

**ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
VILLAGE OF SOUTHAMPTON
FEBRUARY 27, 2020
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 Tuesday, February 27, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.

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

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

MINUTE APPROVAL

MOTION by D. Guzewicz, second J. McCormack

To approve the minutes from the December 19, 2019 public hearing.

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

PENDING DECISIONS

On the application of **JAMES BRACKEN**, 20 Downs Path, there is a written decision in the file.

MOTION by K. Guidera, second D. Guzewicz

To approve the written decision on the application of JAMES BRACKEN.

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

On the application of **71 WALNUT STREET**, 71 Walnut Street, there is a written decision in the file.

MOTION by K. Guidera, second D. Guzewicz

To approve the written decision on the application of 71 WALNUT STREET.

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

ADJOURNMENTS

On the application of **ANDREW & DANA STONE**, 527 Meadow Lane, the applicant has requested an adjournment.

MOTION by K. Guidera, second D. Guzewicz

To approve the applicant's 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 **AESO REALTY LLC**, 145 Coopers Farm Road, the applicant has requested an adjournment.

MOTION by K. Guidera, second D. Guzewicz

To approve the applicant's request for adjournment on the application of AESO REALTY LLC.

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

PENDING CASES

On the application of **LIFTON GREEN LLC**, 765 Hill Street, pending advisory from ARB.

On the application of **MEREDITH JOYCE TRUST**, 765 Hill Street, present for the applicant was John Bennett. They were waiting for advisory report from ARB. This is residentially zoned; it is near McLachlan real estate. There was an application before the ARB to remove two buildings and they were able to show the ARB that one of the buildings was appropriate for demolition. The antique store would be to remain because it has historicity. There is a lawsuit regarding this but that is not before the Board tonight. They demonstrated that the rear portion of the two-story single-family house can come down while preserving the front facade. The front is to be preserved per this application. The location is problematic, they request it to be moved back further 20' per ARB advisory. It is currently very close to the street. The application was made to convert it to either a guest house or an accessory apartment. The relief required to do that is to permit the use as guest house and build a house that blends with the neighborhood at the rear. The request for an accessory apartment would be their preference. They would maintain the location but push it back 20'. The map shows 30' but the current request is 20'. It is in conformance with the desire of the ARB. In their mind since it is historic, they want it to be visible. D. Guzewicz reiterated 20' is the request, yes, the application was amended. Counsel Kirst noted it is updated in the file. They will need front yard relief and it is larger than what's allowed, they have cut it down by half.

In 2014, the code states that you take out from the accessory structure for the GFA, they don't think it is fair because it is a historic structure and they must preserve it. They feel it should be granted because both of the structures were in use and created before any historic designation existed. They predate any GFA limitation and it is not a clean slate, it is an existing application. They have to recognize it is a unique situation. It predates zoning and historic designation and GFA limitation. There is no precedential value per J. Bennett. He also desires it to fit in with the existing neighborhood, he pulled other houses and there are two examples close of 5000 square feet. Those were submitted to the file. This keeps the structure proud to the house and it will be costly to rebuild in accordance with historic standards, but they will preserve the structure. That law was 2 or 3 years before the zoning change. K. Guidera noted they want to violate the GFA because there are two residences on the premises, it is problematic. J. Bennett has a case adjourned before the Supreme Court in hopes this will all go away with their decision. If J. Bennett had his way, he'd demolish this building. He feels they are giving up a lot to make it happen, there is great expense to preserving the accessory. The Board feels it can be built to meet the code. M. Greenwald asked what the numbers are regarding GFA. They want 5000 square foot and maintain 1404 accessory; it is 864 in excess of the zoning code. K. Guidera noted that if the main house was 4300, it would comply. D. Guzewicz noted that the process started before the zoning change, if it was blank without this structure, 6400 would be what was allowed. The zoning reduced to 10% of lot area. He feels it is different from the application that M. Greenwald stated early. M. Greenwald feels that it is not a huge deal to conform. If it is a guest house it will not be rentable, it doesn't change the use of the house though. This is an area variance and not a use variance noted J. Bennett. It is a separate building on the same property. K. Guidera noted it makes no difference if the guest house or apartment is having people on the property. It lowers the intensity of the use on the property contends J. Bennett. He doesn't feel it is a big ask, and not precedential but K. Guidera doesn't agree. They are willing to walk away from the lawsuit that he has. K. Guidera is not comfortable with the application. Chair Devinney noted that when they grant that there will not be affordable housing. J.

Bennett states that he can go back and ask regarding affordable housing. J. McCormack wanted to know what the difference is between the 10 and 12%, it would have been 6348 and it would not have to take out the GFA. Counsel Kirst asked what the plot area is the calculation. M. Greenwald asked when the was the last time the property transferred; it is still held by the family. It was on the market for sale and there was a contract signed and subject to taking both of them down. The buyer walked away from the sale. The only opposition was a broker and it turned out they were fine with application as amended. J. McCormack asked if either of the adjoining properties have accessory buildings, no he doesn't think so.

MOTION by K. Guidera, second D. Guzewicz

To close for written decision on the application of MEREDITH JOYCE TRUST but allowing written submissions until the next work session.

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 asked to be recalled later.

On the application of **LAMBARE NY LLC**, 135 Toylesome Lane, the applicant has withdrawn their application.

On the application of **RICHARD DEL'AQUILA**, 227 Halsey Street, present for the application was Richard Del'Aquila. He submitted an affidavit of mailing and posting. The house was renovated in 2007 and 2009. There was new septic that would accommodate up to 6 bedrooms. The zoning in 2018 that lowered the GFA affected their intention to add a bedroom on the second floor and touch as little of the house as possible. Their requests do not encroach on neighbors and do not affect the sky plane. They are not asking for anything out of line with the neighborhood. The existing house is approximately 3100 square feet and the addition would add 400 square feet, which would consist of a bedroom and bathroom. The calculations on the plan does not include the entire proposed garage, but the pool house that exists is included in the GFA. The garage is allowed; and they plan to remove the pool house structure, because they want to put bath in garage. They presented pictures that demonstrate the existing conditions and the house is shifted very much to one side of the property. The driveway cannot be moved and the setback from the garage was to line up with existing driveway. The sky plane is still a problem on the garage, the west side of the garage does partially encroach, they could build it not to violate by changing to a hip roof, but it is not as appealing architecturally or consistent with the neighborhood. The yard is highly screened so the violation will not be perceived by the neighbor. They planted arborvitae for screening, and they are large and provide a full hedgerow. Chair asked for calculation of sky plane relief; it is 60 cubic feet. On the south side of the house they propose to add a gable on the existing shed roof, it is in the setback by one foot because of the existing condition. It is a setback issue because the existing wall is non-conforming but no sky plane issue. The GFA calculation without garage is 3538 square feet. The calculations are on the plan. All the proposed additions are over existing structure to the west. The garage is proposed 5' off the property line and it is supposed to be 10'. The access to the garage is very restricted if they comply with the side setback, the relief will make easier access to the garage.

MOTION by K. Guidera, second D. Guzewicz

To close for written decision on the application of RICHARD DEL'AQUILA.

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. This has been adjourned a couple of times. He will have Bailey Larkin demonstrate an area variance option, if use variance is not appealing to the Board. They are trying to develop three homes on this light industrial property. The use variance is always to down zone a property, he has researched Patty Salkin on use variance, most cases are where someone was trying to put a business use in residential zoning. Putting a residential use in light industrial is up zoning. The use variance standards are not applicable, nor should they be applied according to J. Bennett. Counsel Bruyn recommended the use variance to handle this application as the best means of dealing with the situation. This Board has already adopted a use variance as change from one nonconforming use to another. The use would change from office to residential which would be covenanted to use affordable housing guidelines. M. Greenwald asked about the house that was built on White, the code has a section that allows single family house as special exception.

Bailey Larkin spoke as to an area variance option; she was flipping through prior decisions and in the past, there was extensive non-conforming decisions. This has a single-family house to expand from single family to two family with accessory apartment. There is precedent for expanding the use as long as not expanded more than 50%, they are looking to construct 2200 square feet and the apartment over garage would expand to 73%. All parking has to be complied with and there is more than ample parking for the proposed. They propose to have an easement for on-site parking. They would propose two family residence with accessory apartment. It is not out of character of the neighborhood. The lot coverage is allowed at 25% and they are proposing 9%. On this property there could have 10,000 square feet of industrial use instead of the smaller residential use proposed. These would be affordable units managed by Suffolk County Housing Authority.

J. Bennett asked the Board to take these new arguments into consideration. The apartment is a problem for K. Guidera. D. Guzewicz asked why not attach the garage; J. Bennett it would be three family which he felt would not be appealing to the Board, but the Village likes the appearance of single-family dwelling with detached garage, so they proposed it with that thought in mind.

MOTION by K. Guidera, second D. Guzewicz

To approve the applicant's request for adjournment on the application of COMMUNITY BAPTIST CHURCH.

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

On the application of **SOUTH LANE PROPERTIES LLC – RE: 72 GIN LANE**, present for the applicant was Thomas Gibbons. This is a third-party appeal by 104 Gin Lane, they want Board to revoke permits that allowed the construction of a house 13 feet from the dune. This was a subdivision that was covenanted by the Planning Board, this was Lot 3 that has the cottage and the Village wanted to prevent expansion of the cottage. In 1993 the end result of the litigation provided a new covenant that specifically prohibits any building withing 100 feet of crest of the dune. It is a two-story single-family dwelling. They were permitted to add a second story but that was never done. This house has been rebuilt several times. Their argument is that the Coastal Erosion Permit and the building permit were invalid because they were not allowed to go before going before the Planning Board. They have standing because they contend, they are an aggrieved party since they are a neighbor or affected party. He is 15' apart from this property and his appraisal report shows the value is 95M, the value with 2 story cottage is now 90M, that is a 5M loss. Mr. Bennett has a letter that he submitted that stated that John Foster stated they don't need a variance. He feels that the Planning Board covenant was very specific. The house that existed in 1993 was knocked down and 2003. The substance of the appeal is that the

Building Inspector did not have the right to issue the permit under the Planning Board decision. He wants this Board to vacate these permits. This Board has to worry about precedent on this application. Chair Devinney asked why can't the Planning Board deal with this. T. Gibbons cannot go before the Planning Board directly without this decision. D. Guzewicz said wouldn't be a variance for what is stated in the letter, he says it doesn't state anything in the letter. He asked this to be held open so that he can submit a written submission, so he has time to respond in writing.

John Bennett for 72 Gin Lane, he has a lot to say but will ask for adjournment. He contends that these arguments that Mr. Gibbons made have been heard before requesting a stay against construction and the stay was not allowed. They went to the appellate division and one of the things that was shown is how far along this house has been constructed. The very same arguments were used, and he states that the case law that has been shown doesn't fit the criteria. They have made these arguments and the Court did not stop the project. It is crystal clear law, no question whatsoever, he cited case law that he has no standing to raise the issue of this covenant. The real crux is that he has no standing because his client doesn't own a lot in subdivision and does not have standing. The plaintiff is not a party so has no right to enforce the covenant. If you are not a party to the grant or in chain of title you have no right, they are a stranger to it. He states there is no case before them. The ZBA cannot raise it and the building inspector has not come to raise the covenant. There was a house in the 90's when Brouse's owned it. That house that was the subject of litigation and that house was torn down and a new one was built in 2004. This is the third house which is two level house, the Village has taken the position the house can be built. They did nothing for 140 days to challenge and he was given notice with the letter so to start the 60 days. His client waited and they did not proceed timely. There is a house 13' from coastal erosion line. The court stated that there is no reason you can't have a second story; it is in same footprint. This same argument was made and litigated and was told to grant second story twenty years ago. There is no standing to raise this argument. He feels this is an unnecessary application and he is a serial objector to change in the neighborhood. He objects to all neighboring construction. His house is 250' away from where the house is being constructed in same envelope. His view shed is not impacted, FEMA requires that it is higher, but his view is no different.

Bailey Larkin spoke regarding the appraisal that was submitted. There are factual inaccuracies in the report. For example, they used four properties as a comparison, and they use adjustments. South Lane is noted at 16,000 square feet, but it is actually 19,000 square foot and underestimating the size. They also have acreage incorrect. 1050 Meadow Lane was used, and it just sold, they used an estimated price. The facts in the analysis are incorrect. Those were the largest inconsistencies. Aerial images were submitted as part of their submission to show the inconsistencies. They took the opportunity and they hired their own appraiser.

Chair Devinney asked Counsel Kirst is there standing. Counsel stated the decision of standing is for the Board to make on whether they are an aggrieved party. The covenant that is part of the condition of subdivision approval and the Building Inspector looks at that when deciding if the permit is allowed. You do not have to be in the subdivision to be an aggrieved party. D. Guzewicz would like to be aware of the supreme court decision. The building inspectors agreed it was not a problem with the covenant and didn't prevent construction of new house in 2004. The whole argument is based on the covenant and he has no standing to do so. Chair stated they don't usually look at appraisals when considering an application. K. Guidera noted that they are being asked whether they have standing or not. Counsel Kirst stated that they need to find that he is or is not an aggrieved party.

Mike Lynch, appraiser for 72 Gin Lane, he prepared a report. He inspected the property a couple of weeks ago. He is here to speak to the appeal by the neighbor at 104 Gin Lane, he found that they did not have a devaluing of his property. They are 9' higher than what was there before, they are alleging their view shed was obstructed because of this property. He prepared using other nearby properties on the south side of Gin Lane. In his report on page 3, paragraph 6, he speaks about 104 Gin Lane. The neighbor is alleging that main residence blocks his lateral view, he is arguing that view shed is affecting overall value. He has a wide parcel and is relatively close to the ocean. 56 Gin Lane combined with 72, a combined price of 93M at sale. That's the highest sale on Gin Lane over past ten years. He demonstrated the properties that he used to make his comparisons on value. He doesn't see how there is damage to neighboring properties. Lateral views do not diminish value. J. Bennett noted that 1030 Meadow Lane is in front of 1050 Meadow Lane. The envelope pushes out well to the south, the purchasers of the property were aware, and it was not an impediment to their purchase.

John Bennett noted a John Foster letter of August 30, 2016. He read the letter into the record. In 1989 the ZBA denied and then was overturned. Coastal Erosion Hazard Law was in effect at this time. In 1993 the appellate court upheld the decision. The envelope could be used but would move back 100' they could build larger. The existing house could be built higher to FEMA regulation. In 2003 a new one-story house with fully finished cellar was constructed. They then asked whether they could construct a two-story house and it would comply with FEMA. It would need to comply with sky plane, and it does. The covenant wasn't changed, it was looked at whether it complied. He'd like it to be held open.

T. Gibbons stated that they didn't deny the covenant and they didn't deny that they can't build within 100' of the crest of dune. It is a Planning Board covenant; he states the cases that J. Bennett stated do not apply. The court in the Horan case stated that close neighbors have standing even if not part of subdivision and can be aggrieved. Without proof of damage people have right to grieve close properties. Chair states that they are looking at how he is aggrieved, they show monetary damages. He contends that letter was not from John Foster. His appeal was timely. Chair Devinney stated it seems that they have to figure is there an aggrievance. Chair doesn't know if that will hold up, Counsel Kirst disagrees with the cases that T. Gibbons and J. Bennett have cited. He states that people have to show that they are aggrieved, they are correct in that they have to hear the party out, but it doesn't go to the ultimate conclusion. The Board has to figure whether he is aggrieved.

MOTION by K. Guidera, second D. Guzewicz

To approve the applicant's request for adjournment on the application of SOUTH LANE PROPERTIES LLC.

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

On the application of **LAKE AGAWAM CONSERVANCY**, First Neck Lane, affidavits of mailing and posting were submitted. Present for the applicant was Katherine Sommo. She is looking for a modification of timing of the cutting of the water lilies from Fall to Spring. D. Guzewicz stated that the last time they stated it was critical to do the cutting in the fall and they argued that spring was not a good time. They may be very limited in timing. The plan is that the aerators will limit water lilies, they will be reduced. J. McCormack stated that the water lilies would be left to dry out and there will be more traffic in spring, so where will they dry out? They have a time limit imposed by the Town for the drying, it has to be done by end of April per K. Sommo. She also asked that there was a strong argument about removing them in Fall was ideal, they had asked for a report in the following Fall to find out efficacy, how will that work with a spring start, when will be an appropriate time for the report? Once the aerators are in, they

should be diminished somewhat. They have to report to the Town as well as the Village and they will present findings. She can't speak to what they will report.

Chair stated that the Board felt disrespected because they were asked to expedite the application and they feel it was rude overall. She states it was timing, they did not have a contractor on board at the time. The money was not sorted out as well, her understanding is that it is worked out now. The issue was the Town Trustees permit was issued and the Village permit was slow, and the contractor did not want to use his equipment in the Lake in December for fear of freezing.

C. Voorhis had a couple of things, he corrected that the Board did act in October to take care of. The original application stated that they need to die back to disrupt nitrogen. The fall cutting and conditional five-year permit were issued. The other amendment requested was that 472 First Neck Lane is not part of the application at this time. He spoke with Dr. Gobler and Ed Warner and the consensus is that it can't really do any harm to aerate now. Removing in October is beneficial, the timing is addressed by the permit. He doesn't feel there is a basis to say no, his expectation is that they will get quite a bit of growth and they will look to do something in Fall. It will help to remove as much as possible for aerators. He would ask that the decision that he prepared be looked at by the Board. He made a number of modifications and updates.

MOTION by K. Guidera, second D. Guzewicz

To close for written decision on the application of LAKE AGAWAM CONSERVANCY.

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

On the application of **DPB SOUTHAMPTON LLC**, 70 South Hill, affidavits of mailing and posting were submitted. Present for the applicant was Harry Contes. He asked is 71 Walnut was approved for pool; K. Guidera responded no and offered the written decision to H. Contes. The request is for a 10x20 swimming pool and it is a pre-existing non-conforming lot. It is a corner lot with no other option to put a pool on the property. He feels it will not affect character of the neighborhood. It is public road, but it is not a through neighborhood. Every home on South Hill has a pool. The proposed pool is approximately 72' from nearest neighbor. You cannot see the pool at any time of the year even in winter. It is a small pool request; the benefit of the applicants cannot be achieved any other way. K. Guidera asked if they are calling it a spa, the only reason it was granted is because it wasn't a pool and didn't fit the code for a pool. It is under a 100 square feet of the pool. D. Guzewicz stated they maximized the house and they made it impossible to get a larger pool on the cramped lot. Counsel stated he doesn't know that they would be able to have a pool with a different house, perhaps smaller. They are requesting variance to remove spa and put in pool. M. Greenwald asked if there are any variances that provide 68% relief in this century, H. Contes noted that he will look. He noted that real estate listing will not sell because of small pool, the house is currently vacant. James Gleason was cited as pool approval for 10' wide and will not affect any other neighbors, he feels it is similar. The zoning was R12.5 and 35' out of 40' required is not the same as 22' where 70' required. K. Guidera stated the people knew the zoning when they bought the property. M. Greenwald noted that it is a substantial variance. D. Guzewicz stated they get this sort of application all the time, these properties have to be planned. Chair stated that they got the property at a reduced price and they are looking for changing it when it really could not handle a pool all along. The Board is not concerned about the monetary problem for the applicant, it is about what is allowable in the Village.

Four neighbors signed a letter that are in opposition. D. Guzewicz stated that pool associates with activity in a front yard. The cited applications that mentioned by H. Contes are small requests for relief.

K. Guidera, noted that the cited Armande variance for a pool on a corner lot is a larger piece of property. M. Greenwald noted that the problem is that this has been before them many times, they granted the spa, and they have heard the arguments being made. It is substantial with not facts to support the granting of the variance. The market value was not considered correctly, and the Board doesn't deal with that.

Dawn Barnard, owner of the house, states that her neighbor to the East, you can see his pool the entire length of his property. The corner of Captains Neck and South Hill doesn't conform either, or it is closer than this would be. They stated they should have gone for the variance before building the house. The previous house had variances granted that she had a right to, but they could have possibly designed the house with pool in mind.

Andrew Lichtman, neighbor, stated that he is authorized to speak for neighbors. They bought this house on .21 acre for 1.4M. They got variances to build this house and they have requested 3rd or 4th for a pool and they had an affidavit when they brought Article 78, and they said a spa would add 250k to the value and now they are back again to try for a pool because it hasn't sold. Village attorney talked about noise in his decision and that is one of their large concerns. All the neighbors have pools on larger lots. Chair asked if animus from neighbors was regarding the size of house built, the neighbors are upset that it keeps going on and on.

Counsel for the applicant would like an adjournment to fully look at variances granted in the last century that have a large request for relief.

MOTION by K. Guidera, second D. Guzewicz

To accept the applicant's request for adjournment on the application of DPB SOUTHAMPTON LLC

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

NEW CASES

On the application of **SOUTHAMPTON REAL ESTATE CORP**, 30 White Street, affidavits of mailing and posting were submitted. Present for the applicant was Nicholas Alimanestianu, the owner. There is a C of O for the pool that was submitted. He'd like a variance to make this business a single-family home. Chair would like to see the parking diminished. He won't change any exterior. Board is feeling not opposed to this. One set of garages will be turned into living space. Counsel states there is no real problem to do so. GFA is ok and he is applying for 8 bedrooms and there are nine spaces to park. Are there GFA and lot coverage calculations, he noted they are included. He needs to do a new septic and that would have to be part of the written decision. There are currently 4 bathrooms and some powder rooms.

John Bennett, neighbor, is supportive to have a house there and feels it is attractive. He notes that he is a good neighbor.

MOTION by K. Guidera, second D. Guzewicz

To close for written decision on the application of SOUTHAMPTON REAL ESTATE CORP.

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

On the application of **JAF 160 OX PASTURE HOLDINGS**, 160 Ox Pasture Road, affidavits of mailing and posting were submitted. Present for the applicant was John Bennett. This application is for relief for

guest house on top and garage below. This is a 9.1-acre parcel. There is an aerial photo that shows the structures on the property. The prior application variance grant was conditioned to be guest house, what they would like to do is renovate and enlarge floor area all within the existing footprint. The existing first floor is garage and they want to convert to a kitchen and dining area, bathroom too. There is 210 square feet on first floor and 1,220 on second floor. They will be adding 1,400 square feet it will increase by 106.7%, it is 3 times in excess of allowed zoning, however, it won't change the appearance of the property because not changing structural features of the house. The only issue for this Board may question is the large request. The Board has allowed more than 50% at other times on a private road off of Great Plains. It was in the nature of an area variance. This lot is large and has no physical expansion, it is just the interior.

Dan Butler, architect, noted that it is a simple 2,000 square footprint that is making the first floor more functional. The footprint doesn't change on the first floor, but the space is utilized differently, and second floor stays the same.

MOTION by K. Guidera, second D. Guzewicz

To closed for written decision on JAF 160 OX PASTURE HOLDINGS.

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