THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS OF THE VILLAGE OF MONTEBELLO WAS HELD ON THURSDAY, MAY 15, 2O14 AT THE MONTEBELLO COMMUNITY CENTER. THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 7:48 P.M. FOLLOWED BY THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.

Present:	Rodney Gittens	Chairman
	Janet Gigante	Member
	Stan Shipley	Member
	Jack Barbera	Member
	Scott Goldstein	Member
Others Present:	Ira Emanuel	Assistant Village Attorney
	Gloria Scalisi	Planning & Zoning Clerk
Absent:	Alice DiSanto	Member

Member Goldstein made a motion to approve the minutes of April 17, 2014, seconded by Member Barbera. Upon vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Kimberly Cleary Connolly
41 Mile Road
48.15-1-32
Public Hearing

> Application of Kimberly Cleary Connolly, 41 Mile Road, Montebello, New York, 10901 which was submitted to the Village of Montebello Zoning Board of Appeals for an Area Variance from the requirement of Section 195-19C of the Zoning Code of the Village of Montebello to permit construction, use and maintenance of a fence greater than four (4') feet in the required front yard. The total acreage for the parcel is 0.650 acres. The property is located on the west side of Mile Road, approximately zero feet of the intersection of Nottingham Drive in the Village of Montebello, which is known and designated on the Ramapo Tax Map as Section 48.15, Block 1, Lot 32 in an R-35 Zone.

Chairman Gittens established the posting, publication and mailing legal requirements were met. Chairman Gittens read the application; the Applicant's narrative and denial letter from the Village Building Inspector, dated April 23, 2014.

The Applicant, Kimberly Cleary Connolly, discussed her application for an Area Variance to the Zoning Board of Appeals. Mrs. Connolly stated that the house was purchased in 2010 and in the back side of the house is not very useable due to a very "woody" area and also a poison ivy issue. The terrain, in the back, is not safe for their two year old child. The corner of Mile and Nottingham is a very busy corner and children cannot play in that part of the yard without it being fenced. Mrs. Connolly was also concerned with wild animals such as deer, wild turkeys and unleashed dogs roaming the property. Mrs. Connolly informed the Board that she is a teacher at Suffern High School and is very much concerned with her privacy from the students

running and walking by. Mrs. Connolly presented pictures of five foot fences on corner lots on Mayer Drive and Danielle Court.

Member Barbera stated that the current fence on the Cleary-Connolly property is six feet tall. Mrs. Connolly stated that the fence is five feet with a one foot decorative top.

Chairman Gittens questioned the Applicant on whether the side where they want to move the fence is a side yard or a front yard. Mrs. Connolly stated that she was under the impression that a corner lot has two front yards. Mr. Ira Emanuel, Assistant Village Attorney, stated that Mrs. Connolly's impression is correct.

Member Barbera stated that, after visiting the property, the fence measure six feet and the application states that it is a five foot fence. Therefore the requested variance is for two feet not one.

Mr. Emanuel questioned the measurement of the proposed fence to the curb line or right of way. Mrs. Connolly responded that they measured the proposed fence to the curb line. Mr. Emanuel stated that the pavement is not a correct measurement; the property line is usually about ten feet in from the pavement. Therefore the variance requested is closer to fifteen feet than twenty-five feet.

Member Shipley stated that in his experience with deer or wild turkeys it doesn't matter how high the fences are they will jump them. Member Shipley stated that he has a problem with the height being six feet.

Chairman Gittens understands the Applicant's need for privacy but the Village of Montebello has a standard of allowing only four foot fences in the front yards. Chairman Gittens stated that Village wants an open community not a gated community. Also, the Chairman stated that they do not want to set a precedent in the community.

Mr. Emanuel questioned the Applicant on what can be accomplished with the six foot fence being sought that cannot be accomplished with a four foot fence. Mr. Connolly stated that they already have a six foot fence and financially it would save lots of money to move it rather than get a new fence or modify the existing one. Mrs. Connolly stated that the financial burden would be overwhelming.

Chairman Gittens opened the Public Hearing.

Henry and Carol Cronk, 16 Nottingham Drive, Montebello, New York, are the neighbors directly across the street from the Connolly home, stated that they have no objections to the proposed fence. The proposed fence would be just one line on one side of the property. Mr. Cronk stated that it would not look like a fortress because the proposed fence would not be surrounding the entire property.

Member Barbera informed the Applicants that they have a vinyl fence and it can be cut to size.

No one wishing to comment, Member Goldstein made a motion to close the Public Hearing, seconded by Member Barbera. Upon vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Ira Emanuel, Assistant Village Attorney, read the Resolution into the record:

VILLAGE OF MONTEBELLO
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

IN RE: APPLICATION OF KIMBERLY CLEARY AND DAVID CONNOLLY
CALENDAR CASE NO. 1162

Before the Board of Appeals of the Village of Montebello, at a public hearing held at Montebello Village Hall, Montebello, New York, on May 15, 2014, for variances from the provisions of Section 195-19.C, of the Zoning Local Law of the Village of Montebello to permit the construction, maintenance, and use of a fence greater than 4 feet high in a required front yard.

The premises which are the subject of this application are located at 41 Mile Road, which is on the West side of Mile Road, and 0 feet South of the intersection of Nottingham Drive in the Village of Montebello, and which is known and designated on the Ramapo Tax Map as Section 48.15, Block 1, Lot 32, in a R-35 Zoning District.

The Board, upon motion duly made by Mr. Goldstein, and seconded by Mr. Barbera, resolved:

WHEREAS, the applicant was represented by themselves, and the following documents were placed into the record and duly considered:

Application; Narrative; Short Environmental Assessment Form; Building Inspector's Denial Letter dated April 23, 2014; drawing showing the location of the requested variance; and

WHEREAS, the proposed action is a Type II action under the regulations promulgated pursuant to the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was held on May 15, 2014, and the testimony of the following persons was duly considered: applicant; Henry Cronk and Carol Cronk, 16 Nottingham Drive; and

WHEREAS, all the evidence and testimony was carefully considered and the Zoning Board of Appeals has made the following findings of fact:

The applicant is the owner of the subject premises, which is improved with a single family house and an outdoor swimming pool. The pool is currently surrounded by a six foot high vinyl fence, which is behind the required front yard. The applicant wishes to enlarge the enclosure surrounding the pool by extending the existing fence into the required front yard along

Nottingham Drive, so that it will be 25 feet from the paved surface of the street. The proposed fence would extend the fence by 42 feet on the easterly end and 75 feet on the westerly end.

The applicant claims that a six foot high fence is needed for a variety of reasons, including child safety, protection from animals (including deer and loose dogs), and protection from traffic. In addition, the applicant states that the unenclosed area is the best place for their children to play, as the enclosed area has poor drainage and is not conducive to lawn.

Upon questioning from the Board, the applicant stated that it wished to relocate the existing fence, rather than installing a conforming fence and/or shrubbery, because they felt it would be more economical to relocate the fence.

Henry and Carol Cronk, who live directly across Nottingham Drive from the proposed fence location, stated that they had no objection to relocating the fence as requested.

WHEREAS, this Board has examined the written documentation and reviewed the testimony of the witnesses with respect to the applicant's request for a variance, and, pursuant to the requirements of section 7-712-b(3) of the Village Law, has made the following determinations:

(1) "whether an undesirable change will be produced in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties will be created by the granting of the area variance":

This Board has almost always disapproved fence height variances of the kind sought here, as it wishes to avoid a "tunnel" effect along Village roads. In almost all instances, the protection and privacy sought by an applicant can be achieved, usually with better results, by the planting of hedges or other landscaping.

The area in question has very few fences, and no solid fences in a required front yard. Thus, the introduction of a six foot high solid fence, especially the white PVC proposed by the applicant, is out of character.

(2) "whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by some method, feasible for the applicant to pursue, other than an area variance":

The applicant's concern with protection from loose dogs and deer can be met with thick landscape screening. Deer can easily jump over a six foot high fence, and dogs can easily dig below any fence. The proposed PVC fence will not protect against vehicles. Landscaping can provide the necessary privacy, as well. As discussed above, nothing prevents the applicant from expanding the pool enclosure by means of a conforming fence.

If the applicant wishes to enlarge the pool enclosure into the required front yard, it can do so with a four foot high fence, which will conform to the required codes. Landscaping can augment the conforming fence.

(3) "whether the requested area variance is substantial":

The applicant seeks to bring the fence to 25 feet from the paved surface of Nottingham Drive. However, the applicant's lot line is approximately 10 feet from the paved surface. Thus, the applicant, knowingly or not, wishes to reduce the required front yard from 50 feet to 15 feet, or by 70%. In addition, the proposed fence is six feet high, as opposed to the permitted four foot height – a 50% variation. Such a variance is substantial, especially given that the applicant's goals can be achieved without a variance.

(4) "whether the proposed variance will have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district":

The neighborhood currently does not have fences within required yards. The visual impact will be adverse.

(5) "whether the alleged difficulty was self-created":

The difficulty results entirely from the applicant's desire to relocate the fence.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the application of Kimberly Cleary and David Connolly for variances from the provisions of Section 195-19.C of the Zoning Local Law of the Village of Montebello to permit the construction, maintenance, and use of a fence greater than 4 feet high in a required front yard, as set forth in the application submitted herein, is hereby denied.

MEMBERS PRESENT:	YEA or NAY
Rodney Gittens, Chairman	Yea
Janet Gigante	Yea
Scott Goldstein	Yea
Stan Shipley	Yea
Jack Barbera	Yea

MEMBERS ABSENT:
Alice DiSanto

The Chairman declared the resolution approved and the application denied.

Carol Cronk
16 Nottingham Drive
48.15-1-41
Public Hearing--Continued

Application of Carol Cronk, 16 Nottingham Drive, Montebello, New York 10901 which was submitted to the Village of Montebello Zoning Board of Appeals for Area Variance; Front Yard column 5 [Required: 50 Feet; Proposed: 15 Feet] of the requirement of the Bulk Table, Section 195-13 Use group 9 of the Zoning Code of the Village of Montebello to permit construction, maintenance, and use

of an in-ground swimming pool on a single family dwelling. The total acreage for the parcel is 0.63 acres. The property is located on the north side of Nottingham Drive, approximately zero feet of the intersection of Mile Road in the Village of Montebello, which is known and designated on the Ramapo Tax Map as Section 48.15, Block 1, Lot 41 in an R-35 Zone.

The Applicant's representatives, Mr. Peter Kikot, Landscape Designer/Sales Manager, at Biosphere, and Peter and Carol Cronk are in attendance.

Mr. Emanuel stated that the Building Inspector, Lawrence Picarello, submitted a revised denial letter dated April 14, 2014, in which lesser bulk requirements apply. The discussion is about 15.8' versus 35' as opposed to 15.8' versus 50'. The magnitude of the variance is less.

Member Barbera stated that he has no issues with the revised plan.

Member Shipley stated that he also has no issues with the revised plan.

Member Goldstein stated that he preferred the kidney shaped pool but other than the shape he also has no objections to the revised plan.

Chairman Gittens stated that he was satisfied with the additional information in the revised plan. The request is not a substantial request.

No one wishing to comment, Chairman Gittens made a motion to close the Public Hearing, seconded by Member Goldstein. Upon vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Ira Emanuel, Assistant Village Attorney, read the Resolution into the record:

VILLAGE OF MONTEBELLO
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

IN RE: APPLICATION OF CAROL CRONK
CALENDAR CASE NO. 1163

Before the Board of Appeals of the Village of Montebello, at a public hearing held at Montebello Community Center, Montebello, New York, on April 17, and May 15, 2013, for variances from the provisions of Section 195-13, Use Group g, Column(s) 5, of the Zoning Local Law of the Village of Montebello to permit the construction, maintenance, and use of an in-ground swimming pool in a required front yard.

The premises which are the subject of this application are located at 16 Nottingham Drive, which is on the north side of Nottingham Drive, and 0 feet west of the intersection of Mile Road in the Village of Montebello, and which is known and designated on the Ramapo Tax Map as Section 48.15, Block 1, Lot 41, in a R-35 Zoning District.

The Board, upon motion duly made by Mr. Goldstein, and seconded by Ms. Gigante, resolved:

WHEREAS, the applicant was represented by Peter Kikot of Biosphere Landscaping, and the following documents were placed into the record and duly considered:

Application; Narrative; Short Environmental Assessment Form; Building Inspector's Denial Letter dated February 21, 2014, revised April 14, 2014; drawing showing the location of the requested variance; Village Engineer's memorandum dated March 18, 2014; Applicant's addendum dated May 5, 2014; landscaping plan dated May 5, 2014; Village Engineer's memo dated May 13, 2014; and

WHEREAS, the proposed action is a Type II action under the regulations promulgated pursuant to the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was held on April 17, and May 15, 2013, and the testimony of the following persons was duly considered: Peter Kikot, applicant's representative; Debbie Dowd, 37 Mile Road (adjacent neighbor); and

WHEREAS, all the evidence and testimony was carefully considered and the Zoning Board of Appeals has made the following findings of fact:

The applicant is the owner of the subject premises, which is improved with a single-family dwelling. The applicant wishes to add an in-ground swimming pool to her lot, and proposes to locate it in a required front yard.

The parcel is a corner lot, having frontage on both Nottingham Drive and Mile Road. The long part of the lot extends along Nottingham Drive, and the house runs parallel to that road. Thus, the area behind the house is relatively narrow.

The applicant presented a narrative describing how she came to site the pool at its proposed location. Two other locations on the parcel were investigated. One, to the rear of the house, created the need for different variances and would have intruded into the privacy of the adjoining neighbor to the north. The second, to the west of the house, would require unwanted proximity to the existing driveway, and also is in a low-lying, wet area of the property. This would necessitate additional expense and upkeep. Further, as it adjoins the garage, it is far from the living areas of the house, thus making supervision more difficult.

The selected area, north of the house, is near an existing stone patio and play area. The applicant notes that it will function as part of the recreation area of the house, and that it is visible from within the house. However, it intrudes into the required front yard of Mile Road, reducing that dimension to 15.8 feet.

The revised denial letter from the Building Inspector provides for a different use group than originally identified. Because the lot is undersized, the Building Inspector utilized the relief provisions of § 195-89 and applied Use Group x.1. Under Use Group x.1, the required front yard

is 35 feet, not 50 feet. The application is deemed amended accordingly. A variance is still required, albeit of lesser magnitude.

A review of the maps in the area show that, in the area of the proposed pool, there is a distance of approximately 15 feet between the lot line and the existing paved surface of Mile Road. Thick plantings exist in the area between the pool apron and the lot line, providing visual screening from the road.

In his review memorandum, the Village Engineer noted that the proposed pool is smaller than most residential swimming pools, at 420sf vs. 700-800sf. He also noted that the area proposed is generally flat, with a slight downslope to the West. He notes that the ground continues to slope to the West, following the slope of the road.

It is noted that this application is not subject to review by the Rockland County Planning Department.

Debbie Dowd, the immediately adjacent neighbor, expressed concerns about drainage impacts, as the water table in the area is high. She was advised by the Board that drainage issues were not before the Board, but that she could express her concerns to the Village Engineer. In any event, the Village has strict regulations regarding drainage impacts. The applicant's representative stated that the Village's drainage requirements would be adhered to because they help to insure the integrity of the pool. Ms. Dowd also stated that the suggested pool location is acceptable to her.

In an addendum to her application, dated May 5, 2014, the applicant revised the configuration and location of the proposed pool, and provided additional details. The pool is to be a rectangular, rather than free-form pool, with dimensions of 14' x 30' (420sf). It is to be set behind the front line of the existing dwelling (parallel to Nottingham Drive), and to be moved 3.5 feet further West of the Mile Road lot line (thus decreasing the extent of the needed front yard variance). The existing berm along Mile Road will be extended further North and along the northerly lot line. The patio surrounding the proposed pool will be 1460sf in area, yielding total development coverage of 27.5%. A landscaping plan was also submitted, showing the location of the newly configured pool along with grading. The plan also shows the existing gravel play area to be relocated further to the West, with the area currently used as a play area to be converted to a berm and bioswale.

The Village Engineer provided a memo dated May 13, 2014, detailing engineering concerns relating to the construction of the pool.

WHEREAS, this Board has examined the written documentation and reviewed the testimony of the witnesses with respect to the applicant's request for a variance, and, pursuant to the requirements of section 7-712-b(3) of the Village Law, has made the following determinations:

(1) "whether an undesirable change will be produced in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties will be created by the granting of the area variance":

In-ground swimming pools are not an unusual amenity in this part of the Village. According to satellite imagery, the homes immediately north and south of the subject both have pools, although those pools appear to be within their respective building envelopes.

Unlike other parcels, however, the subject lot is unusual in that it is long and narrow, and has two front yards. There is little area available for a swimming pool to be located. The location of this pool, coupled with the existing landscaping, reduces its impact on the neighborhood.

In addition, the applicant has reduced the size of the pool from the average residential size, and relocated the pool 3.5 feet into the lot, further mitigating its visual impact.

(2) "whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by some method, feasible for the applicant to pursue, other than an area variance":

The applicant has shown that she has explored other locations on her property to site the pool. We believe that her reasons for rejecting those other areas make sense, given the way in which the property is laid out and used, and given the potential impact on her neighbors.

(3) "whether the requested area variance is substantial":

Arithmetically, the requested variance is large. Its impact is mitigated by the plantings. The relocation of the pool reduces the magnitude of the requested variance.

(4) "whether the proposed variance will have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district":

The pool, if properly constructed with appropriate storm water management measures, will have little impact on physical and environmental conditions. Those measures will be overseen by the Village's Building Inspector and Engineer.

(5) "whether the alleged difficulty was self-created":

The difficulty arises from the placement of the existing house on the lot, and the narrowness of the lot itself.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the application of Carol Cronk for variances from the provisions of Section 195-13, Use Group x.1, Column(s) 5, of the Zoning Local Law of the Village of Montebello to permit the construction, maintenance, and use of an in-ground swimming pool in a required front yard, as set forth in the application submitted herein, is hereby approved, subject to

1. the swimming pool shall be built in conformance with a drawing entitled, "Cronk Residence, 16 Nottingham Drive, Montebello, NY, Landscape Plan" prepared by Biosphere Landscape Architecture, dated May 2, 2014, consisting of

one sheet, it being understood that, so long as the construction conforms to the requirements hereof, the pool may be rectangular or free form;

2. no portion of the swimming pool shall be less than 15.8 feet from the Mile Road (easterly) lot line, nor shall any portion of the swimming pool extend beyond a line extending from the front facade of the existing house, all as shown on said drawing;

3. the swimming pool shall be laid parallel to the side of the existing house, as shown on said drawing;

4. the applicant shall comply with comments S-2 through S-6, inclusive, of the Village Engineer's memo dated May 13, 2014 to the reasonable satisfaction of the Village Engineer;

5. the applicant shall submit its building plans to the Village Engineer for review and shall include appropriate subsurface storm water runoff detention;

and the Building Inspector is hereby directed to issue a Building Permit and Certificate of Occupancy to the applicant upon compliance with the terms and conditions of this resolution and with all other applicable laws, rules and regulations.

MEMBERS PRESENT:	YEA or NAY
Rodney Gittens, Chairman	Yea
Janet Gigante	Yea
Stan Shipley	Yea
Jack Barbera	Yea
Scott Goldstein	Yea

MEMBERS ABSENT:
Alice DiSanto

The Chairman declared the resolution approved and the application approved.

Nafesa Farid
652 Haverstraw Road
40.16-1-3.2
Public Hearing—Continued

Application of Nafesa Farid, 652 Haverstraw Road, Montebello, New York, 10901 which was submitted to the Village of Montebello Zoning Board of Appeals for Area Variances; Front Yard column 5 [Required: 50Feet; Proposed: 0 Feet] of the requirement of the Bulk Table, Section 195-13 and a fence greater than 4 feet from the Side and Rear Yard Exceptions requirement of Section 195.19C of the Zoning Code of the Village of Montebello to permit construction, maintenance, and use of a 50'foot X 80'foot Basketball Court and a 66inch high

fence in the front driveway of a single family dwelling. The total acreage for the parcel is 3.05 acres. The property is located on the west side of Route 202 (Haverstraw Road), approximately zero feet of the intersection of Wilber Road in the Village of Montebello, which is known and designated on the Ramapo Tax Map as Section 40.16, Block 2, Lot 3.2 in an ER-80 Zone.

Majid Mohammed
658 Haverstraw Road
40.16-2-3.1
Public Hearing—Continued

Application of Majid Mohammad, 658 Haverstraw Road, Montebello, New York, 10901 which was submitted to the Village of Montebello Zoning Board of Appeals for Area Variance of a fence greater than 4 feet from the Side and Rear Yard Exceptions requirement of Section 195.19C of the Zoning Code of the Village of Montebello to permit construction, maintenance, and use a 66inch high fence in the front driveway of a single family dwelling. The total acreage for the parcel is 1.90 acres. The property is located on the west side of Route 202 (Haverstraw Road), approximately zero feet of the intersection of Wilber Road in the Village of Montebello, which is known and designated on the Ramapo Tax Map as Section 40.16, Block 2, Lot 3.1 in an ER-80 Zone.

In attendance were the Applicant's representatives, Mr. Majid Mohammed and Mr. Azam Mohammed along with the Applicant's Engineer, Mr. Ray Ahmadi. Both applications were discussed simultaneously.

Chairman Gittens stated that these Applications are a continuation from last month and additional information was read into the record; new drawing (2pages) with a revision date of 4/30/14; Narrative summaries dated 5/1/2014; a Memorandum from the Building Inspector dated 5/15/2014; and a Memorandum from the Village Engineer dated 5/14/14.

Mr. Ahmadi stated that the application for Mr. Majid Mohammed at 658 Haverstraw Road, Montebello, New York is being withdrawn at this time and for the application for 652 Haverstraw Road only the portion of the application that deals with the wall on Haverstraw Road is also being withdrawn.

Mr. Emanuel discussed the Building Inspector's memo dated May 15, 2014 in which states that the lights are a prohibited use in this location [195.11J Prohibited Uses; Use dangerous to the comfort, peace and enjoyment of the area]. Mr. Emanuel informed the Applicant that if they want to pursue the lights they need to amend their application and re-notice the public.

Mr. Ahmadi informed the Zoning Board of Appeals that the Applicants will be removing the lights entirely from the application. Mr. Ahmadi informed the Board that he will put a four foot black chain link fence on three sides and a six foot tall fence on the inboard side.

Chairman Gittens questioned the Applicant on why they need a fence around the court to begin with. Mr. Mohammed replied that it is a multi-sport court.

Mr. Ahmadi stated that the applicant will plant trees on the north and south portions of the property line to help hide the visual impact of the basketball court. The trees planted would be 6-7 feet tall.

Chairman Gittens questioned the Applicant on whether he will change the plans to reflect the changes discussed at this meeting. Mr. Ahmadi stated that he will remove the lighting completely, add the correct sizes to the fence surrounding the basketball court.

Chairman Gittens stated that the Applicant will need to appear one more time so that the Board will vote on a plan that reflects all the changes discussed.

Chairman Gittens opened the Public Hearing.

Kevin Stevens, 642 Haverstraw Road, Montebello, New York stated that he was surprised to see the lights on the plan since at the last meeting the Applicant stated that he would remove them. Mr. Stevens would like to see a final plan before the Board can make a final decision. Mr. Stevens would like to request that the Applicant move the berm to the south slightly west to lessen the visual impact.

David Stern, 676 Haverstraw Road, Montebello, New York stated that they no objections to the basketball court as long as the Applicant removes the lights.

Mr. Mohammed discussed the lighting and foot candles.

Mr. Emanuel stated that it is not necessarily the light per se; it is what the light will allow. In addition to the actual physical aspect there is noise and commotion.

Elizabeth Stevens, 642 Haverstraw Road, Montebello, New York the objections to the lights were more than just the visual aspect. Mrs. Stevens stated that they would approve the plan with the condition that there are no lights on the court and no future lights.

Mr. Emanuel stated that the Board cannot prohibit an Applicant from making an application in the future.

Chairman Gittens stated that this application has no lights.

No one else wishing to comment, Member Goldstein made a motion to continue the Public Hearings of 652 Haverstraw Road until the next scheduled meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals on June 19, 2014, seconded by Member Gigante. Upon vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Member Gigante made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Member Goldstein. Upon vote, the motion carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.