

**VILLAGE OF HASTINGS-ON-HUDSON, NEW YORK
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
REGULAR MEETING
JANUARY 26, 2012**

A Regular Meeting was held by the Zoning Board of Appeals on Thursday, January 26, 2012 at 8:00 p.m. in the Meeting Room, Municipal Building, 7 Maple Avenue.

PRESENT: Chairman Brian Murphy, Boardmember Ray Dovell, Boardmember Matthew Collins, Boardmember David Forbes-Watkins, Boardmember Mark Pennington, Village Attorney Marianne Stecich, Building Inspector Building Inspector Deven Sharma, and Deputy Building Inspector Charles Minozzi, Jr.

CITIZENS: Unknown

**Case No. 3-12
Sean Hayes & Nina Stechler-Hayes
41 Summit Drive**

Addition and alterations to an existing house.

- 1. Front Yard: Existing - 30.92 Feet, 11 Feet; Proposed-26.5 Feet;
Required - 30 Feet {295-68.F.(1)(a)}**
- 2. Side Yard: Existing and Proposed - 3.75 Feet;
Required - 12 Feet {295-68.F.(1)(c)}**

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Minozzi, are the mailings in order for that application?

Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi: Yes, Mr. Chairman, all the mailings are in order.

Chairman Murphy: OK, and our board has received the packages. So without further adieu, Mr. Hayes, I don't know if you're going to speak or your architect.

Sean Hayes, applicant – 41 Summit Drive: I'll defer to my architect.

Josh Heitler, Lacina Heitler Architects: I'm representing the Hayeses and the Stechlers.

Chairman Murphy: Welcome. Good evening.

Mr. Heitler: This is one page that wasn't in the booklet, so we have some copies for you. Basically, it does show sort of a more neighborhood overview just to locate the house. This is Summit and Calumet. This is a fairly steeply-sloping site higher on Summit Drive, and dropping steeply down to Calumet Drive here.

Then the site plan, the existing house is towards the Summit Drive side, and it has two existing one-story additions to what was probably the original brick Colonial house. And the proposal is to add a second story to each of those additions. The one to the north is nonconforming, existing nonconforming. And so the request is to continue that – the existing nonconforming condition – to keep the house symmetrical and not to expand the footprint anything beyond the existing footprint, which is about half of the allowable. The allowable is about 25 percent of the site, and this is about 12 percent to 13 percent of the site.

We are asking also for a small addition at the front of the house that does slightly pierce the 30-foot front yard setback. The reason for that addition is that for whatever reason this house was built, really, with its front door facing Calumet. And the entry from Summit, which has now become the front door, is actually underneath the stair landing and is rather compromised and low. So the proposal here is that by building out a little bit we can extend the stair a little further before it makes the turn, and they can come in through what really is their front door at a more reasonable height than the current height. Underneath the landing is just over 6 feet. So this house essentially has a back door, and the little bit of the relief here would allow us to redo the entrance.

Maybe this is best illustrated in three dimensions. This is four views of the existing house, showing the one-story additions and the existing entry and, alongside of it, just adding a second story on both sides and then coming out very slightly with the addition at the entrance.

Chairman Murphy: So let's start with just the addition on the front to the entrance side. I understand the reason is, essentially the front of the house ... you want the front door on Summit, which is better access to the driveway and garage? Is that essentially what you're ...

Mr. Hayes: Yeah. Basically, in the '50s they switched the front of the house, or the address, from Calumet to Summit, as we understand it. And that's because Summit's basically a level drive and Calumet is a massively steep slope and would not be fun to enter into every day with groceries or otherwise. And as Josh points out, it feels like you're going into a cave, and then it opens up. Which sort of doesn't do justice to the house, we believe.

Mr. Heitler: I'm just looking. Expanding on what you can see in the site plan, the north and the south, there are two lots. Essentially there's a Calumet facing and a Summit facing. And so it's only these half a dozen or so lots here that are through lots. Some of those have garages and other structures down Calumet. This doesn't, and it's overgrown. There's no real access now for this particular lot from Calumet.

Chairman Murphy: OK. And so in terms of the front yard setback, it's a modest request. It's basically 3-1/2 feet into the 30-foot required front yard setback. And the reason for that is you need to capture enough stairway space and entry space to get in from that side?

Mr. Hayes: Correct.

Mr. Heitler: So in the section here, this is the stair that goes from the ground floor to the second floor. By adding this additional piece, we'll be able to come up a few more steps before the landing. This is about 6 feet of headroom. If we're into this new area we can go a little further – two or three more risers.

Chairman Murphy: I see. That gives you the height you need to properly enter in the front door.

Mr. Heitler: Yes. Currently, it's about 6 foot 1 inch, so you're right under that landing.

Chairman Murphy: Right. It's tight now. And this also includes a two-story addition which, by itself, would not require a setback. But then there's a little bit of a front porch and stoop in front of that, as I understand it?

Mr. Heitler: Yeah. The house and the street are not parallel, so this is the setback line. And only the very corner is piercing the setback. I would say this shaded area is the proposed addition ... I would say that's about 5 percent of it that actually is beyond the setback.

Mr. Hayes: Of the structure. And then there's a front porch.

Chairman Murphy: Right. It's really the covered front porch that's, if you will, impinging on the required setback.

Mr. Heitler: Correct.

Chairman Murphy: And that's an open porch, as you've got it?

Mr. Heitler: Correct.

Chairman Murphy: I guess one suggestion I had for the Board to consider is whether we condition the approval of that on keeping it open rather than enclosing it, given the modest encroachment.

Mr. Heitler: I don't think we would have an issue with that.

Chairman Murphy: OK, let's stick with the front porch first, and I'll throw it open to the other Boardmembers to follow up with whatever questions they had. David, do you want to start?

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: No, I don't really have anything on the porch.

Chairman Murphy: OK. Matt, you got anything on the front?

Boardmember Collins: No.

Chairman Murphy: OK, so the front's pretty straightforward.

The real discussion, the issue we need to have, is on the side, and particularly the north side. Because the south side is conforming, you're within the footprint. The real question is, you're adding some bulk now on both stories. I understand this way you'll make it symmetrical. But tell us, you're 4-1/2 feet on one; the closest corner on the west side is ...

Mr. Heitler: Four 8-1/2 from the property line.

Chairman Murphy: Yeah, 4.8-1/2 and it needs to be at least 8, I believe, so that the two sides are 20.

Mr. Heitler: Right.

Chairman Murphy: So you're in about 3-1/2, call it halfway between what's required by the code and what you're asking for. But you're staying within the existing footprint, as I understand it. So why do you need this to capture that much space on the second floor on the north side?

Mr. Heitler: Well, I think part of this is, the second floor space is being added to the bedroom. So one of the wings, the one that happens to be on this side, is being used to expand the children's bedrooms. So right now, the existing house has two small bedrooms here. We are adding a bathroom and moving one of the bedrooms to the addition, and having a shared playroom. So the space on the north addition is being used for the children's room.

Chairman Murphy: And when you say "small," what are the existing dimensions?

Mr. Heitler: The existing dimensions? Can you pull that off? I would say approximately 10 by 13.

Chairman Murphy: OK, so the two bedrooms now are 10 by 13, and you're going to ... I'm sorry, it's about 300 square feet or 150 square feet on each side?

Mr. Heitler: The addition?

Chairman Murphy: Yeah, the addition.

Mr. Heitler: The addition is ...

Chairman Murphy: Just on one side.

Mr. Heitler: About 300 feet on each side.

Chairman Murphy: On each side, OK. And the only question we grapple with is, given the proximity ... I mean, you're extending an existing nonconformity and you're staying within the footprint, which is typically what we require anyway.

Mr. Heitler: Sure. I think what we would add is just that – I mean, we could go back to the site section – you know, the owner would like to add some square feet. We're somewhat limited in where we can add them. We obviously can't go forward because of the front yard setback, and we essentially can't go backward because the slope is so steep that those are sort of punitively expensive square feet to build from a foundation point of view.

And here, we have existing foundation, existing footprint. And so to the extent that some square feet needed to be added, this does seem like the most straightforward place, within the confines of the site, to add it, also keeping the architectural character of the house.

Chairman Murphy: Right. You're trying to preserve that formal symmetry of the house. I understand that. The real question is the need, and is there ... the question the code asked us to ask, and for you to answer, is, is there an alternate way, with less of an encroachment, that you could accomplish what you're trying to accomplish.

So I understand on the west side, because of the slope and the difficulty of the terrain, I suppose you can't do too much there. But what about on ... you know, what about coming forward? You have at least a few feet on the front yard.

Mr. Heitler: Well, really not much. I mean, this just misses the corner over here.

Chairman Murphy: Oh, I see.

Mr. Heitler: I think the only other place that you could build, given the 8 and the total of 20, would be to add more to the south side. And, you know, essentially, the argument against that from our point of view is the unbalance of the house and, again, the fact that this was here. I don't know if you would do a different addition if these weren't already prior additions where they are. That's really leading us.

Chairman Murphy: And tell me again why the additional space. Just to increase the living area, and to add a bathroom for the kids' bedrooms?

Mr. Hayes: Yeah, it's to add a bathroom. But also, one of the children's rooms basically doesn't even have a closet in it. It's small and doesn't have a closet, and the other one almost has no closet space. I didn't really have much in the way of closets when I was growing up, but it seems kids now it's kind of unacceptable, apparently. And the rooms were pretty small.

Chairman Murphy: All right. And in terms of ... I drove by and took a look. You know, it's really just a question of the neighbor to the north. There's some space there; their house seems to be perhaps set back maybe 20 feet off the line, just by eye. So there is some space there. But to me, that's the only potential negative in the plan. Otherwise, I understand why you're doing it; the look, and all of that, makes sense.

So with that comment, why don't I throw it over to the rest of the Boardmembers.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: I have one question before getting into the development. In going over to the property, I noticed a sign from the real estate office that said the building was under contract. Has the actual sale been effected?

Mr. Hayes: Yes.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: OK. Because I wasn't sure.

Mr. Hayes: No, we closed the sale.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: OK.

Chairman Murphy: And Mr. Hayes, just for our record, when did you close?

Mr. Hayes: On Tuesday.

Chairman Murphy: Thank you.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: So it was tight.

Mr. Hayes: Yep, it was tight.

Chairman Murphy: Go ahead, David. I know you had some other questions.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: On the former front, now back, you're proposing to ... I'm not quite clear on what you're proposing to do back there. Clearly, you can't do a great deal because that is a hellacious falloff. But if you'd describe it a little bit.

Mr. Heitler: Well, what the client requested – obviously, they have children – was some more flat area. Even this has a bit of a slope to it. So the proposal here is to add a patio at the level of the ground floor, accessible from all the rooms.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: OK, you're going to have to build up to that.

Mr. Heitler: They're going to have to build up there, so we are looking into the sort of structural solution to that. But we are proposing to build a patio that will be either retained above or have foundation piers into the side of the hill.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: What kind of ... assuming you have to build up, what kind of a protection for the underneath of that built-up patio area are you planning?

Mr. Heitler: In terms of animals getting in there?

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: Animals, and also just from the point of view of aesthetics; looking up from Calumet.

Mr. Heitler: I think at this point there's obviously going to be some budget considerations for that. We've discussed doing anything from a continuous stone-faced wall to having stone piers with infill latticework, which is probably going to be more cost-effective. But we would not ... both from a maintenance point of view and a safety point of view, that area beneath would be screened, at the very least, for animals, leaves, things like that.

Chairman Murphy: Approximately how high would that wall be, given the steepness?

Mr. Heitler: I think it's about 5 feet. It varies a little bit because the grade is not perfectly parallel, but it's in the neighborhood of 5 feet.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: Is there enough room to do some plantings along that wall? That hill, I find it intimidating.

Mr. Heitler: Yeah.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: And coverage, just from the thought of looking up from Calumet on a new semi-structural thing without some protective covering, et cetera gets me bothered.

Mr. Heitler: Again, I think it's a little bit hard to picture, but it'll be up that hill and approximately 5 feet of wall. It's not like you're going to get that sort of 20 foot high retaining wall that I could see your concern. Also, this is currently fairly planted. It is wintertime, and you all went by and it was fairly ... but this is – "forest" is the wrong word – but there are plantings here. And I know that there is a landscape plan that the clients intend to ...

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: I would hope some evergreen possibly.

Mr. Hayes: If you were to look where we currently live on 14 Lefurgy, we have one of the most-planted yards probably in all of Hastings. We're less about lawn and more about plants.

Village Attorney Stecich: Mr. Murphy, just so David understands, my guess – and Deven can verify this – is, they're probably going to have to have steep slope review. Because it looks like they're doing work on a steep slope, and this stuff should come up. This would be subject to the Planning Board's steep slopes review of this.

Mr. Heitler: Sure.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: This has not been through the Planning Board?

Village Attorney Stecich: Not yet. On steep slopes, until they get their ...

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: Well, it was clearly a steep slope from the get-go. Why didn't it go ...

Village Attorney Stecich: Well, they'll go before it at the next meeting.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: OK, but why is it here if we don't know what the Planning Board is ...

Village Attorney Stecich: Because I don't think it relates to the variance. The steep slope isn't in the variance area.

Chairman Murphy: Yeah, the variance isn't on that side, David.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: That's true, OK. All right. Well, the variance is partly on that side, if I look at the way the lines ride.

Village Attorney Stecich: Except that the work is going ... oh, they don't need a variance for the work in the back, no. And if he's going up ... I mean, if they weren't doing that work in the back it wouldn't need ... if they weren't doing the work in the back, they were just doing the two additions, they probably wouldn't need steep slope review. It's because they're doing the work in the back.

Chairman Murphy: Right.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: OK.

Chairman Murphy: I'm comfortable that that's a Planning Board issue, not a Zoning Board issue.

Matt, you have some questions?

Boardmember Collins: I don't have any questions. The side yard is the thing. But in my view, the justification is there. They're not exacerbating the condition. The only reason I would hesitate is if there was a strong objection from the neighbors to the north. Otherwise, it really looks like a sharp design addressing a sensible need that anyone can relate to. And I think they're doing the very best they can, under their limitations. And by the way, this is a side yard condition that describes a lot of our oddball houses in Hastings.

Chairman Murphy: Yeah, true enough.

Mark, did you want to follow up with some things?

Boardmember Pennington: I have similar thoughts and comments as already expressed. The massing on that other side of the house is fairly significant, and I agree that if it were a concern for the neighbors it would be a concern for us. I drove by, as well, and it looks to

me that there's enough air between the houses and sight line that the neighbor would have adequate air and not have the site impinged. So despite the fact that there's a significant amount of change to the existing nonconformity, I don't see a concern.

Chairman Murphy: Ray, how about you?

Boardmember Dovell: Well, I was looking for other ways that this might be accomplished by shifting the mass around the back of the house. But the DNA of the house is pretty well set architecturally, and there's not a central hall. It's a fairly narrow strip of a house, and I just don't see it working. And I just don't see a way to shift these flanking masses around the back and to make it work internally without really compromising the architecture of the building.

I think it's a fairly major variance, in that it's two stories right up against the lot line. And the only thought I had is that is there a way of perhaps ... you know, the terrace being an open portion of it, is there a way to flip that to the other side, if you follow what I'm saying. Is there a way to flip-flop the master to put the terrace, which is open, as a way to minimize the effect of that wall against the side lot line.

Boardmember Pennington: The terrace is covered, is it not?

Boardmember Dovell: The terrace is covered, but it is open.

Boardmember Pennington: It's an open space.

Boardmember Dovell: Yeah, it's an open space, and if that were on the variance ...

Chairman Murphy: I see what you're saying. Put that on the master bedroom side.

Boardmember Dovell: Yes.

Chairman Murphy: I don't know. Mr. Heitler, is that ...

Mr. Heitler: Let me just see if we understood. But even without addressing the question, unless we were to demolish the existing one-story structure that exists in the side, that would be there.

Chairman Murphy: Yes, we understand.

Mr. Heitler: The incremental ...

Boardmember Dovell: I'm only saying the open porch area would be where you're requesting the ...

Mr. Heitler: I understand. So flipping it around.

Boardmember Dovell: And it presents an open ...

Mr. Heitler: Sorry, I didn't understand.

Boardmember Dovell: It would present an open corner to the ...

Chairman Murphy: To the north, rather than to the south.

Boardmember Dovell: Right.

Mr. Heitler: I think the only limiting factor to that is that there's an existing stairway to the attic that isn't in the center. It's to the side where the kids are. So that would limit the amount of master space if you were to flip the entire plan. So while it seems very symmetrical, this particular attic stair is biased to the one side, leaving more space for the master on the side which we put it. So that would be the main sort of internal structural reason driving where the master was placed.

Also, obviously, this is the southern side. So we saw that as suitable for an open porch, more so than the northern side.

Chairman Murphy: OK. Ray, that's a good question. It's hard to see how else they might accomplish that other than ...

Boardmember Dovell: I just don't see it.

Chairman Murphy: Right.

Boardmember Dovell: The existing building is a brick structure?

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: Yeah.

Mr. Heitler: The center is brick, and the side wings are currently wood-sided. It's a wood structure.

Chairman Murphy: No, it's a very nice plan. I mean, it really is. It's well-done and thoughtful and all that. It's just a little bit of a concern because it's so much bulk on the second floor.

Mr. Heitler: One thing I would offer, hopefully to sort of ease your minds a little bit, we obviously looked at it very carefully. The house to the north, in addition to being what appears to be more than the minimal setback from the property line, as with most of the houses on this ridge it is fully oriented towards the view. There are very few windows, openings, that are facing the Hayes' house. Obviously, they've built their terrace and oriented their windows towards the spectacular view. So again, it doesn't seem like the primary outdoor space for their lot.

Boardmember Dovell: Do you have balconies on the roof? You have a balustrade that goes ...

Mr. Heitler: No, we're not proposing any access to the roof. They're purely decorative.

Boardmember Dovell: So that balustrade is just decorative.

Mr. Heitler: Correct. One of the things we wanted to do was minimize the bulk. So we didn't want to do any kind of a pitched roof on the side additions that would have added any height or bulk. And so this is a flatter, minimally-pitched roof, and the balustrades were just intended as decorative.

Boardmember Dovell: But the existing building – with the one-story additions on it – it's how you kind of expected it's handled. You know, they're flat, fairly restrained wings on the house.

Mr. Heitler: Sure.

Boardmember Dovell: And the center portion of the house reads as the dominant feature.

Mr. Heitler: As the star.

Boardmember Dovell: I just feel like the balustrade is increasing the extent of the variance, and it's really not necessary. You know, there's no deck up there. I don't think it improves the appearance of the house.

Boardmember Pennington: I actually agree with that because it does ... it makes it look more massive, unless there is a safety reason or a functional reason for it.

Chairman Murphy: I guess I don't agree with that. It's an open railing. I mean, to me it adds some visual interest to what would otherwise be two big boxes.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: Well, the question there is ...

Chairman Murphy: So it's not the railing that's adding massing to me. It's the second story.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: The question there is, how high is the railing off of the roofline. A relatively low line above the roof may make sense, but this appears to be a standard-height fence to protect from people falling off. And that's maybe way more than is needed.

Mr. Heitler: To sort of address all the comments, we certainly looked at it without them. And we felt that while we wanted the main house to be the star, the boxes were just too plain and simple by themselves, and not able to sort of look like part of the house in the way that we were looking at it.

It's a standard balustrade product, so it comes at what is typically the railing height of approximately 36 inches. So we could try to find another product that was a bit lower but, again, because we're using normal parts that's what's shown.

Chairman Murphy: Yeah, I don't know. A 3-foot open railing doesn't offend me. The question is the bulk of that addition. I don't know.

Is there anybody in the audience who wants to be heard? Sir, do you ...

Wayne Olson, 33 Summit Drive: I'm the neighbor to the south.

Chairman Murphy: Oh, OK.

Mr. Olson: If Mr. Hayes wants to [stipulate if I want to build on the second floor of my kitchen], then OK.

Chairman Murphy: Thanks. If you wish to speak, just identify yourself.

Mr. Olson: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm at 33 Summit Drive, which is just to the south. And if I understand correctly, the variance that's being requested does not apply to that portion of the house which abuts my property.

Chairman Murphy: Correct.

Mr. Olson: So I guess I'm not an interested party.

Chairman Murphy: OK. Thank you, Mr. Olson.. Appreciate it.

So I guess just to reiterate, on the front there's no issue. But I would recommend that whoever makes the motion condition it on keeping that an open front porch area and not enclose it.

On the side yard setback question, it's a little bit of a close call because of the massing. But I guess I tend to agree with Matt. In my mind, I understand why the applicant's doing it. I don't see an easy way to accomplish that in a different way.

And so I guess the only real question is whether the Board feels there's some other condition or limit that would make sense for that north wing on the second floor. Because it's a large space that extends the existing nonconformity. I guess for me, it was because the house to the north really isn't that close it doesn't seem to be a big problem.

But Ray, you're the resident architect. So if you can't see a way to do it a different way, I certainly ...

Boardmember Dovell: Without severely compromising the house.

Chairman Murphy: Right, right.

Boardmember Dovell: And spending money needlessly. I think that's the simplest way to go about it.

Chairman Murphy: Yeah. Well, that's sort of where I come down on it.

Mark, what do you think?

Boardmember Pennington: I think that's an appropriate analysis.

Chairman Murphy: OK, all right. Fair enough.

Building Inspector Sharma: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a quick comment. I think, inadvertently perhaps, Josh and you thought the side setbacks are 8 feet and 20 feet together. In the R-10 district, it's 12 feet minimum and 30 feet together.

Chairman Murphy: Oh. OK, thank you.

Building Inspector Sharma: So I just wanted to make sure that you understand that.

Chairman Murphy: I'm sorry. Thank you for that. My mistake. I was misspoken, but thank you.

OK, any last comments? Are we ready? Can I have a motion, then, on the two on the front yard setback and the side yard setback for at application, Sean Hayes/Nina Stechler-Hayes, 41 Summit Drive?

On MOTION of Boardmember Collins, SECONDED by Boardmember Forbes-Watkins with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board resolved approve Case 3-12 for the addition and alteration, the front yard conditioned on the porch not being enclosed upon completion at any time, and for the side yard variance.

Chairman Murphy: And just for clarity, the front yard, what's proposed is 26.5 feet, 30 feet required. And on the side yard, what's being proposed is – oh, I don't know if this is right.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: It's 3.75.

Chairman Murphy: No, that's not right.

Boardmember Collins: I thought it was 4 feet 8-1/2 inches.

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Heitler, what's the side yard that's being ...

Mr. Heitler: The smallest proposed is 4 feet 8-1/2.

Chairman Murphy: Four feet 8-1/2 inches, required 12 feet, as Mr. Sharma pointed out. So with those clarifications.

Chairman Murphy: The vote's unanimous, 5-0. Mr. Hayes, thank you. Good luck.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: Good luck.

Chairman Murphy: Sorry that you'll be moving out of my block.

OK, that's all we had for our agenda tonight.

Approval of Minutes, Regular Meeting, December 8, 2012

Chairman Murphy: The minutes, I was not at the last meeting. But if the Boardmembers who were ... anyone have any corrections to the minutes?

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: Page 23, Ray speaking, there are two instances where it's the word "*physical*" hardship. I believe the word should be "fiscal" hardship.

Chairman Murphy: Fiscal, F-I-S-C-A-L?

Boardmember Dovell: Yes, that's right. I remember that. You're right.

Chairman Murphy: OK, so noted.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: Otherwise, very nice.

Boardmember Dovell: It was "physical."

Chairman Murphy: Oh, it was "physical."

Boardmember Dovell: I meant "physical."

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: Even though the context, "fiscal" makes more sense.

Boardmember Dovell: I wanted to understand the physical hardship. I also addressed the fiscal hardship, but I addressed that in another part.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: Further in the paragraph?

Boardmember Dovell: Yeah.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: OK. We have to make an economic assessment.

Chairman Murphy: OK, so the minutes on that page will remain as prepared. Anything else?

Boardmember Pennington: No further comments.

Boardmember Forbes-Watkins: Nothing.

On MOTION of Boardmember Forbes-Watkins, SECONDED by with a voice vote of all in favor, the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of December 8, 2011 were approved as presented.

Chairman Murphy: Four-0.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Murphy: Should we adjourn our meeting, Marianne?

Village Attorney Stecich: Yes.

Chairman Murphy: OK. All right, and with that, our meeting's adjourned. Thank you very much.

