

The minutes of the Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting held on Thursday, March 8th, 2018, beginning at 7:30 PM.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

<u>ROLL CALL</u>	Edwin Rivera, Chairman	- Present
	Jose Guareño	- Present
	Deyanira Martinez	- Present
	Richard Santiago	- Absent
	Jose Hilario	- Present
	Dennis Michaels, Village Atty.	- Present
	Ruben Berrios, Bldg.Inspector	- Present
	Michelle Ventura, Clerk Typist	- Present

Chairman Rivera opened up the meeting by introducing the first item on the agenda, Jorge Lopez, 33 Division Street. **27.46-1-40**

Dennis Michaels: This is the continued Public Hearing of Jorge Lopez, 33 Division Street converting a one family into a two family dwelling where variances are needed for minimum lot area, minimum lot width, front yard, right and left side yards, and total width of both side yards as well as zero off street parking. Mr. Lopez is also amending his previous application to add additional variances for a third story addition and a variance for extending the side of a conforming building without required bulk in an R-3 Zoning district. Mr. Michaels asked the applicant Jorge Lopez if there were any new changes to the application since last month's meeting.

Jorge Lopez: Mr. Lopez answered no.

Edwin Rivera: Mr. Rivera stated the Public Hearing is open and asked the public to come forward with any questions or concerns regarding the application Jorge Lopez, 33 Division Street.

Pastor Caliman: Pastor Caliman from the Baptist Church, Haverstraw NY. My question is, from the last report we have, has anything changed as far as permits to do what he wants to do to continue the work?

Ruben Berrios: Mr. Berrios explains we can't issue permits unless you get an approval. There is still a stop work order on the third floor.

Dennis Michaels: Mr. Michaels agrees and states this board has to approve what he's proposing before he can get a building permit to do the work. Whatever work was being done without the appropriate approvals, a stop work order has been issued by the Building Inspector Ruben Berrios.

Pastor Caliman: Mr. Caliman asks if it's up to the board to decide whether or not he can continue.

Dennis Michaels: Correct. Before anyone else comes up to speak, I would like to read a correspondence letter the Village Zoning Board of Appeals received from

the Rockland County Department of Planning, dated January 22, 2018, 2 pages signed by Douglas J. Schuetz and it reads in substance,

“Disapprove. No site plan was provided with this application. A site plan prepared by a surveyor or engineer must be provided in order to properly evaluate this application. The following comments reflect our additional concerns about the project:

1. Permitting development that does not comply with the applicable bulk standards can set an undesirable land use precedent and result in the overutilization of individual sites. The lot size and width are only 25% and 28% of the required minimums for this use, respectively. The existing structure extends almost to the front and side property lines, providing only a small fraction of the required minimum front, side and total side yards. No off street parking spaces are provided while four are required. The ability of the existing infrastructure to accommodate increased residential density on undersized parcels is a countywide concern and must be evaluated. This evaluation must consider whether local roads will become more congested and the sewer system, storm water management systems and the public water supply will be overburdened. The Village must consider the cumulative and regional impacts of permitting such development.

2. The Town of Haverstraw is reason this proposal was referred to this department for review. The municipal boundary is approximately 215 feet to the east at the mean high tide of the Hudson River. As required under Section 239nn of the State General Municipal Law, the Town of Haverstraw must be given the opportunity to review the proposed subdivision and provide any concerns related to the project to the Village of Haverstraw.”

Mr. Michaels asked the clerk if this application was sent to the Town of Haverstraw for Review.

Michelle Ventura: Ms. Ventura stated she did not.

Ruben Berrios: Mr. Berrios believes that was an error due to the property being more than 2000 feet away. The park belongs to the Village and not in the Town.

Dennis Michaels: Mr. Michaels believes if you are around 500 feet of a County stream or River it must go to the County not to the Town. So this is definitely more than 500 feet from the Town of Haverstraw?

Ruben Berrios: Correct.

Dennis Michaels: Mr. Michaels legal opinion is, if this site at its closest point is more than 500 feet from the Town of Haverstraw boundary, than it does not need to go to the Town of Haverstraw for their consideration or comments. So if this board were inclined to approve this application, we would need a super majority vote. This means 4 members would have to vote to override the disapproval of the County and that particular comment. Comment number 1, I would ask the board that there are some technical suggestions that may require the Village Engineer's input. I'm unsure if this went to Eve Mancuso but for example, it talks about “the ability of the existing infrastructure to accommodate increased

residential density on undersized parcels is a countywide concern and must be evaluated” so perhaps this could also go to the Village Planner Max Stach. I will leave that to you all to discuss. “This evaluation must consider whether local roads will become more congested and the sewer system, storm water management systems and the public water supply will be overburdened.” Again, that would be for the Village Engineer. “The Village must consider the cumulative and regional impacts of permitting such development” which is a Village Planner question. Mr. Michaels asked the board what their thoughts were on sending this application and receiving feedback from the Village Planner and or Engineer. Again, if your inclination is at some point to approve this application, you need to override the County’s disapproval by a supermajority vote. Not only that, but you’d have to explain your reasoning for the override. These points brought up in comment number 1 are not legal concerns but technical concerns so I cannot guide you on these items. This is a 3 family zoning district, meaning you can have up to a 3 family building in the zone as a matter of right. This doesn’t mean you automatically get to build a three family residence. You have to get variances which may or may not be approved.

Ruben Berrios: Mr. Berrios summarizes the letter by letting the board know it states it will increase our roads and sewer systems, storm water management systems and the public water supply.

Edwin Rivera: Mr. Rivera asks if we send this to the Village Engineer, we cannot close the public hearing correct?

Dennis Michaels: That is correct. This is a one family residence proposing a two family dwelling in a zoning district that allows up to three. So what Ruben is saying is, this is permitted in the zone and not in overutilization in terms of its use.

Jose Guareño: Mr. Guareño asked the applicant Jorge Lopez how many bedrooms existed before work began and how many exist now.

Jorge Lopez: Mr. Lopez answered before there were four and now there are still four.

Jose Guareño: So the increase is the additional bathroom for the apartment would be the only drainage concern because the footprint is not changing. The overall dramatic change that was done to the property was the third floor addition that was not in the original plans. From my recollection, he wasn’t adding 6 or 7 bedrooms. He stayed within the confinement of 4 bedrooms, which we were aware of. The second apartment would then have to have a kitchen and bathroom addition. What set the entire application back was the third floor laundry addition. The third floor addition has a stop work order because he didn’t have a permit to do the work that he did. Prior to that, we were inclined to the application. We heard everyone’s concerns, but at the end of the day, what set everything back was the third floor addition that he did not have a permit for. Ultimately the decision will be based solely off the third floor addition, whether it’s done tonight or in another meeting. We will also have to address the letter and take it from there.

Dennis Michaels: So the sentiments I'm hearing is the County's comment number 1 with regarding to local roads being more congested and sewer systems, storm water management systems and the public water supply being overburdened, and considering regional impacts it's not justified because he's proposing a two family residence in a three family zone. The only reason he's here is because he is adding a third story into livable space. This doesn't increase the density of the neighborhood because it does allow up to three families.

Ruben Berrios: Mr. Berrios explains the application had to go to the county originally because the property is within 500 feet from the Hudson.

Edwin Rivera: Mr. Rivera asked Mr. Lopez how big the third floor is.

Jorge Lopez: The third floor is about 150 square feet.

Deyanira Martinez: What's the difference to comply with the code?

Ruben Berrios: You're only allowed 2.5 stories.

Jose Hilario: Going back to the letter, we don't have to send the letter to the Town of Haverstraw, correct?

Dennis Michaels: You don't as long as it's greater than 500 feet from the Town of Haverstraw boundary.

Edwin Rivera: Mr. Rivera asked Jorge if he needed the third floor.

Jorge Lopez: Mr. Lopez stated the third floor has the furnace on that level.

Edwin Rivera: Mr. Rivera asked if it were possible to move it to another floor.

Jorge Lopez: Mr. Lopez stated it wouldn't work well and it's better to have it run from the top.

Deyanira Martinez: How is the basement in size and it is currently empty?

Jorge Lopez: The basement is 17 by 18 feet and it is empty at the moment. Eventually it will have a bathroom and washer and dryer for the first floor apartment. So the upstairs will be around 12 by 14 feet.

Pastor Caliman: So the basement according to his plans is to have a recreation room and a bathroom. The recreation room will eventually become a bedroom.

Ruben Berrios: When you have habitable space in the basement like a bedroom for example, that would have to be approved by this board. If you're going to finish it to be a recreation room or a family room and you meet all the state code requirements you do not need to get permission from the zoning board.

Pastor Caliman: But you won't really know what it's being used for.

Dennis Michaels: Pastor, your concerns are valid. Anyone violating the law is an appropriate concern for anyone in the community. But this board cannot evaluate the land use application based upon the potential that the occupants or the owner will violate the law. So if Mr. Lopez or the future owner of this building, occupants, tenants etc. are going to do anything in that building that's contrary to applicable law whatever that law may be, that's law enforcement/ code enforcement and it's not something within this board's jurisdiction.

Pastor Caliman: Mr. Caliman says the attic and the basement will then be habitable space.

Ruben Berrios: If it's for a bedroom you have to get permission from this board. If not, it can be used for anything other than a bedroom. If he asks this board for an approval of a bedroom in the basement you could do that as long as the board votes that it's ok. As far as the third floor, it has to meet code. It has to be sprinkled; it has to meet the height requirement, and have an egress window. Once you have all that you can pretty much use it for whatever you want.

Geraldine Chinnery, 16 Coolidge Court, Haverstraw NY: Ms. Chinnery needed better clarification on exactly what the set back variances really mean.

Ruben Berrios: When you're constructing a building, for example a one family dwelling, you have to have a certain amount of square footage for the entire lot size. For a single family set back, you need 25ft in the front, 25ft in the rear, and 10/15 side yard at no time less than 10. For a two family dwelling, you're required to have 30ft in the front, 30ft in the rear and 15 on the sides from the space between the house to the property line. That's what a setback is.

Geraldine Chinnery: Does he currently have that?

Ruben Berrios: Mr. Lopez does not, that's why he's here.

Geraldine Chinnery: So how do you propose that he gets that?

Ruben Berrios: The board has to issue a variance(s) for that. The only thing he has is the rear but he doesn't have the sides or the front.

Geraldine Chinnery: So if you give him those variances, how does he get that space?

Ruben Berrios: He doesn't.

Dennis Michaels: There's no physical change. The zoning regulations determine how big a building can be according to height, width and length. A setback is the distance between the exterior outside of the building and its nearest property line. So the side yard setback in Mr. Lopez's case has to be 15ft. So that means his side yard has to be 15ft wide from the outside of the building to the nearest property line. He currently doesn't meet that and he's not changing the outside of the building other than aesthetics and bumping out that third level. So the footprint of the building is not changing but because he's changing the third level,

the attic is now going to become a floor; he needs to get variances for these preexisting nonconformities. Whenever a building is too big for what's allowed in the zoning regulations, it's nonconforming. So he was allowed to continue those nonconformities forever until he changes what's there. So since he's changing what's there now he needs variances for those nonconformities. He's supposed to have a minimum 10,000 square foot lot, and only has 2000 square feet which is not unusual in the village. Most of the lots in the village are probably substandard, so he'll need a variance for that. The front yard needs 30 feet but he only has 1.7 feet so he needs a variance for that. Does this help you understand?

Geraldine Chinnery: I hear what you're saying but my question is, once you allow the variances how does he get the feet?

Dennis Michaels: He doesn't. The variance means he doesn't need it anyone because this board gave him a variance, they varied from the regulations. They're allowing Mr. Lopez to vary what the code requires.

Geraldine Chinnery: So you're just giving him permission to use what he has even though it doesn't meet code.

Pastor Caliman: Is parking allowed in the rear?

Dennis Michaels: He needs off street parking; he's supposed to have four spaces on his lot. He's not proposing off street parking, that's why he's here for that so he'll need variances from that regulations as well.

Chairman Rivera asked the public to come forward with any other questions or concerns.

Geraldine Chinnery: So no certificate of occupancy is given when he's finished?

Ruben Berrios: He does get a CO, but we have a program in the Village called Rental Registration where all the property owners have to register. We have to know who's living there as far as tenants, and we have to do a physical inspection between two to three years. If there's anything going on in the basement we would know.

Edwin Rivera: Mr. Lopez, if this board granted this variance for parking, because street parking at night is a nightmare, would you purchase a permit for the municipal lots?

Jorge Lopez: We would buy those parking permits.

Chairman Rivera asked the public to come forward with any other questions or concerns.

Dennis Michaels: So it sounds like you don't need to send this to the Village Engineer or planner is that the consensus of the board?

All board members agreed.

Dennis Michaels: Well if you have no other information or reports you'd like to hear from the Building Inspector, Village Engineer and or Village Planner, and no more questions for the applicant then you can close the public hearing. You can deliberate and decide the application this evening. You do have up to 62 days from when you close the public hearing to decide on this application.

Chairman Rivera made a motion to close the Public Hearing for Jorge Lopez, 33 Division Street, Haverstraw, NY 10927.

RESOLUTION **14-2018** Motion by: Jose Hilario
Seconded by: Deyanira Martinez
Carried by: All

Edwin Rivera: Mr. Rivera announced they will not vote tonight. They have 60 days to deliberate.

Dennis Michaels: So the Public Hearing is closed so we cannot hear from anyone. This is procedural information only. The board will deliberate and they must deliberate in public. The public has the right to attend the deliberation and observe but no one can speak, ask questions or comment. They may deliberate at the next meeting, so call and ask if the deliberations will be discussed in the April 12th Zoning Board meeting. As a courtesy to all people here for 33 Division, they did not anticipate deliberating on Mr. Lopez application this evening.

Chairman Edwin Rivera introduced the final applicant of the night, PAG Investments LLC, 217 Rte 9W, Haverstraw, NY 10927. **26.42-1-9**

Dennis Micheals: Anyone who is interested in this application, they're proposing a 100,000 square foot self storage facility.

Amy Mele, Attorney: My name is Amy Mele, 4 Laurel Road, New City NY. I'm the attorney representing the applicant Gurshnel Alexander, from PAG Investments. We're here tonight informally because we have an application for a self storage facility at the corner of 9W and Gurnee Avenue. Self Storage facilities need to be of a certain number of square feet to really make them viable. We've worked really hard with all of our consultants. We've been to your Technical Advisory Committee meeting and we've been to the Planning Board once and shown this application. What we had originally was a 5 story building that stepped down as you went down the road. We got feedback that nobody liked the 5 story concept. We went back to the drawing board and came back with a 4 concept. The reason we're here tonight is because my client, Mr. Gurshnel Alexander and his partner Mr. Aritson who are here tonight, they want honest feedback. If this is something the Village would like, we think it could be of value to the Village. It doesn't have a lot of traffic and won't create a lot of traffic. We have two representatives here tonight to show you renderings. We think it'll be a nice entrance way and a low intensity use. If you all believe we don't see any way we could go through with this, we'd prefer not to spend any more money on it and move onto our next project. We worked hard to blend in with the environment and have a least visual

impact on any surrounding residence; it would be a nice gateway to the village. We were also going to do an informal before the ARB, to make sure they liked our plans. We just want to hear everyone's feedback and if it goes in our favor we will be back for a formal.

Jeffrey Martel, Stonefield Engineering: We are of course asking for a height variance. There's actually a 35 foot grade change on this property. We have what we're calling a 4 story building. However from the rear, it's actually lower than the 35 feet allowable. There's a full story that's embedded within the ground. If you look at it from another view, there are actually two stories that are embedded because the grade sits that much higher on the west side. This use is a bit of an anomaly this use when you consider the size of the building verses the intensity of the building. Traffic generation is extremely low, activity is relatively minimal. The modern facilities now all are gated with high security. They close at 10 pm at night. You have to get codes to get into the building and there isn't open entry to this facility. The intent is predominately brick structure and looking to vary different design components. We spoke to DOT and we got a conceptual letter from them that they are agreeable to the driveway. These facilities are designed for trucks to come on and off. We have compliant size loading areas that are parking spaces, there are no loading docks. Statistics show 95% of the business is residential based, such as glorified closets, attacks for people. You can't run businesses through here and there are no outlets in the units. This is truly designed for storage purposes only. On the first floor we have 6 parking spaces; the office is tucked on the "L" shape part of the building. You enter the building on the second floor. There are a total of 10 parking spaces on the site, 6 around the office and 2 by the driveway that we envisioned for the employees and two more opposite the loading. We've maintained the building within the allowable setbacks. We're really just asking for two variances. One is the height and the other is a function of the use, there are 11 loading required and we are proposing 4. This is because we're trying to follow the warehouse standards there.

Bob Zumesky, Remus Architecture: These buildings are very well maintained. You want people to be drawn to the facility to store their previous valuables. Part of the reason why we want to dress up the two facades is to implement the clock tower to make it a town center. We added the bow window feature to tie in with the buildings you have on Main Street. The rear elevation is something we wanted to lighten and add metal panels but none of this is set and stone. We still need to speak with the ARB. We want a nice clean brick type building to fit in with the other buildings you have.

Amy Mele: If we come back before the board I'll have a formal application, the narrative with my legal argument, the factors that you'll have to consider. We can find plenty of examples of 4 story buildings along 9W area. You have some buildings in Nyack where you have 10 foot ceilings, so I feel what you're looking to do here is make sure it fits in well with the area. The height we're asking for is 42.9 at the highest point and your maximum is 35 feet. We don't want to double the height or the stories as you can see. Lastly to reiterate what was said by both experts, on this corner there could be a lot more intense uses. I think this would be such a great use of this corner because it wouldn't be a high traffic, high intensity use. You also don't have self storage facilities to find in your code so

we're going with warehouse which is why we need the variance for the loading berths. I will get the Village Engineer examples of the parking because she was asking whether it was sufficient or not. I found one town locally, Clarkstown that requires no parking for the people coming and going and only for the employees. Let's face it, you'd really only going once maybe twice a year to get your Christmas decorations or you're going to put more things in it. We believe it's a nice addition and if we could hear any informal feedback from the board it would be valuable to us in going forward.

Ruben Berrios: So you added more parking?

Jeffrey Martel: Yes, we added four more spaces. The Planning Board members were concerned about the number of parking spaces. When it opens there will be some activity but once its 80-90% full, the average turnaround is every two years or a couple times a year. We originally came in with 6 parking spaces but added 4 more. From the road, the parking lot is not visible and from the residence because of the retaining wall, this is actually sitting about ten feet lower than this grade.

Amy Mele: Six parking spaces are actually more than the code requires but we understood the concerns and added four more spaces.

Bob Zumesky: Twenty minutes at a time tops is the average that people take when visiting these sites. Also the sanitary load on this is less than a single family residence. There will be one toilet and sink which will have very little impact.

Edwin Rivera: How many employees will you have there?

Amy Mele: Probably really one employee the most two.

Jose Hilario: I don't think the parking will be much of an issue.

Bob Zumesky: The point of the clock tower was to make it that focal point of 9W and Gurnee.

Emily Dominguez, Deputy Mayor and Village Trustee: How many storage units will there be in total?

Bob Zumesky: Approximately 800 units which sound like a lot but these are anywhere from 30 square feet to 100 square feet, so they're not very large. The time frame spent there is very minimal, that's why it's considered low traffic.

Deyanira Martinez: You presented this to the Planning Board members?

Amy Mele: Yes we did and the only concern I believe was with the number of parking spaces so we added 4 more and the height of the building. Originally there were 5 stories but we brought it down to 4. They liked the brick on the outside and the clock.

Jose Guareño: When I saw the agenda I thought it was going to be a big metal box to be honest. But this is very appealing.

Edwin Rivera: Between 8am to 5pm traffic is busy.

Amy Mele: That's why we proposed a self storage low intensity facility.

Bob Zumesky: Since the entrance and exit is only one way out, we're not creating more traffic where people will want to cut through.

Amy Mele: Again, if you're inclined favorably towards it, our next step is the ARB. If they give us some feedback, when we come back before you formally we will bring the ARB's feed back as well.

Edwin Rivera: Will this affect drainage?

Jeffrey Martel: We're going to be bound to the storm water management regulations that exist. We're going to have an underground detention within the parking lot, it hasn't been designed yet. That would be part of the SEQRA review process and it will get reviewed by the State and the Village here. We think there's a viable approach to the design and something that will be part of the next steps if we get feedback here that we don't think is detrimental to proceeding.

Dennis Micheals: Obviously they want feedback because this is very costly. They'd like an understanding that you are not bound by your thoughts. This is not a public hearing, but if there's anyone in the public that is interested in this project, it's up to the Chairman to allow feedback, but again this is not a Public Hearing. I would limit each speaker to 30 seconds.

Chairman Rivera asked the public to come forward if they have any questions or feedback they'd like to bring up.

Emily Dominguez: Ms. Dominguez suggested making the plans visible for the public to see.

Beth Champeau, 120 Rte 9W, Haverstraw: How are you getting your statistics of length of visit and how many cars will be parked there at one time? People come with more than one car at a time if you have an auction; there could be up to 15 cars there at a time. How will that be managed?

Bob Zumesky: Remus Architecture has been designing self storage facilities for 20 years now. We've gotten involved in it from the very beginning. Many people have misconceptions when they watch storage wars and things like that. When you refer to something like that, there will probably be at most 4 or 5 vehicles there for that type of auction. These statistics are based on the type of major manufactures we deal with. There are national companies that have facilities all over the country and dictate to us how many parking spaces are required. They analyze at their facilities.

Paul Remus, Architect, NJ: Our experience is in planning self storage facilities. So our statistics are based off our knowledge in our licensed area in profession. We've done work all over the County such as Maryland, Virginia, and Texas etc.

Geraldine Chinnery: Was any other space in Haverstraw looked at besides 217 Rte 9W?

Gurshnel Alexander: Yes we did look at a property across the street behind the plumbing supply but they don't want it there.

Geraldine Chinnery: But nothing in Haverstraw like the old Gracious building?

Gurshnel Alexander: No.

Jose Guareño: Mr. Guareño states he's in favor.

Edwin Rivera: Mr. Rivera states he's in favor but the only thing that is of concern is the height variance.

Deyanira Martinez: Ms. Martinez stated she is in favor but the height is also concerning.

Emily Dominguez: What is the height?

Dennis Michaels: At its highest it's 42.5 feet.

Jeffrey Martel: Because of the top of the site, it's actually less than 35 feet of the entire western side because there's a whole story that's buried. On the eastern side it varies but where the full fourth story is exposed in that corner is 42.5. At its lowest it would be 32 feet which is closest to the residential area.

Emily Dominguez: How high is the retaining wall?

Jeffrey Martel: The retaining wall varies as well. At its highest point it's about 6 to 8 feet on average.

Bob Zumesky: The clock tower will come up higher but we want that to be a focal point.

Beth Champeau: What is your lot coverage and what's the allowable lot coverage.

Dennis Michaels: They don't need a variance for lot coverage. They only need it for height and the number of stories and for this anomaly because its being treated as a warehouse use, there's actually a minimum number of loading berths. They're only proposing 4 and you would think less is better but apparently they have to have a minimum number of loading berths which is 11. I believe that's a less intense use because the more loading berths you have, the more trucks you're going to have.

Amy Mele: So to wrap this up, we have pushed and proved and does this thing over again. We cannot build this facility and make money at 2.5 stories and 35 feet. So if you all as a principle say you know, we're not inclined to grant these types of height variances my attitude, no is an answer I'd just like to hear it early. But if you're telling me, I'm concerned, but if you can come back here and show me under the 5 criteria under the state law for an area variance that you meet it and are entitled to it with no impact on the neighborhood, we're inclined to look at this application and give it a fair shake then we will move forward and go to the ARB.

Edwin Rivera: We're here to help you and not necessarily decline the application variance. I love the building and i know the busy traffic times will not interfere with this facility. That's exactly what we need in that corner, a low traffic facility.

Jose Guareño: The height is not incorporating the tower height.

Amy Mele: Correct.

Jose Guareño: In a worst case scenario, if you had to incorporate that clock and level it with the ceiling of the building would you? Because, it's as high as the light poles and no one really likes to look at light poles.

Dennis Michaels: The calculations doesn't include the clock tower and it doesn't have to be included because its being used as a accessory.

Bob Zumesky: If we reduce the height of the clock tower, you wouldn't see the clock and only see wires.

Jose Guareño: I'm in favor of this project. I like the aesthetic of it. I love that it's all brick and not metal.

Jose Hilario: There aren't much residential properties near the projected site. You might come across residents on the surrounding areas that may have issues once you move forward with the project.

Amy Mele: We'll have our public hearing and we will deal with them. Our pitch is quite honestly going to be, there are so many more uses that could be so much more traffic intensive and so much less attractive. So allowing this at this corner is really a win win I believe for the residents in the community.

Emily Dominguez: You mentioned earlier there's no electricity but, how will each storage unit be powered?

Jeffrey Martel: You do have a light in each storage unit but you don't have an outlet. So you can't plug in a laptop.

Dennis Michaels: Is it fair to say that you all are in favor of the concept of the general design of the project and what's being proposed in terms of its use, design, its aesthetic, and just a little concerned with the height at the highest point. You're ok with the 32 feet at the western elevation end of the building

which is less than the 35 feet allowance. It's really only the eastern and south eastern side of the building that has the 42.5 feet that's slightly concerning. Other than that you're generally favorable to the proposal.

All board members agreed.

Amy Mele: Thank you and have a great night.

Mr. Dennis Michaels closed the informal.

Chairman Edwin Rivera entertained a motion to approve the January 2018 minutes.

RESOLUTION **15-2018**

Motion by: Deyanira Martinez
Seconded by: Jose Hilario
Carried by: All

Chairman Edwin Rivera entertained a motion to approve the February 2018 minutes.

RESOLUTION **16-2018**

Motion by: Jose Hilario
Seconded by: Jose Guareño
Carried by: All

With no further business to be conducted by the Zoning Board, Chairman Rivera entertained a motion to adjourn the meeting.

RESOLUTION **17-2018**

Motion by: Deyanira Martinez
Seconded by: Jose Guareño
Carried by: All

The Clerk Typist to the Zoning Board is hereby authorized, directed and empowered to sign these Minutes, and file a copy thereof in the office of the Village Clerk:

Michelle Ventura, Clerk Typist