

**MINUTES OF THE YORKTOWN ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS  
FEBRUARY 23<sup>RD</sup>, 2017**

The regular monthly meeting was held at the Zoning Board of Appeals, Town of Yorktown, at the Yorktown Town Hall, 363 Underhill Avenue, Yorktown Heights, New York on Thursday, February 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2017. The meeting began at 6:30 p.m.

The following members of the board were present:

Gregg Bucci  
Robert Fahey  
Gordon Fine  
William Gregory  
John Meisterich

Also present is Town Attorney, Michael McDermott and Assistant Building Inspector Joe Venitucci. The meeting was aired on Channel 20 Cablevision and Channel 33 Verizon Fios.

It was announced that the next public hearing would be held on March 30<sup>th</sup>, 2017, site visits are scheduled for March 25<sup>th</sup>, 2017. Mailings are to be sent from March 6<sup>th</sup> and March 15<sup>th</sup>, 2017.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**PULVERMILLER, CATHERINE #5/17** This is an application for a special use permit for an accessory apartment. The property is located in an R1-20 zoning district.

**Property Address: 2624  
Windmill Dr.**

**Section 27.15, Block 1, Lot 39**

Upon motion by Fine, seconded by Fahey and unanimously voted in favor by Bucci, Fahey, Fine, and Meisterich, this item was scheduled for a Public Hearing on March 30<sup>th</sup>, 2017, and referred to the Building Inspector.

**ABRAMS, DAVID #6/17**

**Property Address: 3461  
Sagamore Ave.**

**Section 15.16, Block 2, Lot 12**

Upon motion by Fine, seconded by Fahey and unanimously voted in favor by Bucci, Fahey, Fine, and Meisterich, this item will be handled administratively and referred to the Building Inspector.

**ADAMS, DONNA & HOYLE,  
DONALD #7/17**

**Property Address: 2959  
Sherman Ct.**

**Section 25.12, Block 1, Lot 4**

Upon motion by Fine, seconded by Fahey and unanimously voted in favor by Bucci, Fahey, Fine, and Meisterich, this item will be handled administratively and referred to the Building Inspector.

**LEDERER, ANTHONY &  
COOPER, SHARA #8/17**

This is an application for a special use permit for an accessory apartment. The property is located in an R1-80 zoning district.

**Property Address: 1441 Old Logging Rd. West Section 47.17, Block 1, Lot 13**

Upon motion by Fine, seconded by Fahey and unanimously voted in favor by Bucci, Fahey, Fine, and Meisterich, this item was scheduled for a Site Visit on March 25<sup>th</sup>, 2017, a Public Hearing on March 30<sup>th</sup>, 2017, and referred to the Building Inspector.

**LOWNDES, KAREN & DICK #9/17**

**Property Address: 500 Vine Rd.**

**Section 59.10, Block 2, Lot 30**

Upon motion by Fine, seconded by Fahey and unanimously voted in favor by Bucci, Fahey, Fine, and Meisterich, this item was scheduled for a Site Visit on March 25<sup>th</sup>, 2017, a Public Hearing on March 30<sup>th</sup>, 2017, and referred to the Building Inspector.

This is an application for a proposed addition with a front yard setback of 32' where a minimum of 75' is required as per section 300-21 and Appendix A of the Town Zoning Code. This property is located in a R1-80 zone.

**TRAURING, EVERETT #10/17**

**Property Address: 479 Elizabeth Rd.**

**Section 27.17, Block 2, Lot 51**

Upon motion by Fine, seconded by Fahey and unanimously voted in favor by Bucci, Fahey, Fine, and Meisterich, this item was scheduled for a Site Visit on March 25<sup>th</sup>, 2017, a Public Hearing on March 30<sup>th</sup>, 2017, and referred to the Building Inspector.

This is an application for an accessory structure with a side yard setback of 10' where a minimum of 20' is required and a height of 19'9 1/4" where a maximum of 15' is permitted as per sections 300-21, 300-14 and Appendix A of the Town Zoning Code. This property is located in a R1-40 zone.

**DeSANTIS, PHIL & PAULINE #11/17**

**Property Address: 3215 Gomer St.**

**Section 17.17, Block 3, Lot 34**

Upon motion by Fine, seconded by Fahey and unanimously voted in favor by Bucci, Fahey, Fine, and Meisterich, this item was scheduled for a Site Visit on March 25<sup>th</sup>, 2017, a Public Hearing on March 30<sup>th</sup>, 2017, and referred to the Building Inspector.

This is an application for an existing carport with a side yard setback of 10' where a minimum of 15' is required and a combined side yard setback of 30.23' where a minimum of 40' is required as per section 300-21 and Appendix A of the Town Zoning Code. This property is located in a R1-20 zone.

### **CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**DINEEN, KATHLEEN #48/16**  
**Property Address:**  
**2090 Crompond Rd.**  
**Section 37.14, Block 2, Lot 8**

This is an application to modify an existing special use permit for a day care facility per 300-53 of the Tow of Yorktown Zoning Code. This property is located in an R1-10 zoning district.

Application before the Planning Board for site plan approval.

Upon motion by Fine, seconded by Fahey and unanimously voted in favor by Bucci, Fahey, Fine, Gregory, and Meisterich, this item was adjourned, waiting on site plan approval.

**DINEEN, KATHLEEN #49/16**  
**Property Address:**  
**2090 Crompond Rd.**

This is an application for a variance to allow an addition to a daycare facility to have a building coverage of 10057.5 sq. ft. where 7404 sq. ft. is the maximum allowed per 300-21 and

**Section 37.14, Block 2, Lot 8** Appendix A of the Town of Yorktown Zoning Code. This property is located in an R1-10 zoning district.

Application before the Planning Board for site plan approval.

Upon motion by Fine, seconded by Fahey and unanimously voted in favor by Bucci, Fahey, Fine, Gregory, and Meisterich, this item was adjourned, waiting on site plan approval.

**YANCOPOLOULOS, KAREN #66/16** This is an application for special use permit for an accessory apartment per 300-38 of the Town of Yorktown Zoning Code. This property is located in an R1-80 Zoning District.

**Section 47.19 Block 1, Lot 22**  
**Property Address:**  
**1280 Echo Hill**

Mailings and sign certification in order.

Architect, Joseph Palumbo appeared on Applicant's behalf.

Memo from the Assistant Building Inspector, dated September 28, 2016 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 Building Permit and Certificate of Occupancy for the accessory apartment.

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

**YANCOPOLOULOS, KAREN #74/16** This is an application for a variance pertaining to a proposed accessory apartment (special use permit, Section 300-38 of the Town of Yorktown Zoning Code) where the proposed accessory apartment will have a usable floor area of 1240 square feet which exceeds the maximum permitted 800 square feet, and which exceeds 33% of the usable floor area of the main building as per Section 300-38-B(5). This property is located in an R1-80 Zoning District.

**Property Address:**  
**1280 Echo Hill Path**  
**Section 47.19 Block 1, Lot 22**

Mailings and sign certification in order.

Architect, Joseph Palumbo appeared on Applicant's behalf.

Memo from the Assistant Building Inspector, dated December 6, 2016 states:

The applicant is requesting a variance for an accessory apartment with a floor area of 1240 square feet where 800 square feet is permitted and exceed 33% of the main residence as per Section 300-38-B(5) in an R1-80 zone.

I have no objection to granting the requested relief.

The Board discussed the application and applied the statutory factors.

Upon motion by Fine, seconded by Fahey and unanimously voted in favor by Bucci, Fahey, Fine, Gregory, and Meisterich, the application for a variance was granted to allow an accessory apartment (special use permit, Section 300-38 of the Town of Yorktown Zoning Code) where the proposed accessory apartment will have a usable floor area of 1240 square feet which exceeds the maximum permitted 800 square feet, and which exceeds 33% of the usable floor area of the main building as per Section 300-38 (B) (5), with the stipulation that it pertains only to the requested variance and not the remainder of the property line and it be built in substantial conformity with the plans submitted.

**NEW PUBLIC HEARING**

**NEWMAN, JOSEPH & RACHEL #1/17** This is an application for renewal of a special use permit for a accessory apartment. This property is located in an R1-20 zoning district.  
**Property Address:**  
**388 London Rd.**  
**Section 17.17, Block 3, Lot 27**

Not open. Applicant need to provide the list of who the notice was sent to.

**ANTONUCCI, DEAN #2/17** This is an application to allow a shed with a side yard setback of 8.5' where a minimum of 10' is required as per section 300-21 and Appendix A of the Town Zoning Code. This property is located in a R1-10 zone.  
**Property Address:**  
**1572 Wenonah Trail**  
**Section 25.08, Block 2, Lot 52**

Mailings and sign certification in order.

Melissa Antonucci appeared before the Board.

Memo from the Assistant Building Inspector dated February 22, 2017 states:

I have inspected the property on February 22, 2017. The foundation for the shed (building permit #20160417) was not laid out properly and was built in the incorrect location.

There is a tent structure over 200 square feet in size located in the rear yard that requires a building permit.

Mr. Gregory said the applicant indicated he was removing the tent.

Chairman Fine asked Mr. Gregory to run through his question regarding side yard vs. rear yard vs. front yard.

Mr. Gregory said they looked at the survey of the property and it looks like the structure itself, the shed, is located in the front yard as opposed to the rear yard. He said he asked the Building Department to clarify that.

Chairman Fine read another memo from the Assistant Building Inspector stating: According to the architect's submission for what is now building permit 20160417, the lakeside of the house was historically considered the front yard, this is how the 10ft. setback of the shed to the property line was approved.

Mrs. Antonucci said they went forward based on what the building department said and poured the slab.

Mr. Gregory suggested that they grant the variance but grant it on the basis of the fact that it should have a 12ft. setback instead of a 10ft. setback, just based on all the reading of the survey.

Chairman Fine asked if they're determining that to be the front yard.

Mr. Gregory said yes.

The Board discussed the application and applied the statutory factors.

Upon motion by Fine, seconded by Fahey and unanimously voted in favor by Bucci, Fahey, Fine, Gregory, and Meisterich, the application for the variance was granted. The Board is determining that the requested variance is actually the front yard of the house not the side yard. It's a front yard variance with a setback of 8.5ft. where a minimum of 12ft. is required instead of 10ft., with the stipulation that this pertains only to the requested variance and not the remainder of the property line, and the area where the proposed shed is going to be is determine to be the front yard of the property. In addition, the varaiance is contingent upon the tent structure being removed.

**DiPAOLO, FRANCINE #3/17** This is an application to allow an existing air conditioning unit with a setback of 34.5' where a minimum of 40' is required for a side yard as per 300-21, 300-13G and Appendix A of the Town Zoning  
**Property Address:**  
**1404 Arch Drive**

**Section 16.13, Block 2, Lot 9** Code. This property is located in a R-20 zone.

Mailings and sign certification in order.

Memo from the Assistant Building Inspector dated February 22, 2017 cited no objections in granting relief. The applicant will need a mechanical permit 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 Bucci, Fahey, Fine, Gregory, and Meisterich, the application for a variance was granted to allow an existing air conditioning unit with a setback of 34.5' where a minimum of 40' is required for a side yard as per 300-21, 300-13G and Appendix A of the Town Zoning Code, with the stipulation that it pertains only to the requested variance and not the remainder of the property line.

**RPG PROPERTIES #4/17** This is an application for new multifamily structures with a side yard setback of 32'6" where a minimum of 50' is required and a combined side yard setback of 65' where a minimum of 100' is required as per sections 300-21 and Appendix A of the Town Zoning Code. They also require a variance for having a building separation of 80' where a minimum of 90' is required as per section 300-21(3)(a)2(a) of the town Zoning Code. This property is located in a R-3 zone.

**Property Address:**  
**3574 Lexington Ave.**  
**Section 15.15, Block 1, Lot 22**

Attorney Albert Capellini representing the applicant.

The premises in question is located on the Easterly side of Lexington Avenue in the Town of Yorktown. It is 1.10 acre of land that was improved by a one family dwelling, and the proposed to be improved with 8 residential apartments, located in two buildings which the site plan will show. This property was re-zoned from R1-20 to R-3 in June 2016, and is presently in front of the Planning Board for site plan approval.

Mr. Capellini showed the Board the layout of the plan that is before the Planning Board.

He said because of the way the buildings are cited, it requires three variances. One is for the back yard, which instead of being 50ft. it's 32.5ft. that's on both sides. The other is the distance of the combined side yards which are 65ft. where you need 100ft. (50 & 50), the R-3 requires 50ft. of front, side and rear, and the third zoning variance is the separation between the buildings. There are two buildings, 4 units in each building, two story apartments. They are 80ft. apart, you need 90ft. That was asked that we provided so that there would be a bit larger back yard for each of the tenants.

Chairman Fine asked if they're giving up the center to get more in the back.

Mr. Capellini replied yes.

Mr. Bucci asked if the 90 foot design was to keep the building further apart for fire safety. Mr. Capellini said it's not a building code reason, think it's a number wherein you can fit the parking. The parking is in between the two buildings.

Mr. Capellini showed the Board where the fence will be placed, as to block any bright lights from vehicles spreading out into the neighborhood to the East.

Mr. Capellini said to the East is a residential development known as Ellis Street, Clover Street, etc., and to the West is Lexington Avenue. Lexington Avenue is a very eclectic scenario, you have to the North of this site a single family home that has grown over the years. Believe there're 6 apartments in that one family home. Directly South of this property is a congregate care nursing facility. Across the street is a multi-family bungalow type of situation that exist, there are two of them in the Cortlandt township. So the character of the neighborhood is essentially oriented to Lexington Avenue, it is not really part in terms of the character of the residential homes to East of this property. The Planning Board realizing that we could do an as of right scenario (which he showed the plan to the Board).

The only difference here is the back yard of the apartments would be in the buffer area that the Planning Board and Town Board feels is a desirable thing to have to separate this complex from those residential homes.

There are a couple of no variance scenario, the second one looks like a bunker (which was shown on the plans), four back to back to each other and the parking gets closer to the neighborhood. The ideal layout as you'll see from the Planning Board memo in support of the application is the one; Option A-1-90, which provides a buffer to the Easterly neighbors.

Mr. Bucci asked Mr. Capellini if he's saying he have several methods of doing this without coming before this Board.

Mr. Capellini said right, but they believe that this is the best planning way to do it.

Mr. Bucci asked, you're saying this is preferable for the neighborhood and everyone involved, but it would require the Board to grant some variances.

Mr. Capellini said absolutely.

Mr. Fahey asked if the driveway width that's open onto Lexington Avenue, does that change or is that the same size as proposed in all the plans.

Phil Saunders, Architect, responded said yes.

Mr. Fahey asked what the width of the driveway is.

Mr. Saunders said 30ft.

Mr. Fahey asked if they could get a fire apparatus to the furthest units that are being proposed, is there room to turn around in that lot.

Mr. Capellini said as long as there's no cars parking there, yes.

Mr. Fahey asked, in the building proposed, are there supposed to be sprinklers.

Mr. Capellini said they have to be.

Mr. Fahey then asked if there's a hydrant on the property.

Mr. Saunders showed the Board on the plans where the hydrants will be. Whatever the code need to do, they will. They haven't done architectural drawings.

Mr. Capellini said they're going through plan approval so they still have to affirm up some of details. He said this also have to be reviewed by the Fire Prevention Board.

Mr. Meisterich asked if the roof are peaked roof or flat.

Mr. Capellini said they will show a rendering (a rendering of 6 units was shown).

The original proposal was for 18 units on this site and then it got withered down slowly in front of the Town Board, ultimately it came down to that is would be 8 units.

Memo from the Assistant Building Inspector dated February 22, 2017 cited no objections.

Memo from the Planning Board dated February 23, 2017 states:

The Planning Board is currently review the subject property for approval of a Residential Site Plan. During the process the Board reviewed several alternative layouts for the proposed units. The alternative that requires no variances necessitates the construction of one building in the center of the property with a circular driveway and parking surrounding it. The Board found this layout highly undesirable for many reasons, the few most significant being that this layout required a significant amount of impervious surface, brought vehicles closer to residential neighbors on all sides, allowed for very little landscaping or screening, and give the individual units no outdoor living space. In addition, the refuse enclosure would be located in the eastern portion of the sire closest to the adjacent neighborhood.

For these reasons, the Board felt it was more desirable to separate the building into two rows with the parking in the center of the sire. To that end, the applicant submitted two alternatives that separate the buildings and did not require variances; Option A (later known as Option A-1-90) and Option E. The Planning Board did not favor Option E because the rear of one of the rows of unit would face Lexington Avenue. This orientation provided no privacy for the units and an undesirable streetscape.

The Board therefore preferred Option A-1-90 because it minimize many of their previous concerns.

This layout significantly decreases the amount of impervious surface required for access and parking and increases the outdoor living spaces both around the units and on the eastern side of the site against the adjacent neighborhood. This layout also provides ample room for landscaping and screening. A fence is proposed along the east side of the parking area to block headlights from shining into the adjacent neighborhood. Finally, the refuse enclosure is located along Lexington Avenue and away from existing homes.

The Town Code requires the proposed two buildings to be 90 feet apart, however the Board requested the applicant submit a plan showing the buildings 80 feet apart to evaluate the impact. The only difference between the two plans is that 5 feet of lawn area was taken from in front of the units on each side, and added to the side yards. The Board determined this 5 feet would be better used in the side yards, than in the front of the units. Therefore increasing this variance and decreasing the side yard variances, would create the most desirable living environment for the proposed project. For these reasons, the Planning Board prefers Option A-1-90 and supports the variances as requested.

Chairman Fine said an affidavit was submitted from Gerry Walsh, but Counsel can summarize. Mr. Capellini said the large photo that was given to the Board is a Google map of Exhibit F in the affidavit, it shows the character, the nature on the orientation on Lexington Avenue is a separate character that exist on Ellis Street and Clover Road. One is totally residential, the latter of which and the former which is along Lexington is totally eclectic.

Mr. Bucci asked what is being proposed in the buffer.

Mr. Capellini said nothing, it is to remain a buffer.

Mr. Bucci asked, is it going to be a lawn, natural vegetation; are you going to put a fence along the back.

Mr. Capellini said it will be natural vegetation.

Thomas Perron, a neighbor whose property borders this property appeared before the Board to voice his concern. He said as you're probably not aware of, is the proposal to change from R-1 zoning to R-3 basically put the neighborhood into an uproar and they made an attempt to stop it with a petition. 95% of the neighborhood said they did not care for rental property to be in their neighborhood, and there's no way that this is not part of their neighborhood. The neighbor, Louie who use to live on that property, it was a single family home. When these gentlemen came to him 4-5 years ago, they wanted to run a sewer line so they can improve the lot, but they did not get the variances.

His feeling is the plan was all along to put some kind of out of character, not characteristic to the neighborhood, alien unit in a one family home area. The whole neighborhood spoke out against it but they were voted down by the Town Board, now it went to the Planning Board.

What this type of project opens up to the neighborhood is a tremendous impact on the land area, you're not accounting for the fact you're going to have 8 families there, multiple cars, trucks, dogs, dogs barking, the density, the cars running, could be motorcycles, could be RVs, could be trucks for businesses, you're impacting the neighborhood. Children have to go to school, renters do not pay property taxes like we do.

Chairman Fine said the owner of the rental property does.

Mr. Perron said it's true, but it's not going to be anything in comparison to what we pay.

What he's trying to get at is if you're going to go and cram so many people into a 1 acre lot that's perfect for a one family or two family house, what is the hardship? There's no hardship here. If that's the case, why don't you let them build up to the property line and give them what they want and put up multiple structures, but if you're having this meeting to determine whether this is sensible or not. Isn't it sensible to keep the character of the neighborhood, the way it is, one family homes, now it's two family homes, maybe.

Chairman Fine said there are several criteria the Board has to review by law.

First, it's not a question whether or not we like the proposed usage, it's permissible, but the first we need to look at whether or not they need the variances. If they can do the project without the variances, because if they can do the project without the variances there's nothing we can do about it.

Mr. Perron said the project is a multiple family dwelling in a one family neighborhood.

Chairman Fine responded but it's a permissible use.

Mr. Bucci told Mr. Perron we're not here to decide whether or not multiple family is preferable for this lot as oppose to single family, we're here to basically decide whether they need a certain amount of relief from the setbacks.

Chairman Fine said and in looking at that is whether or not they can do this without any variances whatsoever, and what they've shown us is yes they can. So, if you step back to that point of view, if we say fine build it without any variances, then what the Planning Board is says they can do it, but it's not going to look very good.

Mr. Fahey said told Mr. Perron essentially the way it's written right now, you go three choices and this is the lesser of three evils. For you now, you'll have a worst case scenario with the other two that are laid out, this was the more acceptable to everyone, more appealing to the eye. But as far as whether you could have the number of houses that are going to be there, we have no choice in that, it's the matter of the design of the layout of the property.

Mr. Bucci asked, if we say not to that or determine that that doesn't seem to be something that's to be approved, are the other two possibilities something that you'll be able to live with. It's your lesser of three evils.

Mr. Gregory told Mr. Perron this has everything to do with design of layout, there's already been an action by the legislative body, the Town Board, who has zoned the property to R-3. What that essentially does it will allow the use of the property as multi family, it's permitted.

What's happening now with the Planning Board is they're going through the review of the design that the applicant has presented to them, and what they're trying to do is come up apparently with the design that they think fits the neighborhood better than all their alternatives, and as a result of this what they've come up with is a design that they think is a better design not only for the neighbors, but also for the neighborhood as a whole. We're not in a position at this juncture to say you can't do the 8 units or 6 units.

Mr. Perron asked if there's enough room for a fire truck to go in there.

Chairman Fine said that's why it have to be reviewed by the Fire Prevention.

Mr. Bucci said this is something that needs to be brought up at the Planning Board because they are the ones that's going to approve that site plan, that's really where that argument needs to be made.

Mr. Perron said the Planning Board didn't care about the character of the neighborhood but you care about the character of the neighborhood, and the character of the neighborhood is being changes by something really outrageous.

Mr. Perron then asked if there'll be fire escapes on the back of the units.

Mr. Gregory said what they have to do in addition to getting site plan approval there are building codes that define things dealing with fire safety that they're going to have to comply with.

Mr. Perron asked about the fence. He would determine that they should request a variance for some sort of sound wall, some king of high wall.

Mr. Meisterich said that's a good point, right now on the plan there's screening. That is something we do have a little bit of leeway to define, we can see a way to improve the screening somehow. There's a rendering that was shown with natural screening.

Mr. Capellini said he wanted to make a point, the issue is variances for side yard, for separation of the building, not the issue of compatibility, not the issue of whether it's destructive to the character of the neighborhood, because those issues were decided by the Town Board when they rezoned the property to R-3. There are certain thing that go along with R-3, there's more activity that exists than a single family home. That's all built into the R-3 zoning.

Chairman Fine asked if the buffer area is being discussed with the Planning Board, what's going there.

Mr. Saunders responded yes, this plan was a reaction to the last work session with the Planning Board, it was to add the additional landscaping.

Mr. Capellini said it is because of Mr. Perron, because he came to the meetings, to the Town Board along with his neighbors and to the Planning Board that's why they have this plan that has a buffer, an unadulterated buffer. There's not going to be any activities to occur in there. It's not going to be the back yard for any of the units, it's all been shifted for the benefit of the neighbors.

Mr. Saunders said on the original plans to meet the code had a playground, and the Board said to remove it. They've heard all the comments of the neighbors about the sound barriers, the noise, the does, and the cut through traffic, and think they've come up with a plan that address all the issues, don't see a 15ft. sound barrier like you see on the interstate is going to be built here, this is the plan from the last session with the Planning Board.

Chairman Fine asked if the fence will need a variance for height.

Mr. Capellini responded no. He said the rest of the issues are laid out, the last point which is the fifth criteria, is this a hardship that we created, we can't say that. In this case we can actually say we didn't create that, we were asked to put it this way. To point out the fourth criteria, all of the environmental concerns, sanitary, sewer, water, stormwater management, all of those are being handled by code. This will be an up to date complex.

The Board discussed the application and applied the statutory factors.

Upon motion by Fine, seconded by Fahey and unanimously voted in favor by Bucci, Fahey, Fine, Gregory, and Meisterich, the application for variances was granted for new multifamily structures with a side yard setback of 32'6" where a minimum of 50' is required, a combined side yard setback of 65' where a minimum of 100' is required, also a building separation of 80' where a minimum of 90' is required, with the stipulation that it be constructed per the Planning Board designation Option A-1-80 on their plan, this is subject to Planning Board approval as well as Fire Prevention review.

Recording Secretary, Glenda Daly

Meeting adjourned at 7:51pm

Happy Zoning!