

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS OF THE VILLAGE OF MAMARONECK, NEW YORK, HELD ON THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 2011 AT 7:00 P.M. IN THE COURTROOM AT 169 MT. PLEASANT AVENUE, MAMARONECK, NEW YORK.

These are intended to be “Action Minutes” which primarily record the actions voted on by the Zoning Board at the meeting held November 3, 2011. The full public record of this meeting is the audio/video recording made of this meeting and kept in the Zoning Board’s Records.

PRESENT: Clark Neuringer, Chairman
Barry Weprin, Vice Chairman
Robin Kramer, Secretary
Gregory Sullivan, Board Member
Dave Neufeld, Board Member
Anna Georgiou, Counsel to Board
Rob Melillo, Building Inspector

Kathleen McSherry, Court Reporter, was present at the meeting to take the stenographic minutes, which will not be transcribed unless specifically requested.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to Order by Chairman Neuringer at 7:10 p.m. and he introduced everyone and detailed the procedures for the meeting. The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, December 1, 2011.

1. Adjourned Application #1SP-2008, HAIKU ASIAN BISTRO, 265 Mamaroneck Avenue

Chairman Neuringer noted for the record that according to the Fire Inspector, the violations had been remedied.

A motion to close the public hearing was made by Mr. Weprin, seconded by Mr. Sullivan.

Ayes: Neuringer, Kramer, Sullivan, Neufeld, Weprin

Nays: None

2. Adjourned Application #19SP-2006, SANDRA & DON SCHWARZ/TRUSTEES D/B/A/ DCH MIDLAND LLC., 260 W. Boston Post Road

Paul Noto, attorney for the applicant, addressed the Board. He stated that this is a BMW car dealership. The special permit is up for renewal and the applicant wishes to renew its special permit to operate a car dealership. Mr. Noto referenced a letter submitted to the Zoning office from Larry Fraioli.

Mr. Noto stated that there are no violations and the dealership is in compliance with the conditions of the site plan approval. He indicated that Mr. Fraioli’s letter references street parking which

can't be enforced by the dealership. He said that the dealership can't force staff to park on the property; if it's a public street, the dealership can't force staff to park on the property.

Chairman Neuringer asked if the dealership staff wear uniforms and Mr. Noto indicated that they do. Chairman Neuringer reminded Mr. Noto that the original special permit brought up substantial parking issues and it was impressed upon that employees should park on the property. Mr. Noto stated that there is parking for the employees.

Chairman Neuringer asked if Mr. Noto knew if inventory was stored in the designated parking spaces. Mr. Noto requested an adjournment so that he could bring a representative from BMW to the meeting to discuss the parking.

Mr. Weprin asked if the Board can find out if the dealership can enforce employees to park on site. Anna Georgiou, attorney for the Board, stated that she would look into the matter and get back to the Board. Ms. Kramer stated that she did not believe people can be prohibited from parking on a public street.

Chairman Neuringer asked the Building Department to provide the Board with the approved site plan. Mr. Sullivan questioned the authenticity of the letter because it was unsigned and also asked why the Board was requesting site plans after receiving one letter of complaint. Mr. Melillo noted that the Building Department has never received a complaint about parking.

Chairman Neuringer asked if anyone in the audience wished to address the Board. None did.

The matter was adjourned to the December 1, 2011 meeting.

3. Application #7SP-2000, C & K DRY CLEANING CORP. D/B/A MAMARONECK CLEANERS, 965 Mamaroneck Avenue

Chairman Neuringer called the next application. The applicant did not appear. Unless the applicant appears later, the matter is adjourned until December 1, 2011.

4. Application #5SP-2001, BEKIR DEDE D/B/A TOP RAK, LTD., 540 Mamaroneck Avenue

Chairman Neuringer called the next application. The applicant did not appear. Unless the applicant appears later, the matter is adjourned until December 1, 2011.

5. Application #11SP-2008, DCH MAMARONECK, LLC. D/B/A DCH TOYOTA CITY, 700 Waverly Avenue

Paul Noto, attorney for the applicant, addressed the Board. He stated that this application is for the 700 Waverly service center. The special permit was approved in 2008, but opened this September 2011. The applicant is requesting a renewal and is in full compliance, Mr. Noto said.

Mr. Weprin stated that since the service station has only been open a few months, he feels a three year term should be imposed. Ms. Kramer asked about the parking agreement and Mr. Noto referenced his letter to Village Attorney Michael McDermott. Mr. Noto stated that this is a repair center so there are no cars parked. Ms. Kramer asked that if the owner decided to sell, what insurance would the Board have that the parking agreement would continue. Mr. Noto stated that the applicant would lose the special permit. He noted for the record that both the applicant and the business that has the parking agreement are owned by the same entity.

Chairman Neuringer asked if anyone in the audience wished to address the Board. None did.

A motion to close the public hearing was made by Mr. Sullivan, seconded by Mr. Weprin.

Ayes: Neuringer, Kramer, Sullivan, Neufeld, Weprin
Nays: None

6. Application #13SP-2008, PEOPLE'S UNITED BANK, 1444 E. Boston Post Road

Paul Noto, attorney for the applicant, addressed the Board. He stated that the Mosia service station turned into a bank with a drive-thru window. He noted that there are no complaints with regard to the operation of the bank and drive-thru window. Mr. Weprin asked how long the establishment had been open. Mr. Noto stated 2 ½ years.

Chairman Neuringer asked if anyone in the audience wished to address the Board. None did.

A motion to close the public hearing was made by Mr. Sullivan, seconded by Ms. Kramer.

Ayes: Neuringer, Kramer, Sullivan, Neufeld, Weprin
Nays: None

7. Application #14SP-2011, ADRIANA SALAMONE D/B/A CHERRY TREE YOGURT, 448 Mamaroneck Avenue

Adriana Salamone, the applicant, addressed the Board. She stated that she is applying for a new special permit to open and operate a yogurt store at 448 Mamaroneck Avenue. The hours of operation will be Sunday through Thursday, 10:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. and Friday and Saturday, 10:00 a.m. to midnight.

Ms. Salamone stated that this is not a franchise. She purchases yogurt from various vendors and it will be a self-service establishment serving healthy treats. Ms. Salamone noted that this will be a family friendly venue. The establishment will be open year round and she will serve a variety of yogurts. Ms. Salamone stated that she plans to open in March of 2012 and that she already has a signed lease. She noted that all documents were submitted to the Building Department.

Chairman Neuringer asked if anyone wished to address the Board. None did.

A motion to close the public hearing was made by Mr. Sullivan, seconded by Mr. Neuringer.

Ayes: Neuringer, Weprin, Kramer, Sullivan, Neufeld
Nays: None

8. Adjourned Application #5I-2011, LEONARD AUBREY & KATHLEEN SAVOLT & LOIS FENTON, regarding 746 The Parkway

Kathy Savolt, the applicant, addressed the Board. She distributed a summary of the last meeting and then read from her submission. Chairman Neuringer stated that when the wall was erected, it was done with a building permit; there was no requirement to go before the Planning Board or BAR for site plan approval. Ms. Savolt stated that this demonstrates how outdated the code is. Chairman Neuringer stated that this was a discussion for another time.

Ms. Savolt stated that she has spent money purchasing plants to cover the wall. The walls are there, she noted; they will learn to live with them. She stated that she does not like the walls, but they are there.

A discussion arose regarding Section 300 of the code. Ms. Savolt stated that the pool is not screened and it is a nuisance to the neighbors. Chairman Neuringer noted the setbacks and Ms. Savolt stated that she never said there was a violation of the setbacks. Her issue is that the way the walls are set back, it doesn't provide screening.

Mr. Weprin asked if the Building Department looked at Section 300. Mr. Melillo stated that this is why the applicant is before the Board; to meet the criteria of the pool section of the code. Mr. Melillo noted that the fence is on top of the retaining wall. Ms. Kramer and Mr. Melillo discussed the fact that the plan mentions putting the fence parallel, not on top of the retaining wall. They also discussed the tiered aspects of the wall.

Mrs. Fenton, the applicant, addressed the Board. She distributed a letter to the Board and read from the letter. Chairman Neuringer noted that the walls previously constructed were done pursuant to the Building Permit and Mrs. Fenton stated that she assumed so. Chairman Neuringer said those walls exist; that is a non-issue. Mrs. Fenton stated that what is on top of the wall is her issue. Chairman Neuringer wanted to make it clear to Mrs. Fenton that because the wall is on private property, the Board can't grant her permission to paint the side that is facing Mrs. Fenton.

Chairman Neuringer asked about the existing equipment enclosure complaint and Mr. Melillo stated that because of the noise, he made a determination about the enclosure.

Chairman Neuringer asked if anyone wished to address the Board.

Martha Sokol McCarty, attorney for the Mr. & Mrs. Cohen, addressed the Board. She noted for the record that she did not receive a copy of either submission from Ms. Savolt or Mrs. Fenton. She was provided a copy of both. Ms. McCarty stated that the walls built in 2010 are not subject to what is before the Board now. She indicated that the walls were built according to what was approved.

As for planting instead of a wall on top of the retaining wall, evergreen plantings will not stop someone from falling, Ms. McCarty stated. It was noted that the Cohens would prefer an open fence to a closed fence, but the Building Inspector feels that due to the noise, the fence should be solid.

Ms. McCarty stated that at the BAR meeting, Ms. Savolt had submitted a plan that was extremely elaborate. She said the Savolt/Fenton applicants are made about the wall and Ms. Savolt is upset she didn't get the screening she had wanted.

Ms. McCarty noted that the applicant had sought the help of the Village Arborist and it was felt that all parties were happy with the Arborist's plan. Ms. McCarty said the Cohens presented a plan, there was a hearing and now the applicants (Savolt/Fenton) want to complain.

Chairman Neuringer asked if the pool as built is the same as the plan that was approved by the BAR. Ms. McCarty stated that she believed it was and Mrs. Cohen confirmed that. Mr. Neufeld asked if a variance was required at the time the walls were built. Ms. McCarty answered no; everything was done through the Building Department. The applicants were not required to go before any Board, Ms. McCarty stated.

Mr. Cohen addressed the Board. He noted that the lower wall goes from zero to six feet, the setback is six feet and there is a six foot wall that covers the entire property. Discussion arose as to the type of trees that were proposed by the Arborist. The plants were always on the lower part of the terrace.

Chairman Neuringer asked why, during the entire construction period of the pool, there was no protective barrier fence shown on the drawings. Ms. McCarty stated that after everything was approved, the Building Department decided the retaining wall acted as a barrier. Chairman Neuringer asked, why from day one, there was no concern or desire to protect the pool with fencing. Ms. McCarty answered that the applicants wanted to but were told that the Building Department determined they needed a variance. She also noted that both the BAR and the Building Department approved the plans. Mr. Melillo stated that he determined the need for a variance.

Mr. Cohen stated that he believes the record reflects the as built pool complies with all setback requirements. He also noted that the expensive of moving the pool equipment will cost him \$15,000 to \$20,000 and will not make a difference to the Savolt/Fenton applicants.

Mr. Sullivan asked if the applicants could submit an amended plan showing the pool equipment was moved 90 degrees. Chairman Neuringer stated that there is an as-built survey and it was approved by the Building Department.

Ms. Savolt wished to correct the record by stating that the Cohens went to the BAR twice; the discussion about the screening was for the wall, not the pool. The original proposal was for bamboo, but the previous Building Inspector said bamboo was invasive and he would not approve it, Ms. Savolt said. She said she did provide the Cohens with suggestions at a cost to her.

Ms. Savolt clarified that Susan Oakley is a planting consultant to the Planning Board, not the Village Arborist. Chairman Neuringer asked if the issue of bamboo came up with Mrs. Oakley and Ms. McCarty stated that the Cohen's suggested planting was turned down due to its invasiveness.

Ms. McCarty read from the site plan, noting that the evergreens are used to screen the section of the fence. Ms. Kramer asked what the growth rates of these trees are. Ms. Cohen stated that the trees grow 12 to 18 inches a year and that she planted plants that would grow rapidly. Ms. Cohen said that Ms. Oakley informed them that Ms. Savolt was unhappy with the bamboo and asked if the Cohens would change it. Another type of planting was suggested, but Ms. Savolt was unhappy with that choice.

Ms. Cohen stated that she did have a conversation with Ms. Savolt's landscaper and she planted everything he suggested. We will cover the walls, Ms. Cohen stated.

Mr. Cohen stated that the wall is not before this Board. This matter is about screening of the wall and for the pool. He went on to say that the former Building Inspector never told Savolt/Fenton that plantings should be done at the top.

Chairman Neuringer stated that he wanted to read Section 300 of the code more thoroughly. Mr. Neufeld requested a topographical map and Mr. Cohen stated he would provide one to the Zoning office. More discussion arose regarding the topographical map. Mr. Cohen stated he would also provide the survey dated August 2010.

The matter was adjourned until the December 1, 2011 meeting.

9. Adjourned Application #3F-2011, MATTHEW & JENNIFER COHEN, 746 The Parkway

Ms. McCarty, attorney for the applicants, addressed the Board. She stated that she respectfully asks the Board to approve the variance request because this is a safety issue. The wall was always built with the notion that a fence would also be erected for safety issues, she said. She also asked that the Board review her letter regarding criteria for variances.

Chairman Neuringer stated the he would like to review Section 300. Mr. Neufeld asked who lives at 746 The Parkway and Ms. Cohen stated herself, husband and two children.

The matter was adjourned until the December 1, 2011 meeting.

10. Adjourned Application #30A-2011, HPS 122 LLC. C/O H-P CAPITAL, LLC., 122-134 Mamaroneck Avenue

Chad Donohue appeared on behalf of the applicant. He stated that he is responsible for the care and management of the property. Both the architect and owners were unable to appear before the Board tonight. Mr. Donohue stated that HPS is finished with the Planning Board and that everything was approved. Mr. Melillo corrected the record by stating that the Planning Board did

not approve the application and it is tentatively scheduled for the next Planning Board meeting. He noted that there are some parking issues.

Chairman Neuringer asked if parking matters are Planning Board or Zoning Board issues. Ms. Georgiou stated that outside of variances, it is within the purview of the Planning Board with site plan approval. Both Chairman Neuringer and Ms. Kramer do not feel it is that clear cut.

Discussion arose around a situation where an individual paid a substantial amount of money to purchase parking so that a variance wouldn't be required. Chairman Neuringer mentioned the buy-out provision to Mr. Donohue. Ms. Kramer stated that Molly Spillane's Restaurant applied for a variance of the obligation of parking. More discussion arose regarding the obligation and requirements regarding parking.

Mr. Donohue stated that the intent was that the applicant was providing space in the rear of the building and that there is a give and take in this situation. He continued by stating that the intent of this request is that the applicant has given something and is asking for something back.

Chairman Neuringer stated that the applicant is proposing the creation of additional floor area. Mr. Melillo questioned whether an additional variance would be needed. Ms. Kramer believed that to be the case.

Chairman Neuringer suggested requesting detail and clarification from the Planning Board on the extent of public access to the walkway, including the anticipated days of the week/hours per day proposed for the walkway to be fully accessible to the public and in what manner will public access be restricted. He suggested sending an advisory transmittal to the Planning Board. Ms. Georgiou stated that normally there would be some interaction between the two boards since it is being heard right now on both boards. Ms. Kramer stated that this Board needs to hear from the Planning Board. Chairman Neuringer noted that there was no transmittal from the Planning Board. Ms. Powers confirmed that the Chair for the Planning Board had no comment on this application. Mr. Donohue stated that he met with the Village Manager and will be meeting with the Board of Trustees at the next work session (November 7, 2011). Chairman Neuringer reiterated that there should be more dialogue between the Planning Board and Zoning Board.

Mr. Donohue asked if the Board received the materials Ms. Kramer requested at the October meeting and Chairman Neuringer confirmed that the documents had been received by the Board. Mr. Melillo clarified that the Zoning Board is questioning whether there can be a buy out with respect to parking.

Ms. Georgiou stated that she can prepare a transmittal to the Planning Board.

The matter was adjourned to the December 1, 2011 meeting.

11. Adjourned Application #31A-2011, BRIAN & ANDREA MURPHY, 312 Wagner Avenue

Chris Busnel, the architect, appeared on behalf of the applicant. He stated that the applicant is proposing to add an addition to a non-conforming house. Mr. Busnel went on to say that he submitted photos and additional documents.

Chairman Neuringer thanked the Mr. Busnel for providing additional documents. He asked what the ultimate plan was for the attic. Mr. Busnel stated that the attic will remain completely unfinished; it will be used primarily for storage. He said that the applicants have two children who currently share one bedroom. Their wish is to expand in order to make more room.

Chairman Neuringer noted that the house will be 7 ½ feet from the adjoining house and that this appears to be the worst configuration. Chairman Neuringer suggested that the roof line be changed. Mr. Busnel stated that changing the roof line would alter the current configuration. Chairman Neuringer stated that he believed there were other alternatives and those alternatives have not been presented to the Board. Chairman Neuringer also stated that the height of the building will increase by ten feet.

Ms. Kramer asked what the height will be from the roof of the second floor to the roof of the house and Mr. Busnel answered eight feet. Chairman Neuringer felt it was more than eight feet and he suggested using dormers to mitigate the design and create less of an impact on the neighbor.

Mr. Busnel offered to provide alternate plans if the Board desired. Discussion arose as to whether the applicant would have to go back to the BAR and it was determined that they would have to. Mr. Sullivan stated that he did not have a problem with this type of construction. Mr. Busnel stated that he has letters stating that the neighbors have no issue with the addition.

Brian Murphy, the applicant, addressed the Board. He noted that the roof line is lower than the two houses adjoining his. Mrs. Murphy handed out additional photographs to the Board. After reviewing the photos, Chairman Neuringer asked Mr. Murphy if he would have an issue if it were his house that was impacted by the addition and he stated he would not. Mr. Murphy stated that his neighbor offered to attend tonight's meeting. Mrs. Murphy handed out letters of support to the Board. Mr. Busnel concluded by saying he felt this was the best design for the applicant. He also stated that the applicant met every other criterion with regarding to conforming.

Chairman Neuringer asked if anyone wished to address the Board. None did.

A motion to close the public hearing was made by Mr. Neufeld, seconded by Mr. Weprin.

Ayes: Neuringer, Weprin, Kramer, Sullivan, Neufeld

Nays: None

Chairman Neuringer asked if the applicants for application #7SP-2000 or #5SP-2001 were in attendance. No one appeared. Chairman Neuringer asked Ms. Powers to notify the two applicants that because they did not appear, their applications were adjourned to December 1, 2011. Chairman Neuringer noted for the record that Realty Guild LLC (#32A-2011) had withdrawn its application.

12. Application #33A-2011, RIGOBERTO BECERRA, 722 Prospect Avenue

Giovanni Zapata, the architect, appeared on behalf of the applicant. He stated that the applicant is proposing to alter a non-conforming structure in order to enlarge a bathroom on the second floor. Mr. Zapata stated that he would be adding approximately six feet. The alteration will align with the house in the back of the house. Mr. Zapata indicated that this is a two-family residence.

The second variance requested is to enclose the porch; it is a small space and the applicant wants to open it up, Mr. Zapata stated. He indicated that this will decrease the non-conformity on the first floor. Mr. Zapata noted the narrowness of the porch and explained that this is why the applicant wishes to open it, giving it more space. Mr. Zapata said that one of the units is on the first floor and the second unit is on the second floor.

Ms. Georgiou noted for the record that this is one more variance required, Section 342-64A, because this would be an alteration of a two-family dwelling in a one-family district; this would increase the non-conformity.

Chairman Neuringer asked if anyone wished to address the Board.

Sean Reilly stated that he lives behind the applicant's property and would like to see the pictures. It was noted that there will not be any change to the back of the house and Mr. Reilly stated that as long as that was the case, he was fine with the alteration.

A motion to close the public hearing was made by Mr. Sullivan, seconded by Mr. Neufeld.

Ayes: Neuringer, Weprin, Kramer, Sullivan, Neufeld

Nays: None

APPLICATIONS CLOSED

1. Application #29A-2011, DARRIN DELUCIA, 1421 Arlington Street

The Board discussed the merits of the case. Both Ms. Kramer and Mr. Sullivan stated they had no issue with the application. The applicant is building the exact same thing in the exact same place. Chairman Neuringer stated that he was concerned with the setback issue and felt the applicant should be able to move the shed three feet. Mr. Sullivan noted that there is a large slope near the shed, making it difficult to move it over. Chairman Neuringer stated he felt it is a new garage. Mr. Sullivan felt the new garage would enhance the neighborhood. The Board found the within application was a Type II action not subject to review under the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA).

A motion to approve the area variances was made by Mr. Sullivan for the reasons stated on the record and recorded in the verbatim transcript, seconded by Ms. Kramer.

Ayes: Kramer, Weprin, Sullivan
Nays: Neuringer
Abstain: Neufeld

2. Application #1SP-2008, HAIKU ASIAN BISTRO, 265 Mamaroneck Avenue

The Board discussed the merits of the case. The Board found the within application was a Type II action not subject to review under the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA). Due to the multiple violations, the Board placed a three year term limit on the renewal of the special permit.

A motion to approve the renewal of the special permit with a three year term limit was made by Mr. Weprin for the reasons stated on the record and recorded in the verbatim transcript, seconded by Mr. Neufeld.

Ayes: Neuringer, Kramer, Weprin, Sullivan, Neufeld
Nays: None

3. Application #11SP-2008, DCH MAMARONECK, LLC. D/B/A DCH TOYOTA CITY, 700 Waverly Avenue

The Board discussed the merits of the case. Ms. Kramer stated that she had issues with the parking and wanted to verify that the parking conditions are part of the resolution. The Board found the within application was a Type II action not subject to review under the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA). Due to the fact that the Toyota City opened in September 2011, the Board placed a three year term limit on the renewal of the special permit.

A motion to approve the renewal of the special permit with a three year term limit was made by Mr. Weprin for the reasons stated on the record and recorded in the verbatim transcript, seconded

by Ms. Kramer.

Ayes: Neuringer, Kramer, Weprin, Sullivan, Neufeld

Nays: None

4. Application #13SP-2008, PEOPLE'S UNITED BANK, 1444 E. Boston Post Road

The Board discussed the merits of the case. The Board found the within application was a Type II action not subject to review under the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA).

A motion to approve the renewal of the special permit with no term limit was made by Mr. Weprin for the reasons stated on the record and recorded in the verbatim transcript, seconded by Mr. Sullivan.

Ayes: Neuringer, Kramer, Weprin, Sullivan, Neufeld

Nays: None

5. Application #14SP-2011, ADRIANA SALAMONE D/B/A CHERRY TREE YOGURT, 448 Mamaroneck Avenue

The Board discussed the merits of the case. Ms. Georgiou noted that Section 342-45 food service establishment be included in the resolution. The Board found the within application was a Type II action not subject to review under the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA).

A motion to approve the special permit with a three year term limit was made by Mr. Weprin for the reasons stated on the record and recorded in the verbatim transcript, seconded by Mr. Neufeld.

Ayes: Neuringer, Kramer, Weprin, Sullivan, Neufeld

Nays: None

6. Application #31A-2011, BRIAN & ANDREA MURPHY, 312 Wagner Avenue

The Board discussed the merits of the case. The Board found the within application was a Type II action not subject to review under the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA).

A motion to approve the area variances was made by Mr. Weprin for the reasons stated on the record and recorded in the verbatim transcript, seconded by Mr. Sullivan.

Ayes: Kramer, Weprin, Sullivan, Neufeld

Nays: Neuringer

7. Application #33A-2011, RIGOBERTO BECERRA, 722 Prospect Avenue

The Board discussed the merits of the case. Mr. Sullivan stated that the look of the house will improve by granting the variances. The Board found the within application was a Type II action not subject to review under the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA).

A motion to approve the area variances was made by Mr. Sullivan for the reasons stated on the record and recorded in the verbatim transcript, seconded by Mr. Weprin.

Ayes: Neuringer, Weprin, Sullivan, Neufeld
Nays: Kramer

MINUTES

A motion to approve the minutes of September 1, 2011 was made by Mr. Sullivan, seconded by Ms. Kramer.

Ayes: Neuringer, Weprin, Sullivan, Kramer, Neufeld
Nays: None

ADJOURN

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Mr. Sullivan, seconded by Ms. Kramer.

Ayes: Neuringer, Weprin, Sullivan, Neufeld, Kramer
Nays: None

On motion duly made and carried, the meeting was adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

ROBIN KRAMER
Secretary

Prepared by:
Ann P. Powers