

**ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS  
VILLAGE OF SOUTHAMPTON  
OCTOBER 24, 2019  
PUBLIC HEARING**

Due notice having been given, the public hearing of the Zoning Board of Appeals for the Village of Southampton was held in the Board room of the Municipal Building, 23 Main Street, Southampton, NY on Thursday, October 24, 2019 at 6:00 p.m.

Board members Chair Rob Devinney, Mark Greenwald, Kevin Guidera, and Dan Guzewicz and Julia McCormack were present.

Counsel for the Board David Kirst was present. Environmental Planning Consultant Chic Voorhis was present.

Chair Devinney opened the meeting. He introduced the new Board member Julia McCormack and new Counsel for the Board David Kirst.

**MINUTE APPROVAL**

MOTION by D. Guidera, second D. Guzewicz

**To approve the minutes of the September 26, 2019 public hearing.**

On Vote: Chair Devinney, M. Greenwald, K. Guidera, D. Guzewicz and J. McCormack

**ADDITIONAL**

On the application of **CAPTAINS NECK 1 LLC**, 455 Captains Neck Lane, the Board did not discuss this case.

On the application of **MICHAEL & SYLVIA RUTHERFORD**, 33 Layton Avenue, there was an error in the original decision that had the setback at 27.7', it should be 29.2'.

MOTION by K. Guidera, second R. Devinney

**To amend the written decision due to technical error. The decision should read 29.2', in lieu of 27.7' on the application of MICHAEL & SYLVIA RUTHERFORD.**

On Vote: Chair Devinney, M. Greenwald, K. Guidera, D. Guzewicz and J. McCormack

**ADJOURNMENTS**

On the application of **GLENN NUSSDORF**, 210 Meadow Lane, there is a letter requesting adjournment in the file.

MOTION by K. Guidera, second D. Guzewicz

**To approve the applicants request for adjournment on the application of GLENN NUSSDORF.**

On Vote: Chair Devinney, M. Greenwald, K. Guidera, D. Guzewicz and J. McCormack

On the application of **ELINOR COHEN**, 359 Meadow Lane, affidavits of mailing and posting were submitted. The applicant has requested adjournment for this application.

MOTION by K. Guidera, second D. Guzewicz

**To approve the applicants request to adjourn on the application of ELINOR COHEN.**

On Vote: Chair Devinney, M. Greenwald, K. Guidera, D. Guzewicz and J. McCormack

## **PENDING CASES**

On the application of **ANDREW & DANA STONE**, 527 Meadow Lane, present for the applicant was Gil Flanagan. This case has been on the agenda for some time, he was only recently retained. He has nothing new to submit, however, he did submit a memo to Mica Strunk, and it is part of the file. He intends to present in November, the application is back on track.

MOTION by K. Guidera, second by D. Guzewicz

**To approve the applicants request for adjournment on the application of ANDREW & DANA STONE.**

On Vote: Chair Devinney, M. Greenwald, K. Guidera, D. Guzewicz and J. McCormack

A member of the audience that arrived late desired to be heard on this application.

MOTION by K. Guidera, second by D. Guzewicz

**To open from adjournment on the application of ANDREW & DANA STONE for public comment.**

On Vote: Chair Devinney, M. Greenwald, K. Guidera, D. Guzewicz and J. McCormack

Mrs. Hurford, a neighbor, would like to know what was proposed. Chair Devinney expressed that there was nothing new presented. She noted that they need a wall, it stood for a hundred years and she would like the wall. The wall is crumbling, she heard that her insurance company is paying, and she is not happy about that, and he is only replacing half the wall.

G. Flanagan stated the proposal is only to propose the part of the wall that needs to be replaced. D. Guzewicz stated that they will present next month, and she should attend.

She wants her landscaping that was disturbed to be restored. G. Flanagan addressed her concern and stated that it will be brought back and to the same height. She feels the wall was not maintained properly. Chair Devinney stated that it was not in the purview of this Board to decide why the wall failed. D. Guzewicz stated that it needs to be strong to maintain the wall and the future wall will be built to stay. Counsel Kirst stated she can review plans in the Building Department. The new plans will be submitted at next hearing. Chair asked her to go up to the Building Department and ask to access the information. Counsel stated she can ask if there are any new submissions to the file. G. Flanagan stated that her concerns will be addressed in their plan. C. Voorhis noted that he can visit the site and evaluate the condition.

MOTION by K. Guidera, second by D. Guzewicz

**To approve the applicants request for adjournment on the application of ANDREW & DANA STONE.**

On Vote: Chair Devinney, M. Greenwald, K. Guidera, D. Guzewicz and J. McCormack

On the application of **LIFTON GREEN LLC**, 270 Ox Pasture Road, M. Greenwald is recused from this application. This application is pending advisory report from the ARB. Andrew Goldstein has been retained as Counsel for the applicant and is requesting adjournment to the December public hearing.

MOTION by K. Guidera, second by D. Guzewicz

**To adjourn for all purposes on the application of LIFTON GREEN LLC to the December public hearing.**

On Vote: Chair Devinney, K. Guidera, D. Guzewicz and J. McCormack

Recused: M. Greenwald

On the application of **MEREDITH JOYCE TRUST**, 765 Hill Street, this application is pending advisory report from the ARB. John Bennett was present for the applicant; they have an application similar to the past. They want to take the antique shop and convert it to a guest house. He's at a loss as to why they don't have the advisory report yet. He suggested Counsel Kirst compose a letter to pursue the matter. He expects the opinion will be that the location will be maintained but moved back 20' because it is literally on the line of the property close to the road. The discussion at the Board was that they would be supportive with the rear of the structure being removed but the primary remain on and east west axis but moved back 20', he will be asking to renotice to change the moving back from 30' to 20'. He asked the Board to follow up to see where they are in the process.

MOTION by K. Guidera, second D. Guzewicz

**To approve the applicants request to adjourn for all purposes on the application of MEREDITH JOYCE TRUST to November.**

On Vote: Chair Devinney, K. Guidera, M. Greenwald, D. Guzewicz and J. McCormack

On the application of **BLC HILLSIDE INVESTMENTS LLC**, 132 South Main Street, present for the applicant was Timothy McCulley. He explained the application at the last hearing but reviewed that they are moving the pool house and garage to more conforming locations. The C of O for the tennis court was submitted per the request of the Board. Counsel Bruyn asked for 2007 map for subdivision and declarations for change of lot line in 2014 and those were submitted. Single and separate surveys and 1998 plans for pool house and garage were requested at the last meeting and he has submitted those. Plans with dimensions and new survey showing better delineation of gazebo for more clarity were part of his submission. They have a garage over the line of the flagpole lot, they want to move it to more conforming location. It will be 40' away from church if moved. The pool being moved will be bring it into conformance. They have a Planning Board application as well, if they are approved all will be conforming to the size of the lot.

Chair Devinney asked should they wait on the Planning Board to render their decision; T. McCulley stated that the problem with that is that they are trying to expedite the process. The problem with waiting for the subdivision is they must go through many processes, and they aren't sure they will even be approved. He is assuming they will be, but he can't guarantee that. D. Guzewicz stated they will need variances for the garage and pool house, but Planning Board approval would make them conform. T. McCully states that he would like the Board to look at it as is, without the Planning Board being part of the consideration. D. Kirst stated the Board needs to determine that as proposed does it meet the criteria; does it stand on its own merits. T. McCully noted that lot coverage and GFA will comply no matter which option they obtain. The lot line modification was done in 2018, as part of that declaration, it required that if they sell this lot, they must move the garage, they want to do that now to conform.

D. Guzewicz stated that he is not clear if it is expanding a non-conforming, D. Kirst stated if they stay in conformance of use than it is not a concern. D. Guzewicz feels the use is changed by the additions inside. M. Greenwald has a significant problem with that as well. Playroom, utility storage, bathroom, laundry room, they feel that it no longer looks like a garage. It doesn't change the use according to C. Talbot in Building Department stated T. McCully. He states that garages get used for other uses than vehicles and storage. The bathroom doesn't contain a shower. D. Kirst stated it is C. Talbot's discretion

as to if there is change of use, they could do work in there without changing the non-conformity. D. Kirst stated they can ask for C. Talbot's input on that to add as part of the file.

MOTION by K. Guidera, second D. Guzewicz

**To close for written decision on the application of BLC HILLSIDE INVESTMENTS LLC.**

On Vote: Chair Devinney, M. Greenwald, K. Guidera, D. Guzewicz and J. McCormack

On the application of **COMMUNITY BAPTIST CHURCH**, 16 Rev Raymond Lee Court, present for the applicant was John Bennett. He responding to some requests for additional information to take two lots and put them back to their original lines. He submitted a letter dated Oct 23, 2019 that contains case law regarding the treatment as separate lots. When unmerged they would create two family use for affordable housing. They received and submitted a confirmation letter from the Housing Authority pertaining to use. The parking scheme is in the October 23, 2019 submission. The additional parking would be provided by an easement for 20 spaces and a handicap space. The parking on the church now is provided by an easement on the property to the north, a submission of that easement was made. The existing church has easement parking on north and the twenty spaces added on the affordable housing property. For the two-family house and apartment, they need two spaces per unit for that dwelling and one additional space for the apartment. The parking is to code if the two-family dwelling doesn't exceed 3 bedrooms per unit. The commercial setback is 10', it is light industrial zoned.

D. Guzewicz stated that in the work session there was concern that Plant Street gets loaded up with parking and they are afraid that the businesses will fill up the parking lot. He feels that one entrance on Powell Avenue, with no Plant Street entry and exit will prevent that. J. Bennett stated they can make that adjustment. The thought was that they didn't want to mix the institutional use with industrial. D. Guzewicz clarified that he wants the Plant street curb cut removed, just the utilizing Powell for parking. J. Bennett located the preference of the Board, they want to eliminate the church parking Plant Road use. That prevents work traffic from filling the parking lot. K. Guidera stated they want one entry into garage for the residential use, that curb cut is okay, but the church parking should be off Powell. J. Bennett will investigate it. Counsel Kirst wants to investigate the number of uses and permitted uses, extra uses is why they are here per J. Bennett. Counsel Kirst stated that it may need to be noticed for section B use. K. Guidera asked about the density for the affordable housing, J. Bennett noted that there is always a tradeoff for affordable housing. Chair feels it will always be a dilemma. D. Guzewicz asked if they have Board of Health approval, J. Bennett stated that they haven't gone yet but will probably utilize credits to obtain the approval. The septic will probably be two systems.

MOTION by K. Guidera, second by D. Guzewicz

**To approve the applicants request to adjourn for all purposes on the application of COMMUNITY BAPTIST CHURCH.**

On Vote: Chair Devinney, M. Greenwald, K. Guidera, D. Guzewicz and J. McCormack

On the application of **259 S MAIN A REV TRUST**, 259 South Main Street, present for the applicant was Rebecca Brown from Araiys Design. Counsel Kirst is recused from this application. This is two separate applications, one for the dock and one for the fill and a wall that not approved but added later. They will be considered together for the purposes of this hearing. Steven Rota submitted plans, there is really nothing new to offer other than approval received for the dock by the Trustees, that approval was submitted.

C. Voorhis stated in summary, that they met in the field, the plans expand the buffer that had previously been established. It provides for greater setback and buffer from Lake Agawam, that is balanced by additional fill outside the prior buffer and a subtle regrade. The wall that was not authorized will be mostly removed, except for a small portion to retain the added fill.

MOTION by K. Guidera, second by D. Guzewicz

**To close for written decision on the application of 259 S MAIN STREET.**

On Vote: Chair Devinney, M. Greenwald, K. Guidera, D. Guzewicz and J. McCormack

C. Voorhis had a prepared permit because all materials were submitted before the work session, this is active construction and the buffer has been installed and inspected by C. Voorhis. DP1 shows the installation, on the middle of page 2 is the number of reasons why they don't feel it will have a negative impact. The next part are the special conditions and it is cross referenced to the permit in place. On page 3 they reference 3 plans that are part of the set. Erosion control, hours of operation etc. are noted on the last page. It was noted that a date was incorrect, the November date should read 2015 not 2019. C. Voorhis will make the amendment.

MOTION by K. Guidera, second by D. Guzewicz

**To accept the prepared written permit as amended by the Environment Consultant on the application of 259 S MAIN STREET.**

On Vote: Chair Devinney, M. Greenwald, K. Guidera, and D. Guzewicz

Abstained: J. McCormack

## **NEW CASES**

On the application of **PATRICIA MCEVOY SHERMAN**, 6 Squabble Lane, affidavits of mailing and posting were submitted. Present for the applicant was Andrew Goldstein and Jim Walker from InterScience. Their office worked to resolve a NYS DEC violation. They are required to plant this by November 15<sup>th</sup>, they have pressure from the State to plant, and they have been approved. It is native plantings with a path through the 75' buffer. Wickapogue Pond had a 5-year program for cleaning up and it has been successful. They'd like to undertake a 3-year program to cut the common reed invasion and get native plants established again. The two together are a huge improvement. There are photographs and a design narrative included in the submission. C. Voorhis had materials emailed because they are under deadline. It is standard protocol by Marty Shay, it is reliable and works well. Thereafter there is a good result and free of common reed. He is asking if there is a timing problem, he will return to DEC to ask for delay. The planting can be done anytime but should be done after the first part of the common reed treatment. They are removing the goose fence.

C. Voorhis stated it is a question of timing, he has not prepared a written decision at this time. He reviewed the consent order. He may question some plantings as respect to sunlight and if they have survival conditions it may not be an issue. The plantings will go in November 2019, but they will remove the goose fence in December 2020. He will need to return to the DEC because he won't make the date. D. Guzewicz asked about the previous plan, it all grew back once it was done. Bruce Horwith did the previous work and they did well, but the problem was that someone wasn't funding the work properly and it was not done often enough. It needs to be cut at grade so that water will come over and in winter kill the phragmites. The common reed project wasn't done often enough and frequent enough. C. Voorhis stated this is one homeowner, the last one was a joint. C. Voorhis asked about a root barrier, he stated these will come back quickly. They will require 85% survival on plantings for three years. It's a

good example for the neighbors and they tend to follow suit. They have experience in these projects and the results are spectacular.

C. Voorhis stated that Meadowmere Lane had a very successful plan and they do work well. He asked if he'd change anything on these plans. J. Walker stated that he may make a couple of suggestions, the DEC did approve the plantings. C. Voorhis stated that he'd like to adjust the plantings and he'd like root barrier. J. Walker would like to see how some of the plantings fair, the Virginia Creeper is interesting to see how it does and Wild Geranium could be beautiful but draws deer.

C. Voorhis stated that it is possible they can get a decision for the November hearing if all requested materials are submitted by the work session.

MOTION by K. Guidera, second by D. Guzewicz

**To approve the applicants request for adjournment on the application of PATRICIA MCEVOY SHERMAN.**

On Vote: Chair Devinney, M. Greenwald, K. Guidera, D. Guzewicz and J. McCormack

On the application of **HENRY & BERNADETTE WATKINS III**, 44 Halsey Neck Lane, affidavits of mailing and posting were submitted. Present for the applicant was Henry Watkins, they are requesting an 18' terrace that extends 8' into the setback. They are renovating now, and they expect completion by summer. There is an existing pergola which is 30' from the property line, the pergola is open ended. The terrace will be 52' from the property line. D. Guzewicz asked if the proposed porch steps come down 2' by edge of pool, they feel that could be a safety issue. H. Watkins stated they will entertain safety suggestions. In the past they have had these issues, the steps can be pointed southerly or recess into the porch area. The distance for safety would be at least 5' from the coping. K. Guidera stated they can go out the south or north side or recess the steps. They can pull back the terrace 3 or so feet. M. Greenwald asked what happened since project is underway. At what point did they plan to add a porch in the back; H. Watkins noted that what happened was that at some point it was realized that they had 52' where 60' is needed, they needed variance anyway. The Building Permit was issued, and it came up at that issuance. The file can be requested regarding that problem. D. Guzewicz wants a measurement on the plan that shows the distance from the steps to the pool. The fencing is to code, the terrace will be less than 30" off the ground. Counsel Kirst stated the surveys will need to be corrected showing the change. The Board let H. Watkins know that if they received the new plans by the 19<sup>th</sup>. then they can be ready to be approved.

MOTION by K. Guidera, second Guzewicz

**To approve the applicants request for adjournment on the application of HENRY & BERNADETTE WATKINS III.**

On Vote: Chair Devinney, M. Greenwald, K. Guidera, D. Guzewicz and J. McCormack

On the application of **LAKE AGAWAM CONSERVANCY**, Lake Agawam, affidavits of mailing and posting were submitted. Present for the applicant was Charles McGuckin and Dan Golezzio. They are proposing to do Lake work, the issue is the toxic algae within the Lake. They are looking to do a few remedies; this is related to removal of water lilies on south by the shoreline and add aeration systems similar to existing systems in the Lake now. They are proposing to remove the strand of water lilies that is a 129,000 square foot portion. There are five homeowners willing to provide electrical power to provide aerators at the edge of south end. By permission the Town, the parking lot at the South will be used for staging to let vegetation dry out for disposal. They reached out to NYS DEC and provided a no

jurisdiction confirmation. They want to get this done by Fall but are running out of time, it may end up Spring. The problem is that this section of the lake, the nature of wind blows from southwest and algae accumulates because wind can't thin it out. The water lilies trap the algae. The conservancy will pay for this work. They applied in early October for C. Voorhis review and addressed his comments. The aerators are bottom diffuse aerators and designed for shoreline use. There is no electrical power that goes in the Lake. This is the recommended type of aerator by the Village. D. Guzewicz asked if they are to run constantly; C. McGuckin answered yes, they do. He asked if the GFI trips, who maintains them. C. McGuckin will go over that with Gary Goleski. From what he has seen they run steadily; in this case it would be the homeowners to reset the GFI. D. Guzewicz stated that they possibly can have an indicator light and be serviced, and the homeowner caretakers or landscapers can be responsible for that. The units have a three-year warranty. Chair asked about decibel level, they are all enclosed in aluminum box, it equates to a pool pump noise. They offer an insulation for sound per C. Voorhis. Counsel Kirst said if they break noise requirements the village could handle it. Chair asked if the aeration will keep the lilies from returning. They feel they will grow back in a years' time; they request a five-year maintenance period. Chair noted that wind-blown algae is not a good thing; he noted they will improve circulation from the bottom up and algae shouldn't become airborne. The algae likes to come up at day and down at night. D. Guzewicz asked for a report at end of 3 years. Chair Devinney asked if the existing aeration has done anything for Lake, it was noted that in the radius it's not a heavy green, it reduces algae accumulation. The conservancy is evaluating several things to help the situation in Lake Agawam. They are trying to have the process be comprehensively reviewed so that everyone is on the same page. Their focus with this application is mainly southwest side of lake. It is about 10 properties or about 4 acres but only 50' wide. Reducing the die off that stinks is important; it does help fuel additional algae the following year.

C. Voorhis asked about town hearing for approval, he hasn't met with them yet. C. Voorhis noted that they have looked extensively at this problem and an inventory of lily pads was done in 2007, they allowed some native lilies because they are beneficial to a degree. One of the things that makes this project beneficial is the timing. Cutting stalks and leaves and will allow uptake nitrogen from the Lake in Spring. They recognize the need for the project, and they were hoping it could be done this Fall. He'd like to arrange for things in a cost-effective manner since it's a nonprofit. C. Voorhis spoke with Dr. Goble and Ed Warren and they feel it will be beneficial. C. Voorhis gave presentation to Village Trustees last month, there are many projects that are happening on the Lake. C. Voorhis has draft conditions, noise dampening kit can be fitted on compressors. It was discussed at work session and they appear to be addressed in the submission dated today. They were to provide a free-standing report, so it is cleaner. Making sure no erosion in staging area, location of aerators and they conform to FEMA. They can talk about permit conditions. There are two issues, if the cutting is in the Fall that would help the decay process. The Spring cutting would be when the water lilies will uptake the nitrogen, that would be less beneficial to remove them. Cutting in the Spring may not be the best for fish habitat as well. C. McGuckin noted they need to do it in the off season, he doesn't see why it can't be done in colder weather if weather permits. The request is for a five-year permit, concept is good, but they may be able to learn in the first year, an annual report may be beneficial for the Board. C. Voorhis has an outline for the report that should be done annually. D. Guzewicz asked how close to approval with Town; he noted that he is on the docket. D. Kirst asked if the installation of aerators for Fall; no, they think Spring for the installation of aerators.

C. Voorhis stated he has some draft conditions to discuss if they would like to cover them. They are taking Article 24 for conservation. He has a lot of experience and it is scientifically proven to be beneficial. C. Voorhis went over the conditions, he handed out a draft. The draft describes the project,

this is also a little different, it is an unlisted action and has a negative declaration attached to it. The first part goes through the description of problem and the proposed work. Water Lily is native to the Lake, however, cutting at proper season is beneficial. He fully agrees with the benefits of the projects as outlined by the Conservancy. The Town Trustees will need to review and approve. They will issue the permit to the five participating property owners; they are requesting as a group. It is difficult by homeowner; the permit will be drafted to tax maps and addresses. The Conservancy cannot be a permittee, that is how Wickapogue was handled in the past.

Dan Golezzio, executive director, thanked C. Voorhis. They are happy to do whatever is necessary to make the Board happy. They would like the permit as a group, Counsel Kirst says that is not allowed. The permit would be for power and no upland vegetation removal will be authorized other than a small compressor area, it cannot be cleared. Compressor installation is subject to Village code. Water Lily is authorized to occur in the Fall in 2019 subject to condition by this Board. The Permittee will submit letters of concurrence who are not listed as parties to this permit, there are gaps in five owners' properties. They make sure work is taking place in front of their properties. D. Golezzio stated what if they can't get letter of concurrence and it holds up the work. The notices have had no complaints, he is asking for a little latitude for the couple of properties that they may not have communication from. They will reach out to them and try get through to them, he asked to work on that language. They can do certify mail notification may suffice. That was done for this application. D. Kirst stated it is up to the Board, they may want an extra layer of another mailing. C. Voorhis will amend that point. Town Trustee permit will be obtained for staging area and any other needed. All Village codes must be met. A water Lily report will be prepared after one year and submitted to ZBA. Not a tremendous cost to produce the report, the narrative is part of the permit. D. Golezzio asked if they envision them coming back with noticing yearly, their preference is continuing what is authorized, they prefer not to come back through the process. D. Kirst is not sure if the Board has a renewal process. Not a renewal but just a report on progress, if there is an adjustment then they need to come back. Modifications will need to be renoticed. It can be on the agenda as a Discussion item instead of as a case. A five-year permit is a long period of time, D. Kirst stated it could be one year with renewal. Chair stated it could be five year if they can step in if not going well. D. Kirst stated that C. Voorhis can review if it is positive or negative impact. C. Voorhis stated that they have done renewals in the past. They would come and present the report annually. Guidera stated what about annual extension after report, discussion and then annual extension. Adjustments can be made with the extension. Water lily material will be dumped at an approved location. Erosion control at staging so that upland vegetation doesn't end up in Lake. Sound dampening kit option to be fitted to compressors for decibel reduction. Finally, all standard staging requirements must be met. They can park at the Town Trustee lot at south end for staging purposes. M. Greenwald feels the language could be tighter on point 2, he notes that they cut only in Fall or Winter and not Spring or Summer. C. McGuckin asked that if other homeowners would like to join on, if they would be allowed to. K. Guidera stated it is 5 homeowners currently, and not 6. He'll just make sure it is consistent. The six aerators is accurate, one property has two aerators to operate.

MOTION by K. Guidera, second by D. Guzewicz

**To adopt the draft decision as amended by Environmental Consultant on the application of LAKE AGAWAM CONSERVANCY.**

On Vote: Chair Devinney, K. Guidera, M. Greenwald, D. Guzewicz and J. McCormack

MOTION by K. Guidera, second D. Guzewicz

**To close the meeting.**

On Vote: Chair Devinney, M. Greenwald, K. Guidera, D. Guzewicz and J. McCormack

MOTION by D. Guzewicz, second M. Greenwald

**To reopen the meeting.**

On Vote: Chair Devinney, M. Greenwald, K. Guidera, D. Guzewicz and J. McCormack

MOTION by K. Guidera, second D. Guzewicz

**To accept negative declaration under SEQRA on the application of LAKE AGAWAM CONSERVANCY.**

On Vote: Chair Devinney, M. Greenwald, K. Guidera, D. Guzewicz and J. McCormack

MOTION by K. Guidera, second D. Guzewicz

**To readopt negative declaration under SEQRA as amended on the application of LAKE AGAWAM CONSERVANCY.**

On Vote: Chair Devinney, M. Greenwald, K. Guidera, D. Guzewicz and J. McCormack

MOTION by K. Guidera, second D. Guzewicz

**To close the meeting.**

On Vote: Chair Devinney, M. Greenwald, K. Guidera, D. Guzewicz and J. McCormack

Respectfully Submitted by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
JoLee Sanchez

File Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Village Clerk