

TOWN OF LAKE LUZERNE
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
NOVEMBER 19, 2009

MEMBERS PRESENT: DONALD BURNHAM, DAVID COLLINS, STANLEY GOLDBERG, JAMES MANDLE, HELEN HEDGER AND ALTERNATE KATHLEEN HURLEY. ALSO PRESENT: ZEO SAHEIM, ABSENT LEGAL COUNSEL RUSSELL THARP.

MR. THARP NOTIFIED CHAIRMAN GOLDBERG THAT HE WOULD NOT BE PRESENT AT THE MEETING.

A MOTION TO ACCEPT THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER MEETING WAS MADE BY HEDGER, SECONDED BY MANDLE. ROLL CALL VOTE: BURNHAM, ABSTAINED, COLLINS, AYE, GOLDBERG, AYE, MANDLE, AYE, HEDGER, AYE, HURLEY, ABSTAINED. MOTION CARRIED.

A MOTION TO ACCEPT THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER MEETING WAS MADE BY BURNHAM, SECONDED BY MANDLE. ROLL CALL VOTE: BURNHAM, AYE, COLLINS, ABSTAINED, GOLDBERG, AYE, MANDLE, AYE, HEDGER, ABSTAINED, HURLEY, AYE. MOTION CARRIED.

AGENDA:

ANGELICA BAUER – AREA VARIANCE-AV09-11
PARCEL ID# 298.16-1-49, HAMLET RESIDENTIAL ZONE
51 VILLAGE VIEW DRIVE– THE APPLICANT PLACED A STORAGE SHED ON THE PROPERTY WITHOUT OBTAINING THE PROPER PERMITS PRIOR TO ERECTING THE SHED. THE MEASUREMENTS WERE QUESTIONED AS THERE WAS A FENCE CONSTRUCTED IN THE INTERIM. THE REASON FOR THE VARIANCE REQUEST IS BECAUSE THE APPLICANT CANNOT MEET SETBACK FROM THEIR PRINCIPAL BUILDING. THE MINIMUM DISTANCE BETWEEN TWO BUILDINGS IS 10FT, THEY NEED AN AREA VARIANCE FROM 10FT TO 5 FT.

ZEO SAHEIM LETTER OF DENIAL FOR LAND USE PERMIT READS AS FOLLOWS:

ZEO SAHIEM MAILED NOTIFICATION LETTERS TO THE FOLLOWING PROPERTY OWNERS THAT ARE LOCATED WITHIN 500FT OF THE APPLICANTS' PROPERTY: BREWER, GUMPRECHT, BUSCARNERA, WEEKS, SQUEGLIA, GEISEL, PHILLIPS, 462 BROADWAY LTD, LABELLE, PIONTEK, RAMOS, SEBER, TAYLOR, STRAUSS, JORDAN, LEWANDOWSKI, SOUTHWORTH, TODD, BARBERA, FELSKA, COWLEY, HALPERN, WADE, LUTHER, OPPENLANDER, CARROLL, SCHMIDT, DENSMORE, AMES,

GRAULICH, BENNETT, SCHAFFER, CHUBB, MANGAN, GIANNINI, SILVER, GRANDIS, TAYLOR, VISCARDO, MCKNIGHT, CROOKS, DELGAUDIO, KRUMHOLZ, CASEY, MESSITT, BRADY, CARRIER, HUNT, DIMITRIADIS, SHERLOCK, BERTRAND, KAUFMAN, KILGALLEN, COURTNEY, HORWITZ, SCHAFFER, LUZERNE-HADLEY FIRE DEPT., TOSELAND, TILTON, WILLIAMS, TEBBANO, KEANE, OPDYKE, AND KESSLER.

ZEO SAHEIM READ THE LAND USE PERMIT DENIAL LETTER:

TO MRS. ANGELICA BAUER:

YOUR REQUEST TO PLACE A STORAGE SHED ON YOUR PROPERTY IS DENIED. I BASE MY DENIAL ON ARTICLE 3 SECTION 14 PARAGRAPH B, 3, D OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE TOWN OF LAKE LUZERNE STATES NO CLOSER TO 10 FT TO THE PRINCIPLE OR OTHER ACCESSORY BUILDINGS . YOUR PLOT PLAN SHOWED YOUR SHED TO BE 5FT FROM YOUR PRINCIPAL BUILDING, YOU WILL NEED AN AREA VARIANCE FROM 10FT TO 5 FT FOR RELIEF. YOU MAY APPLY FOR AN AREA VARIANCE, I HAVE ENCLOSED AN APPLICATION, PLEASE RETURN THE APPLICATION TO ME WITH A FEE OF \$75.00 IF YOU WISH TO GO AHEAD WITH THE VARIANCE REQUEST.

SIGNED BY ME.

CHAIRMAN GOLDBERG- I WOULD LIKE TO SET THE TABLE BEFORE YOU SPEAK. OUR UNDERSTANDING OF WHAT THE VARIANCE IS YOUR REQUEST IS TO PLACE A 10FT WIDE SHED ON THE LEFT SIDE OF YOUR HOME. ZONING REQUIRES THAT YOUR SHED MUST BE 10FT FROM THE PROPERTY LINE AND 10FT FROM YOUR PRIMARY RESIDENCE. THE TOTAL FOOTAGE REQUIRED IS 30FT. YOUR PLOT PLAN SHOWS YOU HAVE 25FT BETWEEN THE PROPERTY LINE AND THE PRIMARY RESIDENCE AND THAT YOU WANT TO PLACE THE SHED 10FT FROM THE PROPERTY LINE LEAVING ONLY 5FT FROM THE PRIMARY RESIDENCE. THEREFORE YOU ARE ASKING FOR A 5FT VARIANCE FROM THE PRIMARY RESIDENCE. IS THAT CORRECT?

MR. BAUER – YES

CHAIRMAN GOLDBERG- TELL US ABOUT THE HARDSHIP.

MR. BAUER-THE HARDSHIP IS THAT WE DO NOT HAVE ENOUGH SPACE TO PUT THE SHED WHERE IT MEETS REQUIREMENTS FROM PROPERTY LINES AND THE HOUSE. THE SHED IS TO BE USED FOR SNOWBLOWER, BIKES, SHOVELS ETC...

CHAIRMAN GOLDBERG – WHAT ABOUT GAS?

MR. BAUER- YES, FOR THE SNOWBLOWER.

BURNHAM- I HAVE A QUESTION, I WAS OVER MEASURING THE PROPERTY, AS FAR AS THE DISTANCE FROM YOUR HOUSE TO THE FENCE, I CAME UP WITH ONLY 21FT AND YOU HAVE 25FT ON YOUR PLOT PLAN. I AM JUST WONDERING IF THE FENCE IS ON THE PROPERTY LINE OR IS THE LINE CLOSER TO THE OTHER HOUSE THAT BORDERS YOU?

BAUER – I BELIEVE IT IS

BURNHAM – YOU BELIEVE WHAT IS?

BAUER – THERE IS PROBABLY ANOTHER FOOT OR TWO FOOT BETWEEN THE FENCE AND THE PROPERTY LINE.

GOLDBERG – THIS PLOT IS A GUESS WORK, YOU ARE KIND OF GUESSING WHERE THINGS ARE?

BAUER- I MEASURED IT.

GOLDBERG – WE LOOK FOR PIPES OR ANY INDICATIONS OF PROPERTY LINES, WE GOT 21.7 FT BETWEEN FENCE AND HOUSE.

BAUER – I MEASURED FROM HENDRICKS TO THE HOUSE AND OVER.

HEDGER – YOU ARE MEASURING FROM THE FENCE? WHAT DID YOU USE FOR YOUR LINE?

BAUER- I CAME 100FT FROM HENDRICKS.

BURNHAM – WE MEASURED 100 FEET FROM HENDRICKS AND CAME EXACTLY TO YOUR FENCE . BUT WHEN WE MEASURE FROM HOUSE TO FENCE IT IS ONLY 21FT.

GOLDBERG – DO YOU HAVE A STAMPED SURVEY OF YOUR PROPERTY.

BAUER – NO

GOLDBERG – YOU YOURSELF DON'T KNOW WHERE THE PIPES ARE FOR THE PROPERTY LINE?

BAUER – NO, I HAVE AN IDEA WHERE THEY ARE, I KNOW WHERE THEY WERE AT ONE POINT, BUT HAVE BEEN MOVED.

COLLINS – I SEE ANOTHER SHED OUT BACK ACTUALLY NON CONFORMING IS THAT GOING TO REMAIN THERE?

GOLDBERG – IT’S THE SAME SHED.

COLLINS – THAT’S THE SHED THAT IS GOING TO BE MOVED?
IS IT GOING TO BE IN FRONT OF THE FENCE OR BEHIND THE FENCE?

BAUER –BEHIND THE FENCE.

COLLINS – AS FAR AS THE PLUS OR MINUS OF 3FT FROM THE FENCE IT’S KINDA OF A VARIABLE WITH FENCING ALONG PROPERTY LINES WHERE PIPES AREN’T FOUND.

ZEO SAHEIM – THEY ARE NOT ASKING FOR RELIEF FROM THE LEFT LINE ONLY FROM THE HOUSE.

COLLINS – THEY ARE WORKING ON THE 25FT AREA THAT IS ONLY 21.5FT.

GOLDBERG- IF YOU WANT RELIEF FROM THE HOUSE AND YOU PLACE THE SHED 10FT FROM THE FENCE, WHICH IS THE ONLY THING YOU CAN DO, THEN YOU WILL HAVE 10FT AND 10FT FROM THE SHED YOU WILL HAVE 1FT 6” FROM THE HOUSE TO THE SHED, YOU WILL BE RIGHT ON TOP OF YOUR HOUSE. SO EVEN IF THE PROPERTY LINE ISN’T THERE, YOU ARE STILL FENCING YOURSELF IN. SO THE AREA AVAILABLE RIGHT NOW FROM THE STAND POINT OF HAVING THE FENCE UP IS ONLY 21FT 7” AND FROM THE STAND POINT OF WHERE THE PROPERTY LINE IS, WE CANNOT JUDGE THAT.

COLLINS- THE BASIC ISSUE YOU TOUCHED ON BEFORE IS THAT YOU ARE GOING TO BE STORING LAWN DEVICES AND SNOWBLOWERS, THINGS LIKE THAT AND THEIR FUEL, THERE IS A FIRE LOAD THERE. THE 10FT FROM YOUR STRUCTURE FOR ACCESSORY BUILDINGS IS BASED ON THAT SO THAT YOU DON’T GET THE EXPOSURE IF THAT BUILDING SHOULD CATCH FIRE, IT DOESN’T SPREAD TO THE RESIDENTS, A FOOT AND A HALF MIGHT JUST AS WELL BE TOUCHING IT. THAT IS AN ISSUE TO CONSIDER WHEN MINIMIZING THE DISTANCES.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

ARDEN WEEKS- PRESENT AT MEETING

THE FOLLOWING CORRESPONDENCE WAS READ INTO THE MINUTES AND MADE PART OF THIS RECORD:

RE: AREA VARIANCE AV09-22: ANGELICA BAUER, PARCEL # 298.16-1-49,
HAMLET RESIDENTIAL ZONE (HR) LOCATION: 51 VILLAGE VIEW

LETTER FROM JEFFREY SCHAFFER, 47 VILLAGE VIEW – I CANNOT BE PRESENT AT THE ZBA PUBLIC HEARING ON 11/19/09 CONCERNING THE ABOVE REFERENCED VARIANCE APPLICATION. PLEASE ACCEPT AND SUBMIT THIS LETTER IN LIEU OF MY ATTENDANCE AND AS PART OF THE RECORD. MY WIFE (PATRICIA) AND I OWN PROPERTY AT 47 VILLAGE VIEW THAT IS ADJACENT TO THE ABOVE REFERENCED PARCEL. WE NOTE IN YOUR LETTER THAT THE “APPLICANT PROPOSED TO ERECT A METAL STORAGE SHED AND CANNOT MEET SET BACK FROM ANOTHER BUILDING”. HOWEVER, PLEASE BE ADVISED THAT APPLICANT HAS GONE AHEAD AND ERECTED SUCH STRUCTURE WITHOUT BOTHERING TO SECURE THE NECESSARY VARIANCE. AS YOU ARE AWARE, ZONING REQUIREMENTS AND ORDINANCES WERE “INVENTED” IN NEW YORK IN THE EARLY PART OF THE LAST CENTURY. MANY LOCALITIES FOLLOWED OUR LEAD AND ESTABLISHED SUCH ORDINANCES TO PREVENT OBNOXIOUS AND/OR INCOMPATIBLE USES WITHIN RESIDENTIAL AREAS IN ORDER TO PROTECT PROPERTY VALUES, THEREBY CHANGING PROPERTY VALUES AS WELL AS LEADING TO DELETERIOUS QUALITY OF LIFE CHANGES. ZONING PRINCIPLES DO RECOGNIZE THE NEED FOR GRANTING OCCASIONAL EXCEPTIONS THROUGH THE USE OF VARIANCES. HOWEVER, I AGAIN MUST POINT OUT THAT APPLICANT DISREGARDED TOWN PROCEDURES TO APPLY FOR AND BE GRANTED A VARIANCE...THE VARIANCE APPLICATION SHOULD THEREFORE, BE DENIED. WE SAY THIS NOT MERELY TO PROVIDE A TESTIMONIAL TO SUPPORT GENERAL ZONING PRINCIPLES, BUT IN HOPES OF MAINTAINING AND ENSURING THE CHARACTER FOR AS LONG AS POSSIBLE, OF LAKE LUZERNE. TO MY KNOWLEDGE, ALL OF US ON VILLAGE VIEW AND ADJACENT ROADWAYS HAVE COMPLIED WITH ESTABLISHED ZONING AND WHERE NECESSARY, HAVE FILED FOR THE NECESSARY VARIANCE(S). I MUST POINT OUT THAT THOSE OF US DENIED TOOK THE “NO” TO MEAN NO AND NOT TO GO AHEAD AND ERECT A “METAL STORAGE SHED”. I APPRECIATE THIS OPPORTUNITY AND I THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIMELY HANDLING OF THIS MATTER . SINCERELY, JEFFREY SCHAFFER

MEMBERS OF THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS:

I, TINA DIMITRIADIS, OWNER OF 9 PINE ROAD, LAKE LUZERNE, UNFORTUNATELY AM UNABLE TO ATTEND THE PUBLIC HEARING SLATED FOR THIS EVENING REGARDING THE PROPERTY NOTATED ABOVE. I HEREBY REQUEST THAT MR. SAHEIM READ THIS LETTER PUBLICLY TO THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS OF LAKE LUZERNE DURING THE TIME SLOTTED FOR “PUBLIC HEARING”. MY IMMEDIATE AND EXTENDED FAMILY HAS BEEN OWNERS OF VARIOUS PROPERTIES WITHIN THE AREA IN QUESTION FOR OVER 65 YEARS. SO, NEEDLESS TO SAY, WE HAVE THE UTMOST RESPECT AND LOVE FOR THE “TOWN OF LAKE LUZERNE”. DURING THESE YEARS WE HAVE SEEN MANY CHANGES BEING BOTH GOOD AND BAD. IN REFERENCE TO APPLICANT PROPOSING TO ERECT A

METAL STORAGE SHED NOT MEETING THE "SETBACK" FROM ANOTHER BUILDING, I AM IN FAVOR OF THIS BOARD APPROVING THE NEED FOR AN AREA VARIANCE FROM 10' TO 5'. I DON'T FEEL THAT THIS APPROVAL CAUSES ANY HARM OR PROBLEM FOR ANY OF THE SURROUNDING PROPERTIES IN THIS AREA. RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED, TINA K. DIMITRIADIS.

MR. SAHEIM: MY SISTER AND I HAVE NO PROBLEM WITH GIVING MS. BAUER THE VARIANCE SHE NEEDS TO PUT A STORAGE SHED ON HER PROPERTY. WHEN MY MOM REQUESTED A VARIANCE FOR THE SHED ON OUR PROPERTY MANY YEARS AGO, OUR NEIGHBORS HAD NO OBJECTION. PEGGY AND I FEEL WE SHOULD SUPPORT OUR NEIGHBORS AS THEY SUPPORTED US. THANK YOU FOR SENDING YOUR EMAIL ADDRESS TO MAKE IT EASIER FOR ME TO RESPOND. MY SISTER IS IN FLORIDA UNTIL APRIL-MAY. NEITHER OF US WILL BE ABLE TO MAKE THE MEETING ON THURSDAY. BARBARA CHUBB/MARGARET GARDNER.

MANDLE- IS THIS A SEASONAL OR YEAR ROUND RESIDENCE.

BAUER – YEAR ROUND

GOLDBERG- BEFORE I CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING, I JUST WANT TO SUMMARIZE MY UNDERSTANDING OF WHAT INCURRED. YOUR PLOT PLAN AS PRESENTED IS INCORRECT AND OUR SITE VISITS CONFIRM THAT. ALL WE CAN SEE IS THAT THE FENCE DEMARCATES A LIMIT WHETHER IT IS THE PROPERTY LINE OR NOT, THAT IS AS FAR AS YOU CAN GO, YOUR FENCE. IN THAT CASE THE DISTANCE FROM THE PRIMARY PROPERTY TO THE PROPERTY LINE OR FENCE IS 21FT 6IN. IF YOU PLACED YOUR SHED 10FT FROM THE FENCE, YOU WILL BE 1FT 6IN FROM YOUR RESIDENCE. THE VARIANCE FOR THAT WOULD BE 8FT 6IN OR ALMOST 90%. IF YOU PLACE THE SHED IN THE CENTER BETWEEN THE PROPERTY LINE, THE FENCE AND THE PRIMARY RESIDENCE, YOU WILL REQUIRE TWO VARIANCES, EACH ONE 5 1/2FT ON EACH SIDE BOTH 45% AND THAT WOULD TOTAL UP AGAIN TO 90%.

ARDEN WEEKS – 64 VILLAGE VIEW- MY QUESTION WOULD BE, I AM AN AGENT OF MR. SCHAFFERS' BUT ALSO AN INTERESTED COMMUNITY MEMBER AND I AM WONDERING IF YOU MAKE A DECISION ON THE VARIANCE, WHEN IT BECOMES FINALIZED IF IT NEEDS TO BE ESTABLISHED WHERE THE ACTUAL PROPERTY LINE IS AS OPPOSED TO WHERE THE FENCE IS BECAUSE IT MAY NOT BE THE SAME THING AND I AM INTERESTED BECAUSE IT IS A POSSIBILITY THAT ONE OF MY NEIGHBORS HAD A SIMILAR BUILDING AND PLAN IN THE WORKS AND WHO EVER BUILDS OR PUTS SOMETHING UP IS RESPONSIBLE FOR DEFINITELY IDENTIFYING THE PROPERTY LINE AND IT SEEMS THAT

THIS HAS NOT BEEN DONE IN THIS CASE. THE FACT THAT THE FENCE IS THERE DOESN'T NECESSARILY MEAN THAT IS THE PROPERTY LINE. SO THAT WOULD BE MY CONCERN TO MAKE SURE THAT THAT IS VERIFIED BEFORE A DECISION IS MADE.

CHAIRMAN GOLDBERG – I UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU ARE SAYING BUT WE HAVE AN ENCUMBRANCE THERE WHICH IS A FENCE AND THIS SHED IS GOING TO BE PLACED INSIDE THAT FENCE WHETHER THE PROPERTY LINE OR NOT HE CANNOT PLACE THAT SHED ANY CLOSER THAN 10FT. WE DON'T KNOW WHERE THE 10FT ARE. IF YOU WANT TO GO BACK AND GET A CERTIFIED SURVEY OF YOUR PROPERTY THAT WOULD BE AN ALTERNATIVE BEFORE WE MAKE A DECISION.

ANGELICA BAUER- NO, I WOULD TAKE THE SHED DOWN BEFORE I WOULD PAY FOR A SURVEY, THE FENCE IS FINE, WE CAN TAKE DOWN THE SHED. MAYBE WE COULD APPLY FOR A BUILDING PERMIT TO BUILD ONTO THE HOUSE.

ZEO SAHEIM – THAT IS A POSSIBILITY AS WELL.

ANGELICA BAUER – THE SNOWBLOWER, BIKES ETC WOULD HAVE TO STAY THERE, WE HAVE NO PLACE TO PUT IT.

ZEO SAHEIM-WHEN MEASURING FROM HENDRICK TO POINT ON VILLAGE VIEW, THERE IS A SMALL SEPARATE LOT ON HENDRICK THAT IS NOT IN PLAY HERE. YOU WOULD HAVE TO ACTUALLY COME IN 25FT, THIS LOT IS ONLY 75FT WIDE.

CHAIRMAN GOLDBERG – WE DID MEASURE IT TO BE A TOTAL OF 100FT.

ZEO SAHEIM – WHICH IS THE ENTIRE TWO LOTS, WHERE HERS IS ONLY 75FT WIDE. SHE DOES ALSO OWN THAT VACANT LOT BUT IT IS CERTAINLY A SEPARATE LOT AND THESE ACCESSORY STRUCTURES WOULD THEN BE ON VACANT LAND, WHICH IS NOT ALLOWED.

BAUER – RIGHT BECAUSE THAT IS WHERE I THOUGHT I WOULD HAVE ROOM.

ZEO SAHEIM- IF THE BOARDS DECISION TONIGHT WAS TO ALLOW FOR A STAY OF THIS APPLICATION IN ORDER TO PROVIDE NEW INFORMATION ON THE LEFT SIDE SETBACK, I WOULD HAVE TO RE-NOTIFY ALL THE NEIGHBORS BECAUSE WHEN I NOTIFIED THEM I DID NOT BRING INTO PLAY THE LEFT SIDE SETBACK SO THAT MIGHT BRING IN SOME MORE OPPOSITION.

CHAIRMAN GOLDBERG-RIGHT NOW THE WAY IS IT PRESENTED THE PLOT PLAN IS INCORRECT, IT'S ONLY 21.5FT, IF YOU ARE LEAVING THE FENCE THERE, YOU DO HAVE A PROBLEM, WE CANNOT ASSUME WHERE THE PROPERTY LINE IS SO YOU HAVE VERY LITTLE TO WORK WITH AT THAT POINT, EVEN IF YOU MOVE IT 10FT FROM THE HOUSE AND HAVE A 10FT SHED, YOU HAVE A FOOT AND A HALF AGAINST THE FENCE. WE DON'T KNOW WHERE YOUR PROPERTY LINE IS AND WE DID MEASURE AND THE 100FT INCLUDING THE TWO PROPERTIES CAME TO WHERE YOUR FENCE IS.

CHAIRMAN GOLDBERG CLOSED THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 8:10 PM.

CHAIRMAN GOLDBERG REVIEWED THE FIVE CRITERIA AND THE BOARD DISCUSSED ISSUES REGARDING THE MEASUREMENTS, SAFETY BURDEN, AND THE POSSIBILITY OF COMBINING THE TWO LOTS.

A MOTION TO DENY THE VARIANCE WAS MADE BY COLLINS, SECONDED BY HEDGER. ROLL CALL VOTE: BURNHAM, AYE, COLLINS, AYE, GOLDBERG, AYE, MANDLE, AYE, HEDGER, AYE. MOTION CARRIED.

BOARD BUSINESS:

THE BOARD DISCUSSED CHANGING THE MEETING TIME FROM 7:30PM TO 7:00 TO BE CONSISTENT WITH ALL OTHER MEETINGS AND DECIDED TO CHANGE IT AND SEE HOW IT WORKS AS THERE ARE BOARD MEMBERS THAT MAY FIND IT DIFFICULT TO BE PRESENT AT 7:00 DUE TO WORK SCHEDULES.

A MOTION TO CHANGE THE MEETING TIME TO 7:00PM STARTING WITH THE JANUARY 28TH MEETING WAS MADE BY GOLDBERG, SECONDED BY BURNHAM. ROLL CALL VOTE: BURNHAM, AYE, COLLINS, AYE, GOLDBERG, AYE, MANDLE, AYE, HEDGER, AYE. MOTION CARRIED.

CHAIRMAN GOLDBERG ASKED THAT ALL MEMBERS BE SEATED FIVE MINUTES PRIOR TO MEETING TIME, DISCUSSED HAVING TWO MEMBERS REVIEW APPLICATIONS FOR COMPLETENESS TO AVOID THE RESIDENT HAVING TO COME BACK TO AN ADDITIONAL MEETING DUE TO INCOMPLETE INFORMATION, REVIEWED THE STATE LAW PERTAINING TO MEETINGS, ASKED ZEO SAHEIM TO INCLUDE A SAMPLE PLOT PLAN IN THE APPLICATION PACKETS TO HELP RESIDENTS IN COMPLETING THE APPLICATION AND PLOT PLANS, INDICATED THAT ALL MEMBERS SHOULD WEAR THEIR ZBA BADGES FOR IDENTIFICATION WHEN DOING SITE VISITS, REVIEWED TRAINING REQUIREMENTS FOR BOARD MEMBERS AND DISCUSSED POSSIBLY HAVING A TRAINING SESSION HERE AT OUR FACILITY, ZEO SAHEIM WILL CHECK INTO THAT FURTHER.

WITH NO FURTHER BUSINESS, A MOTION TO ADJOURN THE MEETING WAS MADE BY COLLINS, SECONDED BY BURNHAM. ROLL CALL VOTE: BURNHAM, AYE, COLLINS, AYE, GOLDBERG, AYE, MANDLE, AYE, HEDGER, AYE.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

LORRI HOLCOMB
SECRETARY