

**Town of Clarence
Zoning Board of Appeals
Minutes**

Tuesday May 13, 2008
7:00 p.m.

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

Zoning Board of Appeals members present:

Chairman Raymond Skaine
Arthur Henning
Ryan Mills

Vice-Chairman Daniel Michnik
Hans Mobius
David D'Amato

Other Town officials present:

Director of Community Development James Callahan
Planner Brad Packard
Supervisor Scott Bylewski
Town Attorney Steven Bengart
Councilman Bernard Kolber
Planning Board Liaison Richard Bigler

Other Interested Parties Present:

Janet Hay
Doug Moore
Jeffrey Barthelme
Judith Torrontor
Catherine Sinha
Mark Sandle
John Ganschow
Nady Maouad
Rocco DelGrosso

John Hay
Angelo Louisos
Joseph Lang
Rau Sinha
David Metzger
Patricia Sandle
John Hennessey
Mike Schiavone
James Milbrand

New Business

Appeal No. 1

Janet Hay
Residential Single-Family

Requests the Board of Appeals approve and grant a 7' variance to allow a 3' side yard setback for the placement of a back-up generator at 9840 Hollingson Drive.

Appeal No. 1 is in variance to Section 229-55 (E) (1) Dimension and Area Requirements.

DISCUSSION:

The concern of the Zoning Board of Appeals members is that the generator has already been installed. The applicant explained that a Hector's Hardware representative said there was no need for a

permit to install the generator and that it could not be placed elsewhere on the property. Ryan Mills clarified that the generator could be placed elsewhere, however it would be more costly to do so.

Neighbor notification forms are on file.

ACTION:

Motion by Daniel Michnik, seconded by Arthur Henning, to **approve** Appeal No. 1, as written.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

Appeal No. 2

Doug Moore
Agricultural Floodzone

Requests the Board of Appeals approve and grant a variance from the Base Flood Elevation Law in order to construct an addition to an existing pole barn at 9830 Tonawanda Creek Road.

Appeal No. 2 is in variance to Section 107 Flood Damage Prevention.

DISCUSSION:

A letter from the Town’s Engineering Department was received and is on file with regards to this variance request. The conditions of the letter were discussed and the applicant agrees to all. The conditions will be made part of the motion.

ACTION:

Motion by Ryan Mills, seconded by Hans Mobius, to **approve** Appeal No. 2, as written with the following conditions as listed in the Town of Clarence Engineering Department letter:

- Property owner to obtain Floodplain Development Permit from the Engineering Department prior to any work.
- Property owner submit a letter of understanding to the Engineering Department accepting the increased flood risk associated with constructing the pole barn finished floor elevation 2.7 feet lower than the requirement set forth in Local Law 03-2000.
- All other proposed construction and/or filling operations on the subject property must be in conformance with all requirements set forth in Local Law 03-2000 – Flood Damage Prevention and will be reviewed for compliance by the Engineering Department prior to issuance of a building permit.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

Appeal No. 3

William Louisos
Residential Single-Family

Requests the Board of Appeals approve and grant a 3’ variance to allow a 2’ side yard setback for the construction of an accessory structure at 5000 Glenwood Drive.

Appeal No. 3 is in variance to Section 229-55 (E) (1) Dimension and Area Requirements.

DISCUSSION:

Angelo Louisos is representing his son William Louisos and explains that if the shed is 2 feet from the fence the doors to the shed will have more room to open.

Neighbor notification forms are on file.

The size of the proposed shed is 10’ x 16’. Mr. Michnik asked why the applicant couldn’t put the shed forward of the trees that are on the property; 15’-20’ away from the proposed location. Mr. Michnik thinks this is a better location. Mr. Louisos said his son would rather put it closer to the fence than in the middle of the back yard.

Mr. Mobius suggests all the paperwork reflect the size of the proposed shed as 10’ x 16’ as opposed to 10’ x 14’. He asked the applicant if the fence runs along the property line or if it is located in from the line. Mr. Louisos does not know. Mr. Mobius explains that if the fence is 1 foot in from the lot line the applicant is losing that foot.

Mr. Louisos said the family will construct the shed, as they are contractors. Mr. Mills asked if the applicant has thought of other positioning options for the shed. Mr. Louisos said he and his son have had many discussions; his son is set on this location. Trees have been purchased to be planted in between the two existing trees.

Mr. Henning points out that the back yard is quite large. Mr. Louisos agreed and said the back end of the yard slopes down and there would have to be a lot of fill brought in to build it up. Mr. Henning was told by Mr. Louisos’ grandson that the shed will be used for lawn maintenance equipment, and goes on to say that this type of equipment can be stored any place on the property. Mr. Louisos said his son does not want to look out his backyard and see a shed, that’s why he keeps planting trees.

ACTION:

Motion by Ryan Mills, seconded by Hans Mobius, to **approve** Appeal No. 3, as written.

Raymond Skaine	Aye	Daniel Michnik	Nay
Arthur Henning	Aye	Hans Mobius	Aye
Ryan Mills	Aye		

MOTION CARRIED.

Appeal No. 4

Jeffrey Barthelme
Residential Single-Family

Requests the Board of Appeals approve and grant a 3’ variance to allow a 9’.5” side yard setback for the construction of an addition to an existing attached garage at 4249 Trailing Drive.

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

DISCUSSION:

Jeffrey Barthelme is present and explains that currently the garage is 10’ from the side lot line. The garage floor is heaving badly and the construction is not the best as it had been converted from a single car garage to a two car garage. His cars do not fit in the garage because the door is not high enough. He would like to build a new garage that is more appropriate. He wants to move the garage over 6” so the door will accommodate an SUV stored comfortably in the garage. He has an architect rendering for the garage but did not realize he would need it for this meeting. The materials will match the house; the gable on the garage will match the gables on the house. The architect is Bill Keller.

Neighbor notification forms are on file.

Mr. Mills asked for clarification that the variance would be to accommodate a standard two car garage with an overhead door. Mr. Barthelme said this is correct, he would like one large door; there will be approximately 18” on either side of the door. Everything that is there now will be eliminated.

In response to Mr. Michnik’s question regarding the second floor of the garage, Mr. Bethelme said he plans on making the second floor accessible from the house on the upper story. It is clarified that the measurement of the proposed garage is closer to 21’. The construction will be completed this year.

ACTION:

Motion by Daniel Michnik, seconded by Arthur Henning, to **approve** Appeal No. 4, as written.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

Appeal No. 5

Joseph Lang
Residential Single-Family

Requests the Board of Appeals approve and grant a 6’ variance to allow a 4’ side yard setback for the placement of a back-up generator at 8670 Sheridan Hill.

Appeal No. 5 is in variance to Section 229-55 (E) (1) Dimension and Area Requirements.

DISCUSSION:

Joseph Lang is present and explains that his power goes out a lot and he and his wife are not well, often they have to go on oxygen, he’s afraid if the power goes out he and his wife will have to be without oxygen. He can not go out and start a generator.

Chairman Skaine asked if this was the only location the applicant could place the generator. He also asked who will be installing the generator. Mr. Lang said Zenner & Ritter will install the generator and explains that the gas and electric lines are in the area of the proposed location. His grandchildren visit him and play in the back yard; he is concerned for their safety as well.

Mr. Mills clarifies that the generator could be put at a different location but it would require an extension of the gas line. Mr. Lang concurs.

Various members of the Board thank Mr. Lang for clearly staking his property.

One neighborhood notification form is on file.

ACTION:

Motion by Arthur Henning, seconded by Ryan Mills, to **approve** Appeal No. 5, as written.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

Appeal No. 6

Judith Torrontor
Residential Single-Family
Appeal No. 6 is in variance to Section 101-3 (C) (2) Regulations.

Requests the Board of Appeals approve and grant a 2' variance to allow the construction of a 6' fence along a corner lot at 6371 Goodrich Road.

DISCUSSION:

Judith Torrontor is present and explains that currently there is a chain link fence on her property that her dog can climb; she has tied temporary green fencing to the top of the current fence to help keep the dog on her property. Nothing can be planted at this corner; she has to berm it up two feet (2') on the outside of the fence so she can landscape the area of the fence. She would like to put up a stockade fence and wants to replace the existing fence. A two foot berm will be put along Keller Road.

Neighbor notification forms are on file.

Mr. Mills asked if the applicant has entertained a setback for the fence. Ms. Torrontor said no, she just wants to replace what she has; the objective would not be met if there is a setback.

Chairman Skaine is concerned with the height of the fence with regards to the line of site. The area from the fence to Goodrich Road is already landscaped with trees as high as 30'. Ms. Torrontor is an accident investigator and is aware of the liability; in fact, she had some trees removed because of it.

Mr. Michnik said he parked his car across the street from the applicant's property and his view was a generous clearance to make a right or, coming out of Keller, to make a left.

ACTION:

Motion by Hans Mobius, seconded by Daniel Michnik, to **approve** Appeal No. 6, as written.

Raymond Skaine	Aye	Daniel Michnik	Aye
Arthur Henning	Nay	Hans Mobius	Aye
Ryan Mills	Nay		

MOTION CARRIED.

Appeal No. 7

Catherine and Ravi Sinha
Planned Unit Residential Development

Requests the Board of Appeals approve and grant a 10' variance to allow a 35' side yard setback for the placement of an inground swimming pool at 5496 Oakfield Lane.

Appeal No. 7 is in variance to Section 229-52 Setbacks.

DISCUSSION:

Catherine and Ravi Sinha are present. Chairman Skaine asked if the applicants were aware that the property needed to be staked. The members of the Board who visited the site did not see any stakes. Ms. Sinha said the application was submitted by Pacific Pools. Joe Bowden, from Pacific Pools, said he was aware that a variance was required for the installation of the pool; however a salesman applied for the variance and Mr. Bowden did not see the packet listing the "staking" requirement.

ACTION:

Motion by Daniel Michnik, seconded by Arthur Henning, to **table** Appeal No. 6 until the property is properly staked, it will then be placed on the next meeting agenda, which is June 10, 2008.

ON THE QUESTION:

Town Attorney Steven Bengart is the owner of the property to the south west of the applicant. As a neighbor to the property he is advising the Zoning Board of Appeals Board that he is in favor of the variance request. He also points out that there is a packet that goes out with every variance and listed within the packet is the requirement to stake the property. It appears that Pacific Pools submitted the application.

Ms. Sinha provided the Board with a fourth neighbor notification.

Mr. Mills suggests asking the applicant what the time line is for building the pool; will tabling the request severely impact the time line? Ms. Sinha said they are ready to start building.

Raymond Skaine	Nay	Daniel Michnik	Aye
Arthur Henning	Nay	Hans Mobius	Nay
Ryan Mills	Nay		

MOTION FAILED.

Mr. Bowden makes the Board aware of the fact that the pool will be inside a fence that has already been granted a variance. Mr. Bowden said the pool will be 35’ off the easterly portion of the property and 15’ off the back property line. The code requires a 45’ setback off the side yard, thus the request is for a 10’ variance.

Mr. Mills asked if there is any place else the pool could be located in the yard that would not require a variance. Ms. Sinha said it could be positioned between the patio and the bottom of the garden but the pool would need to be smaller and the entire yard would need to be fenced.

Currently the fence runs along the easterly corner of the property and along the rear of the property.

Mr. Michnik asked if the pool could be brought closer to the patio. Mr. Bowden said it would be difficult to get the fence line through there. The fence would end up going all over the patio and through the trees, thus trees would have to be removed and part of the patio destroyed. Moving the pool closer to the patio would only gain 1 or 2 feet for the setback.

ACTION:

Motion by Ryan Mills, seconded by Arthur Henning, to **approve** Appeal No. 7, as written.

Raymond Skaine	Aye	Daniel Michnik	Nay
Arthur Henning	Aye	Hans Mobius	Aye
Ryan Mills	Aye		

MOTION CARRIED.

Appeal No. 8

David and Nancy Metzger
Residential Single-Family

Requests the Board of Appeals approve and grant:

- 1.) A 320 square foot variance to allow the construction of a 1040 square foot detached garage.
- 2.) A 2.25’ height variance to allow the construction of an 18.25’ tall detached garage.

Both requests apply to 5205 Hillcrest Drive.

Appeal No. 8 is in variance to Section 229-55 (D) and 229-55 (E) (2) Accessory Structures.

DISCUSSION:

Chairman Skaine informs the Board of a series of communications that Becky Brock has had with the Supervisor Bylewski. Ms. Brock sent an e-mail to Supervisor Bylewski and it reads as follows: “Good Morning Scott, Could you please tell me who I need to contact in regards to the meeting planned for the Metzger homestead zoning ordinance planned for this evening.” Supervisor Bylewski replied: “Dear Becky, Feel free to call our Director of Community Development James Callahan at 741-8933.” Ms. Brock sent an e-mail to James Callahan and read as follows: “Dear Mr. Callahan, Per our phone conversation today at 2 p.m. regarding the notification that was put in my paper box on Sunday May 11th regarding the Notification for the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting scheduled for Tuesday May 13, 2008 for the garage construction at 5205 Hillcrest Dr. I would like to confirm that this garage structure is not

going to be an apartment. This is quite a large square footage for a garage (1040 sq ft) as my home is only 1170 sq ft. I do not want this to set a precedence for the neighborhood. If this zoning variance is approved for this structure then down the road if I so choose to do the same I would expect to be approved also for this large of garage on my property. Thank you for your time in this matter and I look forward to hearing from you. Regards, Becky Brock.” Mr. Callahan advised Ms. Brock that he received her e-mail and will notify the Zoning Board of Appeals members of the same.

David Metzger is present and explained he sent out numerous neighbor notification forms but only one was returned, it is in the file. He goes on to explain that he bought the house in 1987, in 1996 he took the house down to the wood floor deck and built a two-story home. At that time it was the intent to match the garage with the same siding as the home. He has tried to rework the existing garage but it will not work. The vehicles need to be parked one behind the other; they can not be parked side by side. There is a Florida room, with a different floor elevation, attached to one side of the existing garage. The back half of the existing garage was an addition in 1967. After taking all these things into consideration it would not be cost effective to rework the existing garage. The existing garage is 1055 sq ft, the proposal is actually downsizing the size by a few square feet. As you look at the house the proposed garage will be moved back about 7’ and towards the left of the property. This will give more length to the driveway and a place to park the camper along side the garage. The reason for the change in the roof pitch is so it architecturally matches the house. Mr. Metzger would like to keep all his belongings in one structure rather than having one garage and a shed or two. The proposal is for a typical roof, it does not provide for any storage on a second floor let alone an apartment. All materials and architectural designs will match the house. It is a single 8’ x 18’ garage door. Most likely the contractor that did the house will also construct the proposed garage. The garage should be complete by this summer.

ACTION:

Motion by Arthur Henning, seconded by Daniel Michnik, to **approve** Appeal No. 8, as written.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

Appeal No. 9

Mark Sandle
Residential Single-Family

- Requests the Board of Appeals approve and grant
- 1.) A 2’ 6” variance to allow a 2’6” rear yard setback for the construction and placement of an accessory structure.
 - 2.) A 1’ variance to allow a 4’ side yard setback for the construction and placement of an accessory structure.

Both requests apply to 4540 East Overlook Drive.

Appeal No. 9 is in variance to Section 229-55 (E) (1) Dimensions and Area Requirements.

DISCUSSION:

Neighbor notification forms are on file.

Mark and Patricia Sandle are present. Mr. Sandle refers to the bath changing house for the pool and a small storage shed on the survey. These structures were deemed dangerous and were taken down. The square footage of the proposed structure is just under that of the total for the two structures that were torn down.

Mr. Michnik asked why the applicant couldn't place the shed to the south end of the pool. Mr. Sandle said this is the way they designed the back yard; the landscaping was designed as such and is complete. Mrs. Sandle said there is also a gate in the area. The accessory structure will mimic the house. Mr. Sandle said gravel will be put in and the building will be put on sonic tubes. Mr. Sandle will be constructing the shed. The height will be 7' with a 5'12' pitch. There is a slope where the proposed pool house will be located, Mr. Sandle said he will fill the entire area in; the structure will be level with the pool.

ACTION:

Motion by Arthur Henning, seconded by Hans Mobius, to **approve** Appeal No. 9, as written.

Raymond Skaine	Aye
Arthur Henning	Aye
Ryan Mills	Aye

Daniel Michnik	Aye
Hans Mobius	Aye

MOTION CARRIED.

Appeal No. 10

John Ganschow
Agricultural Rural-Residential
Appeal No. 10 is in variance to Section 229-39 (B) Lot Provisions.

Requests the Board of Appeals approve and grant a .16 acre variance to allow a 1.17 acre lot in the Agriculture Zone at 9985 Keller Road.

DISCUSSION:

John Ganschow is present and explains that twelve years ago he separated off two building lots at 150' x 340', his plan was to eventually separate off this third one. There are duplexes on the other two lots. Chairman Skaine clarifies that the width of the lot is acceptable; it is the depth that is the issue.

Mr. Mills suggests Mr. Ganschow could expand with his own personal property. Mr. Ganschow said he could do that but he was trying to keep them all within the same variance and this is what he had left from his original property. A single house would be located on the property. If the variance is granted Mr. Ganschow will have a survey done and sell the lot; the remaining lot would be a legal lot.

Neighbor notification forms are on file.

ACTION:

Motion by Arthur Henning, seconded by Hans Mobius, to **approve** Appeal No. 10, as written.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

Appeal No. 11

John Hennessey
Residential Single-Family

Requests the Board of Appeals approve and grant:

- 1.) A variance to allow the construction of a detached garage, this is in addition to the existing attached garage
- 2.) A 7'1" height variance to allow for the construction of 23'1" tall detached garage.

Both requests apply to 4193 Heather Drive.

Appeal No. 11 is in variance to Section 229-55 (H) and 229-55 (E) (2) Accessory Structures.

DISCUSSION:

Neighbor notification forms are on file.

John and Elaine Hennessey are present. Mr. Hennessey explains the request is due to the desire for more storage space; his teenage daughter will be getting a car and he prefers to store it in the garage especially in the winter. He shows the Board members a design of the proposed garage and explains that its architecture will match the house.

Mr. Mills asked if the applicant explored options connecting the garage to the house. Mr. Hennessey thought of that but there is a tree that would have to be removed; the tree is approximately 4' in diameter and he does not want to damage or move it. Nor does he want to close off his backyard by connecting a garage to his house. Mr. Mills asked about a step breezeway. Mr. Hennessey said that would cut into the backyard. There will not be a second floor in the garage, just rafters for storage.

Mr. Michnik asked if the applicant would move ahead even if the height variance was denied. Mr. Hennessey explains if the height is lowered he loses the architectural piece and the retail value may suffer. Mrs. Hennessey said she wants to make it look like the garage was meant to be there, not that it was an afterthought.

ACTION:

Motion by Raymond Skaine, seconded by Arthur Henning, to **approve** Appeal No. 10, as written.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

Appeal No. 12

Nady Maouad
Residential Single-Family

Requests the Board of Appeals approve and grant a 26’ variance to allow a 74’ front yard setback for the construction of an addition to an existing garage at 5765 Newhouse Road.

Appeal No. 12 is in variance to Section 229-52 (A) (3) Setbacks.

DISCUSSION:

Neighbor notification forms are on file.

Mr. Maouad is present and explains he desires more room for the storage of his children’s toys and to allow parking for his two cars. He is looking to re-stucco or use stone to re-do his house and the garage would match. Mr. Skaine did not see the property staked, however, the applicant explained the dimensions to Mr. Mobius when he visited the site.

Mr. Maouad said the round doors will be gone; it will be one single door. The actual variance may be less than what the applicant is requesting.

Mr. Mills asked if the applicant explored going back behind the existing garage. Mr. Maouad said he can not go back because the family room is behind the garage. With the proposed addition the garage will accommodate 4 vehicles.

Mr. Maouad explains his family room is approximately 25’ x 23’. The existing garage is 24’ x 24’.

ACTION:

Motion by Hans Mobius, seconded by Ryan Mills, to **approve** Appeal No. 12, as written.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

Appeal No. 13

Blum Builders
Planned Unit Residential Development

Requests the Board of Appeals approve and grant a 0.9’ variance to allow a 44.10’ front yard setback for an existing new home at 9765 Cobblestone Drive.

Appeal No. 13 is in variance to Section 229-52 Setbacks.

DISCUSSION:

One neighbor notification form is on file.

Mike Schiavone, an attorney with Lipsitz Green Scime Cambria LLP, is representing the applicant. He explains that the requested variance arose out of an surveying error between the original

site and an as-built survey that was prepared in connection with the construction loan. The reason for the error, and subsequently the variance request, is because of how the house is situated on the lot in relation to the roadway. The home is actually situated on two lots and is angled in such a manor to provide the maximum amount of privacy in relation to the curvature of Cobblestone Drive. The request is not for the entire frontage of the wall; it is for the right most corner of the house. The square footage of the house is between 3,000 and 4,000.

Chairman Skaine said he appreciates the applicant coming forth with this information and requesting a variance.

ACTION:

Motion by Daniel Michnik, seconded by Ryan Mills, to **approve** Appeal No. 13, as written.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

Appeal No. 14

Rocco DelGrosso
Residential Single-Family

Requests the Board of Appeals approve and grant a 8’ variance to allow a 2’ side yard setback for the placement of a back-up generator at 8131 Floss Lane.

Appeal No. 14 is in variance to Section 229-55 (E) (1) Dimension and Area Requirements.

DISCUSSION:

There are no neighbor notification forms on file. The property owner, Jim Milbrand is present along with the contractor, Rocco DelGrosso.

Chairman Skaine reports that the property had no stakes to indicate the request. Mr. DelGrosso said he sprayed the ground to mark the location of the generator on Sunday. The Board members view the sites a week to two before the meeting, thus missing the spray painted area for this request.

Mr. DelGrosso explains the only other place to locate the generator would be a concrete patio that is 10’ x 22.25’ along the rear west of the house and would require installation of 150’ of gas line.

Chairman Skaine asked if the applicant considered placing the generator behind the fence that is on the property.

Mr. DelGrosso said he spoke with one of the neighbors and they had no problem with the placement of the generator.

Mr. Mobius was present at the site when another neighbor said he had no problem with the location of the generator.

Mr. Michnik voiced his concern over the neighbor snow plowing his driveway and wondered if there is a possibility of the snowplow or the snow damaging the generator in any way. Mr. Milbrand said he has never seen any snow near his air conditioner and this is the same area the generator would be. He is willing to plant some bushes around the generator.

ACTION:

Motion by Hans Mobius, seconded by Arthur Henning, to **approve** Appeal No. 14, as written.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

Motion by Daniel Michnik, seconded by Ryan Mills, to **approve** the minutes of the meeting held on April 8, 2008, with the following correction:

-Let the record show that Councilman Bernard Kolber was in attendance at this meeting.

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

MOTION CARRIED.

Chairman Skaine suggests entering an Attorney Client Privilege Session.

Meeting Adjourned at 8:51 p.m.

Carolyn Delgato
Senior Clerk Typist