

**TOWN OF STILLWATER
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
November 9, 2020 @ 6:30 PM
STILLWATER TOWN HALL**

Present: Chairman Donald D'Ambro
Christine Kipling, Member
Timothy Scrom, Member
Joseph Urbanski, Member

Also Present: James Trainor, Attorney for the Town
Paul Male, Town Engineer
Lindsay Buck, Town Planner
Sheila Silic, Secretary

Absent: Richard Rourke, Member
Charles Dyer, Alternate Member
Ellen Vamocka, Town Councilwoman

Chairman D'Ambro called the meeting to order at 6:30 P.M.

Review and Approval of Minutes of Zoning Board of Appeals:

Mr. Scrom made a motion to approve the minutes of the October 13, 2019 meeting, seconded by Ms. Kipling. A roll call vote was taken. The motion passed unanimously.

ZBA2020-02 LeFever Area Variance, 1 Aft Court

Chairman D'Ambro recognized Mr. Mark LeFever who gave a brief recap of the project to the Board this evening. Mr. LeFever stated that he owns 1 Aft Court and that he and his wife would like to move there permanently. Mr. LeFever stated that he would like to add an addition to the existing home for a master bedroom and a small bedroom on the side and the rear of the dwelling. Mr. LeFever stated that he was before the Zoning Board on October 13, 2020. Mr. LeFever stated that at the last Zoning Board meeting Mr. Male and the Zoning Board Members had asked for the map to be updated and to look at reducing the setbacks requested for the Area Variance. Mr. LeFever stated that he has had the map updated, reduced the requested setbacks for the Area Variance and has stayed within the 40% lot coverage.

Mr. Male stated that the Building, Planning and Development Department had asked for a number of changes to the map. Mr. Male stated that the changes to the map are the addition of site location map, Zoning Board project number, 10-scale map, the distance from NYS Route 9P was corrected, the impervious area was not provided but, with the Chazen Companies map it appears to be 39.1%, the setback lines have been corrected, the proposed deck wording has been changed, the shed has been removed and the sewer connection is shown. Mr. Male stated that the applicant is requesting the front yard setback from 20 ft. to 16.5 ft. a reduction of 3.5 ft. and the side yard setback from 10 ft. to 5.5 ft. a reduction of 4.5 ft. Mr. Male stated that the deck was approved in 2016. The applicant has shown the parking area for the two cars and provided a copy of the easement documentation for Aft Court.

Mr. Scrom asked what is the total square footage of the dwelling. Mr. LeFever stated that the dwelling is ~900 sq. ft. Mr. Scrom asked if it includes the deck. Mr. LeFever stated that it did not include the deck. Mr. Scrom asked if the dwelling is a two-story dwelling. Mr. LeFever stated that it is one-story dwelling. Mr. Scrom asked Mr. Lefever what the distance is to the nearest structure to his property. Mr. LeFever stated that his nearest neighbor is to the right with the stockade fence.

Chairman D'Ambro proceeded to open the public hearing and asked if anyone wished to provide public comment.

Claude Gauthier 97 County Route 76

Mr. Gauthier asked what the distance is between your property and the nearest neighbor. Mr. LeFever stated that it is between 30 ft. to 50 ft. Mr. Gauthier asked what the side yard setback is from the building. Mr. Male stated that the side yard restrictions are 10 ft. Mr. Male stated most of the buildings that are on NYS Route 9P do not meet the side yard setbacks for the RRD Zoning District. Mr. Male stated that the distance can not be 50 ft. but is more like 10 ft to 15 ft to the nearest neighbor. Mr. LeFever apologized and stated that Mr. Male is correct.

Chairman D'Ambro asked if anyone else wished to make public comment and hearing none he closed the public hearing.

Chairman D'Ambro asked if anyone on the Board had any additional concerns or questions and hearing none he asked to move to discuss SEQRA.

**TOWN OF STILLWATER
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
2020 RESOLUTION NO. 2**

WHEREAS, Mark LeFever has submitted an application to the Zoning Board of Appeals seeking an Area Variance in order to expand a residence on property located at 1 Aft Court, Stillwater, more fully identified as Tax Map Number 218.20-2-8; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant is seeking an area variance for the set-back requirement contained Stillwater Zoning Code §3.5(D); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to § 14.2(D) of the Stillwater Zoning Law, the Town properly and timely published a notice for public hearing conducted on November 9, 2020; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), the proposed action is a Type II action requiring no further SEQRA Action; and

WHEREAS, the Zoning Board of Appeals had duly considered the application and the elements necessary to consider the granting of an Area Variance by taking into consideration the benefit to the applicant if the variance is granted, as weighed against the detriment to the health, safety, and welfare of the neighborhood or community by such grant;

Now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Stillwater Zoning Board of Appeals hereby makes the following findings:

1. An undesirable change will be produced in the character of the neighborhood and a detriment to nearby properties will be created by the granting of the Area Variance because it conforms to other properties in the neighborhood;
2. The benefit sought by the applicant cannot be achieved by some method, feasible to the applicant to pursue, other than an Area Variance because there is no additional property for applicant to combine with this parcel;
3. The requested Area Variance is borderline substantial, but it expands the residence away from the applicant's closest neighbors;
4. The proposed variance will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district because it conforms with other properties in the neighborhood; and
5. The alleged difficulty was not self-created because the lot was very small to begin with; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the application of Mark LeFever for an area variances to allow for a residential expansion on property located at 1 Aft Court, more fully identified as Tax Map Number 218.20-2-8 is GRANTED conditioned upon the applicant satisfying the comments contained in the Engineering Review Letter by Paul Male, PE dated November 4, 2020.

A motion by Member Urbanski seconded by Member Kipling, to adopt Resolution No. 2 of 2020

A roll call vote was taken on Resolution No. 2 of 2020 as follows:

ZB2020-04 Hardcastle Area Variance, 520 NYS Route 9P

Chairman D'Ambro recognized Mr. Karl Hardcastle who will be presenting the project this evening. Mr. Hardcastle stated that his property is located at 520 NYS Route 9P and consist of 1.71-acres. Mr. Hardcastle stated that he asking for an Area Variance for road frontage. Mr. Hardcastle stated that he would like to subdivide the property and create a building lot for his family.

Mr. Trainor stated that you are asking for an Area Variance for Lot 2. Mr. Male stated that Lot 2 does not currently exist. Mr. Male stated that Lot 1 and Lot 2 are one tax parcel. Mr. Trainor stated that the applicant will have to submit a subdivision application to the Planning Board. Mr. Male stated that the applicant is asking for an Area Variance now so, when the project goes before the Planning Board this Lot can be created.

Mr. Urbanski asked if the applicant will meet the minimum square footage for a building lot. Mr. Male stated that Lot 1 will consist of 0.50-acres and Lot 2 will meet all the setback requirements. Mr. Urbanski stated that the applicant will not need any other Area Variances for Lot 1. Mr. Male stated that Lot 1 and Lot 2 will be conforming. Mr. Urbanski asked if there is a line sight for ingress and egress. Mr. Male stated that it appears where the driveway enters onto NYS Route 9P is a straight-a-way.

Mr. Scrom stated that his copy of the SEQRA Form is unsigned. Ms. Lindsay Buck stated that she has a signed copy of the SEQRA Form in the file.

Chairman D'Ambro proceeded to open the public hearing and asked if anyone wished to provide public comment.

Jerry Nunez 4 Backwind Dr.

Mr. Nunez asked Mr. Hardcastle if the public access that is being requested is to NYS Route 9P. Mr. Hardcastle stated that is correct.

Kevin O'Connor 35 Pine Ridge Rd

Mr. O'Connor stated his concern is his view of Saratoga Lake will be distorted by the new dwelling being proposed. Mr. O'Connor asked where the dwelling will be located on Lot 2. Mr. Hardcastle stated that as of right now they are considering building the new dwelling on hill behind his home. Mr. Hardcastle stated that the dwelling will be more towards Aft Court and would not distort Mr. O'Connor's view. Mr. Trainor stated that the other concerns would be addressed once he makes his submission to the Planning Board for subdivision. Mr. Trainor stated that the Zoning Board can only address the Area Variance concerns.

Judy Lister 37 Pine Ridge Rd

Ms. Lister stated that she was here several years ago when he wanted to build a dwelling for himself and his wife on the property. Ms. Lister stated that the dwelling had been rented and then sold but Mr. Hardcastle was not living in the dwelling. Mr. Hardcastle stated that the property you are questioning is owned by Doug Post.

Chairman D'Ambro asked if anyone else wished to make public comment and hearing none he closed the public hearing.

Chairman D'Ambro asked if anyone on the Board had any additional concerns or questions and hearing none he asked to move to discuss SEQRA.

**TOWN OF STILLWATER
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
2020 RESOLUTION NO. 3**

WHEREAS, Karl Hardcastle has submitted an application to the Zoning Board of Appeals seeking an Area Variance in order to subdivide property located at 520 NYS Route 9P, Stillwater, more fully identified as Tax Map Numbers 218.20-2-11 and 218.20-2-46; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant is seeking an area variance for the road frontage requirement contained in Stillwater Town Code §210-106; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to § 14.2(D) of the Stillwater Zoning Law, the Town properly and timely published a notice for public hearing conducted on November 9, 2020; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), the proposed action is a Type II action requiring no further review; and

WHEREAS, the Zoning Board of Appeals had duly considered the application and the elements necessary to consider the granting of an Area Variance by taking into consideration the benefit to the applicant if the variance is granted, as weighed against the detriment to the health, safety, and welfare of the neighborhood or community by such grant;

Now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Stillwater Zoning Board of Appeals hereby makes the following findings:

1. An undesirable change will not be produced in the character of the neighborhood and a detriment to nearby properties will not be created by the granting of the Area Variance because it conforms to other properties in the neighborhood;
2. The benefit sought by the applicant cannot be achieved by some method, feasible to the applicant to pursue, other than an Area Variance because there is no other place on the lot to acquire road frontage;
3. The requested Area Variance is not substantial, because it has minimal effect on the road traffic or on other properties;
4. The proposed variance will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district because the proposed home meets all other setback

and zoning requirements; and

5. The alleged difficulty was not self-created because there is no other place on the lot to acquire the required road frontage; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the application of Karl Hardcastle for an area variance to allow for a residential subdivision on property located at 520 NYS Route 9P, more fully identified as Tax Map Numbers 218.20-2-11 and 218.20-2-46 is GRANTED conditioned upon the applicant satisfying the comments contained in the Engineering Review Letter by Paul Male, PE dated November 5,2020.

A motion by Member Scrom seconded by Member Urbanski, to adopt Resolution No. 3 of 2020.

A roll call vote was taken on Resolution No. 3 of 2020 as follows:

Chair Donald D'Ambro	Yes
Member Richard Rourke	Absent
Member Timothy Scrom	Yes
Member Joe Urbanski	Yes
Member Christine Kipling	Yes

Resolution No. 3 of 2020 was adopted at a meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Town of Stillwater duly conducted on November 9, 2020.

ZBA2020-03 Grayson Mobile Home Park (Still Meadows MPH) Area Variance 96 County Route 76

Chairman D'Ambro recognized Mr. Larry Grayson who is the owner of Still Meadow Mobile Home Park. Mr. Grayson stated that he will be presenting the project this evening along with Mr. Alden Gaudreau. Mr. Grayson stated that the mobile home park has been located at 96 County Route 76 for 61 years. Mr. Grayson stated that originally there were 9 lots with 9 mobile homes. Mr. Grayson stated that they are proposing to reduce the number of lots down to 4 with double wide mobile homes. Mr. Grayson stated that they are making it more of a senior mobile home park. Mr. Gaudreau stated that they have reduced the number of Area Variances being requested to 12. Mr. Gaudreau stated that they are seeking Area Variances from Zoning Code section 134.9 B (2)(b) setback reductions for Lots 1-4 from the property line, 134.5 B (2)(c) reducing the setback from County Route 76, 134.10 A (4) reduction of the overall park acreage, 134.10 B (1) to allow a dead-end road, 134.10 E (1)(a) relief from connecting to a public sewer, 134.10 F (2) relief from the required open space, 134.10 relief from the internal roadway to meet Town Subdivision Standards.

Mr. Scrom stated he has concerns with the Area Variance for road frontage regarding Lot 1 and Lot 3. Mr. Scrom stated that his concern is a vehicle that miscalculates the curve and hits into Lot 1 or Lot 3. Mr. Scrom asked if there are any plans for a barrier to protect the mobile homes and/or the residents of Lot 1 and Lot 3. Mr. Gaudreau stated that a berm could be acceptable in

that area. Mr. Grayson stated that the new mobile homes will be further into the mobile park than the mobile homes that had been there currently. Mr. Male stated that the existing mobile home is about 25 ft. from the roadway. Mr. Scrom asked if there is a name for the road in the mobile home park for 911 purposes or will it be known as Still Meadows Lot 1 through Lot 4. Mr. Grayson stated that it will be known as Still Meadows Lot 1 through Lot 4. Mr. Scrom stated that he would still like a berm or some type of barrier between the roadway and Lot 1 and Lot 3. Mr. Scrom asked if that could be part of the Area Variance approval.

Mr. Scrom asked if the Zoning Board could send a recommendation to the Planning Board regarding the berm. Ms. Lindsay Buck stated that she and Mr. Male would forward the Zoning Board's request regarding the berm to the Planning Board. Ms. Lindsay Buck stated that the Planning Board would also receive a copy of the Zoning Board Minutes and Resolutions.

Mr. Urbanski stated that in previous conversations with Mr. Grayson there were concerns regarding the existing residents. Mr. Urbanski asked what is going to happen to the residents that are there with this new proposal. Mr. Grayson stated that he does not know what is going to happen with residents who are living in the mobile home park currently. Mr. Urbanski stated that the mobile homes that are currently existing will be removed and replaced with new or newer mobile homes. Mr. Grayson stated that is correct.

Ms. Kipling stated that there are current restrictions in place due to Covid-19 that do not allow landlords to evict tenants.

Mr. Urbanski stated that Ms. Kipling has a valid point regarding COVID-19 and the ability to evict renters. Mr. Urbanski stated that he believes the sunset time frame should be 6-months instead of having a sunset time frame of 1-year. Mr. Urbanski stated that Mr. Grayson can come back before the Zoning Board of Appeals and apply for an extension if needed.

Mr. Scrom stated that he agrees with Mr. Urbanski on the 6-month time frame for the sunset clause.

Mr. Urbanski stated that the Zoning Board of Appeals is potentially granting a number of Area Variances. Mr. Urbanski stated that Mr. Grayson has made progress with cleaning up the mobile home park and wants to make sure that Mr. Grayson keeps moving forward in the process. Mr. Urbanski stated that is why he believes that a shorter time frame for the sunset clause must be implemented.

Mr. Male stated that Mr. Grayson can have the septic system inspected and can apply to the Planning Board for Site Plan Review. Mr. Male stated that Mr. Grayson has submitted an Operating Permit Application to the Building Department. Ms. Lindsay Buck stated that it would probably take a minimum of 3-months for this project to receive Site Plan approval from the Planning Board. Ms. Lindsay Buck stated that it would be 1 to 2 months after Site Plan approval before Mr. Grayson could start any type of work at the mobile home park. Mr. Urbanski stated that he understands that it may take some time for the Planning Board to grant the approvals, but, there are multiple things that can be done within that 6-month time period.

Mr. Urbanski stated that the septic system can be inspected, he can continue cleaning up the garbage on the property and along the neighbor's property line, working on the Site Plan for the mobile home park, contacting Ms. Lindsay Buck to be placed on the Planning Board Agenda and submitting the permits for the mobile home park to be approved. Mr. Urbanski stated that he would expect a report stating what Mr. Grayson has completed within that 6-month time frame if he comes back before the Zoning Board of Appeals to seek an extension.

Mr. Male suggested that Mr. Grayson be placed on the May 2021 Zoning Board of Appeals agenda. Mr. Trainor stated that there are conditions for the 180 days that need to be met with the sunset clause and if they are not met the Area Variances become non-existent. Mr. Urbanski stated that if Mr. Grayson is going to apply for a hardship regarding the sunset clause, the Zoning Board of Appeals would need to determine whether or not it is a hardship case. Mr. Trainor stated that before the sunset expires, Mr. Grayson would need to apply for a hardship extension before the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Mr. Trainor stated that the Planning Board will address the issues regarding the berm once Mr. Grayson has submitted an application to the Planning Board. Mr. Trainor stated that the setback for the road frontage is a valid concern for the Zoning Board of Appeals but, it appears to be further away from the roadway and more conforming. Mr. Trainor stated that with the history of the mobile home park his recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals is to consider a sunset clause for any approvals of the requested Area Variances that the Zoning Board of Appeals may grant.

Chairman D'Ambro asked Mr. Trainor for a recommendation on what would be a suitable time frame for the sunset on the approvals. Mr. Trainor stated that the Zoning Board Members should ask Mr. Grayson what would be a suitable time frame. Mr. Grayson stated that it will take some time to move forward with the clean up as we are moving into the winter months. Mr. Grayson stated that he can not evict the residents during COVID-19 restrictions and with the winter months approaching. Chairman D'Ambro asked Mr. Grayson how much time he would need to remove the mobile homes. Mr. Grayson stated that once the eviction notices are issued the residents have 90-days to vacate the premises. Mr. Grayson stated that it would most likely be April at the earliest. Mr. Trainor asked Mr. Male for his recommendation on a time frame regarding the sunset clause. Mr. Male asked the Board if one year would be adequate as the winter months are approaching. Chairman D'Ambro stated that one year seems reasonable.

Chairman D'Ambro stated that there is a notation on the map for a crushed stone driveway. Mr. Grayson stated that is correct and would like to have the driveway paved at a later date.

Ms. Kipling asked if the occupants of the mobile homes are renting or do they own the mobile home. Mr. Grayson stated that he owns the mobile homes except for Lot 9 which is owned by the tenant. Ms. Kipling stated her concern with the sunset clause time frame regarding COVID-19 and the landlord grace period that the Governor has been extending which does not allow the landlord to evict the tenants. Mr. Trainor asked Ms. Kipling if she is referring to the applicant being able to apply to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a hardship from the 6 month time frame from the sunset clause. Ms. Kipling stated that is correct.

Ms. Lindsay Buck asked Mr. Male if there are any immediate health issues that were not addressed by the Building Inspector or the Stillwater Town Court currently on the site. Mr. Male stated that Mr. Myers, Building Inspector/Code Enforcement Officer went through the mobile homes with Mr. Grayson about two week ago. Mr. Male stated that any missing or defective smoke alarms and/or Carbon Dioxide detectors were replaced or installed. Mr. Male stated that there were some issues with regard to access points for ingress or egress that were addressed.

Chairman D'Ambro proceeded to open the public hearing and asked if anyone wished to provide public comment.

Richard Griffiths 95 County Route 76

Mr. Griffiths stated that these plans seem a lot more agreeable than the plans from the last meeting. Mr. Griffiths stated that he is aware of four accidents on that particular curve with one of the vehicles landing next to one of the mobile homes. Mr. Griffiths stated that he believes that having four double wide mobile homes is still too congested on 1.88-acres and does not fit with the neighborhood. Mr. Griffiths stated that although these plans are better I am still opposed to this project.

Claude Gauthier 97 County Route 76

Mr. Gauthier stated that he likes the new proposal of four double wide units on foundations. Mr. Gauthier stated that this proposal will make the mobile home park more presentable. Mr. Gauthier asked Mr. Grayson if these are new double wide mobile homes. Mr. Grayson stated that they would be newer mobile homes depending on what the Town of Stillwater allows us to move into the mobile home park. Mr. Gauthier asked if this will bring the mobile home park into compliance with the Town of Stillwater Zoning Code. Mr. Grayson stated that is correct. Mr. Gauthier stated that he believes a barrier would be a good idea for the residents who would be residing at Lot 1 and Lot 3.

Louise Maynard 67 County route 76

Ms. Maynard stated that her property is adjacent to Mr. Grayson's property. Ms. Maynard stated that there was a fire in one of the mobile homes a few years ago and the Fire Department was concerned that her dwelling would catch fire. Ms. Maynard stated that her concern is with the restructuring of Lot 4 and with it being only 27 ft. from her dwelling. Mr. Male stated that the plans show her dwelling is about 50 ft to 60 ft. from Lot 4.

Michael Trefzger 93 County Route 76

Mr. Trefzger stated that he is happy that Mr. Grayson is cleaning up and restructuring the mobile home park. Mr. Trefzger stated that he is not opposed to what Mr. Grayson is proposing, but, he does oppose the setback request for road frontage. Mr. Grayson stated that the new mobile home will be further back from the roadway than the one that is currently there.

Chairman D'Ambro asked if anyone else wished to make public comment and hearing none he closed the public hearing.

Chairman D'Ambro asked if anyone on the Board had any additional concerns or questions and hearing none he asked to move to discuss SEQRA.

**TOWN OF STILLWATER
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
2020 RESOLUTION NO. 4**

WHEREAS, Lawrence M. Grayson and Grayson Properties LLC has submitted an application for 12 area and other variances regarding the Still Meadows Mobile Home Park located at 96 County Route 76 and more particularly described as Tax Map Np. 243.00-1-26.2; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to SEQRA the proposed variance approvals are all Type II actions requiring no further review; and

WHEREAS, the applicant appeared before the Zoning Board of Appeals on October 13, 2020 for a conceptual review of more than 40 potential variances for 9 mobile home lots; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was held on November 9, 2020 after the application was limited to 12 variances and a total of 4 double-wide mobile home lots to be permitted in the park; and

WHEREAS, the public comment centered on the cleanliness and safety of the park but was generally favorable toward the proposed changes and variances; and

WHEREAS, the zoning board members expressed concern about whether the applicant would follow-through on the proposed changes once the variances were granted, given the applicant's previous record of noncompliance;

Now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Stillwater Zoning Board of Appeals hereby recommends to the Planning Board that the applicant be required to install a significant berm or barrier for safety reasons between County Route 76 and the mobile homes to be located on proposed Lots 1 and 3; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Stillwater Zoning Board of Appeals makes the following findings:

1. An undesirable change will not be produced in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties will not be created by the granting of the 12 Variances because the park is being improved and the changes will decrease existing issues regarding emergency services access.
2. The benefit sought by the applicant cannot be achieved by some method, feasible to the applicant to pursue, other than these 12 Variances because there is no additional property available for the applicant to utilize or acquire.
3. The requested 12 Variances are substantial but generally improve the safety and habitability of the park while eliminating an eyesore.
4. The proposed variance will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district because there will be less of an impact on the neighborhood once

the changes are made.

5. The alleged difficulty was not self-created because the setup of the park pre-existed the changes in the Zoning Code regarding mobile home parks in 1974 and in 2014;

And be it further,

RESOLVED, that the Zoning Board of Appeals hereby conditionally approves the following variances set forth in Paul Male P.E.'s review letter of November 4,2020, so long as the conditions hereinafter listed are satisfied within the required time-frame:

1. A 31.2-foot rear set back variance for Lot 1;
2. A 47-foot rear setback variance for Lot 2;
3. A 3 5.2-foot rear setback variance for Lot 3;
4. A 59.8-foot rear setback variance for Lot 4;
5. A 62.2-foot setback variance from the County Route 76 Row Line for Lot 1;
6. A 66-foot setback variance from the County Route 76 Row Line for Lot 3;
7. A 3.12-acre variance in the required overall park area;
8. A 59.5-foot variance from the required public road frontage;
9. A variance to allow a dead-end road which is otherwise prohibited;
10. A variance to allow the existing gravel road not to be improved to meet Town Highway standards;
11. A variance from the Town Code requirement to hook-up the park to public sewer as none is available; and
12. A .25-acre open space variance; and be it further

RESOLVED, that each of the twelve (12) variances granted herein shall expire on May 10,2021 unless all of the following conditions have been satisfied to the written satisfaction of the Town's Building, Planning and Development Department before that date:

1. The applicant has submitted to the Town a certification from a New York licensed professional engineer certifying that the existing septic system is in good working order and will adequately support the four (4) new double-wide units;
2. Before any of the new double-wides are occupied, the applicant shall apply for and obtain a building permit and certificate of occupancy per §134-8 of the Stillwater Town Code;
3. Before any of the new double-wides are occupied, the applicant shall apply for, obtain and renew annually thereafter an Operating Permit for the mobile home park per §134-10 of the Stillwater Town Code;

4. The Applicant shall apply for and obtain site plan approval from the Town Planning Board per §134-10 of the Stillwater Town Code;

5. The applicant shall otherwise satisfy all requirements contained in Paul Male P.E.'s November 4, 2020 review letter and with all other applicable Stillwater Town Code and legal requirements; and be it further,

RESOLVED, that the Secretary is authorized and directed to transmit a copy of this Resolution to the Applicant, the Town Clerk and the Building Inspector-Code Enforcement Officer.

A motion by Member Urbanski, seconded by Member Scrom, to adopt Resolution No. 4.

A roll call vote was taken on Resolution No.4 of 2020 as follows:

Chair Donald D'Ambro	Yes
Member Richard Rourke	Absent
Member Timothy Scrom	Yes
Member Joe Urbanski	Yes
Member Christine Kipling	Yes

Resolution No. 4 of 2020 was adopted at a meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Town of Stillwater duly conducted on November 9, 2020.