



**Mr. Ken Fox**, of Fox Architecture, also came forward and was sworn in. He then presented Exhibit A-1, a colorized version of Z-1, as submitted, and Exhibit A-2, a colorized version of Z-2, as submitted. In addition, he presented Exhibit A-3, a series of photographs of the property.

**Mr. Pokorny** stated that they are proposing to tear down the existing residential home and garage, and are proposing to construct a new, climate-controlled storage building. He explained that the existing residential home and garage are both in disrepair, and have not been occupied for quite some time. Their existing buildings are not climate-controlled. The current occupancy of the existing facility is approximately at 97%. They are proposing a three-story building with handicap access and lift elevator. There will not be any overnight parking at the facility, and he does not expect there to be additional traffic issues in the area due to the nature of the business. He then described the proposed traffic flow on the property. There are currently no restroom facilities on the property, and there are no plans for any in the proposed building. They would, however, like to keep the well functioning for purposes of watering grass and plants on the property.

**Mr. Senesky** asked if the applicant had received the report from the Health Department.

**Mr. Pokorny** stated he did. He continued by stating that the existing parking lot is gravel, and in order to keep impervious coverage to a minimum, he would like to continue the gravel around the proposed building.

**Ms. Fallon** asked if the handicap area would be paved.

**Mr. Pokorny** stated that the handicap area would be paved, including required signage. He then stated that there would not be any need for additional signage on the property, except for the labeling of the building as "D," and numbers of each storage unit. He continued by describing the floor plan of the building, and stated that there will be a monitoring system at the proposed building.

**Mr. Senesky** asked if the property is a manned facility.

**Mr. Pokorny** stated that it is an unmanned facility. The property is a satellite location for their main facility on Edison Road. The existing buildings are only accessible from 6 a.m. to 10 p.m. Seventy-five percent of their clients are homeowners, and 25% are small business owners.

**Mr. Senesky** asked what preventative measures they take to prevent hazardous waste spills, etc.

**Mr. Pokorny** stated that they have been in business for 40 years, and have never had an issues. The client leases clearly state that no hazardous waste is allowed on any of their properties, in addition to the clients signing a document that they are aware the local police have access to any given storage unit 7 days a week, 24 hours a day.

**Mr. Senesky** asked what the procedure is for clients that do not pay their monthly fee.

**Mr. Pokorny** stated that if any given client is 30 days past due, they do not get access to their unit unless they provide payment. After 90 days they will notify the client by certified letter that the contents of their storage unit will be put up for auction.

**Mr. DiFrisco** brought up a credibility issue with the applicant. He explained that when the original buildings were built, they were given approval for one-story buildings. The applicant ignored what was approved, and proceeded to build two-story buildings.

**Mr. Pokorny** clarified that the existing buildings are 1 ½ story buildings, and that was before he was employed by the business. The history of the company should speak for itself. There have been no issues with this property over the last 20 years.

**Mr. Senesky** asked what type of lighting is on the property.

**Mr. Pokorny** stated that the lighting on the property has recently been recently upgraded to LED lighting, and are on a timer that shuts them off from 2 a.m. to 6 a.m.

**Chairman VanderPloeg** asked if there was any landscaping proposed.

**Mr. Pokorny** stated there is not, but if the Board requires it, they would not be opposed.

**Mr. Gregor** recommended that the Board request the applicant to provide a landscaping plan.

**Mr. Fox** stated that the applicant will provide a landscaping and lighting plan that will include existing and proposed as one site.

***Chairman VanderPloeg opened the meeting to the public.  
The public portion was closed.***

**Mr. Ken Fox**, the Architect and Planner for the applicant, came forward. He described the property and the surrounding area.

**Mr. Senesky** asked how close the nearest residential home was to the structures on the property.

**Mr. Fox** stated that the nearest residential home is 490 feet away from the structures. He then presented Exhibit A-4, a color photograph of the existing garage, and Exhibit A-5, a color photograph of the existing residential home. The septic on the residential property will be removed in accordance with state regulations, and the driveway to the residential home will be removed. The applicant is proposing a three-story building with the first level having outside access, and the remaining two floors will be accessed via an elevator. He then stated that the applicant will require a height variance, not for the actual height of the building (35 feet), but for the number of stories (3). The proposed building will be eight feet higher than the existing buildings.

**Mr. Gregor** pointed out that prior resolutions limited the storage buildings to 1 ½ stories.

**Mr. Hooker** argued that since the existing storage buildings are on a separate lot from the proposed storage building, the Board should not have to consider whether or not the proposed project conforms to a prior resolution on an adjoining property.

**Mr. Galfo** argued that the applicant stated earlier in the testimony that the two properties would be merged as one, yet the applicant, for purposes of this application regarding prior

resolutions, wants to keep the properties separate. He then voiced his concerns about the proposed lighting, and asked if those lights would be higher than the highest lights on the existing buildings.

**Mr. DiFrisco** voiced his concerns regarding the aesthetics of the proposed building, and asked the applicant to try and “soften” the exterior of the building.

**Mr. Fox** stated that they will be providing a lighting and landscaping plan, and they are seeking approval for the use variance and the preliminary site plan approval.

**Mr. Gregor** asked if there would be above-ground propane tanks.

**Mr. Pokorny** stated there would be.

**Mr. Gregor** asked that the air conditioning units and the propane tanks be shown on the site plan.

**Mr. Bakera** asked if all three floors would be temperature-regulated, and how many air conditioning units there would be.

**Mr. Pokorny** stated that only the second and third floors would be temperature regulated, and there would be two, rooftop air conditioning units on the building. There will also be a central station alarm and Knox box for emergency access.

**Mr. Gregor** asked Mr. Fox to add the location(s) of the water access points around the building on the site plan. He then continued to reference and discuss the remaining points in his report. He asked why the parking lot was not going to be paved, and if a paved handicap parking space would be provided.

**Mr. Fox** stated that the applicant has had gravel on the existing property for 20 years with no issues, and they would like to continue that on the proposed project property. Since this will not be a manned facility, they do not feel that parking spaces are necessary.

**Mr. Senesky** asked if they would provide dumpsters or garbage cans on the facility.

**Mr. Pokorny** stated there will not be any dumpsters, but there will be garbage cans in the lobby of the proposed building. He would rather not have a dumpster because the customers would take advantage of throwing away their personal belongings, and it would be a mess.

***Chairman VanderPloeg opened the meeting to the public.***

**Mr. Glenn DeSantis**, a resident at 17 Commodore Drive, came forward. He asked Mr. Fox for his definition of an “evergreen buffer.”

**Mr. Fox** stated that an evergreen buffer is a line of evergreens, as deemed appropriate by the Board, near the property line.

**Mr. DeSantis** then asked which previous resolutions are currently in force. There was a prior resolution having a condition for two rows of evergreens that, to this day, have never existed.

**Mr. Fox** stated that the new resolution, if approved, would contain the conditions from previous resolutions in addition to the conditions for the new approval.

**Mr. DeSantis** then asked if the applicant could build another climate controlled building that would look exactly like the existing buildings.

**Mr. Fox** stated they could, but the applicants feel the proposed three-story building would better serve the residents and the demand for this type of storage building.

**Mr. Pokorny** added that it is not financially feasible or practical to construct a climate controlled building the same size as the existing building because it will not generate enough revenue to support the costs.

***The public portion was closed.***

***There was lengthy discussion on whether or not to take a vote without seeing the required revisions/conditions on a final site plan due to the non-compliance of previous approvals.***

**Chairman VanderPloeg** made a motion to approve the two “D” variances and the three “C” variances that were discussed at tonight’s hearing with the condition that the Board will see the applicant before preliminary and final site plan approval is granted. **Ms. Fallon** seconded the motion.

**In Favor:** Chairman VanderPloeg, Ms. Fallon, Mr. Bakera, and Mr. Galfo.

**Against:** Vice-Chairwoman Galfo and Mr. DiFrisco.

***Due to some clarification issues, Mr. Senesky recommended that the vote be rescinded, and have the applicant carry the application to another meeting that is suitable for all parties in order to provide appropriate revised plans.***

**Chairman VanderPloeg** made a motion to carry the application. **Mr. Galfo** seconded the motion.

**In Favor:** Chairman VanderPloeg, Ms. Fallon, Mr. Bakera, Mr. DiFrisco, and Mr. Galfo.

**Against:** Vice-Chairwoman Galfo.

**Chairman VanderPloeg** made a motion to carry the application to Monday, September 23, 2019, with no further notice. **Mr. Galfo** seconded the motion.

**In Favor:** Chairman VanderPloeg, Vice-Chairwoman Galfo, Ms. Fallon, Mr. DiFrisco, Mr. Bakera, and Mr. Galfo.

