

Planning Board
April 9, 2019

The Planning Board meeting was held on Tuesday, April 9, 2019 in the Municipal Center Courtroom. The meeting commenced at 7:00 p.m. with Chairman John Gunn; Members Rick Muscat, Jill Reynolds, Pat Lambert and David Burke (in at 7:25 p.m.). Also in attendance were Building Inspector David Buckley, City Attorney Jennifer Gray, City Engineer Art Tully, and City Planner John Clarke. Members Gary Barrack and Randall Williams were excused.

Training Session

Mr. Clarke reviewed updates to the City's zoning code and mapping changes under consideration by the City Council. Changes include elimination of the PB and OB zoning districts along Main Street as they will become a new Transitional zoning district permitting low impact uses that blend in with the adjacent residential districts. Discussion took place with regard to additions to the Historical and Landmark Overlay District. Mr. Burke joined the meeting at 7:25 p.m.

Regular Meeting

The regular meeting started at 7:30 p.m. with Mr. Gunn calling for corrections/additions or a motion to approve minutes of the March 12, 2019 meeting. Mr. Gunn made a motion to approve the minutes of the March 12, 2019 meeting as presented, seconded by Mr. Burke. All voted in favor. Motion carried.

ITEM NO. 1 CONTINUE PUBLIC HEARING FOR SEQRA ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW ON APPLICATION FOR SUBDIVISION, 2-LOT RESIDENTIAL, SUBMITTED BY DELAPORTAS ENTERPRISES I, INC., 52 DENNINGS AVENUE

This item was adjourned to the May 14, 2019 meeting.

ITEM NO. 2 CONTINUE PUBLIC HEARING ON APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN APPROVAL RELATED TO SPECIAL USE PERMIT, THREE-UNIT RESIDENTIAL, 21 SOUTH AVENUE, SUBMITTED BY PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL DIOCESE OF NEW YORK

Architect Tomasz Mlynarski of Barry Donaldson Architects returned to finalize approval for renovations to the existing residential church owned building to create three residential apartments at 21 South Avenue. The location of the sewer line was determined to be completely on their property which connects to the sewer main in Beacon Street therefore no easement is needed. Mr. Mlynarski reported revised plans include improved grading lines and adjustment to the accessible parking space as requested.

Mr. Gunn opened the floor for public comment. No one from the public wished to speak and Ms. Reynolds made a motion to close the public hearing, seconded by Mr. Lambert. All voted in favor. Motion carried.

Members reviewed the draft resolution of approval prepared by the City Attorney and circulated to members for review prior to the meeting. After careful consideration, Mr. Muscat made a motion to adopt the draft resolution of Site Plan Approval and Certificate of Appropriateness, seconded by Ms. Reynolds. Barrack. All voted in favor. Motion carried.

ITEM NO. 3 CONTINUE PUBLIC HEARING FOR SEQRA ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND OPEN PUBLIC HEARINGS ON APPLICATIONS FOR SUBDIVISION APPROVAL AND SITE PLAN APPROVAL, 6 UNIT RESIDENTIAL “FERRY LANDING AT BEACON”, BEEKMAN STREET, SUBMITTED BY FERRY LANDING AT BEACON, LTD.

This item was adjourned to the May 14, 2019 meeting at the request of the applicant and Mr. Gunn opened the floor for public comment.

Lee Kyriacou, 1076 Wolcott Avenue, thanked Planning Board members for their service. He spoke about zoning changes under consideration by the City Council and explained their review will be thorough and well thought out. Mr. Kyriacou recognized the Planning Board serves as the executor of the zoning code and expressed his appreciation for the board’s hard work in administering the zoning code. He looked forward to the joint meeting with members of the City Council, Planning Board, and Zoning Board of Appeals on Monday, April 22, 2019.

Theresa Kraft, 315 Liberty Street, reported at least 10 people were present to talk about this project but left because the agenda listed the item as adjourned. She asked members to visit Bayview Avenue to see the spectacular views that would be compromised by this development, and urged members to protect view sheds.

Arthur Camins, 39 Rombout Avenue, was not in favor of this development. He reported the developer cut down virtually all trees on the property, even on the cliff where no construction is proposed. He felt something amiss in the process because the developer appears to presume approvals will be granted. Mr. Camins understood zoning may permit this development yet felt it should not be built because this property is the first thing one sees when coming from the train station. He believed this parcel should not be developed.

Kevin Byrne, 61 Tioronda Avenue, was pleased the zoning code is being updated because it is not currently user friendly. He requested zoning changes be done in a transparent manner.

Stosh Yankowski, 86 South Chestnut Street, felt nothing should be developed on this property and that the City Council should pay the developer to take it over by eminent domain. He understood a four story structure is permitted however pointed out that mechanical equipment on the roof turns into a fifth story. Mr. Yankowski was amazed that trees were cut and asked that the project be denied.

Theresa Kraft, 315 Liberty Street, reported the site was formerly a gas station and investigation should be done to see if there is underground contamination.

ITEM NO. 4 CONTINUE PUBLIC HEARING FOR SEQRA ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW ON APPLICATION FOR CONCEPT PLAN, SUBDIVISION AND SITE PLAN APPROVAL, MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT, 248 TIORONDA AVENUE, SUBMITTED BY CHAI BUILDERS CORP.

Mr. Gunn summarized progress on the application process, and engineers Larry Boudreau, with Chris LaPorta, of Chazen Engineering were present to continue review of the proposed residential/office project located along Tioronda Avenue. Mr. Boudreau provided an overview of the environmental constraints, described building layouts and elevations, and outlined the proposed greenway trail location. Photo simulations of the project were presented.

Mr. Clarke asked that a detailed explanation of how the City's steep slope legislation is satisfied in regard to the proposal be submitted for review. He compared the applicant's school impact study with Rutgers multipliers and determined the development would potentially add 9-16 students. This would not be a significant impact considering the school district has experienced an enrollment decline. Mr. Clarke explained the ADA compliant section of the greenway trail should be shown on the concept plan with the understanding that more details will be worked out during Site Plan review. He asked that the "no adverse impact" statement issued in 2013 from the Office of Historic Preservation be made part of the EAF narrative.

Mr. Boudreau reported the Army Corp of Engineers has been contacted and the NYS Department of Transportation is currently reviewing their traffic study. In response to public comment about the site entrance, he explained this location was part of the previous approval and was also the MTA approved location for crossing. In addition a guiderail will be installed, signage will be added, and clearing will take place to increase sight distance. Mr. Gunn opened the floor for public comment.

Lisa Alvarez, 23 Hammond Plaza, felt the board should look at the number of apartment units that are currently empty before approving more projects. She felt attention should be given to the impacts the development will have on water usage, flooding, and infrastructure. Ms. Alvarez asked who will clean up creek and dead fish when the water is low. She estimated nearly 300 unoccupied apartment units exist and urged the board wait until there is 80% occupancy before approving another lasting development that will be harmful to Beacon.

Theresa Kraft, 315 Liberty Street, felt attention should be given to stormwater runoff that will cause oil and gas to drain into the creek. The environment should be protected.

Arthur Camins, 39 Rombout Avenue, thought a four story building required a variance and believed the argument that fewer stories would not be economically viable to be an invalid justification for a variance. He felt it should not be the City's responsibility to make a development economically viable for an applicant. Mr. Camins expressed concern for the loss of existing views of the creek and dam.

Kevin Byrne, 61 Tioronda Avenue, had concern for environmental impact mitigations to protect landscaping, steep slopes, and stormwater runoff. He felt the dam should be available and open to the public.

Mr. Tully explained areas on the site are set aside for stormwater mitigation however the design is not finalized yet. He added that if space set aside for mitigation is not adequate the applicant must adjust the site plan to make it comply with all environmental requirements. Ms. Reynolds had concern for proper remediation because in its day the former Tuck Tape site was one of the biggest polluters. Mr. Boudreau explained the previous owner went through complete site remediation and upon completion the DEC decommissioned the property from their list of contaminated sites.

Mr. Clarke explained building height is measured from the side of the building that faces the public street. In this case the side of the building that faces Tioronda Avenue is three stories therefore a variance is not needed for building height. No protected view sheds exist on this site, and one of the two proposed greenway trail spurs extends to the dam located on the creek. Discussion took place with regard to the easement which provides access to the adjacent Sisters' property. Further negotiations will be taking place with them in regard to extending an easement to the Wolcott Avenue emergency access. Mr. Boudreau reported their traffic study considered potential future development of the Sisters' property and 555 South Avenue. The applicant will return to continue review at the May meeting.

ITEM NO. 5 PUBLIC HEARING ON APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN APPROVAL, 9 APARTMENTS IN 3 BUILDINGS, 53 ELIZA STREET, SUBMITTED BY PIE DEVELOPMENT COMPANY

Design team Attorney Taylor Palmer, Engineer Mike Bodendorf and Architect Aryeh Siegel were present to review their client's proposal to change the existing commercial operation at 53 Eliza Street into a residential development. Mr. Palmer reported the application was referred to the Architectural Review Subcommittee however work on changes to the elevations had not been completed in time for submission deadline. The public hearing was subject to a meeting with the Subcommittee however it was properly noticed and the applicant was willing to continue review of other site plan aspects. Mr. Muscat made a motion to open the public hearing, seconded by Mr. Lambert. All voted in favor. Motion carried.

Mr. Siegel described his client's proposal to change the commercial contractor yard and offices into nine condominium units within three buildings organized around a landscaped court yard. Work has taken place on adjusting building design and elevations to make certain the height and number of stories are within permitted limits. Floor and landscape plans will be submitted for review at the next meeting, and building elevation renderings will be done next week to meet with the Architectural Review Subcommittee. Discussion took place with regard to the covered driveway entrance, and height of the arch covered drive was reviewed and accepted by the City's Fire Chief.

Mr. Clarke reviewed his comments and advised front yard setbacks must fit in with adjacent houses and porches need to be at least five feet wide. He felt the proposed portico entry into the site would not fit in with the neighborhood. Mr. Tully advised the applicant to be aware that the Health Department has different requirements for a condo development, and explained more information on soil testing is needed. Remaining comments are listed in his review letter. Mr. Gunn opened the floor for public comment.

Arthur Camins, 39 Rombout Avenue, noted the multi-residential use does not conform to current zoning regulations and urged the board not to consider economic justification as means for a variance. Mr. Gunn advised him that the Zoning Board of Appeals granted a variance allowing a nine residential unit development to replace the pre-existing non-conforming commercial use. The Planning Board also reviewed the proposal and agreed a residential use would be more in compliance with the neighboring residential zone.

Theresa Kraft, 315 Liberty Street, felt the overhead bridge access should not be permitted and asked the board to stop issuing and supporting variances. Mr. Gunn clarified that the Planning Board does not grant variances, and only supports them when the board feels strongly that it makes good planning sense.

Discussion took place with regard to garbage removal, the dumpster enclosure and location, and truck turning radius on site. Mr. Burke asked that when presenting to the architectural review subcommittee that proposed buildings be shown in context with other buildings on the street. Mr. Gunn announced the following letter was submitted and reviewed by the board:

I am writing this to you on behalf of my 89 year old mother, Virginia Stafford, long term resident of 57 Eliza Street. My mother has had medical issues (multiple hospital and rehab stays) over the past year and so has not been able to attend prior planning board meetings regarding the proposed variance for 53 Eliza Street. She does have a concern with respect to the increased traffic and parking associated with 9 family units immediately adjacent to her residence. Given there are on average 2.28 vehicles per household (Feb 2008 study by Experian Automotive), 9 family units would result in a need to adequately house and address increased traffic for approximately 20 vehicles. This concern may have already been raised at an earlier planning board meeting and if so, I apologize. If not, I hope that the board will consider this concern as part of the review process to granting the variance. Thank you for your attention. - Michael Stafford

ITEM NO. 6 PUBLIC HEARING FOR SEQRA ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW ON APPLICATION FOR CONCEPT PLAN, SUBDIVISION AND SITE PLAN APPROVAL, MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT, 23-28 CREEK DRIVE, SUBMITTED BY 23-28 CREEK DRIVE, LLC

Ms. Reynolds made a motion to open the SEQRA public hearing, seconded by Mr. Muscat. All voted in favor. Motion carried. Attorney Taylor Palmer, Cuddy & Feder, described his client's proposal to construct a mixed-use development on the former City DPW site to include 20,000 sq. ft. of commercial space, eight apartments, a small park and greenway trail. The project will reduce Inflow and Infiltration into the sanitary sewer system and City water and sewer services will serve the development. Updated plans were submitted based on consultant comments and the traffic study was updated as requested. Access to the site will be from Churchill Street with an emergency access via Creek Drive. The parking lot layout was reworked and work on the greenway trail will continue with the greenway committee. Once the SEQRA review process is complete, the applicant will return to the City Council for Concept Plan Approval and go to the Zoning Board of Appeals for necessary variances before returning to the Planning Board for Site Plan Approval.

Mr. Siegel reported the former DPW site is now vacant and the existing structures will be demolished. The building will have eight apartment units on the upper floor with 20,000 sq. ft. commercial space on the first two floors and in a small separate workshop building. Zoning requires a mix of 25% commercial space and this proposal provides 60%; a total of 95 parking spaces will be provided, some in garage space under the building. The access road was widened to 20 ft. to provide adequate emergency vehicle access. A minor change in the location of the workshop building will provide additional green space. The building design will reflect industrial buildings along the creek and will sit 36 ft. below Tioronda Avenue. Variances will be needed for building height, number of stories, apartment size, and parking spaces.

Mr. Clarke reviewed his comments related to SEQRA review. The calculations for area deductions related to steep slopes and flood plains must be submitted; any major trees and those that will be removed must be identified on the site plan; and adjustment is needed where the patio encroaches on the greenway trail easement. In addition the sidewalk in the upper parking lot should extend along the entire building to connect the southern parking area with the building entrance.

Mr. Tully advised that an environmental audit must be done and application must be made to the DEC and Army Corp of Engineers. He asked that any mechanical equipment on the roof or outside of the building be shown on the plan for consideration during architectural review.

Engineer Mike Bodendorf reported they made a joint application to the DEC and Army Corp of Engineers as required, and an environmental audit will be done to determine whether remediation is needed. Mr. Gunn opened the floor for public comment and acknowledged the following letter was submitted and reviewed by the board:

My name is Jessica Shay, and I reside at 67 Tioronda Avenue from the planned development at 23-28 Creek Drive here in Beacon. I am writing to ardently request that this development be denied. If anything, the stretches of land alongside Fishkill Creek should be preserved as peaceful and natural areas. This particular place would be an ideal place for Greenway Trail or Public Park – NOT an ideal place for MORE big apartment buildings. We need to preserve these areas for nature and wildlife and the peaceful enjoyment of our town. My front and bedroom windows look out upon Fishkill Creek. When my windows are open, I can hear the rushing of the water from the creek. Pedestrians enjoy the walk along Tioronda Avenue from Main Street to Madam Brett Park, the hiking trails on Mount Beacon, or to and from Sargent School all day long. It's a peaceful stretch – and it's magical that this direct view of the creek can be come upon so soon after one leaves Main Street. The creek and its banks are also home to a lot of wildlife. In the morning, I hear a woodpecker pecking away at a tree, and in the evening I often hear a family of foxes. And of course, every morning and evening, a herd of about 20 deer crosses up the creek bank, saunter down Tioronda, and find their way through the Elks' lawn and, regrettably for me since I am a vegetable farmer, through my yard. I rue the day that the sound of that woodpecker will be replaced with construction noise and the noise of people and increased traffic. I hope the deer stage a sit in right down the center of the Avenue. When the snow is melting, or even when we've had any decent amount of rain, the creek burgeons and become rapid and seems to overflow its banks. The first harbinger of spring for my daughter and I has come to be the roar of the creek as we hear it we step out of our front door. What will become of the runoff from these new buildings? Will their runoff and sewage end up directly in our creek? Even if this is currently allowed within our zoning and regulations – is it wise? Is it the best thing for our town and our environment? One can also enjoy a stunning view of Mount Beacon from Tioronda Avenue. I noticed that this plan includes a 4-story building that would stand taller than the current

zoning/regulations allow. The architects have requested a variance. Is it a good idea to allow something taller to be built that will block our view of that gorgeous mountain? As I consider the possibility of an increased population along Tioronda Avenue, I have to wonder – where will all of these people park their cars? The plan shows that there will be not enough parking spaces for 2 cars per apartment. Most families in Beacon have two cars. There is already a 6 month+ wait list for a parking permit at our train station. When there is a festival or a big even at the Hudson Valley Brewery, people park their cars along Tioronda Avenue. The avenue become squished into single lane traffic. The street becomes dangerous for pedestrians and children. And sometimes, I can't even get out of my own driveway because someone has desperately parked their car across from it in the too-narrow area of the avenue. Why would we bring so many more people and their cars to this area? I'm sure that the developers and architects will and have had answers to some of these questions – answers based in traffic surveys, intricacies of the laws, the classification of the creek, etc. But I would ask you to step back. I would ask that you consider these questions on a basic and common sense level. Maybe it's legal. But – is it a good idea? Do we need more big buildings in Beacon? Should we allow variances when those variances exist for the reason of protecting the character of Beacon? Is it a good idea to build a giant building on the banks of this creek? Is it good for the water? Is it good for the environment? Is this what we want for Beacon?

Theresa Kraft, 315 Liberty Street, expressed concern about the environmental condition of the site, and for gas and oil runoff into the creek. She felt the project will add too much traffic on Churchill Street and the number of employees will be a burden on the residential neighborhood.

Arthur Camins, 39 Rombout Avenue, was pleased to see the commercial space but had concern that the new building will block views of the mountain from Tioronda Avenue. He felt a great deal of attention should be given to architectural review of the project. Mr. Camins spoke about the housing development next to City Hall because he believed details of the architectural approval were not being followed.

Thomas Wright, 24 Grove Street and Chairman of the Greenway Committee, spoke about discussions they have had with regard to the greenway trail. The plan shows a big turn at the north end of the trail and they would like to see it staked out to show its exact location. At one point the trail appears to extend over the property boundary therefore Mr. Wright wanted to be certain a gap is not created. They had concern about proposed stairs and that the trail wanders away from the creek due to areas set aside for stormwater mitigation.

Kevin Byrne, 61 Tioronda Avenue, felt new development in this location provides an opportunity to improve the quality of water in the creek as long as proper landscaping and soil retention methods are given thorough consideration.

Frank Filiciotto with Creighton Manning reviewed the applicant's traffic study prepared by Maser Consulting. He found it compliant with all industry standards and acceptable in terms of SEQRA review. Three buildings will be accessed from Churchill Street therefore he advised the applicant to protect Creek Drive as an emergency access with some type of movable gate. He recommended additional signage to properly direct traffic to the Churchill Street access.

Richard D'Andrea of Maser Consulting reported his client will address the City's traffic consultant comments and recommendations. Their study included off-site ideas for consideration that had been previously recommended – (1) add an-all way controlled stop at the

intersection of Main Street and Tioronda Avenue, and (2) remove the “No Right Turn” restriction on Churchill Street at the intersection of Main Street. Mr. Filiciotto recommended the City add an additional sign across from that intersection to reinforce the no right turn limitation.

Discussion took place with regard to shared parking, reducing density of the development, flood zone lines, and potential impact on downstream properties that may occur due to climate changes. Mr. Tully reported mitigation measures will be put into place to prevent impacts to downstream properties. In response to the letter submitted (see above), Mr. Clarke explained development will be on the southern portion of the property and a park will be on the portion of property across from the Shay residence. The public hearing will be continued at the May meeting.

ITEM NO. 7 CONTINUE REVIEW OF APPLICATION TO AMEND AN EXISTING SITE PLAN APPROVAL, BREWERY AND RELATED USES, SUBMITTED BY JEFF O’NEIL, 511 FISHKILL AVENUE

Aryeh Siegel reported revised drawings were submitted based on consultant comments from last month. Corrections were made to the parking table, the chain link fence will be removed with the exception of that around the retention pond near Fishkill Avenue, the City verified adequate water supply is available, and responses to traffic comments from the City and NYS DOT were submitted. Draft resolutions of approval were prepared and circulated to members prior to the meeting however final comments from the NYS DOT must be received and addressed before the SEQRA review process can be closed out. The applicant will return to the May meeting for further review.

ITEM NO. 8 CONTINUE REVIEW OF APPLICATION TO AMEND AN EXISTING SITE PLAN APPROVAL, RESIDENTIAL/PROFESSIONAL OFFICE/RESTAURANT WITH OUTDOOR SEATING AND ENTERTAINMENT AREA, 554 MAIN STREET, SUBMITTED BY DANA COLLINS

Engineer Stephen Burns reported the public hearing was closed last month and revised plans were submitted for review. A wood fence will be installed along Verplanck Avenue, parking stops were added, the musician’s nook was relocated, and a wrought iron fence is proposed to screen the off-street parking area. Mr. Clarke asked that the fencing along Verplanck Avenue be moved to remain solely on their property as a portion currently encroaches the City’s right-of-way. Mr. Burns explained if the fence is moved to remain on their property it will not function because it will be nearly three feet away from the sidewalk on a steep slope. The musician’s nook will be a wooden enclosure, and live music will be monitored so results can be reported to the board within 45 days as requested.

A lengthy discussion took place with regard to the location of the fence along Verplanck Avenue and it was agreed that a clause could be added to the resolution requiring a license agreement with the City to allow the fence to remain on City property. The applicant will also work with board consultants on defining an appropriate style fence to adequately screen the off-street parking area.

Members reviewed the draft resolution of approval and all conditions outlined in the resolution. After careful consideration, Ms. Reynolds made a motion to grant Site Plan Approval subject to conditions outlined in the resolution and as discussed, seconded by Mr. Muscat. All voted in favor. Motion carried.

ITEM NO. 9 REVIEW APPLICATION TO AMEND AN EXISTING SITE PLAN APPROVAL (ADD A PARTIAL 4TH FLOOR), RETAIL/RESIDENTIAL, 208 MAIN STREET, SUBMITTED BY 206-208 MAIN STREET, LLC

Architect Aryeh Siegel explained this project received approval in July for three apartments on the upper floors and retail space on the ground level. He described his client's proposal to revise the approval to add a partial fourth floor to create one additional apartment for a total of nine units. Mr. Siegel reported the fourth floor will be adjusted to comply with the 15-foot step-backs as required. He explained the additional apartment does not change parking requirements and only minor engineering comments were presented.

Mr. Clark explained the addition of a fourth story requires a Special Permit from the Planning Board required in the CMS zoning district. He informed the applicant of scrutiny and concern the community has expressed for building heights on Main Street therefore advised that criteria outlined in Section 223-18(E)(7) must be justified in order for the board to grant approval. He asked the applicant to prepare written comments and rationale for each of those conditions for review. A lengthy discussion took place and members in general was not in support of the fourth floor addition because it is a stand-alone building, the height will not appropriately fit in on that side of Main Street, and it will overshadow the residential property to the rear.

Miscellaneous Business

Consider request for one 90-day extension of Subdivision Approval – 31 Mountain Lane, submitted by Penelope Hedges

On behalf of Penelope Hedges, a letter was submitted by Glennon Watson of Badey & Watson requesting a 90-day extension of Subdivision Approval to finalize items for the Dutchess County Health Department required before the plat can be filed with the County. After some consideration, Mr. Lambert made a motion to grant a 90-day extension as requested, seconded by Mr. Gunn. All voted in favor. Motion carried.

Review NYS Department of State Division of Coastal Resources Draft RGP

City Attorney Jennifer Gray explained the New York State Department of State Coastal Consistency Unit issues a five-year general permit which authorizes the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers to perform emergency storm recovery activities in regulated waters in New York State, including Dutchess County (among others). Because this permit will be expiring, they are seeking comment from communities that have approved LWRP's on their proposal to issue a new regional permit. The City Council asked the Planning Board to review and comment on any policies in the LWRP that may be impacted with respect to emergency work deemed necessary in response to unusual and extreme storm conditions. After some discussion, members felt the action was not significant but recommended the City Council look at any impacts it may have on the LWRP or the Harbor Management Plan.

Zoning Board of Appeals – April Agenda

Members reviewed the latest variances (5 total) being sought from the Zoning Board of Appeals for an accessory apartment at 27 Fowler Street. They are seeking approval to provide one off-street parking space where zoning requires two off-street parking spaces for the accessory apartment; to allow parking in the front yard; a 0.3 ft. side yard setback; a 3.7 ft. rear yard setback; and to enlarge the accessory structure which will exceed the maximum size permitted. After a lengthy discussion and review, Mr. Gunn made a motion to support the variance to provide only one off-street parking space; not support the request to allow parking in the required front yard; not support enlarging the accessory structure; and to remain neutral with regard to the side and rear yard setbacks. Ms. Reynolds seconded the motion. All voted in favor. Motion carried; 5-0.

There was no further business to discuss and the meeting was adjourned on a motion made by Ms. Reynolds, seconded by Mr. Burke. All voted in favor. Motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 10:31 p.m.