

Town of Monroe
Zoning Board of Appeals Minutes
Tuesday, January 27, 2026
www.townofmonroeny.gov

Generated by Norinne McSweeney

Members Present

Chip Postiglione, Zach Murphy, Steve Thau, John Seeley
Counsel - David MacCartney

Welcome

Roll Call

Pledge of Allegiance

Point Out Fire Exits

Administrative

Appointing of Deputy Chair for 2026

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Zoning Board of Appeals for the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to appoint Steve Thau as Deputy Chairman for the year 2026 expiring on December 31, 2026.

On a motion by Zoning Board of Appeals Chairperson Postiglione, seconded by Zoning Board of Appeals Member Seeley

Ayes: Zoning Board of Appeals Chairperson Postiglione, Zoning Board of Appeals Member Murphy, Zoning Board of Appeals Member Scully, Zoning Board of Appeals Member Thau, Zoning Board of Appeals Member Seeley

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Approval of 2026 Meeting Schedule

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to approve the 2026 meeting schedule.

On a motion by Zoning Board of Appeals Chairperson Postiglione, seconded by Zoning Board of Appeals Member Thau

Ayes: Zoning Board of Appeals Chairperson Postiglione, Zoning Board of Appeals Member Murphy, Zoning Board of Appeals Member Scully, Zoning Board of Appeals Member Thau, Zoning Board of Appeals Member Seeley

Nays: None

Abstain: None

New Projects

Planning Board Appeal

Applicant Representative:

Adam Rodd - attorney

Bonnie Franson - Planning Board Chairwoman

Good Evening Adam Rodd on behalf of the Town of Monroe Planning Board relating to a project located at 485 State Route 208. The mentioned project has had 2 pre-application meetings concerning the development of this property. As the Planning Board Chairman can elaborate further, at the first meeting the applicant represented that they plan to put in a bus terminal and plans were submitted which were part of this package. As you can see from the proposed site plan, all the plans indicate roughly several spaces for the parking of buses and a virtually equivalent number of spaces for the parking of vehicles, demonstrating that the purpose of the use of the property would be for the drivers to drive onto the property pick up the buses that are parked there, drive the buses on their various routes, return to the property, park the buses, and then get back into their cars to drive home. The site plan indicates that this is a bus terminal or a bus depot, as the applicant actually informed the Planning Board during the early part of the meetings. As the Board knows, in the GB district there are various uses that are permitted and uses permitted by special permit and that requires site plan approval. A bus depot or a bus terminal is not one of the uses. The applicant is apparently attempting to characterize the use here as an automotive service repair station and, clearly as indicated on the site plans this is not the primary use. The mere fact that the applicant might say with respect to the buses that we're going to park and store them there before they take their route, and we will service them or perhaps repair them that does not make the primary use an automobile repair use. At the request of the Planning Board, they are appealing the determination of the Building Inspector that it wasn't an allowable use in the GB zone to this Board. And as this Board knows you are perfectly empowered to make a de novo determination whether the proposed use is permitted in the zone.

Chairman Postiglione - When they went to the Building Inspector, he made the determination that it was right for a service or a maintenance building.

Mr. Rodd - I think the Building Inspector deemed what was proposed an auto automotive service station and, therefore, it was a use permitted subject to special permit approval and site plan approval. The Planning Board disagrees with that characterization of the use to be put on the property, and we therefore appeal to the Zoning Board.

Chairman Postiglione - When this was brought to the Planning Board, the application was brought for a bus garage. So is that right?

Ms. Franson - To be clear, the meeting was a pre-application meeting which did not involve the entire Planning Board. This was a pre-submission meeting. No application had been received at that point. It's something that's informal that we do, where a potential applicant can come in and get a sense of whether something will be allowed. Specifically, Ms. Torre, who is our attorney, was on that call, Mr. Mann who was representing the potential application, was also on the call, as was myself. I can tell you distinctly that during that Zoom call, at some point, Ms. Torre initially questioned the representative, you're saying this is a bus terminal, because that's what was represented and our attorney's reaction was that's not allowed in the GB Zone. The response from Mr. Mann I recall was I saw that it was allowed as a special use. What he got confused was there is a special use called bus passenger shelter and bus passenger shelter is one of those small structures where someone waits for a bus. right and so we said no that's not allowed. Even though we discussed the application some of the other issues associated with it site features, etc. It didn't go very far because our attorney said, "No, this based on what you've expressed and what you're doing here, it's not allowed." That was our first pre-submission

meeting.

Chairman Postiglione - at that point did they go to the Building Inspector or did they actually submit after that initial meeting? And thank you for clearing that up with that pre-meeting. Did they actually give a submit?

Ms. Franson - they have yet to submit a formal application to the Planning Board. What transpired is the potential applicant asked for a second pre-submission meeting and our instant reaction was, "Oh, well, you know, that's interesting because we already discussed that this isn't allowed here." When we got into that second pre-submission meeting, that question was raised. why are you still proposing this? are you going to go for a use variance? Are you going to get a zone change? Still not allowed. That's when we discovered at that pre-submission meeting that unbeknownst to us, the applicant had gone to the Building Inspector, submitted some information in writing, including the site plan, and Mr. Maldonado made his determination without letting us know. We discovered it by chance during that second pre-submission meeting. I would say the sequence is first pre-submission meeting, where we said this isn't allowed, then they went to Mr. Maldonado without us knowing, us meaning the people on the pre-submission call and the Planning Board and then the second pre-submission where we discovered that in fact had happened.

Mr. MacCartney - this is the first time being presented to the Board and it's going to require a public hearing. If you have anything further that you'd like to hear from the applicant, any further preliminary questions or data you'd like to hear or have them bring to the hearing, now would be the time to talk to them about it.

Chairman Postiglione - as we sit here as a Zoning Board it sometimes feels like we get stuck between two parents, they don't like the answer mom gave them and go get an answer from dad or vice versa, it's just a tough spot.

Member Seeley questioning #7 on the submission if the applicant responded.

Chairman Postiglione - the Building Inspectors determination basically sees fit for a maintenance building or maintenance facility. Thanks, I'm going to give the other group a chance to speak.

Mr. MacCartney - Keeping in mind, this is not the public hearing.

Chairman Postiglione - No, we're just talking and gathering information so everybody knows their options.

Mr. MacCartney - The applicant is the Planning Board, the underlying applicant, the land use applicant, doesn't have the right to speak before you tonight because it's the first time on the agenda, They absolutely have the right to be heard, as they've submitted an opposition, at the public hearing, they have a full right to be heard and protect their rights. If you want to hear from them now, it's within your discretion to hear from them and if you don't, that's also fine.

Ms. Franson - I would only add that unless I'm not aware of a submission made, it's not even an applicant. It's a potential applicant because we don't have a formal application,

Chairman Postiglione - in the spirit of trying to get a handle on this because there's a lot going on with the timeline. I would like to hear from the other side just to get a couple of questions in my own head straight.

Ms. Franson - If the potential applicant from the Planning Board's perspective allowed to speak is that the end for this evening and then everything else will be taken up at the public hearing or can we come back up? I just want to understand.

Chairman Postiglione - You could come back up.

Mr. MacCartney - Keeping in mind right now we're this is a 30,000 foot view of the application. We don't have to get into the nitty-gritty. We're not taking testimony, but to allow the Board to get their head around what the issues are.

Ms. Franson - we've only just received Zarin and Steinmetz opposition. We haven't even really had an opportunity to take a look at it.

Representatives for the proposed applicant:

Mr. Richmond - Zarin & Steinmetz, LLP
Joel Mann - Brach & Mann Associates

Chairman Postiglione - thank you for coming in front of the Board to help get the timeline and what's going on here in order. I do appreciate how the Planning Board laid it out for us on their view, but go ahead with your view.

Mr. Richmond - first I would like to start off with a couple of procedural issues that we've laid out in our letter to your Board of January 20, 2026. In the first instance, this appeal was filed 30 days after the Building determination was issued by the Building Inspector. So, we think that this, pursuant to the Town code, which only allows your Board to entertain appeals that are timely filed. So, we submit that this is not timely filed. We've also raised in our letter, we do not think the Planning Board has the ability, has the authority to commence appeals. They clearly under your Town code are limited to reviewing site plans, special certain special permits, approving plats, modifying certain zoning requirements related to cluster subdivisions, but nothing allows them to file an appeal with your Board. As your Board is aware, the law is very clear that the Planning Board does not have the authority to interpret zoning code. And I think that goes hand in hand with their lack of authority to bring an appeal to the merits. We have been clear that this is an automotive service station service repair that this is where buses are going to be brought at the end of the day for repair. They're going to be electric vehicles. They're going to be recharged. Drivers are going to come there in the morning to pick up the buses, so the parking is an accessory use which as the Building Inspector determined is both those the primary use as an automotive service station is permitted by special permit under the Town Code and the accessory parking use is also permitted at best giving the Planning Board some lenience. They're raising an ambiguity which again it's up to the applicant. The applicant determines what the use is the law is clear. For example, I bring to your attention CAM Hampton One Realty Corp versus Board of Zoning Appeals of East Hampton 273 AD2 385 that the a zoning board does not permit speculation that a permit applicant is going to use a property for something that's not permitted or something that wasn't justified. Again, the Building Inspectors determined, it's indisputable and the Planning Board doesn't contest it that automotive service stations are allowable by special permit in the GB district. What we're proposing is located on a site that's ideal for that kind of use. It's right off of State Highway 17. It's bounded by the lake. It's not going to have impacts. Again, these are going to be electrical buses. zero emission buses. So, they're not going to have a limited environmental impact, if any. But, the Planning Board's speculation that it would be used illegally for a bus terminal or a bus depot respectfully provides no basis for your Board to overturn the Building Inspector. Again, what we are proposing is a service station. The Building Inspector is free to make site visits to determine that it's being used as a service station. Again, these are buses, you know, used by commuters that are offloaded and loaded at a different location. Again, they do need regular maintenance.

Mr. Mann - Mr. Chairman we don't want to put you in a hard position between the Planning Board and the Building Inspector, but again I was at the first tech meeting before I got my attorney involved and the proposal like Ms. Franson said we proposed the first submission with the same site plan whatever a different configuration, but the same site plan we have automobile service and repair station with associated offices and she's right that the attorney asked the question under which code is this allowed and initially when I submitted that on my bulk table it's under GB every type of business. Example: if you have an air conditioning company that has their shop, storage, and offices its allowed under the code, then they have the service vans that go out during the day and come back at night and park there. Everyone understands that the parking is accessory. The main use is the building and then you have the parking as the accessory. The same thing, I got a little bit shocked by the question and didn't have a clear language and understanding to explain why at the first meeting that's why I told them let me go back to the code and make sure that I have everything right. So, I went back to the code book

the zoning book I looked over everything I have falls under the GB. So I decided let's go to the Building Inspector to make sure that I'm on the right path. I proposed the plan with the land use determination form. I had the attorney write a letter explaining the use. We have an automotive service station where we will be servicing the buses with associated offices for the company, and we have cars parked for the people that work in there or taking out the buses. And then they have the buses coming down being serviced refreshed in the building or outside. But that's the use of the property and they and at the morning they're going back out pick up people, but this is not a location where people are being picked up or dropped off. This is not a bus terminal or anything like that. So we gave them the explanation and we got back the interpretation. At the second tech meeting, we proposed that to the Planning Board. At that point I felt that they were thinking I want to say that openly here I didn't try to go behind their back. It was just innocently I was trying to figure out how to use the property. I went to the Building Inspector to get a better understanding and had him write the letter. We got the interpretation. The second tech meeting we proposed that letter to the Planning Board. It seemed they had a feeling and, I want to say that clearly that was not my intent, that we want behind their back and got some type of interpretation. Why we went all to the tech meetings typically I will put an application to the Planning Board we tried to get the tech meeting because as I explained that at the tech meeting it's uncertain type of property the shape of the property the location. It's on the Route 208. I'm not sure if that was submitted to you. Route 208 has a proposal from the DOT to be rerouted in a different location. So we had a traffic consultant Phil Greeley from Colliers at that meeting to make sure that we want to see which direction we're going before spending so much money getting into the Planning Board paying all the fees we want to know how the Planning Board's feeling is on that and specifically about the location of the entrance, we had multiple options it was more like the surroundings of the property the different shape. I was not even thinking that there's going to be a question on the use this was something that was very clear that this is something that falls under use like the building inspector interpreted with that, I hope that we can get this cleared up.

Chairman Postiglione - you could see where there's confusion, by listening to what you just said and listening to what they said. I am going to summarize what I feel is going on. In that first pre-meeting that you asked the Planning Board for, at that meeting they heard bus garage, you said maybe you misrepresented what you were saying, so you said you were a little shocked by the question from the lawyer and you didn't know how to answer it. After the meeting ended, you started thinking how did it go like this? You started looking back on how you might have represented it, thinking and doing your due diligence that you felt you were right. At that point did you go to the Building Inspector for his determination or realize that maybe you didn't represent the project the way you felt and maybe give the Planning Board another try before going to get another determination by somebody else. Listening to what Mr. Mann just had to say about it in his own words. I'm just trying to get a timeline of why this is in front of the ZBA right now.

Mr. Richmond comments on Chairman Postiglione summary. When I hear about the first meeting, it seems like a bit of a red herring. Regardless of what happened at that meeting, we clearly then advanced a plan for an automotive service station. That's what was before the Building Inspector. We didn't want to waste any more of the client's money pursuing a use. Mr. Mann I was trying to understand exactly, it was the same use that I was proposing but the second tech meeting for the Planning Board I proposed as at the first. I was in the middle of the meeting saying I was shocked it was like phrased in, I explained to have an automobile repair station, then they asked me is this a bus terminal. A bus terminal is not allowed. I was starting to think no this is not a bus terminal because a bus terminal is basically where you picking up or you exchanging things. No I have a repair shop. I just didn't have the words to explain it and get it better. I was thinking okay let me before I say anything let me go back make sure that I have the right backup for everything and what we are allowed. I went back and looked at the zoning a

repair station doesn't say any automotive repair station isn't allowed. Parking is not limiting anything. You can have all type of accessory parking for any of your equipment just like if you have like excavation companies or something like that. They also parking their machinery there. So I just want to have the right words and make sure that I explained myself clearly and that's what I did. I did the narrative, went to the Building Inspector, got the clarification, went back to the second tech review meeting so I can clear this up. We're good on tech meeting, double checked on the zoning so we can move forward with all other items that came up at the tech meeting and then I got noticed with the appeal.

Chairman Postiglione wants to get copies of any paperwork that was submitted for the 2 tech reviews including any paperwork given to the Building Inspector and received back from him.

Ms. Franson - I'd just like to bring to your attention that our submission that was made by our attorney does have the map that shows office and maintenance. The reference to repairs I believe was added after the fact, but we would need to get dates on that to be certain. I would just add Mr. Richmond nor any attorney was present at the first meeting. So, the reality is our attorney was present. She is on maternity leave at this point. I think it would be beneficial if possible to get her notes. We may use the word terminal station, those are not defined in our code, but what was clear after the first meeting was the primary purpose was to store buses there. Essentially, drivers would come, they would get on the bus, they would drive wherever they're going to drive and then they would return. In fact, from my perspective, that is further defined by the second plan where there's exactly 29 buses and exactly 29 vehicle parking spaces, one for each bus driver. So that doesn't leave a lot of spaces for repairs. But that's my opinion looking at the map and again through the lens that the very first meeting this was described as a place that they were going to the primary purpose was to store the buses where people would get on, they would go wherever and then they're stored there. At the second meeting, I asked, okay, if this is if you're now saying this is a repair garage, then it would seem once they're repaired, if that's the primary purpose, they will leave. But these buses stay there 24/7 except for when they're on the roads. So all of these from my perspective are pointing to the fact that the primary purpose is not to repair them. it's a bus depot station etc where they're going to use it primarily for placing their buses there. There were also other pieces of information that were submitted in the letter to the Building Inspector about wetlands other stuff from our perspective that will be addressed if the applicant come back for site plan approval they would have to meet special use permit standards site plan standards. From our perspective that will be done later. We're really trying to focus just simply on, is this really a use that was allowed?

Member Thau - Am I to assume also that the bus drivers when they pick up their bus in the morning, they're bringing their personal vehicle, parking it on site, and then leaving with the bus for the day? Has that been discussed?

Ms. Franson - That would appear to be what the intent is with the 29 vehicle parking spaces.

Member. Thau - If you have 29 vehicle bus operators, then you have 29 people showing up for work, taking the bus and driving and leaving their car. Yes. At the location.

Ms. Franson - that's my perspective again, this was all during a presubmission, so this hasn't been in front of the Planning Board. You know, there were only so many questions we asked because the reality that this had already received a land use determination was a surprise to us. I want to emphasize we're not here to say we like, we don't like at all. It's not about any kind of predetermination or this is or isn't appropriate. It's simply is this in fact allowed in the zone because after our first presubmission meeting and discussion with our attorney and what was represented not just the word that was used but the way it was in its totality represented it was not a repair station. It was a place to store buses essentially. And if you know again, if it's allowed it's allowed. If it's not it's not. But we're coming to you to make that determination.

Member Thau - I'm sorry. I have just one more quick question. Under column three on exhibit C, number three indicates parking pursuant to article 12. Do you know what the article 12 is in states?

Ms. Franson - article 12 would be parking and loading space requirements, garages and service stations.

Mr. Rodd - one other item that was mentioned by the applicant the issue of timeliness and I just want to emphasize that you know a couple of points the Planning Board as I understand it first was provided with the determination from the Building Inspector on October 25 and the appeal was filed on November 7, 2025. Their argument as I understand it is the determination was actually rendered on September 10, 2025 you know which is true, but that was never provided to the Planning Board. I'm just as a factual matter that determination was not provided to the Planning Board by anyone. not the applicant or Mr. Maldonado. Under the code apparently that there is no requirement for a determination to be forwarded to every single board and agency. I just wanted to address that point. Again, we're not quibbling with the fact that an automotive service station is allowed in the GB district. That's a given and we agree with that. The definition of an automotive service station uses the word primarily to perform those tasks. That's the primary use and the gist of the appeal is the primary use here is clearly the storage and parking of buses so that the drivers go there, park their vehicles, go to the bus, drive away to do their pickups, drive the buses back onto the property and then store the buses until the next day of use. And that's why there's on their own plans there's a an exact correlation or virtually exact correlation on all the plans between automotive parking spaces and bus storage spaces. I would submit and just you're the final arbiters of that as the Zoning Board that does not sound like any auto repair shop that I think most of us understand in terms of the use of purpose.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Zoning Board of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to schedule a public hearing for February 24, 2026.

On a motion by Zoning Board of Appeals Chairperson Postiglione, seconded by Zoning Board of Appeals Member Seeley

Ayes: Zoning Board of Appeals Chairperson Postiglione, Zoning Board of Appeals Member Murphy, Zoning Board of Appeals Member Thau, Zoning Board of Appeals Member Seeley

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Sebastian Bialasiewicz (Z106-2026) SBL # 30-3-2

5 Carol Drive

Monroe, NY

Applicant Representative:
Sebastian Bialasiewicz - owner
Kris Kozlowski - Architect

Mr. Bialasiewicz - we are trying to do an addition to our house. We applied for a building permit and it was denied, we were referred to the ZBA for a variance. Per the letter from the Building Inspector we need a variance for lot area and front yard set back on a nonconforming structure. The existing dwelling is approx. 26 feet from the property line for the front yard set back and required is 40 feet. The proposed addition would meet the zoning requirements.

Chairman Postiglione - reviewed the project.

Lot area required 20,000 sq/ft existing is 16,992 sq/ft existing nonconforming condition
Front yard is 25.6 feet where 40 feet is required difference of 14.4 also existing nonconforming condition

Where are you proposing to put the addition?

Mr. Bialasiewicz - we are proposing to build on the right side of the house.

Survey that was submitted was from 2022 applicant did hand out a new survey.

Chairman Postiglione - how long have you owned the property?

Mr. Bialasiewicz - since 1999 correction 2019.

Chairman Postiglione - have you done any work on the property at this point?

Mr. Bialasiewicz - no nothing. We didn't know about the 20,000 sq/ft requirement when we purchased the house. When we did the survey you can see that the property line is going through the middle of the space between our dwelling and the street, unnatural wide utility space. From the history of the property the building was originally used as an office then converted to living space.

Discussion and review of the plans just handed to the board.

Applicant will be removing some black top to reduce the lot coverage
removing the stairs and the stoop making it one level
can you provide a larger layout of the dwelling

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to set the public hearing for the Bialasiewicz project for February 24, 2025.

On a motion by Zoning Board of Appeals Chairperson Postiglione, seconded by Zoning Board of Appeals Member Thau

Ayes: Zoning Board of Appeals Chairperson Postiglione, Zoning Board of Appeals Member Murphy, Zoning Board of Appeals Member Scully, Zoning Board of Appeals Member Thau, Zoning Board of Appeals Member Seeley

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Returning Projects

**Joel Brach (Z105-2025) SBL # 7-1-45
190 Cromwell Hill Road
Monroe, NY 10950**

Applicant Representative:
Josh Dembitzer - The Mylu Team

Chairman Postiglione - I was not present when you were here the first time.

Member Murphy - they purchased the property from what I could see exactly like this, but now going back it doesn't pass because of total lot coverage and of the shed in the backyard. I was able to walk the property for quite some time. It didn't look like anything was freshly built or new. This looked like these things had been here for quite some time. So they kind of inherited this total lot coverage issue. But they were nice enough to give us a new updated survey showing us exactly the square footage of each area.

Chairman Postiglione - the only thing I currently have is the new survey. Fill me in on what happened during the last meeting.

Member Murphy - there is an issue with the shed in the backyard. It's currently approximately 2 and 1/2 ft away from the fence, but it needs to be 5T. That shed is pretty well built into the ground. You know, I took a look to see if it was movable, it's been there for a while. Then the lot coverage, the lot coverage is a lot of concrete patios, It's very nice backyard. It's has some ponds, and fountains. Um, but that's kind of probably where we got some of this lot coverage issue from. It also has a massive driveway in the front. So, those things kind of start adding up on them.

Chairman Postiglione - how long have you owned this property?

Mr. Dembitzer - I'm not the owner I'm representing the owner Joel Brach. I would say 2-3 years.

Member Murphy - nothing on the property looked like it was fresh from the past two years.

Chairman Postiglione - the property is not coming in as pre-existing non conforming?

Member Murphy - yes it is.

Mr. Dembitzer - I went for a permit it was denied and I was referred to the ZBA for a variance.

Notes from the Building Inspectors letter:

Property in the RR-1 zone

it is a corner lot as per section 57-3 has additional setback requirements

57-39 all yards on corner lots and existing through lots abutting any street shall meet the requirements for front yard setbacks for the district in which the lot is located.

57-41 Where a lot extends through from street to street the applicable front yard regulations shall apply on both frontages

shed to the rear left is in violation no permit of record for it and in violation of 57-38 accessory building shall not be constructed within 5' of any rear or side lot line. Applicant needs to get a permit for the shed and move to comply with the above code or get a variance.

Front Yard setback 50' required existing 35.9" off Jonah Drive encroachment of 14.1'

Lot coverage 15% existing per as built survey 34.7% difference of 19.7% over the maximum allowed

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to schedule a public hearing for the 190 Cromwell Hill Road property.

On a motion by Zoning Board of Appeals Chairperson Postiglione, seconded by Zoning Board of Appeals Member Thau

Ayes: Zoning Board of Appeals Chairperson Postiglione, Zoning Board of Appeals Member Murphy, Zoning Board of Appeals Member Scully, Zoning Board of Appeals Member Thau, Zoning Board of Appeals Member Seeley

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Minutes

09232025 Minutes

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to approve the September 23, 2025 minutes.

On a motion by Zoning Board of Appeals Chairperson Postiglione, seconded by Zoning Board of Appeals Member Seeley

Ayes: Zoning Board of Appeals Chairperson Postiglione, Zoning Board of Appeals Member Murphy, Zoning Board of Appeals Member Scully, Zoning Board of Appeals Member Thau, Zoning Board of Appeals Member Seeley

Nays: None

Abstain: None

10232025

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to approve the October 23, 2025 minutes.

On a motion by Zoning Board of Appeals Chairperson Postiglione, seconded by Zoning Board of Appeals Member Thau

Ayes: Zoning Board of Appeals Chairperson Postiglione, Zoning Board of Appeals Member Murphy, Zoning Board of Appeals Member Scully, Zoning Board of Appeals Member Thau, Zoning Board of Appeals Member Seeley

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Adjournment

Adjournment of Meeting

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Town of Monroe hereby makes a motion to adjourn tonight's meeting.

On a motion by Zoning Board of Appeals Chairperson Postiglione, seconded by Zoning Board of Appeals Member Thau

Ayes: Zoning Board of Appeals Chairperson Postiglione, Zoning Board of Appeals Member Murphy, Zoning Board of Appeals Member Scully, Zoning Board of Appeals Member Thau, Zoning Board of Appeals Member Seeley

Nays: None

Abstain: None