

**MEETING OF THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
OF THE TOWN OF GLENVILLE
THE GLENVILLE MUNICIPAL CENTER
18 GLENRIDGE ROAD, GLENVILLE, NY 12302
Monday, May 22, 2023**

PRESENT: Chairman David Hennel, Dick Schlansker, Brian Peterson, Barry Suydam and Charles Beers.

ABSENT: None.

ALSO ATTENDING: Attorney: Colleen Pierson, Esq.; Deputy Building Inspector: James Pangburn; Planning Department: Nicholas Chiavini; Stenographer: Kristen Bode

Chairman Hennel called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

MOTION: To accept the April 10, 2023 minutes. The minutes were approved unanimously.

MOVED BY: David Hennel

SECONDED: Brian Peterson

AYES: 4 (Hennel, Schlansker, Peterson, Suydam)

NOES: 0

ABSENT: 0

ABSTAIN: 1 (Beers)

MOTION CARRIED

PUBLIC HEARING

- 1) Application of, Chris and Sarah Benson, 1982 West Glenville Road, Glenville, NY 12302.** To construct a 2,880 sq. ft. storage barn. The property is located in the Rural Residential/Agricultural Zoning District and is identified on the tax map as parcel #4.-3-39.

In accordance with the Codes of Glenville, the following variance is requested:

270-9 F 3

Accessory structures shall not exceed 2400 square feet in the Rural Residential zoning district. The applicant is proposing to build a 2,880 square foot structure. A variance of 480 square feet is requested.

B. Peterson read the application and the review factors for the variance request into the record.

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.

Answer: Since we are requesting only a nominal change in the overall footprint of the barn (an additional 480 sq. ft.), we do not believe any undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood will be created. Rather, the footprint of the proposed structure will provide more storage to move unsightly farm equipment, trailers, tractors, etc. under cover and out of sight. The design of the barn is meant to stay true to the rural character of our neighborhood, with a deep barn-red upper and black wainscoting below. If anything, the proposed structure will make our property look tidier and be a benefit to nearby properties. There are many properties with barns located throughout our neighborhood, so ours will be no different.

2. Whether the applicant can achieve their goals via a reasonable alternative which does not involve the necessity of an area variance.

Answer: The only other means possible for achieving our goals of creating more storage without requiring a variance would be put up two (2) separate structures, which would create unnecessary additional site work, construction and expense.

3. Whether the requested area variance is substantial as compared to the lawful dimensions allowed by zoning code.

Answer: The requested area variance is only a 20% increase from the lawful dimensions.

4. Whether the area variance will have an adverse impact on the physical or environmental conditions of the neighborhood or community.

Answer: Since we are requesting only a nominal change in the overall footprint of the barn (an additional 480 sq. ft.), we do not believe there will be any adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in our neighborhood. We are disturbing only a small additional amount of open hayfield. No trees need to be removed as part of the additional proposed footprint. Since we live in the Rural Residential/Agricultural zoning district, a barn of the proposed size is not unusual and will not impact the physical conditions of the neighborhood.

5. Whether there has been any self-created difficulty.

Answer: We do not believe that we have self-created difficulty in the proposed construction.

The application was signed by the property owner on April 24, 2023. Notice of the application was mailed to 26 property owners within 500 feet. This was not a County referral.

--Letter received from 6 property owners, each letter is a carbon copy--

Zoning Board of Appeals,

"I understand the property located at 1982 West Glenville Road is applying for a variance for the Town Code Section 270-9 F 3, which limits the maximum size of accessory structures to 2,400 square feet. I have reviewed the general site plan and support the variance of an additional 480 square feet."

Signed by,
1946 West Glenville Road, 1906 West Glenville Road, 1759 North Road, 2059 West Glenville Road, 1999 West Glenville Road and 2107 West Glenville Road.

D. Hennel asked if the applicant wanted to add anything to the application.

Applicants do not wish to add anything to the application.

Chairman Hennel opened the public hearing.

Chairman Hennel asked if anyone wishes to speak in favor of or opposed to the motion.

A woman from the audience asked what the height for the structure would be and if it was two stories.

Chris Benson stated the mean height is 15 feet and no to two stories.

D. Hennel stated the mean height is 15 feet. That is the maximum that's allowed without a variance.

C. Beers stated the peak height would be 24 feet.

D. Hennel asked if anyone else would like to speak in favor of or opposed to the motion.

Chairman Hennel opened up any further questions from the Board.

D. Schlansker asked if the 87 foot piece of property in front of this new dwelling is considered a front yard or a side yard.

J. Pangburn stated side yard.

D. Schlansker stated there would be the 50-foot set back.

J. Pangburn stated that would be determined by the actual road frontage.

D. Schlansker stated the 300 foot is the front yard and that would be an extension of the side yard.

J. Pangburn stated correct.

D. Hennel stated the property owner is over 10 acres and it's no closer than 55 feet to any property line.

C. Benson stated the 85 is from the corner of the property to the other corner of the property. We are only going to be 12 feet beyond that edge. It will be more than 55 feet.

B. Peterson asked if there is going to be a kitchen, kitchenet or bathrooms.

C. Benson stated no.

B. Peterson asked if the barn will be used for business.

C. Benson stated no.

B. Suydam asked if the front faces West Glenville Road and how are the applicants going to get back to the barn.

C. Benson stated there is a gravel driveway behind the existing barn that opens up to a path. It's not on the site plans. There's a gravel road that goes along the fence line that opens up to the front of the new barn.

B. Suydam asked if that's existing.

C. Benson stated yes.

D. Hennel asked if anyone would like to speak in favor of or opposed to the motion.

D. Hennel closed the public hearing.

MOTION:

The applicant having applied for an area variance after having been denied a building permit for a 2,280 square foot storage barn located at 1982 West Glenville Road, Glenville, NY and as identified on tax map # 4.-3-39 in the Town of Glenville, New York;

The applicant having applied for an area variance with regard to the Codes of the Town of Glenville 270-9 F 3. that accessory structures not exceed 2,400 square feet in the rural residential zoning district thus requesting variance to allow an additional 480 sq

feet of storage because the proposed use of the property would be in violation of such restriction or set back requirement; and

The Board having considered the application, after a full and complete public hearing on May 22, 2023, and after having considered the benefit to the applicant as weighed against any detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood or community; in particular,

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.

Finding of fact: No, property is a 10+ acre lot in West Glenville where other nearby properties also feature large barns and other structures. Applicant has included in application that new barn will have similar materials / look / design as other buildings on property. While property is not actively used for farming, requested barn size would be allowed for such use on other nearby parcels.

2. Whether the applicant can achieve their goals via a reasonable alternative which does not involve the necessity of an area variance.

Finding of fact: No, without having to build two separate smaller structures (that would be allowable), the proposed 2,880 sq ft barn appears to be most feasible alternative to provide amount of storage space.

3. Whether the requested area variance is substantial as compared to the lawful dimensions allowed by zoning code.

Finding of fact: No, while variance is for 20% more than allowable space, as multiple buildings could be constructed we don't find request to be substantial.

4. Whether the area variance will have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district.

Finding of fact: No, neighboring property owners have reviewed and provided written letters of support for proposed building. Location of barn on property also appears to minimize any visual impacts to other nearby properties and will allow for more enclosed / indoor storage of vehicles and equipment.

5. Whether there has been any self-created difficulty.

Finding of fact: Yes, situation is self-created but this should not alone preclude the granting of this variance.

CONDITIONS: 1) Design / colors / exterior of barn to be installed and maintained as outlined in application to be deep barn red-upper with black wainscoting below.

2) The location of the building as identified in the drawings submitted dated 4/24/23, which provides for a minimum 50-foot set back from all sides.

3) Limited for personal use and storage of personal items. Not to be used as a business or residence.

MOVED BY: David Hennel

SECONDED BY: Brian Peterson

AYES: 5 (Hennel, Schlansker, Peterson, Suydam, Beers)

NOES: 0

ABSENT: 0

MOTION GRANTED

- 2) **Application of, Danial B. Snyder, 696 Bolt Road, Glenville, NY 12302.** To build a garage addition to an existing attached garage. The property is located in the Rural Residential/Agricultural Zoning District and is identified on the tax map as parcel #14.-3-6.

In accordance with the Codes of Glenville, the following variance is requested:

270 Attachment 1 - Side Setback

Minimum side setback is 50 ft, in the Rural Residential/Agricultural Zoning District. The applicant is proposing to construct a attached garage addition that is 10ft from the property line. A variance of 40 feet is being requested.

B. Peterson read the application and the review factors for the variance request into the record.

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.

Answer: No. Property next door is open field. Encroachment is hardly noticeable and is owned by my son and his wife.

2. Whether the applicant can achieve their goals via a reasonable alternative which does not involve the necessity of an area variance.

Answer: The proposed garage is to be "attached" to the existing attached garage side by side facing the road.

3. Whether the requested area variance is substantial as compared to the lawful dimensions allowed by zoning code.

Answer: Only requires a variance because zoning codes were changed after the existing building was built.

4. Whether the area variance will have an adverse impact on the physical or environmental conditions of the neighborhood or community.

Answer: When the new garage is completed, it will add to the look of the home and be more functional for all.

5. Whether there has been any self-created difficulty.

Answer: Yes.

The application was signed by the property owner on April 7, 2023. Notice of the application was mailed to 8 property owners within 500 feet. This was not a County referral.

--Letter from Corey Snyder, 502 Bolt Road, Glenville, NY 12302, dated April 22, 2023:

"To Whom it May Concern:

Concerning the property of Dan and Lisa Snyder at 696 Bolt Road in Glenville, NY. I am Corey Snyder. My wife Christina and I reside at 502 Bolt Road and own the property on both sides and behind 696 Bolt Road. We have, of course, approved and encouraged my parents to build a new garage attached to their existing single car garage. There is plenty of room around the house for this and will not affect our property or any operation of ours in any way. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Signed Corey Snyder"

D. Hennel asked if the applicant wanted to add anything to the application.

Daniel Synder did not wish to add anything to the application.

Chairman Hennel opened the public hearing.

Chairman Hennel asked if anyone wishes to speak in favor of or opposed to the motion.

Chairman Hennel opened up any further questions from the Board.

D. Hennel asked if the house is without the garage right now.

D. Synder stated there is an existing garage there.

D. Hennel stated you're going to go 16 feet to the right as you're facing the house.

D. Synder stated yes. The existing garage is 16 feet.

D. Hennel asked when the property was subdivided into two parcels and when the house was built.

J. Pangburn stated 1952.

D. Hennel stated it pre-dates the zoning with the side set backs that are currently in place.

B. Peterson asked if the garage will be used for business purposes.

D. Synder stated no.

B. Suydam asked what the interior height of the addition will be.

D. Synder stated 8 feet.

D. Hennel asked if there will be gutters on the side.

D. Synder stated if necessary.

D. Schlansker started lighting on the building but his son's house is so far away, it is irrelevant here.

D. Hennel asked if anyone else would like to speak for or against the motion.

D. Hennel closed the public hearing.

MOTION:

The applicant having applied for an area variance after having been denied a building permit related to the required 50' side yard setback per Town Code Section 270 Attachment 1 at 696 Bolt Road, Glenville, NY and as identified on tax map # 14.-3-6 in the Town of Glenville, New York;

The applicant having applied for an area variance with regard to the Codes of the Town of Glenville 270-7C Side Setback requirement of 50 ft within the rural residential zoning district because the proposed use of the property would be in violation of such restriction or set back requirement; and

The Board having considered the application, after a full and complete public hearing on May 22, 2023, and after having considered the benefit to the applicant as weighed against any detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood or community; in particular,

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.

Finding of fact: No, physical location of a garage within the ~100x277 ft lot can achieve an attached structure with this proposed driveway access. With the proposed change in setback, no observable visual characteristics are altered as viewed from Bolt Road. Adjacent property / neighbor has no opposition to proximity to shared property boundary.

2. Whether the applicant can achieve their goals via a reasonable alternative which does not involve the necessity of an area variance.

Finding of fact: The parcel is a small single-family residential non-conforming plot that does not allow for other options with same or similar access for the resident.

3. Whether the requested area variance is substantial as compared to the lawful dimensions allowed by zoning code.

Finding of fact: Yes, the requested variance of 40 ft is over 80% of the required side setback. However, when acreage and placement of structures on the other side of the property is considered, as well as functionally similar alternatives, this seems like a reasonable solution that outweighs potential negative impacts.

4. Whether the area variance will have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district.

Finding of fact: There are no known impacts to the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood/district. This variance also carries written support of the neighboring landowner who would be most affected by this change, and there are no neighboring structures or houses near the side property line where the garage will be built.

5. Whether there has been any self-created difficulty.

Finding of fact: Yes, the situation is self-created. However, this self-created difficulty should not alone preclude the granting of this variance, and the positive impacts to the owners outweigh any negative side effects currently able to be assessed.

CONDITIONS:

1) Strictly limited to the 16 ft x 28 ft structure granted for garage construction and no other current or future encroachments will be deemed acceptable for future additions, modifications or accessory structures. Applicant understands and agrees that no further building / additions are allowed within this area.

MOVED BY: Charlie Beers

SECONDED BY: Barry Suydam

AYES: 5 (Hennel, Schlansker, Peterson, Suydam, Beers)

NOES: 0

ABSENT: 0

MOTION GRANTED

- 3) Application of, Catherine Graziose, 4 Lee Road, Glenville, NY 12302.** To permit an install of an above ground pool. This pool has already been installed without a permit. The property is located in the Suburban Residential Zoning District and is identified on the tax map as parcel #15.19-3-12.

In accordance with the Codes of Glenville, the following variance is requested:

270-9 E Setback for swimming pools.

All swimming pools and their associated equipment and structures (i.e., decks, pumps, etc.) must be located at least 10 feet from side and rear property lines. The pool has been installed without a permit 8ft from the property line. A variance of 2 ft is being requested.

B. Peterson read the application and the review factors for the variance request into the record.

- 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.

Answer: No – pool is not visible from front yard / street.

- 2) Whether the applicant can achieve their goals via a reasonable alternative which does not involve the necessity of an area variance.

Answer: No – pool is already installed too close to property line. Would be substantial hardship to move.

- 3) Whether the requested area variance is substantial as compared to the lawful dimensions allowed by zoning code.

Answer: No – variance request is for two (2) feet to put pool closer to property line.

- 4) Whether the area variance will have an adverse impact on the physical or environmental conditions of the neighborhood or community.

Answer: No – pool is not visible from road / neighbor's property. Would not be visible if variance is granted.

- 5) Whether there has been any self-created difficulty.

Answer: Yes – we hired a pool company to install the pool. We assumed they knew the zoning ordinances but they installed the pool too close to the property line.

The application was signed by the property owner on May 16, 2023. Notice of the application was mailed to 54 property owners within 500 feet. This is not a County referral.

--E-mail from Sharon Feldman, 2 Lee Road, Glenville, NY 12302, dated May 22, 2023:

"My name is Sharon Feldman and I am the owner of 2 Lee Road. I have spoken to Mr. Pangburn on Thursday May 18th regarding the variance for 4 Lee Road for above ground pool to close to my property line. I have had the fiancé' of owner of 4 Lee Road approach me several times in the week of the 5/18 to speak to me and request a letter regarding this issue.

I have listed below my concerns:

There is a chance my leach field is there or abouts by the property line between 2 and 4 Lee Road, if something was to happen to the pool it has the potential to impact my septic system.

Also, will change my privacy/noise level with the pool so close to my home and property line as the neighbors normally have visitors and numerous weekend parties. The deck to my understanding is going to be built connected to the house and extended to the pool which raises the deck to oversee my yard and home. I would be more comfortable if they would consider a privacy screen or barrier between the property line.

I would appreciate the town considering enforcing the variance ensuring compliance with town code. Enforcing the code will help with addressing the above concerns.

Thank you for your time,

Sharon Feldman"

D. Hennel asked if the applicant wanted to add anything to the application.

Cathrine Graziose does not wish to add anything to the application.

Chairman Hennel opened the public hearing.

Chairman Hennel asked if anyone wishes to speak in favor of the motion.

Molly Mossey, 4 Lee Road is in favor of the motion.

Chairman Hennel asked if anyone else wishes to speak in favor of or opposed to the motion.

Chairman Hennel opened up any further questions from the Board.

D. Hennel asked if there was a building permit.

C. Graziose stated no, we used a pool company and thought the pool company would notify us if a permit was needed. We proceeded without a permit and now we are in this situation.

D. Hennel asked if the pool company put the pool in the position they were supposed to or put it in the wrong position. Was it staked out?

C. Graziose stated we staked out where we thought it would go and they asked if it was too close to the fence and I said I don't know and another employee said it was fine. It got placed there.

M. Mossey stated they were a subcontractor for Islander Pools. We were told by Islander that all the ordinances would be followed. It seems something got lost in translation with the subcontractor and unfortunately, they put it 2 ft too close to the fence.

Collen Pierson asked if the contract with Islander Pools provide they would take care of the building permit and itemize what they would do.

C. Graziose stated no.

C. Pierson asked did it itemize what they would do but did not include the building permit or did it not itemize what you were getting at all.

C. Graziose stated we didn't sign anything with Islander Pools. It was all over the phone and text message.

C. Pierson asked if the applicant paid over the phone.

C. Graziose stated we paid with a check.

D. Hennel asked if the applicant has anything in writing that they understand they're complying with the regulations.

C. Graziose stated we don't really have anything in writing from them. We are first time homeowners and didn't realize this is what it was.

B. Suydam asked if the applicants got a receipt.

C. Graziose stated yes and an invoice from the contractor but there are no terms and conditions on the invoice stating what they would do, just the pool dimensions and installation.

D. Hennel asked does it state if they are going to comply with the regulations.

C. Graziose stated no.

D. Hennel stated I'm only asking because that way it's not your liability to move the pool. They put it in the wrong spot.

C. Graziose stated that is an issue. Should the variance be rejected, that is something we're going to have to discuss with them. They already sent us that we can pay again to move the pool. That's why we're applying to see if we can get it to stay where it is.

M. Mossey stated the pool is full. If we had to move the pool, we would have to drain it and it would go into our basement and probably our neighbors yard and basement. We are concerned about draining it as well.

Charlie Beers stated I don't believe we're in position to take any of that into consideration. How do you mitigate potential negative impact to your neighbor. You have one individual out of 54 that took the time to write to the Board that really didn't want it to happen. You had 53 other opportunities to have people here or in writing supporting your project. You don't have any of that. One out of 54 took the time to throw a couple red flags up. You've had time to think about it. How do you mitigate that.

C. Graziose stated we wrote for her a list of rules we'd be happy to comply with – a curfew, noise level. We told her we would always be available to her if she ever feels the noise is too loud and no one would have access to our house or pool when we aren't there to supervise.

M. Mossey stated we also have the option to put in a divider or some other plan to screen from outside the property. I know in her letter she is concerned about our deck. We have a 6 ft stockade fence so that's not really an issue. We can plant a divider between the property line to create a privacy barrier if that's an issue for her too. It's a difference of 2 ft so we didn't really rally our neighbors around us to come in and speak for us. We didn't know that was an option.

C. Pierson stated the rules you're making about a curfew, those aren't enforceable between these neighbors. I appreciate that but it's a lot different than physically putting up an additional screen. The deck is going to be how many feet off the ground?

C. Graziose stated it's going to be about a foot off the ground. There was a deck there. It was unstable. We ripped it down because it was rotting. Our plan was to build in the same exact dimensions where it was. It was about a foot off the ground.

C. Pierson asked if the deck will be level with the top of the pool.

C. Graziose stated no.

C. Pierson stated in the letter, they seem to think it's going to look over the fence.

C. Graziose stated that's not the case. The plan was to build a deck, have it next to the pool, build a tiny platform of steps going into the pool. It's not going to be at level with the fence. It's a totally private yard with a stockade fence. You can't see through it. She can technically see over it because her deck is high and she can see into our yard.

C. Beers stated if you create a problem with her leach field or any portion of her septic, she'll have a \$30,000 nightmare and you're asking for a non-compliant change of rules over a \$5,000 problem you created.

C. Graziose stated that is news to us about the leach field. If that's going to become an issue then I'd like to know exactly where the leach field is. She did not bring that up to us. That doesn't even seem to be in code that close to our property. I understand now our pool is theoretically in a position to impact her septic system but we didn't know that going into this variance application. Should it be 2 ft over, I can't imagine that's going to be a whole lot better for her leach field.

D. Hennel stated the applicant also stated concerns if you had to drain the pool that would flood your basement. If that means that area is wet.

J. Pangburn stated you wouldn't be allowed to just drain it out onto the road. You'd have to pump it back onto a truck where it was filled from.

C. Graziose stated we filled it from our hose.

J. Pangburn stated you can't just dump it out onto the grass especially out there with the lots being so tight.

R. Schlansker asked if the Town has a side yard set back for a leach field or septic system.

J. Pangburn stated yes – 10 feet off of the side property line or with replacements, you're limited to the space. Depending on the number of bedrooms, you may have to go larger and it's not uncommon for a waiver to be granted to be closer to the property line.

R. Schlansker stated if it's built closer to the property line, would it then be their responsibility because a neighbor had to build a leach field closer to the property.

J. Pangburn stated as far as the health code, it can override the setbacks to allow people to treat their waste water safely and if it's going to be too close to the property

line then having a system that's undersized, that would override any additional concerns.

R. Schlansker stated I understand the leach field came before the pool.

J. Pangburn stated that's a hypothetical, I don't know what their system is or how close it is to the property line but it's not uncommon to be closer than 10 feet. If it's an older system, it may be preexisting to the health standards.

B. Suydam asked why the applicant is building the deck below the pool.

C. Graziose stated the house isn't that high off the ground. We don't want to step up from the house. We want to replace exactly what was there, which was about a foot off the ground.

B. Suydam stated in the past, we've offered the option to table something. You have a lot of options. You can figure out the cost analysis for all the shrubs to put up along the boarder. You can reach out to Islander Pools and tell them your situation and see what they can do to accommodate the problem, can they move the pool. If they'll move the pool for the amount of money it costs to plant all the shrubs. You move the pool two feet then you don't have to plant all the shrubs. You also might have the option to find 52 other people to say they are in favor. This has been built. I get it, new homeowners, I have a little bit of compassion for you. You definitely should get something in writing every time. That's just my suggestion.

D. Hennel stated I would agree with that. Right now you have a lot against you. I think if you take some time to gather more information.

B. Suydam stated if we vote for this tonight and it's a no then it's a no. If it's a no, you can't get another chance. I'm not saying when you come back it's a guaranteed yes.

D. Hennel stated I was surprised too with the way it's placed. I wasn't in the back yard to see it. I was curious why you didn't put the pool directly under the deck then you still get the 20 feet from your septic.

C. Graziose stated right, that's in the shade. There is a massive maple tree on that side of the property.

D. Hennel asked where is the equipment for the pool.

C. Graziose stated it's on the back of the pool – away from the house.

D. Hennel stated it's not in that 10 foot.

C. Graziose stated correct.

D. Hennel stated when you're talking about the deck – you're replacing this deck.

C. Graziose stated right now there is no deck there.

R. Schlansker stated 2 ft is not going to make a major difference with regard to noise. The sound is irrelevant in the letter submitted.

C. Graziose stated for what it's worth – we're good neighbors. We're pretty quiet.

D. Hennel stated the other problem is – you guys are great neighbors but if you sell the house, the next neighbors could not be so great.

B. Peterson stated if they decide to table it – do they have a chance of going after the builder or does the responsibility of the permit fall on the homeowner.

C. Pierson stated I was just looking at their website to see if it shows the services they offer and we offer permit. I don't see that. There are a lot of reviews on Angie's list that state you have to find your own electrician and get the permit yourself. It doesn't seem that's a standard they do. If it's not in the contract that they get the permit for the homeowner, then it would be on them. Were there any other services related to the pool – did you need an electrician?

C. Graziose stated we have an electrician lined up for the electrical work. We have not done any of that yet since the pool essentially being temporary at this time.

C. Beers stated I would like to hear from more people.

D. Hennel asked if the applicant is requesting the Board table this application to the next meeting.

C. Graziose stated yes.

D. Hennel stated the applicant has requested tabling to the next meeting.

AYES: 5 (Hennel, Schlansker, Peterson, Suydam, Beers)

NOES: 0

APPLICATION TABLED TO JUNE 26, 2023 MEETING

MOTION: To adjourn the May 22, 2023 meeting of the Town of Glenville Zoning Board of Appeals at 7:50 PM.

Moved by: Chairman Hennel

Seconded by: Charlie Beers

AYES: 5 (Hennel, Schlansker, Peterson, Suydam, Beers)

NOES: 0

ABSENT: 0

MOTION APPROVED

Next agenda meeting: June 19, 2023

Next meeting: June 26, 2023

Submitted by,

Kristen Bode, Stenographer

Date

ZBA Chairman

Date

Town Clerk

Date

FINAL