



William D. Reilich
Supervisor

TOWN OF GREECE

BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MINUTES

NOVEMBER 8, 2017

Work Session Began: 6:30 p.m.

Meeting Began: 7:00p.m.

Place: Community Conference Room, Greece Town Hall

Present

Albert F. Meilutis, Chairman

Thomas F. Hartwig

Randy T. Jensen

Cathleen A. Nigro

Bradford Shea

Anthony F. Wechsler

Christopher A. Schiano, Esq., Deputy Town Attorney

John T. Caterino, Planning Assistant

Maryjo Santoli, Zoning Board Secretary

Absent

Andrew P. Forsythe

Additions, Deletions and Continuances to the Agenda

Announcements

BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MINUTES
November 8, 2017

Old Business:

1. Applicant: Savannah Radigan
Location: 583 Fox Meadow Road
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 089.05-6-23
Zoning District: R1-E (Single-Family Residential)
Request: An area variance to allow six (6) dogs to be kept at a residence, instead of the maximum three (3) dogs permitted per dwelling unit. Sec. 211-30 A

Ms. Nigro offered the following resolution and moved for its adoption:

WHEREAS, the Applicant came before the Town of Greece Board of Zoning Appeals (the "Board of Zoning Appeals") relative to the property at 583 Fox Meadow Road, as outlined above; and

WHEREAS, having considered carefully all relevant documentary, testimonial and other evidence submitted, the Board of Zoning Appeals makes the following findings:

1. Upon review of the application, the Board of Zoning Appeals determined that the application is subject to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (New York State Environmental Conservation Law, Article 8) and its implementing regulations (6 NYCRR Part 617, the "SEQRA Regulations") (collectively, "SEQRA"), and that the application constitutes an Unlisted action under SEQRA.
2. The Board of Zoning Appeals has considered the Proposal at a public meeting (the "Meeting") in the Greece Town Hall, 1 Vince Tofany Boulevard, at which time all parties in interest and citizens were afforded an opportunity to be heard.
3. Documentary, testimonial, and other evidence were presented at the Meeting relative to the Proposal for the Board of Zoning Appeals' consideration.
4. The Board of Zoning Appeals has carefully considered environmental information that was prepared by the Applicant and/or the Applicant's representatives or the Town's staff, which included but was not limited to maps, drawings, descriptions, analyses, reports, reviews, and an Environmental Assessment Form ("EAF") (collectively, the "Environmental Analysis").
5. The Board of Zoning Appeals also has included in the Environmental Analysis and has carefully considered additional information submitted by the Applicant's representatives, including but not limited to: oral or written descriptions of the Proposal; maps and other drawings of the Proposal; and various oral or written comments that may have resulted from meetings with or written correspondence from the Applicant's representatives.
6. The Board of Zoning Appeals has carefully considered additional information and comments that resulted from telephone conversations or meetings with or written correspondence from the Applicant and the Applicant's representatives.
7. The Board of Zoning Appeals also has included in the Environmental Analysis and has carefully considered information, recommendations, and comments that may have resulted from telephone conversations or meetings with or written correspondence from various involved and interested agencies, including but not limited to the Monroe County Department of Planning and Development and the Town's own staff.

BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MINUTES
November 8, 2017

8. The Board of Zoning Appeals also has included in the Environmental Analysis and has carefully considered information, recommendations, and comments that recommendations, and comments that may have resulted from telephone conversations or meetings with or written correspondence from nearby property owners, and all other comments submitted to the Board of Zoning Appeals as of this date.
9. The Environmental Analysis examined the relevant issues associated with the Proposal.
10. The Board of Zoning Appeals has completed Parts 2 and 3 of the EAF, and has carefully considered the information contained therein.
11. The Board of Zoning Appeals has met the procedural and substantive requirements of SEQRA.
12. The Board of Zoning Appeals has carefully considered each and every criterion for determining the potential significance of the Proposal upon the environment, as set forth in SEQRA.
13. The Board of Zoning Appeals has carefully considered (that is, has taken the required "hard look" at) the Proposal and the relevant environmental impacts, facts, and conclusions disclosed in the Environmental Analysis and all additional relevant information submitted.
14. The Board of Zoning Appeals concurs with the information and conclusions contained in the Environmental Analysis.
15. The Board of Zoning Appeals has made a reasoned elaboration of the rationale for arriving at its determination of environmental significance and the Board of Zoning Appeals' determination is supported by substantial evidence, as set forth herein.
16. To the maximum extent practicable, the project as originally designed or as voluntarily modified by the Applicant will minimize or avoid potential adverse environmental impacts that were identified in the environmental review process.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED that, pursuant to SEQRA, based on the aforementioned information, documentation, testimony, and findings, and after examining the relevant issues, the Board of Zoning Appeals' own initial concerns, and all relevant issues raised and recommendations offered by involved and interested agencies and the Town's own staff, the Board of Zoning Appeals determines that the Proposal will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment, which constitutes a negative declaration.

Seconded by Mr. Hartwig and duly put to a vote, which resulted as follows:

VOTE:	Mr. Forsythe	Absent	Mr. Hartwig	Yes
	Mr. Jensen	Yes	Mr. Meilutis	Yes
	Ms. Nigro	Yes	Mr. Shea	Yes
	Mr. Wechsler	Yes		

Motion Carried

BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MINUTES
November 8, 2017

Ms. Nigro then offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

WHEREAS, the Applicant, Samantha Radigan, came before the Town of Greece Board of Zoning Appeals, regarding the property at 583 Fox Meadow Road, as outlined above.

Mr. Chairman, with regard to the application of Savannah Radigan, 583 Fox Meadow Road, Mrs. Radigan appeared before the Board on September 5, 2017 to request a variance to allow six dogs to be kept at her residence, where no more than three dogs shall be permitted per dwelling unit.

WHEREAS, the findings of fact are as follows. The property is 80 feet x 150 feet, being 12,000 square feet or 0.28± acres. On September 5th, Mrs. Radigan appeared before this Board for the aforementioned variance. She and her family have lived at this property since July of 2016, meaning all six (6) dogs were in her possession when she and her husband purchased the property. Also, it was indicated that her home is approximately 1680 square feet of living area. This request for a variance is before this Board as a result of a neighbor's complaint to the Town about barking dogs at Applicant's address. The property owners were cited by the Town's Code Compliance Department, which is awaiting action from this Board.

Mrs. Radigan testified that she was not aware of the ordinance's requirement for a maximum of three (3) dogs allowed per dwelling unit, which is different from the town where she moved from. The names, sex, and birth year of each dog is as follows:

- Prince, a neutered male, born in 2015.
- Mouse, an unspayed female, born in 2015.
- Chubsy, a neutered male, born in 2015.
- Taris, a neutered male, born in 2014.
- Princess, an unspayed female, born in 2014.
- Mina, an unspayed female, born in 2007.

All six (6) of the dogs are Chihweenies, which is a hybrid/mix of a Chihuahua and a Dachshund breed of dogs. Furthermore, she stated that she owns another property in Amsterdam, goes there often, and could possibly can keep them there.

At the same meeting, several residents came forward to voice opposition to this variance. The Board received oral and photographic testimony from Reginald Lucas, of 284 Buck Hill Road; Robert Skrypyk, of 372 Buck Hill Road; Jeanette Pape, of 567 Fox Meadow Road; Nancy Slater, of 570 Fox Meadow Road; and Angelo DeSimone, of 575 Fox Meadow Road. The neighbors addressed their concerns regarding this application, which included, but was not limited to: excessive noise; health issues due to feces not properly picked up; the lawn being unkempt; and concern for the animals and their living environment. As a response to the Board regarding the upkeep and maintenance of the dogs, Mrs. Radigan testified that she collects the feces of the dogs in the yard only once a week. As a result, the Board voted in favor to continue the public hearing until the meeting of October 17, 2017 in order to provide Mrs. Radigan time to consider alternatives that would allow her to come closer to the zoning requirement of a maximum of three (3) dogs. She was asked to return with a plan of the number of dogs she ultimately wished to retain and the amount of time she would need to achieve that target number.

On October 17, 2017, an e-mail correspondence from Mrs. Radigan was read aloud to the Board. In the correspondence, she stated that she was not going to remove any dogs from the property, was planning on moving out of the house in the next few months, and had no further information to provide to the Board. As a result, the Board voted in favor of closing the public hearing and to render a decision on November 8th.

BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MINUTES
November 8, 2017

In making its determination, the Board of Zoning Appeals shall take into consideration the benefit to the applicant if the variance is granted as weighed against the detriment to the health, safety, and welfare of the neighborhood or community. In making such determination the Board shall also consider the following:

1. Whether an undesirable change will be produced in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties will be created by the granting of the area variance. This Board evaluates these types of applications on a case-by-case basis. After careful thought to all the data presented and listening to all the testimony pertaining to this application, it is my belief that the continued harboring of these six (6) dogs at this location would indeed change the character of the neighborhood and would be a detriment to nearby properties. No property in the immediate area has received approval from this Board to have more than three (3) dogs. Also, as testified by the applicant on September 5th, the feces from the dogs are only picked up from the rear yard only once a week.
2. Whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by some method, feasible for the applicant to pursue, other than the area variance. The Applicant could find alternative homes for three (3) of the dogs and by doing so, would comply with the Town's Zoning Ordinance and need no approval from this Board.
3. Whether the variance is substantial. The variance overall is substantial, especially when you take into consideration that five (5) dogs could be at the property for almost 15± years, which is roughly a normal life expectancy for Chihuahua and Dachshund breeds. In past cases when this Board has approved more than three (3) dogs, they had shorter life expectancies. Also, the female dogs are unsprayed and could have the potential to give birth to additional dogs at the residence.
4. Whether the proposed variance will have adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district. It can be argued that an adverse effect or impact on the conditions in the neighborhood. Also, as mentioned previously and as testified by the applicant, dog feces are only picked up from the backyard area of the property once a week.
5. Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created, which consideration shall be relevant to the decision of the board of appeals, but shall not necessarily preclude the granting of the area variance. It could be argued that this difficulty was self-created.

Therefore, based on the aforementioned findings of fact, I move to deny this application.

Seconded by Mr. Hartwig and duly put to a vote, which resulted as follows:

VOTE:	Mr. Forsythe	Absent	Mr. Hartwig	Yes
	Mr. Jensen	Yes	Mr. Meilutis	Yes
	Ms. Nigro	Yes	Mr. Shea	Yes
	Mr. Wechsler	Yes		

Motion Carried
Application Denied

BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MINUTES
November 8, 2017

New Business:

1. Applicant: Michael Coates
Location: 31 Skycrest Drive
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 060.07-3-15
Zoning District: R1-E (Single-Family Residential)
Request: An area variance for a proposed shed (12.0 feet x 14.0 feet; 168.0 square feet) to be located in the front and side yard, where accessory structures, such as sheds, are permitted in rear yards only. Sec. 211-11 E (3)

Mr. Shea offered the following resolution and moved for its adoption:

WHEREAS, the Applicant came before the Town of Greece Board of Zoning Appeals (the "Board of Zoning Appeals") relative to the property at 31 Skycrest Drive, as outlined above; and

WHEREAS, having considered carefully all relevant documentary, testimonial and other evidence submitted, the Board of Zoning Appeals makes the following findings:

1. Upon review of the application, the Board of Zoning Appeals determined that the application is subject to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (New York State Environmental Conservation Law, Article 8) and its implementing regulations (6 NYCRR Part 617, the "SEQRA Regulations") (collectively, "SEQRA"), and that the application constitutes a Type II action under SEQRA. (SEQRA Regulations, §617.5(c)(10).)
2. According to SEQRA, Type II actions have been determined to not have a significant impact on the environment and are not subject to further review under SEQRA.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED that, based on the aforementioned documentation, testimony, information and findings, SEQRA requires no further action relative to this proposal.

Seconded by Ms. Nigro and duly put to a vote, which resulted as follows:

VOTE:	Mr. Forsythe	Absent	Mr. Hartwig	Yes
	Mr. Jensen	Yes	Mr. Meilutis	Yes
	Ms. Nigro	Yes	Mr. Shea	Yes
	Mr. Wechsler	Yes		

Motion Carried

Mr. Shea then offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

Mr. Chairman, regarding the application of Michael Coates, 31 Skycrest Drive, Mr. Coates appeared before the Board of Zoning Appeals this evening, requesting an area variance for a proposed shed (12.0 feet x 14.0 feet; 168.0 square feet) to be located in the front and side yard, where accessory structures, such as sheds, are permitted in rear yards only.

BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MINUTES
November 8, 2017

WHEREAS, the findings of fact are as follows. This parcel is located at 31 Skycrest Drive and is located in an R1-E (Single-Family Residential) neighborhood. The applicant, Mr. Michael Coates, appeared before the Board this evening and stated that he has lived there for eight months. His shed that he is proposing to install is 12 feet x 14 feet and will be in the side yard, which is considered the front yard because of the shape configuration of his property. The need for this shed is for garden storage equipment because his back yard is in a flood-prone area; therefore, it would be affected by the spring situation. There will not be any electrical connections inside or out; the proposed shed will be placed on blocks, and will be professionally installed. Mr. Coates spoke with his neighbors and no one had any negative comments and no one appeared tonight in favor or opposed to this application.

Having reviewed all the testimony and evidence as just summarized in the findings of fact, and having considered the five statutory factors set forth in New York State Town Law, Section 267-b, and finding that the evidence presented meets the requirements of this Section, and having found that there is no significant detriment to the health, safety, and welfare of the neighborhood or community and that the benefit to the applicant is substantial, and having found that this is a Type II action under SEQRA, requiring no further action by this Board, I move to approve this application, with the following conditions:

1. That the applicant obtain all necessary Town building permits.
2. Also, based on Town engineering's recommendation that nothing be stored in the flood-prone area, the applicant must stay outside of the 20-foot Town drainage easement.

Seconded by Ms. Nigro and duly put to a vote, which resulted as follows:

VOTE:	Mr. Forsythe	Absent	Mr. Hartwig	Yes
	Mr. Jensen	Yes	Mr. Meilutis	Yes
	Ms. Nigro	Yes	Mr. Shea	Yes
	Mr. Wechsler	Yes		

Motion Carried
Application Approved
With Conditions

BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MINUTES
November 8, 2017

2. Applicant: Michael Werner
Location: 269 Salmon Creek Drive
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 017.04-3-33
Zoning District: R1-E (Single-Family Residential)
Request: a) An area variance for a proposed accessory storage structure (open-sided; 12.0 feet x 19.0 feet; 228.0 square feet to be located in the front yard of a waterfront lot, where accessory structures, such as covered patios, are permitted in rear yards only. Sec. 211-11 E (3), Figure 5
b) An area variance for a proposed accessory storage structure (open-sided; 12.0 feet x 19.0 feet; 228.0 square feet) to have a (east) side setback of 0.0 feet, instead of the 7.0 feet minimum required. Sec. 211-11 E (1), Table I

Mr. Hartwig offered the following resolution and moved for its adoption:

WHEREAS, the Applicant came before the Town of Greece Board of Zoning Appeals (the "Board of Zoning Appeals") relative to the property at 269 Salmon Creek Drive, as outlined above; and

WHEREAS, having considered carefully all relevant documentary, testimonial and other evidence submitted, the Board of Zoning Appeals makes the following findings:

1. Upon review of the application, the Board of Zoning Appeals determined that the application is subject to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (New York State Environmental Conservation Law, Article 8) and its implementing regulations (6 NYCRR Part 617, the "SEQRA Regulations") (collectively, "SEQRA"), and that the application constitutes a Type II action under SEQRA. (SEQRA Regulations, §617.5(c)(10) & (12).)
2. According to SEQRA, Type II actions have been determined to not have a significant impact on the environment and are not subject to further review under SEQRA.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED that, based on the aforementioned documentation, testimony, information and findings, SEQRA requires no further action relative to this proposal.

Seconded by Mr. Wechsler and duly put to a vote, which resulted as follows:

VOTE:	Mr. Forsythe	Absent	Mr. Hartwig	Yes
	Mr. Jensen	Yes	Mr. Meilutis	Yes
	Ms. Nigro	Yes	Mr. Shea	Yes
	Mr. Wechsler	Yes		

Motion Carried

BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MINUTES
November 8, 2017

Mr. Hartwig then offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

Mr. Chairman, regarding the application of Michael Werner, 269 Salmon Creek Drive, in an R1-E (Single-Family Residential) district, Michael and Maureen Werner appeared before the Board of Zoning Appeals this evening, requesting an area variance for a proposed accessory storage structure (open-sided; 12.0 feet x 19.0 feet; 228.0 square feet) to be located in the front yard of a waterfront lot, where accessory structures, such as covered patios, are permitted in rear yards only; and an area variance for a proposed accessory storage structure (open-sided; 12.0 feet x 19.0 feet; 228.0 square feet) to have a (east) side setback of 0.0 feet, instead of the 7.0 feet minimum required.

WHEREAS, the findings of fact are as follows. This evening, the Werners mentioned that they have owned this property for approximately 23 years and the need for this structure at this time is storage of outdoor furniture and lawn equipment. It cannot be located elsewhere on the property, and structures of this nature are typical on waterfront lots. It will be of open construction based on an existing concrete slab, and there will be no plans to enclose it in the future. There will be no utilities run to the structure and the location, the setback of zero feet, is consistent with other properties in the area, as the neighboring property variance was approved for their shed of 0.46 feet in 2005. The Werners mentioned that they have spoken to their neighbors on either side. There was a letter dated October 11, 2017 from Craig Bryce, mentioning his approval, and also the neighbors on the other side, the Hettigs, also mentioned their approval.

Having reviewed all the testimony and evidence as just summarized in the findings of fact, and having considered the five statutory factors set forth in New York State Town Law, Section 267-b, and finding that the evidence presented meets the requirements of this Section, and having found that there is no significant detriment to the health, safety, and welfare of the neighborhood or community and that the benefit to the applicant is substantial, and having found that this is a Type II action under SEQRA, requiring no further action by this Board, I move to approve this application, with the condition that all necessary building permits first be obtained.

Seconded by Mr. Wechsler and duly put to a vote, which resulted as follows:

VOTE:	Mr. Forsythe	Absent	Mr. Hartwig	Yes
	Mr. Jensen	Yes	Mr. Meilutis	Yes
	Ms. Nigro	Yes	Mr. Shea	Yes
	Mr. Wechsler	Yes		

Motion Carried
Application Approved
With Condition

BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MINUTES
November 8, 2017

3. Applicant: Northgate Animal Hospital
Location: 1055 Denise Road
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 060.07-10-2
Zoning District: DMU (Dewey Avenue Mixed Use)
Request: An area variance for a proposed addition (852± square feet) to an existing building, to have a front (north) setback of 69.0± feet (measured from the south right-of-way line of Denise Road), instead of the 30.0 feet maximum permitted. Sec. 211-17.1 D (2) (a) [1]

Mr. Jensen offered the following resolution and moved for its adoption:

WHEREAS, the Applicant came before the Town of Greece Board of Zoning Appeals (the "Board of Zoning Appeals") relative to the property at 1055 Denise Road, as outlined above; and

WHEREAS, having considered carefully all relevant documentary, testimonial and other evidence submitted, the Board of Zoning Appeals makes the following findings:

1. Upon review of the application, the Board of Zoning Appeals determined that the application is subject to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (New York State Environmental Conservation Law, Article 8) and its implementing regulations (6 NYCRR Part 617, the "SEQRA Regulations") (collectively, "SEQRA"), and that the application constitutes a Type II action under SEQRA. (SEQRA Regulations, §617.5(c)(7) & (12).)
2. According to SEQRA, Type II actions have been determined to not have a significant impact on the environment and are not subject to further review under SEQRA.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED that, based on the aforementioned documentation, testimony, information and findings, SEQRA requires no further action relative to this proposal.

Seconded by Mr. Shea and duly put to a vote, which resulted as follows:

VOTE:	Mr. Forsythe	Absent	Mr. Hartwig	Yes
	Mr. Jensen	Yes	Mr. Meilutis	Yes
	Ms. Nigro	Yes	Mr. Shea	Yes
	Mr. Wechsler	Yes		

Motion Carried

Mr. Jensen then offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

Mr. Chairman, regarding the application of Northgate Animal Hospital, 1055 Denise Road, Mr. Eric Ferri, representing Dr. Hughes, who owns the Northgate Animal Hospital building, appeared before the Board of Zoning Appeals this evening, requesting an area variance for a proposed addition (852± square feet) to an existing building, to have a front

BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MINUTES
November 8, 2017

(north) setback of 69.0± feet (measured from the south right-of-way line of Denise Road), instead of the 30.0 feet maximum permitted by the Dewey Avenue mixed use.

WHEREAS, the findings of fact are as follows. Mr. Ferri, representing the applicant, stated that the building has been owned by Dr. Hughes for several years, 15 years or longer. The reason for the addition is for additional office space, a lobby along with another examining room. The Dewey Avenue Mixed Use corridor was put in place in 2012; this was to increase pedestrian travel along this mixed use. With this building being there prior to the implementation of the Dewey Avenue Mixed Use, this would cause a financial hardship and would be very difficult for the applicant to make the addition and to meet the requirements of the 30 feet maximum permitted. This addition will also be in the front (north) of the building and once again this will be used for office space, lobby, and an exam room. This is also considered being a financial hardship.

Having reviewed all the testimony and evidence as just summarized in the findings of fact, and having considered the five statutory factors set forth in New York State Town Law, Section 267-b, and finding that the evidence presented meets the requirements of this Section, and having found that there is no significant detriment to the health, safety, and welfare of the neighborhood or community and that the benefit to the applicant is substantial, and having found that this is a Type II action under SEQRA, requiring no further action by this Board, I move to approve this application, with the following conditions:

1. That the applicant obtain all necessary permits.
2. Also, this is subject to Planning Board approval.

Seconded by Mr. Shea and duly put to a vote, which resulted as follows:

Absent

VOTE:	Mr. Forsythe	Absent	Mr. Hartwig	Yes
	Mr. Jensen	Yes	Mr. Meilutis	Yes
	Ms. Nigro	Yes	Mr. Shea	Yes
	Mr. Wechsler	Yes		

Motion Carried
Application Approved
With Conditions

SPECIAL ZONING TOPICS

Old Business:

1. Applicant: 4320 West Ridge, LLC
Location: 4232-4350 West Ridge Road
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 073.01-1-3, 073.01-1-4, 073.01-1-5, 073.01-1-6, 073.01-1-7,
073.01-1-21, 073.01-2-63, 073.01-2-64.111, 073.01-2-64.12,
073.01-2-68.1 (part)
Zoning District: BG (General Business)
Request: a) A special use permit to operate a motor vehicle service
station. Sec. 211-17 C (3) (b) [2], Sec. 211-35
b) A special use permit to operate a gasoline dispensing station.
Sec. 211-17 C (3) (b) [1], Sec. 211-34
c) An area variance for a proposed gasoline dispensing canopy
to have an area of 5640 square feet, instead of the 1500 square
maximum permitted. Sec. 211-34 C

On a motion by Mr. Hartwig and seconded by Mr. Jensen, it was resolved to continue the public hearing on this application until the meeting of February 20, 2018, per the request of the applicant.

VOTE:	Mr. Forsythe	Absent	Mr. Hartwig	Yes
	Mr. Jensen	Yes	Mr. Meilutis	Yes
	Ms. Nigro	Yes	Mr. Shea	Yes
	Mr. Wechsler	Yes		

**Motion Carried
Application Continued Until
Meeting of February 20, 2018**

BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MINUTES
November 8, 2017

2. Applicant: Bell Atlantic Mobile Systems of Allentown, Inc. (d.b.a. Verizon Wireless)
- Location: 1510 Maiden Lane
- Mon. Co. Tax No.: 059.19-3-1.1
- Zoning District: R1-18 (Single-Family Residential)
- Request: a) A special use permit for a proposed cellular service telecommunications facility, consisting of a freestanding antenna tower (119 feet-high, including lightning rod) and related antenna(s), accessory antenna structures, and access driveway. Sec. 211-56 A
- b) An area variance for the use of barbed wire (188± linear feet) on top of a fence, where the use of barbed wire or other similar strands of sharpened enclosure material shall not be permitted, except as provided in Section 211-49. Sec. 211-46 E

On a motion by Mr. Jensen and seconded by Mr. Wechsler, it was resolved to continue the public hearing on this application until the meeting of January 16, 2018, per the request of the applicant.

VOTE:	Mr. Forsythe	Absent	Mr. Hartwig	Yes
	Mr. Jensen	Yes	Mr. Meilutis	Yes
	Ms. Nigro	Yes	Mr. Shea	Yes
	Mr. Wechsler	Yes		

Motion Carried
Application Continued Until
Meeting of January 16, 2018

BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MINUTES
November 8, 2017

ADJOURNMENT: 7:35 p.m.

APPROVAL OF BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MEETING MINUTES

The Board of Zoning Appeals of the Town of Greece, in the County of Monroe and State of New York, rendered the above decisions.

Signed: _____

Date: _____

Albert F. Meilutis, Chairman

NEXT MEETING: November 28, 2017