

Zoning Board of Appeals

TOWN OF BRUNSWICK
336 Town Office Road
Troy, New York 12180

MINUTES OF THE BRUNSWICK ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS REGULAR MEETING HELD MAY 17, 2021

PRESENT were ANN CLEMENTE, CHAIRPERSON, E. JOHN SCHMIDT, PATRICIA CURRAN, ADRIAN MORIN, and JOHN MAINELLO III.

ALSO PRESENT was CHARLES GOLDEN, Brunswick Building Department.

The draft minutes of the April 19, 2021 regular meeting were reviewed. Chairperson Clemente noted that on page 4, paragraph 3, concerning the application for two area variances by Scott Newell, that Mr. Newell has already demolished the structure currently on the project site, whereas the minutes state that he was planning to demolish the structure. Chairperson Clemente made a motion to approve the minutes of the April 19, 2021 regular meeting subject to the noted correction, which motion was seconded by Member Morin. The motion was unanimously approved, and the minutes of the April 19, 2021 regular meeting were approved subject to the noted correction.

The draft minutes of the April 26, 2021 special meeting were reviewed. There were no edits or corrections to be made to the minutes. Chairperson Clemente made a motion to approve the minutes of the April 26, 2021 special meeting without correction, which motion was seconded by Member Mainello. The motion was unanimously approved, and the minutes of the April 26, 2021 special meeting were approved.

The first item of business on the agenda was an application for two area variances submitted by Richard Wark Jr. for property located at 113 Flower Road. The applicant seeks to demolish an existing shed and build a 30-foot by 50-foot garage in the same location, requiring

area variances for front setback and building an accessory structure in front of a primary structure to do so. Richard Wark Jr. was present to review the project. Chairperson Clemente asked Mr. Wark if he had made any changes to the application since the last Zoning Board meeting and he said that he had not. The Notice of Public Hearing was read into the record by Attorney Gilchrist, noting that the Public Hearing Notice was published in the Troy Record, placed on the Town sign board, posted on the Town website, and mailed to owners of all properties located within 300 feet of the project site. Chairperson Clemente opened the public hearing on the application. There were no public comments on the application. Chairperson Clemente inquired whether the Town Building Department had received any written comments on the application. Mr. Golden stated that two comment emails had been received on this application and he read both into the record. The first, sent May 12, was from Wayne Fletcher, a neighbor living at 70 Flower Road. The second, sent May 14, was from Norma Fletcher, Mr. Wark's next-door neighbor living at 138 Flower Road. Both comment emails were in favor of the project. Member Schmidt noted that there is a camper at the bottom of a hill on the project site and asked Mr. Wark if he owned the property where that camper is located. Mr. Wark confirmed that he does. Member Schmidt asked why he could not build the garage there. Mr. Wark stated that there is a significant topographical change on that part of his property and that it near swamplands, meaning he would have to cross or pave over swamplands to get there, which would be a major financial investment and is not feasible. There were no other questions or comments from the Zoning Board. Chairperson Clemente made a motion to close the public hearing, which was seconded by Member Curran. The motion was unanimously approved, and the public hearing was closed. Chairperson Clemente stated that this was a Type II action under SEQRA. The Zoning Board then reviewed the elements for consideration on the area variance application. As to whether the requested variance would result

in an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or create a detriment to nearby properties, Chairperson Clemente noted that the applicant is proposing a 16-foot front setback where a 75-foot setback is required, and a secondary structure in front of a primary structure. She also noted that the applicant has stated that there are similar accessory structures in the area and the garage will be visually well-hidden from neighbors due to vegetation on his property, leading to no change in the character of the neighborhood. As to whether a feasible alternative was available, Member Schmidt stated that the applicant had shown that there is no other location on his property where the garage could go, so there is no feasible alternative. As to whether the requested variance was substantial, Member Curran stated that it was, but because it is in a rural area and on a dead-end road, it will not have a great impact to the area. Member Schmidt stated that the impact is also offset by being below road-level, helping decrease visibility of the garage. As to whether the variance would create an adverse environmental or physical impact, Chairperson Clemente stated that there would be no environmental impacts due to this action. Member Morin asked the applicant what type of equipment was going to be stored in the garage. Mr. Wark stated he would store mowers, tractors, and other equipment needed for property maintenance there. As to whether the difficulty giving rise to the need for the variance was self-created, Chairperson Clemente stated that the difficulty is self-created, but is not determinative here. Chairperson Clemente asked if there should be any conditions with the approval of this variance and the Zoning Board agreed that the record did not warrant imposition of any conditions. Member Curran made a motion to grant the area variances, which was seconded by Member Mainello. The motion was unanimously approved and the area variances were granted. Chairperson Clemente directed the applicant to continue to coordinate with the Town Building Department on this matter.

The second item of business on the agenda was an application for two area variances submitted by Lawrence Freeman for property located at 6 Carolina Avenue. The applicant seeks to demolish an existing garage and build a 14-foot by 20-foot garage in the same location, requiring area variances for rear yard and side yard setback to do so. Lawrence Freeman was present to review the project. Chairperson Clemente asked Mr. Freeman if he had made any changes to the application since the last Zoning Board meeting and he said that he had not. The Notice of Public Hearing was read into the record by Chairperson Clemente, noting that the Public Hearing Notice was published in the Troy Record, placed on the Town sign board, posted on the Town website, and mailed to owners of all properties located within 300 feet of the project site. Chairperson Clemente opened the public hearing on the application. There were no public comments on the application. Chairperson Clemente inquired whether the Town Building Department had received any written comments on the application. Mr. Golden stated that no written comments had been received. There were no other questions or comments from the Zoning Board. Chairperson Clemente made a motion to close the public hearing, which was seconded by Member Curran. The motion was unanimously approved, and the public hearing was closed. Chairperson Clemente stated that this was a Type II action under SEQRA. The Zoning Board then reviewed the elements for consideration on the area variance application. As to whether the requested variances would result in an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or create a detriment to nearby properties, Member Curran stated that the garage is replacing a garage in the same spot, so there will be no impact, and actually should be a visual improvement. As to whether a feasible alternative was available, Member Morin stated that there was no other location on the property to place a garage, so placing the new garage in the same spot as the old one is the only feasible option. Chairperson Clemente stated that the Rensselaer County Bureau of Economic Development had

sent a letter to the Town dated May 17, 2021 stating that the garage should be moved 1-2 feet to allow for maintenance; however, given site conditions, there is no available room to move the proposed garage location. As to whether the requested variances are substantial, Chairperson Clemente stated that the project is located on a 0.16-acre lot in an R-9 district. Member Curran stated that the variances are substantial, but it is just replacing an existing garage. Member Morin asked Mr. Freeman how long he had owned the property. Mr. Freeman stated that he's owned the property since 1982, so 39 years. Member Morin stated that if he's gone 39 years without a complaint about a garage at that location, this is not an issue. As to whether the variances would create an adverse environmental or physical impact, the Zoning Board noted that no impacts are anticipated. As to whether the difficulty giving rise to the need for the variances is self-created, Member Curran stated that it is not self-created as the garage must be placed at that location due to being on a small lot. Chairperson Clemente asked if there should be any conditions with the approval of these variances and the Zoning Board agreed that the record did not support imposition of any conditions. Member Curran made a motion to grant the area variances, which was seconded by Member Morin. The motion was unanimously approved and the area variances were granted. Chairperson Clemente directed the applicant to continue to coordinate with the Town Building Department on this matter.

The Zoning Board then addressed the sixth item of business on the agenda since it was not yet 6:30pm, when the third item, another public hearing, was noticed to be heard. The sixth item of business on the agenda was an area variance application submitted by Lord Avenue Properties, LLC for property located on Lord Avenue. The applicant seeks to construct a 50,000 square foot supermarket building, loading dock area, parking, and stormwater facilities. Walter Lippmann, a Project Manager with MJ Engineering and Land Surveying, P.C., was present for the applicant.

Mr. Lippmann stated that this project was last in front of the Zoning Board at its March 15, 2021 meeting seeking an area variance for the heights of light poles on the project site. Specifically, the applicant is proposing 21-foot tall light poles, but the Town Zoning Code allows a maximum height of 15 feet for light poles. Since that meeting, the project has been in front of the Planning Board. The project is currently on the agenda for the Planning Board's May 20 meeting. The Planning Board had previously discussed the possibility of holding a joint public hearing with the Zoning Board on the applications in front of both Boards. Chairperson Clemente asked the Zoning Board members if they were interested in a joint public hearing and all members were. The Planning Board tentatively is looking to hold the joint public hearing on June 3, subject to the applicant submitting additional traffic information. Chairperson Clemente asked the Zoning Board members if they were available to attend a joint public hearing on June 3 and all members were. Chairperson Clemente asked about the procedural status of the application. Attorney Gilchrist stated that the joint public hearing is tentative, subject to a Planning Board determination that the application is complete to hold the hearing, discussion of which will continue at the Planning Board's May 20 meeting.

The Zoning Board then returned to its regularly scheduled agenda. The third item of business on the agenda was an area variance application submitted by Peter Jones and Heather Jones for property located at 41 Tamarac Road. The applicants seek to build a 10-foot by 12-foot shed on their property, requiring an area variance for side yard setback to do so. Heather Jones was present to review the project. Chairperson Clemente asked Mrs. Jones if she had made any changes to the application since the last Zoning Board meeting and she said that she had not. The Notice of Public Hearing was read into the record by Chairperson Clemente, noting that the Public Hearing Notice was published in the Troy Record, placed on the Town sign board, posted on the

Town website, and mailed to owners of all properties located within 300 feet of the project site. Chairperson Clemente opened the public hearing on the application. There were no public comments on the application. Chairperson Clemente inquired whether the Town Building Department had received any written comments on the application. Mr. Golden stated that no written comments had been received. Chairperson Clemente stated that the Rensselaer County Bureau of Economic Development had sent a letter to the Town dated May 17, 2021 stating that the project will not have a major impact on County plans and that local consideration shall prevail. Chairperson Clemente asked if the lot next door was an empty lot. Mr. Golden confirmed that the lot, 55 Tamarac Road, was currently empty. Chairperson Clemente asked how big that lot was. Mr. Golden examined the map and determined the lot to be approximately 7.1 acres, with a house on the lot, and located upgradient on a hill with a different driveway location. Chairperson Clemente made a motion to close the public hearing, which was seconded by Member Curran. The motion was unanimously approved, and the public hearing was closed. Chairperson Clemente stated that this was a Type II action under SEQRA. The Zoning Board then reviewed the elements for consideration on the area variance application. As to whether the requested variance would result in an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or create a detriment to nearby properties, Chairperson Clemente stated that sheds and other outbuildings are typical in that neighborhood, so this application will result in no impact. As to whether a feasible alternative was available, Chairperson Clemente stated that a leachfield takes up a large area of the backyard, the potential alternate location is in conflict with a future plan for a pool installation, and there is adequate number of evergreen trees near the location of the shed to provide screening. As to whether the requested variance was substantial, Member Curran stated that it is, but Member Morin added that it is not adversely affecting any neighboring properties. As to whether the

variance would create an adverse environmental or physical impact, Member Curran stated that the applicant is taking down two sheds and replacing them with one new structure, there are other outbuildings in the area, and there are no aesthetic impacts. As to whether the difficulty giving rise to the need for the variance was self-created, Member Morin stated that it was, but there are no reasonable alternatives and is not determinative. Chairperson Clemente asked if there should be any conditions with the approval of this variance and the Zoning Board agreed that the record did not support imposition of any conditions. Member Curran made a motion to grant the area variance, which was seconded by Member Mainello. The motion was unanimously approved and the area variance was granted. Chairperson Clemente directed the applicant to continue to coordinate with the Town Building Department on this matter.

The Zoning Board then addressed new business since it was not yet 6:45pm, when the fourth item on the agenda, another public hearing, was noticed to be heard. The first item of new business was an area variance application submitted by Kenneth Maurer for property located at 6 Michael Street. The applicant seeks to build a 10-foot by 10-foot deck at the front of the house on the property. Shannon Haverty, co-owner of the property, was present to review the project. Chairperson Clemente asked Ms. Haverty if the Zoning Board members had permission to visit the site. Ms. Haverty said yes. Member Curran asked what waste removal system was on the property. Mr. Golden said it has a public sewer. Chairperson Clemente stated that the application was complete. A public hearing on this application is scheduled for June 21, 2021 at 6:00pm.

The Zoning Board then returned to its regularly scheduled agenda. The fourth item of business on the agenda was an application for two area variances submitted by Scott Newell of Compass Realty for property located at 1691 NYS Route 7 at the corner of Deepkill Road and NYS Route 7. The applicant seeks to construct a new building at the sight of the previous structure,

which needed to be demolished due to damage after it was hit by a vehicle, and requires area variances, both for front yard setback due to this lot being a corner lot. Scott Newell was present to review the project. Chairperson Clemente asked Mr. Newell if he had made any changes to the application since the last Zoning Board meeting and he said that he had not. The Notice of Public Hearing was read into the record by Chairperson Clemente, noting that the Public Hearing Notice was published in the Troy Record, placed on the Town sign board, posted on the Town website, and mailed to owners of all properties located within 300 feet of the project site. Chairperson Clemente opened the public hearing on the application. William Koester, of 24 Deepkill Road, stated that he would like all property owners to be sent public notices as both he and his wife own their property, but only he was listed on the envelope. Mr. Koester stated that the area where the applicant plans to build is environmentally sensitive as the Deepkill runs through it, and that there are beavers in the area. Mr. Koester also asked when comments on environmental impacts would be taken to make a SEQRA determination. Attorney Gilchrist stated that public comments concerning environmental impact will be accepted at the public hearing, then the Zoning Board will make a determination under SEQRA prior to acting on the variance application. Chairperson Clemente inquired whether the Town Building Department had received any written comments on the application. Mr. Golden stated that no written comments had been received. Maury Kimmel, of 2 Deepkill Road, stated that he owns a garage on the other side of the property and said the Zoning Board should approve the variances because the prior building obstructed the visibility of traffic, but the new building will create a clearer view onto Route 7. Mr. Kimmel also stated that the previous building has had many uses since he's owned his property and he had no concerns about the new building's use as a realty office. Mr. Kimmel also stated that he understands the concerns about the new building's environmental impact, but the building will be far enough away

from the Deepkill that it will have minimal to no impact. Michael Robidoux, of 8 Flower Road, stated that he does not live near the site, but that the project should be approved since the previous building was hit by a car and needed to be torn down, which is out of the applicant's control. Chairperson Clemente asked about the setback numbers on the corner lot. Mr. Golden stated that two front setbacks are required; the first, along the Deepkill, is proposing 25' 3'' of setback, and the second, along Route 7, is proposing 14' 6'' of setback. 75 feet is required of front setback in the B-L district. There were no other questions or comments from the Zoning Board. Chairperson Clemente made a motion to close the public hearing, which was seconded by Member Morin. The motion was unanimously approved, and the public hearing was closed. Chairperson Clemente stated that this action is for a non-residential area variance, so a short Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) was prepared by the applicant. The Zoning Board reviewed the short EAF, which stated that the old structure has already been demolished and that the new structure will observe the drainage easement on the lot. The short EAF also stated that the new frontage will be along the Deepkill, rather than Route 7. Attorney Gilchrist stated that the EAF notes that the site and/or the adjacent property contains a waterbody. Attorney Gilchrist stated that in light of the location of the waterbody, the Zoning Board should determine if mitigation/erosion of sediment control during construction should be required. Mr. Golden determined the distance from the waterbody to the location of the proposed building to be 44-45 feet. Mr. Newell stated that the leachfield on the property limits the disturbance area and that while no vegetation removal is proposed as part of the project, State workers already cut a lot of vegetation during a drainage project last year. Attorney Gilchrist stated that a mitigation measure to consider is a requirement for erosion and sediment control measures, with such a plan required at the time of the issuing of the building permit, and inspection before any site grading allowed. The Zoning Board discussed the extent of

the grading on the site. Chairperson Clemente stated that the Rensselaer County Bureau of Economic Development and Planning had sent a letter to the Town dated May 17, 2021 stating that the project will not have a major impact on County plans and that local consideration shall prevail. Chairperson Clemente reviewed the short EAF, the distance from the building to the Deepkill, and concerns of the applicant's neighbor. Chairperson Clemente stated that mitigation could be an erosion and sediment control requirement, inspection prior to construction, maintenance during construction, and no vegetation removal near the kill. Member Mainello made a motion to adopt a negative declaration under SEQRA, which motion was seconded by Member Curran. The motion was unanimously approved, and a SEQRA negative declaration adopted. The Zoning Board then reviewed the elements for consideration on the area variance application. As to whether the requested variance would result in an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or create a detriment to nearby properties, Member Curran stated that it would improve the area due to constructing a smaller building, moving the building back, and creating better visibility onto Route 7, resulting in no negative impact. As to whether a feasible alternative was available, Member Morin stated that the applicant has nowhere else to put the building and that the drainage easement on the property and septic system limits options. As to whether the requested variance was substantial, Member Curran stated that it is, but the original building set closer to the lot line than what is currently proposed, which will improve compliance and increase safety. As to whether the variance would create an adverse environmental or physical impact, Member Morin stated that because a smaller building will be built, there will be a smaller impact on the environment than before. Also, impacts to the Deepkill will be mitigated through erosion and sediment control measures. As to whether the difficulty giving rise to the need for the variance was self-created, Member Curran stated that it was not because the previous structure was hit by a

car and needed to be demolished. Chairperson Clemente then reviewed the proposed conditions on the project: creation of sediment and control measures that would be reviewed by the Town Building Department before issuing a building permit; that the erosion and sediment control features be inspected prior to construction; that all erosion and sediment control features be maintained during construction activities; and no vegetation removal within 5 feet of the Deepkill. Member Morin made a motion to grant the area variances with the stated conditions, which was seconded by Member Mainello. The motion was unanimously approved and the area variances were granted subject to the stated conditions. Chairperson Clemente directed the applicant to continue to coordinate with the Town Building Department on this matter.

The fifth item of business on the agenda was an application for two area variances submitted by Tamarac Solar, LLC for property located at 126 Brick Church Road. Gillian Black, Director of Project Development from Eden Renewables, and Anna Rehder, Project Engineer from Environmental Design Partnership, LLP, were present to review the application. Mr. Black stated that the Planning Board had adopted a Negative Declaration under SEQRA at its last meeting on May 6. Mr. Black also stated that the Zoning Board is currently considering two area variances on the project concerning utility poles and setbacks, and that if the variances are granted, he will be back before the Planning Board at their next meeting on May 20. Chairperson Clemente briefly discussed the utility poles issue concerning visibility and the proposed lot line setbacks, then reviewed the history of the application by summarizing minutes of prior meetings. Chairperson Clemente stated that for the project's internal lot lines, 100 feet of setback is required and 20 feet of setback is being proposed, and that the utility poles are for electric interconnection. Chairperson Clemente noted that at the Zoning Board's January 25, 2021 meeting, 20-foot internal lot line setbacks were discussed, as well as the project having two poles and two pad mounts, with all other

poles being underground. Chairperson Clemente noted that at the Zoning Board's February 22, 2021 meeting, it was mentioned that two poles are required by National Grid, but that the applicant will install only one pole if National Grid allows, and that it was mentioned that it is cheaper to have more poles on a site, but that the applicant is still proposing fewer poles. In terms of the 100-foot relief, no solar panels are planned for the southwest field, necessitating relocation of panels on the site, for which the internal lot line setbacks are sought. Chairperson Clemente stated that a joint public hearing was held with the Planning Board on April 1, 2021, at which public comments were made and written responses to those public comments were later received by the Zoning Board. Chairperson Clemente then briefly reviewed the project's complete EAF. Chairperson Clemente stated that on page 4 of the EAF, reference is made to a structure being 15 feet high and asked for clarification. Mr. Black stated that this was referring to the modules on top of the racks, which will rotate and have a maximum height of 15 feet. Chairperson Clemente asked about the current status of the utility poles on the site. Mr. Black stated that the poles will be 30 feet high, which is industry standard, and that while a solar project like this would normally have seven poles, this project will only use two, which will be 20-25 feet apart. Mr. Black also stated that the first pole will be 25 feet off the edge of Brick Church Road and that the second pole will be 25 feet beyond that, and that the second pole will terminate to pad-mounted boxes, and the rest of the utility line will be underground. The Zoning Board then discussed the construction schedule and staging of the project. The Zoning Board asked if the project site would be restricted. Mr. Black stated that there would be an access easement for the adjacent farm and that there would be a fence on each side of Brick Church Road with a gate to prevent intruders. Member Morin asked if there would be a Knox box on the site and Mr. Black said there would be. Mr. Morin said that there should be coordination with the local police and fire departments for security. Mr. Black said that

he would give the Knox box information to Mr. Golden to forward to those departments. Chairperson Clemente asked about screening on the project site. Mr. Black stated that it's difficult to screen the poles on this site, but that planting can be added near the pad-mounted boxes and require regular maintenance. Mr. Black also stated that the utility poles must be kept clear for National Grid access and the 25-foot wide gravel road, and that National Grid would be able to add another pole within their right-of-way on the opposite side of Brick Church Road with still only two poles on the project site. Chairperson Clemente asked if there would be any glare to the west of the project site. Mr. Black stated that there are no significant vantage points to the west of the site, that visual analysis had been done on the site and had found no significant impact, and that very little glare is anticipated. Chairperson Clemente asked if the project is visible from NYS Route 351. Mr. Black stated that it is, but that there is a limited visual impact, which is discussed in the assessment report. Attorney Gilchrist stated that the project's visual assessment report has been reviewed by the Planning Board and confirmed that the report analyzes the visual impact from a vantage point on Route 351, which is mitigated by the existing Borrego solar project. Member Curran asked that if any variances are granted with the project, whether the variances stay with the property itself. Attorney Gilchrist stated that any variances granted would stay with the land for this project on the site, and that if there were to be a different project on the site in the future, regardless of who the applicant for that new use was, they would need to review setback compliance with the Town Code for that new use. Chairperson Clemente stated that a Negative Declaration under SEQRA has already been adopted. The Zoning Board then reviewed the elements for consideration on the area variances application. As to whether the requested variances would result in an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or create a detriment to nearby properties, Chairperson Clemente stated that there would be no change in character

because there is already a solar project next to the project site. As to whether a feasible alternative was available, Chairperson Clemente stated that there is not, as visual impacts from the southwest field on the property would be far greater than the proposed panel locations. As to whether the requested variance was substantial, Chairperson Clemente stated that it is on the numbers, but there is a neighboring solar field already in existence, and that there is no objection from Dewey Delsignore, who owns the neighboring property. As to whether the variance would create an adverse environmental or physical impact, Chairperson Clemente stated that there would not be as a Negative Declaration has already been adopted. As to whether the difficulty giving rise to the need for the variance was self-created, Chairperson Clemente stated that it is, but that it is not determinative, and that the project will allow for more open land to remain open. Member Mainello stated that there are two other solar projects in Brunswick and asked if there could be any overlap with people being served solar power by those two other projects. Mr. Black stated that this project will only be open to Brunswick residents at first for a period of time, then be open to anyone in the area with a National Grid account. Mr. Black also stated that this project will work independently and not with either of the two other projects. The Zoning Board then discussed the difference between commercial and community solar projects. Chairperson Clemente made a motion to grant the area variances, which was seconded by Member Schmidt. The motion was unanimously approved and the area variances were granted. Chairperson Clemente noted the Planning Board still needed to act, but also directed the applicant to continue to coordinate with the Town Building Department on this matter.

The Zoning Board then returned to new business. The second item of new business was an area variance application submitted by William Bridgewater for property located at 8 Tarbell Avenue. The applicant seeks to make his front porch two feet longer. No one was present to review

the project. Mr. Golden noted that Mr. Bridgewater had been present, but had since left the meeting. Chairperson Clemente reviewed the application, stating that the applicant requires a side yard variance for the project and that 30 feet of setback is required, but only one foot of setback is proposed. Mr. Golden stated that the left side of the house already has only one foot of setback and that this is a pre-existing non-conforming use. Furthermore, the replacement deck will allow the homeowner full access to their front door as the current deck does not allow them to open their door all the way. Chairperson Clemente stated that the application was complete. A public hearing on this application is scheduled for June 21, 2021 at 6:15pm.

The third item of new business was an application for two area variances submitted by Michael Robidoux for property located at 8 Flower Road. The applicant seeks to extend an existing deck across the entire front of his house and add steps to the side of the deck. Mr. Robidoux was present to review the application. Chairperson Clemente noted that the house is on a corner lot. Mr. Robidoux stated that he is not moving any closer to Flower Road as a result of this action. Mr. Robidoux also clarified that two front variances are needed, one requesting 36.75 feet of setback and the other requesting 57 feet of setback where 75 feet is required for both. Chairperson Clemente stated that the application was complete. A public hearing on this application is scheduled for June 21, 2021 at 6:30pm.

The index for the May 17, 2021 meeting is as follows:

1. Wark – area variances (approved).
2. Freeman – area variances (approved).
3. Lord Avenue Property – area variance (tentative, June 3, 2021, joint public hearing).
4. Jones – area variance (approved).
5. Maurer – area variance (June 21, 2021).

6. Newell – area variance (approved with conditions).
7. Tamarac Solar – area variances (approved).
8. Bridgewater – area variance (June 21, 2021).
9. Robidoux – area variances (June 21, 2021).

The proposed agenda for the June 21, 2021 meeting is currently as follows:

1. Maurer – area variance (public hearing to commence at 6:00pm).
2. Bridgewater – area variance (public hearing to commence at 6:15pm).
3. Robidoux – area variances (public hearing to commence at 6:30pm).