

+

**VILLAGE OF HASTINGS-ON-HUDSON, NEW YORK
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
REGULAR MEETING
MAY 24, 2012**

A Regular Meeting was held by the Zoning Board of Appeals on Thursday, May 24, 2012 at 8:00 p.m. in the Meeting Room, Municipal Building, 7 Maple Avenue.

PRESENT: PRESENT: Chairman Brian Murphy, Boardmember Ray Dovell, Boardmember Matthew Collins, Boardmember David Forbes-Watkins, Boardmember Mark Pennington, Village Attorney Marianne Stecich, Building Inspector Deven Sharma, and Deputy Building Inspector Charles Minozzi.

Chairman Murphy: Ladies and gentlemen, we're here for our May 24, 2012 Zoning Board of Appeals meeting. We have two cases on our agenda tonight. The first case, No. 12-12, the application of Richard Saunderson and Sylvia Lee, 298 Warburton Avenue, for view preservation approval. And case No. 12A-12, Guy Sliker and Samantha Witt, 19 Croton Avenue, for alterations and additions on the first and second floors of their home.

So those are our two cases. Mr. Sharma, are the mailings in order?

Building Inspector Sharma: Yes, I was informed by my office all the mailings are indeed in order.

**Case No. 12-12
Richard Saunderson & Sylvia Lee
298 Warburton Avenue**

View Preservation Approval/Recommendations for the addition of a second-story

Chairman Murphy: Why don't we hear first from Mr. Saunderson and Ms. Lee. Just identify yourself, please, for us.

Richard Saunderson, applicant – 298 Warburton Avenue: Thank you. Good evening. We have before you a fairly straightforward case. We're here for view preservation, not for any variance.

The existing house is a single-family house on lower Warburton Avenue, 298, four houses north of the intersection with Pinecrest. The front of the house is Warburton Avenue; the rear of the house is basically the Old Croton Aqueduct. There's also a paper street – mapped, but unbuilt, street – behind the house, Aqueduct Lane.

The existing house, basically, is off-center on the site. What we're proposing to do is do a single-story addition, making it a two-story house. Right now it's a one-story house, a 1949 Cape, basically original. Additionally, we're doing a small entrance addition at the front, which would be a total of one story.

All of the new construction is within the setbacks, no variance.

Chairman Murphy: Right. And as I understand it, the addition on the front is primarily for a mud room entryway to the main level of the house?

Mr. Saunderson: That's correct. It's a foyer entrance.

Chairman Murphy: And the second level is going to be raised about 10 feet, but within the ...

Mr. Saunderson: Correct, 9-and-change. That's correct.

So these photos document the existing conditions. These are the views from the street. These are the two views from the Aqueduct. The views from the Aqueduct show the house to the south, which is a two-story house. And this view shows the house to the north, which is also a two-story house. This is our existing house; one story.

What this photo shows is the existing condition. And drawn in, in light blue, is the proposed bulk of the two-story addition. I think what this illustrates is that the new bulk will not obstruct the view of the river or the Palisades – only of Warburton Avenue and the old industrial Mobil terminal down below. This photo was shot in February, before the leaves came on the trees. This photo was shot April 29, with the leaves on the trees. So basically you really have to look to see the house even.

And this series of photos is a composite panning around from the view to the river, up the Aqueduct, to show the house on Pinecrest Parkway, which is the property behind us further uphill. The house on Pinecrest Parkway is approximately 25 feet above the Aqueduct level; our house is approximately 30 to 35 feet below the Aqueduct level. So this basically shows that I don't think we're obstructing anyone's views up here, as well.

Chairman Murphy: Yeah, that's a pretty significant slope between those two.

Mr. Saunderson: So do you have any questions?

Chairman Murphy: All right. And just tell us again the purpose for the addition, just for

the record.

Mr. Saunderson: Basically, it's for increasing the usable area of the house. It's a two-bedroom house, basically maxed out right now. Rather than increase the footprint of the house, we want to try to minimize the impact, keep the yard as open as possible. Additionally, there's also a storm drain which runs under the property which would make construction across it difficult. We have, actually, a bridge across.

Chairman Murphy: I see. So that's why you stayed within the footprint.

Mr. Saunderson: Right. It's much more economical. And of course we'd rather preserve the greenspace.

Chairman Murphy: OK. And I also noticed on the application that in terms of the total lot area coverage it will be 10.74 percent, so you're well within the 30 percent limit. And really I saw very minimal, if any, impact on the view, which is really the issue here. It's really just the one house behind you kind of up the hill.

Mr. Saunderson: That's correct. That's actually the last house on Pinecrest Parkway.

Chairman Murphy: Ah, I see.

Mr. Saunderson: The furthest north.

Chairman Murphy: I can't see any impact on their view, which would be the only real concern, so I'm satisfied this looks pretty good. Anybody else want to follow up with anything?

Boardmember Dovell: I think it's extremely well-presented. It's very thorough, and I don't see any impact at all on the view.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: As a frequent Aqueduct walker, I can't imagine that that would have any significant meaning to the Aqueduct walker on their views, et cetera. I have no problem with it – none.

Chairman Murphy: Do we have anyone in the audience who would like to be heard on this application? Nobody in the audience.

So unless there are any further questions for Mr. Saunderson, if I could have a motion on view preservation approval.

On MOTION of Boardmember Collins, SECONDED by Boardmember Forbes-Watkins with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board resolved approve Case 12-12, 298 Warburton Avenue for view preservation and recommendations for the addition of a second story.

Chairman Murphy: The vote's 5-0. Mr. Saunderson, you're welcome. Have a good night. Good luck with the project.

Village Attorney Stecich: Mr. Chairman, I guess we should say, on this one and the other application, the Planning Board recommended view preservation approval.

Chairman Murphy: Yes, so noted. Thank you, Marianne. And they didn't have any conditions, right?

Village Attorney Stecich: No, there were no conditions. Wait a minute. This was on Saunderson and Lee. What happened to the other one, Deven? Lisa Globenfelt?

Boardmember Pennington: That's not before us this evening, that one.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: No.

Village Attorney Stecich: The Main Street one.

Boardmember Collins: It's not on the docket.

Village Attorney Stecich: No, 2-4 Main Street. Remember, the Planning Board ... is that what you're here on?

Building Inspector Sharma: Did we talk with the view preservation?

Village Attorney Stecich: No, that was view preservation approval on that, too.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: We have no paperwork on that.

Village Attorney Stecich: No. You know what happened on that? It was on for view preservation approval, and I caught it at the meeting that they needed it because it wasn't on the agenda. OK.

Building Inspector Sharma: Well, Mitch is here. Maybe he can make some presentation.

Village Attorney Stecich: You know, it was a thing where it was absolutely ...

Building Inspector Sharma: There's just a change of the façade.

Village Attorney Stecich: If you could explain it, this is one of those ones that probably if you had a statute that said you shouldn't have to come.

Boardmember Pennington: If it hasn't been noticed?

Village Attorney Stecich: Yeah, it was noticed for the Planning Board. I don't know.

Building Inspector Sharma: I remember seeing it for the Planning Board, including the site plan, as was view preservation approval. For whatever reason, it's not included here.

Mitchell Koch, 20 Marble Terrace: I think I could present it verbally. It's very ...

Village Attorney Stecich: Yeah, but there are notice issues.

Chairman Murphy: You're talking about the Main Street – the 2-4 Main Street?

Village Attorney Stecich: Yeah. And all they are changing is the doorway. It has absolutely no impact on the view because whatever it is is lower than the highest thing. I guess it was just down in the Building Department.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: Next time, anyhow. So let's do it next time.

Building Inspector Sharma: I would suggest we hear it. Mitch is already here. We'll do the noticing tomorrow.

Village Attorney Stecich: The notice didn't go out? It had to have been. It was noticed.

Building Inspector Sharma: Notice did go out with the view preservation aspect for the Planning Board, and it looks like we missed including it for the Zoning Board.

Chairman Murphy: All right, well, let's do 19 Croton Avenue first.

Village Attorney Stecich: Yeah, and then let's talk about that.

Chairman Murphy: And then we'll waste our time with the other thing.

**Guy Sliker & Samantha Witt
19 Croton Avenue**

For alterations and additions on the first and second floors

- 1. Front Yard: Existing and Proposed - 22.2 feet
Required Minimum - 30 feet {295-67F.1a}**
- 2. Total of Two Side Yards
Existing and Proposed - 21.5 feet
Required Minimum - 30 feet {295-67F.1c}**

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Koch, are you going to present?

Mr. Koch: I think it's a [off-mic].

Chairman Murphy: That's fine. Just identify yourself when you're ready, and we're happy to hear your application.

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

Chairman Murphy: Because we record the meeting minutes.

Guy Sliker, applicant – 19 Croton Avenue: Basically, we have an existing house, built in 1928, at 19 Croton Avenue. We're looking to add a bit of new space to the house. The house is nonconforming as built. Really, nonconforming in 1928 due to the front yard setback as well as the sum of the side yard setbacks.

We're proposing to fill in the space behind the existing sunroom extension. It's really not a sunroom. It's really sort of a little peninsula that sticks out. This peninsula that's existing creates sort of a rectangular space behind it, and we felt that the minimal impact on various levels would be to just fill in this space. We're also going to take it to the second level, so a zoning variance was required.

Chairman Murphy: OK. Mr. Koch?

Mr. Koch: I'm the architect of record. I just want to point out that this addition back here would be as-of-right, in fact. The only portion of it that is nonconforming would be this projection over the existing one-story sunroom just forward of the front yard setback line. OK?

Chairman Murphy: But it's along the same front yard setback line that exists on the north end of the house, as I understood it.

Mr. Koch: Absolutely.

Chairman Murphy: And Mr. Sliker, what's the purpose for the addition? What are you doing with the space?

Mr. Sliker: Additional space; essentially an additional bedroom and an additional family room, down here, for our family.

Mr. Koch: I have a plan on the back of that if you just want to show it. It's conceptual [off-mic].

Chairman Murphy: Yeah, it's rough but I'd like to make a record, at least, of what's being proposed.

Mr. Koch: On the ground floor, this un-hatched area is the existing front wall. And what is now a small family room would just be sort of a living room area. In the back, there'd be more of the roughhouse family room off the kitchen for the crazy kids. And then upstairs is a master bedroom suite, basically comprised of an entry area and a closet, the bedroom and bathroom. And that's it.

Chairman Murphy: OK.

Village Attorney Stecich: Mr. Murphy, could I just correct one thing?

Chairman Murphy: Yes, go ahead.

Village Attorney Stecich: Just for the record, you had said that it was built nonconforming. It wouldn't have been built nonconforming. It preexisted the zoning so it's a preexisting nonconforming, which makes a difference. Because if it were built nonconforming it wouldn't be legal. Just so the record's clear, it's preexisting nonconforming.

Chairman Murphy: Got it. So it's grandfathered in, but because they're making the addition they need to apply.

Village Attorney Stecich: Right, the old part of the house.

Boardmember Pennington: Was the sunroom part of the original house, or was that added later?

Mr. Koch: My understanding is that it was part of the original house.

Chairman Murphy: And in terms of the footprint area, your submission indicates 200 square feet is the additional footprint onto 1,080?

Mr. Sliker: Correct.

Chairman Murphy: So the total will be 1,280 square feet, and your permitted footprint is 2,500 subject to the setbacks. So you're well within the footprint area.

Mr. Sliker: And percentage of lot coverage also. So we're coming up to a little less than 20 percent of lot coverage.

Chairman Murphy: Yeah, I see. It makes good sense. It's certainly in keeping with the neighborhood, and adds some limited, but probably necessary, space to a house that's not really that large to begin with. It's just it's a tight block, it's a tight lot. But given that you're keeping the same lot lines, that's ...

Mr. Sliker: Yes, thank you. And it's a minimal addition. We haven't really tried to exceed any of the lines of the house.

Chairman Murphy: No, it'll be a very nice improvement. And I see the symmetry with the north end of the house in terms of the front façade, so that makes sense to me.

Mr. Dovell?

Boardmember Dovell: It's nicely done. It's a nice package altogether. And I think the addition makes for a really nice overall composition to the house. I don't see how you would have done it differently, in that the only thing you're asking for is to build up from an existing foundation, basically. There's no footprint extension into the front- or the side yard.

Mr. Sliker: Yes, just the envelope.

Boardmember Dovell: It's just the height, and it seems minimal.

Chairman Murphy: OK, I agree. Anyone else? David, or Matt?

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: It's fine.

Boardmember Collins: No, it looks good.

Chairman Murphy: Making our life easy tonight. OK. Anyone from the audience wish to be heard on this application?

Seeing none, I guess we're ready for a motion. I guess we can do them one at a time.

On MOTION of Boardmember Collins, SECONDED by Boardmember Forbes-Watkins with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board resolved in the case of 12A-12, 19 Croton Avenue, approval of the front yard variance, existing and proposed, 22.2 feet, with a required minimum of 30 feet.

Chairman Murphy: The votes unanimous, 5-0.

On MOTION of Boardmember Collins, SECONDED by Boardmember Forbes-Watkins with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board resolved in the case of 12A-12, 19 Croton Avenue, approval of the variance requested for the total of two side yards, existing and proposed 21-1/2 feet, with a requirement of 30 feet.

Chairman Murphy: The vote's also 5-0. Mr. Sliker, congratulations. Thank you. Mr. Koch, thank you.

Mr. Koch: Thank you.

Village Attorney Stecich: Here, maybe you can use the survey.

Mr. Koch: We're grateful for anything we get back. We'll just use it for bidding.

Application of Lisa Globenfelt (Contract Vendee) for the alterations to the façade/storefront on the first floor of a mixed-use building at 2-4 Main Street. Said property is in CC Zoning District and is also known as Sheet 4.70, Block 50, Lot 10 on the Village Tax Maps.

Chairman Murphy: Should we hear from you on 2-4?

Mr. Koch, project architect: Absolutely. I understand there's another technical issue.

Village Attorney Stecich: Yeah. For whatever reason, it wasn't on the agenda. Is this going to hold you up? Are you ready to go on this?

Mr. Koch: Yes. We're on a very ... we have a very small window. She's going to take possession and wants to get started. In the first place, I could get my presentation materials in a 10-minute turnaround.

Building Inspector Sharma: No, I can get it downstairs.

Village Attorney Stecich: Yeah. But first of all, it's whether the Board would consider it. I mean, that's the thing.

Boardmember Pennington: So neighbors have received notice of the plan.

Building Inspector Sharma: Yes, they have.

Mr. Koch: Of a Planning Board hearing.

Village Attorney Stecich: And it was on at the Planning Board. I mean, this is a really unusual ... Deven, why don't you go get ...

Building Inspector Sharma: Yeah, let me run down and get it. It's just a storefront.

Mr. Koch: That's right. I had a slightly enlarged one just like this.

Boardmember Pennington: So the only question would be whether there ...

Village Attorney Stecich: Is it possible to go off the record for a session of advice of counsel on this?

Chairman Murphy: OK. Yeah, why don't we do that? We can go in the back.

Village Attorney Stecich: Yeah, let's go in the back.

[RECESS FOR ADVICE OF COUNSEL]

[RESUME]

Chairman Murphy: Off the record, taking advice of counsel, it was brought to our attention that there is another case that should have been noticed for tonight for view preservation approval. And that's the application of 2-4 Main Street. We happen to have Mr. Koch here, who is the architect for that project and the applicant's representative.

So the Board has decided to hear the application first, and determine the status of it and whether in fact we're comfortable essentially voting tonight on it. And if we are, it would be conditioned on notice being sent out first thing tomorrow morning with a two-week notice period for any objections; which is, I think, the best we can do under the circumstances.

So the Board has agreed to hear Mr. Koch. And thank you for being patient with us.

Mr. Koch: Deven just gave me the paperwork, and I managed to ...

Building Inspector Sharma: Then I took it back from you.

Mr. Koch: Did you take it? I'll start doing a verbal discussion of this. This is the property at 2 Main Street and 4 Main Street, in fact, but it's the building where there's the shoe store and formerly a hairdresser on the corner of Main and Warburton. Historically, you can see – and we did some research at the Historical Society and we have images – there used to be a door at the corner of the property. I'll remind everybody that a car hit the corner, and it was plywooded for awhile. They've done not a great job, I think, of restoring it; putting in the storefront. It's a near match.

However, we did find a few images, some of which I put on the application here, of the door at the corner, which I'll present and just take a look.

Chairman Murphy: And just so we're clear, the property we're talking about is the Hastings Bootery.

Mr. Koch: It's the Hastings Bootery currently, yes. Once upon a time, that building comprised three little stores. I don't know, in the '70s or the '80s they opened up the first two from the corner together and removed a partition in between. The building is being bought by a new landlord, Lisa, and she's going to put Chelsea's Closet there. She'll take the two end spaces anyway.

But it seemed to me that putting that door back in the corner would make a great contribution

because we have another corner door on the other side of the street. And really, since the dry cleaners has done that façade work and done a beautiful job – not to mention the wine store – it's really come alive and I think it's a wonderful gateway spot in the Village.

In any case, for the owner of the property having that third door allows her in some future iteration to divide it into three spaces and rent them as it was originally conceived. So on those photographic renderings there I showed a door in the corner. It would be pretty much just a little overhang. It does not project beyond the existing storefront. In fact, it subtracts from it by creating an entryway that's back from the corner. And I can do that without any structural work because it was already there.

Chairman Murphy: It's going to inset off the sidewalk.

Mr. Koch: Exactly.

Chairman Murphy: OK.

Mr. Koch: So there's a negative impact – or I'm sorry, there's no negative impact on the view. It, in fact, opens it up just a little bit more. If you want to look at Rockwood and Perry from the other corner, there it is. So I propose that, in fact, it contributes to the Village cityscape or the townscape and to the urban experience, the pedestrian urban experience, and that it has no impact at all on view preservation.

Chairman Murphy: And Mr. Koch, just tell us what happened at the Planning Board meeting, as well, with this application.

Mr. Koch: The Planning Board approved our application with blessings, and they were very enthusiastic.

Village Attorney Stecich: Well, they approved your site plan approval and recommended view preservation.

Mr. Koch: Absolutely. And I just want to say we have one more stop, of course, at the Architectural Review Board. Once we're approved -- and then we submit to the Building Department – our final stop will be the Architectural Review Board. And Buddy will oversee that, as well. At that point, we'll be talking about signage, a new ...

Village Attorney Stecich: When's the ARB meeting?

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: First Monday.

Mr. Koch: Yeah. I mean, we're going to be submitting soon. And because we're on a very short timeline, we're going to try to probably do it in two stages, with the signage left to later and the doorway and storefront ... which our intention at this time is to rebuild the storefront for all three stores.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: Could you expand upon that short timeline?

Mr. Koch: Well, the shoe store, I believe that they're closing on their property at the end of this month. The shoe store is actually vacating at the end of June by some previous agreement. So construction would start July 1 in a perfect world. And then we have, really, 'til September 1, which is her ... I think it's based upon vacating the shop that she's currently in to get the work done. Which would mean, in fact, we're going to rehab the entire interior of the property and do new mechanicals and new lighting and new ... you know, fire-rated enclosure. Because none of these properties were built to today's standards.

So we're going to really do a very thorough job inside. And it may, based upon budget, mean replacing all of that kind of ... I don't know if you've noticed, but the framing around the windows is banged up and have been replaced here and there. And the one on the corner is put in with a modern kind of storefront.

So it's all a bit of a mishmosh. It's our intention to integrate everything and make it look like a historical piece, something like the bakery but not exactly the same.

Village Attorney Stecich: So you couldn't start before July 1 anyway?

Mr. Koch: That's correct.

Chairman Murphy: OK. Which means, I suppose, we can still do our thing, but subject to ... we might as well give the public a month, until next meeting. If there are any objections they will have to come back on our next meeting and hear them. You know what I mean?

Mr. Koch: I would add a caveat, if I might. Maybe you could allow us to start interior demolition in the event that they vacate ahead of schedule. Every week that we can get in on the process, without altering the exterior, say.

Building Inspector Sharma: Interior demolition has nothing to do with this view preservation.

Mr. Koch: Excellent. But then the building permit application, I don't want it delayed by

this.

Boardmember Dovell: It could be filed as a separate application for interior demo, and then you wouldn't have to ... you could start.

Building Inspector Sharma: Sure.

Village Attorney Stecich: And then you could have it ... I mean, if he's not losing anything you could just have it on for the next meeting. Put the notice, have it on the next meeting. And then you don't have the precedent issue. As a practical matter it's not any different, but at least you haven't set the precedent.

Chairman Murphy: Right. We would prefer to have it formally heard. We were trying to accommodate the applicant because I don't see a problem. But the public hasn't been noticed so they have to be noticed.

So our thinking is, if one month is going to be your likely time frame anyway we might as well just get it noticed up as quickly as possible for the next meeting, now that we've heard it. If there are any other questions, anybody who's a member of the public can show up. Assuming there are none, then this won't hold you.

We don't want to hold you up. This isn't a holdup, but our problem is nobody's had notice. So we have to give the public notice.

Mr. Koch: Right. I just have to speak to the fact that it's going to cost my client an additional several hundred dollars to do the return receipt certified mailing.

Building Inspector Sharma: No, we'll do that. We'll do it.

Mr. Koch: OK. You're going to do all the notice?

Building Inspector Sharma: I'll do all the mailings and everything, yeah.

Mr. Koch: Oh, OK. Well, then no problem. I mean, thank you very much. That's very generous, and if I can help in any way ... I've already set up all the labels so you can have them back.

Building Inspector Sharma: We'll work together. I'll work with you tomorrow.

Mr. Koch: OK.

Building Inspector Sharma: And if we are doing it for next month, then it really doesn't have to be done tomorrow.

Village Attorney Stecich: No, no. That's not the same issue, right.

Mr. Koch: So the only other question is do I reappear at the next hearing? I suppose I have to.

Village Attorney Stecich: Yeah. It'll be first on the agenda, right? If it could be put early on the agenda.

Building Inspector Sharma: Should I put it on both agendas? It has only been on the Planning Board's agenda.

Village Attorney Stecich: The Planning Board already acted on it.

Building Inspector Sharma: So I'll put it on the Zoning Board's agenda.

Chairman Murphy: Yeah, just for our agenda. But please put it first.

Building Inspector Sharma: I'll do that.

Mr. Koch: Do you want me to resubmit those photos?

Chairman Murphy: Yes, that would be a good idea.

Mr. Koch: Great.

Building Inspector Sharma: Did you bring us all 23 copies? I don't know.

Mr. Koch: I beg your pardon?

Building Inspector Sharma: Usually when this happens we ask for 21 or 23 sets of drawings. I don't know if you did that.

Mr. Koch: Actually you told me just to do the 11, or whatever it was.

Building Inspector Sharma: Yeah, it was just the site plan.

Mr. Koch: Well, we could shake down the Planning Board and get their copies.

Village Attorney Stecich: I gave you mine back.

Building Inspector Sharma: No, you can shake down the Building Department. I think maybe some change is required at the senior level.

Mr. Koch: All right, well, it's not a big deal.

Village Attorney Stecich: But he doesn't need to submit 23 copies. Six will be enough, or seven.

Chairman Murphy: Right. And that way we can accomplish our notice function and not get in the way of the project.

Mr. Koch: Thank you.

Building Inspector Sharma: And Mitch, I do apologize for this unfortunate, very inadvertent ... thinking both ways, and it unfortunately happened.

Chairman Murphy: All right. Mr. Koch, thank you.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Regular Meeting of March 22, 2012

Chairman Murphy: So last item is approval of our minutes from the March 22 meeting. Does anyone have any comments or edits to our minutes?

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: I do. Page 52, 61 and 62. I believe they're all the same comments. Somehow, the Village Manager is listed as the speaker.

Building Inspector Sharma: This is the second time this happened. I wonder why the Village Manager comes?

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: He pops in, says a few words, and pops up.

Chairman Murphy: *A deus ex machina.*

Building Inspector Sharma: I mean, who is he confusing for Village Manager?

Village Attorney Stecich: You, Deven.

Building Inspector Sharma: Me?

Village Attorney Stecich: Yeah, you look like the boss.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: Page 52.

Boardmember Collins: Do you know who the speaker is?

Boardmember Pennington: Who the actual speaker was?

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: I'm trying to page to page 52 first and see if it makes sense.

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: Could you repeat that one more time, please?

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: Page 52, where it says "*Village Manager*" saying, "*Thank you.*"

Building Inspector Sharma: What else does he say?

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: It probably was me.

Boardmember Collins: These are the March minutes.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: March, when I was acting chair. So March minutes.

And then page 61 and 62. let's see what we have here. Yes, on 62 ... on 61 we have another "thank you" from the Village Manager.

Chairman Murphy: All right, we'll presume that's you.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: I'll accept responsibility for it.

And on page 62, the Village Manager is quoted as saying "*the yard structures.*" My fault. It's me.

Chairman Murphy: All right.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: Those are the only items I have.

Chairman Murphy: All right. Anybody else on the March minutes? No? OK.

Can I have a motion to approve the minutes, subject to David's very erudite edits?

On MOTION of Boardmember Collins, SECONDED Boardmember Forbes-Watkins by with a voice vote of all in favor, the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of March 22, 2012 were approved as amended.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: OK. Now are we going to do the April 26 minutes also?

Chairman Murphy: Yes, if you're prepared.

Regular Meeting of April 26, 2012

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: Page six, April minutes. The Village Manager appears again.

Boardmember Collins: The phantom Village Manager.

Chairman Murphy: Is that me?

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: It could be you.

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: On page six?

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: I had spoken.

Village Attorney Stecich: Isn't that funny.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: I think that may be you.

Chairman Murphy: All right, so noted.

Building Inspector Sharma: So the chairman he's confusing for the Village Manager. We'll talk to him.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: There was one set of minutes where I think it was Matt who was identified as the Manager. We've shared this responsibility.

Page six on the April minutes. He says: *"Right, it sounds like it."*

Chairman Murphy: And we think that was me.

Building Inspector Sharma: We look for wherever the Village Manager appears, and try to rationally change it.

Chairman Murphy: Is that it, David?

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: That's all I have.

On MOTION of Boardmember Collins, SECONDED by Boardmember Forbes-Watkins with a voice vote of all in favor, the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of April 26, 2012 were approved as amended.

Chairman Murphy: Marianne, nothing else, right?

Village Attorney Stecich: No.

Chairman Murphy: That concludes our business for this evening. Thank you.

And our next meeting will be June 28, I believe.

ADJOURNMENT

On MOTION of Boardmember Dovell, SECONDED by Boardmember Pennington with a voice vote of all in favor, Chairman Murphy adjourned the Regular Meeting.

