

# TOWN OF MONROE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MINUTES

— 10/26/2021

---

TOWN OF MONROE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS (Tuesday, October 26, 2021)

Generated by Norinne McSweeney

Members present Chairperson - Michael Murphy, Kevin Scully, Marci Daniel, Chip Postiglione, Steven Thau

Consultants:

David MacCartney, Esq.

1. Welcome

Procedural: 1.01 Roll Call

Procedural: 1.02 Pledge of Allegiance

2. Appoint New Acting Chairman

Action, Discussion: 2.01 Appoint New Acting Chairman

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Town of Monroe hereby appoints Chip Postiglione to be Acting Chairman in the event Chairman Michael Murphy can't perform his duties thru December 31, 2021.

Motion by Chairperson - Michael Murphy, second by Steven Thau.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Michael Murphy, Kevin Scully, Marci Daniel, Chip Postiglione, Steven Thau

3. Public Hearings

Action, Discussion: 3.01 Town of Monroe Planning Board - Interpretation

Bonnie Franson - Town of Monroe Planning Board Chairwoman

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to open the public hearing.

Motion by Chairperson - Michael Murphy, second by Kevin Scully.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Michael Murphy, Kevin Scully, Marci Daniel, Chip Postiglione, Steven Thau

Ms. Franson is here representing the Planning Board on an appeal from the Building Inspectors interpretation involving frontage. The appeal was triggered by the review of an

application we've been involved with along Allison Drive. We are looking at this from a broader perspective in terms of the implications it has when we review an application that involves the term "frontage". The Planning Board views the term frontage to mean the location of the lot from which you gain access. Ms. Torre's appeal letter details our rationale with regard to the interpretation and she relies on the definitions and frontage itself is not defined in the zoning chapter there are terms that make reference to frontage and in particular the definition of lot is defined specifically makes reference to a lot on which a proposed use is intended to be located shall have not less than the minimum area and with required by this chapter for a lot in the district in which such land is situated and shall have its principal frontage on a street or on such other means of access as may be determined in accordance with the provisions of law. From our perspective when the term frontage is used in the code it also required that access is gained from that frontage and this was all triggered by a provision in the special use permit requirements for public or private schools that say "frontage shall be along a major collector road" and the intent was that frontage meant getting access. Chairman Murphy I did review the building inspectors previous decision and in his decision he emphasized the term maintained frontage, so a maintained frontage is a frontage with a driveway that's actually being used and maintained. Member Postiglione is the school built? I visited the site and watched and it's heavily traffic and acting as a school right now. Ms. Franson the town has been involved with shutting down the school because it was operating without a special use permit and a site plan. The interpretation is being triggered by the review of this application, but it has broader implications for whenever we review a development where frontage is required. Whether it's on a major collector or a state road. Based on your determinations if you interpret as we are that frontage is supposed to be meaning access from the major collector and if an applicant cannot get access from where there is frontage then it might require a waiver or a variance. open to the general public for questions: Sarah O'Connell 223 Cromwell Hill Road the property in question is behind my house I agree with the boards interpretation of the term frontage. The driveway curb cut on Allison Dr is a local road and a cul-de-sac, I feel it would be detrimental to the neighborhood if something like this was to be allowed. So I strongly oppose the variance or you know the waiver. I think it would have a huge impacts not with just the traffic so many other concerns and broader implications that I hope the planning board is taking into consideration and I hope we are kept abreast of what is happening as if we hadn't received a certified letter we wouldn't know what was going on. Harley Matsil - bus traffic and speed should be a consideration Mia Mahoney - from someone who has been to private school and have a private education my concern is how is it you can have a private school on a cul-de-sac isn't there some king of fire codes. I mean god forbid there was some kind of incident where the fire department had to get there, usually private schools have more than one entrance. How is this allowed? Chairman Murphy that is a good question but under tonight's meeting we are only talking about the narrow scope of the interpretation that has to be made here on road frontage. You are certainly welcomed to follow along with the Planning board meetings as they further hear this application before them. Ms. Franson what stage is the Planning Board in are they waiting to get through this process in order to schedule the

public hearing or where does it stand. Ms. Franson there are things that have been requested by the applicant that have not yet been turned in, also need to have this process finished to see if additional review of the application needs to be completed, we are not ready to make a SEQRA (State Environmental Quality Review Act) determination., nor are we ready for a public hearing. Tai Ronen - is the application available to the public. Yes the application is available you can submit a foil request through the town clerks office, plus there are items on the Planning Board webpage. Mr. MacCartney your next step for an appeal or interpretation is the board members can discuss generally now how each of you feel, not take a vote and let me get a resolution that address the legal issues and get it together for the next board meeting for a vote. Chairman Murphy though we are using this one particular property as an example, what we are deciding on here tonight is an interpretation of the terminology that's in the zoning code of lot frontage. My belief that frontage is a maintained frontage where there is an active driveway. Member Scully agrees with Chairman Murphy. Member Daniel agree with Chairman Murphy an active lot to me is a maintained driveway when I think about frontage. Member Thau also agree that frontage is maintained driveway. Member Postiglione is also in agreement with the other members.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to close the public hearing.

Motion by Kevin Scully, second by Marci Daniel.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Michael Murphy, Kevin Scully, Marci Daniel, Chip Postiglione, Steven Thau

Action, Discussion: 3.02 DG Management (Z052-2020) SBL # 1-1-96 Schunnemunk Road  
applicant withdraw from tonight's meeting

Action, Discussion: 3.03 Verizon - Professional Square (Z065-2021) SBL # 1-1-89 491 Route 208

Scott Olson - Young & Sommer LLC  
Kathy Pomponio - Verizon Wireless Project Manager  
Michael Crosby - Verizon Wireless Radio Frequency Engineer  
Bryan Sarchi - Site Acquisition  
Steve Matthews - Tectonic Engineering - Survey/Site Design/Construction

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to open the public hearing.

Motion by Chairperson - Michael Murphy, second by Kevin Scully.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Michael Murphy, Kevin Scully, Marci Daniel, Chip Postiglione, Steven Thau

this project is located at 491 State Route 208 Professional Square LLC located in the heavy industry zoning district and that is the main reason we are here before you as you know your town code only allows new facilities to be in the utility overlay district and the number of those districts and the size are extremely small. Shows the utility overlay districts on a map. Traditional use variances are difficult but there is a special standard for personal wireless facilities such as this, which makes a use variance much easier to obtain, the courts recognize that these types of public utilities need to be everywhere, they can't be excluded from residential or other districts. The proposed building we plan to utilize is a 5 story building, no residential properties in the area. We are proposing to install 6 antennas on the existing penthouse on the roof in groups of 2 in 3 separate sectors. The equipment will also be located on the rooftop. There is an existing antenna on the building, but we don't know who's it is or what it is used for. Reviewed pictures of the added service the antennas will give to the area. not only do we need these antennas for coverage purposes but also for capacity purposes. Showed some additional photos with the additional locations that were looked at, view of the building from Rt. 208. Chairman Murphy did you fly a balloon at the height of the new antennas so that we could see where they are? Mr. Olson I don't believe balloons were needed at this location they were able to scale the antennas based on existing structure. Chairman Murphy last time I questioned the equipment being visible from the rooftop and there is some shielding on the left side of the roof and asked if it could be added to the right side. Mr. Olson I spoke with Mr. Matthews regarding this and he said where the equipment is going to sit towards the center of the roof width-wise it's not going to be visible. Chairman Murphy asking for additional photos showing the roofline from different angles not sure the equipment wouldn't be visible from the roadway. Member Postiglione asked if there was a cross section or profile of the roof where the penthouse sits is how high the fascia would come up from the actual roof in measurements. Mr. Matthews replied with the elevation of the top of the wall which is the top of the parapet is 61 feet and to the top of the penthouse is 68 feet and the roof elevation is 56.9 so the parapet itself is just over 4 feet tall which is substantial and why it is blocking views of the penthouse. Chairman Murphy we don't have our report back from the telecommunications representative so at this point we can't close the public hearing is there anything else you would like to present. checked with the public to see if anybody wanted to speak Joe McKay located close to this property and will be submitting comments on this Mia Mahoney what was the date of the pictures that were shown in the presentation Mr. Olsen would need to provide the date to you. Mr. Matthews late July or early August Mr. MacCartney asked Mr. Olson regarding shot clock extension. They discussed the options. Chairman Murphy mentioned talking to the town board and potentially updating that overlay district to make that zone more inclusive of good sites that would service the industry. Carry meeting over to the November meeting.

Action, Discussion: 3.04 Matsil 474 Round Lake Park Road (Z063-2021) SBL # 4-4-24

Harley Matsil - owner Jacob Zocco

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to open the public hearing.

Motion by Chairperson - Michael Murphy, second by Steven Thau.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Michael Murphy, Kevin Scully, Marci Daniel, Chip Postiglione, Steven Thau

make an addition to my home, going out 5 feet in the back not as far as the existing patio so as not to change the set back would like to add a second floor and some outside decking to the second floor to the front and side with some stairs up to the flat rooftop deck delayed issues getting Jacob Zocco on for the meeting to assist Mr. Matsil Applicant was supposed to submit additional photos of the upper deck, revise the bulk table, list of supplies being used Mr. MacCartney reviewed the variances. Lot area, lot width existing conditions, lot area is 15,000 sq ft and existing is 9672 sq ft, minimum lot width is 85 existing is 75 but variances are required because of the expansion, minimum side yard again existing 15 feet required have 13 ft and .5 feet total 14 ft total side yard 40 feet required 27 feet provided that is not changing, existing lot coverage is 25.7 but 25 is the max and proposed is 31.3 Mr. Zocco the deck will be a conventional permeable deck. I noted every item on the property broken down for lot coverage on the amended application and because the deck is permeable it does not count towards lot coverage. My calculation includes all the hard surfaces. reviewed photos of the property second floor is going to be the same size foot print of the whole house' deck will be in front of the house and on the side new house flat roof going to be used as a deck open deck doesn't not effect side yard set back, but it does count towards lot coverage applicant replied calculated into current lot coverage submitted reviewed how the lot coverage calculation was configured spoke about the existing path which will now be under the front deck/balcony spoke of the roof top deck that it isn't going to be a durable deck, can't walk on it to much vinyl membrane material if it's not a usable deck why do you need the stairs to go up? open comments to the public Kelly & Mark Trevorah 8 Tephanic Ave all properties close by main concern the roof top he would be looking directly into our property, put up a fence to improve our property and improve our privacy and that is very concerning to me Chairman Murphy I walked the area paying close attention to the topography it seems the surrounding properties are up hill above this property, my perspective the houses uphill of this parcel might be looking out over the top, remember this isn't going to have a peaked roof just the flat top, the roof going from 15 ft to 18 ft is still within the code, I did look to see if this would cause any blockage of view shed but I never consider being on the rooftop and looking out towards the neighbors residences. David Carreras - 458 Round Lake Park Road- sent an email with comments in case I wasn't able to attend this evening. My concern is the flat roof and it becoming habitable outdoor entertainment space, my view of the lake would now be Mr. Matsil deck and that is my concern. I proposed to get a professional evaluation from a real estate agent of what this change to my natural surroundings and settings would have to my

property value. With the short notice of the letter didn't really allow me time to start that process, so I am asking the board to allow that time for that to happen, so myself and maybe other neighbors could really reassess how this impact would happen to the tree lines. My house is really appealing when the foliage drops I get a full beautiful view of the lake and that view will now change. George Tanner - concerned about aesthetics of the neighborhood. We have views of the lake from our back yard and from our third floor that would be changed to looking at Mr. Matsil rooftop deck. Chairman Murphy one of the factors that we discuss in our decision are changes to the character of the neighborhood. Secretary McSweeney reviewed the process for sending out the mailings for public hearing. Residents who sent in comments via email were read into the record by Chairman Murphy and Mr. MacCartney. Member Scully question regarding the roof. A lot of neighbors had concerns about the roof is that part of the variance, I didn't think it was. Chairman Murphy no the roof height is not part of the variance. It is different then what people are use to seeing so instead of a shingled roof they will be seeing a flat deck surface. Mr. MacCartney there are 4 variances: 3 existing conditions that are necessary because of the expansion - single side yard with total side yard, lot width and lot area and then the lot coverage due to the expansion. Mr. MacCartney explained to the board what the next steps would be at this time. open discussion with the applicant to come up with some design aspects and trying to minimize the overall lot coverage variance needed. what type of railing on rooftop deck being used present materials, present the plans that are accurate to what is actually going to be done on the property Mr. MacCartney brought up is that the board shouldn't be designing someone's house as a zoning board, the applicant is looking for guidance but this is not like a brainstorming session were we all come up with the best design for all the different parts of the house that's beyond the zoning boards jurisdiction. What you should be doing is looking at the variances sought and then look at the factors and deciding on the variance criteria and whether it want to grant the variance or not grant the variance. If the applicant is willing to do something to reduce the impacts the board can ask them that. You shouldn't be discussing the materials and what you like better. If applicant wants to come back in November with a new design and materials and a reduction to reduce the variances sought then do that. Held over to November 23rd.

Action, Discussion: 3.05 Kingsville Synagogue (Z061-2021) SBL # 1-1-4.32 10 Kingsville Dr

David Niemotko - representing the applicant

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Town of Monroe hereby motion to open the public hearing.

Motion by Chairperson - Michael Murphy, second by Chip Postiglione.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Michael Murphy, Kevin Scully, Marci Daniel, Chip Postiglione, Steven Thau

presented last meeting to create attic into a 3rd story we are seeking a 1/2 story variance completed all the necessary paperwork and have submitted it we clarified the first & second story layout and the third story proposed layout cover letter dated August 2nd which outlines the number of bedrooms there will be 5 additional bedrooms on the 3rd floor last meeting you asked for an affidavit from the owner regarding intent to complete the site work previously approved by the zoning board and the planning board. The affidavit has been prepared and signed but not notarized as applicant is in Florida. Was submitted today very late. I realize it is not notarized I am told it will be and submitted as a condition of this meeting or the next meeting. Chairman Murphy reviewed the previous application synagogue in the basement level which generated the need for additional parking which was eventually approved by the ZBA and Planning Board. At the present time none of the outside approvals have been addressed. Chairman Murphy addressed Mr. Niemotko as to if any of the interior improvements that were approved have been completed or started as of this point. Mr. Niemotko replied no. Review of site plans which included what was happening on all floors of the building. So what you are currently here before the ZBA for is an approval to change the building from a 2 1/2 story house to a 3 story house creating habitable space in the attic area and that exceeds the maximum number of stories in a building. Member Postiglione after the last meeting I thought there were a few things that were suppose to happen the plans all combined into one set which was done, a notarized affidavit from the owner regarding what was going on at the property there was an affidavit submitted late like today and it was not notarized or the owner at the meeting. I recently went past the property and it is no different then it was when we viewed picture from the Chairman a couple of months ago. So I have to question what are we doing here? Member Daniel I agree completely I'm not sure what is being presented in front of us, if the town policy is buildings to be 2 1/2 stories and that has been exceeded what is actually being presented to us to make a decision on. Mr. Niemotko the problem with this presentation is you are combining what has been approved in the past to what we are currently looking for. We are here before you to get approval for a half-story variance. meeting was opened to the public for comments - no public in attendance board reviewed the 5 factors Mr. MacCartney the discussion I have heard on the 5 factors you are ready for a vote at this time to grant or deny and to authorize me to prepare a resolution consistent with that decision and for the chairman to sign it.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to close the public hearing.

Motion by Chairperson - Michael Murphy, second by Marci Daniel.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Michael Murphy, Kevin Scully, Marci Daniel, Chip Postiglione, Steven Thau

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to deny this application.

Motion by Chairperson - Michael Murphy, second by Steven Thau.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Michael Murphy, Kevin Scully, Marci Daniel, Chip Postiglione, Steven Thau

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion for the Counsel Mr. David MacCartney to prepare a resolution and for the Chairman to sign it upon review for consistency with the proceedings tonight.

Motion by Steven Thau, second by Kevin Scully.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Michael Murphy, Kevin Scully, Marci Daniel, Chip Postiglione, Steven Thau

#### 4. New Project

Action, Discussion: 4.01 Congregation Sheri Torah (Z064-2021) SBL # 2-1-29 49 Larkin Drive

Joel Mann - Brach & Mann We are before you for an area variance for an existing religious school. In 2018 the Planning Board approved the use of Temporary Trailers while the school was being built to house the girls, the resolution of approval was for 3 years. Also a site plan approval for a building called Glenwood II on Forest Ave was granted at the end of 2018. The plan was for the girls to move into Glenwood II once the construction was completed. It took a few months to get the building permits and all the extra plans required and the school started construction in 2019, then Covid hit construction was shut down for a period of time, the school was struggling with funding as all construction relies on private money and there was no fundraising at that time. We have also been struggling with rising costs and lack of building materials, everything is back ordered for months. The construction is now at the 2nd floor and the joists for the roof are back ordered 12-16 months. We originally submitted to the Building Inspector who referred us to the Planning Board to get an extension of 3 years on the trailers. The Planning Board referred us to the ZBA to get an area variance to extend the approval for a period based on the original approval. It's an existing site hooked up to public water & sewer. Member Scully addressed Chairman Murphy and Counsel MacCartney if the Planning Board did the original approval why is it before the ZBA for an approval now? Mr. MacCartney response was his first thought as well, but in researching it the Planning Board can only authorize an approval for 3 years, so they don't have the jurisdiction and the power to grant another permit for an additional 3 years. So if there needs to be more than 3 years they need to appear before the ZBA for relief from that section of the code. Reviewed the site plan and the history of Glenwood I & II. Scheduled for Public hearing in November

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to set the public hearing for November 23, 2021.

Motion by Chairperson - Michael Murphy, second by Kevin Scully.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Michael Murphy, Kevin Scully, Marci Daniel, Chip Postiglione, Steven Thau

## 5. Returning Projects

Action, Discussion: 5.01 Jule Rutledge (Z054-2020) SBL # 11-1-1 228 Sunset Terrace

Rommel Lasso - representing applicant Mr. Lasso reviewed the aspects of the project. We received violation letter from the Building Inspector on the new "shed" accessory building that was built without a permit. Intent was to knock down old shed and use this new one for storage. Received violation letters and then got the survey which brought up three areas that needed variances. They are building height, lot coverage and setback from the main road. Property is located on a corner lot so the distance was different then what we figured at first.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to schedule for a public hearing on November 23, 2021.

Motion by Kevin Scully, second by Steven Thau.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Michael Murphy, Kevin Scully, Marci Daniel, Chip Postiglione, Steven Thau

Action, Discussion: 5.02 Michael Adams (Z062-2021) SBL # 1-1-55.111 485 Rt 208

Joe McKay - Catania, Mahon & Rider brief overview Mr. Adams initially come to the board as he was proposing to construct a pavilion and a two-story storage shed on his property. So he came seeking a variance for both buildings. Each structure needs to be 50 Feet back from the lake front. The shed is proposed to be 20 feet giving a 30 foot variance the pavilion proposed to be 10 feet giving a 40 foot variance, the pavilion also needed a variance from the rear or sideline setback required 5 foot proposed 0 feet variance 5 feet after the original application was processed the Town Engineer and the Building Inspector walked the property with him for the purpose of determining the water line to essentially determine the setback. There is a letter from the Town Engineer Mr. S. Arnott when the waters edge was located it was actually 2 feet shallower than what was depicted on Mr. Adams proposed plan. During the walk with the engineer and the building inspector my client was informed that there were 2 pre-existing non conforming sheds on the property, he has the option of removing the sheds or seeking variances for them as well. There is a correspondence from the building inspector as the front westerly shed and the north side shed. The front shed is encroaching into the neighbor's property so that needs to be relocated, the neighbor is NYS DOT. So this should would be relocated which requires a 60 foot setback and the proposed location would require a 45 foot variance, the code also prohibits sheds or structures in the front yard so that would be an additional variance for that shed. IN respect tot he second pre-existing shed that would also require the 50 foot setback for the lakefront and my client is proposing to relocate that and that

new area would require a 30 foot variance. So tonight am asking to make sure all the variances are correct and ask that this applicant be set for a public hearing at your next meeting. Chairman Murphy now that we are aware of the proposed actions it would be beneficial to have a document that actually shows the existing shed and where it is being moved to. Everything needs to be reflected on the map at the public hearing so that it can be shown as existing and proposed. This is just my feedback but I am not inclined to allow 2 more structures to be built within the 50-foot setback from the lake. This is a 3.5 acre property and he's got a lot of land developed if you can't find your way out of requesting the setback you know I can't guarantee you're going to get a variance on that when it come time to make a decision there are alternatives in my mind to where you are going to relocate these sheds. If you put the shed and pavilion outside that 50 foot setback we wouldn't even be here. I understand living on the lake want the best view and putting the pavilion right up on the lake frontage if this was approved for you we would have to consider what other parcels in the town that would want approvals. We can't look at this property as an isolated issue even though he has no real neighbors up close to him once an approval is granted for one it starts a snow ball effect. We take the setbacks very seriously that's why the rules were put in place. Again it is a large piece of land that has already had clear cutting for the pool and patio which didn't require a variance but it still a lot of clearing going on up by the lake so while you are modifying your map you may want to think about that. I am aware we have to go through the whole process before we make any hasty decisions but I'm giving you the advantage of hearing what's on my mind in advance of the public hearing. Mr. McKay my client has been trying to get everything into compliance. We only received the letter from the building inspector last week and my client has done everything he could to get correspondence to the board and update this. So I thought at least if we had a clarification of what the variances were and have the plan possible updated within the 2 weeks requirement to show them on the plan. Thank you for getting us on the agenda for this evening. Chairman Murphy we only received the Town Engineer with his approval of the shoreline depiction until yesterday. Now that we have all the facts in hand and we're changing some of the aspects of this application I just wanted to give you a read ahead as to where I fall on this topic and I don't represent the entire board but if you can have a map back to Norinne showing what your ultimate proposal is here to get through these variances. Mr. McKay now that everything is before the board there are actually 6 variances that would be required the board may be willing to accommodate several of the variances than others but of course I'll make a further submission with our arguments. I think you're aware that the property is unique that there are no neighbors really can't be seen from the road which will be presented to the board it may be something that it's not all or nothing or the board may choose to allow a variance of a lesser amount after the public hearing which is up to the board and we will get you as much information as we can. Chairman Murphy if you're sending something to the survey or marking it up showing him where you want to relocate these buildings if you can get us that post haste we will at least have that much information in hand something that depicts what your intentions of solving this is in a form of a draft plan by November 2nd then follow up with the formal plan. Mr. McKay confirm

what you need by the 2nd. Chairman Murphy take the existing map you have right now mark out where you're proposing to put these two other sheds (which will ultimately need to be on a signed survey). If you can get us that information by the 2nd we will be willing to schedule a public hearing for November. Mr. McKay it is ok for my client or myself to delineate it on the survey and then follow up with the formal survey. Chairman Murphy yes that is what I am saying. I am giving you that latitude as I know you have to mark something up for the surveyor. Motion made to set public hearing for November 23 2021.

BE IT RESOLVED that the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to schedule a public hearing for November 23 2021 for this applicant if the draft copy of revised plans are received in office by November 2 2021.

Motion by Kevin Scully second by Steven Thau.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Michael Murphy Kevin Scully Marci Daniel Chip Postiglione Steven Thau

#### 6. Minutes

Action Discussion: 6.01 May 25 2021 Minutes

held over to November

Action Discussion: 6.02 June 22 2021 Minutes

held over to November

Action Discussion: 6.03 July 27 2021 Minutes

held over to November

Action Discussion: 6.04 September 28 2021 Minutes

Held over to November

#### 7. Adjournment of Meeting

Action: 7.01 Adjournment of Meeting

BE IT RESOLVED the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Town of Monroe hereby adjourns the meeting at 1:00 am October 27 2021.

Motion by Chairperson - Michael Murphy second by Kevin Scully.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Yea: Chairperson - Michael Murphy Kevin Scully Marci Daniel Chip Postiglione Steven Thau

"