

Clarence Zoning Board of Appeals Minutes
Tuesday, May 8, 2007
7:00 p.m.

Chairman Raymond Skaine called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Zoning Board of Appeals members present:

Raymond Skaine, Chairman
Ryan Mills

Arthur Henning
Hans Mobius

Zoning Board of Appeals members absent:

Daniel Michnik, Vice-Chairman

Other Town officials present were:

James Callahan, Director of Community Development
James Hartz, Assistant Director of Community Development
Town Attorney Steven Bengart
Councilman Scott Bylewski
Councilman Bernie Kolber
Richard Bigler, Planning Board Member

Other Interested Parties Present:

Theresa Platek
Bob Wolinski
Helen Juron
Julius Juron
Brad Davidzik
Dave White
Jay Capozzi
Ray Balkowski
Chris Carollo
Tim O'Brien
James Laczkowski
Charles Mumm
Daniel Platek
Charles Greaves
Jeff Hassenfratz
John Maley

Rita Sifkovits
Roy Scheifla
Carol Kirchner
Jeff Palumbo
Len Satola
David Mavis
Ed Woodworth
Jeff Markarian
Beatrice Carollo
Susan Wickenhiser
Dan Singer
Norman Kirchner
Nadeane Scheifla
Joyce Greaves
Camellia Pirrone-Briand

Motion by Arthur Henning, seconded by Hans Mobius, to **approve** the minutes of the meeting held on April 10, 2007, as written.

Raymond Skaine	Aye	Arthur Henning	Aye
Ryan Mills	Recuse	Hans Mobius	Aye

MOTION CARRIED.

Old Business

Appeal No. 4

Silvestri Architects/Waterford Village Bank
Traditional Neighborhood District

Requests the Board of Appeals approve and grant a variance to allow parking within the front yard setback for a new bank at 8411 Main Street.

Appeal No. 4 is in variance to Section 229-67 (B) (1) Design Standards.

DISCUSSION:

Town Attorney, Steven Bengart notes for the record that prior to the start of this meeting there was an attorney/client conference was held.

Raymond Skaine informs the Board that Jeff Palumbo, who is the client representing Appeal No. 4 under Old Business, has requested this item to be tabled.

ACTION:

Motion by Raymond Skaine, seconded by Hans Mobius, to **table** Appeal No. 4 under Old Business until the June 2007 meeting.

Raymond Skaine	Aye	Arthur Henning	Aye
Ryan Mills	Recuse	Hans Mobius	Aye

MOTION CARRIED.

New Business

Appeal No. 1

Capozzi Corporation
Planned Unit Residential District

Requests the Board of Appeals approve and grant a 2.5' variance to allow a 10' side yard setback for a garage addition at 5117 Rockledge.

Appeal No. 1 is in variance to Section 229-52 (A) (4) Setbacks.

DISCUSSION:

The client is not in attendance.

ACTION:

Motion by Raymond Skaine, seconded by Ryan Mills, to **table** Appeal No. 1 until the applicant requests the re-opening of the appeal.

Raymond Skaine	Aye	Arthur Henning	Aye
Ryan Mills	Aye	Hans Mobius	Aye

MOTION CARRIED.

Appeal No. 2

Edward & Sheri Woodworth
Residential Single-Family

Requests the Board of Appeals approve and grant:

- 1.) a 4' variance to allow a shed to be built 2' from the house.
- 2.) a 5' variance to allow a 5' side yard setback for the placement of a concrete pad and a generator.

Both requests apply to 8644 Millcreek Drive.

Appeal No. 2 is in variance to Section 229-55 Accessory Structures.

DISCUSSION:

Based on recommendation by Council, Raymond Skaine recuses himself as he has a relationship with Dr. Woodworth.

In the absence of Vice-Chairperson Daniel Michnik, Ryan Mills takes the position of Chairperson.

Mr. Woodworth explains he wants to install a whole house generator. The approximate distance between the house and the lot line is 11'. To place the generator behind the house is difficult because of the close proximity of the water body. His research has indicated that the generator should be placed at a low elevation in proximity to the water body. He would like to neaten things up on the side of his house by putting a concrete pad in. The air conditioning unit and the generator would go on the pad, there would be landscaping in front of the pad. Where it drops down the hill, nothing will be seen from the street. He would also like to put in a shed. All the neighbors sheds are in a position on their property so as not to be in close proximity to the water body, he would like to do the same. Mr. Woodworth spoke with both neighbors and there were no objections. Neighbor notifications are in the file.

In response to Mr. Henning's question asking for further explanation on the generator, Mr. Woodworth explains that a whole house generator is automatic, is hooked up to natural gas, it sits outside in a permanent casing and when the power goes off this generator cycles on within 20 seconds and runs whatever portion of the house the owner chooses. Mr. Henning asks if the applicant would agree to abide by certain fire codes, Mr. Woodworth agrees. The size of the shed is 10' by 8'.

Mr. Mills asks for details on the material to be used for the shed. Mr. Woodworth explains there will be a poured concrete slab, traditional stick lumber with ply wood and whatever the Building Department dictates as far as the fire rating. The siding and shingles will match that of the house, as close as possible. Mr. Woodworth said to put the shed in the middle of the side yard would be to put it in the

middle of a grade drop, which would not work. If it was to be built close to the pond, he and all his neighbors would be looking at the shed when they are in their yards.

Mr. Woodworth plans on putting two (2) bushes in front of the generator. He has explored other options for placement of the generator and the only other spot would be in front of the house, which he thinks would be unsightly. If the generator was put in the back yard it would be too close to the water body. If it were placed on the other side of the house, next to the shed, there would be no way to run the electric and gas lines since he has a finished basement with a dry walled ceiling.

Mr. Mobius suggests using arborvitae trees for the landscaping as they will muffle the sound of the generator when it runs. Mr. Woodworth agrees and thanks Mr. Mobius for this suggestion.

ACTION:

Motion by Arthur Henning, seconded by Hans Mobius, to **approve** Appeal No. 2 as presented, with the following conditions:

- the shed will be constructed per the Town's Building Department specifications, which include the fire proofing materials as necessary.
- there is to be appropriate foliage or shrubbery be place around the generator.

Raymond Skaine	Recuse	Arthur Henning	Aye
Ryan Mills	Aye	Hans Mobius	Aye

MOTION CARRIED.

Appeal No. 3

Kittinger Gallery
Major Arterial

Requests the Board of Appeals approve and grant a 17.5 square foot variance to allow a second sign on an approved pole sign at 5363 Transit Road.

Appeal No. 3 is in variance to Section 181-4 Sign District Specifications.

DISCUSSION:

Ray Bialkowski, president and owner of the Kittinger Furniture Company in Buffalo, NY, is present. Jeff Markarian, of Markarian Rug Company, is present as well. Mr. Bialkowski feels both company names are recognizable and can be an important part of the Clarence Community. He said it is important to have the names displayed on the sign so people know they are there.

Mr. Skaine explains that the 5' by 12' current sign is in compliance with the existing Town's Sign Code. The Zoning Request for Appeal is for the second sign underneath, which is 2' by 7'1".

Mr. Henning asks if the signs will blink. Mr. Bialkowski said they will not blink; they will be lit at night.

Mr. Mills asks about the construction materials for the sign. Mr. Bialkowski said the columns will be stone. The Kittinger Furniture Company and the Markarian Rug Company are separate entities. Kittinger owns the building and Markarian rents space.

ACTION:

Motion by Arthur Henning, seconded by Hans Mobius, to **approve** Appeal No. 3, as presented.

Raymond Skaine	Aye	Arthur Henning	Aye
Ryan Mills	Aye	Hans Mobius	Aye

MOTION CARRIED.

Appeal No. 4

Christopher Carollo
Residential Single-Family

Requests the Board of Appeals approve and grant a variance to allow the positioning of a pond 20' from the property lines at the north west corner of the lot at 8720 Clarence Center Road.

Appeal No. 4 is in variance to Section 93-19 (D) Specifications.

DISCUSSION:

Christopher and Beatrice Carollo are present. Mr. Carollo explains he is working with Wes Stone of Stone Associates. Mr. Stone is working on the drainage plan. There is an easement that runs across the backyard property line. Representatives from the Town Engineer's Department have been out to the property and have observed what is happening with regards to the drainage. The engineer has worked with Mr. Stone to come up with the presented plan. Mr. Carollo does not have a letter to this effect, yet. However, Mr. Carollo said the Town's Engineer's Department and Mr. Stone are both on board with the plan. Mr. Carollo said what he is trying to achieve is to clean up the northwest corner of the property and provide a place for run-off for his house and the neighbors. He is open to any suggestions from the Board and assures the Board that it will be built to Town specifications and will be maintained.

Tim O'Brien, if 6143 Blossom Court, is concerned for the safety of his four small children; his neighbors on either side of him each have three small children as well. The proposed pond is 8' deep and approximately 100' by 150' by 200'. It is about a quarter of an acre in surface area.

Susan Wickenhiser purchased the property at 8710 Clarence Center Road, which is directly west of the lot in question. Ms. Wickenhiser was not notified of the variance request. Mr. Skaine points out that there are no neighbor notifications in the file. Mr. Carollo said he was advised that only neighbors within 150' of the pond would have to be notified; Ms. Wickenhiser's property is 400' from the pond. Mr. Skaine clarifies that the neighbor notifications are for adjoining neighbors. Mr. Carollo provides the Board with one neighbor notification it is from John Kensey of 6183 Blossom Court. This neighbor is the closest to the proposed pond. Mr. Carollo attempted to contact the neighbor at 6189 Blossom Court, Joseph Gworek, however, he was unsuccessful. Ms. Wickenhiser asks if the pond is going to be filled with water or is it going to be used for drainage and will be dry for half the year. Mr. Carollo said he is not planning on lining the pond; he is not trying to capture water there. This is part of the drainage plan for his home; he will give any neighbor permission to utilize the pond as a catch basin for their drainage as well.

Mr. Skaine did not see stakes and asks Mr. Carollo if he staked the area. Mr. Carollo did not stake the area.

Mr. Mobius visited the site. He suggests fencing be used to help mitigate the safety issue.

Mr. Mills is concerned with the safety issue as well. He asked Mr. Carollo if other scenarios have been considered with regards to drainage. Mr. Carollo said the proposed plan is a detailed comprehensive plan that Mr. Stone and the Town's Engineering Department has worked on. He has looked at other options but this is the one he wants. An alternative solution has not been provided, Mr. Carollo will research other options, however he wants to move forward since the building season has begun.

Mr. Carollo explains that fill will be brought up to complete the drainage plan and the elevations; it will also help with the wet problem on his property and the neighbor's property.

Mr. Mills also has a concern with notification of neighbors and indicates that all adjacent neighbors, no matter how far away they are from the proposed pond, should be notified. He would like to see them notified and obtain their feedback.

Mr. Carollo points out that Meadowlakes has a pond with no fence around it. Mr. Mills explains that the pond was part of subdivision development, not an individual. Mr. Carollo explains that the pond will be on his private property and would like people to stay off his private property. He understands the safety issues but he said children should not be playing on another person's property. He will put in as many safeguards as he can but parents need to take responsibility for their children.

Mr. Bengart points out that the proposed pond is along a bike path and is an attractive nuisance. The other issue is that not all the neighbors have been notified and Board would like to hear from them prior to making a decision. Mr. Skaine said that may not be necessary. There is a lot of traffic on the bike path.

Mr. Henning asked what Mr. Carollo would do if the Board denied his request, would he change his proposal or forget his proposal. Mr. Carollo said he would not forget his proposal. If the Board feels this request will not be approved this evening, he asks that it be tabled to allow him time to research and to provide more neighbor notifications. He will better prepare of the next meeting and will return with his attorney. Mr. Henning suggests the applicant take photos of other ponds in the area, Mr. Carollo agrees.

Mr. Skaine refers to the criteria used by the Zoning Board of Appeals when rendering a decision on a request:

- An undesirable change will be produced in the character of the neighborhood.
- The benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by some other method.
- At almost an 80% variance, this is a substantial request.
- The proposed variance will have an adverse effect on the neighborhood as it is an attractive nuisance.
- The alleged difficulty appears to be self-created.

Mr. Carollo disagrees with the criterion which states the variance would have an adverse effect on the neighborhood; he has spent a lot of time and money cleaning up the parcel. He is willing to work with Town to reach an agreement with regards to his variance request.

Ms. Wickenhiser explains that before she purchased the land from Mr. Carollo he told her that he planned to put a pond in. He also told her he would install a fence around the pond, she has small children and she does not have a problem with the pond if there is a fence around it.

ACTION:

Motion by Raymond Skaine, seconded by Ryan Mills, to **table** Appeal No. 4, per the applicant's request. The appeal will be heard at the June 12, 2007 meeting at which time the applicant has agreed to provide additional information as discussed. A copy of these minutes will be forwarded to the appropriate neighbors so they do not have to attend the June 12, 2007 meeting; these neighbors are to provide their address to Jim Hartz.

ON THE QUESTION:

Mr. Carollo will have every neighbor on Blossom Court notified, this per Mr. Mills suggestion. Mr. Carollo will also stake the property. Mr. Mills feels the Meadowlakes residents across the bike path are relevant as well and should be notified. Mr. Carollo disagrees with the relevancy of the Meadowlakes neighbors; however, he agrees to notify these neighbors as well.

Raymond Skaine	Aye	Arthur Henning	Aye
Ryan Mills	Aye	Hans Mobius	Aye

MOTION CARRIED.

Appeal No. 5

James Laczkowski
Clarence Hollow Overlay District
Traditional Neighborhood District

Requests the Board of Appeals approve and grant a 20' variance to allow a 50' wide lot at 10749 Main Street.

Appeal No. 5 is in variance to Section 229-67 (B) (1) Design Standards.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Laczkowski said he purchased the property years ago with the plan to open a ceramic studio, his wife developed asthma and the property was never developed for their own use. The property is 211' deep, his business was in the back building and above that he built offices and an apartment, the front building was rented and has been renovated. He would like to sell the front building.

Mr. Skaine explains that if the request is granted the address on Main Street would remain and the new parcel would have an address of Academy Street. The applicant explains that the new parcel already has an address of 4920 Academy Street with the Post Office; both properties have their own sewer tap.

Mr. Laczkowski explains he would like to sell the building as it is. If the building were to be demolished it would be difficult to meet the setbacks when building a new structure.

If the request was denied, Mr. Laczkowski would rent the front building, again.

Mr. Laczkowski will do nothing with the 12' piece of property that is north of the back building.

ACTION:

Motion by Hans Mobius, seconded by Arthur Henning, to **approve** Appeal No. 5, as written.

Raymond Skaine Aye
 Ryan Mills Aye

Arthur Henning Aye
 Hans Mobius Aye

MOTION CARRIED.

Appeal No. 6

Daniel M. Singer
 Residential Single-Family

Requests the Board of Appeals approve and grant
 1.) a use variance to allow for a commercial
 structure for use as a nail salon.
 2.) a front yard setback variance to allow for
 parking in the front yard.
 Both requests apply to 8353 Main Street.

Appeal No. 6 is in variance to Section 229-47 Permitted Uses.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Singer explains that he is waiting for a clarification from the Erie County Health Department regarding what he can do with this property. He is proposing a 1500 square foot commercial building; it will house a high-end natural nail care spa. There will be no ingress or egress off of Susan Drive. Mr. Singer purchased the property in December of 2004, it was zoned Commercial. The property was rezoned to Residential through the adopted Zoning Amendment of March 9, 2005. Mr. Singer believes his situation is an unnecessary hardship, the property is incapable of any use or return on initial investment with its residential zoning; it can not be used for a residential dwelling due to its size and not having sewers. The plan submitted will fit the character of the neighborhood. Parking will be located on Main Street. The plan is that each employee would take care of up to three clients at once; the spa would have only 8 or 9 customers in the building at one time. Mr. Singer said the hardship is not self-created; it was created when the Town of Clarence adopted the Zoning Amendment on March 9, 2005. There will be a lot of plantings at the site; there will be a sidewalk on Main Street, no evening hours, maybe Saturday hours.

Mr. Skaine explains that Mr. Singer has requested this item to be tabled.

Nadeane Scheifla, of 4292 Susan Drive, wonders when this property became a number on Main Street rather than on Susan Drive. The answer is unknown. She explains that from 3:30 pm to 5:30 pm the traffic is bumper to bumper on Main Street. She feels the traffic that will be generated will create a very dangerous situation. Ms. Scheifla was in the nail business for many years, if the proposal is for natural manicures and pedicures she advises that is not a big money maker. If this business is not successful, what happens to the building?

Roy Scheifla, of 4292 Susan Drive, voices his concern with how difficult it is to get on to Main Street for the volunteer firemen that live in the area and need to respond to a number of emergency calls daily. Mr. Scheifla wonders what type of septic system will be used; Mr. Singer said the Erie County Health Department will determine that. It will go between the building and the cemetery.

Bob Wolinski, of 4282 Susan Drive, believes there will be a lot of traffic generated if the request is granted and the project is developed as planned.

Mr. Skaine advises that the Engineering Land Survey prepared by Wm. Schutt & Associates dated February 2007 is in the file and available for the public to view in the Planning and Zoning Office.

Charles Mumm, of 4272 Susan Drive, wonders if the applicant will change his mind and what the next proposal might be for this property. Mr. Skaine explains that if the applicant wanted to change the use he would have to go before the Town board to obtain a Change-In-Use permit.

Rita Wolinski, of 4282 Susan Drive, asked Mr. Singer if he knew the property was zoned Residential when he bought it, Mr. Singer explains that it was zoned Commerical when he bought it.

Dan Platek, of 4232 Susan Drive, asks how the Town views the property, Mr. Skaine said the Town views the property as being zoned Residential. Mr. Platek wonders if there is a need for another nail salon in the Town of Clarence, he is advised that it is the property owner's right to choose how he wants to propose developing the site.

Carol Kirchner, 4212 Susan Drive, is the individual who gathered over 70 petitions with regards to the original proposal. She presents a map showing the lot in question as being zoned Residential. Ms. Kirchner said nail places are not the most desirable places to have and they also have an odor problem. She asks what the sign will look like. Mr. Skaine explains that if the Zoning Board of Appeals approved the variance request, the matter of the signage would be reviewed by the Town Board/Planning Board; the neighbors would be afforded an opportunity to be involved in that process as well. Mr. Singer said if the project gets this far he will sit down with everyone and discuss signage and landscaping.

It is clarified that the request is not to rezone the property, but for a use variance in a Residential area.

Jeff Hassenfratz, of 4287 Susan Drive, does not feel the change in use as requested would fit the area. He agrees with the traffic concerns.

Camellia Pirrone-Briande, of 4165 Clardon Drive, agrees with the traffic concerns.

Rita Sifkovits, of 4287 Susan Drive, said nail salons produce fumes and asks what Mr. Singer meant by "natural". Mr. Singer explains that the fumes come from gel coats or extensions, he is proposing natural nail care, which would include filing, soaking, massaging and applying lotions, there are no glues or heat guns. Ms. Sifkovits believes the value of the homes in the area will depreciate with the commercial development of this property.

Charles Greaves, of 4277 Susan Drive, asks if a customer comes in with nail polish already on her nails, won't it have to be removed. Mr. Singer said it will be removed with nail polish remover. Mr. Greaves said nail polish remover has fumes. He also said the present dumpster location on the plan looks horrible.

Julius Juron, of 4217 Susan Drive, asks what the applicant will do with the building if the business is not successful. Mr. Singer does not see this happening.

Another residence asks, when this project gets to the Planning Board stage, that the Planning Board members go to the site to experience the traffic problems. Mr. Bigler, liaison to the Planning Board, is present and will take the concerns back to the Planning Board.

Mr. Mills asks the applicant if he has exhausted all the remedies and possibilities with regards to the use or sale of this lot from a residential perspective. Mr. Singer said he was advised that a residence could not be built on the property because of the square footage. Mr. Mills asks if the applicant has explored the appellate procedure, Mr. Singer said he has not.

Mr. Henning clarifies with the neighbors that are present that the opposition is not necessarily to the nail salon; it is to any commercial development at that site. They all agree.

Nadeane Scheifla does not want to be told that Mr. Singer can not build a residential home on the lot, when there may be a chance of this possibility.

ACTION:

Motion by Raymond Skaine, seconded by Hans Mobius, to **table** Appeal No. 6, to allow time for Mr. Singer to obtain a response from the Erie County Health Department and forward it to Jim Callahan of the Planning and Zoning Office, at which time, a date may be set for this item to be heard at a future Zoning Board of Appeals meeting.

Raymond Skaine	Aye	Arthur Henning	Aye
Ryan Mills	Aye	Hans Mobius	Aye

MOTION CARRIED.

Appeal No. 7

Renaldo & Palumbo
Commerical

Requests the Board of Appeals approve and grant

- 1.) a 13.53 square foot variance to allow a 45.53 square foot monument sign.
- 2.) a 58.58 square foot variance to allow 158.58 square feet of building signage.
- 3.) a variance to allow more than 1 wall sign.

All requests apply to 9217 Main Street.

Appeal No. 7 is in variance to Section 181 Signs.

DISCUSSION:

Jeffrey Palumbo and Brad Davidzik, from the law firm of Damon & Morey, are present along with David White from Walgreen's and David Mavis from Benderson Development. Leonard Satola owner of Woodside Village is present as well.

Mr. Palumbo explains that the applicant has tried to be in conformity with surrounding area in terms of signage.

Mr. Mills asks if the applicant might want to scale down the square footage on the monument sign, this would delete a variance request. Mr. Palumbo said if it were to be scaled down it would reduce the copy change from 3 rows to 2 rows, this is not as effective nor is it as aesthetically pleasing. Mr. Davidzik points out that the ground sign across the street at Rite-Aid is quite large. Mr. Palumbo said the site plan has been revised considerably, due to meetings with the Planning Board. Mr. Mills asks about a

possible reduction in the Walgreen's sign, David White said the presented sign is the new company logo. Mr. Mills asks if Walgreen's would consider a slight modification to the monument sign. With regards to the second request Mr. Mills asks if these signs are standard to all Walgreen's, Mr. White said although these signs are not on 100% of the Walgreen's Buildings this type of signage is important to them, it is their brand identity.

Mr. Mobius asks Mr. Palumbo how these signs compare to the building on Transit Road and County Road. Mr. Palumbo said there are fewer wall signs at the Transit Road and County Road location. He also indicated that the applicant looked at various sign designs; however, it became too congested when trying to fit two words on one sign.

Mr. Palumbo points out that there was a trade-off for the sign at the Transit & County Roads location; instead of an electronic reader board a "photo" and "pharmacy" sign was approved.

ACTION:

Motion by Hans Mobius, seconded by Arthur Henning, to **approve** Appeal No. 7, as written. When the submission is before the Sign Review Board they will take into consideration the discussion held this evening.

ON THE QUESTION:

Mr. Mills suggests amending the motion with respect to variance request number one, he would like to see an all stone monument sign, Mr. Mobius and Mr. Henning do not agree. Mr. Mobius said if the brick goes all the way up the sign, eventually, due to wind, the brick will shift and the signage between the brick will crack. Mr. Bigler will relay these concerns to the Planning Board.

Raymond Skaine	Aye	Arthur Henning	Aye
Ryan Mills	Aye	Hans Mobius	Aye

MOTION CARRIED.

Appeal No. 1

Capozzi Corporation
Planned Unit Residential District

Requests the Board of Appeals approve and grant a 2.5' variance to allow a 10' side yard setback for a garage addition at 5117 Rockledge.

Appeal No. 1 is in variance to Section 229-52 (A) (4) Setbacks.

DISCUSSION:

Jay Capozzi is present and indicates this is the second variance for this address. Mr. Capozzi said originally he checked with the Building Department and was advised this garage addition was acceptable. It came to his attention when he went to the Building Department to obtain a building permit that it did not meet the required setbacks. Neighbor notifications are on file.

In response to Mr. Mills question regarding what type of material will be used for the construction of the addition, Mr. Capozzi said it will match the existing structure exactly. Mr. Capozzi agrees that landscaping will be put in along the side of the addition.

ACTION:

Motion by Hans Mobius, seconded by Arthur Henning, to **approve** Appeal No. 1, as written.

ON THE QUESTION:

Mr. Mills suggests amending the motion to include the requirement that the landscape plan be submitted to and reviewed and approved by the Landscape Review Committee. Mr. Mobius agrees, Mr. Henning does not.

ACTION:

Motion by Hans Mobius, seconded by Ryan Mills, to **approve** Appeal No. 1, with the condition that the landscape plan be submitted to and reviewed and approved by the Landscape Review Committee.

Raymond Skaine	Aye	Arthur Henning	Aye
Ryan Mills	Aye	Hans Mobius	Aye

MOTION CARRIED.

The applicant is advised to contact the Planning and Zoning Office if he has further questions on submitting a landscape Plan.

Meeting adjourned at 9:09 p.m.

Carolyn Delgato
Senior Clerk Typist