

**MINUTES
VILLAGE of ARDSLEY
ZONING BOARD of APPEALS
REGULAR MEETING
WEDNESDAY, MAY 24, 2017**

PRESENT: Patricia Hoffman, Esq., Chair
Mort David
Maureen Phelan Gorman
Michael Wiskind

1) **Call to Order**

The Chair called the regular meeting to order at 8:04 pm.

2) **Announcements and Approval of Minutes**

Announcements

The Chair announced that one Board member is excused this evening, but that three votes (three out of four) are still required. The Chair advised that applicant also has the option of the Chair polling the Board in advance of a vote or adjourning the matter.

The Chair announced that the next meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals is scheduled for Wednesday, June 28, 2017 at 8:00 pm.

Approval of Minutes

The approval of Minutes was adjourned.

3) **Public Hearing**

Application for Variance from Village Code Requirements

Salvation Army

22 Judson Avenue, Ardsley, New York.

Section 6.80, Block 67, Lot 12, in an R-3 One-Family Residential District.

For proposed second story addition to existing non-conforming building, where 18.9-foot existing and proposed front yard setback depth is less than the 20-foot minimum required (Village Code §200-26A).

Present: Patricia Hoffman, Esq., Chair
Mort David
Maureen Gorman-Phelan
Michael Wiskind

Attendees: Michael J. Maturo, AI, Dyami Architecture & Interiors
80 Red Schoolhouse Road, Suite 105, Chestnut Ridge, NY 10977
Leo Chen and Cathy Sun, 28 Judson Avenue, Ardsley, NY 10502

The Chair read the Legal Notice.

Open Public Hearing

The Chair stated that the Board has received applicant's Affidavit of Mailing. The Chair summarized that applicant Salvation Army seeks to construct a second floor above the existing first floor, which is an existing non-conformity, as the required setback is twenty feet and the existing setback is 18.9 feet. The Chair continued that the frame house was erected in approximately 1961; has street frontage is 100.57 feet; that the existing structure is one and a half stories with a height of eighteen feet six inches where the proposed height is twenty-seven feet six inches, and that there have been no other applications made for these premises.

Mr. Wiskind stated that he is one of the neighbors who received notification of the Public Hearing, and therefore wished to recuse himself. The Chair advised applicant that now three out of three votes would be required. Mr. David and Ms. Gorman-Phelan stated that they each live approximately two blocks from subject premises.

Mr. Maturo produced the green cards that had been received. Mr. Maturo advised that they had mailed to a required and an optional list, that they were missing two or three responses from the required list, and that they were missing fifty to sixty percent of replies from the optional list, which they had obtained from the Town (sic) and did not have unit numbers for the condominiums.

Mr. Maturo distributed updated plans as agreed. Mr. David asked if the update means that the covered entry is not included, and Mr. Maturo advised that yes, the covered entry is not included, which is the only change to the plans previously submitted. Mr. Maturo showed on the plans that the porch was removed and that they are just continuing the eave down with a shadow line at the entryway so that there are no projections or columns.

Mr. Maturo introduced the proposal by calling the Board's attention to sheet A-600 and the cover sheet of the application, which contain photos of how the house sits relative to its neighbors, and explained that the proposed addition is to the front with no change to the side elevation. Mr. Maturo added that they also are doing a minor addition to extend the kitchen at the rear of the building well within the setback, so no variance is required.

Mr. Maturo continued that the house is currently listed as a one and a half story structure, with the half story referring to the habitable space within the dormers, where a stair goes up to two bedrooms and a bathroom. Mr. Maturo stated that the two bedrooms upstairs are too small for the family that is expected to reside in the house, and that they also want to reconfigure the downstairs.

Mr. Maturo stated that the front of the house is just about a foot short of the setback, and noted that the property line is further back than the curb line, making it appear that the house is not as close to the property line as it is. Mr. Maturo also referred to upper photo E-3 on sheet A-001, showing that the immediately adjacent house, which is a two-story structure, is either closer to or the same distance from the property line as is the subject property. Mr. David asked if the adjacent property to which Mr. Maturo referred is on Lakeview. Mr. Maturo replied that they are not making any application for the façade facing Lakeview, only for the façade facing Judson, so the adjacent residence to which he referred the is tan and brown building on Judson.

Mr. Maturo stated that the current home is old, tired and small, and that the family who will be moving in needs more space, so they would like to add the second floor. Mr. Maturo explained that they could add a second floor as of right if they stepped the second floor back by one foot, but that it would be a considerably greater expense to set the second story back one foot than to carry the existing façade straight up. Mr. Maturo added that he thinks that the property would be more attractive with better curb appeal without a step back, and referred to photo E-3 on sheet A-601.

Mr. David asked why there is a need for an addition. Mr. Maturo stated that the family moving in has an elderly relative who will be living with them so they need an additional bedroom downstairs, and/or the family moving in has two or three children and the upstairs is very narrow and crowded. Mr. Maturo advised that the plan calls for renovating the bathroom and creating a third bedroom upstairs, as shown on sheet A-102.

Mr. David pointed out that there appears to be a conflict in that Mr. Maturo has described the home as one and a half stories while according to the documentation it is one and three-quarter stories. Mr. Maturo stated that he referred to it that way because the civil engineer has it listed as one and a half stories. Mr. Maturo explained that the house is essentially two stories in that a full height staircase leads to full height rooms upstairs, but surmised that they civil engineers may have dubbed it one and a half stories because the full-height area upstairs covers only a portion of the footprint of the building.

Ms. Gorman-Phelan asked if this was rental property. Mr. Maturo stated that the property is owned by Salvation Army and that it will be occupied by people who would manage the local corps and who are employees of Salvation Army.

Ms. Gorman-Phelan asked the age of the children who will be moving in. Mr. Maturo stated that he believes that they are younger than teenagers. Mr. Maturo explained that there are two different corps commander families who might move in depending on the schedule. Mr. Maturo added that the proposal offers future flexibility if employees are transferred down the road.

The Chair reminded Mr. Maturo that this is a one-family residence. Mr. Maturo stated that only one family would live there. The Chair asked Mr. Maturo if he said that the family moving in may have an older relative. Mr. Maturo replied that family moving in may have an in-law that they have to take care of. The Chair asked if the family did not have another child. Mr. Maturo asked if the Chair meant a child of the in-law, and the Chair replied that this is what she meant. Mr. Maturo advised that the family most likely to move in is a mother and father and grandparent and children. The Chair asked if there is only one kitchen in the house. Mr. Maturo replied that there is only one kitchen, that it is a one-family residence. The Chair asked if they were putting in a small kitchen or small heating unit, and Mr. Maturo replied that they will not. The Chairs explained that Mr. Maturo had given her the impression that two families might be living there at the same time. Mr. Maturo replied that it would never be two families, that it would always be one family.

The Chair asked if all property expenses are paid for by Salvation Army. Mr. Maturo replied that yes, they Salvation Army owns the property and pays the taxes on it, and that it would be the family that manages the corps that would live there. The Chair asked how long Salvation Army has owned the property. Mr. Maturo stated that, based on the earliest documentation he could find, he believes Salvation Army has owned the property since it was built, but he cannot verify that because he does not know if there has been a change in title. Mr. David stated that he knows that the house has been owned by Salvation Army for the 43 years he has lived in Ardsley.

Ms. Gorman-Phelan referred to the top portion of sheet A-601 and stated that it looks like the left side of the house is jutting back, and that in the front the left side protrudes further than the right. Mr. Maturo stated that on the front façade everything is in line with the

existing first floor of the building and that in the drawing to the right of the one to which Ms. Gorman-Phelan referred, one can see that it is projecting back a foot in the back where there is plenty of setback room. Ms. Gorman-Phelan asked if where the roof dips down in the front of the house, the left side is not out further than the right side of the door. Mr. Maturo confirmed that it is out further, but referred to drawing B-3, the existing eave projects there, and they propose carrying the eave down for aesthetics to create a shadow line. Mr. Maturo added that they also propose adding horizontal siding on the bottom with an accent band and a shake type shingle on top to give the house a country home feel.

The Chair asked what the front entrance will look like if the porch is gone. Mr. Maturo stated that only the eave would be projecting, as they had to remove the front porch and there is now no covered entry, as shown on sheet A-600. Ms. Gorman-Phelan asked if the proposed eave is set back eighteen feet nine inches from the property line. Mr. Maturo replied that it would project one foot further into the setback, just as current eave does. Mr. Maturo added that he understands that an eave can project into the setback, but a covered porch cannot. The Chair asked is that is where the eave is now. Mr. Maturo replied that the proposed eave is the same seventeen feet nine inches from the property line as the existing one.

The Chair asked how many bedrooms and bathrooms exist now and are proposed. Mr. Maturo A-101, stated that seen on the bottom of sheet A-101 is the master bedroom, and that the area showing the expanded bathroom is currently a bedroom, so the plan is to remove one bedroom from the lower floor and create a wider bathroom. Ms. Gorman-Phelan asked if there are now three bedrooms and two bathrooms and if there will be four bedrooms and two bathrooms. Mr. Maturo explained that the house presently has two bedrooms and one bathroom on each floor, so it has now and will still have four bedrooms, and that they plan to renovate the existing bathrooms and add a bathroom so there will be three bathrooms.

The Chair asked what is now in the area that says “new kitchen and breakfast room.” Mr. Maturo replied that the area with dark hatched lines is the existing patio, and that four feet two inches is the extent of the addition from the face of the garage so that it aligns with the back of the current residence, so that area does not yet exist. Mr. Maturo continued that to the left of that, where it says “expanded dining room,” is currently the dining room and the tiny kitchen. The little expansion will house the new kitchen and new breakfast room will be in the area that is currently a mudroom.

Mr. David asked if the garage will remain a garage, and Mr. Maturo replied that the garage will remain unchanged.

Mr. David asked if there will be any change to the chimneys, and if a chimney includes a fireplace. Mr. Maturo stated that one of the chimneys is within what is now the house but looks as if it was originally external, and on that side there was a fireplace that was closed

off long ago, so we propose removing the massive chimney to afford a little more room in the breakfast room. Mr. Maturo added that that chimney is just to vent out the boiler that is the basement below and runs straight up from it. Mr. David commented that Mr. Maturo's documentation is like a walk through Ardsley history.

The Chair asked if there is a master bedroom above the expanded first floor bedroom, and Mr. Maturo replied in the affirmative. The Chair asked if then the house would have the equivalent of two master bedroom suites. Mr. Maturo stated that this is so, but explained that this is being done in case a resident has an older relative who then would not have to walk upstairs. Mr. Maturo added that it is for the same reason that they are widening the downstairs bathroom to make it oversized, showing access with a wheelchair turning radius and providing clearances from the bathroom through to the bedroom. Mr. Maturo explained that the closet also was designed to provide wheelchair access through the door and not because they wanted a very big closet, just as they made the bedroom larger to make it more accessible and not to have a big bedroom. The Chair asked if the individual moving in is wheelchair bound. Mr. Maturo said that he did not know, but was told that they have an elderly relative and requested that type of access on the lower floor. The Chair pointed out that there is no wheelchair access from the outside. Mr. Maturo replied that the relative may or may not be in a wheelchair, but that even if someone is on crutches or a walker it is a lot easier to navigate, especially if someone had to help them into a shower. The Chair explained that the reason for the question is that we would not want applicant to make these improvements and then come back for another variance because they need a ramp entrance. Mr. Maturo replied that applicant has no intention of making any other alterations.

The Chair stated that because of the two master bedroom suites, she is bound to reiterate that this is one-family residence, and that there is no such thing as a mother-daughter residence in Ardsley. Mr. Maturo replied that the house is a one kitchen and one family house for an extended family, and not a two kitchen or two families. The Chair stated that if the elderly relative were to move out, the space they vacate does not become rental space, nor space for another family to move in or for another individual from the Salvation to be housed there. Mr. Maturo stated that Salvation Army knows and agrees with that. Mr. Maturo added that this project is the eighth project on which he has worked with them and they do everything by the book, even filing for permits when not required. The Chair said that she wants the information about it being and remaining a one-family house to be on the record. Mr. Maturo stated that Salvation Army would be fine with the Zoning Board of Appeals making this as a condition of approval.

The Chair asked if the garage is a one-car garage. Mr. Maturo advised that the existing one-car garage is narrow, but applicant has no interest in expanding it.

The Chair asked if the entrance to what is now the mudroom goes away. Mr. Maturo stated that the Chair is correct, and referred to sheet A-600 showing the existing entrance to the

mudroom with steps, and sheet A-601 showing the steps and the door removed and replaced by windows as part of the breakfast nook.

The Chair asked if the proposal does not increase the protrusion further into the setback and Mr. Maturo replied that the Chair is correct. The Chair asked that the addition just goes straight up, and again Mr. Maturo replied that this was correct. Mr. David asked if, aside from the front setback, the property is compliant with the zoning laws, and Mr. Maturo replied that it is.

Ms. Gorman-Phelan asked if there is a floor plan of the existing interior. Mr. Maturo stated that it had not been included in the materials because Mr. Tomasso had advised that the focus would be mainly on the front as that is the only area in need of a variance, but that they do have those plans and can send them to you. The Chair asked if this a cape with the basic cape layout of entrance, living room, dining room, kitchen, bedroom, bedroom and bathroom. Mr. Maturo replied that it is, with an opening to the mudroom. The Chair asked if the bathroom is in the back in this house, and Mr. Maturo replied that it is. The Chair commented that there are only about three floorplans for a cape.

The Chair asked if any member of the public wished to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application.

Ms. Cathy Sun and Mr. Leo Chen stated that they have questions. Ms. Sun stated that they are the new owners of 28 Judson Avenue, having purchased last year, and that they really like the neighborhood and the street. Ms. Sun stated that they have not yet met the neighbor at 22 Judson, and we learned that it belongs to the Salvation Army. Ms. Sun said that some of their questions, such as how many people will live there, have already been addressed by the Zoning Board, but they would like to know how long the residents will live there, and will there be frequent changes of people living there because they are Salvation Army employees, or will it be more permanent. Mr. Maturo responded that they understand that it will be two parents and two children and maybe an elderly relative. Mr. Maturo advised that he does not know how long the family will reside there, because it will depend upon how long they manage the community center, but he has seen other families remaining in other towns for five, ten and two years. Mr. Maturo added that he does not know how Salvation Army determines where families reside, or if it has to do with other family requirements. The Chair asked if it is a few months and then someone else. Mr. Maturo replied that during the approximately ten years he has been working with Salvation Army, the shortest residence he has seen is two years.

Ms. Sun then asked if this proposed construction is to accommodate this incoming family, what will happen if this family moves out in a couple of years and the new family wants additional changes, because they do not want to live where there constantly do construction and adjustments. Mr. Maturo stated that he believes that this is the first time they have added to the building since the 1950s and whenever they added the garage and the little

mudroom, and from what he understands, this is the only addition that they would do. Mr. Maturo added that Salvation Army has square footage requirements that they do not exceed, so once they add the second story and still have four bedrooms, that will be like what their typical residence is, and they have a mandate for themselves not to make the residences bigger than that, so they certainly would not go for another variance. Mr. Maturo further added that he cannot envision how another variance would be possible, and that he believes that the only reason for seeking this variance is because it is in line with the existing non-conforming use.

Mr. David referred to Ms. Sun's concern about the length of time with construction, and asked Mr. Maturo to estimate how long it would take to make the addition if approved. Mr. Maturo stated that the only foundation work is in the back area, which would be out of view, and that they can remove the upper floor within a week and frame within a week and a half or two weeks for something of this size and then enclose it in another two weeks. Mr. Maturo explained that after the building is enclosed they will put new siding on the entire house rather than just make it look like patchwork, and will replace all the roof and siding to create a uniform look, and Mr. Maturo estimated that it would probably be an additional four months for the exterior work.

Mr. David stated that applicant will also need electrical and plumbing work on the interior. Mr. Maturo advised that there is existing plumbing on the second floor, and that the new bathroom was placed next to the existing bathroom, so that it can connect to existing plumbing lines. The Chair stated that it looks as if there is thirty feet to the setback in the rear and twenty-five feet to the left and about none on the right, so even if they wanted to increase the size of the house, they would not have a lot of room to do that. Mr. Maturo concurred, and added that that would be an extreme expense for a little gain and that Salvation Army would not invest in that type of a project.

Mr. David asked Ms. Sun if the existing house is creating any water problems to you. Ms. Sun replied that they have not noticed any until now, but they do not know if the new construction will cause any. Mr. David asked Ms. Sun if she has seen water in the basement or garage. Ms. Sun replied that when there was a big rain, they noticed some water in the basement, but they do not know what caused it. The Chair asked Ms. Sun if she is uphill from this house. Ms. Sun replied that she thinks they are level with the neighbor. Ms. Sun added that they also are close to the front of the property and that although she would want to check, she thinks they are a little further set back.

Ms. Sun asked how the second floor addition will be. The Chair asked how much higher is the peak on the new roof than on the existing roof. Mr. Maturo stated that the existing is eighteen feet six inches, the proposed is twenty-seven feet six inches, and the allowable is thirty-eight feet, so the proposed room is quite a distance below the allowable height. Mr. David explained that the roof will be about nine feet higher, which is permissible under the Zoning Code.

Ms. Sun stated that they like many of the houses in the neighborhood, and that someone mentioned the historical appeal of the neighborhood which they like, and they wonder if this new construction will change the appearance a lot. The Chair asked Mr. Maturo if he had an elevation of the completed front of the house. Mr. Maturo showed that there will be a shadow line to break up the mass of the house and more detail to make it look more residential in scale, rather than carry the roof straight across and have a blank façade, so we are carrying the eave out the same foot just as an accent. The Chair asked how far out the it comes, and Mr. Maturo replied to the edge of the steps. The Chair asked if the stoop will be similar to what is here, and Mr. Maturo replied yes, a landing and two steps. The Chair asked Mr. Maturo to show the proposed addition to the public.

Mr. Maturo stated that they are recreating the steps just a hair further out because of the slope of the steps is a little damaged and because it is part of upgrading the entire exterior of the house. Mr. Maturo added that they are replacing all the windows so there is no mismatch, and that they are replacing the aluminum siding with vinyl siding with an accent band and a shake roof to cut down the mass of the house, because now it reads like a tall one story building and we want it to look more residential in appearance and not just like a blank wall, so this pattern is an old-fashioned wood shake shingle, and we will put trim boards around, noting that the Sun/Chen house has trim boards, and in sum Mr. Maturo is trying to add character to the house with smaller details.

Mr. Maturo showed that they could extend the house all the way out to the dashed line on the left, and that they chose not to extend the house in that direction because they wanted it to be the least intrusive to the neighbors and the properties on the front as they could, so Mr. Maturo advised Ms. Sun that the house will not become any closer to your house. Ms. Sun asked about the roof, and Mr. Maturo replied that the roof will align. Ms. Sun stated that there is a narrow space between the two houses, a driveway that leads to her garage with some trees planted along the driveway and a small space between her driveway and the house, so the two houses are not that far apart. Mr. Maturo showed that the hatched line on the drawing is the edge of her driveway which is over the property line and goes onto applicant's property. Ms. Sun advised that there is a fence. Mr. Maturo showed Ms. Sun the little squares on the drawing that is the fence that goes back and around the property. Mr. Maturo showed that Ms. Sun's slate platform and asphalt driveway also go over the property line onto this property. Mr. Chen asked if Mr. Maturo did the survey, and Mr. Maturo replied that it had been provided by a licensed surveyor. Mr. Maturo stated that Salvation Army has no issue with the fact that this is over the property line, that they have never raised it as a concern, and they have no desire to raise it as a concern. The Chair advised the neighbors that this should have come up at their closing.

Ms. Gorman-Phelan noted that there is an enclosed makeshift storage shown in D-1. Mr. David said that it is listed as a shed. Ms. Gorman-Phelan said that there is also a vinyl shed all the way in the back on the left side, and asked if that is the shed that is listed. Mr.

Maturo stated that the vinyl shed is staying and that the makeshift shed is being removed as shown on the plans. Ms. Gorman-Phelan noted that removing the makeshift shed would give the neighbors extra room, and asked if applicant was planning on building something else there. Mr. Maturo replied that he told applicant that they could build there as it is within their fenced area, but they are not going to build anything there. Ms. Gorman-Phelan asked if this makeshift shed is reflected as roof over storage area on sheet A-001, and if this is what is coming out, and Mr. Maturo replied yes to both.

The Chair asked the neighbors if they had any other questions, and they advised that all their questions had been answered.

The Chair asked Mr. Maturo if he had an appointment with the Planning Board. Mr. Maturo explained that he understood they need to appear before the Zoning Board first and then go before the Planning Board. The Chair advised that the Planning Board will talk to address water retention and storm water planning. Mr. Maturo stated that he has already spoken with Mr. Tomasso, who had advised that because the roof is being extended only to the size of the existing roof it is are not adding storm water runoff, and that the small addition in the back would not add much runoff, he believes that the proposal falls below any requirement to change the storm water management.

The Chair stated that generally where a proposed addition does not increase an existing non-conformity, the Zoning Board of Appeals has approved this type of variance. Mr. David indicated his inclination to approve, and noted that it will improve the appearance. Ms. Gorman-Phelan stated that she is concerned about two master bedroom suites and the potential for turnover, but noted that the surrounding properties are two stories, this will have no impact on traffic, it does not increase the current non-conformity, and the house currently looks tired and the proposal will not adversely impact the neighborhood. The Chair stated that the proposal is to go up, not out, so that it does not change the footprint of the house, and that there apparently is a need to increase the size of the house which, at only 1300 square feet, is tight even for only four people.

Close Public Hearing

Mr. David moved, and Ms. Gorman-Phelan seconded, that the Public Hearing be closed.

Vote: 3 in favor, none opposed, none abstaining, as follows: Chair – aye; Mr. David – aye; and Ms. Gorman-Phelan – aye.

Mr. David proposed, and Ms. Gorman-Phelan seconded, the following Resolution:

WHEREAS, Salvation Army, of 22 Judson Avenue, Ardsley, New York, 10502, has applied to this Board for a variance from strict application of the requirements of Section 200-26 Subdivision A of the Zoning Ordinance of the Village of Ardsley, which requires

a minimum front yard setback of Twenty Feet, so that the second story addition can be built on the wall of the first story, which protrudes 1.1 feet into the setback; and

WHEREAS, this application is made under the authority of Section 200-97 Subdivision B of the Zoning Ordinance of the Village of Ardsley, affecting premises known as 22 Judson Avenue, Ardsley, New York, and designated on local tax maps as Section 6.80, Block 67, Lot 12, in an R-3 One-Family Residential District; and

WHEREAS, a Public Hearing on this application was held by the Zoning Board of Appeals at the Municipal Building, 507 Ashford Avenue, Ardsley, New York, on May 24, 2017, after due notice by publication; and

WHEREAS, at the Hearing, architect Michael J. Maturo of Dyami Architecture and Interiors appeared on behalf of Salvation Army in support of this application, and neighbors Leo Chen and Cathy Sun of 28 Judson Avenue appeared with questions about, but neither in support of nor in opposition to, this application; and

WHEREAS, this Board, after carefully considering all testimony and the application, finds the following:

WHEREAS, this Board, in weighing both the potential benefit to the applicant and the potential detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood if the variance is granted, has determined that:

- (1) neither an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood nor a detriment to nearby properties will be created by the granting of the variance, as the proposed addition will continue the second story along the same plane as the existing first story which protrudes 1.1 feet into the front yard setback, and neighboring properties are two story residences with similar front yard setbacks;
- (2) the benefits sought by the applicant cannot be feasibly achieved other than by variances, as Salvation Army needs to provide increased and reconfigured space to meet the needs of the family expected to reside there, and to expand the second story 1.1 foot back from the first story or to extend the house elsewhere would require more structural work at significantly greater cost;
- (3) the requested variance to add a second story extension is not substantial, as it continues the existing 1.1-foot encroachment into the front yard setback, and it is not substantial in that the location of the proposed addition is where it will least impact its neighbors;
- (4) the proposed variances will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district in that the proposed

addition will not add to the impervious surface, and in that the proposed addition will make the house look more comparable to its neighbors; and

- (5) the circumstance requiring the variance was not self-created in that the house was built in its present location prior to the zoning requirement of a twenty-foot front yard setback.

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved that the application of Salvation Army is granted.

PROPOSED BY: Mr. Mort David

SECONDED BY: Ms. Gorman-Phelan

VOTE: 3 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions, as follows:
Patricia Hoffman, Chair – AYE;
Mort David – AYE;
Maureen Gorman-Phelan – AYE
(Mr. Amir was not present, and Mr. Wiskind was recused.)

4) **Adjournment**

There being no other business before the Zoning Board of Appeals, on motion of the Chair, seconded by Ms. Gorman-Phelan, which motion passed unanimously, the meeting was adjourned at 9:05 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Judith Calder
Recording Secretary