

**VILLAGE OF HASTINGS-ON-HUDSON, NEW YORK
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
REGULAR MEETING
OCTOBER 27, 2016**

A Regular Meeting was held by the Zoning Board of Appeals on Thursday, October 27, 2016 at 8:00 p.m. in the Meeting Room, Municipal Building, 7 Maple Avenue.

PRESENT: Chairman Matthew Collins, Boardmember Ray Dovell, Boardmember David Forbes-Watkins, Boardmember Sean Hayes, Boardmember Adam Anuszkiewicz, and Village Attorney Linda Whitehead

Chairman Collins: Let's begin. Welcome to our October 27, 2016 Zoning Board of Appeals meeting. We're now in session.

We have two cases on our docket. Actually we have three, but one has been deferred to our next meeting, or our future meeting.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Or later.

Chairman Collins: Yeah, or later. We will get into it shortly. But Linda, I understand through Buddy that the mailings are all in order.

Village Attorney Whitehead: The mailings are all in order. It's been confirmed.

Chairman Collins: All right, very good. We'll start with Case 14-16.

**Case No. 14-16
Ed & Margo Small
87 Pinecrest Drive**

View preservation approval as required under Section 295-82 for the construction of a rear wood deck on their single-family dwelling at 87 Pinecrest Parkway. Said property is located in the R-10 Zoning District and is known as SBL: 4.100-95-35 on the Village Tax Maps.

Chairman Collins: Before we get started, let me just lay out a couple of ground rules. We have two microphones. We have a standing microphone. Christina has the other one, it's a wireless. We just ask that anyone who wishes to be heard make sure you speak into the microphone. The first time you speak please introduce yourself; your name and address. We've got a remote transcription process happening, so though you don't see a stenographer here the meeting minutes are being captured remotely. So we need to hear you clearly through the microphone in order for all that information to be picked up. We'll let everyone who wishes to be heard be heard tonight.

With that, we'll begin. Christina, the floor is yours.

Christina Griffin, project architect: I'm the architect for the renovation and new deck at the Small residence. We are here for view preservation review of the deck. We've been to the Planning Board and we got a favorable decision from them. Now we're here to show you the drawings of the deck and the view studies we've prepared.

This is the site plan, and I can blow this up a little bit. They are adding a new deck in the back of the house. This deck meets all the zoning requirements for setback, and the deck and the house meet the requirements for lot coverage. There's an old driveway that goes all the way in the back, and the garage, but it's not used because it's not practical. This is just a rough section through the site so you can see the grade goes down. It's almost at the first-floor level in the front, and goes all the way down to the basement level in the back.

These are our floor plans. The deck is going to be accessible from the first-floor level off the kitchen. This will give them some nice outdoor space from the main living area. Right now, the only way to get outside is to go down through the basement and the garage doors. These are our elevations. This is the back of the house; this is the new deck we're proposing, with the garage underneath and the big sliding doors above at the living room and, actually, dining area and kitchen. This is our side elevation on the north. I want to show you our side elevation. I've blown this up so you can see it, but it's not easy to move. This is our elevation on the south showing the deck.

Our view preservation studies, where we've taken photographs from different properties, we have a key plan. This is taken from Pinecrest Parkway. This is a before picture and this is an after picture. This is looking over the neighbor's ... there's a fence here between the two properties. And this is the neighbor on the ... this is a view taken from the northern corner of the house. This is a view actually taken all the way out on the road, looking at the house. This is before and after. There is a little overlay of the deck we can just barely see from here. This is the view from 67 Pinecrest. This is the house itself of this property. This is looking from their yard into the yard of 87 Pinecrest. This is before, and this is the after showing the deck.

The deck doesn't really interfere that much with the views of the river, but of course this time of year it's hard to see the river. This is another before and after picture taken from 91 Pinecrest, from their deck, a little closer than the other one I showed you, before and after. Those seemed to be the only views we could get that showed the deck when you're looking west towards the river.

Chairman Collins: OK. I noticed, too, that the photography capturing the deck in a rendering of the deck – in those summer or spring seasons with leaves – of course is going to give one perspective. But my sense from that particular location is that even with the leaves off the trees the impact on river view here is going to be minimal. It won't be nothing, but I think it'll be minimal. And I appreciate the extent to which you've captured the views from different vantage points. But I really think the only likely impact is in those spaces close to the property line, on Pinecrest, on either the north or south side.

Again, as I said, the impact is minimal. And I don't know, other than moving that deck in – which I would only suggest you do if there was strong opposition to this development – moving it closer to the house, therefore, to reduce the angle and the impact from the side, I can't see really too many ways for you to further minimize the impact. So from a view preservation standpoint, seeing as that's the only consideration you're here before the Board for, I see no concern and I'm in favor of the project.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Just for the record, at the Planning Board meeting last week the Planning Board did approve the view recommendation to this board. In fact, some of the members said they thought this one could've even been a waiver.

Chairman Collins: Yeah, I understand that. I think it was a hard one.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Yeah, Kathy explained it.

Chairman Collins: Kathy and I weren't sure, and we thought the waiver only applies if there is zero impact. We weren't sure that zero impact could be validated.

Village Attorney Whitehead: This way, if there is somebody concerned it gives them an opportunity to be heard.

Chairman Collins: Yes.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: That's the first question. Have we heard anything from any neighbor either north or south that would suggest in any way they are bothered by this? I can't imagine why, but have we heard from them?

Ed Small, applicant: I asked both sides.

Ms. Griffin: You did?

Mr. Small: Yes.

Ms. Griffin: Do they both have decks, as well?

Chairman Collins: If you're going to speak, sir, we're going to need you to speak into the microphone.

Mr. Small: Oh, I'm sorry.

Chairman Collins: Just introduce yourself, please.

Mr. Small: I asked the people on both sides is there any problem, and they said no they both have decks.

Village Attorney Whitehead: And Buddy said the Building Department has received no complaints or concerns.

Chairman Collins: OK.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: One very nitpick. The cover page of the sheets suggests this is 89 Pinecrest, and I gather we are at 87 Pinecrest.

Mr. Small: Eighty-seven.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: It should just be clarified .

Chairman Collins: Good catch, David.

Mr. Small: You don't need me.

Chairman Collins: No, thank you Mr. Small. Any other comments or questions from the Board?

Boardmember Dovell: I just had one question about the site plan on S-1. You've indicated the existing building is noncompliant with respect to side setbacks. On either side there are small noncompliances (sic).

Ms. Griffin: That's true.

Boardmember Dovell: I was just looking at the deck. The deck on the – I guess it's on the east side – seems to encroach over one of the side lot lines? I'm just puzzled by that.

Ms. Griffin: According to the code, in fact, we had submitted for a zoning variance (off-mic) allowed (off-mic).

Cable Access Director Corso: Christina, can you get the microphone?

Ms. Griffin: Oh, sorry.

Cable Access Director Corso: Can't hear you. Thank you.

Ms. Griffin: Actually Buddy called me, and we had submitted for a zoning variance. He said there's an exception for a deck to come into the side yard setback by a few feet. Are you familiar with that, Linda?

Village Attorney Whitehead: No, but I have the code. And Buddy's texting me.

Ms. Griffin: I was surprised because I wasn't familiar with that. There's an exemption – or not exemption, there's like an exception – for the deck. The deck can go into the rear yard and side yard by a certain number of feet. Actually, I withdrew the zoning variance application after we received a call.

Village Attorney Whitehead: *"A terrace or uncovered porch or deck with its floor level no higher than that of the main entrance to the building may project into a required yard not more than 6 feet, or to a point not closer than 6 feet, to any property line, or half of the minimum required setback, whichever is less."* Who knew?

Chairman Collins: That's a good catch though, Ray. There's the answer.

Village Attorney Whitehead: That is 295-26(b)6.

Chairman Collins: No, thank you, Ray, for catching that. That's a good thing to have just checked on.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Yeah, and now it's clarified.

Chairman Collins: Yeah, yeah. Anybody else? OK.

Does anyone in the audience wish to be heard on the case? OK, then may I have a motion?

On MOTION of Boardmember Forbes-Watkins, SECONDED by Boardmember Hayes, with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board resolved to approve the application for view preservation, Case No. 14-16, 87 Pinecrest Drive.

Chairman Collins: The vote is unanimous.

Ms. Griffin: OK, thank you so much.

Chairman Collins: Congratulations. Good luck.

**Case No. 15-16
Tabi Realty, LLC
425 Warburton Avenue
** Deferred to Future Meeting ****

The Hearing will be held on the application of Tabi Realty, LLC for view preservation approval, as required under Section 295-82, and relief from the strict application of Sections 295-72.1.E(1a&c), 295-40.B(1&2), 295-41.A and 295-29.A for the demolition of an existing three-family and construction of a new building containing three townhouse units on its property at 425 Warburton Avenue. Said property is located in the MR-O Zoning District and is known as SBL: 4.70-52-10&11 on the Village Tax Maps.

Nonconformity details of the proposed construction are as follows:
Front yard setback: Existing – 0.2 feet; Proposed – 4.7 feet; Required – 11 feet {295-72.1.E.(1a)}; Variance Required – 6.3 feet
Side yard setback (side 2): Existing – 0.3 feet; Proposed – 2.7 feet; Required – 17.7 feet {295-72.1.E.(1c)}; Variance Required – 15 feet
Driveway slope: Existing – 16 percent; Proposed – 15 percent; Required – Maximum 12 percent {295-40.B(1)}; Variance Required – 3 percent
Driveway slope @30 feet from prop. line: Existing – 16 percent; Proposed – 15 percent; Required – Maximum 3 percent {295-40.B(2)}; Variance Required – 12 percent
Driveway area: Existing – 500 square feet; Proposed – 1,229 square feet; Required – Maximum 960 square feet {295-41.A)}; Variance Required - 269 square feet
Parking space size: Existing – N/A; Proposed – 8.6 feet x18 feet; Required – 9 feet x 18 feet {295-29.A}; Variance Required – 0.5 feet (width)

Case No. 16-16
Timothy Baer & Sarah Walters
18 Kent Avenue

Relief from the strict application of the Village code Section 295-68F.1.a, for construction of a new covered front entrance extension at their home at 18 Kent Avenue. Said property is in R-10 Zoning District and is also known as SBL: 4.120-127-20 on the Village Tax Maps.

Non-conformity details of the proposed project are as follows:
Front Yard: Existing and Proposed – Existing – 23.6 feet; Proposed to addition – 24.2 feet; Required minimum – 30 feet {295 - 68F.1.a.};
Variance required – 5.8 feet

Chairman Collins: We'll move to our final case, which is Case 16-16 for Timothy Baer and Sarah Walters at 18 Kent Avenue, seeking a front yard variance. It looks like you're two for two tonight, Christina.

Ms. Griffin, project architect: Yes.

Chairman Collins: All right, go ahead.

Ms. Griffin: I designed a two-story addition to this house at 18 Kent Avenue. This is a sketch to show what the addition will look like. Currently, the house ends here. What we'd like to do is add another bay to the porch and another dormer to replicate the dormers that are there. We just felt this is the best way to get the addition to harmonize with the original house. In order to do so, we are aligning the new porch with the existing porch; this is new, and this is existing. This dormer is also aligned with the existing dormers, and this wall is nonconforming. It doesn't meet the 30-foot setback for an R-10 zone.

This is our site plan. The dashed line shows the required setback of 30 feet. There's currently a setback of 23.6 feet at the corner of the house on this end, then it becomes 24.5 because there's a slight angle to the shape of the lot in relationship to where the house is located. We actually looked at the possibility of doing this addition and meeting the front yard setback, but we weren't happy with the design of it. I'll show you the two different façades.

First, I just want to go through the floor plans. This is just showing the basement level. We're planning to have an unfinished basement. This is the second bay to the porch. Right now, it just has one big pillar here; we're adding another one. The first-floor plan, the house, we're planning to add a family room and study on the right. If we did not extend the porch we would be within the setback. The dashed line is the setback. We want to add the porch for aesthetic reasons.

The house – I'm just going to give you the floor area of the house right now – is 2,298 square feet, including the rec room in the basement. We'd like to add an addition that's going to add about 867 square feet. This is our second-floor plan. The house has three fairly small bedrooms, and we'd like to add a bedroom that's the master bedroom. These are existing dormers that are really very charming – it has like an arts and crafts look – so we would like to add a third dormer and line it up, replicate the look with the exposed rafter tails and the trim that's on the existing dormers.

This top elevation is what we'd like to do, what we're proposing. This is the existing porch, and the house ends here. This is the new porch with the new dormer here. We're also adding a window that's going to be very similar to the existing one on the other side. This is the façade that would be code compliant. If we wanted to do the two-story addition and meet the front yard setback we would not be able to do the porch and we would not be able to do the dormer because these features are now nonconforming on the original house.

These are just the views, the side of the house and the rear. Actually, this is the view of the addition with the new porch. What we'd like to do is match the angle of the roof, match the dormer, and match the style of window so we really tie the new addition into the existing. That's the rear façade. We're also going to, on the rear of the house, extend the dormer at the top. It becomes similar and the siding all lines up, the stone matches existing. But of course, in the back we made the setback. Also building a new deck. This is on the north elevation, which is showing the existing façade. On the other side of the house you see it's very similar to what we're proposing about the addition on the other side of the house.

Here are the photographs of the house and the neighbors surrounding this property. The existing house has a lot of charm. We want to have the same very similar look, the same stone, similar porch, same overhangs and trimwork. Just to compare, this is what we're proposing. These are just other photographs of the house – side elevation, rear elevation. We want to replace the deck with something that fits better with the house. There are the photographs of neighboring properties. Most of the houses are similar in size, except for this one which is a 25-count.

Our main reason for requesting the variance is really so we can have this charming porch that really ties the addition nicely with the original house.

Chairman Collins: OK, thanks for your presentation. I think it's a lovely design, and I think you presented it very well. I have two questions for you. The first is, though you've just explained to us why you're requesting the variance from an architectural standpoint, can you remind us what need the applicant is seeking to meet by what is a very substantial expansion within the home? Is there a reason? For example, is the family growing?

Village Attorney Whitehead: The only expansion that needs a variance, though, is the ...

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: We don't have ... it's not part of our concern.

Ms. Griffin: We can do this addition without (cross-talk) ...

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: I don't think it's part of our concern. Our concern is the extension into the (cross-talk) ...

Chairman Collins: Understand where I'm going with this is, one of the five factors is can the applicant achieve the goal through some other means. That's where I'm going with this. The question is, what is the goal?

Village Attorney Whitehead: The benefit sought. So what is the benefit sought.

Chairman Collins: Right, that is what I'm asking. And that is one of the five factors.

Village Attorney Whitehead: But it's not with the whole addition – and I think this is David's point – it is of the small piece of the variance.

Chairman Collins: OK, so we can limit the question to that area.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Yes.

Chairman Collins: But I think it is a relevant question. And I lead with this question quite often when we see applicants – even for ones where there's a minor intrusion into a yard – and we want to know, or we'd like to know if, ultimately, can the benefit be achieved by some other way. And to know that you have to understand what the benefit is. By the way, a benefit that you've just articulated I think very convincingly is that there is a benefit in achieving architectural symmetry. It could just be a design thing.

Ms. Griffin: That's one benefit. It's also just a very small house. They feel very congested. It's the kind of house that (cross-talk) ...

Chairman Collins: Microphone, Christina.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Microphone.

Cable Access Director Corso: Thank you.

Chairman Collins: Thank you, Jen.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Poor Jen.

Ms. Griffin: Their only entry in the house is right into the living room, and we can't find any other solution than to leave that this way. But you come into the living room and dining room, and this area just feels very congested for a family. They'd really like to have space that is away from the front entrance, and for the kids to study and for the family to have more open space. Upstairs especially, the bedrooms are quite small. This dimension, I think, is about 7 feet so this bedroom is very tiny and they would like to spread out. The bathroom's very small, too.

It's a growing family, and I think they would like to have a little more space in the house. By this addition, without the dormer, also wouldn't allow us to get light into this part of the new addition. Not only do we like the way it looks, but it gives light into the master bathroom.

Chairman Collins: OK.

Village Attorney Whitehead: And the bulk of the master bathroom is in the section requiring a variance.

Chairman Collins: Yeah. Oh, that's helpful. That's my first question.

My second question is, it appears that in order to accommodate the addition you're going to be building into a lovely little – I'll call it – elevation to the side of the house that has some beautiful flowering trees and some nicely trimmed bushes. I mean, it's very well gleaned, or landscaped. I'm wondering if you and the applicant have a plan to address the landscaping after the addition is in because it looks to me like you will be required to take out some nice trees.

Ms. Griffin: I think we have an idea of what we might have to do there, but the owner's here and maybe he knows better. I think this tree might be (cross-talk) ...

Chairman Collins: Go ahead, sir. Just introduce yourself.

Tim Baer, applicant: Hi. My wife and I are the owners of 18 Kent. No, you're absolutely right. But just to address your first question with respect to the variance requested and to Christina's point, we contemplated very briefly an addition that wouldn't require stepping over the setback. But what drew us to the house when we moved here in '09 was its arts and crafts style. Maintaining three dormers in symmetry – one, two and three – and maintaining the porch to do the absolute best we can to keep the arts and crafts style, even at our significant cost to do the stonework and everything else associated with maintaining it, is our preference. That's why we're requesting this.

With respect to the landscaping, there is ... I don't know what that pink flowering tree is, I'm afraid.

Male Voice: (Inaudible).

Mr. Baer: That's what I was going to think, dogwood as well. That's the one significant tree that will need to be removed. The bushes will need to be, hopefully, preserved and brought out. We have a landscaper we use, Tim Downey, who's a local person. He's quite thoughtful around preservation and repurposing. You probably see his love-'em-and-leave-'em signs throughout town. He's probably among the lead practitioners. He will be working with us to ... we have some junk trees which will flat-out come out. But away from that, he will be working with us to maintain the plantings we have and replace, if possible. We'll also be replanting some amount of meaningful trees in replacement of that dogwood to preserve our privacy to our southern neighbor. That's it.

Chairman Collins: OK. Thank you, Mr. Baer. That's a good answer. Those are the only two questions I have.

Boardmember Anuskiewicz: I have a question related to Matt's question and really to the southern neighbor. Because you could have actually kept the same design and put this addition on the north side as opposed to the south side. Really, to have the symmetrical composition you can go north or south. You have more land to the north, and that would have allowed you to not necessarily come so close to your southern neighbor and also would have allowed your family room to kind of open up to your yard instead of having it kind of opening up to the southern neighbor. I'm just curious, was that an option you explored and is there a reason why that doesn't work?

Ms. Griffin: Yes, we did. It really had to do with the second floor. The stair comes up here, and if we have to connect here we'd have to knock these rooms out. Here, it's very simple. By having the stair here connecting it to the new bedroom, we wouldn't have to remove these spaces.

Boardmember Dovell: You also wouldn't have as nice of a porch.

Ms. Griffin: Yes.

Boardmember Anuszkiewicz: Sure, but you have a bigger family room. I understand your answer.

Village Attorney Whitehead: And it does more than meet the side yard setback.

Mr. Baer: Just for what it's worth, we didn't do an exhaustive dig into it. But by going to the south side, you preserve a very play-friendly yard. By going into the north side, you create two non play-friendly yards. My kids are young and we use that north side, and I think it'll be quite attractive for future owners, whenever they may be, to have a sizeable piece of yard versus two sort of small and not particularly usable pieces of yard.

Ms. Griffin: I also want to mention that's the way the driveway is. The driveway leads to a garage in the back that they don't use a lot. But at least if you want off-street parking, that's outside the setback. That's where it would be. We wouldn't be able to do that if we had the family room on that side.

Boardmember Dovell: What's the footprint of the variance area you're looking for, the noncomplying area?

Ms. Griffin: The porch.

Village Attorney Whitehead: The portion that's in the setback?

Chairman Collins: Yeah, the porch plus the second floor.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: Oh, it's the footprint.

Chairman Collins: Right.

Ms. Griffin: Let me do that in a minute.

Chairman Collins: It looks like it's about 5-1/2 feet deep by ...

Boardmember Dovell: By 13-8, it looks like.

Chairman Collins: Roughly, maybe a little bit less than that.

Ms. Griffin: Nine by 14.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: Yep, that's a good round number.

Ms. Griffin: And 70 square feet.

Boardmember Dovell: Seventy square feet?

Ms. Griffin: Yes. That's the porch, and then on the second floor ...

Boardmember Dovell: It's roughly the same.

Ms. Griffin: Yes, it must be the same because they line up. This is just a slightly different shape. So it's a little less than 70 square feet because the roof of the porch is here. This fits over the porch.

Boardmember Dovell: It's actually quite a small area.

Chairman Collins: Yeah, and we've certainly seen more significant incursions. OK, anything else? Sean, did you have anything?

Boardmember Hayes: No.

Boardmember Dovell: The existing house is a really nice presence on the street, and you really see it as you walk by. I think what you've done is really lovely. I don't have any objection to this. I think it's minimal, I think it was very respectful of the character of the street and especially of the house. I hope you can match the stone. That would be my biggest concern. They are bigger pieces of stone, and I hope you're able to find the right stuff, Christina.

Ms. Griffin: You know, I've been through this before. I remember I had stone that came out of my own property and I gave it to neighbors to help them match when they had these problems.

Village Attorney Whitehead: You stockpile stone?

Ms. Griffin: I do.

Chairman Collins: I bet architects would do that sort of thing.

Ms. Griffin: Yeah, of course.

Chairman Collins: From samples, everything else. You never know.

Boardmember Hayes: Plenty of stone in Connecticut.

Ms. Griffin: But there's a lot of ways when you're determined. You do samples, you get a really good mason that has a good eye. I feel pretty confident because I have done it several times. Also, this is a type of granite that actually came right out of the ground. It's easy to find, but you have to get the right color combination and the right pattern. We will work on it.

Chairman Collins: And considering that some of it has really aged with the house and you're going to be putting in the new stuff, it'll take some artistry to make it work.

Ms. Griffin: It does. We sometimes color the grout so it looks like the old grout.

Chairman Collins: Yeah. I think the only thing I would encourage the Board to consider is a condition because I do think it adds something lovely to the character of the current property. I'm glad to hear from the homeowner that there is a plan to do that, but I think preserving that maintains a positive character attribute. David, did you have anything else?

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: No, and I agree with you about the landscaping. My only problem is, how does one condition landscaping other than to say approved with the requirement that plantings be provided?

Chairman Collins: Yeah, I've kind of done that. I agree with you, but it is something we've done before.

Village Attorney Whitehead: I think you've done more complicated ones, larger ones, where you had an actual planting plan and it was part of the plan you approved.

Chairman Collins: Let me put it this way. I'm certainly not going to withhold my support for the project if that is not a condition. But to me, if there's a way even to add it as a lightweight condition for the record I think that would be the right way to approve it.

So if there's nothing else, can I get a motion?

Village Attorney Whitehead: The public.

Chairman Collins: For the record, does anyone else wish to be heard? Now, if I could get a motion thank you.

On MOTION of Boardmember Forbes-Watkins, SECONDED by Boardmember Hayes with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board resolved to approve the application of 18 Kent Avenue, Case No. 16-16, for relief for the front yard extension, existing 26.6, proposed addition 24.2, where the required minimum is 30 feet; with the understanding that the Zoning Board encourages the owners to do decorative planting/landscaping that is appropriate to the character of the neighborhood.

Chairman Collins: The vote is unanimous. Congratulations and good luck to you.

Ms. Griffin: Thank you.

Female Voice: Thank you very much.

Village Attorney Whitehead: It's a cute house.

Chairman Collins: That's a lovely home you have.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Regular Meeting of September 10, 2016

Chairman Collins: We only have one possible source of comments on the minutes. David, did you have anything you'd like to add to the record?

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: I found no egregious errors; nothing that gave me cause for concern.

Chairman Collins: My only concern here, and it's so purely procedural that it hardly rises to the form of concern, is that none of us can vote on these minutes.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Just hold them for next month.

Chairman Collins: We'll withhold our vote.

Village Attorney Whitehead: Buddy said they came in on Monday. He thought they were sent out.

Chairman Collins: Well, we'll have them ... I think then I will adjourn the meeting. We're off the record.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Next Meeting Date December 8, 2016

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Collins adjourned the Regular Meeting.