

**VILLAGE OF HASTINGS-ON-HUDSON, NEW YORK  
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS  
REGULAR MEETING  
FEBRUARY 27, 2014**

A Regular Meeting was held by the Zoning Board of Appeals on Thursday, February 27, 2014 at 8:00 p.m. in the Meeting Room, Municipal Building, 7 Maple Avenue.

**PRESENT:** Acting Chairman David Forbes-Watkins, Boardmember Ray Dovell, Boardmember Mark Pennington, Village Attorney Marianne Stecich, and Deputy Building Inspector Charles Minozzi, Jr.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** We have a very limited agenda tonight. First, I should say if there are any people here to speak to the proposal of the Gordons, at 51 Warren Street, that proposal has been deferred until next month. So if anyone is here for that purpose, they could depart because there's not going to be any listening to it.

**I. APPLICATIONS**

**Matthew Gordon  
51 Warren Street  
(Now Deferred until March Meeting – 3/28/14)**

**Application for the extension of variances granted by ZBA  
on December 13, 2012**

**The application for extension of previously granted approvals was granted at the ZBA's last meeting on January 23 on a condition that the prescribed notification and mailings be done to see if there is any adverse reaction to the ZBA's action.**

**The notice of this action was posted in papers on February 7, 2014 and mailings done as required. The Building Department did not receive any comments or inquiries about this application and or ZBA's action.**

**I. APPLICATIONS**

**Case No. 04-14  
Gabrielle Lesser  
36 Calumet Avenue**

**Relief from the strict application of Section 295-68F.(2)(a)[2] of Village Code  
for construction of a swimming pool in the backyard of their house  
at 36 Calumet Avenue**

**The variance sought is as follows:**

**Development Coverage:**

**Existing/Proposed – 40.54%/42.32%**

**Permitted Maximum – 35%{295-68F.(2)(a)[2]}**

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** We have one item, case number 04-14, Gabrielle Lesser, 36 Calumet Avenue. Who's going to speak for this?

**Gregory Attard, Keane Coppelman Gregory Engineers:** I will be.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** Please identify yourself at the microphone.

Before we go ahead further, I need to do two things. One, I want to check, have we gotten our mailings in order?

**Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi:** I've been informed by my staff that all the mailings are in order.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** Very good. The other thing is, as you can see, there are only three Boardmembers here tonight. The zoning law requires that any approval of a zoning ordinance change must be made by a majority of the entire Board, which means that in this particular case if we are to approve this case it must be approved by all three of us; a majority is not sufficient.

Because of that, there is the option for the person proposing something to withdraw until the next meeting. And also during the course of this discussion, before any voting, if that seems to be appropriate to the person who's applying, they can do so. Is that clear?

**Village Attorney Stecich:** David, could I just amplify that a little bit?

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** OK, go right ahead.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** You're absolutely right. The other thing the applicant should understand is that if it goes to a vote and it's two-to-one, even if it's two in favor and one against, it's a denial and that's the end of it. Just so you realize that.

**Mr. Attard:** I'm representing Gabrielle Lesser. Just to clarify, I guess, we would be more than happy to give our presentation, but I would not want to limit my client's potential for this approval based on the limited number of Boardmembers.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** Well, I don't want to get into a situation where we're going through an entire presentation, and then going to have to do the exact same thing next month because there will be more Boardmembers here who will not have seen the presentation.

**Boardmember Pennington:** There will be one additional Boardmember because one of our Boardmembers has recused himself because he lives in proximity to the subject site. Just so you know that for the next meeting.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** No, there can be five. The chairman is away tonight, I'm the captain now. He will be here, presumably, next month as well as the alternate, who could not come tonight. As a result, there would presumably be five people here next month.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Can I just speak with you one second?

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** Sure.

OK, if the applicant is not willing to proceed to a vote tonight, that would mean that we will have to come back next month and re-hear the entire process for the two additional people who will be here. I think that is a most unfortunate thing to do. And therefore, with great apologies to the many people who've come presumably to make comments concerning this proposal, it just doesn't make sense unless we're willing to go to a vote.

**Gary Rosenberg, 43 Buena Vista Drive:** Could I ask something?

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** Yes.

**Mr. Rosenberg:** Legally, they have a right to present.

**Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi:** Please state your name for the record.

**Mr. Rosenberg:** If I understand it, legally they have a right to present. And they have a right to decide. It wasn't their fault that there are three members here. They have a right to decide prior to the vote, after the presentation, whether they want to bring it to a vote. I think that for the Board to – I would say, from what I hear – intimidate them into giving up what is

absolutely their right to do – after they assembled everybody, they're paying professionals to be here – to sit down and say, "You know, it's your right, but you better not do it," I just have a ... I think that's not fair to them. And I appreciate it means taking your time.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** I'm not worried about our time, sir. Please understand that. I'm also worried about all of the people here who are going to be sitting here who are going to present, and if we are not going to come to a vote they're going to have to come back next time anyhow.

**Mr. Rosenberg:** I think that's the law. And I think to tell us that that's the law, but you better not take your rights, is inappropriate.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** Thank you, I appreciate that. On advice of counsel, you agree?

**Village Attorney Stecich:** As I said, I think it's a good idea to go forward, and the other members can watch it on the video.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** OK, we will proceed.

**Mr. Rosenberg:** This is all video?

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Yes.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** I apologize.

**Mr. Rosenberg:** Oh, so then they could certainly see it.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** But they can't question.

**Mr. Rosenberg:** People will be back.

**Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi:** You have to speak into the microphone if you're going to speak, sir.

**Mr. Attard:** OK, we do understand that the presentation will be made and, should we not elect to go to a vote, that we'll be back before a larger board at the next scheduled meeting to potentially re-present our case.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** Please go ahead.

**Mr. Attard:** So after that somewhat ... start, we're here tonight to present to you our proposal for some improvements and modifications to the existing site. The Lessers, who are currently residents of the Village, have purchased the property and are currently doing some internal renovations and have also looked to see what can be done to improve the overall site in terms of the landscape and some of the layout. So myself, along with Richard Quigley of IQ Landscape Architects, have been retained by the owner to kind of study some options. And this is what we're here before you to present.

The main reason we're before this board is because, unfortunately or not, as the property changed hands currently this lot is existing nonconforming in terms of its development coverage. Right now, the lot is not exceeded in building coverage. But again, just based on what we find to be somewhat a narrower and deeper lot, there's a fair amount of access – whether it be walkways or driveways – getting from Calumet, which is truly the front yard, as well as Summit, into the property.

So we initially studied it, and we did find that no matter how we looked at it there would ultimately be an issue with development coverage. So going through a couple iterations of different schemes we kind of settled on this one, where what we're proposing to do is to take a detached garage and make it attached to the principal structure, kind of bringing the overall mass of the property closer. As well as one of the goals of the redevelopment of a property for the new owner was to potentially create a swimming pool on their property. In terms of setbacks and things of that nature, and use, it is allowable. But, again, we had been running up against this overall development coverage.

So kind of coming into that, with that known hardship which was inherited during the purchase of the property, what we've looked to do is try to mitigate to the extent possible and really look to ask for this small additional increase. It was approximately allowable of about 35 percent; we're currently at about 40. And what we're asking this board is in the range of about 42 percent of development coverage. Although the Village's code does not recognize things such as green roofs and permeable pavers in terms of deducts for the development coverage, we are proposing environmental mitigation factors to try to reduce any impacts in its development, as well as trying to reduce the impervious coverage on the lot.

The last thing that I would like to point out is – again, staying with the actual topography and the lay of the property – this was the ideal location for siting a swimming pool. It's sited in such a way that it doesn't require any large amounts of grading or filling or things of that nature. We have laid it out. And really, because it lies with the natural contours, in a way there would be very minimal visual impacts to any of the adjoining neighbors. And we don't really foresee there being any issues in terms of views to the west towards the river.

I'm not sure, Richard, if you had any other points. If there are any other questions or specificities that you'd like to understand, we'd be more than happy to answer them.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** OK, obviously, the first question that concerns me is drainage.

**Mr. Attard:** Yes.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** The property is obviously sloped, to say the least.

**Mr. Attard:** Yes.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** And adding more development coverage throws some water somewhere. Where are you planning to ...

**Mr. Attard:** That's a very good question, and that was one of the main facets of my firm being retained. That's something we do, is come up with these stormwater mitigation plans for during construction as well as post construction. So we do, obviously, realize that there's new impervious being created by the pool and the pool terrace. And we also want to improve the overall drainage of off-site running coming on to the property, adjoining neighbors, as well as ensuring that there are no impacts down to Calumet right now.

I did a full study of the site. We've looked at where all the existing issues are and we will find ways to mitigate them. The main mechanism we'll be using to do so will be some type of subsurface infiltration system within the front yard area.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** The front yard?

**Mr. Attard:** That is correct. Just because, as you pointed out, we have a pretty good slope from rear to front. So just based on the gravity collection of all that stormwater runoff, that would be the ultimate point that we'd look to mitigate it. We've looked into the potential of some type of a connection into Calumet. Based on my research, and in speaking with the Building Department, it doesn't seem as though there's actual drainage piping within that portion of Calumet. I believe when it comes towards the south, at that throat onto the other road, there are some drain inlets. So we will find a way that ... because, really, we have two things going on. And before we'd even gotten to this point, this is where we were retained to look at some legitimate concerns with this property.

Not only are we going to be mitigating the new impervious, we're really looking to come up with a plan to potentially capture most of the runoff from the driveway as well as the roof's that, at this point, pretty much discharge from the site unmitigated. So without going into the full design – which, my understanding, would come into play further down the line from appearing before this board – we will be designing and installing a fairly robust stormwater mitigation system.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** David and Buddy correct me, I imagine this is going to need steep slopes approval.

**Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi:** Absolutely going to need steep slopes approval.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Because it's construction on them. So those are important questions, and they'll have to be reviewed by the Planning Board.

**Mr. Attard:** I'm glad you brought that up, as well. I did research the Village's ordinance on steep slopes. It seems as though you guys have a – and correct me if I'm wrong – there is a contiguous area of disturbance. What we are finding right now ... I would like to move from the microphone, but I do understand I need to speak into it. Thank you.

What you will find is, although it does have a fairly strong differential from rear to front, there are portions that do level out. This is one of those portions that is flatter than the rest, which is another key reason that we'd like to install the mitigation system here. Because really, what I'm also trying to point out is that the overall disturbance of the site is proposed to take place within the areas that are less steep than others. There is a band of steep slopes within here. We'd be more than happy to provide a slope disturbance analysis. But above and beyond that, I believe – and correct me if I'm wrong – it was 15 percent?

**Village Attorney Stecich:** If it's a ground area of at least 1,000 square feet, with a slope of 15 percent or more. But ground areas ... it doesn't have to be contiguous.

**Mr. Attard:** OK. So then we will be more than happy ...

**Village Attorney Stecich:** My guess is you probably have a total of 1,000 when you include the pool in that.

**Mr. Attard:** If ground area does not mean it needs to be contiguous ...

**Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi:** That's correct.

**Mr. Attard:** OK, that's fine.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** It really screens out for that kind of review anyway.

**Mr. Attard:** Absolutely we'd be happy to provide that slope disturbance analysis of the existing steep slope areas, what we're proposing to disturb. And based on that analysis, if we find there's areas that can be avoided because of disturbance, what we did present to you was kind of our overall goal. If there are some things that need to be slightly modified, we're more than open to do so.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** OK. One question that sort of follows along the same line. A pool often is built up. The ground is raised, or the pool itself is raised and causes water to sheer off on the sides. What are your plans with respect to maintaining some degree of continuity with the present iteration?

**Mr. Attard:** That's a very good question, if you give me one moment. So what Richard and I had looked at, typically, when him and I work together, there'll be a concept that comes up. And your question is, usually – as soon as the design is established – that's the next thing that we look at. What we'd be looking to do in this particular case, right now the existing contour is 36, basically, through the pool. So we're approximately half a foot lower within that area, again trying to maintain the minimum amount of cuts. What we'd be doing from the corners of the coping would essentially be pitching slightly backwards – whether we do an area drain in the middle or some type of a perimeter trench drain – that would be utilized to pick up the majority of the stormwater from the actual pool area.

Without having the design, obviously it's hard to understand. But we would look to try to pick up as much of the runoff from the existing driveway as possible. Because it's a benefit to the property owner, it's a benefit to the Village, and it's really something that we're looking to achieve as part of the overall ... when we're in there constructing a mitigation system, if we can enlarge it to the extent possible to incorporate other areas of runoff, that's absolutely what we're looking to do. Because we are also faced with an off-site sheeting condition that's pretty much generally along Summit. So although we're kind of limited to our own property we would, without taking too much off-site runoff and mitigating, obviously, like to kind of improve upon the existing condition.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** Boardmembers have question?

**Boardmember Pennington:** I'll start with a comment, then follow with some questions. It looks to me, if my math is correct, what you're proposing to do in adding additional



development on the site is a change of 1.78 percent from the existing use. But compared against the permitted, it's a change of 7 percent.

**Mr. Attard:** That is correct.

**Boardmember Pennington:** Which is a significant change. Our charge, as a board, is to grant the minimum variance possible under the circumstance. You've spoken to that, and I'd like to understand a couple of things; what alternatives you considered in the configuration for the site, and also if you could speak to the environmental mitigations that you alluded to – what those specifically would be.

**Mr. Attard:** Absolutely. I think it's appropriate to get into the specificity of why we're here. When you look at this lot, it's approximately 24,000 square feet. So each percent above the 35, not to say it's minimal, but it is rather small. So we are faced with a difficult task in terms of trying to ... if we were able to come in and say we would only be granting a variance for the existing nonconformity that would be one thing. But, really, the hardship to my client is that we do understand that, starting from scratch, we're almost 5 percent over allowable. And obviously, every percent above and beyond that is something that your board is faced with making that decision on.

We had studied a number of different options. I think, in all fairness, this is the final concept that we came up with that we felt very comfortable coming to you and asking for this variance without feeling as though we were just asking for more than what was appropriate. Again, the siting is pretty set in terms of where it could be located. And the additional coverage, such as patios and walkways associated, again, it's a very steep-sloping lot so it does require steps for access. So there are certain additional development coverage aspects that come into play just based on the lot itself.

I hope I'm answering your question as directly as possible. But on the whole, have we evaluated other areas? Yes, we have. With the understanding that the lot and the site itself kind of dictate where and what can happen, or how these need to happen.

**Boardmember Pennington:** Unless, of course, you adjust the size of the proposal. You've got a difference of 434 square feet between the existing development area and the proposed development area, which is not a very big difference. So as I look at this I wonder, are there ways that you could reconfigure and resize the patio, pool, other aspects of the proposal to bring that number down.

**Mr. Attard:** To answer you, and again I apologize if I'm repeating myself, we did, in consulting with the client and the other design professional. This is what we felt was, from

our side of the fence so to say, a fair kind of request to this board. One thing that we did elect to do – as I think you kind of pointed out with the numbers – is, we had taken a detached structure and made it attached. We are trying to recreate that structure over an area that is already considered to be developed coverage. I do understand where you're coming from, but for us to go square foot by square foot to take it down, if it's something that you guys are going to request we do, it does kind of ... it's something that we don't necessarily think is totally fair to our client.

And then to speak again to the environmental mitigation. What we are looking to do, in order to help with what you had just brought up about trying to narrow that 400 square foot or whatever it may be, we are looking to incorporate a pretty significant area of permeable paver. Again, under the build use code it's not recognized as being a non-developed surface. But we are trying to ... as well as the fact that the garage that was previously detached now is attached, will actually incorporate a green roof. And that's something that the owner understands the cost and the maintenance implications of that type of a green roof structure, and they're more than happy to move forward with it.

Again, I understand your questioning. But really, I also hope that the overall Board understands that we have given a pretty significant amount of time and effort into developing this concept in order to come before this board to ask for what is ... again, because of the existing nonconformity it magnifies what we're actually looking to do with this plan.

**Boardmember Pennington:** So the ECO Paver portion of the driveway is in the dark color, at the bottom?

**Mr. Attard:** Essentially where you see as the hatched area.

**Boardmember Pennington:** And the reason it's located there, as opposed to for the entire length?

**Mr. Attard:** Well, it is somewhat of ... it is a pretty steeply-sloped driveway. We do find that the pavers themselves actually function a little more effectively when they're not on an actual incline, just based on the tires kind of wearing away at them. Also, too, it's an area that we are better suited to have some type of an under-drain or other drainage. Because, although the permeable pavers will be there, we are intending to try to pick up any additional runoff above and beyond that. Same thing with the green roof system. There will be an under-drain system, where we will capture that and then, ultimately, discharge it to the stormwater mitigation system.

**Boardmember Pennington:** Could I ask a few more questions about how you access the pool space?

**Mr. Attard:** Sure.

**Boardmember Pennington:** On your drawing, there's something that's described as a "bridge." How does that connect? From where to where?

**Mr. Attard:** So that's a very good question. This kind of came into play with the overall concept of combining the mass of the lot together and trying to bring it into one structure. So right now, if you could kind of see this section view here, this would be looking essentially west towards the river. Right now, if you see on your plans, there is an existing kind of porch or patio that comes off the rear of the structure. We're proposing to add the garage on here and essentially bring it out into this slope. One side of the garage wall will act as the retaining structure.

But what we're proposing to do is to actually step down onto the green roof and have it essentially come out onto the pool deck level. Just because of the existing slopes here, there will be a portion that'll actually be suspended as a bridge.

**Boardmember Pennington:** The reason I asked the question is, I'm trying to understand how many access points exist and are needed, and whether some are redundant.

**Mr. Attard:** Really, what we were looking to do is to provide for two main routes of ingress and egress from the pool area. One would be from that second floor level, and that would also kind of ... I believe that, programmatically, it falls in line with where people would change and things of that nature to come out. As great as it is to have people come from the second floor, there may be instances where you do want to get to the pool from the first floor or the exterior area. And that's what kind of dictated the additional set of stairs that are running down through here.

**Boardmember Pennington:** And what is the distance between that additional set of stairs and the side property boundary there?

**Mr. Attard:** This set of stairs here?

**Boardmember Pennington:** Right.

**Mr. Attard:** I apologize. I don't have it in front of me, but if you look on the drawings that you guys have, the second sheet, you may see some ...

**Village Attorney Stecich:** No. The marking is there, but there's not a number attached to it.

**Mr. Attard:** So essentially, as Richard had just pointed out, we're maintaining the same ... right now, there is an existing staircase essentially being built within that same area. If I had to single it out, having an actual scale, it would probably be in the neighborhood of 8 to 10, potentially 12, feet off the property line.

**Boardmember Pennington:** So it's 8 feet for accessory structures that are allowed in the side yard?

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Well, that wouldn't be an accessory structure. Let me look at it. There are provisions for stairs projecting into a side yard. Let me take a look at it.

**Mr. Attard:** I did review the code myself for the same issues. When we were re-siting the garage, previously it was an accessory. We actually were more conservative and looked at, now, technically, if it's attached. We did interpret it as being a part of the principal structure.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** A part of the principal structure.

**Mr. Attard:** For the garage.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Yeah, it wouldn't be accessory.

**Mr. Attard:** Yes.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** No, no. Free-standing steel stairs can project, I guess, like the old fire escapes can project, but not regular stairways. So, Buddy, wouldn't that stairway have to meet the side yard setback?

**Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi:** We consider that landscaping, with stairs and walls like that.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** You consider stairs landscaping?

**Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi:** Mm-hmm.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** OK.

**Boardmember Dovell:** What is the width of the garage?

**Mr. Attard:** I'm sorry. If you wouldn't mind, in terms of north-south or east-west?

**Boardmember Dovell:** Well, as you drive in, what is the width of it from what you show as a patio, which looks like an inset patio, to the ...

**Mr. Attard:** Yeah. So if you went from the edge of the patio to the edge of the retaining wall, it's approximately 23 feet.

**Boardmember Dovell:** Twenty-three feet.

**Mr. Attard:** Mm-hmm. I think they're 9-1/2 foot (inaudible).

**Richard Quigley, IQ Landscape Architects:** It's actually 24.

**Boardmember Dovell:** I find the whole thing a little hard to decipher because you haven't really developed the scheme. You know, it's hard to see what the site section looks like.

**Mr. Attard:** OK.

**Boardmember Dovell:** You're really missing a site section from Summit all the way down to Calumet. Because that's how you're going to perceive it, and my sense is that this is going to be terrifically visible from Summit, just looking at your pictures. The site is a little strange because it goes to two streets.

**Mr. Attard:** Correct.

**Boardmember Dovell:** And the Summit end of it is really the backyard.

**Mr. Attard:** That is correct.

**Boardmember Dovell:** But for a lot of people it's not the backyard, it's the front yard. So the impact of that whole accumulation of structures and pool I think really needs to be illustrated a little more definitively.

**Mr. Attard:** I'm sure we could come up with another way to illustrate it. But just so you do understand, our thoughts were that by removing that accessory garage that it kind of did open up the feel of the space. And topographically and from an elevation standpoint – and I do understand it's hard to perceive without a section – that the edge of curb, so to speak, on Summit is on the magnitude of about 6 to 8 feet above what that pool deck elevation is.

So our feeling was, with pretty significant and robust screening, that any views would either be above, looking at the existing ... because the other thing to keep in mind is, the majority of views looking into the site from Summit pretty much dead end on the back of the existing residence as it's sited. Because of the fact that the lot is somewhat narrow, and the adjacent structure is based on their required side yard setbacks, it does ... the house itself is kind of with the focal point. Obviously, my client would not want people driving by and looking in. So our feeling is that although it's not 100 percent clear to see without the section, that we are for the most part avoiding, anyone from looking in or impacting the view of anyone that would be driving by.

**Boardmember Dovell:** That's fine, I understand what you're saying. But it needs to be illustrated. You know, it needs to be illustrated with a site section and a little more detail to the roof configurations and just exactly what you're doing back here. There's not an elevation of the garage, and these things are kind of what we would expect before we begin to act on something; a little more thoroughness.

**Mr. Attard:** Sure.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** Do you have any questions at this point?

**Boardmember Pennington:** It's a little difficult to see how it all hangs together. I mean, it looks like you actually have less square feet of driveway in the new plan than the old because the garage is going to be taking up some of the space that the old driveway took up.

**Mr. Attard:** That is correct. And also, in the existing condition there is a portion of driveway on this. So if you could imagine, the pool would be roughly up in this area. But there is a portion right now that is paved, and this is going to be taken out and vegetated. So, again, with the overall intent of reducing runoff from the site because there are existing issues.

But getting back to your statement, yes, the reason that the numbers are the way they are is because we are reconstructing the garage over the existing driveway, as well as removing a decent portion of it.

**Boardmember Pennington:** So looking at your schematic for the proposed development, it doesn't appear to me that there's any single item that's not necessary to the plan. It's a question of the sizing of the elements, as I view it.

**Mr. Attard:** Then I think we're in agreement because that's kind of what I was trying to get at before. That all the elements are there not because we're trying to be overdoing our plan. It's really a matter of needs.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Could I follow up on one of Mark's questions? Because you were asking about the stairways. Isn't there a third stairway? There's the bridge, there's the long stairway that runs along the side property line. And isn't there a set of stairs that head out toward Summit?

**Mr. Attard:** Yes. This would pretty much just be a small flight of stairs here.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** OK, so it's a third access to the pool.

**Mr. Attard:** I wouldn't say it would be access. I believe it's going to be pool equipment.

**Mr. Quigley:** Our intention there is that we wanted to create a significant buffer in terms of vegetation, et cetera.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Right.

**Mr. Quigley:** But not make it look deliberate, and make it kind of a garden/strolling area.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Yeah, I see that drawing. But this is not the drawing we have. I'm looking at the drawing we have, and it's got stairs and it has all these circles. And your legend doesn't indicate what the circles are.

**Mr. Quigley:** Well, it's AutoCAD drawing as opposed to a hand-drawn illustrative. But it's basically depicting the same thing. What it is, it was a series of little garden path stones that our client would be able to create. Our client presently lives in Hastings, has a wonderful piece of property, and really enjoys having landscape. So one of the things we incorporated here was to have a little stroll garden, maybe a little tiny bench up there, and just a place to go be from the pool and just walk out. And, at the same time, be able to create a very, very naturalistic landscape that people from Summit will see. They will not see the pool, nor do our clients see Summit.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** But that does, then, create a third access to the pool.

**Mr. Quigley:** No, it's not an access, sir. Because the fencing which surrounds the pool, there's no way out there. It's purely just a little garden feature as part of the experience of being at this pool area.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** You really can't tell that from the drawings that we have. That should have been submitted because this does not reflect that.

**Boardmember Pennington:** Well, is that the walkway that's shown here as comprising 55 square feet of cover?

**Mr. Quigley:** Yes.

**Boardmember Pennington:** And then there's another walkway down ... 197 square feet of cover. Similar construction, similar concept, little round garden stones.

**Mr. Attard:** Yes, absolutely. From an illustrative or a pictorial standpoint, we did want to make sure that we encompassed that because we knew that every square foot, essentially, counted. So we were trying to illustrate ... although as Ms. Stecich pointed out, the actual rendering kind of brings the concept closer together. These were kind of just more engineer drawings done for the zoning analysis purpose. But yes – to clearly answer your question – yes, those are essentially stepping stones or pathways.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** And those are part of the development calculation?

**Mr. Attard:** Yes, they are in the numbers. And from my interpretation, they were required to be put in there under the definition of being an impervious surface.

**Boardmember Pennington:** You mentioned the pool fence, and I couldn't tell from the drawings. It looks like it ties into one of the retaining walls. Is that the way it works, to enclose the space?

**Mr. Quigley:** I'll explain this. What happens is, the pool fence actually sits on top of the middle terraced wall. These are 2-foot high terraced walls. What you have is a series. You're going from the driveway up to a little lightly sloped-in back here, which will have wonderful cascading plants and perennials and things like that. The second wall works out very well because the fence is kind of hidden when you're out of the pool and also kind of up a little higher from when you're at the garage port area. It goes underneath the bridge, comes across, comes to the landing of where the stairs are where a code-compliance gate would be, comes in to the fence that runs along the property line, comes up above.

Plantings will be planted on both sides. You won't even see this fence if our landscape treatment works as successfully as it hopes. And then it continues around with just another access point. This is just to have another point of access. Not necessarily would anybody be



using that, but it would be good to have another point in which we could arrive here. That was our intent with the fencing. To keep it very, very discrete, integrate it with planting to both sides. And the fence kind of works its way in, and you don't see it from either side.

**Boardmember Pennington:** OK, thank you.

**Mr. Quigley:** So that's the intent.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** You're calling that an access point, there, in the pool?

**Mr. Quigley:** Well, I would call it more that people would come to maintain the pool, they would go to check the mechanical equipment, which is right here. That would be more of a maintenance access point. It certainly would be, again, code-compliant, self-closing, self-latching. It probably would even have a lock on it. The only other person that could use it would be the person that's going to maintain the pool. They're going to come in with their truck, they're going to park their truck here. They're going to come in, they're going to do whatever chemical treatment they have to do to the pool. They're going to check out the pool equipment, which is right here, which also meets all the setback requirements. That will be heavily screened, as well. That's the intention for that.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** So a limited number of approved accesses to a pool, and I'm not sure of the number.

**Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi:** Two.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** We've identified three, have we not? You have two, correct? This is the single access from the bridge, and the steps. It's the same one?

**Boardmember Dovell:** At grade, there are two. The only way you can get to the pool from the house is across the bridge.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** If the Board has no further questions at this point, I would open the debate to the floor for comments from individuals. Please, if you wish to make comments come up to the microphone, identify yourself, and then proceed as you see fit. Anyone?

**Bill McGowan, 177 Villard Avenue:** My property is adjacent to 136 Calumet. We'd like to extend a welcome to the Lessers. I'm sure they're going to make great neighbors. Just not convinced that their pool is going to be.

I think it's important to give a little context here of what this area of the neighborhood is like and what it's experienced over the past several months. There was a project a few doors down that was part of the Sills property. It was a building of a garage, and it was probably slated for being about a two- or three-month project. Backhoes arrived, and what they found was rock and a lot of it. Lester is one of my best friends. I've known him since kindergarten and we're good pals, but it was a living hell. Backhoes and jackhammers existed six, sometimes seven days a week, and the project went on for about seven months.

This neighborhood is filled with creative people who work from home – writers, novelists, photographers, musicians – who really cringe at the thought of the kind of noise pollution that will be created from having to dig not just a foundation for a garage, but we're talking about a pool that I assume the deep end probably extends to about 8 feet. That's what most pools are. And I would imagine you'd have to dig down another foot or 2 beyond that just for the making of the pool.

I don't know whether any geological survey's been done on this piece of the property, but I think we all know this village is built on rock and ledge. And I think it would be prudent for us to have some kind of assessment as to what's under that ground so this project doesn't start and become a nightmare for everybody in the area. We're particularly impacted because our house, literally, is adjacent. In fact, the driveway that you see at the top is a shared driveway with us and 136. We are directly below the property that is slated to be built on. So, of course, when you dig that deep and move that much ground we're concerned about where that water's going to go. I've heard some of the comments by the designers as to how they're going to mitigate that. I'm obviously just concerned about what we're going to find underneath that, and the incredible chaos and disruption that will exist.

I know the Lessers themselves know what that can be like. I know in their own neighborhood, the Merton-Humphreys had a hot tub that they went to install in a garage and the entire neighborhood shook for a period of weeks and months from just a hot tub. This is a very big pool. I think there are a number of questions that I know we would, and some of the other residents would, like to have answers to before any decision is rendered on this project. We'd like to know how long the construction job was going to take, whether there are any water lines or pipes that could be discovered in the breaking of ground and the laying of the pool; will the street be dug up at any point for additional pipes that have to feed water into the pool; where a pool pump will be located? if pool pumps break they can send off water into other properties? Obviously, water damage is a concern from some of the neighbors.

And also, Summit Drive is a very small and wind-y street, especially at this bend in the road. We all know, for the construction of something this grandiose, you need big trucks delivering

cement, delivering water. Some of these trucks can weigh 65,000 pounds. I'm not 100 percent sure these streets can handle that kind of stress. And, in fact, the top of the driveway where these trucks would have to come is a shared driveway. It's something that we have ... it's the only way we have access in and out of our house. So how that driveway could be blocked by trucks delivering things is another question. I'd be happy to provide to the Board a list of our concerns and our questions, rather than take the time now at the microphone to list them all.

If my very best friend was moving next door to me I would implore them not to do this. It has nothing to do with my personal feelings to the Lessers. I'm sure they're wonderful people. This is not a project that we feel should be embarked on. Thank you.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** Thank you. Further questions?

**Eileen Baecher, 44 Calumet Avenue:** My driveway runs up all along the south of my property line. It's the shared property line with 36, and directly abuts the backyard that this proposal is for. I think if the variance is to be based on a question of impermeability I'd like the Board to consider the use of the permeable surfaces and the vegetative roof, and sort of adjusting what the raw numbers might look like.

I think there's a huge drainage problem that's created for all of us on the west side of Summit Drive by the way the road drains. It's not a question of what is coming off of her property. Individually, what happens to Calumet Avenue, it's a question of what comes off the top of Villard, Ravine and down all the way across Summit. I mean, I've had my property receive sheets of water off of Summit when there are breaks in the curbing. And it's a problem that's not necessarily created by what is on her property, but by what is just the lay of the land generally.

I would say that my husband and I do not have any issue. We lived through the building of the garage. It is difficult, but I think that in fairness this is their property, they should be allowed to do what they would like to do on their property as long as it doesn't create long-term issues. There are going to be difficulties in any construction process, but I'd like to think about the fairness to them in terms of what they purchased and what their longer-term uses and what the longer-term impact is on the neighborhood. Thank you.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** Thank you. Do we have any further?

**Helen Troubetzkoy, 42 Summit Drive:** I've lived her for 50 years or more so I've seen a lot of changes. By the way, the pool next door to me, which was put in by previous owners probably 20 years ago, at that time they had to dynamite. Because, really, everything is just

rock, rock, rock. Now, I concur with what Bill McGowan said because everything he said is completely correct.

I want to say I live on the hill, so I live on top. For me, the view of the house in question, I see it. Where they're going to put the pool, it's the first thing that when I look out of my windows that I see. So I hope that they really will take care of doing a very good screening. Because otherwise, they're just like in my rear window. I hope this project .... I welcome the Lessers, too. We have a very nice street, but I really hope they will think very seriously of what they're doing.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** Thank you.

**Maura May, 47 Calumet Avenue:** I'm right across the street from the Lessers. I also lived through the Sills' construction project and the banging into the ground for several months. I know the Lessers, the contractors that they hired, would come for weeks and then disappear for weeks. I am saying the Lessers – sorry, I mean the Sills, the Sills project. They would come for weeks, and then disappear for weeks. It was frustrating because it wasn't over in one hit. We heard it down on Calumet, everybody heard it. I heard the Humphreys' garage project, as well.

I think what the Lessers are proposing to do with the property will only make it nicer to look at from every angle. The garage that exists now is an eyesore. Gab has excellent taste regarding landscaping. I've seen her landscaping, and it is private and well-screened and can only make the property more beautiful to look at and also raise the property values around her. So I agree that it's tough to have trucks coming in on Summit. It is a horrible corner. I pick up a kid at the Lessers' house all the time ... at the Sills' house all the time. It's a dreadful corner. However, I think the end result it will just benefit everyone around because it will raise property values.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** Thank you.

**Gina Randazzo, 1 Summit Drive:** I'd also like to welcome Gab and Rich to the neighborhood. I couldn't be more thrilled that they're going to be my neighbors. I wish you years of happiness and health in your new home.

My concern, 1 Summit Drive is directly across the driveway. My side yard, or backyard, is directly across from where the pool will be. I have heard a number of really bad stories from relatives regarding the digging of pools. I came here, really, to find out about what that process would be. Is there blasting? Is that allowed? Is it just digging? I don't know, I'm

curious about that. I'm concerned about the foundation of my house. Obviously, that rock that you're going to be digging into is under my house, too.

So those are my questions. The stories that I've heard were with engineering firms, architectural firms that were very well-respected. I'm not doubting anybody that anybody's hired, but that's what I would like to find out more about. Thank you.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** Thank you.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Are you looking for an answer on the blasting? Is blasting permitted? It's allowed by permit if, in the opinion of the Building Inspector, no other means of rock removal is available. But if permitted, there needs to be a bond posted and it needs to be noticed. But our code does allow blasting.

**Gary Rosenberg, 43 Buena Vista Drive:** I'm about a block away, and we had gotten a variance to put in a pool. It's interesting that we're talking about impermeability. Because I would tell you that our pool is a stormwater retention area that we swim in. That to take a look at the 750 feet of pool, you have at least 3 inches to get over the top. Which means that you have 760 additional feet that are not permeable under the code. But if you have a runoff of water, it's going into the pool. I would tell you that I understand the technical definition. But since we're talking about what happens in rain and what happens in snow, OK, there was a time I used to wonder what happens when we get a torrential rain, will it go over the pool. Maybe if we got a foot-and-a-half or 2, but I'm saying that our pool is, if anything, when there's a problem with water it goes into the pool. It never goes out of the pool.

So I would tell you that I understand that technically it's increasing the number. But if you take the 760 feet of the pool, they're actually decreasing the amount if you consider what the pool is as far as stormwater retention. Which is the purpose, I believe, of the impermeability. I think you're actually improving the situation by the square footage of the pool, even though it counts against them. I think since that's the purpose of the variance and that's the question for the variance. They're really going from ... if you take just the square footage of the pool, they're decreasing the amount of space that's not taking water.

So I think since that's the consideration here, it's not whether it disturbs a neighbor. The consideration is whether or not they're exacerbating a variance requirement. The requirement here is impermeability, and I can guarantee you that, having watched my pool for all these years, to call that an impermeable surface that is going to contribute to runoff, it's the definition in the code. It's why you had granted the variance.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** Thank you. Other comments, questions?

**Mr. Rosenberg:** And let me say I assume you can blast. I will tell you that ours went straight into rock. We're between Buena Vista and Euclid. We're on a straight slope, it's all rock, OK? I would not blast right next to my house. So yes, it wasn't cheap and it wasn't easy. But everything was done with machines carving out the rock on our pool. Nobody could tell you everything was going to be perfect, blasting, and our pool is probably 9 feet from our house – 7 feet, 8 feet from our house.

**Mr. McGowan:** I want to just draw attention to one thing that the designer himself said when Mr. Pennington was asking him if it was possible to have a plan B that was a scaled-down version. You said it was a matter of needs. I would actually beg to differ. I think when we're talking about a very large swimming pool we're not talking about something that's needed; I think we're talking about something that's wanted. I think it's important for the Board to keep that in mind.

**Steve Silverstein, 12 Forest Avenue:** I'm the general contractor on this job, and I've been part of the design discussions from the very beginning. I just want to say one thing. I think Mr. Rosenberg's comments about the surface of the pool not being counted in the calculation is a good one. But what I wanted to say is that the existing garage that is proposed to come down, that the roof of that garage – if you compared it to the roof of the proposed garage – it's ... I mean, I don't have the topo in front of me and the elevations, but I would say it's probably 8 to 10 feet below – maybe more if you went to the peak, maybe 15 feet all the way at the peak of the existing garage. The proposed garage is going to actually be a foot or two below what is now a flat roof over a mud room area. There are steps down to that, and then there is about a 2-foot transition onto the pool level.

I know there isn't a cross-section of that. But if you're talking about from Summit looking down onto this project, I think the sight lines are going to open up quite a bit by taking away the structure that's there and rebuilding it down by the house. Not to mention that that whole idea became almost like a light went off, and we said, "You know what? You're walking from your garage, which is 40 feet, 50 feet away from your house, on a very steep slope. And now you're going to have a garage that's contiguous to your house that you're going to be able to walk into that's going to sit on an impervious surface that's going to have a lower roof than the one that's existing."

So all of that just seemed to make a lot of sense in terms of the design. And just one last thing. I live directly across the street from the Humphrey-Mertons. Personally, there hasn't been a huge inconvenience for me for them to do that project. I'll just say that in all candor it's not a big deal for me.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** Thank you.

**Mr. Quigley:** I wanted to let you know about the process in which we were designing the pool. I design pools for a living. Your standard pool that's out there in the industry today, if you were to go to a Sylvan pool, which is kind of the cookie-cutter pool builder, your average pool size is 20 by 40. Most pools will graduate up from there. We reduced this pool to 38 by 16, so it is not an oversized pool. It's very much in scale to the site and the landscape treatment that we're trying to achieve. It works very well within the envelope of an area that really was conducive to developing a pool. So this is not an oversized pool. Thank you.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** Thank you.

**Gabrielle Lesser, currently 3 Floral Avenue:** We're soon to be 36 Calumet. First, I just want to thank everybody for coming out on what's proving to be the coldest night so far of the year. I really appreciate hearing from everybody what their feelings are and what they're thinking about this. That's purposefully why, if I had your e-mail address, I tried to send everybody as much detail as I could ahead of time. So thank you for coming out.

It's also been very helpful to hear what the Board has to say on the questions. I think it probably would make a lot of sense for us to go back and look at how we can make some of these drawings a little bit more explicit, especially elevations and things like that, because we are dealing with something that's pretty much like that.

I think there's definitely some parts of this that we could work on, on the drainage sides. There's a fair amount of walkways around the house that right now, as far as I can tell, only the deer use them. So I think we could change some of those to something that's much more permeable than it is right now. I think I'd like to take a look at that.

I think the other thing I wanted to say was, it really matters to me what the lot, the whole lot, looks like. Right now, I feel like we're moving into a lot that has sort of three chunks. There's this backyard chunk and, from what I could tell, there was a fire pit there and basically just cigarette butts and cigarette packs and beer cans in it when we got the house. I'm not sure what the backyard was used for by the previous owners. The front yard is really in need of some drastic sort of overhaul in terms of the plantings there. They get scorched and they get eaten, and I think I'd really like to see about trying to put in something that feels a little bit more indigenous and a little bit more woodlands and something that the deer aren't going to find as appetizing, hopefully.

In my house at Floral Drive, when we moved in, that house had a chain link-fenced dog run on the east side of the house. We took down the chain link fence, put up teak fencing and created a garden area there. We've done that pretty much throughout the entire yard. I definitely welcome any of my neighbors to come up and see, once the snow melts, the kind of garden I like to have in there. It's something that we're really willing to invest in.

You can see a lot of green stuff on there and it can all look very sort of pie in the sky, but that's really the kind of garden I'm looking for. I'm not necessarily very deer-friendly, but I'd like to kind of make it so that whole hill feels much more like something other than something that water just pours off of. So that's kind of what we're going for here, something that integrates the whole thing as a whole and provides appropriate screening so people have their privacy, we have our privacy, sight lines are restored or kept together.

And I really appreciate everybody coming out tonight and giving us their feedback on it. It sounds like it would make sense, especially since there is a video, I guess, of this that the other members can watch, for us to probably adjourn tonight and come back when we have the full Board. One, it will give us a bit of time to process the input we've gotten from everybody and possibly, make some of our drawings a little clearer. Two, we'll have the full Board membership here, which would be very useful. So thank you.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** OK. We'll consider that a formal deferral 'til the next meeting.

**Ms. Lesser:** I figured I would cut to the chase.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** OK.

**Denise Rosenberg, 43 Buena Vista Drive:** Just one more comment?

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** Sure.

**Ms. Rosenberg:** We certainly appreciate Gab and Rich Lesser's commitment to the community, and are so pleased that they've chosen to stay. And we welcome them to our neighborhood.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** OK. Are there further comments?

I would like to thank the audience. And I apologize to you for almost cutting you off. I think this has proven useful. I do think at the next session we are going to need to give the



two members who haven't been here an opportunity to do some questioning. It certainly is not possible to come up with good ideas simply by watching TV.

I also would suggest that in thinking about an approval, at a minimum we would want to include the green roof on the garage as a requirement if that is permissible on this application.

**Village Attorney Stecich:** Yeah, that's certainly permissible.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** There may be other things that come to mind. I don't know whether they will or not. But I also think we want to see an enhancement of the drawings that Mr. Dovell was suggesting.

**Mr. Attard:** I'm sorry. Specifically, just some sections?

**Boardmember Dovell:** A site section so we can see actually what the grade is doing there physically.

**Mr. Attard:** Absolutely.

**Boardmember Dovell:** And what the garage looks like and how the bridge looks and that sort of thing.

**Boardmember Pennington:** And as for the drainage issues, you mentioned that you're in the process of doing some engineering on a retention facility. It certainly wouldn't hurt to have more details about that, whether they're formally required at this stage or not. It would help us to wrap our brains around where the water's going and how it's going to be managed.

**Mr. Attard:** Sure, we can begin to. [Off-mic] kind of show points of collection and piping and alternate [off-mic].

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** All right. At this point, I think we'll declare this session for this particular application over.

The Board has one other minor piece of business to deal with, mainly the minutes from the last meeting. You don't need to stay to listen to that. Thank you very much.

## II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

### **Regular Meeting of January 23, 2014**

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** I see that you have some thoughts, Mark.

**Boardmember Pennington:** I actually have 14 pages with corrections and five pages with questions. I'm happy to hand over the edits to Buddy, but the questions ...

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** Before you get to those questions, did you question the whole section called "old business" and "new business?" Because I don't think that our operation has the concept of old business and new business in a true good sense. So I think those headings should be just eliminated from the minutes now and in the future. Particularly since if you look at the heading "old business" you'll find, for instance, that we're doing Tony's Restaurant on old business, but that came up for the first time at this last meeting. So that was new business if it's any kind of business.

So, please, let's just drop that designation. It doesn't make sense. OK, now.

**Boardmember Pennington:** The questions I have chiefly relate to the motions and the votes. There's text in here that doesn't make sense to me. As an example, on page eight, on the matter – I've got these out of sequence – but this is the Gordon matter. It reads, "*The Board approved to extend the previously approved variances.*"

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** No, that's not correct.

**Boardmember Pennington:** Because the variance lapsed.

**Boardmember Dovell:** So it wouldn't be an extension.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** It simply approved the variances.

**Boardmember Pennington:** Approved to grant the requested variances.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** Right.

**Boardmember Pennington:** So I've made that edit, and I'm happy to pass it along.

On page 18, in the matter that ... I've got my page numbers out of sequence, so I don't recall which one it was. But on the motion, the minutes reflect that there was one opposition. But the minutes read that all were in favor. It doesn't reflect who voted against.

**Boardmember Dovell:** I did.

**Boardmember Pennington:** You did?

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** I thought it was Adam.

**Boardmember Dovell:** He voted against one and I voted against the last one.

**Boardmember Pennington:** So he voted against the Snowden, and you voted against whichever one this was. So I think we need to have this corrected to reflect this.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** That needs to be corrected, without question.

**Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi:** Are you going to give me a list of the changes?

**Boardmember Pennington:** I'll give you the actual pages.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** The question is, on page 18, which application are we looking at. I think we're looking at the application from Tony's Restaurant, 524 Warburton. That was your vote now. So it was Boardmember Dovell, and it therefore was a four-to-one vote in favor.

**Boardmember Pennington:** And a similar issue on page 35, where when we get to the motion it says, "*on motion of ...*" and then there's just an empty space, seconded by empty space, with a voice vote of all in favor the Board approved subject to variances. So I just think maybe it's a matter of the person transcribing the minutes looking at the name plaques and putting the correct names in, or us doing this when we do the edits. But it's not complete.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** As I recall, I said to Matt, "You make the motion" because he seemed to have a better handle on it than anybody, "and I'll second it." In fact, I didn't question that particular page 35 thing because it sort of followed from the prior colloquy between Matt and myself regarding the motion and the second.

**Boardmember Dovell:** That was for the spa and pool?

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** Yes.

**Boardmember Pennington:** It leaves me wondering exactly how these little paragraphs are put in. Because Marianne's question in the following paragraph talks about numbered items

one, two, three and four, and the motion refers to three items. Maybe there was no fourth, but I'm not confident that they're capturing all the discussion in here.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** I couldn't agree more with that. At this point, I have a hard time developing a logical fill-in. Do you?

**Boardmember Pennington:** Well, I can hand over the pages with the hard-line edits, and maybe also the pages.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** But do you have a hard-line edit for that motion and second?

**Boardmember Pennington:** I don't. So maybe it's a matter of looking at the recording again.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** I think we have to go back and go back all the way to ...

**Boardmember Dovell:** I think maybe it should be re-transcribed with a little more accuracy?

**Boardmember Pennington:** Then, hopefully, we don't have to look at them again. It takes almost as long as the meeting to read these.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** Yeah, this definitely was the ... all were not in favor, also, on page 35. This is the one where Adam voted no. So it was a four-to-one.

Are you continuing on, page by page? On page 26, Building Inspector Sharma. Actually, 1080, 540 twice. And then it's written as 10,080. It should be corrected to be 1080 again.

Next one.

**Boardmember Pennington:** Rather than go through them, I just handed over ... unless we need to absolutely discuss them, I think they're pretty clear, the ones that I've got.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** I'm quite willing to accept your additions and recommendations as written and turned over to the office.

**Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi:** We'll turn it over to the secretary, yes.

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** If we can have a second on the motion for that? Motion and second, all in favor.

### **III. ADJOURNMENT**

**Acting Chairman Forbes-Watkins:** The next meeting is scheduled for March 27.

**Boardmember Dovell:** And maybe there'll be something on the agenda.