he remembered this came up in March 2011 when the subject was their property, and at that point they kept on talking about the pergola and you plainly said a pergola does not need a variance.

Chairman Fine said he is not talking about a variance, a certificate of occupancy.

Mr. Christensen said the building department said it could possibly need a building permit but there were not going to pursue it.

Chairman Fine said he is curious why the building inspector did not bring up the issue of the pergola, if it is a structure in the ground, which really needs something, not necessarily a certificate of occupancy.

Adam Rodrigues, Special Counsel said a certificate of occupancy is required for the pergola.

Upon motion by Fine, seconded by Fahey and unanimously voted in favor by Fahey, Fine, Gregory, and Meisterich, this item was adjourned so the building department can go back out and check if the pergola needs a building permit and certificate of occupancy.

YORKTOWN JAZZ LLC

#31/20

Property Address:

3220 & 3216 Crompond Rd.

Section 26.18, Block 1, Lot 18

This is an application to allow an area of 198 s.f. of building sign coverage where a maximum of 77 s.f. is allowed. Directory signs, each with an area of 6.96 s.f. where a maximum of 4 s.f. is allowed. A directory sign with 20" letters where a maximum of 6" is allowed and a sign area of 62.67 s.f. where a maximum of 35 s.f. is allowed per 300-193.11 and Appendix D of the Zoning Code. **The building and directional signs are for Pad B

Mailings and sign certification in order.

Michael Grace, Attorney, representing the applicant. Mr. Grace said this is to accommodate AAA and Starbucks, they are in the building that is newly erected.

Noticed the application for clarification of the 55ft. setback that was granted where 75ft. was required due to the taking by NYS of some area to augment Route 202. There was some confusion as to whether that only went to Pad B, but actually got it for the entire frontage of all the lots.

Memo from ABACA dated, October 8, 2020 states:

The Board noted that the monument sign in the application shows spaces for three tenant signs and is concerned with how many more tenants may be proposed to be placed on this sign. There is the potential for a minimum of two additional tenants on this site occupying the third space on Pad B and potential future tenants at Pad C. If additional future signage is the intent, the Board encourage the applicant to incorporate additional possible signage to the monument sign in this submission for review and approval.

Notwithstanding the above, the ABACA has no objections to a variance being granted for the added building signage to Pad B and the changes to the monument sign as shown in this application.

Chairman Fine asked what is the situation with the Planning Board memo.

Mr. Grace said Robin is the one who rose the issue that the sign variance will be needed, and is in front of you because of the Planning Board. It is a double front facing building so to speak of, wanted two front façades instead of one front façade, because it faces Lowes as well as 202.

Ms. Steinberg said the Board requested the signs on the back to make the building look more like a front on both side and not the back of a building.

Memo from the Assistant Building Inspector dated, October 6, 2020 states: I have inspected the property on October 1, 202 and have no objections in granting relief. The applicant will need a sign permit, electrical permit and certificate of compliance for this work.

The Board discussed the application and applied the statutory factors.

Upon motion by Fine, seconded by Fahey and unanimously voted in favor by Fahey, Fine, Gregory, and Meisterich, the application for a variance was granted to allow an area of 198 s.f. of building sign coverage where a maximum of 77 s.f. is allowed. Directory signs, each with an area of 6.96 s.f. where a maximum of 4 s.f. is allowed. A directory sign with 20" letters where a maximum of 6" is allowed and a sign area of 62.67 s.f. where a maximum of 35 s.f. is allowed per 300-193.11 and Appendix D of the Zoning Code. **The building and directional signs are for Pad B. With the stipulation it pertains only to the requested variance and not the remainder of the property line and in substantial conformity to the sign plans submitted and per the Planning Board comments herein.

Recording Secretary, Glenda Daly

Meeting adjourned at 8:36pm

Happy Zoning!