

**VILLAGE OF HASTINGS-ON-HUDSON, NEW YORK
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
REGULAR MEETING
JUNE 23, 2011**

A Regular Meeting was held by the Zoning Board of Appeals on Thursday, June 23, 2011 at 8:00 p.m. in the Meeting Room, Municipal Building, 7 Maple Avenue.

PRESENT: Chairman Brian Murphy, Boardmember Marc Leaf, Boardmember Matthew Collins, Boardmember David Forbes-Watkins, Boardmember Mark Pennington Village Attorney Marianne Stecich, and Building Inspector Deven Sharma

CITIZENS: Unknown

Chairman Murphy: Good evening, everyone. We're here for a June 23, 2011 Hastings Zoning Board of Appeals meeting.

We have four cases on our agenda, two from last time. The first case we'll hear is the application of Amishi Shah and Josh Lasser, 17 Rosedale for a two-story addition. Second case will be 81 Rosedale, the application of Robert Wilt for the construction of a new garage.

Third case will be the application of St. Matthews Evangelical Lutheran Church, 7 Farragut Avenue for construction of an ADA-compliant ramp. And finally, our last case will be the application of Ms. Raad, 770 North Broadway for construction of a sunroom. And that's view preservation approval only.

Mr. Sharma, are the mailings in order?

Building Inspector Sharma: Yes, all the mailings. I have been told they are in order.

Chairman Murphy: OK. And all the Boardmembers have gotten the meeting minutes from the last meeting and we've had a chance to review them, at least for our first two cases.

I. OLD BUSINESS – (Adjourned from Previous Meeting)

**Case No. 8-11
Amishi Shah & Josh Lasser
17 Rosedale Avenue
For a proposed two-story addition
(Adjourned from 5/26/11 meeting)**

1. Driveway Entrance Grades:

Proposed – 6% to 15%; Required Maximum – 3% within 20 feet of the front property line, {Section 295-40.A.(2)}

2. Rear Yard: Existing – 11foot 11 inches

**Proposed for the Addition – 17 feet 5 inches
Required Minimum – 30 ft. or 30% of the lot depth
{Section 295-68.F.(1)(b)}**

Mr. Weinstein, I know you've submitted the elevations and new plans that we had requested. Mr. Dovell unfortunately cannot be with us tonight, and I had expected him to ask you about them. But why don't you tell me a little bit about what you've done.

Edward Weinstein, architect for applicant: Actually, there are two things that we're coming back with. Number one, we're confirming our commitment to remove the garage as a condition, which was suggested by the Board at the last meeting. And we've prepared four elevations to give you a sense of what the house ... the existing house is being renovated, and the addition is being added to the north.

You can see we've got traditional features. It's going to have siding and dormers and shutters. We think it'll be an asset to the neighborhood, and it will certainly be consistent with the scale and character of the neighborhood. And I think those were the questions that the Board had.

Other than that, we have the request for the two variances, one being the rear yard and the other is the driveway slopes.

Chairman Murphy: OK. I also know, just in reviewing the minutes, a couple of things. One of the conditions – also at least I think the condition should be – we're going to remove that driveway on that same yard.

Mr. Weinstein: Correct.

Chairman Murphy: Keep it impervious, or planted, condition – given the fact that you're maximizing the permitted coverage.

Mr. Weinstein: That will be, yes, permeable surface.

Chairman Murphy: Right. And then the tree. Mark, I don't know if you had anything more to say on that. I just wanted to give you one last chance. I mean, I think we all had a chance to go back and look at it. I think we know the situation.

Boardmember Pennington: We did have some discussion about whether the variance requested touched the tree. I went to the property this evening and looked at it, and I think it's a safe conclusion with respect to setback. But as you think about the driveway and the grade, that last 10 feet going down is going to get into the root system of the tree and potentially even the initial 10 feet from the curb in.

So it seems to me there is some impact of this plan on the tree, and whether the tree would survive the work that was done, or not.

Mr. Weinstein: Just to clear that up, it was always our intention to remove the tree. In fact, the trunk of the tree – the center of that trunk – sits smack-dab in the middle of the addition, and right at the 30-foot ... it's set back 30 feet from the property line.

So not only would it be impossible to do this addition without removing that tree, it would be virtually impossible to do any addition without removing the tree.

Boardmember Pennington: That's all been discussed and established. This is what I would propose: that as a condition for the variances, the requirement for permeable surfaces also include a requirement for planting of small shrubbery or trees to mitigate the effect of the façade. Because it's an enormous loss to this neighborhood, that tree. It may not be in good condition, it may be a hazard to the house. But I think the plan does have some impact on the tree, and requiring some kind of planting would be a proportionate mitigation.

Chairman Murphy: Makes sense to me. Mr. Weinstein, any reaction to that?

Mr. Weinstein: I have to consult with my clients. And they have nodded to me they agree that they will agree to a reasonable amount of planting. I don't know what specifically you had in mind, but they will agree to put in planting in that area. I think they'd probably want to do that anyway.

Boardmember Pennington: You know, I don't want to dictate. But I was thinking not just grass; you know, shrubbery, small trees.

Mr. Weinstein: No, I understand. Shrubs and probably specimen trees.

Boardmember Pennington: Right. To soften, and to make up for the missing tree.

Chairman Murphy: Yes, I think that makes sense.

Mr. Weinstein: That's fine.

Chairman Murphy: And Mark, when you make the motion, if you want to phrase it with those conditions that would make sense, assuming there's no other objections or comments from the Board.

Boardmember Collins: I would not want that requirement to be put on the approval. I don't think that it ... first of all, I think that the idea of mitigating the loss of the tree with some shrubbery, given *that* tree, we're talking about a fairly significant loss of the tree. And I don't know that planting a few shrubs is going to make up for what's taken down.

And furthermore, I don't think it should be imposed upon the property owners to put up a tree or any shrubbery in its place unless it fits what they want to get done aesthetically.

Chairman Murphy: Anyone else?

Boardmember Leaf: I guess I come around to thinking that the variances that are before us specifically don't have anything to do with the tree. I think that it would be great if we had a more robust tree ordinance that could protect trees like that. But we don't, so I don't think there's anything for the Zoning Board to do regarding the tree. And it's not a very significant variance that's being requested. It seems pretty minor, given the circumstances.

But I do think it's worthwhile pointing out that the existing house is one of the very few number of modest homes that are available in our community. We're getting rid of a modest home, and putting up a very large, big home. We've had other issues in front of this board regarding the accommodations that we want to make to encourage fair and affordable housing as required by the mandates at the state and county and federal level.

I just think it's worth pointing out that we are reducing the stock of affordable housing here by allowing this change. Now, I think, given the precedents for this board, given the way we operate, I don't think that we can all of a sudden impose that upon you to deny the variance on the grounds that it's taking affordable housing out of the system.

But I just think it's worthwhile mentioning it because in the future it may be appropriate to think about whether a change that is being requested in existing housing is appropriate if it reduces the stock of affordable housing and puts up housing which is never going to be affordable for anybody else afterwards.

Chairman Murphy: Well, there are other ways to solve that problem, and we're going to be asked to help solve them in the near future.

Boardmember Leaf: That's right.

Chairman Murphy: So look, I hear what you're saying. But the reality is, in this particular lot configuration the variances they're actually requesting and needing are fairly minor.

Boardmember Leaf: No, I was indulging myself with a little bit of speechifying. But I just wanted to put it out there.

Chairman Murphy: OK.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: I'm deeply disturbed by this. Of course, there is no basis for me, as a Zoning Board member, to vote no on this. I will be voting yes, but with great reluctance.

I think that people have come into the community – are coming into the community – taking a small house, making it a McMansion, destroying a gorgeous old tree. And I think it's truly within legal rights, but it ain't right. And that's all I have to say.

Chairman Murphy: All right. Any other comments? Mark, I'll give you a moment to think about the conditions. I just don't know whether you want to put that last one on there or not. It's up to you. I think it's fine. We've done it before. I think it's actually a reasonable idea under the circumstances.

Boardmember Pennington: We can put it up for a vote, and if it's defeated then that's fine.

Chairman Murphy: We'll just restate it. OK. Any more comments from the audience before we put this to a vote?

David Dosin, 15 Rosedale Avenue: I live right across from the house. I just wanted to say a few things, if I may.

First of all, I think it's important. Although I do agree with the affordable housing and everything, these people ... you always read now, with the economic environment that we live in, that people are moving away from Hastings and leaving Hastings. Here we have two young, born-and-raised Hastings people wanting to stay in our community. So I think that's very important, too.

We have no objections to the addition. And as for the tree, I've been after Mr. Newell, the previous owner, to try and prune that tree. I mean, trees are great, trees are beautiful. But I think that they have to be taken care of; kept in check, and pruned. This particular tree that we're talking about – and I am no tree expert – but as a police officer here in the Village I have seen what destruction trees can do.

This tree is very large. The trunk looks like it's starting to rot. It's right over their house, and it's starting to go into my yard. We've had limbs fall on our cars from that tree during storms. But Mr. [Newell] XXX would never, you know, prune it or anything. That's why the tree got like it is today.

It is a beautiful, gorgeous tree. But again, it is starting to get sick. And from my standpoint, I think it poses a big, big danger to the community where we live. Because if it's going to go, it's going to take out his house, it's going to take out part of my house. Or it's going to go the other way and take down the wires and everything else, and go across the road which could cause a lot of other problems.

But that's all I have. I appreciate your time.

Chairman Murphy: OK, thank you. Appreciate it. Anyone else on this application?

Building Inspector Sharma: Mr. Chairman, there was a letter from Raf Zaratzian supporting the application. I left some material off earlier today.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: We received it.

Chairman Murphy: Was that on the ...

Village Attorney Stecich: It's on this thing. It looks like it's a piece of the agenda. It looks like an agenda item.

Building Inspector Sharma: Here we go.

Village Attorney Stecich: It looks like this. It looks like it's an agenda, but it's a letter.

Chairman Murphy: OK. It looks like it's actually an e-mail from Raf, dated yesterday, in support of the application. So noted, thank you.

OK, I guess we're ready for a motion, take a vote?

On MOTION of Boardmember Pennington, SECONDED by Boardmember Forbes-Watkins with a voice vote of (4-1 – Collins against] XXX, the Board resolved [that Case No. 8-11 for variance from the setback and driveway slope requirements be granted, with three conditions: the removal of the existing garage, the removal of the existing driveway to become a permeable rather than an impermeable surface and I would add also a requirement for planting of a small number of small trees as a third condition] XXX.

Building Inspector Sharma: Would we leave it up to the architect or the property owners to decide what they would replace it with?

Chairman Murphy: Yes.

So it's approved 4-to-1. OK? Good luck with it. Thank you.

Village Attorney Stecich: I don't need these drawings. Maybe you can use them.

Building Inspector Sharma: Did we approve all the variances?

Chairman Murphy: Yes.

Boardmember Collins: I just want to make it clear that my voting of no is based not on the variances requested, but on the conditions.

Chairman Murphy: Yes. Understood, and so noted.

Case No. 9-11

Robert Wilt

81 Rosedale Avenue

**For the construction of a new garage to replace an existing but currently demolished,
non-conforming garage**

(Adjourned from 5/26/11 meeting)

1. Rear Yard for Accessory Structures

Existing for the Old Demolished Garage 4 feet 10 inches to 5 feet 7 inches

Proposed for the New Garage – 6.5 feet

Required Minimum – 8 feet {Section 295-69.F.(1)(b)}

2. Side Yard for Accessory Structure

Existing for the Old Demolished Garage – 4 feet 10 inches to 5 feet 7 inches

Proposed for the New Garage – 5 feet 9 inches

Required Minimum – 8 feet {Section 295-69.F.(1)(c)}

Chairman Murphy: Our next application, Mr. Wilt or his representative. Just identify yourself, thanks.

Edward Mitchell, attorney – Nobile, Magarian & DiSalvo: I'm here on behalf of Robert and Debra Wilt, who are here also, as is their architect, Douglas Alligood.

This application concerns a new garage in the back corner of their property. A garage has existed in this corner probably for the last 80 years. And originally it was the Wilts' intention to preserve and restore the existing structure. Unfortunately, when they began that process it literally collapsed. And the contractor then went ahead and poured footings and new walls for a new structure before it was realized that a variance was needed. So that's why we're here.

The old structure was obviously nonconforming, but the difference between the new structure and the old structure is that the new structure is actually smaller than the old one. And it's also slightly further from the rear and side yards than the preexisting structure was. It's obviously safer, and it's, we feel, more aesthetically pleasing than the old dilapidated structure.

The similarities are that it is the same design, roughly, as the old structure, and it fits in with the character of the other garages in the area. It's also no higher than the old structure was.

Chairman Murphy: Let me just stop you there for a moment, Mr. Mitchell. Mr. Sharma and I had a conversation today about the height, and I asked Mr. Sharma to take a look at the poured wall and just measure it for us so that we have an actual measurement of the height.

And Mr. Sharma, could you just tell us how high the existing poured wall is for that garage structure.

Building Inspector Sharma: So we measured the height of the wall at its highest point. But on the two sides it was 14 feet or a little bit less depending. It was difficult to determine what the finished grade is eventually going to be because of the excavation and dirt all around it.

But our thinking was, it's going to be 13 feet 10-1/2 inches, or 14 feet – the maximum – depending on where the grade ends up being finished.

Chairman Murphy: OK. Thank you, Mr. Sharma.

Mr. Mitchell, go ahead.

Mr. Mitchell: Thank you. Well, putting aside the height issue, the requested variance obviously is not substantial. It's an 8-foot setback, and to the side yard the survey shows that it's 6 feet 5 inches, and to the rear yard it's 5 feet 9 inches. So it's a relatively minor variance that they're seeking.

Also, if you look at the survey – which I believe everyone has a copy of ...

Chairman Murphy: Do we have the actual original, sealed survey that we asked for?

Village Attorney Stecich: Deven was going to bring those tonight.

Building Inspector Sharma: I do.

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Mitchell, there was an issue raised by the neighbors last time over where the line actually is. And so we did have a copy of a survey, but it wasn't certified so we asked for the actual ...

Village Attorney Stecich: Well, no. Actually we didn't have the survey. What we had was the architect's reproduction of the survey.

Chairman Murphy: Yes, yes.

Village Attorney Stecich: But, no, no. We got the survey. They were in our packet. We got the survey. The one we had wasn't certified. They provided two certified ones, which Deven says he has. But it's exactly the same as the survey that came in our packet. It's this one. It's the survey by ...

Mr. Mitchell: Kulhanek and Plan.

Village Attorney Stecich: It's that one, yes.

Chairman Murphy: OK, got it.

Mr. Mitchell: The side yard is 6-1/2 feet, although if you look at it visually it may appear less than that because the [Objectins] XXX had installed a wall last year which actually encroaches onto the Wilt's property by approximately a foot-and-a-half. So the difference between the garage structure and the fence is slightly less than 6-1/2 feet, but that's attributable to the encroachment which was just recently put in.

Chairman Murphy: Say that again?

Mr. Mitchell: The fence shown along the north property line ..

Chairman Murphy: You mean the wooden fence, the neighbor's fence?

Mr. Mitchell: Yes. That's the neighbor's fence, and it encroaches onto the Wilt's property a foot to a foot-and-a-half. So that would make the distance between the garage and the boundary line appear less because of the encroaching fence.

Chairman Murphy: So what you're telling me is, based on the certified survey, the neighbor actually built their fence on his property?

Mr. Mitchell: Yes.

Chairman Murphy: OK.

Mr. Mitchell: As far as I know, the neighbor has not presented any survey which contradicts the Kulhanek and Plan survey map.

Chairman Murphy: OK.

Mr. Mitchell: They maybe had indicated that they were going to, but they have not.

Chairman Murphy: We haven't received one – right, Mr. Sharma? – from Mr. [Considine] XXX, or ...

Building Inspector Sharma: No, we have not. No.

Mr. Mitchell: So in addition to being not substantial, we think that it's in conformance with the other garages in the neighborhood. In fact, probably all the garages on this block are nonconforming. They're all built before the current zoning restrictions. So it's not out of character.

And it's not a self-created situation in that it's existed here for 80 years. And if the old structure hadn't fallen apart we wouldn't be here tonight. Unfortunately, it didn't make it. And through no fault of their own, they're obligated, or forced, to build this new structure. It would be a great inconvenience, though, to have to move it after the foundation walls have been poured.

Chairman Murphy: No, I understand. I mean, the beef was they poured the foundation and the footings without asking for permission.

Mr. Mitchell: Right.

Chairman Murphy: That's never a good strategy, but it happens. I understand, I understand. I went and I looked at it myself today. So the fact is, it's set back far enough off the street it's actually hard to see it because about two-thirds of it is behind the house.

Mr. Mitchell: Right.

Chairman Murphy: OK.

Mr. Mitchell: Let me ... is there anything further? No, we have nothing further, then.

Chairman Murphy: All right, thank you.

Mr. Mitchell: Thank you.

Chairman Murphy: Any questions from other Boardmembers? No?

All right. Are the neighbors here, or is there anyone who wishes to speak on this application?

Patricia [Urban] XXX, 76 Rosedale Avenue: I'm across the street. I just want to say that the preexisting structure was very dangerous. And she has three little children, and friends over, and it was just a very dangerous structure for those kids to be playing in. And that's all.

Chairman Murphy: OK, thank you.

Ms. [Urban] XXX: You're welcome.

Chairman Murphy: No, we saw the photos of what it looked like before. I mean, we had a full discussion last time. This one seems pretty straightforward to me. It's correcting a very

Chairman Murphy: That's right.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: OK, I will accept those as a friendly amendment.

Boardmember Leaf: Thank you, David.

Chairman Murphy: That vote's unanimous. It's approved. Mr. Mitchell, thank you.

Case No. 11-11
St. Matthew's Evangelical Lutheran Church
7 Farragut Avenue
For the construction of an ADA Compliant Ramp at the Fellowship Hall

Variance is sought for the side setback for the Ramp
Required Minimum – 8 feet; Proposed – Zero feet

Village Attorney Stecich: Oh, Mr. Murphy, on the next certifications I have a memo from the Planning Board just with recommendations.

Chairman Murphy: OK, sure.

Boardmember Leaf: View preservation, Marianne?

Village Attorney Stecich: One was view preservation. And on St. Matthews, besides recommending view preservation approval it also recommended ... I just wanted to let you know that they granted site plan approval for the ramp.

Boardmember Leaf: So is St. Matthews in the view preservation district? Because in their application they didn't ask for view preservation approval. But I wondered – it's on the other side of a ...

Village Attorney Stecich: You know what?

Eva Klein Bouhassira, architect for applicant: Good evening.

Village Attorney Stecich: You know what? I might have had it ... was St. Matthews in ... did it have ... no, OK. Then that's my mistake. You know what it was? They granted site plan approval and recommended that you grant the variance.

Boardmember Leaf: Very good.

Village Attorney Stecich: I'm sorry.

Chairman Murphy: OK. So we'll take up our next case, the application for St. Matthews Evangelical Lutheran Church.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: Good evening.

Chairman Murphy: Please just identify yourself. Thanks.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: Suddenly it feels really lonely here.

Chairman Murphy: It emptied out quickly after that last one.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: I'm the architect for the applicant, St. Matthews Lutheran Evangelical Church, 7 Farragut Avenue.

And yes, we just went to the Planning Board last Thursday and we were granted the site approval. We also got a recommendation to the Zoning Board in support of the application. There was the question of the view preservation raised, but it is on the other side of Farragut. It's past the Aqueduct and Broadway, so it is not in the view preservation. And the Inspector and I checked, so I'm quite certain.

Chairman Murphy: OK, thank you.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: I'm sure everybody's familiar with the property. There's several pictures which I submitted, but we know where the church is.

The church owned the entire property. Just a few short years ago, in about 2007, the property had undergone a subdivision. Originally, the property had the chapel, which is the first building going from the north, from the intersection. Then it has what is called a fellowship hall, which is the flat-roofed two-story building in the rear. And then it had the parsonage – which is the nice old house – which has been subdivided and sold off.

On this survey, you still see both of the properties. During the subdivision, this property line, which is now the line which determines the side setback for the fellowship hall. So the application has to do with the hall. This is a building which is a split-level building. Coming from the parking lot, half a level is the upper level, the other half is the lower level.

The lower level is in use by the [co-op nursing school] XXX. And, in fact, there is access from the rear yard directly into the classrooms. There is no elevator or ramp that brings you to the upper floor. And coming from the front door, you have to take half a flight of steps to get upstairs.

The upstairs is a space which is primarily used by the church. However, they use it not only for their own meetings, but also they are used by community groups for classes, events, meetings, a number of gatherings. The hall can be ...

Chairman Murphy: So the access to the upper floor is for public, bigger meetings?

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: Yes.

Chairman Murphy: It's not private office space or anything like that?

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: There is the church office space. There's also a kitchen and a restroom. But in fact, the space is designated for about 200 occupants as a public space. It basically is a large room which has flexible furnishings, and there can be large groups of people that come there. You know, it's used for different purposes, and they would like to increase the accessibility.

Right now, there is the interior staircase, which I mentioned, and then there's the exterior egress staircase on the right which is a steel stairway which is shown on the pictures. There is just no other way to get there. So now the church considered what would happen if they would install any sort of equipment such as an elevator or something. It is all very costly, plus there's the cost of maintaining equipment like that over time which is also considerable.

They would like to, instead, put in a permanent ramp which would comply with ADA requirements. This makes for a rather long ramp because the height to get from the parking level – which actually does have a designated ADA spot – to the hall level is 5 feet. In other words, it's about 60 inches. So this is 60 feet of a ramp, plus the landings. The question is, where would we place a ramp like that.

On the front of the building there are a number of obstacles. There is an oil tank, there are window wells, there are plantings, and the parking spaces themselves which they don't want

to lose. Because the parking also already has a bit of an odd layout, where there are two rows of cars parking behind each other. So there's a shortage of parking as it is.

As it happens, to the north – where not only the stairway is located already, which is the first determinant – also the door is there that leads into the hall, which will stay there. This is where we're proposing to install the new ramp. When the property was subdivided, the setback which was established was 8 feet 2 or 3 inches, which was really done in mind with the standard side setback. At that point, the thinking wasn't forward enough to say, well, what if we would like to build something on this side. We will have no space other than the setback itself to do that.

Chairman Murphy: The only issue for me is, do you know ... where the ramp is being proposed ...

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: Yes.

Chairman Murphy: ...there's really nothing next to it now back there, right? It's behind the house.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: It's behind the house. The house has a play space and a grass area in the rear. They put up a fence which kind of goes partway along the building. If you look at the picture, you can sort of see it there. Then there is nothing in that space. They use it for a trash receptacle, but that's very ad hoc. They're really not supposed to be there because they have bins for trash which they built on the other side of the building already.

Chairman Murphy: But is it buildable back there?

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: Yes. Yes, it serves no other purpose. I don't know if you can see there. I could possibly open up my computer and give you a full-color picture.

Chairman Murphy: No, I can see.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: There is no other purpose for this space. In fact, it's not even really used for travel in the backyard to the parking lot at all.

Chairman Murphy: But my question is ... yeah, go ahead, David.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: The three-story frame building is owned by the church?

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: Not anymore.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: It is a private home?

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: It was sold off to a private owner, and it is now a one-family residence. It's now a private home, yes.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: OK. So what comments have we heard from the owners of this property with respect to the ramp?

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: To the ramp, OK. All the notices were mailed to the owners within 300 feet. But, in fact, we hand delivered this one particular notice to the owner. The family knows the church, the boardmembers communicated with them when they purchased the property. One of the boardmembers and myself talked to the family, and explained it to them.

I actually left a set of plans with them to show them exactly what the intent was. They do not have any objections. They did not voice any objections to anybody, they did not come to this meeting. They do not feel they would be affected by a ramp.

Chairman Murphy: And what's the highest point that the ramp would be, then, off the ground? About 5 feet?

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: About 5 feet, yes.

Chairman Murphy: And that fence is about the same, I guess.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: The fence is about 6 feet or so, yes.

Chairman Murphy: My other question was, the way it was subdivided, is that space that's part of the private home now? Is that their backyard basically?

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: It is their backyard, yes.

Chairman Murphy: But it's not otherwise buildable. You can't build another ...

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: The subdivision. Does that include that entire angled area with a driveway and remains of a frame garage and a frame barn?

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: In the rear, yes.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: They all belong to the owner of the three-story frame building?

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: They do.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: That would appear to be buildable to me.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: It is not. In fact, the church looked into that when they were doing the subdivision because they were hoping to have another lot there. But it would have been a flag lot, and there was no access to it from the street.

I don't remember the details, but I know it has been discussed. And at the end, they decided that the third lot was not possible. It was then just included as part of the parsonage lot.

Village Attorney Stecich: I think they're asking a different question. Not whether it could be a separate lot, but whether this three-story frame building could expand back there.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: Well, it's a very large lot so I don't quite ...

Village Attorney Stecich: So it is buildable.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: It could be either, is the question.

Village Attorney Stecich: They're right. It couldn't be a separate lot.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: It could not be a separate lot.

Village Attorney Stecich: This would be a flag lot; you know, not without a lot of variances.

Chairman Murphy: Yes.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: Yes, I think there was some discussion in the neighborhood, and there were some other neighbors who attempted something that would have been a flag lot. That did not go through, and at the end everybody closed the issue and said this will never be a lot.

So that is not going to happen. Then this is a single-family house, and I don't know what else they would possibly want to build back there. It's just a really large, beautiful backyard. They don't seem to think that whatever the ramp would do would interfere with any of their

current or future plans for their property. Because, in fact, they do have a plethora of open space and they feel that this is not something that would affect them.

Chairman Murphy: But what changes it a little bit is the subdivision. That's what we're just trying to understand.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: Right.

Chairman Murphy: What the limits are. Because lot number two on your plan, there's a common driveway, right, that serves lot one and lot two?

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: The church and the fellowship hall.

Chairman Murphy: On the macadam driveway.

Boardmember Pennington: To the south side of the house.

Chairman Murphy: Serves the house and lot one, yes, and it goes all the way back into what's marked as lot two, yes?

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: This is one lot at this point as far as I understand.

Village Attorney Stecich: Eva, what zone district is this? Do you know?

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: This is the R-7.5. It's noted somewhere on this.

Chairman Murphy: Well, I don't understand because it says lot two on it, with a separate building envelope. See off to the back right?

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: Yes.

Chairman Murphy: Where the driveway goes back there?

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: Lot area, 18,000 square feet.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: You know, all I can say is that I may not be familiar with every detail of what goes on with this lot and what exactly transpired during the subdivision. The lot that we're working on is the property line, which is 9 feet from the parking lot.

The number 15 Farragut Avenue, which is labeled as Number 15, is the new owners that own this new lot. They use it as a backyard. They can see the side of the building, and they don't object. What happens all the way there in the back, I don't know exactly.

Chairman Murphy: Look, it's clearly marked as a separate building envelope in the lot.

Village Attorney Stecich: Eva, what's the width of the lot with the three-story building on it? I can't tell.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: Is it 227 feet?

Village Attorney Stecich: I don't think so. Because if it's 75.04, and then 27.32, all right then ... you know what? I take that back because I think that does meet the requirement. The required frontage in that district is 75 square feet. And I think the limitation is that at least 30 percent of the frontage has to be on the street.

Building Inspector Sharma: It's 70 percent.

Village Attorney Stecich: Oh, it's 70 percent. Thirty percent doesn't. OK, 70 percent. That's why it can't. OK.

Building Inspector Sharma: So being there is a preexisting nonconforming lot, conceivably they could come back and get permission to build on it.

Village Attorney Stecich: What do you mean, a preexisting nonconforming lot?

Building Inspector Sharma: Isn't this like a separate lot, with the dimension of 27.32?

Village Attorney Stecich: If one person owns it, all of it – even it was preexisting before – it's merged as one lot. And the only way it could be more than one lot is to come in for a subdivision. But while there's the necessary area, there's not the necessary street frontage.

Chairman Murphy: That's right. OK. So what you're telling me is, regardless of what this shows it's one big lot.

Village Attorney Stecich: I don't know. I guess we would have to see the property card. But it is confusing, that lot two thing there.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: Yes, I'm sorry. I didn't really pay attention to that because I was told that this was pulled off and it belongs to the house.

Village Attorney Stecich: You know what's odd? Lot two looks like it's that kind of trapezoid thing. It looks like it's an island in the middle of the other lot.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: I have received this from the surveyor. And I wonder if it's just something that was under discussion at some point and it wasn't actually legally ever implemented and done. Because I don't believe that lot exists the way that it's shown there. Maybe it was just something else under discussion.

Boardmember Pennington: May I ask a related, but different, question? It seems we're struggling with what impact this might have on the neighbors if it would be built. Why is it not possible, or is it possible, to build the ramp on the other side, the north side, of the fellowship hall on church property there? To the left of the entrance as you face it.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: Put a door in.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: Well, everything is [off-mic]. But what happens is, [off-mic] the existing door and the egress there was on the right.

Village Technology Director Zaratzian: You got to get her talk into a microphone.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: ...said is a minor obstacle.

Building Inspector Sharma: Eva, please speak in the microphone.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: But what would be the primary reason not to do that would be that this area is actually used by people walking back and forth. In other words, it is a part of an everyday life of the site. There is a tremendous number of parents and children that go back and forth because of the daycare functions. The children play there, they store their little outside cars there, they get picked up.

And also, I think when people access the chapel space, as you can see, there's a walkway and there is a lower level classroom space in that building as well that is used by the school. So in other words, that space is frequented. And a large structure like this would actually impact and compromise the flow of traffic there.

It's also very pretty and green and park-like. It goes towards Reynolds, and it's sort of a semi-functional/semi-recreational space. So having this really large steel structure there would be quite unpleasant and would detract from the park-like setting that the chapel has

and the school has. It would really not be an improvement that they could sort of be proud of.

Chairman Murphy: Do you know what motivated the request for the ramp?

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: They just would like to make the space more available to the community. They have a lot of people coming there who are older. Some people might come in a wheelchair, other people are just older and have a hard time making it up the steps. They may choose to walk up the ramp as opposed to climb the stairs. And they would like to just basically have that sort of freedom of access for everybody.

Building Inspector Sharma: This would only make the second floor accessible.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: Yes.

Building Inspector Sharma: How about the lower floor? In order to get to the lower floor they would come down the ramp and go around the building to the basement level?

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: No. What happens is, you can come around the building and enter through the rear door.

Building Inspector Sharma: And the restrooms are on one floor, or are they on both floors?

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: There are restrooms on both floors. The upper level does have a restroom. It's slightly smaller than an ADA-accessible restroom. It does not comply at this point in time. However, they also in the future would like to renovate that restroom and make it a little larger so it also would be accessible.

All this is grandfathered, so they are not really compelled to do this. They are just doing it because they feel that they would like to have a facility that can accomplish that. I think they also have people who are interested in renting the space sometimes, and they come and ask for this access and it doesn't exist. They have to forego some of these rental opportunities.

Chairman Murphy: So I guess there's the front door, right?

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: Yes.

Chairman Murphy: And that's the double door.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: Yes, that's the front door.

Chairman Murphy: And this one on the side is the only other door. Is that side door big enough to accommodate a wheelchair?

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: It's a 3-foot door, yes.

Chairman Murphy: OK. So you're trying to use that access with a kind of minimal visual disruption on the side of the building, which I understand.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: Yes.

Chairman Murphy: The only thing, it's unusual to go to a zero setback.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: I understand. It is unusual, and I suppose it would be the story with the variances that each situation is very unique. All I have to say is that this space really serves no other purpose. So it's something that we're hoping would make sense. That even though there is not space left, whatever is the 8 feet that's there right now the only use for it is that staircase.

Boardmember Collins: What about the east, or the rear, wall? I heard your response about the north wall and I want to go back to that, but is there some reason why the east-facing wall would not accommodate this?

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: The rear wall? It has a number of windows and doors which provide the light and the views for the hall, as well as for the classrooms.

Chairman Murphy: That looks out over the playground, right?

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: Yes, it looks over the playground, over Reynolds, compared to the south wall which is just a brick wall. It was nothing at all. It's like you could barely tell it's there if you don't make that turnaround.

Boardmember Collins: Right. But would the ramp be visible from all of the windows in the rear-facing ... you said that there are windows and doors. I'm with the Chairman on this one, and I think this is the noble goal and we want to work with you to find a way to make it work.

But I'm trying to find alternatives that I'm sure you've considered. But I just wanted to make sure I understand why they haven't been pursued, as opposed to going to a zero setback.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: Yes. I do have a picture of the rear wall on my computer. Would you like me to show it to you?

Chairman Murphy: Hang on. One of the questions, too, though Eva, the existing setback is 8-1/2 feet?

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: Yes. It's whatever is labeled there.

Chairman Murphy: Or 8 feet 8 inches, I think. I think that's what it says.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: There it is, yes.

Chairman Murphy: So are you proposing to make the ramp 8-1/2 feet wide?

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: It comes back.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: Well, what happens is, it ...

Chairman Murphy: Oh, that's the loop-back. You need that just in that ...

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: Yes.

Chairman Murphy: Why do you need that? Is it that you need turnaround space?

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: That's the minimum ADA space, yes. And also what happens is, the building has these corners sort of built out with pilasters. That is another few inches that kind of takes a bite. So we end up pretty much 1 inch away from the property line, give or take.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: I might make a comment. I really think this is a very good approach to the problem. They've got a door, they've got a space that you walk over there. And you look at it, and it's just downright useless.

And so they're putting some utilization to a space. The only problem is the question of the next door neighbor.

Chairman Murphy: No, of course that's the issue.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: But if the neighbor isn't raising a question, and if this is not a buildable lot, it's an irrelevancy.

Chairman Murphy: Well, I don't know that it's irrelevant. I can't remember, in all my years, ever granting a zero setback on the sides. Having said that, I take your point. It's useless space, it's not visible from the street where you're proposing it, which I think is a good thing. And this backyard, what I was trying to figure out is how big this backyard is.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: Huge.

Chairman Murphy: And it's either humongous, or it's half that.

Boardmember Pennington: Well, it's really set back quite a distance from the dwelling.

Chairman Murphy: From the street and the dwelling, yeah, which we understand. The only thing, I'm just trying to make sure I understand what the other options might be.

You know, the north wall I take your point. And that's not going to work because the playground's there and that's where the kids go in and out all day. So the only other question I had, see where you have the concrete pads here in the back. Is there another door there somewhere, like wrapped around a corner?

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: Let me show you the pictures.

Chairman Murphy: OK.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: But I'm going to say just one more thing, which is just sort of anecdotal. But as it happens, The owner of the parsonage is a builder. The husband is a contractor. And we actually are hoping that he would be interested in building this ramp because we wanted to sort of make it be nice as neighbors. And it would make everybody's life easier, and we didn't want the conflict.

And, of course, we have to send it out for bids. But really, the thing on the top of the list is that, you know, he could possibly help us to build the ramp. So they really do not have a problem with the ramp being there. They feel that since the stairway is there, and people go in and out sometimes and most of the people go through the main door but occasionally, then having the ramp or having the stair makes no difference to them.

So I will pull up the pictures.

Chairman Murphy: Yeah, I'm just trying to get a sense of how much further back from the back of the house it is.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: Somebody could build there.

Chairman Murphy: Well, that's different.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: That's a big difference.

Chairman Murphy: Well, that's why I was asking. For me, that changes the game. But if it's not buildable, then I don't suppose it matters a whole lot.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: It'll just take one minute. This is why you need accurate [off-mic].

Village Attorney Stecich: No, really that's supposed to be in every submission – a certified survey. And that's why you need it. This is a perfect example because the survey should show it.

Chairman Murphy: Well, we could always ask for that just to make the record clear, I guess.

Building Inspector Sharma: This drawing doesn't describe the meets and bounds, the property lines, very clearly at all.

Village Attorney Stecich: No, and it doesn't even have a line. I mean, it says lot two, but it doesn't have a line. Lot two can't be that ...

[cross-talk]

Building Inspector Sharma: Yeah, where that one lot ends and the other one begins.

Village Attorney Stecich: In the middle of another lot. Do you see? And the numbers don't add up 'cause that says lot area like 18,000.

Boardmember Pennington: Yeah, it's more than twice as much, or almost twice as much.

Village Attorney Stecich: And then the other one says "lot 8,000." I mean, none of it adds up.

Boardmember Leaf: I think that the trapezoid here, and the back of the lot, is supposed to show the building envelope.

Village Attorney Stecich: Probably.

Boardmember Leaf: Or a theoretical lot, if there were a lot.

Building Inspector Sharma: And the setback line shows ...

Boardmember Leaf: There's no lot line.

Building Inspector Sharma: Eva, please get a microphone.

Chairman Murphy: You need to use the microphone, please.

Building Inspector Sharma: At all times, please.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: OK, I'm sorry. I think what happened was here is actually a small copy of a certified survey, which I do have. And the lot that you were looking at there does not exist. This envelope is not there.

I think what happened was, I had a copy of this. And I called the surveyor and I said, "Can you please give me an AutoCAD file of the survey?" They emailed it to me, and I used it for the plan. And I missed the fact that this was something they had there at some point in the process of ...

[cross-talk]

Chairman Murphy: Can I separate this?

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: Yes, please ... subdivision. You could have that, too. And, in fact, that is not on the final certified survey. So this would be my mistake not deleting the envelope that we're now puzzling over.

Chairman Murphy: Right.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: OK.

Chairman Murphy: Well, that helps.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: I have to apologize.

Chairman Murphy: I appreciate that.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: I'm sorry.

I looked at it. I said the same thing. But, in fact, it was not the same thing.

Building Inspector Sharma: I do not remember this subdivision in 2007. I was here.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: Yes. I think that paper will really answer that question.

Chairman Murphy: Right. The copy of the survey that's been handed up shows that the parson's house – the three-story frame building structure – is actually on one large lot that heads back kind of southeast to the corner. So it's not a separate lot, and it's not a buildable lot back there.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: You could put a football field there, but it's not a (inaudible).

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: Here is a picture (I'm not on a microphone) at the rear of the building.

Chairman Murphy: She just doesn't want to lose her computer. I got it.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: So as you can see, there's a whole lot of glass which is on the façade. And to put a large ramp there would not help.

Chairman Murphy: It actually goes down.

Boardmember Collins: Am I seeing it right that it actually goes down, it's recessed? And are these openings ... are these ... is this a doorway?

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: Yes.

Boardmember Collins: These two here?

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: Yes, they go directly ...

Boardmember Collins: Is that at ground level?

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: They go into the classrooms.

Boardmember Pennington: Four doors that go to the four classrooms.

Boardmember Collins: But I think that the point of the ramp was to get access to the second level. OK, so there are ... all right, that helps. So there are no doors to the second level on the back of the property. One would need to be created, and you would have to run a ramp right over the classrooms.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: Over, yes.

Chairman Murphy: Yeah, that's not going to work.

Boardmember Collins: Right, right. That's helpful, thank you.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: And I will show you a picture of the inside of the space. You see, there is this side, which is another useless space. There it is. And then ...

Chairman Murphy: You really ... you have to use the microphone, Eva, because that's the only transcript we have of what you're saying.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: OK, I'm sorry. I just wanted to give you a sense of this space inside, which is ... OK, here it is. This is the room itself, and you can see that it's a large, multipurpose room. There is the door that goes to the outside. This is the door from the interior stairway. There is the kitchen and the church office and the restroom.

So this is why this all then would be accessible.

Chairman Murphy: No, that's very helpful. That's good to see that.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: Because there's the restroom, and there's the kitchen. You know, the space really is available for lots of different reasons, and they just feel that it's not helpful if there's only a stairway.

Chairman Murphy: Right. OK.

Building Inspector Sharma: Eva, can we keep this copy or do you want it back?

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: Yes, you can keep a copy.

Boardmember Collins: I suppose you've also looked at what might be possible if the ramp literally hugged the side of the building all the way from the parking lot. In other words, right to the south, immediate south, of the window well, and then skirting right alongside the building to try to ...

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: You mean one long, straight line? Yes.

Boardmember Collins: Well, making it so that the hugged the side of the house to get to the door, without having to double back.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: Too much slope.

Boardmember Collins: I had a feeling but, again, I wanted to just make sure that ...

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: We did look at it. What happens is, the ramp would have to start sort of halfway into the parking lot, and be very long.

Boardmember Collins: Right. So that can't work.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: And it would ... yes, it would not work very well. And also, they would have to build a retaining wall to actually construct the ramp because there's a little bit of a slope going up towards that fence. And it appears that it would become more of a major construction and a more costly enterprise.

And they are hoping to use that greenspace for plantings. There's some nice flowering bushes to screen out the fence and just sort of have a pleasant environment as opposed to the structure being sort of very apparent.

Boardmember Collins: So you've exhausted other patterns of escalating this ramp to that door.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: Yes.

Boardmember Collins: And they just don't work.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: And they just don't work, yes. There were actually a number of patterns. We could actually look at them if you feel that it's helpful. And actually, the boardmembers and I went through several patterns before settling on this one and saying that of all the compromises we could make this seemed to be the one that was the best.

Because we considered the side approach, the front to the side approach, and all that. But none of that was really helpful. The ramp is too large, something else was lost, it just wasn't working well.

Building Inspector Sharma: By the way, since the ramp is required to be a minimum 3 feet wide, conceivably it can be planned to be at least a foot, foot-and-a-half away from the property line. I guess it could be planned and designed to do that.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: Three feet dimension is the clear between the handrails, plus the handrails. So the minimum dimension is like 44 inches. I don't have it in front of me right now, but yeah it actually is ...

Building Inspector Sharma: OK. So we explore that possibility and see if it can be moved in a foot or so.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: It is actually at the minimum dimension as it is. In other words, I don't believe we have that option. No, we originally were hoping to go actually for a 48-inch clear ramp. And that became less than that in order to ... the required minimum width is 44 inches. And then minus the 2 inches on either side, it becomes 40 inches, which is the required width.

So this is the dimension we're working with: 44 inches for the ramp and 1 inch in the middle, plus the little extended ears on the building – and that is the setback. You know, if we're asking for zero inches, we may have an inch left at the end, but barely.

There's also the requirement for the landings, which is the 60 inches by 60 inches, in order for the wheelchair to make a turn. So these are the minimum dimensions which we have.

Chairman Murphy: So what you're saying is you're not required to put this ramp in, but if you put it in you have to meet these requirements.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: We would like to meet the requirements, yes, so that we can say this ramp does comply.

Chairman Murphy: All right. Anybody else have anything else?

Boardmember Leaf: I'm pretty supportive of the proposal of the church.

Chairman Murphy: No, I think, David, you had it right. My only concern was on the plans that were submitted to us. It showed a second lot back there that appeared to be a building lot, and we've now corrected that. And so while it is unusual to grant a zero yard setback, this lot is pretty unique, the need is there and, obviously, the neighbors don't have any objection.

The main thing being it's a huge, huge backyard area, and this is set well back not only from the street, but it's well back from the back of the neighbor's house so that the intrusion is actually pretty minor, given what's proposed.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: There's more on the second page.

Chairman Murphy: And with your explanations on why other options aren't as feasible, or aren't feasible at all, I think you're right. I think you've picked the best place to do it, with the minimal incursion on the neighbor's backyard.

So I also support it.

Boardmember Pennington: Yes, I fully agree. I think we've heard that they've exhausted every other alternative that's feasible. I wish there was another way to avoid having a zero setback permitted, I think the benefit outweighs the cost in this instance. I think you're doing the community, and certainly the church community, a favor by doing this.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: Thank you.

On MOTION of Boardmember Forbes-Watkins, SECONDED by XXX with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board resolved [approval of Case 11-11 for construction of an ADA-compliant ramp at the fellowship hall, with a required minimum setback of 8 feet and proposed zero feet] XXX.

Chairman Murphy: The vote's unanimous.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: Thank you.

Chairman Murphy: Eva, thank you.

Ms. Klein Bouhassira: Thank you for your careful consideration.

Chairman Murphy: We did have a fourth case on our docket. I don't see anyone else in the room.

Mr. Sharma, did you get any information from the applicant?

Building Inspector Sharma: No. Is it possible to (inaudible) a case in the absence of the applicant? I am just wondering. It's a view preservation case.

Village Attorney Stecich: I don't know ...

[cross-talk]

Chairman Murphy: Well, I can't ... I mean, somebody needs to explain what they're doing.

Village Attorney Stecich: I could imagine a situation where you could, where the drawings are clear. But I don't think these drawings are clear.

Chairman Murphy: Well, I'm not going to do that. If they can't bother showing up, we can't bother talking about it.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairman Murphy: OK, let's see. We have approval of our minutes from the May 26 meeting.

Village Attorney Stecich: And there's one change in there that I think's important. It's on page nine. It says: "*If the Building Inspector (inaudible) recommended the tree ...*" Building Inspector, capital B-I. I don't think Deven recommended removing the tree. It would have been the inspector. It was the inspector they would have retained before they bought it. The house inspector I guess is what it should be. So Deven, you have that correction?

Chairman Murphy: That was on page nine?

Village Attorney Stecich: It's on page nine.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: About the middle.

Village Attorney Stecich: Three-fifths of the way down. I'll give the page to Deven.

Chairman Murphy: I also have one minor correction on page three, last line at the bottom. Instead of saying "*senior segment*," it should say "southern segment of the property."

Building Inspector Sharma: Southern segment?

Chairman Murphy: Yeah.

Boardmember Pennington: On page 12, at the bottom, last line of the page, there's a missing word: "... *that's it's going to be used.*"

And page 19, the Chairman's opening statement talks about building a "*garbage.*" I think what they're talking about is a garage.

Chairman Murphy: I missed that one. OK, you're right.

Boardmember Pennington: And finally, on page 39, at the bottom of the page, there's a question about who was making the motion. And I think it's Marc with a "C," rather than Mark with a "K" because it was Marc Leaf, not Mark Pennington.

Chairman Murphy: OK, got it. So noted. All right, any other edits or amendments from the Boardmembers? No?

On MOTION of Boardmember Forbes-Watkins, SECONDED by [Boardmember Pennington] XXX with a voice vote of all in favor, the Minutes of the Zoning Board of Appeals Regular Meeting of May 26, 2011 were approved as amended.

Chairman Murphy: All right, thank you. Our meeting's adjourned, and our next meeting will be, I think, Thursday, July 28 at 8 p.m. So I'll see you all then.