



TOWN OF
BEEKMAN
New York

4 Main Street
Poughquag, NY 12570
www.townofbeekman.com
(845) 724-5300

**Town of Beekman Zoning Board of Appeals
Minutes of November 5, 2025**

The Town of Beekman Zoning Board of Appeals met for their regularly scheduled meeting on Wednesday, November 5, 2025 at the Beekman Town Hall at 7:00 PM.

The following members were present:

Chairman: Cristian Hanganu
Stella Slattery
Linda Porter

Also present:

Town Attorney – Craig Wallace
Secretary – Sheryl Discher

C. Hanganu – Meeting called to order at 7:13pm
Led the Pledge of Allegiance and indicated emergency exits

C. Hanganu reads out the agenda, said will go over minutes at end.

PUBLIC HEARING

1. **Standke Pole Barn** – Area Variance
15 Walker Rd.
Grid # 6759-00-100442
Zone R-90

C. Wallace directs Chris to make sure all notices required under the code have been met with respect to mailings and publication, then asks Sheryl.

Sheryl states everything received and mailed out on time.

C. Wallace asks about certified mailings.

Sheryl states have all copies and the affidavit.

C. Wallace – States this is an area variance, which is a type 2 action under SEQR. Suggests having an overview by applicant of what he's seeking and make inquiry then open public hearing.

Edward Standke, I live at 15 Walker Rd., corrects himself stating he has a property at Walker Rd.

C. Hanganu motion to open public hearing. Seconded by L. Porter. All in favor. Aye.

Ed hands out some additional illustrations.

C. Hanganu – States there understanding is required variance is 4802 sq. ft.

Ed – Owns 17.6-acre lot with 1912 sq. ft. home on Walker Rd. Requesting area and height variance for a 5200 sq. ft. pole barn which is higher and larger than existing home, for storage of boat and trailer, RV, tractor with 7 attachments, and space for personal wood working and stained-glass hobby workspace, for his wife. References layout drawing handed out showing measurements of equipment which was used to determine size of pole barn. To safely clear entry for RV and boat, need 14ft overhead door, which will make ridge height 26ft. with 4-12 pitch roof. This is below the allowable 35ft. but taller than existing home. The location was chosen to minimize the visual impact on the neighborhood, by distance and natural coverage of property. Mentions illustrations with distances of proposed site to various roads and homes, 750ft from Rt. 55, 610ft from closest point of Walker, 480ft from closest visible neighbor which is 21 Walker, and 620ft from next closest neighbor, 27 Walker. Shielded by 100ft of elevation, higher than neighbors, 140ft higher to Walker and 60ft higher to Rt. 55. Basically, up and way back in the woods. Notes it's almost impossible to see existing home from the street. Plan on putting 6ft of evergreen screening on house and neighbors' side of property. No exterior lighting other than downward facing in front of building, motion detected. Structure will have no water or sewer connection and solely intended for personal storage and hobby workshop. No commercial usage, no livestock, no agricultural purposes.

C. Hanganu – Asks what will the floor be?

Ed – 6" concrete slab to support weight of boat and RV.

C. Hanganu – Asks if it will be footprint of structure or will it extend beyond that?

Ed – Only extensions would be on the aprons on overhead doors. Original plans show white doors, they will be brown. Building is forest green, wainscoting is like a faux stone. Trying to blend in with environment. Trying to even set it further from house, so don't see it.

C. Hanganu – Asks when property was purchased?

Ed – 2012. House is single story with full basement, with 2 car garage.

L. Porter – Asks where is all the stuff kept now?

Ed – Tractor and implements, small trailer, 2 mowers and attachments are on property, stuffed in garage. RV and boat are not on the property. Have leased space for equipment trailer, scissor lift.

L. Porter – Showing applicant picture of his property, asking where the house is.

C. Hanganu – Clarifying address in Pawling.

Ed – Original home and primary residence for the moment. Status will change within year, looking to retire and Walker Rd will become primary.

C. Hanganu – Asks if Walker Rd has been vacant? Renting?

Ed – Nobody is living in it full time, not renting.

C. Hanganu – Asks applicant to go through 5 criteria on application.

Ed – Q1, does not believe so as existing homes cannot be seen by neighbors or the roads, pole barn will be located behind home with natural blending colors, shielded by trees, shrubs and vegetation as well as elevation.

C. Hanganu – Questioning if there are trees there now, or where you plan to put structure, is it clear?

Ed – There are some, but more will be put where they need to be between house and structure and structure and left side neighboring side of structure. Q2, possibly, but desired result will be a site located a significant distance from property with unbearable financial cost. Life is changing, will be on the property 24/7, don't want to commute to offsite location. Cost paying now for storage won't work when retired. Q3, yes variance is substantial, much larger than house, but fits well due to size of property and will not appear out of place.

C. Wallace – Clarifies to Chairman, board is being asked to grant an area variance that's over 1000% of allowable standard under our code. Quite substantial. Legal standard is that ZBA must ensure that it approves the minimum variance deemed necessary and adequate while also preserving the character of neighborhood and safeguarding the community. You may want to expound upon those questions.

Ed – Agrees it's large, but in comparison to size of property, it's less than 7% of the area of the property. It's out of sight, only 2 neighbors will know it exists, unless they come up to house. Not intended to offend anyone. Open to any suggestions to get to where it needs to be.

C. Hanganu – States he went on pole barn website, this is one of the largest and widest they build.

Ed – States other companies make bigger ones, this is based on square footage that he needs, made it as small as he could.

C. Wallace – Tells board they may also want to consider where this property sits off 55, there are large tracks of land, applicant owns 2 other contiguous lots that are 9-10 acres each, across the street are half acre subdivisions and rear of lot on Walker are smaller tracks of land with homes.

Ed – The 3 lots he owns go further up the hill than his house.

C. Wallace – Confirms it's between Starlight and Coon Den.

Ed – Mentions the other two lots are part of Hunters Ridge subdivision from the 60s. That the properties behind are very steep and can't build close to his property lines. Old Coon Den Rd that extends to Walker is on his property.

C. Hanganu – Regarding Q3, substantial variance, what made applicant arrive at size, 5200 sq. ft., of structure?

Ed – The illustration he provided shows his possessions that need to be stored. Can't keep them where they are in the next year, lease runs out, can't afford to pay what he's paying now as he will retire. Wants all his possessions at his home where they will be used and secured. States he started at 6000 sq. ft., decided too big, too expensive. When mapping out items, wanted 3ft from shelves and aisles, need to access equipment with machine. If he stacks some implements, it would save only 64 sq. ft. but some equipment is heavy and can't be put on a rack. Explains weights and sizes of different equipment and that it would be difficult and dangerous up on a shelf.

C. Wallace – Suggests board needs to find out about neighborhood and if there are any large accessory structures in surrounding areas.

Ed – Mentions he passed a large one on route to meeting.

C. Hanganu – States he needs to go out there to see it, recommends board do that as well. Asks applicant to continue with questions 4 and 5.

S. Slattery – References a prior similar situation, where applicant was asked to make adjustments.

Ed – Q4, no as the natural topography and existing vegetation will make pole barn difficult to see and naturally facilitates rainwater and soil absorption. Only issue to environment is that rainwater is concentrated into the gutters then the down spouts, goes into the ground and finds its way down 140ft to lowest area of property. None of that water will join the rain water that goes down the driveway, which when it rains comes down from the hill and sometimes a large volume. This water will be going in opposite direction towards his vacant lot, around house and down the hill.

C. Hanganu – Clarifies with counsel the two variances. Wants height of main structure on the drawing.

C. Wallace – Suggests for applicant to explain to the board the lay of the land and why roof line is going to be so much higher than existing roof line with main structure.

Ed – Mentions when he originally met with Jessica Peterson, they looked at property and map. He wanted to originally put it at lowest line, flattest part of property. She stated can't be done because it's in front of the primary residence. House is sitting 140ft higher than where building would be. So now building itself would be on piece of property that is already higher than the house.

C. Wallace – Explains the code deals with respecting the scale and character of principal structure; accessory shall not exceed 25% principal structure in bulk, second component with respect to height, not to exceed the height of principal structure. Board can make inquiry to other areas of the lot where this structure can go. Corner lot with different versatility as far as interpretation of code, it fronts two different roads.

C. Hanganu – Asking about height of principle structure being 13 ft from front and pole barn being 26 ft from front, is the variance 13 ft?

C. Wallace – Yes.

Ed – Asks in that scenario, is it assumed that both structures are on same level, same plane?

C. Wallace – States it's a pure math problem. Code is clear, height of principle structure. Again, may want to inquire what other areas on lot pole barn can go, considering these factors, especially self-created hardship.

S. Slattery – Asks where else can the structure be placed?

Ed – Seems it doesn't matter where it is because it's physically higher. Originally wanted it closer to the two roads, down the hill where lot levels off. Would've been more difficult to camouflage from the neighborhood, plus there is a stream there. More challenges in that area. Second location choice was on other lot, was told can't do that because there needs to be a primary building on lot. The height issue is based on base of the building to the top, doesn't matter if land is higher or lower. Problem with making it equal to house is some stuff won't fit in. Didn't understand the hardship question. The hardship is the stuff won't fit in a 1200 sq. ft. building. He didn't create the hardship, the house was pre-existing, and didn't think he'd need a big building for storage years down the road. Have almost 40 acres of property between 3 lots.

C. Wallace – References the topo's supplied with application, shows principal residence is between 538 and 548 ft. and proposed structure going to be between 564 and 580 ft., correct?

Ed – 580 is off the area where proposed building is going to go, where the ridge begins to go up sharply. But that's not where it's going to go.

C. Wallace – Asks where is it going?

Ed – Believes it ends at 568 or 570. Position is not written in stone, if a problem can turn it 90 degrees.

C. Hanganu – Asks if board was inclined to consider variance for smaller structure, could that work, if so, what size would work?

Ed – The smaller he makes it, the tighter everything becomes. If told to sell RV, then sure can drop it 800 sq. ft. Will work with board, but if told it can only be 2000 sq. ft., that's impossible. References plans with tractor attachments and workshop, that's 1200 sq. ft. each, and not even looking at other side. Here to work together.

C. Hanganu motion to open public comment. Seconded by L. Porter. All in favor. Aye.

C. Wallace – Instructs chairman to have public state their name and address before commenting.

Teresa (Sissy) J. Rahilly, 21 Walker Rd. Lived here for 24 years, no problem with any neighbors. Asks what the variance from her property to applicants' property regarding encroachment?

C. Hanganu – To his knowledge structure being proposed is not near property line that would encroach on any setbacks.

Sissy – Asks about materials being used to build, would it be possible that no materials be trashed on her property? Right now, there is a pile of brush, two tire rims, that weren't there last year. After the applicants' survey there is trash piled up on her property. Wants to make sure no more materials will be put on her property. Shows board her photo.

C. Wallace – Asks her to print it out for the board.

L. Porter – Asks how many times has she asked applicant to remove debris.

Sissy – She hasn't because she's not sure if he put it there. Just want to make sure during construction there isn't any. Asks how many feet on the adjoining property is she allowed?

C. Wallace – States it's a side yard and according to bulk schedule, 30ft.

C. Hanganu – Clarifies that 30ft. would be to place a structure there. Asks counsel about a driveway.

C. Wallace – States a driveway has nothing to do with it, it's not a structure. Can inquire if there is runoff that comes from high areas of applicants' property down to Ms. Rahilly property.

S. Slattery – Asks if Sissy is worried about view.

Sissy – Not too concerned because she's nestled in. Pole barn will be bigger than her house. Would pole barn depreciate the value of her property?

C. Wallace – This board can't answer that, it's not for their consideration. What is their consideration is how it's going to fit in with rest of community?

C. Hanganu – Asks Sissy if she thinks how it would impact neighborhood.

Sissy – Possibly drainage and wouldn't have the privacy she has now. Questions if any hazardous materials in vehicles.

Michael Mahn, 10 Walker Rd. Wondering where exactly the barn will be, hasn't seen a map. Asks if there will be another entrance added or will existing driveway be used?

Chris shows Michael the plans. Same entrance off Walker.

C. Hanganu – Asks Michael if he'd like to comment on his perspective in terms of neighborhood?

Michael – He keeps woods, and it sounds like applicant is keeping woods. Rather have something like that than another development, like the one across 55 where he gets water runoff. Mr. Standke keeping it the way it is, is fine by him.

C. Wallace – Advises to keep public hearing open and to visit the site.

C. Hanganu motion to keep public hearing open until next ZBA meeting, December 2, 2025. Seconded by L. Porter. All in favor. Aye.

C. Wallace – Advises board to make motion for site visit and reminds board they cannot discuss or deliberate outside the walls of this room.

C. Hanganu motion to make a site visit. Seconded by L. Porter. All in favor. Aye.

C. Wallace – Suggests getting applicants contact info to schedule and reminds board no more than 2 of them can go at a time.

C. Hanganu motion to adjourn. Seconded by L. Porter. All in favor. Aye.