

## **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 MARCH 18, 2024**

PRESENT were ANN CLEMENTE, CHAIRPERSON, PATRICIA CURRAN, E. JOHN SCHMIDT, JOHN MAINELLO III and DARYL LOCKROW.

ALSO PRESENT was MICHAEL McDONALD, Brunswick Building Department.

Chairperson Clemente reviewed the agenda for the meeting, as posted on the Town sign board and Town website.

It was noted that the online livestream of the meeting was not able to be offered due to a technical issue.

The draft minutes of the February 26, 2024 regular meeting were reviewed. Chairperson Clemente noted three corrections: on page 2, line 17, “Planning” should be changed to “Zoning”; on page 4, line 13, “Planning” should be changed to “Zoning”; and on page 8, line 12, “Farrell” was misspelled. Chairperson Clemente made a motion to approve the minutes of the February 26, 2024 regular meeting subject to the noted corrections, which was seconded by Member Curran. The motion was unanimously approved, and the minutes of the February 26, 2024 regular meeting were approved subject to the noted corrections.

The first item of business on the agenda was an area variance application submitted by Robert Patton for property located at 24 Oxford Circle. Robert Patton was present to review the application. The Notice of Public Hearing was read into the record by Attorney Gilchrist, noting that the Public Hearing Notice was published in the Eastwick Press, placed on the Town sign

board, posted on the Town website, and mailed to the owners of all properties located within 300 feet of the project site. Chairperson Clemente asked Mr. Patton if there had been any changes made to the application since the last Zoning Board meeting. Mr. Patton stated that there had been no changes made to the application. Chairperson Clemente opened the public hearing on the application. There were no public comments on the application. Chairperson Clemente asked Mr. McDonald if there had been any written comments on the application and he stated that there had been none, either by written letter or email. Chairperson Clemente asked if the existing shed on the property would remain or be taken down. Mr. Patton stated that the shed would be taken down. 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 also stated that the project was a Type II action under SEQRA, which does not require any further SEQRA review. The Zoning Board then reviewed the elements for consideration on the area variance requested in the 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 reviewed the surrounding properties and stated that the proposed 12-foot by 24-foot shed would remain in character with neighboring properties, many of which also have sheds. Chairperson Clemente noted that sheds and garages are common in the neighborhood. As to whether a feasible alternative was available, Chairperson Clemente stated that the new septic system and topography of the backyard limits the available flat space on the property where the shed could be placed. Chairperson Clemente asked if there had ever been any stormwater runoff issues at the rear of the property, especially during bad storms. Mr. Patton stated that there never been runoff issues at the rear of the property, that stormwater flowed evenly through the back of the property, and that there had never been any pooling of water or erosion at

the area where the proposed shed would be built. As to whether the requested variance was substantial, Chairperson Clemente stated that 20 feet of setback was required and that 3 feet of setback was being proposed. Member Mainello noted that only 3 feet of setback would be significant, but that there was no other option due to the topography of the site, and that there had been no comments or complaints from his adjacent neighbor concerning the placement of the shed. As to whether the variance would create an adverse environmental impact, Member Mainello stated that there were no drainage issues on the property, and that there would be no environmental impacts to the property. Chairperson Clemente also stated that the matter was a Type II action under SEQRA, meaning that there would be little to no environmental impacts. As to whether the difficulty giving rise to the need for the variance was self-created, Chairperson Clemente stated that it was not, as the septic system and topography of the lot limited the usable area in the rear yard for the shed. Chairperson Clemente asked the Zoning Board members if there were any further questions or comments, and there were not. Attorney Gilchrist stated that the Town had received a letter from the Rensselaer County Bureau of Economic Development and Planning stating that the project will not have a major impact on County plans and that local consideration shall prevail. Member Curran made a motion to grant the area variance, which was seconded by Member Lockrow. The motion was unanimously approved and the area variance was granted. Chairperson Clemente directed the applicant to continue working with the Town Building Department on this matter.

The second item of business on the agenda was an area variance application submitted by Anusa Masambo for property located on Greene Street. Anusa Masambo was present to review the application. The Notice of Public Hearing was read into the record by Attorney Gilchrist, noting that the Public Hearing Notice was published in the Eastwick Press, placed on the Town

sign board, posted on the Town website, and mailed to the owners of all properties located within 300 feet of the project site. Chairperson Clemente opened the public hearing on the application. Sabrina Saunders, of 28 Greene Street, stated that she had conducted a survey/petition concerning a separate area variance application to build a house on the property the previous fall, which had been submitted to the Zoning Board members at the November 20, 2023 public hearing on that application. Ms. Saunders stated that she was very concerned about the size of the house and the size of the lot, stating that the proposed house would be bigger than most other houses in the neighborhood, but that it would be on a much smaller lot. Ms. Saunders stated that others in the neighborhood had attempted to purchase the vacant lot for the construction of an accessory structure, such as a garage, but were told by the Town they could not due to the small size of the lot, and asked how the applicant could be able to build a house on the same lot. Member Curran asked if the lot in question was the only vacant lot on the street, and Ms. Saunders confirmed that it was. Ms. Saunders also stated that there had been a previous issue with work done on the lot, with trees that had been taken down being left on the two adjacent lots. Kathy Dinova, of 38 Greene Street, stated that she lived on the other side of the street from the lot, that Greene Street was a narrow street, that it had been difficult to navigate the street previously when tree-cutting equipment was in the street, and that she was concerned that the street would be even more difficult to navigate with construction equipment and vehicles. Ms. Dinova stated that before the tree-cutting, she had consented to having some equipment temporarily placed on her property, but that the tree-cutting workers created damage to her property, specifically ruts in the ground, when placing and removing the equipment. Ms. Dinova stated that the proposed house would be too big for the lot, which is undersized. Ms. Dinova also stated that she previously had a shed on her property which was discovered to be partially on the applicant's property when a survey was done,

that the applicant agreed to take down and remove the shed, that the shed was taken down, but that the remains of the shed were still on her property. Member Lockrow asked about the size of the proposed house, and specifically if a terrace was to be included when calculating the size. The Zoning Board discussed the overall size of the proposed structure. Mr. Masambo stated that the first floor of the structure would be 865 square feet, that the second floor of the structure would be 911 square feet and that the structure would be 1,776 square feet overall. The Zoning Board discussed the report from the Building Department on the percentage of lot occupancy for structures on Greene Street, Otsego Avenue, Oneida Avenue, and Genesee Street, with lot occupancy being the footprint of the structure in relation to the total lot size. Member Lockrow reviewed the report/chart made by the Building Department and again asked what was included in the calculation of the house size. The Zoning Board discussed the issue, noting that the 1,260 square foot footprint listed on the Building Department chart for this proposed house was taken from the application, and that the size of the footprint of the structure included the area of a proposed garage. Member Mainello noted that the square footage of the garage and first floor, not the total square footage of the house, was used to determine the footprint. Member Lockrow asked about two different square footages being listed for the structure. The Zoning Board reviewed the report/chart and concluded that the “living space” was 1,776 square feet, which did not include the garage, and that the structure would be 2,137 square feet overall, including the garage. Therefore, the structure’s footprint (first floor and garage) was 1,260 square feet; the total square footage of the living space (first and second floors) was 1,776 square feet; and the total square footage of the structure (first and second floors and garage) was 2,137 square feet. Chairperson Clemente noted that being clear on these values was necessary for the accuracy of the application and for use when comparing the structure with the character of the area. Chairperson Clemente stated that

concerning the public hearing, the Zoning Board could either close the public hearing or keep the public hearing open for receipt of responses from the applicant concerning the comments received during the public hearing. Member Curran stated that she wanted the public hearing kept open and have the applicant respond to concerns raised by the neighbors about construction vehicles and equipment. Chairperson Clemente agreed as the setbacks were only proposed to be 12.5 feet from the property line and there were practical issues on construction within a constrained space. Member Schmidt stated that he would like to see a signed statement from the contractor addressing the build-out issues raised during the public hearing. Attorney Gilchrist stated that responsive information would be up to the applicant and that the Zoning Board should not dictate what the applicant submitted. Mr. Masambo stated that he understood the issue of the tight construction area and would address that issue, that fencing would be installed along the property line, and that there would be adequate area in the front and rear of the property for construction equipment. Mr. Masambo acknowledged the issues with the tree-cutting contractor, which he apologized for, and stated that the remains of the demolished shed would be removed. Mr. Masambo also stated that he would submit information addressing the build-out issues, which would confirm that construction would not encroach on adjacent properties. Member Curran asked the applicant to address the impact on Greene Street as well, specifically explaining how there would be no impacts to the road itself, accessibility of the road, and neighboring lots. Mr. Masambo stated that he would include a requirement in his contract with the contractors that no impact to Greene Street or adjacent lots could occur. Member Mainello asked if the house would have a basement. Mr. Masambo stated that there would be no basement. Member Mainello stated that since there would not be a basement, there would be no excavation and asked how the site would be graded. Mr. Masambo stated that there would be some grading on the site, but that no material would be

removed from the site. Chairperson Clemente asked if there were any further public comments, and there were not. The Zoning Board agreed that the public hearing would be kept open. Chairperson Clemente made a motion to keep the public hearing open, which was seconded by Member Mainello. The Zoning Board voted unanimously to keep the public hearing open. Chairperson Clemente asked that the applicant submit responses to public comments in writing. This matter is placed on the April 15, 2024 agenda for continuation of the public hearing and further deliberation.

The third item of business on the agenda was an area variance application submitted by Michael Covey for property located at 25 Old State Route 142. Michael Covey was present to review the application. The Notice of Public Hearing was read into the record by Attorney Gilchrist, noting that the Public Hearing Notice was published in the Eastwick Press, placed on the Town sign board, posted on the Town website, and mailed to the owners of all properties located within 300 feet of the project site. Chairperson Clemente asked Mr. Covey if there had been any changes made to the application since the last Zoning Board meeting. Mr. Covey stated that there had been no changes made to the application, but that the drawing submitted with the application had been corrected to show that the proposed greenhouse would be 16-feet by 84-feet. Chairperson Clemente opened the public hearing on the application. There were no public comments on the application. Chairperson Clemente asked Mr. McDonald if there had been any written comments on the application and he stated that there had been none, either by written letter or email. Member Curran asked the applicant if he would be taking down any trees. Mr. Covey stated that he had already taken down some trees shortly after buying the property and that no further trees would be removed. Chairperson Clemente noted that the property had two front setbacks, from Old Route 142 and Route 142 (Grange Road). 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 also stated that the project was a Type II action under SEQRA, which does not require any further SEQRA review. The Zoning Board then reviewed the elements for consideration on the area variance requested in the 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 the lot was like an island surrounded by public roads, that the adjacent neighbors on Old Route 142 lived at a higher elevation, that NYS Route 142 was at a different elevation and distance, that many larger old farms existed further along Route 142, and that the greenhouse would not be out of character in the neighborhood or a detriment to neighboring properties. As to whether a feasible alternative was available, Member Curran stated that there were no other options due to the lot having two front setbacks. Chairperson Clemente agreed and also noted that the topography and slope of the parcel dictated the proposed location of the greenhouse. As to whether the requested variance was substantial, Chairperson Clemente stated that 70 feet of setback was required and the applicant was proposing 20 feet of setback, and while that seemed significant, if the second front setback was considered a rear setback, it would be compliant. As to whether the variance would create an adverse environmental impact, Chairperson Clemente stated that there would be impacts to drainage, traffic, dust, or odor, and that the greenhouse would use equipment that did not produce any noise, meaning that there would be no adverse environmental impacts. As to whether the difficulty giving rise to the need for the variance was self-created, Member Curran stated that it was not due to the road layout surrounding the lot, causing it to have two front setbacks. Chairperson Clemente asked the Zoning Board members if there were any further questions or comments, and there were not. Chairperson Clemente stated that the Town had

received a letter from the Rensselaer County Bureau of Economic Development and Planning stating that the project will not have a major impact on County plans and that local consideration shall prevail. Member Curran made a motion to grant the area variance, which was seconded by Member Lockrow. The motion was unanimously approved and the area variance was granted. Chairperson Clemente directed the applicant to continue working with the Town Building Department on this matter.

The fourth item of business on the agenda was an area variance application submitted by Justin Haas for property located at the corner of NYS Route 7 and Carrolls Grove Road. Justin Haas was present to review the application. The Notice of Public Hearing was read into the record by Attorney Gilchrist, noting that the Public Hearing Notice was published in the Eastwick Press, placed on the Town sign board, posted on the Town website, and mailed to the owners of all properties located within 300 feet of the project site. Chairperson Clemente asked Mr. Haas if there had been any changes made to the application since the last Zoning Board meeting. Mr. Haas stated that there had been no changes to the application, but that he had an updated site drawing prepared, which clarified the setbacks and the location of the entry to the site, which he handed up to the Zoning Board members. Mr. Haas also stated that the property has two front setbacks, from NYS Route 7 and Carrolls Grove Road. Attorney Gilchrist clarified that the applicant was applying for two area variances, one front setback variance and one rear setback variance, and that one of the two front setbacks was met. Chairperson Clemente opened the public hearing on the application. Andy Ross, of 266 Carrolls Grove Road, stated that he and his neighbors understood that the parcel was zoned for this commercial use, but that they were concerned about the potential impacts to surrounding properties. Mr. Ross stated that he wanted clarification on the setbacks, as the updated site map was not available before the meeting. Mr. Ross stated that stormwater runoff was a

concern, and asked whether total non-permeable area had been calculated and if the retention pond proposed for the site would be big enough. Mr. Ross stated that the applicant also owned a self-storage facility in North Troy and if the self-storage units looked the way they do at that other facility, then they would be severely out of character with the surrounding neighborhood. Mr. Ross asked about lighting on the site as no lighting plan had been submitted. Mr. Ross asked about hours of operation, specifically if there would be 24-hour access and security for the site. Mr. Ross asked if the self-storage units would have temperature control options and if so, if there would be air conditioning and/or exhaust units. Mr. Ross asked if any screening was proposed along the property line for the benefit of adjacent neighbors, and whether a landscaping plan had been prepared. Mr. Ross asked if there would be a snow removal area identified. Mr. Ross asked if there would be outside storage in addition to indoor self-storage. Mr. Ross stated that he and the neighbors were actually in support of the self-storage project, so long as it was done properly. Mr. Ross stated that there were already five self-storage facilities in the area, All Storage Solutions on Farrell Road, Brunswick Self-Storage on Brick Church Road, Bolt Storage on NYS Route 2 across from the Tamarac School, Country Storage on Tybush Lane, and ValueSpace Storage on Hoosick Road across from Ace Hardware, and asked if this self-storage project would be economically feasible and if it would be well maintained. Mr. Ross also stated that he would email his comments to the Brunswick Building Department so they would have them in writing. Kate Daley, of 1356 NYS Route 7, stated that she lived next door to the project site and asked why part of her property was shaded on the site map. Tom Daley, of 1356 NYS Route 7, stated that he was concerned about drainage on the site as there was an open ditch along the property line between his and his wife's property and the project site, and a lot of water would drain and flow onto their property without proper drainage maintenance. Kevin Franklin, of 31 Wolfert Avenue, asked about the project's

grading plan, noting that the property was on a slope, and asked how the site would handle runoff, specifically asking if a barrier, such as a retaining wall, would be installed. Chairperson Clemente stated that the Zoning Board would need to consider the character of the area, and that the appearance of the self-storage units, signage, and lighting must be compatible with the surrounding area. Chairperson Clemente stated that a written submission responding to all public comments would be required. Chairperson Clemente also asked if the applicant could directly address Mrs. Daley's question about part of her property being shaded on the site map since she was present. Mr. Haas stated that the shaded area was land Charles Farrell, the property owner, had previously transferred to the Daleys. Member Mainello stated that the additional information would be needed a reasonable period before the next Zoning Board meeting, unlike the updated site map, which was submitted at the current meeting. Chairperson Clemente agreed, stating that the additional information should be submitted the first week of April so the Zoning Board members and public could have adequate time to review that information before the next Zoning Board meeting. Mr. Haas briefly addressed the runoff issue, stating that an updated stormwater plan was being prepared and would be submitted, and confirmed that he would respond to all public comments in writing. Chairperson Clemente asked if there were any further public comments, and there were not. The Zoning Board agreed that the public hearing would be kept open. Chairperson Clemente made a motion to keep the public hearing open, which was seconded by Member Curran. The Zoning Board voted unanimously to keep the public hearing open. This matter is placed on the April 15, 2024 agenda for continuation of the public hearing and further deliberation.

The Zoning Board discussed one item of new business.

The one item of new business was an area variance application submitted by Rebecca Del Gaizo and Jason Del Gaizo for property located at 22 Otsego Avenue. Rebecca Del Gaizo and

Jason Del Gaizo were present to review the application. Mrs. Del Gaizo stated that they were seeking to add a covered front porch to their home, that the home was an existing nonconforming structure built in the 1920s, that the house is currently only 11 feet from the front property line, and that the home's front steps are deteriorating. Mrs. Del Gaizo stated that the proposed covered front porch would be 18 feet across and 6 feet deep, that new steps would be installed, and that the covered front porch would be very similar to the adjacent house at 24 Otsego Avenue. Mrs. Del Gaizo also stated that they are completing a number of improvements to their house, and had obtained a building permit already for part of the separate work on the house. Chairperson Clemente stated that the application was complete for purposes of holding a public hearing. Attorney Gilchrist stated that since the other two matters for the next Zoning Board meeting were continuations of public hearings, the Zoning Board might consider scheduling this public hearing for the start of its next meeting. The Zoning Board agreed to have the public hearing on this matter first on the agenda. A public hearing on this application is scheduled for April 15, 2024 at 6:00pm.

The Zoning Board discussed one item of old business.

The one item of old business was a use variance application submitted by Daniel Hagberg concerning the current self-storage use at the property located at 4021 NYS Route 2. Attorney Gilchrist stated that the Zoning Board had granted the use variance at its previous meeting on February 26, and had directed Attorney Gilchrist to draft a written decision on the matter consistent with the Zoning Board's deliberation and determination. Attorney Gilchrist then handed out the draft Resolution and reviewed it for the Zoning Board. The Zoning Board saw no need for any corrections or changes to the draft Resolution. The Resolution was offered by Chairperson Clemente, which was seconded by Member Mainello. The Zoning Board voted unanimously to approve the Resolution, a copy of which is attached hereto.

The index for the March 18, 2024 regular meeting is as follows:

1. Patton – area variance (approved).
2. Masambo – area variance (April 15, 2024).
3. Covey – area variance (approved).
4. Haas – area variance (April 15, 2024).
5. Del Gaizo – area variance (April 15, 2024).
6. Hagberg – use variance (Resolution approved).

The proposed agenda for the April 15, 2024 regular meeting is as follows;

1. Del Gaizo – area variance (public hearing to commence at 6:00pm).
2. Masambo – area variance (public hearing to continue at 6:15pm).
3. Haas – area variance (public hearing to continue at 6:30pm).

**TOWN OF BRUNSWICK ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS  
REGULAR MEETING**

**March 18, 2024**

**RESOLUTION OF WRITTEN DETERMINATION CONCERNING  
USE VARIANCE APPLICATION: 4021 NY ROUTE 2**

**WHEREAS**, an application was received by the Town of Brunswick Zoning Board of Appeals (“Zoning Board of Appeals”) for a use variance submitted by Daniel Hagberg for property located at 4021 NY Route 2 (the “Parcel”); and

**WHEREAS**, the Parcel is identified as Rensselaer County Tax Map No. 92.-6-2.12, with current owner identified as 2978 NY 2 LLC; and

**WHEREAS**, the current use of the Parcel is for self-storage units, and the site is currently operated as Bolt Storage; and

**WHEREAS**, the record concerning the Parcel includes the following:

1. The current owner acquired the Parcel in 2021;
2. The prior owner of the Parcel, identified as Tamarac Self Storage LLC, had received Town of Brunswick Planning Board site plan approval for the installation of self-storage units in 2008; however, such prior owner had also installed a second phase of expansion for self-storage units on the site without receiving Brunswick Planning Board approval;
3. While self-storage use was an allowable use for the Parcel in 2008 when the Brunswick Planning Board had previously granted site plan approval, the current Town of Brunswick Zoning Law enacted in 2017 placed the Parcel in the Hamlet District, which does not allow self-storage units as a permitted use on the Parcel;
4. Accordingly, self-storage units installed on the Parcel without prior Brunswick Planning Board site plan approval and/or Town of Brunswick permits are not currently in compliance with the Town of Brunswick Zoning Law; and

**WHEREAS**, the owner/applicant has confirmed on the record that the use variance is being sought only with respect to the self-storage structures currently existing on the site, and the intent is to bring the self-storage units currently located on the site into compliance with the requirements of the Brunswick Zoning Law; and

**WHEREAS**, the owner/applicant confirms that the current use variance request does not include any request for placement of any additional self-storage units on the site; and

**WHEREAS**, any future placement of any additional self-storage units on the site will require further review and action by all applicable boards and departments of the Town of Brunswick; and

**WHEREAS**, following a Notice of Public Hearing duly published, posted, and mailed in compliance with the Brunswick Zoning Law, the Zoning Board of Appeals held a public hearing on the subject use variance application on February 26, 2024; and

**WHEREAS**, the Zoning Board of Appeals received no public comments at or before the public hearing, either verbally at the public hearing or in writing received at or prior to the public hearing, and thus closed the public hearing on February 26, 2024; and

**WHEREAS**, the use variance application was duly referred to the Rensselaer County Department of Economic Development and Planning pursuant to General Municipal Law §239-m, with the County response stating that the proposal does not conflict with County plans and that local consideration shall prevail; and

**WHEREAS**, upon a review of the record and following due deliberation, the Zoning Board of Appeals made the following findings:

1. There has been a long-standing use of self-storage units on the site since October 2008; that the Zoning Board of Appeals had requested that the applicant submit economic proof showing that the owner/applicant would not be able to achieve the reasonable economic return on the site with any other permitted use in the Hamlet District; that the applicant had submitted economic proof in form and calculation that is different from the typical economic proof, as the owner/applicant had calculated the cost to demolish and remove all self-storage units on the site, as well as site grading costs, both of which would be required to pursue any permitted use on the site within the Hamlet District, and the Zoning Board of Appeals concluded that based upon such economic proof, it was not economically viable to pursue any permitted use in the Hamlet District for this site;
2. The hardship relating to the Parcel is unique and does not apply to the substantial portion of the land use area or neighborhood; that the prior Brunswick Zoning Ordinance had permitted self-storage units at this location; that a site plan had been reviewed and approved by the Brunswick Planning Board for many of the existing self-storage units on this site; that the current owner has represented to the Zoning Board of Appeals that it was unaware of the compliance issue when it acquired the property in 2021; and that the hardship is unique and is primarily due to the enactment of the Brunswick Zoning Law in 2017 prohibiting self-storage use on the parcel; and that therefore the hardship was limited to this parcel in the Hamlet District with its unique history;
3. That the use of the Parcel as self-storage would not alter the neighborhood, as the self-storage units had been on the property since 2008;
4. That the need for a use variance was not necessarily self-created, due to the fact that the Town of Brunswick changed the zoning classification for the Parcel when it enacted the Brunswick Zoning Law in 2017; that it was the prior owner, not the current owner, that had failed to properly permit the additional self-storage units located on the site; and

**WHEREAS**, based upon a review of the Environmental Assessment Form submitted with the application, as well as the record evidence, the Zoning Board of Appeals duly adopted a negative declaration under the State Environmental Quality Review Act, determining that this action did not have the potential to cause a significant adverse environmental impact; and

**WHEREAS**, in consideration of the findings made by the Zoning Board of Appeals on the elements for consideration in relation to use variance applications as set forth above, and in consideration of whether the application of the 2017 Brunswick Zoning Law to the parcel will cause unnecessary hardship, the Zoning Board of Appeals determined to issue the use variance at its meeting held February 26, 2024, and requested that such determination be set forth in written decision;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Town of Brunswick Zoning Board of Appeals in regular session duly convened as follows:

1. The recital paragraphs set forth above are fully incorporated herein as substantive provisions of this Resolution.
2. The use variance for parcel located at 4021 NY Route 2, Rensselaer County Tax Map No. 92.-6-2.12, seeking continued use of the parcel for the self-storage units only to the extent located on the parcel as of February 26, 2024 and as depicted in the site layout plan included in the use variance application materials, is hereby granted.

The foregoing Resolution, offered by Chairperson Clemente and seconded by Member Mainello, was duly put to a roll call vote as follows:

<b>CHAIRPERSON CLEMENTE</b>	<b>VOTING <u>aye</u></b>
<b>MEMBER MAINELLO</b>	<b>VOTING <u>aye</u></b>
<b>MEMBER CURRAN</b>	<b>VOTING <u>aye</u></b>
<b>MEMBER SCHMIDT</b>	<b>VOTING <u>aye</u></b>
<b>MEMBER LOCKROW</b>	<b>VOTING <u>aye</u></b>

The foregoing Resolution was thereupon declared duly adopted.

March 18, 2024