VILLAGE OF SPRINGVILLE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

May 22, 2024

7:00 P.M.

A meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Village of Springville was held at the Municipal Building, 65 Franklin Street Springville, New York at the above date and time.

Present were:

Chairman: Joe Wolniewicz

Members: Kate Moody

Jamie Raynor

Kimberly Krzemien Bob Laskowski

Also Present: Robin Pirdy

Building Inspector/CEO: John Baker

Clerk: Julie Nunweiler

Zoning Board Chairman Joe Wolniewicz called the meeting to order at 7:01 for a Public Hearing this evening. This Public Hearing is to hear the petition of Robin Pirdy, 192 Woodward Ave. Springville New York File # 10508 for a Variance for Placement of accessory building. This property is located in R-6 District and does not allow accessory buildings to be placed within a required front or side yard.

Due to the applicant's property being located within a R-6 District the applicable section for File #10508 of the Village Code is:

§ 200-10 Placement of accessory buildings and uses.

A. In all districts

(3) Accessory buildings, including private garages, shall not be placed within a required front yard nor within a required side yard.

At 7:03 pm, Chairman Wolniewicz opened the Public Hearing.

At this time, Chairman Wolniewicz called the applicant up to address the board and explain what it was he was looking to do.

Mr. Pirdy explained that he got a great deal on a 10x20 ft shed and had it delivered to his residence and placed it next to his garage as he has a fenced in backyard which would require the fence to be removed. He also explained he would need to pay a fee to have it moved which was more than the fee he paid to apply for the variance so he thought he would try this first.

Chairman Wolniewicz closed the Public Hearing to go into Board Discussion

With there being no further questions, Chairman Wolniewicz asked the Board to go over the factors considered.

At this time, the Zoning Board of Appeals went over the factors considered in their decision:

FACTORS CONSIDERED:

1.	Whether undesirable change would be produced in character of neighborhood
	or a detriment to nearby properties: Yes No $\underline{X(5)}$
2.	Whether benefit sought by applicant can be achieved by a feasible alternative to the variance: Yes $\underline{X(5)}$ No
3.	Whether the requested variance is substantial: Yes X (5) No
4.	Would the variance have an adverse impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood: Yes (4) No $X(1)$
5.	Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created, which consideration shall be relevant

to the decision of the Zoning Board of Appeals but shall not necessarily preclude the granting of the area variance: Yes $\underline{X(5)}$ No ____

DETERMINATION OF THE ZONING BOARD of APPEALS *BASED ON* THE ABOVE FACTORS:

The benefit to the applicant DOES NOT outweigh the detriment to the neighborhood or community. The variance request was <u>DENIED</u>.

RECORD OF VOTE

With there being no other Public Hearings this evening, Chairman Wolniewicz asked the members to table approving of the prior meetings minutes.

At 7:16 p.m., Chairman Wolniewicz made a motion to adjourn the meeting, all in favor, none opposed. Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted