

TOWN OF WARWICK  
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

MARCH 26, 2012

Members Present:

Jan Jansen, Chairman

Mark Malocsay, Co-Chairman

Kevin Shuback

Diane Bramich

Attorney Robert Fink

Norman Paulsen

CHAIRMAN JANSEN:  
minutes from the meeting of February 27, 2012 approved?

Is there a motion to have the

It was noted that not everyone has read the minutes from this meeting.

CHAIRMAN JANSEN:  
will be postponed until the April meeting.

The approval of the minutes

**PUBLIC HEARING OF JPMORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A.** - for property located at 138 State Highway 94, Warwick, New York and designated on the Town tax map as Section 51 Block 1 Lot 40.1 and located in a DS District for a variance of Section 164.43.1H4A allowing 3 wall signs where 1 is permitted and an interpretation of Section 164.43.1H4 that awning signs are permitted in a DS District or, if not permitted, a variance permitting 6 awning signs.  
**Continued from the 2/27/12 ZBA Meeting.**

CHAIRMAN JANSEN: This is a continuation from the 2/27/12 meeting. Is there anything else the Board members would like to discuss?

MR. MALOCSAY: I just asked that anyone interested drive by the location to see where the sign was to confirm what I have been saying about the sign is accurate.

CHAIRMAN JANSEN: We went past it and came back and looking at the trees that are going to be in the way of the signs, it appears that soon the bank and sign will not be visible. We have a compromise as to an additional 1.69 sq feet. I will entertain a motion to approve.

ATTORNEY FINK: Does the Board find that the second sign will create an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or be a detriment to surrounding properties?

MR. PAULSEN: No.

ATTORNEY FINK: Can this be achieved by any other means to identify the primary entrance?

MR. MALOSCAJ: Yes, the sign could be smaller.

MR. SHUBACK: Besides the sign being smaller, no.

MR. MALOSCAJ: We are asked to give the minimum relief.

CHAIRMAN JANSEN: I think when we had our discussion with the Zoning Board and the Town Supervisor, there was at least some agreement that being there was such a slight increase in the size of the sign, they were willing to approve it.

MR. PAULSEN: I don't think a couple of inches, one way or the other, makes a difference.

CHAIRMAN JANSEN: Not from that distance.

ATTORNEY FINK: As to the substantial nature, we are looking for a second wall sign of 25.61 sq feet. That is going to amount to the other sign to 62.48 sq feet, which would be 2.98 sq feet greater than what would be permitted. Of course, it would be a single sign; this is two signs. But what we would be permitted by the sign regulations in the town of Warwick so looking at it from the square footage, one sign to two signs is another. Does the Board view these as substantial or insubstantial requests?

MS. BRAMICH: Substantial, as far as the two signs.

MR. MALOCSAY: Substantial.

CHAIRMAN JANSEN: I don't think it makes any difference one way or the other; they are still not exceeding the total sign allowance.

ATTORNEY FINK: They are, by 2.98 sq feet.

MR. NORMAN: I think it is significant.

MR. SHUBACK: Same here.

MR. MALOCSAY: Then ask the other question.

ATTORNEY FINK: Does the Board find that two signs as opposed to one is a substantial variance?

MS. BRAMICH: Yes.

MR. MALOCSAY: Absolutely.

ATTORNEY FINK: So we have 2 yeses and 3 no's. Is this a self-created hardship?

MS. BRAMICH: Yes.

MR. MALOCSAY: Yes.

ATTORNEY FINK: Would anyone like to make a motion that this is an Unlisted Action with no adverse environmental impact?

MR. MALOCSAY: So moved.

MR. SHUBACK: I second it.

ATTORNEY FINK: Any further discussion; all in favor?

All in favor, (Five Ayes). Motion carried.

ATTORNEY FINK: Any motion to grant this variance allowing a second sign of approximately 25.61 sq feet which also results in an overage of the square footage allowed of 2.98 ft?

MR. SHUBACK: So moved.

MR. PAULSEN: I second it.

CHAIRMAN JANSEN: So moved, any further discussion? All in favor? (Three Ayes and two no's) Motion carried.

**PUBLIC HEARING OF BORIS SHTUTMAN** - for property located at 33 Lakeshore Road, Greenwood Lake, New York and designated on the Town tax map as Section 75 Block 1 Lot 25.1 and located in an SM District for a variance of Section 164.41.A.(1)(b) permitting an existing accessory structure 2.1 feet from the side line where 5 feet are required. **Continued from the 2/27/12 ZBA Meeting.**

CHAIRMAN JANSEN: I believe we had an agreement to approve this motion? The public hearing is closed so we will proceed.

MR. MALOCSAY: Point of order, did we accept the response from the County? If so, the public hearing is still open?

ATTORNEY FINK: Is this going to create an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or be a detriment to nearby properties?

MS. BRAMICH: No.

CHAIRMAN JANSEN: We didn't have the response in our files. So I will open the public hearing. Is there anyone here to address this application? If not, the public hearing is closed.

ATTORNEY FINK: Can this be achieved by any other means?

MS. BRAMICH: No.

ATTORNEY FINK: Is it a substantial variance?

MS. BRAMICH: Yes.

MR. MALOCSAY: Yes, more than 50%.

ATTORNEY FINK: Is this going to have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood?

MR. MALOCSAY: No.

ATTORNEY FINK: Is this self-created?

MS. BRAMICH: Yes; I motion this is an Unlisted Action with no environmental impact.

MR. SHUBACK:

I second it.

CHAIRMAN JANSEN:  
favor?

Any further discussion; all in

All in favor (Five Ayes) Motion carried.

MR. SHUBACK:  
variance as advertised.

I make a motion to grant this

MR. MALOCSAY:

So moved.

MS. BRAMICH:

I second it.

CHAIRMAN JANSEN:  
favor?

Any further discussion; all in

All in favor (Five Ayes) Motion carried.

**PUBLIC HEARING OF AMY PALUZZOLO** - for property located at 12 Sterling Place, Sterling Forest, New York and designated on the Town tax map as Section 76 Block 9 Lot 7 and located in an SM District for a variance of Section 164.45.1 reducing 1 side setback to 5 feet where 7 ½ feet are required and both side setbacks to 15 (+/-) feet where 16.7 feet are required for the purpose of construction of a roof over a deck/porch on a single family dwelling.  
**Continued from the 2/27/12 ZBA Meeting.**

CHAIRMAN JANSEN: The public hearing is open, is there any one here from the public to address this application? If not, public hearing is closed.

ATTORNEY FINK: Is this going to create an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or be a detriment to nearby properties?

MR. MALOCSAY: No.

ATTORNEY FINK: Can this be achieved by any other means?

MS. BRAMICH: No.

ATTORNEY FINK: Is it a substantial variance?

MS. BRAMICH: No.

ATTORNEY FINK: Is this going to have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood?

MR. MALOCSAY: No.

ATTORNEY FINK: Is this self-created?

MS. BRAMICH: Yes, I motion this is an Unlisted Action with no environmental impact.

MR. SHUBACH: I second it.

CHAIRMAN JANSEN: Any discussion, all in favor?

All in favor (Five Ayes) Motion carried.

MS. BRAMICH:  
variance as advertised.

I make a motion to grant this

MR. SHUBACK:

I second it.

CHAIRMAN JANSEN:

Any discussion, all in favor?

All in favor ( Five Ayes) Motion carried.

**PUBLIC HEARING OF STEPHANIE AND STEPHEN RAIMO** - for property located at 43 Pumpkin Hill Road, Warwick, New York and designated on the Town tax map as Section 56 Block 2 Lot 5 and located in an SL District for a variance of Section 164.40N for a proposed addition to an existing garage on a single family dwelling reducing 1 side setback from 17 feet 2 inches to 12 feet 2 inches where 35 feet are required and with a front setback of 44 feet 4 inches where 50 feet are required. **Continued from the 2/27/12 ZBA Meeting.**

ATTORNEY FINK: We received information from the County. They like this because they feel that it will provide affordable housing in an unobtrusive and low impact manner and they applaud the applicant.

CHAIRMAN JANSEN: Public hearing is now closed.

ATTORNEY FINK: Is this going to create an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or be a detriment to nearby properties?

MR. MALOCSAY: No.

ATTORNEY FINK: Can this be achieved by any other feasible method?

MR. MALOCSAY: Not really.

ATTORNEY FINK: Is it a substantial variance?

MR. MALOCSAY: Yes. One side is.

ATTORNEY FINK: Is this self-created?

MR. MALOCSAY: Yes.

MR. SHUBACK: I motion this is an Unlisted Action with no environmental impact.

MR. MALOCSAY: I second it.

CHAIRMAN JANSEN: Any further discussion; all in favor?

All in favor (Five ayes) Motion carried.

MS. BRAMICH:  
variance as advertised.

I make a motion to grant this

MR. MALOCSAY:

I second it.

CHAIRMAN JANSEN:

Any discussion; all in favor?

All in favor (Five Ayes) Motion carried.

**PUBLIC HEARING OF ALBERT & JANICE R. GENITI** - for property located at 172 Union Corners Road, Warwick, New York and designated on the Town tax map as Section 17 Block 1 Lot 21.41 and located in an RU District for an interpretation whether a helicopter landing pad on a parcel improved by a single family dwelling used to access that dwelling for approximately 40 years is a permitted accessory use and/or a legally permitted non-conforming use. **Continued from the 2/27/12 ZBA Meeting.**

CHAIRMAN JANSEN: This matter has been postponed for 2 months to the May meeting. The date is to be determined because of the holiday.

**PUBLIC HEARING OF MARY BETH & VIK STOCKMAN** – for property located at 47 Ackerman Road, Warwick, New York and designated on the Town tax map as Section 31 Block 2 Lot 124 and located in an RU District for a variance of Section 164.46N allowing attachment of an existing garage to an existing single family dwelling which garage is located 26 feet from the front line where 100 feet are required and 29 feet from the rear line where 50 feet are required.

CHAIRMAN JANSEN: We have a timely response from the County and they have no comments. Please tell us your names and a brief description of what you would like to do.

MR. AND MRS. STOCKMAN: My name is Mary Beth Stockman and my name is Vik Stockman.

MR. STOCKMAN: We have a garage and want to build a breezeway between the house and the garage. It will be in a “zig-zag” shape because it is offset. It will be about 38 feet from corner to corner on a 45 degree because the buildings are not in line with each other.

MS. BRAMICH: It actually meets at one point near a sidewalk?

MR. STOCKMAN: The sidewalk goes in between the two and the breezeway will follow the sidewalk, and then turn into the garage.

MR. MALOCSAY: I am really curious. Anytime that we have ever done anything like this with a breezeway in attaching a building, because the garage is already there, generally it is not an issue but the length of the breezeway is just unbelievable. Why do you need a breezeway 38 feet long?

MR. STOCKMAN: In the future, we want to build something in the back of the garage. The town would not let us put anything in unless the garage is attached.

MS. BRAMICH: So the breezeway is the length of the garage?

MR. STOCKMAN: No. Let me show a drawing of the garage and proposed breezeway.

There was a discussion of the garage, house and measurements of the breezeway.

MS. STOCKMAN: We need the breezeway to attach to the garage because we want to build a family recreation room in the near future on the back of the garage.

MR. MALOCSAY: Once they are attached, they are one unit. Once they are one unit, they are allowed other things in what would be the garage; for example, an apartment. So that is why I question, we have never, ever given a variance for a breezeway of 38 feet. The Board is only supposed to give the minimal needed, there has to be a reason that you need this breezeway, other than to make that part of the house to do other things with it. It's going to be an issue later on. This may lead to other people wanting breezeways to attach garages 30 or 40 feet away with the purpose of creating apartments and thus having two houses connected by this breezeway. The Board is supposed to grant only the minimal relief and in this case, I don't know if I approve.

MR. STOCKMAN: This is what Wayne Stevens suggested we do.

MR. MALOCSAY: I can talk to Wayne Stevens to find out exactly what you had planned there or you can tell us now to save some time, but if it's to build something like an apartment...

MS. STOCKMAN: It is a family/rec room in the garage.

ATTORNEY FINK: The intent to do now does not necessarily mean that you could do it another place or another time or someone else might. We could put a condition on it if you are so inclined.

MR. MALOCSAY: I seriously have a problem with a 38 foot breezeway.

MS. BRAMICH: So you are going to take the garage and eventually make it into part of the house as a rec room and it won't be a garage anymore.

MR. STOCKMAN: The garage stays; the rec room will be on the backside.

MS. BRAMICH: So you are going to add on to the garage.

MR. STOCKMAN: garage is a split and a half. No, it is already there; the

MS. STOCKMAN: is a family/rec room and Mr. Stevens said for it to be allowed we have to attach it to the house. Its 24 foot and the back half

MR. MALOCSAY: MR. STOCKMAN: going to be constructed it is going to look good. Yes. So the way the breezeway is

MS. BRAMICH: of the garage being used for now? What is that part of the back

MR. STOCKMAN: this is something we want to do. There is nothing there now,

MR. SHUBACK: quarters or bedrooms? There won't be any sleeping

MS. STOCKMAN: No.

CHAIRMAN JANSEN: this further. I think we have to look into

ATTORNEY FINK: drawing of what the breezeway will look like? Do you have any rendering or

MR. STOCKMAN: Mr. Stevens advised us to come here first, before we spent money on any drawings. We didn't go that far because

MS. STOCKMAN: is acceptable? Is there a way to design that

CHAIRMAN JANSEN: fact that it is such a distance away to attach. I think we have to do due diligence and look at this issue. That is not the problem; the

MR. STOCKMAN: allowed? What is the distance that is

CHAIRMAN JANSEN: There is no set distance. The thing is, if we grant you a variance to do this and you sell your house three years from now and now there is an attached unit. It could be turned into an apartment.

MS. STOCKMAN: It will become part of the main house when attached.

CHAIRMAN JANSEN: We would like to do some research on this application.

MR. STOCKMAN: So there is no distance restriction? It could be 300 feet technically?

CHAIRMAN JANSEN: Yes.

MR. STOCKMAN: So what is the reason now that it can not be 38 feet?

MR. MALOCSAY: If you use that logic on that size, I see that we will be flooded with applications for people attaching their garages to their houses and then converting the garages into something other than garages which was allowed to have those set-back requirements. So how do we say no to them that request half the distance that you are? We even have an issue with some of them that are 8 and 10 feet away and attaching them and then needing front and side yard set-backs. So with most garages, they are allowed to be 5 or more than 5 feet from a property line.

MR. STOCKMAN: So just in case this application gets turned down, we own the property next to this. We have more than a 50 foot set-back, we could swing this road over 50 feet back in again so that this stands by itself.

MR. MALOCSAY: Then it would be up to the Building Inspector and you wouldn't need any variance.

MS. STOCKMAN: Then where does the 100 feet come in?

ATTORNEY FINK: From the front of the building, it needs to be 100 feet.

CHAIRMAN JANSEN: You are saying that this is a town road? It is not, it is a private road; it is a driveway.

MR. MALOCSAY: But the thing you have on Ackerman Road, is many of the houses, including your own house, sit within 50 feet and that so really isn't an issue before us because it is the character of the neighborhood. Show us one house that has a breezeway of 38 feet.

CHAIRMAN JANSEN: The issue is if it is in the character of the neighborhood to have that much of a breezeway.

MS. STOCKMAN: But if we are within the setbacks, if we make a change; then it's not an issue.

MR. MALOCSAY: It's not an issue, you would go before the Building Inspector and he would probably give you permit. It seems you have a lot line change, but a lot of times they have an easement going through the property to get to the back as opposed to people having road frontage. In that case, your property line would be to the right of way of the town. You would have an easement instead of a lot line.

MR. STOCKMAN: We don't go anywhere near the Town property.

MR. MALOCSAY: Talk to the Building Inspector first because, if that were the case, and you didn't need variances, I would question if he would give a breezeway 38 feet long.

MR. STOCKMAN: So apparently, the Zoning Board isn't going to do it.

MR. MALOCSAY: I am only speaking for myself; I don't know what the rest of the Board will do.

MR. STOCKMAN: When will we know that?

CHAIRMAN JANSEN: At our next meeting, next month.

MR. STOCKMAN: I will come back again.

Variance was continued until the April meeting.

**PUBLIC HEARING OF DONALD FISK** – for property located at [61 Shore Avenue, Warwick, New York](#) and designated on the Town tax map as Section 77 Block 1 Lot 23 and located in an SM District for a variance of Section 164.40N reducing front setback from 15 feet to 11 feet where 30 feet are required for the purpose of expansion of an existing single family dwelling, or, in the alternative, for a variance of Section 164.53B.(12) extending a variance for the relief requested granted on 3/22/10.

DONALD FISK: My name is Donald Fisk.

ATTORNEY FINK: Before we begin, the County did respond and they do not have any comments.

MR. MALOCSAY: We have usually extended variances in the past and we have to note if there has been any substantial changes. We can save a lot of time here by answering that question first. The way it is worded, it sounded like there was going to be a change to the original variance.

MR. FISK: There isn't. We were told we need to do a full application.

MR. MALOCSAY: Yes, you do have to do a full one.

ATTORNEY FINK: It's the same relief as was granted before, but there were some people here before that had quite a bit to say about it. They may be here again. You may want to answer Mr. Malocsay's question about any changes.

MR. FISK: No.

MR. MALOCSAY: It's been only 2 years so there have not been any changes in the zoning laws.

MR. PIERCE: Since we last appeared before you and got the variance, we went through the process with the Planning Board with the Health Department and all those approvals are in place for Mr. Fisk to start construction and he has been hoping to do that. But because there is a culvert on Shore Avenue that was damaged during the storms, heavy trucks, like concrete trucks, were not allowed to travel on it and in the meantime the variance expired.

CHAIRMAN JANSEN: So we are not asking for anything new or different.

MR. MALOCSAY: Let's see if there is anyone here from the public that has something to say.

CHAIRMAN JANSEN: Is anyone here from the public to address this application? There are none.

JANE PIERCE: My name is Jane Pierce. I think the objectors that were here at that time; we have communicated with them and she said to me that if you need me to write something to any of the Board regarding the permit, she would.

CHAIRMAN JANSEN: So the motion should be to extend the variance. The public hearing is closed.

ATTORNEY FINK: Is this going to create an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood?

MR. MALOCSAY: These questions are all related to the extension of the variance not the original variance.

ATTORNEY FINK: The original variance is the variance that is before you. You are continuing the original variance.

MR. MALOCSAY: Because if we start answering those questions that way, someone will have to refresh my memory on the whole application.

ATTORNEY FINK: Asks that the application be reopened and that the applicant explain any environmental effects or impacts or lack thereof.

MR. GOETZ: My name is David Goetz. The expansion of the house is toward Shore Avenue because it works best in the small lot, it is a crowded lot; but the Planning Board and other agencies, such as the Health Department, were concerned that we didn't have impacts on the lake that is right on the edge of the property. There is really only one direction to expand and that is towards Shore Avenue.

ATTORNEY FINK: Is this going to create an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood?

MS. BRAMICH: No, motion this is an Unlisted Action with no environmental impact.

MR. SHUBACK: I second it.

CHAIRMAN JANSEN:

Any discussion; all in favor?

All in favor (Five Ayes) Motion carried.

MR. MALOCSAY:

extension of the original variance for two years based on a finding that there has been no change in circumstances.

I make a motion to grant this

MS. BRAMICH:

I second it.

CHAIRMAN JANSEN:  
favor?

Any further discussion, all in

All in favor (Five Ayes) Motion carried.

**PUBLIC HEARING OF MAURICE SCAVULLO** - for property located at 60 Union Corners Road, Warwick, New York and designated on the Town tax map as Section 29 Block 9 Lot 16 and located in an RU District for a variance of Section 164.46J.(16) & (101) permitting up to 4 medium livestock animals to be housed 80(+/-) feet from a lot line where 150 feet are required and to be penned in area less than 1 acre 5 (+/-) feet from the lot line where 50 feet are required and for storage of manure less than 150 feet from any lot line where 150 feet are required.

CHAIRMAN JANSEN: Please identify yourself for the minutes.

MS. SCAVULLO: My name is Lynn Scavullo.

MR. SCAVULLO: My name is Maurice Scavullo.

CHAIRMAN JANSEN: Before we begin, the County has responded "No comments". Briefly tell us what you are trying to do.

MR. SCAVULLO: We built a barn on the property not knowing it was a 150 foot set-back for animals, so the barn was built on a set-back of about 80 feet. We penned in an area of about ¼ acre for two little donkeys and since then we extended the pen to be over an acre. They are our pets.

CHAIRMAN JANSEN: Is anyone here from the public to address this application? No one? I won't close it yet.

There was a discussion of the variance: Section 164.46J.(16) & (101) regarding acreage and size of paddocks and number of animals that could be present.

MR. MALOCSAY: On the first issue, I don't think you need a variance. Anything over an acre in size can be on the lot line. I see you built the barn with 4 stalls, with the intent of owning livestock, the correct way. On the second issue, I don't see how we can issue a variance for the storage of manure but I see you have more than enough property to move the storage of manure to another location.

CHAIRMAN JANSEN: The consensus of the board is that there is sufficient acreage to house two animals. They are allowed up to four animals. The variances we need to address are the distance of the barn and the storage of manure.

MR. SCAVULLO: We are planning on housing one more horse, and maybe one pony, going forward.

MR. MALOCSAY: I propose leaving the barn as is for four animals. In the future, if they want to own more animals, the barn would have to be moved.

MR. SCAVULLO: I would be agreeable to this.

ATTORNEY FINK: First, we will address the distance of the barn? Is this going to create an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or be a detriment to nearby properties?

MS. BRAMICH: No.

ATTORNEY FINK: And the storage of manure?

MR. MALOCSAY: Yes.

MR. CALLARI: My name is Damien Callari and I live right next door. The way the wind blows, the smell of manure never reaches my house. I have never smelled it.

CHAIRMAN JANSEN: Does this present a hardship for you to store the manure at 150 feet?

MR. SCAVULLO: I am going to fence in a pit to provide an area for a container, very close to 150 feet, for the manure to be stored and picked up monthly by a service called "Sweet Pea".

ATTORNEY FINK: Will the manure storage be a detriment if it is stored as the owner states?

MS. BRAMICH: No.

ATTORNEY FINK: The location of the barn, can this be achieved by any other means?

MS. BRAMICH: No, it is already there.

ATTORNEY FINK: The manure storage?

MR. MALOCSAY: Yes, it can be moved 150 feet away.

ATTORNEY FINK: Is the barn a substantial variance?

MR. MALOCSAY: Yes.

ATTORNEY FINK: And the manure storage?

MS. BRAMICH: Yes.

ATTORNEY FINK: Is the barn going to have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood?

MR. MALOCSAY: No.

ATTORNEY FINK: And the manure storage?

MS. BRAMICH: No.

ATTORNEY FINK: As for the barn, is this self-created?

MR. MALOCSAY: There may have been a mistake in granting him the permit for the four stall barn; but that not on their part, so no.

ATTORNEY FINK: And as to the manure?

MR. MALOCSAY: Yes. As regards the barn, I motion this is an Unlisted Action with no adverse environmental impact.

MR. SHUBACK: I second it.

CHAIRMAN JANSEN: Any further discussion; all in favor?

All in favor (Five Ayes) Motion carried.

MS. BRAMICH: As regards the barn, I motion to grant this variance as advertised.

MR. MALOSDAY: I second it.

CHAIRMAN JANSEN: Any discussion; all in favor?  
All in favor (Five Ayes) Motion carried.

MR. MALOCSAY: As regards the storage of manure, I motion this is an Unlisted Action with no environmental impact.

MS. BRAMICH: I second it.

CHAIRMAN JANSEN: Any discussion, all in favor?  
All in favor (Five Ayes) Motion carried.

MS. BRAMICH: I make a motion to grant this variance as advertised.

CHAIRMAN JANSEN: Any second? All in favor?  
Any discussion?

There were some questions among the Board members as to exactly what they were voting on. There was a discussion as the amount of feet required for the manure storage.

ATTORNEY FINK: If you disapprove the variance of 150 feet; we can amend it to change the footage required.

MS. BRAMICH: I want to rescind my motion.

ATTORNEY FINK: Let's make a new motion of granting this variance with the manure being kept not less than 100 feet.

MS. BRAMICH: I make this motion.

MR. MALOCSAY: I second it.

CHAIRMAN JANSEN: Any discussion; all in favor?  
All in favor ( Five Ayes) Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned.  
Pamela J. Carroll ZBA Recording Secretary