

TOWN OF WARWICK
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

Members Present:

Chairman Jan Jansen

Attorney Jeremy Havens

Diane Bramich

Marc Malocsay

Glenn Ehlers

Aaron Ubides (Alternate)

Mary Garcia, ZBA Recording Secretary

Not present: Chris Daubert

PUBLIC HEARING OF Kristina & Christopher Figueroa - regarding property located at 21 Stony Brook Dr., Pine Island, NY 10969, designated on the Town tax map as Section 10, Block 1, Lot 60 and located in the RU district for an area variance from the side yard setback requirements under Town Code §164-40N for a proposed 30'x 40' family room addition with bathroom, where the proposed addition reduces the side setback to 20' where a 75' side setback is required.

Representing the Applicant: Christopher Figueroa, Applicant/Homeowner

Chairman Jansen: Please identify yourself for the record and do you have the mailings?

Christopher Figueroa: Christopher Figueroa. The mails weren't sent, no. They emailed it to my wife's email and it was in her spam, but Connie told us to come.

Attorney Havens: The Town noticed it publicly, that's why Connie said still come in anyway. But because you don't have your notices to your neighbors, nobody really had proper notice to be able to be heard. So there's no point in opening the public hearing. There's no way we could determine the matter tonight. You're going to have to send out those notices in time for the next meeting in December and then we can cover all of the details. If you have anything you want to specifically present to the Board, that's fine, otherwise we'll adjourn it to December.

Christopher Figueroa: Set it for December.

PUBLIC HEARING OF Gabriel Ricciardi, Jr., Swimming Pool Consultant, LLC, - applying for owners WILFRIDO & MARIA VEGA, regarding property located at 6 Johnson Dr., Warwick, NY 10990, and designated on the Town tax map as Section 57, Block 3, Lots 1 and located in the RU district for an area variance from Town Code §164-40N; §140-4.A; 164-41.A(4) & 164-41.B(2) for a proposed 20'x40' in-ground swimming pool with a 4' aluminum fence located in the front yard of the property with a front yard setback of 71.3' where a 75' setback is required.

Representing the Applicant: Gabriel Ricciardi, Swimming Pool Consultant, LLC

Chairman Jansen: Please state your name and briefly tell the Board what you want to do.

Gabriel Ricciardi: Gabriel Ricciardi. We're here to present before the Board where we want to put the pool. There's a drop wall right behind the house. There's also a pre-existing volleyball court and then some parking. We want to put the pool kind of behind the driveway. It still leaves a large setback from the street of 105 feet and we want to put the equipment there where it still leaves the setback off the street of 89 feet and 5 inches. So it's not like it's close. And that's what we're looking to do is to put it on the other part where it drops off in the back on the left hand side, if you're looking at the front of the house. The well's down there, the septic system's down there, and then also the septic line of tanks are behind the house. So we're looking to get a release to put it right there on the property. It will improve the property's value for resale down the road and the neighborhood too.

Diane Bramich: I have a question on that. Since that property's bordering a state highway, do we need anything from the State?

Attorney Havens: Yes. Because the property is adjoining a state highway, a GML 239 referral was required. A response was received on October 31st, 2024 specifying from the Orange County Planning Department that this was a local determination with no further comments.

Diane Bramich: From Orange County or from the state?

Attorney Havens: No, from Orange County.

Diane Bramich: That's a state road.

Attorney Havens: Yes and because it's an area variance, it requires referral to the County Planning Department under GML 239. And they came back saying there was nothing to worry about as far as they're concerned. It's a local determination. It doesn't have any regional or countywide impact.

Gabriel Ricciardi: Actually, the pool's going to be farther back than most houses in the area. The setback will be greater than the houses that are existing.

Chairman Jansen: Anyone from the public want to address this application?

Attorney Havens: So now that the public hearing is open, the Board has to discuss the SEQR. Being that it's a setback, an area variance application for the installation of a swimming pool does qualify as a Type 2 action under SEQR section 617.5 subsection (C) (12) & (16). Would anyone care to make a motion typing the action as a Type 2 action with no adverse environmental impact?

Marc Malocsay: So moved.

Diane Bramich: Second.

Chairman Jansen: Motion by Marc, Second by Diane. Any further discussion? All in favor?

Board Members: Aye.

Chairman Jansen: Any opposed? Motion carried.

Attorney Havens: The Zoning Board needs to determine if a site inspection is necessary.

Marc Malocsay: The way the house sits the pool can't be 75 feet from that private drive. But it's definitely off 17A further than most of the houses.

Chairman Jansen: I agree.

Attorney Havens: We're seeking variances from different provisions of the Code, including §140-4.A, that specifies swimming pools can't be situated within a front yard. And because this property is situated facing two roads both Route 17A as well as Johnson Drive, it technically has to be in compliance with two front yard setbacks. And while it makes the front yard setback for 17A, it's just a few feet shy. That's why we're seeking a front yard setback variance of 71.3 feet, where 75 feet setback is required coming off of Johnson Drive. The ZBA needs to consider any use restrictions and any other conditions that may be imposed.

Chairman Jansen: I don't see any use restrictions because of how close it is and they're conforming to everything else that we require.

Attorney Havens: I do want to note for the record that the Building Department Denial Letter did specifically state that the construction and design must conform to Section 326 of the 2020 Residential Code of New York State. And for everybody's reference, that's the same as Chapter 140 of the Town of Warwick Code, with respect to the self-locking gate, fence, et cetera.

Gabriel Ricciardi: They're actually on the plans already and the pool we build to New York State codes.

Attorney Havens: Any other further questions, comments?

Chairman Jansen: Marc has seen the property and so have I; I'm fine with it.

Attorney Havens: Unless anyone has further questions or comments, we can close the public hearing.

Chairman Jansen: Public hearing is closed.

Attorney Havens: Question number 1, will an undesirable change be produced in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby property be created by granting the variance requested? The applicant states no. The reason given is that it's a private home for family use. Does the Board agree?

Board Members: Yes.

Attorney Havens: Can the benefit the applicant seeks be achieved by some feasible method other than the variance? The applicant states no. Does the Board agree with the applicant?

Board Members: Yes.

Attorney Havens: Is the requested variance substantial? The applicant states no.

Board Members: Yes.

Attorney Havens: Will the proposed variance have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district? The applicant states no. Does the Board agree?

Board Members: Yes.

Attorney Havens: Is the alleged difficulty self-created? The applicant states no. Does the Board agree?

Marc Malocsay: No.

Diane Bramich: It's almost always self-created.

Attorney Havens: Any further deliberations? Would someone care to make a motion granting or denying the variance as advertised?

Diane Bramich: I'll make a motion that we grant as advertised.

Marc Malocsay: I'll second the motion.

Chairman Jansen: Motion by Diane. Second by Marc. Any further discussion? All in favor?

Board Members: Aye.

Chairman Jansen: Any opposed? Motion carried.

PUBLIC HEARING OF KT& M Associates & Ted Edwards - regarding property located at 77 Amity Road & 88 Newport Bridge Road, and designated on the Town tax map as Section 26, Block 1, Lots 117 & 118 and located in the RU district for the renewal of an area variance granted on October 24, 2022 from Town Code §280a permitting access from a 3-lot subdivision to a public highway by a shared driveway and Town Code §164-41C(4)(f) permitting a 6' tall fence within the front yard setback where only 4' is allowed.

Representing the Applicant: Ted Edwards, Applicant, and Brian Friedler, Friedler Engineering

Chairman Jansen: Please identify yourself for the record.

Ted Edwards: Ted Edwards.

Brian Friedler: Brian Friedler with Friedler Engineering.

Attorney Havens: This is an application for a renewal of a prior area variance that was granted on October 24th, 2022. That prior variance included the granting of a 280a variance permitting access from a three lot subdivision to a public highway by a shared driveway, and also a granting of an area variance from the town code 164-41C(4)(f) permitting a 6' tall fence within the front yard setback where only a 4' tall fence is permitted within the front yard setback.

Brian Friedler: It's a 4-lot subdivision; it's 3 new lots and 1 existing.

Attorney Havens: The proposed subdivision was granted conditional approval by the Planning Board on March 20th, 2024. The project site is within the RU district, so it is within the open development area as designated under the Town Code which means that the property can be subdivided and accessed by means of a common shared driveway as opposed to a public road. The Planning Board has authority to permit access to parcels within a subdivision. It's a major subdivision, it's a 4-lot, not minor.

Brian Friedler: Yes.

Attorney Havens: Orange County Planning Department GML 239 referral was made on November 5th, 2024. The GML 239 response from the County Planning Department states it's a local determination but they requested specifically clarification on whether the existing garage is driveway for Section Block and Lot 26-1-30.2, the adjacent parcel to this common driveway will have access to Spruce Hill Lane or Newport Bridge Road as the proposed fence appears to block access to Spruce Hill Lane. Due to the number and access points along Newport Bridge Road in close proximity to each other, it would be ideal to have this driveway access Spruce Hill Lane. In the application there's reference that the adjoining neighbors, 92 Newport Bridge Road, met with the applicant/owner and with the Planning Board and essentially have consented to the building of this fence and where it's located.

Brian Friedler: Yes, they're the ones that requested it with the Planning Board members and the neighbors and came up with that instead of putting landscape buffer that a fence would be installed instead of anything else to block car headlights.

Attorney Havens: Just for the record, I did want to note that we received two letters from two different neighbors, each one dated today and submitted today. One of them from the neighbor at 92 Newport Bridge Road, the immediately adjacent parcel that we were just discussing.

Chairman Jansen reads the letter submitted from homeowners Carole and James Linton, 92 Newport Bridge Road.

Attorney Havens: Do you want to address some of those concerns?

Brian Friedler: There were issues that were brought up in front of the Board. The driveway access for the fire trucks was sent to the fire departments and they had no comments back. We ended up putting a firetruck turnaround at the end of Lot 3, all this has been discussed with the Planning Board. The Planning Board granted approval of it. The propane tank itself is buried, but it's far enough along the shared driveway that it meets the requirements. The propane tank was <inaudible>. All the declarations have been filed with the County Clerk's Office.

Chairman Jansen: So the only thing you had that was in from the County was a maintenance agreement of the driveways, correct?

Brian Friedler: No, there's a few declarations that have been filed with the County. There's the <inaudible> protection notes, the common driveway, biodiversity notes, a maintenance agreement. Those have all been filed with the County. This is the last.

Attorney Havens: Before we open it up to the public hearing, do you have anything else you want to add on the application?

Ted Edwards: No, nothing has changed.

Chairman Jansen: Anyone from the public that wants to address the application?

Carole Linton: Carole Linton, 92 Newport Bridge Road. I was the one submitting this letter and I just want to make sure I understand that we are still doing the 1 foot off the property line, the fence?

Brian Friedler: We are showing it to be on the property line.

Carole Linton: So my understanding when it was approved two years ago, it was going to be 1 foot off the property line. So that has changed?

Brian Friedler: After the ZBA meetings when we were in the Planning Board, we showed it to be a foot because there's going to be a foot of gravel, then the driveway, and another foot of gravel for shoulder.

Carole Linton: So it's going on the property line now?

Brian Friedler: Yes.

Carole Linton: It was a little confusing when it was considered "renewal". I didn't know it was going to be revised from what was submitted two years ago on the letter that we received. And is it vinyl?

Brian Friedler: No.

Carole Linton: So everything that was approved two years ago has changed.

Brian Friedler: We got approval to put a 6 foot tall fence, earth tone, along the front property line. That's what the approval was for.

Carole Linton: You said that the fire department was notified and they didn't comment.

Brian Friedler: They had no comments.

Carole Linton: And I assume I can follow up with that to see if they can turn into that location?

Chairman Jansen: They would have to come back to the...

Carole Linton: It's like only 20-something feet because of the telephone pole; there's a telephone pole within the 50 foot easement.

Chairman Jansen: I think that if that was a problem, the fire department would have contacted us.

Carole Linton: Do we have an idea of when the fence will be installed?

Brian Friedler: No. We have to get approvals; we have to get all this signed off on before we can get a building permit.

Carole Linton: Do we know where it's going to begin and where it's going to end?

Ted Edwards: It's going to start at the back corner.

Brian Friedler: It's 216 feet of fence and it's going to wrap around a little bit in the back.

Carole Linton: So is it about 20 feet from the edge of Newport Bridge Road?

Brian Friedler: It's a little bit further off it for site distance. So I'm not 100% sure what the exact measurement is, but it starts at the corner of your house and it could extend all the way down and wrap one segment down...

Carole Linton: So we don't know where it's going to end. Meaning from Newport to...

Ted Edwards: So start in the back and work up.

Carole Linton: Then where's it going to end?

Brian Friedler: It ends in the back with one segment wrapped around the back.

Carole Linton: Right. Then where's it going to start?

Ted Edwards: Somewhere around the front of your house.

Carole Linton: So we don't know.

Brian Friedler: (*showing Mrs. Linton on the plans*) So if you look here, it's 216 feet. If you measure it, it'd be one segment here and then down to here.

Attorney Havens: So as a point of clarification Mrs. Linton, according to the tax map, your property is 250 feet deep. So if they're going 216 feet, the fence starting from the back corner of your property coming towards the roadway then that would leave 34 feet clearance between the front of the property line and the front of the fence.

Carole Linton: And that's for site...the reason why it's 34?

Brian Friedler: Yes, for sight distance.

Carole Linton: If you look on the other side, you have a telephone pole. And then it has a stone wall fence with weeds and stuff. Is that going to be cleared out for sight distance?

Brian Friedler: It could be maintained too.

Carole Linton: I would really like the fence to begin or end 20 feet from Newport Bridge Road.

Ted Edwards: I don't want to go that close. It's not safe.

Carole Linton: Not safe? It's a whole vehicle length.

Ted Edwards: I was going to put it right to the front of your house, back to the corner. And in one section, the way we discussed.

Carole Linton: I'm looking for—like you are, privacy.

Ted Edwards: What more privacy? You're getting a 6 foot fence.

Carole Linton: I'm just asking if it could be changed to 20 feet. That's all.

Ted Edwards: I don't want to go any further with it.

Carole Linton: So then there would be no problem for me if I wanted to put something right on the corner?

Ted Edwards: If you want to put whatever onto your property, as long as you're...

Carole Linton: Okay. And if the fence needs to be repaired, I know Ted owns 88 Newport Bridge Road. Would it be the owner in the future, whoever owns 88 Newport Bridge, would they be the ones to repair the fence?

Attorney Havens: Yeah. Any property owner would be responsible for general maintenance.

Ted Edwards: There's a driveway agreement between the homes and the fence is all part of it.

Carole Linton: Okay. And then again, my only issue, and I know it's the Planning Board who makes the decision with the propane tank, but I just wanted to make sure the Town is aware of a propane tank in the middle of a 50 foot easement.

Attorney Havens: Ms. Linton, I just want to make sure, it's my understanding that you met with your neighbor and that you consented to the construction of this fence...

Carole Linton: The fence, yes.

Attorney Havens: ...along the boundary line between your property and theirs.

Carole Linton: Yes.

Attorney Havens: And you know and understand based on the comments from the Orange County Planning Department, that that has the potential of cutting off access to this existing garage way behind your house.

Carole Linton: Yes.

Attorney Havens: There used to be a driveway there. And you're okay with cutting that off?

Carole Linton: Yes, we're fine with that.

Chairman Jansen: Anyone else?

Keith Woodruff: Keith Woodruff, 60 Newport Bridge Road. I also submitted a letter to the Board. I don't know if the Board had an opportunity to review it. I did bring up the question of some zoning definitions as to how the areas were going to be calculated because the lot itself where the 280a variance is being granted is a substandard lot that was created in a previous subdivision from 2010. And that was a 2-acre lot that was created as part of the APO inclusion as warranted by the zoning code. But now with the creation of the 280a variance, it's taking away approximately half an acre from the total area from that lot. So now you have only essentially an acre and a half of developable property left of a substandard 2-acre lot. In regards to that, you're also adding impervious but there's no way to verify if that's going to comply with the zoning code. Even though it is a substandard smaller lot it had to comply with the 1989 zoning for setbacks and lot areas and lot coverage. None of those information are provided on the plans, so there's no way to verify it still maintains the area variances would be required to exceed the front set backs. Additionally with the inclusion of this new road it's now going to be considered a corner lot where now with front yard setback would be along Spruce Hill Lane, whereas before it was only along Newport Bridge. So it appears that a variance would have to be required. They're self-encumbering the lot itself by creating this street that would, I forget what the actual front yard setbacks would be for 1989 zoning, but there's no way to verify without having the information provided on the plans.

Ted Edwards: Excuse me this is not a road it's a driveway.

Keith Woodruff: By the way that the zoning code defines it, it is a road or a street. And because it's a street, it's publicly and privately owned. So in this instance, it's a privately owned road or street that is providing access to the adjoining lots of which the driveway easement that has been filed with the County does allow that lot to gain access from that road. So it is a road in all sense of terms and it provides access to the three proposed lots in the back as well as the existing house. So it is a road by all definitions of the zoning code.

Ted Edwards: It's a driveway but I'm not going to argue with you about this.

Keith Woodruff: As well as to the fence, it has been moved. It's my understanding the Planning Board last saw the plans, they did see the fence one foot set back from the property line. It has now been updated

so the fence is currently on the property line. The construction detail for the fence that's provided on the full plan set calls out a 30 inch diameter footing or a post hole for the fence. So I'd like to know how that fence is going to be constructed without encroaching on the adjoining properties.

Ted Edwards: I don't know, a 30 inch hole?

Keith Woodruff: That's what the detail says.

Ted Edwards: Yeah, I don't know. Maybe 30 inches deep, but...

Keith Woodruff: It says 30 inch diameter.

Ted Edwards: I don't know how that got on. I don't know how you do that with a fence.

Keith Woodruff: The last comment I have is in regards to the common driveway location; it's being shoved as close as possible to the adjoining property owner that would be most encumbered by this construction. The way that it's situated, you have your property line with the fence, a one foot separation, one foot shoulder, and then the pavement. The remaining part of the property is left unencumbered except for the fact that it's being left for the adjoining property owner. The cross section detail that was provided on the full plan set shows it as the common driveway centrally located within the 50 foot easement, whereas the plans don't reflect that change.

Brian Friedler: And it's always been like this through the whole Planning Board application. It's been approved by the Planning Board being off to the side. It's a 50 foot easement and there's nothing in the code that says it has to be in the middle of the easement.

Ted Edwards: It's where it's been for 40 years but it's never been paved. That's always been the access route into the farm; trucks, tractors, trailers, trees, in and out. Never been an issue. And this was all over a dirt road. Now I'm proposing to do three houses up there.

Keith Woodruff: The construction detail alone shows that it is centrally located within the easement. So either the detail is wrong or the plans are wrong.

Brian Friedler: Then the detail is wrong.

Keith Woodruff: And the plans that the ZBA had last reviewed back in 2022 did reflect the common driveway centrally located within the easement.

Brian Friedler and Ted Edwards *simultaneously*: No.

Attorney Havens: I did receive your letter and reviewed it. The detail that you're referring to shows generally a 1 foot shoulder on each side, 16 feet of pavement and there are arrows, but there aren't any dimensions on those arrows. And so it doesn't specify that it shifted from one side to the other or that it's centered or anything else. All it simply shows is that it sits somewhere within the outer edges of the 50 foot easement. But it doesn't specify a distance between one shoulder or the edge of pavement to any specific side of an easement. I did look carefully and there is no specification regarding the exact location. What we have to work with is the site plan itself with respect to the location of where the pavement is within the easement area.

Keith Woodruff: Did you also have a chance to review any of the code definitions that I called into question?

Attorney Havens: I did. And you're absolutely right that the creation of Spruce Hill Lane as a common driveway would make this a corner lot and the house would be subject to front yard setbacks on both sides. However, if they were building a house there or if they were adding some other extension to the house, I would see us needing an area variance with respect to that front yard setback. Being that they're proposing the fence on the property line—which is permissible under the code, a fence doesn't have to have any setback. So if they're proposing the fence on the property line as articulated in the plans, it

doesn't matter what the setback is, you're permitted to put a fence on a property line. They're not doing any other improvement other than a driveway which also doesn't have any setback requirements, therefore there's no additional variances that would be required.

Keith Woodruff: What about the lot areas as well?

Attorney Havens: Again, there's no improvement with respect to that particular parcel other than putting a fence along in between a property line that would require any other specific variances.

Keith Woodruff: No, it was more of just the deduction of the net area that's required for the minimum lot.

Attorney Havens: But that would only be relevant if they were building something new where lot area coverage was an issue.

Keith Woodruff: No, not so much the coverage as more of the overall lot area. The lot area of the net lot area is supposed to remove or deduct any unbuildable area. In this instance, it would be the half an acre that's created by the common driveway easement because that driveway easement would then preclude the owner or future owner of that 2-acre parcel from putting a septic, a deck, shed, garage or any other structural improvements within that easement. Because that easement has then been dedicated to the three lot owners in the back.

Attorney Havens: There's no additional improvement to this particular parcel other than the road itself and it is not going to exceed the maximum lot area coverage. Any other questions?

Glenn Ehlers: On the original plan the fence was 1 foot off and now we're going to be on the property line. So do we have a change?

Attorney Havens: So what we have before us is a site plan that shows it on the property line. And perhaps there was two years ago a different site plan that showed it 1 foot off.

Glenn Ehlers: Well then there's a change to the plan.

Marc Malocsay: No. In simpler terms, coming before a Board, you're asking for an extension of the variances that we gave. We gave two variances. The fence can go any place on the property. It was just the height of the fence in the front yard that went from 4 feet to 6 feet. That was our variance. We never said where that fence was going to go. We had plans before us, but the fence can go on the property line, so therefore we gave the variance for that fence. And the other was the 280a.

Brian Friedler: We're looking for a 280a variance and the height of the fence variance.

Marc Malocsay: Which we gave before. So if nothing's changed and if the other Board members feel that way, I'd like to move forward with the extension. But we didn't have a zone change in between the time that you applied to now.

Glenn Ehlers: The other question is on this County comment, was that taken care of?

Attorney Havens: I believe that was the whole point and purpose of asking the neighbor (Lintons) that they did in fact agree and consent and they have no objection to the termination of their prior preexisting access to the back garage. The County also specifically stated local determination which means we can approve it with a simple majority. The Zoning Board needs to discuss SEQR on this. The Planning Board is the Lead Agency but this qualifies as a Type 2 action under SEQR Section 617.5 subsection (C) (12) & (16). Would someone care to make a motion typing the action as a Type 2 with no adverse environmental impact?

Marc Malocsay: So moved.

Diane Bramich: Second.

Chairman Jansen: Motion by Marc. Seconded by Diane. Any discussion? All in favor?

Board Members: Aye.

Chairman Jansen: Any opposed? Motion carried. Any further public comments? Public hearing is closed.

Attorney Havens: Will an undesirable change be produced in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties be created by granting the variance requested? The applicant states no. The reason given is the shared driveway will eliminate the need for multiple driveway cuts and reduce the disturbance area. Does the Board agree with the applicant that no undesirable change will be produced in character of the neighborhood or any detriment to nearby properties?

Board Members: Yes.

Attorney Havens: Can the benefit that the applicant seeks be achieved by some feasible method other than the variance? The applicant states no. Reason given: due to the locations of the proposed lots, it is not feasible to create individual driveways for each new lot. Does the Board agree with the applicant?

Board Members: Yes.

Attorney Havens: Is the requested variance substantial? The applicant states no. The rationale is a 280a variance is not substantial. A 6-foot fence has been agreed upon, has had a site visit with the applicant, neighboring property owners, and the Planning Board members.

Marc Malocsay: Yes.

Diane Bramich: It's substantial.

Chairman Jansen: Yes.

Glenn Ehlers: I don't believe it's substantial just for the location where it is.

Attorney Havens: We have three Board members that say that it is, one that says that it's not. Majority says it is; we're going to mark it as substantial. Will the proposed variance have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district? The applicant states no. The reason given is it keeps in character with the surrounding neighborhood. Does the Board believe that the proposed variance would have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district?

Board Members: No.

Attorney Havens: Does the Board believe that the alleged difficulty is self-created? The applicant states yes because it's a proposed subdivision.

Board Members: Yes.

Attorney Havens: Would someone care to make a motion granting or denying the variance as advertised?

Diane Bramich: So moved.

Glenn Ehlers: Second.

Chairman Jansen: Moved by Diane, Seconded by Glenn. Any further discussion? All in favor?

Board Members: Aye.

Chairman Jansen: Any opposed? Motion carried.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

1. ZBA Minutes of 8/26/24 for ZBA approval.
2. ZBA to discuss changing meeting times from 7:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. starting on January 1, 2025.