

**Village of Harriman
Zoning Board of Appeals
April 2, 2014
7:30pm**

Call to Order

- Chairperson Laurine Miller called to order the Zoning Board of Appeals Regular Meeting at 7:38pm on April 2, 2014 at the Village of Harriman Hall located at 1 Church Street, within the Village of Harriman, New York.

Roll Call

The following persons were present:

- Laurine Miller – Chairperson
- Chuck Crover - Member
- Colleen Farrell – Member
- Carol Schneider - Member
- Ron Walker – Building Inspector
- Jane Leake – Deputy Clerk/Secretary

Also Present

- Joe McKay – Village Attorney

Absent

NONE

Adoption of Minutes

- **Motion** to approve the minutes from March 5, 2014 Public Hearing and Regular Meeting was made by Member Farrell and seconded by Member Crover. 4 Ayes.

Mr. McKay addressed the Board stating for the record I remind the Board that the Board has 62 days in which to make a final determination after the close of the Public Hearing on both of the applications that are pending. I have provided the Board with draft decisions in both cases. There was some more deliberation concerning the Hagopian fence variance application at the last meeting then really discussion with respect to the Harriman Bus Terminal application. I tried to incorporate to the extent that I could some of the comments that were made concerning the Loyal application. There are fewer comments incorporated with respect to the Harriman Bus Terminal only because I don't think there was a sufficient discussion on it, but any way they are there. So the Board wants to review the Drafts. You need to deliberate in public and if you have a need of a specific question we can move into executive session to discuss it, but if it relates to the facts of the application then that discussion needs to be in public.

**Village of Harriman
Zoning Board of Appeals
April 2, 2014
7:30pm**

Member Crover asked in deliberating this do you want us to read through what we already wrote and what we discussed last month.

Mr. McKay replied this is just a draft. You have to look at the factors and there is some general discussion so from my notes and what I recall I have plugged in some of the comments. They could be one person's comments so I think as a whole the Board needs to look at the facts that I put in there. Not every member needs to agree as to the five factors. We can explain there might be some Board members who would approve this and some Board member who would not. So we will make whatever changes are necessary.

Member Crover stated some of your comments you say you would like more deliberation on it.

Mr. McKay replied I do that a couple of times because there was definitely not enough deliberation to actually explain how the test came out.

Member Crover responded so if we just read through your decision openly now and address those open areas would that be okay?

Mr. McKay replied if that is what the Board wants to do that is fine.

Member Crover asked the Board, does that sound good with you guys? The stuff that is in there we discussed last month.

Member Farrell responded we did, absolutely.

Member Crover replied we can state it again and then add to it based on Joe's comments.

LOYAL TIRE - DETERMINATION
102-4-4.2

Present – Mr. Richard H.Sarajian, Attorney of Montalbano, Condon & Frank, P.C. & Applicant Michael Hagopian

Member Crover stated I will read through Mr. McKay's discussion here because it is kind of what we discussed. The Village Code Section 76-3 no fence, wall or other type of construction shall be installed without the approval of the Building Inspector. Village Code Section 76-4 further requires any person or corporation to apply for a fence permit from the Building Inspector before a fence is erected. That section also requires a fence application to be accompanied by plan or sketch showing the proposed location of any fence and material proposed. Section 76-5 provides that the fence regulations set forth applies in all zoning districts within the Village. It also states that commercial properties will require site plan approval. 76-10 the Code authorizes any individual whose fence permit

**Village of Harriman
Zoning Board of Appeals
April 2, 2014
7:30pm**

is denied by the Building Inspector to appeal to the Zoning Board. We have to decide whether there are practical difficulties warranting a variance and whether there is unnecessary hardship on the variance.

Mr. McKay replied actually there are two separate tests. There are the five factors which come from both the 712B NYS law and there is a separate section 76-10 or the Village Code which has a separate test. Mr. Sarajian represented in his research shows that essentially the 76-10 section is valid. I don't necessarily dispute it. I think the Board is required to apply both standards, the State standard and the Village Code standard.

Member Crover stated the section further provides the zoning board of appeals may grant a variance from the requirements of the chapter regulating fence as long as the public safety and welfare are secured substantial justice. The Board determines that the Order of Remedy issued by the Building Inspector correctly determined that the Building Permit was required to install the applicant's fence and that chapter requires site plan approval from the Planning Board fences installed in commercial properties. The Village Code defines a fence as a structure. Structures – the fence issue was an impound yard fence. The code requires the Building Permit be issued prior to the installation or erection of any structure. Here the Building Inspector correctly determined that the Building Permit was required and as much as the applicant erected a fence prior to obtaining a Building Permit the Board upholds the provision of the Order to Remedy.

Mr. McKay replied the Board should discuss each sentence in that paragraph because that is my take on some of the discussions that were had at the last meeting. So you need to look at them and decide if they are right/wrong or if there is any disagreement as to some of it.

Member Crover responded that is exactly what I said last month and I personally agree with it. I don't think we need to elaborate anymore if the rest of the Board agrees with it.

Member Farrell replied yes, I think we discussed some of it at the last meeting. We can certainly discuss it further if anyone has anything they want to add.

Chairperson Miller asked Mr. Sarajian you said you wanted to keep this on the Agenda because you might plan to sue the Town of Woodbury because they didn't renew your towing, is that still a fact or something that will happen?

Mr. Sarajian replied we have not decided yet. We have until May 22nd to decide if we are going to sue the Town of Woodbury. No decision has been made.

Member Crover stated no further on that paragraph. Moreover, the Board heard substantial evidence and reviewed photographs concerning the proposed fact

**Village of Harriman
Zoning Board of Appeals
April 2, 2014
7:30pm**

that the fence was not affixed and therefore no permit was required. The Board and I reject that argument. The structure put in place by the applicant is a fence regardless of the manner in which it is attached. These are my feeling also. Therefore, there is required site plan approval and a permit from the Building Inspector. As such the Board upholds a provision of the Order of Remedy that would require a site plan approval. I agree with that paragraph also.

Member Farrell replied I agree with you. We discussed it at the last meeting. This has been bumping along for several months' now, so it is something I think we have discussed the last few meetings.

Mr. McKay stated just to remind the Board, in reviewing the minutes since the last meeting Mr. Sarajian did provide the Board with information or definition of the Lax Law Dictionary. His argument was that the term temporary should be read meaning in the context of time. How long it was there rather than the manner in which it was affixed, so I don't know if the Board wants to include.

Member Crover stated I was going to address that in the next paragraph. Moreover, the Board here determines that the current fence is. I should say if the applicant is considering a temporary fence, temporary by time or by the fact that it is temporarily installed. To me it is irrelevant and prohibited by Village Code. I think the term of temporary fence can go either way. Either with time during construction and the manner in which it was installed. In other words, it is not set in concrete. It is on pedestals around a construction site so it can be moved as construction proceeds. Even though this isn't a construction project it was set up where it was anchored in the ground but designed so it wasn't in concrete and it could be lifted out. If the applicant does want to consider it a temporary fence instead of a permanent fence I reject that argument. Also, the Village Law prohibits temporary fences. If anybody else has an opinion on that matter, speak it now, change my mind.

No responses from the other Board Members.

Member Crover continued stating as to the portion of the Order of Remedy that required the applicant to obtain site plan approval from the Planning Board because of property and is operating a second business on the lot. The Board determines that the fence was erected in order to comply with the provisions of the Town of Woodbury towing ordinance and was for the purpose of allowing Apple Auto Body to perform towing services for the Town of Woodbury. As such the purpose of the fence was to allow Apple Auto Body to store vehicles on the premises for which Loyal Tire is operating. Two companies were using the same lot for business purpose and such use required review and approval of the Planning Board. As such the Board upholds these provisions. The Order of Remedy would have required site plan approval due to the use of the property by two separate businesses. Again, that is my interpretation of our Code Book. Does anyone else have any comments?

**Village of Harriman
Zoning Board of Appeals
April 2, 2014
7:30pm**

Member Farrell stated no because this is pretty much what I think was discussed at the March meeting and I think that when you address these questions, for myself and I think for the rest of the Board, I think you pretty much captured it in a way that I was interpreting it as well.

Member Crover continued stating whether an undesirable change will be produced in the character of the neighborhood or detriment to nearby properties the Board finds the proposed fence will not produce an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or detriment. Obviously that is because the fence is inside an already existing in-pound yard. So I truly don't think it would be a detriment to nearby properties. Any other comments?

Member Farrell, Schneider & Miller responded no.

Member Crover continued stating whether the benefits sort by the applicant could be achieved by some method feasible in this regard I believe and the Board should observe that there are alternative methods for the applicant to pursue. Simply stating the applicant can apply to the Planning Board for site plan approval, apply for a commercial fence permit and then be issued a permit from the Building Inspector. As a consequence I find that there are feasible options for the applicant to pursue other than to seek and area variance. Any other comments there?

Member Farrell, Schneider & Miller responded no.

Member Crover continued stating whether the requested variance is substantial. It may not be substantial. This is my opinion. There have been many legal issues in the past in this Village regarding fences on commercial properties whether they were erected legally or not. Whether they should have gotten site plan approval or not and because of that fact and the fact that one of our decisions was overturned in the past related to one of these I do not want to make that mistake again and bypass the Planning Board again. So in my opinion it is substantial because of those legal issues in the past. Any other comments there?

No response from Board Members.

Member Crover continued stating whether the proposed variance will have an adverse effect or impact on the fiscal environment conditions in the neighborhood. I am stating yes, to allow two businesses to operate in a storage lot could create more traffic and for that reason I think it should go to the Planning Board for their approval as stated in some of the other factors. Any other comments?

No response from Board Members.

**Village of Harriman
Zoning Board of Appeals
April 2, 2014
7:30pm**

Member Crover continued and whether the alleged difficulty was self-created? Yes, wanting a second business to use the lot for a business that is not even located in the Village of Harriman is a self-created hardship. If it wasn't for that I don't think the applicant would have erected the fence and would be here before us. Whether the applicant will suffer unnecessary hardship wanting the variance, I don't think it is an unnecessary hardship. I think there are other avenues to obtain this.

Mr. McKay stated the first factor is whether it is a practical difficulty or not? The code says the Board shall determine if there are practical difficulties or unnecessary hardships warranting a variance.

Member Crover replied I don't think there is for the reasons that we discussed all along. I don't think there are practical difficulties and I don't think the applicant will suffer unnecessary hardships. They can get the approval through the Planning Board to do this. There are other avenues to take.

Mr. McKay stated I think the applicants submission they referred to the cost. I don't know if the Board wants to specifically address in terms of the cost of the site plan review. I think that was what the applicant was indicating was a hardship. I don't know if the Board wants to discuss that. I don't think there was any financial information provided, per say.

Member Farrell replied we don't know what it would cost because they didn't present anything on that. That was not part of any of the presentation.

Member Crover responded the cost factor wasn't discussed and I don't see a reason to discuss it here at length because when you operate or bring a second business then you should have a business plan together to address those costs. I think if cost of going to the Planning Board was a big issue, we would have heard more about that from the applicants presentation to us. It was a more whether it was a temporary fence, temporary by time, whether it was in concrete, whether the stakes were removable and the door was removable.

Mr. McKay stated just to clarify for the record I just went back and looked at the memorandum in support of the variance request. It doesn't mention any thing financial in respect to the hardship so I think I just represented that, it did. It doesn't. It may be something that was discussed or maybe I just made it up.

Member Farrell replied I think it was brought up at one point where it would be costly to go to the Planning Board. I do believe you did bring that up, did you not?

Mr. Hagopian responded yeah.

**Village of Harriman
Zoning Board of Appeals
April 2, 2014
7:30pm**

Mr. McKay replied I just didn't want to misrepresent what was in the memorandum.

Mr. Sarajian stated when we went through the variance portion of it we talked about the cost of going through an application that was not changing the operation with the exterior fence or anything like that.

Member Farrell responded back to Chuck's point I don't think it would create a hardship for them to come back to the Planning Board for a site plan approval. Does anyone have anything?

Members responded no.

Member Crover stated I think we covered enough material here for a decision.

Member Farrell replied and I think, as I said earlier, this has been bumping along for some time. We've been hearing and absorbing some of this for month's now. This is not just something from the last meeting.

Mr. McKay stated once the Board finishes its deliberations I can provide the Board with a revised decision. If you act by your next Board meeting it may be the 63rd day. So if the Board wanted to do that I would just ask the applicant to extend.

Member Crover asked do we need to do that?

Mr. McKay replied it is just not in final form and my preference would be for the Board to vote on something that was in final form.

Member Crover responded we can't do that in a timely manner. We are going to be one day late.

Mr. McKay replied I would think that the applicant would extend it. That would be pretty standard. If the applicant would not extend it then I think someone on the Board would have to make a motion to vote this evening subject to including the comments you discussed.

Mr. Sarajian asked are you asking me a question?

Mr. McKay replied first I was telling them. Will you consent to the next meeting or do you want a decision tonight?

Mr. Sarajian replied we know the way this one is going so the one day doesn't bother me. What I am more concerned about is the other one which I believe is going to be a favorable decision. I want to make sure there is a vote on that one tonight.

**Village of Harriman
Zoning Board of Appeals
April 2, 2014
7:30pm**

Member Crover stated I would just assume voting on these tonight subject to the changes that were just discussed and if you can email the changes to us and when we all agree that those changes reflect what we voted on then it is fine.

Mr. McKay replied what I would just ask, for the record, if the applicant wants the decision tonight then I would just ask the applicant to consent and that the applicant has no objection to me updating the decision with a final submission.

Mr. Sarajian responded and again my answer to you is I don't want to get the next one that Mr. Sweeney is representing Mr. Hagopian on. I don't want it to be the fact that we said okay take one extra day when the law requires getting your final text of this one. I don't want that to prejudice me and keep me from having getting Mr. Sweeney asked the same question on the next one.

Member Crover replied personally I want to address both of these tonight and make final decisions.

Mr. Sweeney responded I hope that you would. I haven't heard any questions on mine.

Member Crover stated I think the Board agrees with me.

Members Farrell responded yeah, that is fine.

Member Crover replied one is not going to affect the other. If you consent to us doing them both tonight then let's do them both tonight.

Mr. Sarajian asked if I consent for you to do this one next meeting that won't stop you from voting on Mr. Sweeney's application?

Member Crover replied no, it won't.

Mr. McKay asked is that what you meant?

Member Crover stated he was looking for that you wouldn't object to us making a decision on this current one right now.

Mr. Sarajian responded I thought you were saying I wouldn't object for you taking the 63rd day.

Member Crover replied then I stated I would like to close this matter tonight.

Mr. McKay stated I had no intention of holding one application hostage to the other one. The Loyal matter is already seven – eight pages single spaced. It's kind of a work in progress. So I was not trying to tie on matter to the other.

**Village of Harriman
Zoning Board of Appeals
April 2, 2014
7:30pm**

Mr. Sarajian replied I understand that but I didn't want it to look like if we consenting on one, why aren't we consenting on the other was the issue I was raising.

Member Crover responded my point is on this one for Loyal I would like to make the decision now, therefore do you have any objections to us making a decision now subject to changes.

Mr. Sarajian replied you absolutely have the right to make the decision now.

Member Crover stated he wants it on the record that you don't want us to wait to the 63rd day.

Mr. Sarajian replied you are saying it wrong.

Mr. McKay responded they are going to vote tonight. I will incorporate there changes into a final decision which will be execute sometime after tonight, do you have any objection to that?

Mr. Sarajian replied no.

Mr. McKay responded thank you.

Member Crover stated I would like to make a motion that we adopt the decision that was presented and we discussed and made changes subject to the changes of our discussions.

Mr. Sarajian replied my problem is that I don't know what changes they are trying to make.

Member Crover responded I shouldn't say changes. Let me rephrase the word changes, additions because in the decision of the five factors we did not deliberate enough on. So we deliberated tonight and they are going to be added into it. So our discussions tonight are going to be added to the decision.

Mr. Sarajian asked this is what you are asking? Can we vote tonight based on the oral instructions and the oral discussions and have Mr. McKay instead of hand writing in changes, have Mr. McKay make the changes and bring it back to us to be signed at the next meeting. Do I have any objection to that?

Member Crover replied no it can be signed before the next meeting.

Mr. Sarajian stated no, I do not have any objection to that.

Motion was made by Member Crover and seconded by Member Schneider to deny the application. All in favor. 4 Ayes.

**Village of Harriman
Zoning Board of Appeals
April 2, 2014
7:30pm**

Mr. Sarajian stated I would just like that somewhere the record reflects the original draft be preserved. In other words you are not giving us a copy of the original draft and I am going to need at some point to see and make sure that the changes.

Member Crover responded there are no changes. Additions.

Mr. Sarajian replied the additions.

Mr. McKay stated this draft I consider a communication with my client. I am not in the business of preserving drafts. The Board is going to vote tonight because it seems they want to and it fits your client's interest. I will incorporate the comments in the deliberations of this evening into a final decision. I am not going to maintain a draft or provide you with a draft. I think that is a confidential attorney client communication.

Mr. Sarajian asked how will I know that the changes that you make after they vote are only the changes that were discussed tonight.

Member Crover replied because we are not going to sign it unless they are our changes.

Mr. McKay stated it is not a final document. See then I would have to go back to my request to extend it to the next meeting date.

Mr. Sarajian replied and I don't have a problem with that. What I think you should do is exactly what Chuck said, is vote and have you make the changes.

The only concern I have is whether you should actually bring it back to the next meeting to make sure all of the changes you made were accurate to what they wanted.

Mr. McKay responded I understand that point. This is what I anticipated, incorporating the changes, distributing it to the Board Members if they originally approve it.

Mr. Sarajian replied do what you want. It is not that big of an issue. However, you want to do it, I will be fine with it. I mean I don't know if Chuck actually made the changes in grammar?

Member Crover responded I made the notes of our discussions that are being added. I shouldn't have used the word changes. I'm not changing anything. What we discussed last month he wrote down and then what we discussed this month needs to be added to it.

Mr. Sarajian replied go ahead, I don't object.

**Village of Harriman
Zoning Board of Appeals
April 2, 2014
7:30pm**

Member Crover stated so when you send a copy to us Laurine is not going to sign it until we all agree that that properly reflects what was discussed, but that shouldn't prohibit us from voting on it tonight, in my opinion. Again I made the motion.

HARRIMAN BUS TERMINAL
106-2-1 & 2 – AREA VARIANCE - DETERMINATION

Present - Mr. James G. Sweeney, Attorney & Applicant Michael Hagopian

Member Crover stated I am going to go through this as you have outlined it here for us and make some notes on the discussions regarding the matter. The Board has considered the following factors and had made the findings set forth below with respect to the applicants request for a variance from a minimum of 20 foot buffer zone and its further application for a variance for requirements that a 20 foot area be free of pavement and be screened and/or landscaped with evergreens.

Mr. McKay responded there are two variances, one which is the buffer and landscaping section and one with the no parking for 10 feet.

Member Crover replied we are going to address the buffer right now, first. Whether an undesirable change would be produced in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties would be created by granting the area variance. The Board finds that the proposed variance from the minimum 20 feet buffer zone and the further requirements be free of pavement, such with evergreens will not produce an undesirable change of the character of the neighborhood or detriment of the neighborhood properties. There is no buffer in the existing parking lot as it has been used for many years. Right now, and as for the past 60 years or more parking has occurred on that lot for the commuters until recently and cars have parked right up to the edge of the road and there has been no buffer there. So, I don't think it is going to produce an undesirable character or detriment because it is going to be an improvement to the property. Are there any other discussions on that factor?

Members all responded no.

Member Crover continued stating whether the benefits sought by the applicant could be achieved by some other method feasible for the applicant. In this regard the Board observes that there are alternative methods for the applicant to pursue simply stating the applicant can simply conform to the code provisions and in that case the applicant would lose the benefit. I don't like the word additional parking because there is actually going to be less parking then what has been currently used in the past or possibly because there was no official

**Village of Harriman
Zoning Board of Appeals
April 2, 2014
7:30pm**

count in the past. I just know that there used to be a lot of cars and buses there. In that case the applicant will lose the benefit of some parking spaces within the lot.

Member Schneider stated I believe at least 10 spots.

Member Crover replied approximately 12 – 14 parking spaces. I believe those parking spaces are needed to keep the property in a useful manner for its intended use and it is going to be more orderly and less clutter than in the past.

Members responded I agree.

Member Crover continued stating and the Board finds there are no feasible options for the applicant to pursue other than to seek an area variance. Whether the requested variance is substantial, the Board determines that the proposed variance from the buffer variance. There is going to be by code 20 feet and eliminating all of it or more than half of it because they are talking about 9 feet parking up to the edge of the road. That may be considered substantial, but with the neighbors comments and with a fence that is going to go in place to block headlights, I truly don't think that adding the fence in place and having a minimum of 9 feet of green/grass area between the fence and the roadway helps the fact from keeping it from becoming too substantial. Considering how it is currently being used with gravel right up to the edge of the road way and very little un-mowed and crab grass and weeds I think this proposal is better than what is currently being used. So however, the proposed variance is not, in my opinion, substantial when you compare it to what is existing. Any other comments?

Members Farrell, Schneider & Miller replied no, agree.

Member Crover continued stating whether the proposed variance will have an adverse effect or impact on the fiscal or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district. The Board determines that the proposed variance from the minimum 20 feet buffer will not have an adverse effect or impact on the fiscal or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district. These plans are an improvement with less parking then were used in the past. It is neater, cleaner, more organized then presently/previously used. I think it is not going to have an adverse effect, I think it is going to help.

Member Farrell replied the public comments as well from the neighbors felt the same way.

Member Crover stated just for the record this is only part of the property that is along South Main Street where the residential are across the street. Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created, I have mixed feelings on this. The property has been used in a certain way for many years. The new property owner is making some changes and obviously hopes to create a business and

**Village of Harriman
Zoning Board of Appeals
April 2, 2014
7:30pm**

have a profitable business used on the property. Not necessarily changing the use but making it more organized and useful to make a profit. Part of me says that can be self-created because you could comply and have less parking but that might not be a profitable exchange and the property could keep going on and used as is. Some may consider it an eye sore. I'm not convinced that it is self-created because the property has always been used as a commuter parking lot. Any other opinions on that?

Member Miller replied no, I agree with you.

Member Crover stated that concludes the variance on the buffer and our decision that we all agree that we should allow that variance.

Members Farrell, Schneider & Miller replied yes.

Member Crover continued stating as for the second variance from parking within 10 feet of the street line. Whether, an undesirable change will be produced in the character of the neighborhood. The Board finds that the proposed variance from the prohibition of parking within 10 feet of the street line, will not produce and undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood. Deliberation on that is that the new proposed plan is certainly going to be better for the character of the neighborhood than how the property is presently being used. The parking is at the closest point, maybe 9 feet according to the engineer last week. I think from going from 10 feet to 9 feet is not an undesirable change in the character. Right now they can park right up to the edge of the road. Any other comments on that?

Members Farrell, Schneider & Miller replied no.

Member Crover continued stating whether the benefits sought by the applicant could be achieved by some other method, in this regard the Board observes that there are alternative methods for the applicant to pursue. The applicant may simply conform to the applicable code provisions. In that case, the applicant will lose the benefit of needed parking spaces. I don't like the word additional. Of needed parking spaces within the lot to make this project work is his opinion. It is still possibly less parking and more organized parking than in the past. Cleaner, neater looking and I don't think the applicant needs to observe an alternate method and I don't think it will be critical in our decision of the variance. Therefore, the Board finds that there are no feasible options for the applicant to pursue other than to seek an area variance. Any other comments?

Members Farrell, Schneider & Miller replied no.

Member Crover continued stating whether the requested variance is substantial the Board determines that the proposed variance of 10 feet line is statistically substantial. I don't agree with that. They are going to be parking 9 feet instead

**Village of Harriman
Zoning Board of Appeals
April 2, 2014
7:30pm**

of 10 feet. I don't think the one foot difference is substantial. In my opinion the proposed variance is not substantial they are only asking for a difference of 1 foot along South Main and Ramapo Avenue. Any other comments?

Members Farrell, Schneider & Miller replied no.

Member Crover continued stating whether the proposed variance will have an adverse effect or impact on physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood. The Board determines that the proposed variance from the provision of parking within 10 feet will not have an adverse effect or impact on physical environmental conditions of the neighborhood. The past use of the property allows parking to the street line. Keeping parking 9 feet instead of 10 feet, in my opinion, will not have an adverse effect and with the proposed fence that is in there. In the past we put conditions on there that when we eliminate a buffer or give a variance that we require a fence, but I know that this is coming from the Planning Board and the Planning Board is requesting a fence go up there and all parties have agreed to the fence, including the neighbors. I don't want to put any factors in here on what type of fence or anything like that. I just assume let the neighbors and Planning Board work that out with the applicant. Again, I don't think there is going to be any adverse effect as long as that fence is put up along the South Main Street residential area and allowing this variance of 9 feet, which was technically 9 ½ but he asked us to say 9 feet in case he was off a little bit instead of 10 feet from the street line. Whether the alleged difficult was self-created I think it is the same as the buffer variance. I don't know what else to deliberate on that other than I think if is a necessary variance to make the property usable and arrangement laid out and it seems to be approved by the Planning Board and the local neighbors there. If there are no other discussions, on any of the matters and Joe does not have any further questions, I will be willing to make the motion. Is there anything else we need to address Joe?

Mr. McKay replied no. This decision is a draft decision because we didn't deliberate at all. It was somewhat piece mail. I will revise the draft and it will be a little more orderly and include those comments that were addressed tonight.

Member Crover responded again, I made some notes on my comments which need to be added.

Motion was made by Member Crover to allow both area variances based on the discussions that were made here tonight. Seconded by Member Schneider. All in favor. 4 Ayes.

Mr. Sweeney asked the Board to send a copy of the final decision to the Chairman of the Planning Board so the Board will be aware of this Board's decision.

**Village of Harriman
Zoning Board of Appeals
April 2, 2014
7:30pm**

Adjournment

- Motion to adjourn the ZBA meeting at 8:40pm was made by Member Crover, seconded by Member Schneider. *4 Ayes.*

Minutes Respectfully Submitted by:

Jane Leake – Deputy Clerk/Secretary