



TOWN OF  
**BEEKMAN**  
*New York*

4 Main Street  
Poughquag, NY 12570  
[www.townofbeekman.gov](http://www.townofbeekman.gov)  
(845) 724-5300

**Town of Beekman Zoning Board of Appeals  
Minutes of May 5, 2026**

The following members were present:

Colleen Hayes (acting chair)  
Stella Slattery  
Linda Porter

Town Attorney – Joe Eriole  
Secretary – Sheryl Discher

**Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order by the Chair at approximately 7:19pm. The Chair noted the locations of the emergency exits and led the Pledge of Allegiance, followed by a moment of silence for members serving in the armed forces.

**Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes**

The Board acknowledged receipt of the February 2026 meeting minutes.

- **Motion:** By C. Hayes to approve February 2026 minutes
- **Second:** By L. Porter
- **Vote:** Passed (S. Slattery Aye, L. Porter Aye, C. Hayes Aye – All in Favor)

The Chair noted that the January 2026 minutes had been prepared; however, there were insufficient members present who attended that meeting to approve the minutes. The January minutes will be placed on a future agenda.

**Public Hearing**

1. **Applicant:** Greene Pole Barn – 2 Area Variances  
**Property Address:** 15 Hickory Ln  
**Grid Number:** 6959-13-191350  
**Zoning District:** R-45

The Chair introduced the application for two area variances relating to a proposed accessory structure (pole barn) at 15 Hickory Lane.

The applicant requested:

1. Relief from the maximum permitted accessory structure square footage requirement, where the proposed structure exceeded the allowable size by approximately 1,349 square feet.
2. Relief from the requirement that an accessory structure shall not be located closer to the street than the principal structure.

## **Applicant Presentation and Board Discussion**

The applicant, Christopher Greene, reviewed responses to the statutory area variance criteria.

### **Neighborhood Character/Detriment to Nearby Properties**

The applicant stated that granting the variances would not create an undesirable change in neighborhood character or produce a detriment to nearby properties. The applicant explained that the structure would be located well back from property lines, screened by existing vegetation, and consistent with other accessory structures in the surrounding area.

Board members discussed the existing lot configuration and confirmed that previously separate parcels had been merged into a single lot totaling approximately 1.6 acres.

The applicant confirmed:

- The property is owner-occupied.
- The proposed structure would be used solely for personal residential storage, including vehicles, lawn equipment, and a snowblower.
- No commercial use was proposed.
- The structure would contain electrical service only, with no plumbing, heating, or sanitary facilities.

The applicant stated the proposed structure height would be approximately 16 feet.

Board members discussed neighboring accessory structures and reviewed photographs submitted by the applicant depicting similar buildings in the vicinity.

### **Feasible Alternatives**

The applicant stated that the desired result could not reasonably be achieved by other means due to the existing driveway configuration and site layout.

Board members inquired whether alternate locations on the property had been considered. The applicant explained that the proposed location aligned with the existing rough driveway access.

### **Substantiality of the Variance**

Board members discussed the substantial nature of the requested variance, particularly because the proposed accessory structure would exceed the size limitation relative to the principal dwelling.

Discussion occurred regarding whether the proposed lean-to portion of the structure should be included in the total square footage calculation. The applicant stated that the lean-to had been included out of caution because no definitive interpretation had been provided.

Several Board members expressed concern regarding precedent and the proportional relationship between the proposed accessory structure and the residence.

The Board also discussed the fact that the parcel had previously received Board of Health approval for construction of a four-bedroom residence.

## **Environmental Impacts**

The applicant stated that no adverse physical or environmental impacts were anticipated due to the structure's placement and intended residential use.

The Board Attorney advised that a Short Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) would be required pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA).

## **Self-Created Hardship**

The applicant acknowledged that the hardship was self-created but stated that the proposed structure size was necessary for reasonable residential storage needs.

## **Additional Information Requested**

The Board requested the following prior to further consideration:

- Submission of a completed Short Environmental Assessment Form (EAF)
- Clarification of side setback dimensions on the survey
- Identification of septic system locations on the site plan

The Board discussed conducting a site visit. The applicant agreed to accommodate Board members for inspection of the property.

## **Procedural Motions**

The Board Attorney advised that the public hearing should formally be opened and that the discussion be incorporated into the hearing record.

### **Motion to Open Public Hearing**

Motion made by C. Hayes and seconded by S. Slattery

**Vote:** Passed (S. Slattery Aye, L. Porter Aye, C. Hayes Aye – All in Favor)  
**Motion carried.**

### **Motion to Incorporate Discussion into the Public Hearing Record**

Motion made by C. Hayes and seconded by L. Porter

**Vote:** Passed (S. Slattery Aye, L. Porter Aye, C. Hayes Aye – All in Favor)  
**Motion carried.**

### **Motion to Continue Public Hearing to Next Meeting**

Motion made by C. Hayes and seconded by L. Porter

**Vote:** Passed (S. Slattery Aye, L. Porter Aye, C. Hayes Aye – All in Favor)  
**Motion carried.**

2. **Applicant:** Vandeyar Attached Garage – Area Variance  
**Property Address:** 24 Orchard Dr  
**Grid Number:** 6758-01-056716  
**Zoning District:** R-45

### **Application Summary**

The applicant requested relief from the required 20-foot side-yard setback to permit construction of a proposed attached two-car garage measuring approximately 20 feet by 21 feet. The application initially referenced a variance of 15 feet 6 inches; however, during discussion it was clarified that the proposed structure would maintain a 15.6-foot setback, requiring a variance of 4.4 feet.

### **Applicant Presentation**

Dave Vandeyar, owner of 24 Orchard Drive, addressed the Board and explained the request. The applicant stated that the addition was needed to accommodate his growing family and would include a two-car garage while converting the existing garage into living space.

The applicant advised that:

- The proposed garage would be located on the right side of the property.
- The neighboring residence would remain approximately 45 feet from the proposed structure.
- Adjacent neighbor Jon Cosenza at 18 Orchard Drive had no objection to the project.
- The HOA had reviewed and approved the proposal.
- Signed letters of support from neighboring property owners and an HOA approval letter were submitted.

The applicant further stated that the design was prepared to remain consistent with the character and aesthetics of the neighborhood.

### **Board Discussion**

The Board reviewed the statutory variance considerations with the applicant.

### **Neighborhood Character**

The applicant stated that the project would not create an undesirable change in neighborhood character and emphasized that the design had received HOA approval to ensure compatibility with surrounding homes.

### **Feasible Alternatives**

The applicant explained that no practical alternative location existed for the addition due to the positioning of the existing home on the lot.

### **Substantiality of the Variance**

Discussion clarified that the actual variance request was 4.4 feet rather than 15 feet 6 inches as originally stated in the application materials.

## **Environmental Impact**

The applicant stated that the project would not adversely affect environmental conditions and that proper drainage would be maintained. Discussion also addressed existing red maple trees on the property, which the applicant believed could remain.

## **Public Comment**

Jeff Powell, HOA Board member and resident of 12 Orchard Drive, spoke in support of the application. He stated that the HOA Board believed the proposal preserved the character of the neighborhood.

No additional public comments were offered.

## **Close of Public Hearing**

A motion was made by C. Hayes and seconded by L. Porter to close the public hearing. The motion carried unanimously (S. Slattery Aye, L. Porter Aye, C. Hayes Aye – All in Favor).

## **Board Action**

Following discussion, the Board determined that the variance request should be corrected to reflect a 4.4-foot side-yard variance.

**A motion was made by L. Porter and seconded by C. Hayes to approve the area variance for 24 Orchard Drive with the modification that the approved variance amount is 4.4 feet. The motion carried unanimously (S. Slattery Aye, L. Porter Aye, C. Hayes Aye – All in Favor).**

## **Adjournment**

A motion was made by C. Hayes and seconded by L. Porter to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried unanimously (S. Slattery Aye, L. Porter Aye, C. Hayes Aye – All in Favor).