

MINUTES OF THE YORKTOWN ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
APRIL 24TH, 2025

The regular monthly meeting was held for the Zoning Board of Appeals, Town of Yorktown, at the Yorktown Town Hall, 363 Underhill Avenue, Yorktown Heights, New York, April 24th, 2025. The meeting began at 6:30 p.m.

The following members of the board were present:

John Meisterich, Chairman
Robert Fahey
Anthony Altimari

Also present is Christine Keager, Special Counsel, and Steven Fraietta, Assistant Building Inspector.

The meeting was aired on Channel 20 Cablevision and Channel 33 Verizon Fios.

It was announced that the next public hearing would be held May 22nd, 2025, site visits are scheduled for May 17th, 2025. Mailings are to be sent from April 28th to May 7th, 2025.

NEW BUSINESS

CANTONE #11/25 Property
Address: 1818 Amazon Rd
Section 25.11, Block 1, Lot 5

This is an application for a special use permit for a renewal of an accessory apartment that requires a special use permit as per 300-38 of the Town Zoning Code.

Upon motion by Meisterich, seconded by Fanhey and unanimously voted in favor by Altimari, Fahey and Meisterich, this item will be handled administratively.

DISISTO #12/25 Property
Address: 1678 Amazon Rd
Section 25.12, Block 2, Lot 31

This is an application for a special use permit for a renewal of an accessory apartment that requires a special use permit as per 300-38 of the Town Zoning Code.

Upon motion by Meisterich, seconded by Fahey and unanimously voted in favor by Altimari, Fahey and Meisterich, this item will be handled administratively.

DIAZ #13/25 Property
Address: 1465 Hiawaitha Rd
Section 15.12, Block 2, Lots
21

This is an application to construct a second story addition that will require a front yard setback of 24 ft where 30 ft required as per section 300-21 and Appendix A of the Town Zoning Code.

Upon motion by Meisterich, seconded by Fahey and unanimously voted in favor by Altimari, Fahey and Meisterich, this item was scheduled for a Public Hearing on May 22nd, 2025, Site Visit on May 17th, 2025, and referred to the Building Department.

FRANCHI #14/25 Property
Address: 2936 Meadowcrest
Dr Section 26.12, Block 2,
Lots 43

This is an application to construct an addition that will require a variance on a corner lot with a setback of 31.08 ft where 40 ft required as per section 300-21 and Appendix A of the Town Zoning Code.

Upon motion by Meisterich, seconded by Fahey and unanimously voted in favor by Altimari, Fahey and Meisterich, this item was scheduled for a Public Hearing on May 22nd, 2025, Site Visit on May 17th, 2025, and referred to the Building Department.

LAMP #15/25 Property This is an application for a proposed 2 Lot subdivision will require
Address: 357 Crow Hill Rd a variance with a frontage of 25.15 ft where 200 ft required as per
Section 70.08, Block 1, Lots 8 section 280-A of the Town Zoning Code.
Upon motion by Meisterich, seconded by Fahey and unanimously voted in favor by Altimari, Fahey and Meisterich, this item was scheduled for a Public Hearing on May 22nd, 2025, Site Visit on May 17th, 2025, and referred to the Building Department and Planning Department.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

DAMIANO #01/24 This is an application for a special use permit for a new accessory
Property Address: apartment that requires a special use permit as per 300-38 of the
756 Hanover Town Zoning Code.
Section 59.11, Block 1, Lot 19
Adjournment requested by applicant.

POGGIOREALE #35/24 This is an application for a NEW children's day care center that
Property Address: requires a special use permit as per 300-53 of the Town Zoning
2829 Crompond Rd Code.
Section 26.20, Block 2, Lot 3
Application before the Planning Board.

PANBAR REALTY #39/24 This is an application to combine two (2) lots to create one (1)
Property Address: 3301 & single lot that will require a variance for a total amount lot
3307 LOOKOUT ST area of 10,000 sq. ft where 20,000 sq. ft is required as per section
Section 16.17, Block 4, Lots 300-21 and Appendix A of the Town Zoning Code.
20 & 22

Chairman Meisterich said we have had this hearing on going, you tried to purchase two lots and merge them, two 5,000 sq.ft. lots and merge them into a 10,000 sq.ft. lot and seek a variance for that because the minimum lot size in an R-110 is 20,000 sq.ft., so basically you presented everything the last time, we then adjourned it because we did not have a quorum. I have a few new memos.

Memo from the Planning Board, dated February 27, 2025 states:

At its meeting on January 27, 2025, the Planning Board discussed the subject referral for a variance to facilitate the creation of a single-family residential lot consisting of 10,000 square feet, where 20,000 square feet is required. The proposed lot is made up of two 5,000 square foot lots that act as septic areas for each of their adjacent 10,000 square foot lots. Information and comments are as follows:

Property Information 16.17-4-20

Owner of Record: Jose Cadavid

Structure: Septic System

Site Description: 5,000 square foot lot serving as a septic system for adjacent 10,000 square foot parcel 16.17-4-21.

16.17-4-22

Owner of Record: John & Rita L. Marone

Structure: Septic System

Site Description: 5,000 square foot lot serving as a septic system for adjacent 10,000 square foot parcel 16.17-4-19.

Plan Review

The supporting site plan shows the creation of a 10,000 square foot lot with 100 feet of frontage on Hollywood Street, leaving the two existing houses on identical 10,000 square foot lots. The proposed structure complies with the required setbacks and proposes a driveway and curb cut onto Hollywood Street. The footprint of the structure appears to be 60' x 30' and 1,800 square feet, although this is not stated on the plan. The proposal meets lot coverage, lot depth, and lot width. Environmental resource maps do not predict the presence of wetlands within the confines of this neighborhood nor the subject parcel.

Neighborhood and District Conditions

The subject property exists in a single-family neighborhood laid out on a regular grid street system and mapped as an R1-10 zoning district. This district originally required a minimum lot size of 10,000 square feet, but was modified at some point in the latter quarter of the previous century to a 20,000 square foot minimum. The buildout of the neighborhood predominately followed the original requirement, as most lots are over 10,000 square feet or larger. There are a number of substandard lots, less than 10,000 square feet east of the lake, with the smallest containing 5,000 square feet. West of the lake, the neighborhood was largely compliant in lot size, perhaps due to the timing relative to the town's evolution of zoning requirements. There are a number of lots that are configured and of a size that have potential for a subdivision in like manner as the subject parcel (see attached map). The area is served with sewer and water.

Planning/ Zoning Considerations

While it is recognized that the two developed lots were both existing at 10,000 square feet, they both have distinct abutting 5,000 square feet lots which could have, and possibly should have, been combined to be less nonconforming developments. The requested variance therefore appears to this Board to have the effect of increasing the nonconformity of the two existing houses and creating a new developed, non-conforming lot where there was no ability to develop prior. This raises the question as to the impetus for the ca. 1980s change in this district of the minimum area requirement to 20,000 square feet from 10,000 square feet. There is a common perception connecting the historical evolution of design requirements of septic systems with this minimum area increase. However, if septic systems could not be accommodated on 10,000 square feet lots, such impracticality would be self-regulating, as may have been the case with these two developments (requiring an additional 5,000 square feet over the 10,000 square feet original lots) and not require a higher minimum area. Therefore, the increase may have been adopted in order to regulate density of units in the neighborhood and density or size of physical structures related to their lot size. Other considerations, such as population growth, adequate road infrastructure, etc., may have been considered.

The question, therefore, is whether it is desirable to permit development of this zoning district at a density that is contrary to its expected developed density under the zone's current requirements. If so, and if the zoning district's infrastructure characteristics and neighborhood characteristics support density at 10,000 square feet minimum lot size, the Board questions whether the proper course to effect such build-out is via a series of zoning variances. Further, if infrastructure alone is determinative, then other neighborhoods may expect such opportunity even though set in an R1-20 zone or an R1-40 zone. Taking the attached map in this context, the Board questions whether this district can adequately support a development growth of 15 to 25% or more.

While on its face, a structure built on a 10,000 square feet lot may not be anomalous to the neighborhood, and while the granting of this variance and its development will likely not significantly disrupt the characteristics of this neighborhood on its own, the Board feels there are longer-term considerations regarding the appropriate and orderly development of this neighborhood and the Town.

Letter from the neighbors, dated February 1st, 2025 states:

We would like to add a few more points to the discussion we had about this application at the last meeting on 01/ 23/ 2025.

The Builder, (Hopefully we got the gentleman' s name correctly: Louis Pani?) stated - responding to our concerns about the water- runoff—" there are no trees on those lots" That is incorrect, as we said before, and for the record a photo is attached, showing plenty of large trees on those lots, those would be lost as a result of construction there.

He also stated that the zoning ordinance was changed only because at the time there were only septic tanks in the area, - no sewer system - and too many septic tanks would be bad for the environment.

Again, it must be incorrect. If that were the only reason, then the zoning standards could have been reversed after the majority of the properties in this area were connected to the Peekskill sewer system many years ago. Nevertheless, they were not reversed.

We fail to see the hardship that would necessitate a variance, other than the ZONING ORDINANCE itself, but we do not think that qualifies for a variance.

Also, at the last meeting there was talk about the parcels were sized for summer cottages, - and somehow that would be relevant today? We do not see how it would matter today. There are no more cottages here. Practically all houses were remodeled, and updated. Certainly, the applicant would not want to build a summer cottage on this new lot either. So no, - we would not like to go back to the Summer Cottage Era".

Granting this variance, precisely would put us on the path back to the " Summer Cottage Era" because it would provide precedence creating not just one, but three 100' x 100' properties.

Currently all properties are larger in this section of Hollywood Street Please review the highlighted quotes on the attached pages, from New York State, Department of State: Local Government Technical Series. We think they firmly support our opposition of this variance. We ask you again to decline the application for the stated reasons.

Thanks for your attention,

Hollywood Street Residents, opposing the granting of Variance for this Application

Chairman Meisterich summarized the contents of the letter stating it refers to is a set of instructions for the Zoning Board of Appeals telling us how to make deliberation, and reminding us of what or factors to consider in variance.

John Barile said I understand what the Planning Board said I do not think allowing this to happen would really affect the nature of the neighborhood, there is plenty of 10,000 sq. ft. and sub 10,000 sq.ft. lots in the area. I do not see what the drawback would be. I understand the people in the area do not want it, they want as much space and trees as possible I get that, but I do not think this would be a detriment in any way.

Chairman Meisterich ask If there are any comments from the audience, Mr Lazio Kovacs, neighbor came to the podium.

Mr. Kovacs Said I just want to say that they mention 10,000 sq.ft. parcels in the area, but not in the direct area none of that on that street is under 100,000.

Chairman Meisterich said actually that is not true I think the neighbor right next door is 10,000 sq.ft.so you have Hollywood Street where this lot really is.

Mr. Fahey said on that side of the street where they are proposing to build those houses all those lots are 100x100 sq.ft. I did a little research on this property. When they bought those lots, when it was first being developed none of those houses were there. There was an outfit called Mohegan Manor Land Corp. and they were selling properties. It originally started out in 1927 selling 50x100 lots. The two lots that are on that property were bought in 1927 of 50x100, after that in 1932 when the zoning was changed, they went to 100x100. So those two that are there, they were subpar and they got divided. Really if you combine them they would be 100x100 lot not a 50x100 lot, and they would be in conformity with that side of the street. On the other side of the street that was different, those houses came much later, but initially when they first built those houses they were all 100x100 lots.

Mr. Kovacs said yes, but these lots were part of another lot, another owner.

Mr. Fahey said you are right, the lot behind them was a 100x100 lot, the guy bought two lots, but initially if you look how that is laid out, there were supposed to be instead of two 50x100 lots, it was supposed to be one 100x100 lot.

Mr. Fahey discussed with the applicant where the septic systems are located and condition of the septic systems.

Chairman Meisterich told Mr. Kovacs, I just want to point out what I was speaking about the lot sizes a few minutes ago. On Lookout they are all 10,000sq.ft., I was trying to correct my mistake of what I said to you.

Mr. Fahey pointed out that the original two 50x100 lots were sold as such in 1927 and that as such they predate zoning. I asked our attorney if that had/has an impact on this application as it is my understanding that a right of use exists. Our attorney was not sure but would look into the matter and advise.

Chairman Meisterich said the first thing I am going to say is that I am going to Close and Reserve the hearing tonight once I do a motion only because there are only three of us, and really not to your advantage to have three person vote on this, I want the full Board to vote on this one.

Mr. Barile asked, the other gentleman that is not here, I believe he recused himself the last time, so does he get a vote in this.

Chairman Meisterich said no.

Chairman Meisterich said Bill is not here, four is better than three because one vote would deny the application. It is fairly complicated, these issues, and we also requested many records that I think we need to review a little bit more before we render a decision. One of the main thing I suppose that came up through some of this is increasing the non-conformity of the two existing lots, that was said in the Planning Board memo, that have been brought up and I think this is more of a legal issue to me in the sense to say are these lots have they ever been merged or deemed to be merged, and if the answer to that is no, you are not increasing the non-compliance of the two existing lots. So if these lots were never merged in any paperwork, in any legal sense, in any tax documents, if they were not merged, you are not increasing any non-conformity of the two existing properties.

The matter was discussed further and also discussed the septic systems.

Upon motion by Meisterich, seconded by Fahey and unanimously voted in favor by Altimari, Fahey and Meisterich, this item is Closed & Reserved.

NEW PUBLIC HEARING

WINTER

#03/25

Property Address:

1770 Morris Lane

Section 25.16, Block 1, Lot 24

This is an application for a front yard variance and a special permit for an existing shed under 100 square feet and addition of a chicken coop to the shed with a setback of 31.3 ft where 40 feet is required by section 300- 21 with Appendix A and section 300- 81.3 of the Town Zoning Code

Mailings and sign certification in order.

Edward Winter appeared before the Board.

Chairman Meisterich said it is two variances, hopefully that is what was noticed. One is for the shed now, but really the main consideration I suppose is the chicken coop, that supposedly going to be attached to the shed.

Mr. Winter said not attached, adjacent to, next to but not physically attached.

Mr. Altimari said it is going to be on the back side near the stream.

Mr. Winter said the idea was it was going to be hidden, kind of tucked behind the tool shed, and can do an extended run along the side, just to give a little more space. The location was chosen because the property have some pretty steep hills with the creek, and that spot is the furthest from both our house and the neighbor and also figuring it would be tucked behind the shed with a little added screening, no one would ever see it.

Mr. Fahey said out of curiosity, when you did the plans for this, how are you going to get rid of the waste, how do you clean that up, what are you going to do with that.

Mr. Winter said mostly compost system. There is one system where it is called a deep compost, where you just keep adding pine shavings. Basically the interior is a dirt floor, where the hens roost, there is actually a pull out like a plastic sheeting that you can pull out. You can do a deep compost on site where it get kind of turned over until it is decomposed and then you add that as fertilizer to all our gardens, or you can take that and bag it and trash it, but we would not do that we would just turn it over and use it as compost.

Mr. Altimari said so they are going to be on dirt, there is not a floor in the coop.

Mr. Winter said it is a ground floor in the run and then you can add tuns of pine shavings.

Mr. Fahey asked, did Conservation Board come out to see this.

Mr. Winter said no.

Chairman Meisterich said we did not refer it.

Mr. Fahey said we did have some concern when we went out to see this property. When you look at the existing shed, it is obviously going to be some rain runoffs that run down into that stream, and that stream does go into protected wetlands across the street, and my question is, you are dealing with some high nitrogen waste and how do you keep that from running into that protected wetland area.

Mr. Winter said it would be pretty easy to put in an 18-inch retaining wall just on the north side of the coop, and add gravel, that would probably catch runoff and give it a good containment site.

Memo from the Assistant Building Inspector, dated April 21, 2025 states:
I inspected this property on April 17, 2025 and found due to the topographic conditions of the property and location, it would not be feasible to locate the chicken coop in the rear of the house. I have no objections of granting relief for the variance requested and a special permit for the coop.

Letter from neighbor David Raciti, dated April 10, 2025 in support of the application.

The location of the coop was discussed due to concerns about it being in the front yard.

Upon motion by Meisterich, seconded by Fahey and unanimously voted in favor by Altimari, Fahey and Meisterich, the application for a variance was granted for shed with a setback of 31. 3 ft where 40 feet is required, with the stipulation it pertains only to the shed and not the remainder of the property line.

Upon motion by Meisterich, seconded by Fahey and unanimously voted in favor by Altimari, Fahey and Meisterich, the application for a special use permit for a period of one year for a chicken coop with a variance attached that is allowed to be in the front yard, with the stipulation that you implement the screening roughly as depicted in photoshopped rendering submitted and construct a retaining wall to divert the runoff as much as possible away from the stream.

ARDOLINO	#04/25	This is a request for a zoning variance for a lot line change that
Property Address:		will reduce the lot size of 2583 Hedwig Dr from 20,009.0690 sq. ft.
2853 Hedwig Dr.		to 17,839.5835 sq. ft. and increase the lot size of 2845 Hedwig Dr
Section 27.10, Block 1, Lot 26		from 13,544.4992 sq. ft. to 15,713.9712 sq. ft. These properties
		are located in an R1-20 Zoning District.

Mailings and sign certification in order.

Jeffrey Ardolino appeared before the Board.

Mr. Ardolino said own both adjacent properties, had a new survey done with lot line adjustment. For an old lake community, it better balances the two (2) specific properties.

Memo from the Planning Board, dated April 10, 2025 states:

At its meeting of April 7, 2025, the Planning Board discussed the subject referral. The Board has no

planning objections to the issuance of a lot area variance as a result of the proposed lot line adjustment.

Memo from the Assistant Building Inspector, dated April 21, 2025 states:

I inspected this property on April 17, 2025 and found no apparent violations on both properties. I have no objections to granting relief.

Upon motion by Meisterich, seconded by Fahey and unanimously voted in favor by Altimari, Fahey and Meisterich, the application for a variance was granted for a lot line change that will reduce the lot size of 2583 Hedwig Dr from 20,009.0690 sq. ft. to 17,839.5835 sq. ft. and increase the lot size of 2845 Hedwig Dr from 13,544.4992 sq. ft. to 15,713.9712 sq. ft.

FANNING

#05/25

Property Address:

3147 Old Yorktown Rd

Section 26.07, Block 1, Lot 30

This is an application for a special use permit to allow a NEW chicken coop that requires a special use permit as per 300-81 of the Town Zoning Code.

Mailings and sign certification in order.

Brian Fanning appeared before the Board.

Chairman Meisterich said basically it is another one of these chicken coop. You submitted plans that shows the waste management plan, and the containers for the food and the things that are required for the special permit.

The Board and Mr. Fanning discussed where the front yard is and location of the coop.

Chairman Meisterich said as far as this structure, I would make the determination that it is not in the front yard.

Memo from the Assistant Building Inspector, dated April 21, 2025 states:

I inspected this property on April 17, 2025 and have no objections of granting a special permit.

Upon motion by Meisterich, seconded by Fahey and unanimously voted in favor by Altimari, Fahey and Meisterich, the application for a special use permit was granted for a period of one (1) to allow a New chicken coop that requires a special use permit .

CRUZ

#06/25

Property Address:

2109 Allen Ave

Section 37.14, Block: 1, Lot: 1

This is an application to construct an addition that will require a front yard setback of 27.30 sq. ft where 30 sq. ft required as per section 300-21 and Appendix A of the Town Zoning Code.

Mailings and sign certification in order.

Gregory Morman, Architect, appeared on the Applicant behalf.

Mr. Morman said the project itself is an existing single family home, the homeowners are looking to do a small renovation by extending the existing bedroom in the rear to create a master bedroom suite, as well as adding a one car garage. It is the one car garage that is actually encroaching the front yard setback. The community in this area, the roadway is a little swirly as pretty common in the township, it creates a lot of soft corners for a lot of lots which is actually pretty common, but the adjacent corner lot which corner lots always just et double whammy when it comes to zoning. The neighboring lots have soft corners of about 30-40ft. radius where as this property, which I am defining as the hardship mainly, this property have a very large corner radius it is almost a three sided property rather than a four sided property, so with the front yard setback definition, it is simply following what is a 100ft radius on the corner of the property and by adding the one car garage that deminimus encroachment of less than 3ft. is just simple of the geometry of the new garage where it is a square garage with a round corner property line.

In addition, while it is not of topic to the of the variance request, the property is under size and it is

an existing non-conforming, it is about 50% of the required lot size of this district, but in terms of percentage of coverage, everything is conforming. So the only hardship here is the less than 3ft, encroachment of the front yard.

Memo from the Assistant Building Inspector, dated April 21, 2025 states:

I inspected this property on April 17, 2025 and found no apparent violations. I have no objections to granting relief. A building permit and a certificate of occupancy will be required.

The Board discussed the application and applied the statutory factors.

Upon motion by Meisterich, seconded by Fahey and unanimously voted in favor by Altimari, Fahey and Meisterich, the application for a variance was granted to construct an addition that will require a front yard setback of 27.30 sq. ft where 30 sq. ft required, 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.

GAUR **#07/25** This is an application for a special use permit for a renewal of an accessory apartment that requires a special use permit as per 300-38 of the Town Zoning Code.
Property Address:
1798 French Hill Rd
Section 37.18, Block: 1, Lot: 7
Not open. No mailings.

PETRINO **#08/25** This is an application for a zoning variance to construct an addition of a storage room and replace a deck that will require a side yard variance of 9 ft. where 12 ft. is required as per section 300-21 and Appendix A and Town Zoning Code.
Property Address:
1579 Summit St
Section 48.11, Block 3, Lot 39

Mailings and sign certification in order.

Rich Vale, Architect, appeared on the Applicant behalf.

Mr. Vale said we are proposing to renovate the existing deck, so there will be no footprint change. The stairs is rickety so we are going to be replacing that, and trying to hang on to as much of the structure as we can, we are going to see how it goes as we take the decking off. We will be replacing the railings and decking, possibly some of the framing depending on the condition. Additionally Mr. Petrino would like to construct a storage shed underneath the deck. It is setback a couple feet from the 9ft. projection of the deck. The shed would be constructed within the perimeter of the structural post.

Memo from the Assistant Building Inspector, dated April 21, 2025 states:

I inspected this property on April 17, 2025 and found no apparent violations. I have no objections to granting relief. A building permit and a certificate of occupancy will be required.

The Board discussed the application and applied the statutory factors.

Upon motion by Meisterich, seconded by Fahey and unanimously voted in favor by Altimari, Fahey and Meisterich, the application for a variance was granted to construct an addition of a storage room and replace a deck that will require a side yard variance of 9 ft. where 12 ft. is required, with the stipulation it pertains only to the requested variance and not the remainder of the property line, and the project be in substantial conformity to the plans submitted.

GEISLER **#09/25** This is an application for a special use permit to create a NEW accessory apartment that requires a special use permit as per 300-38 of the Town Zoning Code.
Property Address:
1804 Lawrence Rd
Section 3, Block 1, Lot: 7

Mailings and sign certification in order.

David Tetro, Architect, appeared with the Applicant.

Mr. Tetro said the project is a substantial alteration and an addition to an existing home. We are fine with everything on the zoning for that except for the fact that the owner is looking for a special permit for an accessory apartment as part of the alteration and addition.

Memo from the Assistant Building Inspector, dated April 21, 2025 states:

I inspected this property on April 17, 2025 and found no apparent violations. This project requires a building permit and certificate of occupancy.

Chairman Meisterich said I think that that basically sums up everything here that the apartment comply with the code.

Upon motion by Meisterich, seconded by Fahey and unanimously voted in favor by Altimari, Fahey and Meisterich, the application for a special use permit to create a NEW accessory apartment that requires a special use permit was granted for a period of three years, with the stipulation that the project be in substantial conformity to the plans submitted.

MONTENEGRO #10/25 This is an application for a special use permit to allow a NEW
Property Address: chicken coop that requires a special use permit as per 300-81 of
3388 Old Yorktown Rd the Town Zoning Code.
Section 16.15, Block 1, Lot 49
Mailings and sign certification in order.

Edwin Montenegro appeared before the Board.

Chairman Meisterich said we received information about the waste management, of composting, rodent proof containers.

Chairman Meisterich asked if there are any comments from the audience.

Adam Link, neighbor said I have no problem with the chicken coop or chickens, depending on how many they are and if they will be selling or stuff like that, but I do have an issue with roosters.

Mr Fahey said that are not allowed.

Chairman Meisterich said I did not mention that earlier and I will mention it to the applications; the code is very specific no roosters are allowed.

Mohamed Naanani said he is concern about noise with music being played after 11 o'clock at night.

Chairman Meisterich said all the permits, and really not even just permit, what we contend with a lot is you have to be harmonious with your neighborhood, and we are not the noise code enforcement or any of that here, but we do approve these permits and in a year, because that is how long the permit is, when you come to renew it if we deem that it is not harmonious with the neighborhood based on the actual execution of what you actually do, then it is not going to be approved. So I always advise people to take your neighbors concern seriously and be very diligent in how you keep your property, your noise, because we do not just grant approval for things that are not harmonious. Now regarding this memo from the neighbor. The town code requires 30ft. from your property line, 50ft. from your structure, no roosters, a waste Management plan. The code takes care of all these concerns so that if you meet the code, you meet the concern of the neighbor. As far as the noise because there are no roosters. So the plan shows 30ft. and we are also doing a site visit, is fairly private in the backyard so I will not necessarily think we need excessive screening.

Memo from the Assistant Building Inspector, dated April 21, 2025 states:

I inspected this property on April 17, 2025 and have no objections of granting a special permit.

Upon motion by Meisterich, seconded by Fahey and unanimously voted in favor by Altimari, Fahey and Meisterich, the application for a special use permit to allow a NEW chicken coop that requires a special use permit was granted for a period of one year.

Meeting adjourned at 7:10pm

Happy Zoning!