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(The meeting was called to order at 6:01 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Good evening, folks. This is the Village of Greenport Zoning Board of Appeals regular meeting. Tonight we'll be minus one member.

Item number 1 is a motion to accept the minutes of the November 16, 2021 Zoning Board of Appeals meeting. So moved.

MS. GORDON: Second.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: All in favor?
MR. REARDON: Aye.
MR. KAUFMAN: Aye.
MS. GORDON: Aye.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: And I'll vote aye.

Item number 2 is a motion to approve the minutes of the September 21, 2021 Zoning Board of Appeals meeting. So moved.

MS. GORDON: Second.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: All in favor?
MR. REARDON: Aye.

MR. KAUFMAN: Aye.
MS. GORDON: Aye.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: And I'll vote aye.

Item number 3 is a motion to schedule the next Zoning Board of Appeals meeting for January 18, 2022 at 6:00 p.m. at Station One Firehouse, Third and South Street, Greenport, New York 11944. So moved.

MR. KAUFMAN: Second.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: All in favor?
MR. REARDON: Aye.
MS. GORDON: Aye.
MR. KAUFMAN: Aye.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: And I'll vote aye.

Item number 4 is 148 Bay Avenue.
This is the public hearing regarding the area variances applied for by Bridget and Eric Elkin. The applicants propose to make substantial renovations and extensions to an existing single family residence per the attached letter. This property is located in
the R-2 One and Two Family District and is located in the Historic District. This property requires area variances.

The area variances -- for those that have the agenda, the area variances are
listed on the agenda. The Suffolk
County Tax Map is 1001-5-2-15. We're just going to ask -- we have the mailings here, if anyone would like I'll read them in. The stenographer has a copy of the mailings, she'll enter them into the record. I'm going to ask the Building Department clerk, this was noticed? THE CLERK: Yes.

MAILINGS: Rode, Jane, 221 W 20th Street, \#2E, New York, NY 10011. Solomon, Lorene, 135 Bay Avenue, Greenport, NY 11944. Chalkin, Dennis, 161 Central Avenue, Greenport, NY 11944. Chi, Judy, 82 Bond Street, Brooklyn, NY 11217. Wilday, James, 219 Sunset Avenue, Ridgewood, NJ 07450. Israel, Isaac, 889 Harrison Avenue, Fl.2, Riverhead, NY 11901. Sarkis Jr., George, 54 Hangdog Lane, Somers, CT 06071. Walton,

Frances, 171 Central Avenue, Greenport, NY

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Is the applicant here?

MR. ELKIN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Would you like to tell us about your application?

MR. ELKIN: Sure. Good evening, everybody. I'm Eric Elkin for those who don't know me. So the application, it's a home that my wife and I moved into with our kids about 15 months ago, and it's a limited lot as you guys saw today when you came, and really the point of emphasis when we consider how to reconfigure it for the needs of our family was to preserve the architectural integrity and limit the imposition on neighboring properties.

Obviously we're living in tight
quarters there and the exterior walls would move, but the effected properties really would experience no negative impacts on their quality of life and the enjoyment of their properties. So

| 1 | that's really the point of emphasis. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | We're limiting the amount of square |
| 3 | footage that we're adding, the lot |
| 4 | coverage that we're adding in total |
| 5 | it's 62 feet of additional square |
| 6 | footage on the lot. And the third |
| 7 | story, this was a question that came up |
| 8 | today and previously, the third story |
| 9 | it currently has the sufficient ceiling |
| 10 | height to be -- to meet Building |
| 11 | Department requirements, so this isn't |
| 12 | a situation where we'd be actually |
| 13 | changing that roof line in any way. |
| 14 | I'd happily take any questions or |
| 15 | concerns that the Board has. |
| 16 | CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I don't. I |
| 17 | trust the Building Department to decide |
| 18 | the height of the roof as opposed to |
| 19 | the square footage that it covers. So |
| 20 | the only question I would have for you |
| 21 | is we understand -- I understand about |
| 22 | the building and how it's situated on |
| 23 | the lot, but one of the variances |
| 24 | requested -- one of the variances that |
| 25 | you're going to need is for off street |

parking. Have you thought about how you would address that?

MR. ELKIN: Yeah, we had talked about it a bit, and it was a concern of ours actually when we moved in because that street gets quite a bit of parking in the summer, and we had actually talked about whether or not there would be an opportunity to cut that curb on the west side of the home and actually put a spot in there. We're at really fine margins, so if that was a point of concern for the Board that's something that we're open to doing, but we understand it's a tight space, very similar to the neighboring lot to the east.

MS. GORDON: Excuse me. So is there room on the west side if there were a curb cut there, is there room to go so you don't block the sidewalk?

MR. COFFEY: Hi, I'm Isaac Coffey
with Isaac-Rae Architects. There is nine feet of space, which is tight for
a standard car. A compact car parking
space could fit there. It would require obviously, you know, a little bit of removal or trimming of some of the hedges that are currently there, but we have right at basically nine feet of space between the edge of the porch and the property line. So you know, for a smaller car there would be enough space. CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Do you have a smaller car? I'm only kidding. The problem is that you're required to have two parking spaces.

MR. COFFEY: Right. There would be essentially a very, very minimal way to do two parking spaces there.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Well, actually
your application -- your application -and one of the questions that we would ask you, the balancing test, is there an alternative for you to pursue other than an area variance, and there is. So I'm thinking -- I might ask for my colleagues -- have you considered that?

Have you considered an alternative
to --
MR. COFFEY: Specifically for the parking variance, is that the question?

Yes, we talked about it, yes. We do think we can put a parking space, a single parking space there if I understand the question correctly.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: My opinion is that that wouldn't work, but there is an alternative, there's another alternative. The Village makes provision for actually payment in lieu of parking. Have you considered going to the Planning Board and asking?

MR. ELKIN: I wasn't familiar with
that provision for residential
properties. I do know that for commercial properties if you don't meet certain parking requirements they've done so, and so if you're telling me that that's an opportunity for residents as well --

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Well, if
you're required to have parking, the Planning Board -- we can't grant you
that, that's the Planning Board's mandate -- function, but with the situation that we're all familiar with in the Village, you know, parking is an issue, and there is relief other than an area variance. If you want the Zoning Board to decide the parking issue, it will be yes or no. MR. ELKIN: Right. CHAIRMAN SALADINO: If you go to the Planning Board what you actually do is take it off our plate. MR. ELKIN: Yeah, I mean, I would ask you to consider the realities of, you know, that home has been there for a long time, there's really no opportunity to meet current code and the two spot allowance without, to your point, coming up with some alternative payment, I guess. There's nothing that's actually going to change the parking situation in any tangible way. And I'm open to that, I really am. I
would prefer not to have to go to another board to broach that subject.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Usually we hear we don't want to pay the money, it's not that we don't want to go to another board.

MR. ELKIN: Well, I'll candidly tell you I have no idea what the money involved is, but given the state of cost of renovations, I'm sure in the grand scheme of things it's probably manageable, but it's something --

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Well, let me ask the Village Administrator, is that an option for this?

MR. PALLAS: I don't -- I'm trying to find it in the Code now, Mr. Chairman, but I don't think that applies in the Residential Districts, the payment in lieu.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Where would it -- why would it not?

MR. PALLAS: Again, I have to find the reference in the Code, I just don't ever recall it coming up in the Residential District. Just bear with me one moment, I'll try to locate it.

MR. ELKIN: I was familiar with -I just know some of the bigger developments that have gone up in town recently that was a point of contention, and I know they negotiated something. I don't have any details or certainly reference points to point to directly. CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Okay. We're going to put a pin in that for a minute because Paul lost his place in the book there, but do any of my colleagues have a question?

MS. GORDON: I have another question which perhaps is really for the Housing Department. It seems to me that a couple of these requests for variances are based on preexisting nonconforming situations which have not changed, and I'm wondering why -- this is really for the Building Department, I guess. Why do we have to deal, for instance, with a front yard setback? The front yard is not changing and it was -- it is clearly nonconforming.

Everybody on the block is
nonconforming.
ATTORNEY CONNELLY: I agree. It's a preexisting nonconforming property.

MS. GORDON: Right. So why do we have to have this front yard setback variance? And then there are the east yard setback of 1.5 feet, it's very close, it's 1.5 feet, but it's been 1.5 feet for many decades, why do we have to have this?

ATTORNEY CONNELLY: I mean, for the alteration to the property I would agree that the variances are needed, but for what is currently there it's a preexisting nonconforming.

MS. GORDON: So you don't think we need to be ruling on those matters that are preexisting nonconforming and are not going to change.

ATTORNEY CONNELLY: I don't, no.
MS. GORDON: Good. Less work for
us. Okay, John?
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Do we want to hear from the Building Department the
reason?
MR. PALLAS: The policy is that whenever there's any variance required on a preexisting nonconforming that we try to bring in all nonconformity. I think the Code specifies that you're supposed to try to achieve that goal. So that's part of the rationale for doing that.

MS. GORDON: Well --
MR. PALLAS: If there were no variances required at all it wouldn't be coming before the Board.

MS. GORDON: No, no, clearly
there's a request for a variance on the west yard setback, which is perfectly sensible because they're going to be extending a piece on the west side, so I understand that. It's the rest of it which just seems to be unnecessary, and I feel silly voting on something that feels unnecessary.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I always
thought -- if I could, I always thought that by doing this, since the Building

Department had adopted this policy, by doing it we were just legitimizing these nonconformities.

MS. GORDON: Does that make them any less nonconforming?

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: No, not in the least, but it makes them legal.

ATTORNEY CONNELLY: Well, the fact that they're preexisting nonconforming makes them legal too.

MS. GORDON: They're already legal.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Well, their opinion is that -- we're going to have to decide on policy here, guys. You know, we're in the middle. So we have to decide what policy we're going to follow.

MR. REARDON: I'm in a little bit of agreement here. This particular renovation touches three sides of the house, albeit a very minimum size on the east side, so the east side should be one of those things that's taken into consideration, but the front,
they're not touching the front of the house, and it is as it is, and I personally don't think we should be doing more administrative stuff we don't have to. Give the customer an opportunity to make it as expeditious as possible and rule on the things that it really needs.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: We deal what the Building Department puts in front of us. If --

MS. GORDON: We also get opinions
from --
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Oh, absolutely. MS. GORDON: -- from our lawyer. CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Yeah, but we don't make policy. We have a notice of disapproval. I don't know if we have the power to usurp the code enforcement officers.

MS. GORDON: Well, it seems to me we are -- the increases, the 62 feet that are added to the footprint effect the maximum lot coverage and effect the
dimensions of the building on the west, therefore the west yard setback. Those we certainly have to vote on, and I guess, the calculated combined side yard setback. And then the question of course arises with respect to the two and a half stories. On the one hand we're being asked to consider a variance for making the third story, which currently exists, into livable space, but it doesn't change the land use. I mean, I don't know. Would there have been a determination that the extra half story was nonconforming? CHAIRMAN SALADINO: The Building

Department decided that this would become a third story. ATTORNEY CONNELLY: So I think that variance is required because it wasn't used as livable space, so it's becoming a third story. It wouldn't be considered an additional story if it wasn't livable space. MS. GORDON: Okay. Well, yeah. CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Anybody else?

Thank you.
MR. ELKIN: Thank you very much.
Appreciate it.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Is there anyone else from the public that would like to comment on this application? You guys in the back? Anybody in the back? No. Okay. I'm going to make a motion to close this public hearing.

MR. KAUFMAN: Second.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: All in favor?
MR. REARDON: Aye.
MS. GORDON: Aye.
MR. KAUFMAN: Aye.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: And I'll vote aye.

Item number 5 is a discussion and possible motion on area variances applied for by Bridget and Eric Elkin for the property located at 148 Bay Avenue, Greenport, New York 11944. The Suffolk County Tax Map number remains the same at 1001-5-2-15.

What are we thinking about this, folks? Do we want to take these one at
a time and discount them and not vote on them, or do we want to take them in mass and vote on the application?

What's your --
MR. KAUFMAN: I would do one at a time. I think we should just go through them. CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Dinni, Jack? MS. GORDON: Yeah. I think one at a time is good for precision and specificity, but I would like -- should I make a motion to exclude votes on the front yard setback and the east side yard setback?

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Well, would we be making, like, a policy statement that we don't feel that these variances, or would we just approve or deny them as they come, or would we just -- I'm not sure -- I'm not sure -MS. GORDON: It's not policy about the land use issues, it's policy just about our process, and I guess I think our policy should be that we don't -that we don't revisit determinations
that have been made about nonconforming uses.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I'm not disagreeing with you, I'm just trying to figure out a way to move on.

MS. GORDON: Well, if I make a motion to that effect and it's rejected or accepted then we move on on the basis of that.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Well, do you want to make a motion to vote on the ones you think need a variance or the ones that you don't? And we can, you know, it's kind of like how we word it. Do you want to make a motion that we will be voting on parking, on third story, and what was the other one? MS. GORDON: And on the west yard setback.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: And the other ones you're thinking about making a motion that they're unnecessary?

MS. GORDON: And maximum lot
coverage because it is covered -- I believe increased by 62 feet.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Okay. Now I'm -- how about you make the motion on what you think should be excluded from the Zoning Board?

MS. GORDON: I move that we exclude from our vote on these variances the request for a variance of 15.3 feet for the front yard setback, that's number one. And number two, for the east yard setback of 1.5 feet. CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Which one is that?

MR. REARDON: The last one on the first page.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Okay. MS. GORDON: I'm not sure. And then there's one about the combined yard setback, but I guess that refers to both side yards, so I wouldn't include that. So it's just those two.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: So your motion is for the Zoning Board not to consider those two?

MS. GORDON: Not to consider front yard setback and west -- east side yard
setback, which are fixed in the previous designation of nonconforming. MR. PALLAS: Mr. Chairman, if I may just for clarification on the notice of disapproval those would be items 2 and 4.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Okay. MS. GORDON: Thank you. CHAIRMAN SALADINO: So the motion is for the Zoning Board not to consider those two items on the notice of disapproval. Do the members understand the motion? So moved. MR. REARDON: Discussion? CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Okay. MR. REARDON: All right. So if we remove these from the applicant's or from our ability to vote on them, that is the same as accepting them, approving them?

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I think the contention -- Dinni's contention is that these two requests for relief shouldn't be on the notice of disapproval, and they shouldn't be
considered by the Zoning Board.
MR. REARDON: Dee, can I ask why number 4 is included?

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: As not to be considered?

MR. REARDON: Right.
MS. GORDON: Well, it's the for the west yard setback.

MR. REARDON: No, this is the east yard.

MS. GORDON: I'm sorry, for the east yard setback, which remember is that little tiny -- we've just been to the site visit and we saw how close on the east side the building comes to the lot line, and that's not going to change as a result of whether they do this work or not, it's not going to change.

MR. REARDON: But they are doing work on that side of the building.

MS. GORDON: On the east side?
MR. REARDON: Yes, they're squaring off that little Bilco door area.

MR. COFFEY: That's correct. When the rear is extended, the Bilco door area on that side -- now, the conformity or nonconformity stays the same, so it's the same distance but there is an addition to the back corner of the building.

MR. REARDON: Same on both sides. You're not changing the setback on the west side either. MR. COFFEY: Correct. MR. REARDON: You're not going out any further than you are --

MR. COFFEY: The nonconformity remains, but there is work being done in those areas. The front is no worse. MR. REARDON: Thank you. So it's the front of the house that is untouched. The other three sides are going to be impacted by the renovation.

MS. GORDON: Okay.
MR. REARDON: Albeit the east side a very minimal amount, but it's still going to be part of it.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Well, there is
construction in the front of the house also. Aren't you enclosing the front porch?

MR. COFFEY: No, no.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: That's
interior work?
MR. COFFEY: The entire front of the house remains untouched. So if you look at the survey the entire front of the house, the only thing that changes on the house is from that existing bay window, from that line where the holly tree is back is what's being effected, but the entire front facade and around to the west side, all of that remains.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I apologize.
I got confused when you told me the new front entrance is going to be on the
side. I apologize. I just didn't
remember that the front entrance is
going to be on the side.
MS. GORDON: You've revised -essentially revised my motion, so I should withdraw it, right? MR. REARDON: No, I would just
like to just include item 2. Your motion stays except for item 2.

MS. GORDON: Okay.
MR. REARDON: About the front yard setback.

MS. GORDON: That's fine with me.
Is that okay, John?
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Sure. If everyone decides that's what they want to do. I'm personally of the opinion that until there was a -- I think there should have been a discussion between the attorney and the Building

Department about how to progress these variances, how the Village would like to progress the variances, how they want to interpret what was there previously, how it should be dealt with, and I think that should have been a conversation between the Planning Board's attorney perhaps at a later date and the Building Department so the Zoning Board would get to have an up and down vote on what's on the notice of disapproval and not a debate -- not
to debate what we think policy should be. We don't make policy, the Village makes policy. But $I$ think this is an elaborate solution to an almost nonexisting problem, and I'm willing to vote however you guys want. My opinion will be expressed in my vote.

MS. GORDON: I have a question for the lawyer. If we voted for a variance for the front yard setback, would that change the designation of a nonconforming building? Does it update it in some way that is meaningful? ATTORNEY CONNELLY: That's meaningful? No, I don't think that's meaningful. I think what's going to happen is any time that you have a preexisting nonconforming structure that's doing work that needs a building permit it's going to go into the Building Department, and even if the work that's being contemplated by the permit doesn't require a variance they're going to now look at the survey and say well, you have a nonconforming
front yard setback, so you have to go to the Zoning Board for just that relief.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Wouldn't that go to the Building Department only if they increased the nonconformity of the property -- of the building, not the property, the building?

ATTORNEY CONNELLY: I don't think it would make a difference.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Isn't that the policy we've been --

MR. PALLAS: Yes. That's if -essentially if no -- if none of the contemplative work requires a variance then we don't look at preexisting. It's only if some of the work requires a variance, as the Chair stated, we try to legitimize all the preexisting just mainly for the record essentially. That's been the direction we've been going in.

ATTORNEY CONNELLY: I don't think that's right but that's not my decision.

MR. REARDON: Does that mean down
the road if a succeeding purchaser that does a renovation, and they need to get a variance for another part of the property let's say, will that then show up on their need for a variance? If they still had a nonconforming front yard setback and now when this particular client is going through this process to get a variance approved for that front yard setback ten years from now, would a new owner have to go
through that same procedure? MR. PALLAS: That's really a question for the attorney, but $I$ would look at that since it was -- if you move forward with this and grant the variance for the front yard setback, now that's the new -- that wouldn't have to go back again. So I think that's the concept of legitimizing the existence of a nonconformity. CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Did you have another question for the attorney? MS. GORDON: No, I think I
understand this, but if I'm the only person who is a little bit concerned about a future -- that's what I've been wondering, if in the future it would have to be renegotiated, this nonconformity that was determined very long ago, but $I$ don't think it's very important, and now we're dealing only with the front facade, not with either west or east side yard setbacks, so maybe we should just go ahead. And are we going to consider each variance? CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I had suggested that, but there was one I would like to break out about the parking to give the little bit more discussion about the parking. I didn't think it would be a problem to vote on them in mass and just break that one out, but I'm also -- I'm content to -I'm willing to do one at a time. I would ask the attorney as far as the balancing test, do we have to -- I
wouldn't have to do the five questions of the balancing test for each one of
these variances, we could just do them once?

ATTORNEY CONNELLY: You can do them for all.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: So we can do it -- whatever you want, we want to do it one at a time, we can do it one at a time. I'm going to have something to say about the last variance about off street parking. But before I do that, let me -- is there a motion, did we make a motion, was it seconded?

MR. REARDON: It was not seconded, there was a motion.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I'm going to put a pin in it. I'm going to make a motion that the Zoning Board declare itself lead agency for the purposes of SEQRA. So moved.

MR. REARDON: Second.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: All in favor?
MR. KAUFMAN: Aye.
MR. REARDON: Aye.
MS. GORDON: Aye.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I'm going to
make a motion that this is a Type II action. So moved. All in favor?

MR. REARDON: Aye.
MS. GORDON: Aye.
MR. KAUFMAN: Aye.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: And I'll vote aye.

The questions that we would ask for this balancing test, question number 1 is whether an undesirable change will be produced in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties would be created by the granting of this area variance? And the first area variance that we're going to vote on is lot coverage. This is a one family dwelling. The maximum lot coverage is 30\%. The specifications show that the proposed lot coverage is 1,540 square feet. The specifications show the proposed lot coverage is $1,540,35.7 \%$. The allowable lot coverage is 1,292 square feet. This would require an area variance of 248 square feet or
5.7\%. Jack?

MR. REARDON: The question is whether this would propose an undesirable change? No.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Dinni?
MS. GORDON: No.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Seth?
MR. KAUFMAN: No.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: And I don't think so.

We're skipping number 2 or we're going to do number 2? I'm not sure where we're at here with this. Number 2 on the balancing test is whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by some method feasible for the applicant to pursue, other than an area variance? We're still on the first area variance. Jack?

MR. REARDON: No.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Dinni?
MS. GORDON: No.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Seth?
MR. KAUFMAN: No.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: And I'll vote
no.
Number 3 is whether the requested area variance is substantial? Jack?

MR. REARDON: No.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Dinni?
MS. GORDON: No.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Seth?
MR. KAUFMAN: No.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: And I'll vote no.

Whether the proposed variances
will have an adverse effect or impact
on the physical or environmental
conditions in the neighborhood or
district? Jack?
MR. REARDON: No.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Dinni?
MS. GORDON: No.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Seth?
MR. KAUFMAN: No.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: And I'll vote no.

Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created, which consideration shall be relevant to the decision of the

Board of Appeals but shall not
necessarily preclude the granting of
the area variance? Jack?
MR. REARDON: Yes.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Dinni?
MS. GORDON: Yes.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Seth?
MR. KAUFMAN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: And I'll vote yes.

I'm going to make a motion we approve this area variance. Jack?

MR. REARDON: Yes.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Dinni?
MS. GORDON: Yes.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Seth?
MR. KAUFMAN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: And I'll vote yes.

The next one we're skipping or
we're going to do it?
MS. GORDON: That's what I think, but I'm only one person.

MR. REARDON: Do it.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: All right.

Our attorney says we don't have to go through every one of these questions for every variance. The second
variance is a one family dwelling, front yard setback, 30 feet. The plan
shows the front yard setback of 14.7
feet. The required front yard setback
is a minimum of 30 feet. This would require an area variance of 15.3 feet.

I'm going to make a motion that we approve this area variance. So moved.

Jack?
MR. REARDON: Approve.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Is that a yes?
MR. REARDON: Yes.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Dinni?
MS. GORDON: Yes.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Seth?
MR. KAUFMAN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: And I'll vote
yes.
The third variance is the total
dimensions of -- are we doing this one, we're doing number $3 ?$

MS. GORDON: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: The total
dimensions of both side yards for a principal building shall be computed on the basis of four-tenths of the lot width, however, no side yard dimensions shall be less than four-tenths of the total dimensions of both sides computed as aforesaid. No side yard dimensions shall be less than 10 feet. This plan shows a west yard setback of 5.7 feet. The required side yard setback is the minimum of 10 feet. This would require an area variance of 4.3 feet. I'm going to make a motion we approve this area variance. So moved. Jack?

MR. REARDON: I'll second that and approve.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Yes. Dinni?
MS. GORDON: Yes.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Seth?
MR. KAUFMAN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: And I'll vote yes.

Moving on. Did we decide about number 4?

MR. KAUFMAN: We should do it.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Do it. The plan shows an east yard setback of 1.5
feet. The required side yard setback is a minimum of 10 feet. This would require an area variance of 8.5 feet. I'm going to make a motion we approve this area variance. Jack?

MR. REARDON: Yes.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Dinni?
MS. GORDON: Yes.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Seth?
MR. KAUFMAN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: And I'll vote yes.

The total dimension -- I lost my place, sorry, folks. The calculated combined side yard setback -- oh, wait. Let me start from the beginning. The total dimensions of both side yards for a principal building shall be computed based on four-tenths of the lot width, however, no side yard dimension shall be less than four-tenths of the total dimensions of both side yards computed
as aforesaid. No side yard dimension shall be less than 10 feet. The calculated combined yard setback is 13.1 feet. The plans show a proposed combined setback of 7.2 feet. This would require an area variance of 5.9 feet. I'm going to make a motion that we approve this area variance. Jack?

MR. REARDON: Yes.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Dinni?
MS. GORDON: Yes.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Seth?
MR. KAUFMAN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: And I'll vote yes.

The next request is a one family dwelling, number of stories permitted is 2 and one-half. This plan shows the conversion of the attic to livable space. The maximum permitted number of stories is 2 and a half. This would require a variance for the third story. I'm going to make a motion we approve this area variance. Jack?

MR. REARDON: Can I ask a
question --
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Sure.
MR. REARDON: -- of the homeowner?
What rooms are -- what's the floor plan for the third floor?

MR. ELKIN: So it would be two bedrooms essentially and a small landing and one bathroom. So what it currently occupies is above the 2 bedrooms in the front and the hallway.

MR. REARDON: So two bedrooms and a bathroom upstairs in what would be the third floor?

MR. ELKIN: Yes, correct.
MR. REARDON: Okay. Thank you.
ATTORNEY CONNELLY: Do you have to put a sprinkler?

MR. PALLAS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: That would be for -- that's building permit stuff, that's not -- did I make that motion?

MR. REARDON: I think you did.
Yes.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Dinni?
MS. GORDON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Seth?
MR. KAUFMAN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: And I'm going
to vote yes.
The last variance for this
application is a one family dwelling, off street parking. This plan shows no off street parking will be provided. The off street parking per dwelling unit requires two off street parking spaces. This would require a variance of two off street parking spaces. I think that if we look at the balancing test there is an alternative for this applicant to pursue, and my problem is since we've dealt with this only with -- I believe it pertains to the Residential District also, but my problem is that we've only dealt with this issue in the $C R$ or the waterfront commercial. So since there's no site plan approval, right, the Planning Board wouldn't have to approve the site plan?

MR. PALLAS: That's correct.

| 1 | CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Since there's |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | no site plan approval, there's no |
| 3 | opportunity for this applicant if we |
| 4 | say no to go to the Planning Board. |
| 5 | think that alternative -- I think the |
| 6 | alternative -- I think he should be |
| 7 | afforded -- the Village should be |
| 8 | afforded the opportunity for the |
| 9 | applicant to go in front of the |
| 10 | Planning Board and request payment in |
| 11 | lieu of parking for these two parking |
| 12 | spaces before the Zoning Board votes on |
| 13 | it. If the Zoning Board votes on it |
| 14 | and it's yes, you get the variance. If |
| 15 | the Zoning Board votes no -- I'm not |
| 16 | inclined to vote for this, I'll be |
| 17 | honest with you. I don't know how my |
| 18 | colleagues feel. If the Zoning Board |
| 19 | votes no, it dies here. You have no |
| 20 | opportunity to go to the Planning |
| 21 | Board. Me personally, I would like to |
| 22 | see the applicant go to the Planning |
| 23 | Board, request payment in lieu of |
| 24 | parking for the two spaces, and it |
| 25 | would be off of the Zoning Board's |

place, but I'm willing for some
discussion, some input here from my --
MS. GORDON: I think it's
physically impossible to require --
MR. KAUFMAN: Sorry. I think it's an existing nonconformity just like the front yard. It's the way that house was set up. There's no way to put two parking spots on that property.

MS. GORDON: Yeah, and if there's no way to put two parking places and we send them to the Planning Board asking them to pay for two parking, it's just -- it seems to me our motivation then becomes just the income prospect for the Village, and I'm a little uncomfortable about that.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: The income prospect for the Village, the payment in lieu of parking, the money that applicants pay into that go into a dedicated fund that funds alternative parking in the Village. So it's a fund that would be used to alleviate the well known parking problem in

Greenport. Does it effect that
particular -- does it effect 148 Bay Avenue at this particular moment in time? No. MS. GORDON: No, but that's not the case.

ATTORNEY CONNELLY: There's
nothing for the Planning Board to consider. There's no site plan application. You can't just send it to the Planning Board for them to sign the parking in lieu fee.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Isn't the Planning Board the final arbitrator on payment in lieu of parking?

ATTORNEY CONNELLY: But what's the application before the Planning Board to send to the Planning Board? You can't just compel them to make an application to the Planning Board. CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Can you explain to me where in the code that
the Residential District is exempt from --

ATTORNEY CONNELLY: Where in the
code does it say though that the Zoning Board can compel an applicant? CHAIRMAN SALADINO: No, it says that the Zoning Board can require off street parking, can either approve or deny off street parking, the lack of off street parking. The relief to that is to apply -- is to request from the Planning Board payment in lieu of.

ATTORNEY CONNELLY: But again, as
Seth just pointed out too, there's never been parking at this property, so it's a preexisting nonconforming.

You're going to -- I'm sure there's dozens of properties in the Village that -- residential properties that don't have any off street parking. They're all going to have to go to the Planning Board. CHAIRMAN SALADINO: So? MR. KAUFMAN: But this isn't a choice. This isn't someone who is developing a property and simply doesn't want to provide the required parking, and therefore is providing
payment in lieu. This is a property where there's no reasonable prospect of them putting off street parking in there that $I$ can see. CHAIRMAN SALADINO: What would happen -- so you're saying the Zoning Board is obligated to approve this -would be obligated to approve this variance? Because then why wasn't this broken out in our discussion?

MR. KAUFMAN: Why wasn't off street parking? Aren't we talking about it right now?

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: No, no, as far as whether voting on a particular question of policy. We spoke about a question of policy if certain variances didn't belong on the notice of disapproval. If that's, in fact, the case with this, why wasn't this broken out? I personally believe it should be there and my opinion will be expressed in my vote, but we can just vote on it. MR. KAUFMAN: Look, I think it's a situation where all Zoning is about
fairness and about taking into account the overall situation. I don't see how you can force someone to create off street parking where it's functionally virtually impossible to do that or send them off to pay a fee.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: We don't
legislate, we read the code. We can't add or subtract from the code. Like I said --

MR. KAUFMAN: Then we should deny
it. If that's how -- if it's that
rigid, then we should deny it. But I
think there's no way for him to comply with this.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Well,
according to the Code there is a way for him to comply. He could be exempt from parking, he could pay for it. MR. KAUFMAN: Is that actually true though? I mean, if you're saying he can't go to the Planning Board?

ATTORNEY CONNELLY: I don't see what the application would be for the Planning Board. There's no application
for that.
MR. PALLAS: I don't -- I'm not sure of the mechanism to get it to the Planning Board.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Well, let me -- we're burning a lot of time. We're killing a lot of time on this, and I apologize to the public. There's another application after this. I apologize to them for holding it up. We all know -- as members of the Zoning Board we all know the exact process of how something gets in front of the Zoning Board. I didn't think to get in front of the Planning Board was that -actually their mandate says they'll rule on payment in lieu of parking. Here is an applicant that wants to -I'm not saying that wants to, that might have to apply for payment in lieu of parking. Why wouldn't that be reason enough to get in front of the Planning Board?

ATTORNEY CONNELLY: Then that would go before the Planning Board in a
site plan application.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: No, you're adding those words. Where does it say it has to go in front of the Planning Board in a site plan?

ATTORNEY CONNELLY: Because the Planning Board only decides subdivision review, site plan review, and curb cuts.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I thought the Planning Board decided anything that was within their mandate, anything that's in Chapter 150-30.

ATTORNEY CONNELLY: Which is site plan and subdivision.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: And judicial uses and a few other things. Rob, I don't want to get in a big debate here. I mean, we'll just vote. I'll make the motion and we'll just vote. Obviously, you know, the opinion --

MR. KAUFMAN: Sounds good.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: All right.
MS. GORDON: I have a question.
Could we vote to conditionally require
a -- probably not two spaces as I understand it, two spaces would be impossible. Could we vote for a variance for one space or condition a request -- condition an approval on the creation of one space, which we've determined there is room for, even if it's a little cramped. CHAIRMAN SALADINO: We saw the home that Mr. Elkin wants to revitalize. Do we really want to condition making him put his Prius or his Escalade on his front lawn? I mean, is that something we really want to see on Bay Avenue? MS. GORDON: Well, but the alternative that you're proposing is to go pay for two parking spaces. I don't know why that's different. Why is it conceptually different? CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Well, because the money will go into a dedicated fund. The Village -- plus it's part of our code, it's in our code, it's not like we're making this up, I mean, it's
there. If you can't provide off street parking you can request up to 20 spaces from the Planning Board for payment in lieu of, it will go into a dedicated fund, and sometime in the future if this is progressed with other properties and different buildings and in the future there will be sufficient parking in Greenport that there won't be a problem to park or the Village Board -- we don't legislate, the Village Board will take a look at that, which I believe they're looking at now, aren't they? Payment in lieu of? MR. PALLAS: Yes, that is under review right now. CHAIRMAN SALADINO: It's under review right now, and they might create legislation that further clarifies this, but right now I'm just reading the Code. The Code says he has to provide off street parking, he can't, the alternative to that is either a variance or payment in lieu of. I don't know, to me it's kind of like
black and white. But again, I'm
prepared to just call the vote.
MR. KAUFMAN: Just to ask one more time, can they actually go and apply for this, is that actually possible?

ATTORNEY CONNELLY: I don't see what the mechanism is to get in front of the Planning Board.

MR. KAUFMAN: Can they actually do this, or are they just going to be coming around again?

MR. PALLAS: I don't know of any mechanism. I'll defer to the attorney's answer on that.

MR. KAUFMAN: I don't see how we can vote to send them for something that's not clear that they can actually do.

MS. GORDON: I agree.
MR. KAUFMAN: I don't think that's really a viable path.

MR. REARDON: What's to prevent a resident from filling out an application to the Planning Board and seeking the purchase of anywhere up to

20 spots? Any resident could do it at any time if they don't have off street parking and they wish to. They can't simply make an application to the Planning Board?

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Jack, I honestly didn't think it was that complicated. I thought it was relatively routine, but apparently it is.

MR. REARDON: I know we're working through this, but we have chosen to -CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I'm willing

```
to --
```

MR. REARDON: -- handle them all. CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I'm willing
to --
MS. GORDON: I also don't think
the two off street parking space requirement is enforced, and I will confess that when I built my house nobody even mentioned two parking spaces. We have one parking space, which is all we need but -CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Do we really
want to open up Pandora's -- do we really want to open up that Pandora's box about what happened? I mean, remember what we said, we shouldn't be looking back. Do we really want to talk about an application from 12 years ago that didn't require two parking spaces?

MS. GORDON: No, I was just illustrating the fact that it's a complex issue, which is often not handled with any legal rigor.

MR. KAUFMAN: Look, we should vote on this so that way we can get to the other ones, right? But if the rest of the Board feels strongly that we should not grant this and send them to the Planning Board, let's do that, but then we should at least have a plan for what happens if the Planning Board won't take it so we're not in limbo. The entire project hinges on this vote.

MS. GORDON: Can we approve
everything else and let them do their work while this particular thing gets
worked out for another month?
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: It would just mean -- it would mean a trip to either back here -- the Planning Board meets on Thursday, right? I'll tell you what, I'm going to call this vote. I'm going to call this vote. I'm going to make a motion that we approve -- the plan shows no off street parking to be provided. The off street parking per dwelling unit requires two off street parking spaces. This would require a variance of two off street parking spaces. I'm going to make a motion that we approve this variance. Jack? MR. REARDON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Dinni? MS. GORDON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Seth?
MR. KAUFMAN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I'll vote no.
Easy peasy.
MS. GORDON: So that's it.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Anybody has a problem with that, the decision will be
at Village Hall in five days. If you want judicial review, go see them for the decision. Thank you, folks. Item number 6 is 220 Fifth Avenue. This is going to be a discussion and possible motion on area variances applied for by Ian Crowley and Angelo Stepnoski for the property located at 220 Fifth Avenue, Greenport, New York 11944. The Suffolk County Tax Map

Number is 1001-4-8-7. The public hearing was held. It was closed. We postponed our discussion for a month. We as a Board we decided we would take this up. I'm going to open it up to the members, is there any discussion about this? Or if not, $I$ can start, whatever you guys want to do. Again, the balancing test, those five questions, you should kindly respond to those five questions and this way we can create a narrative if there's someone that either the applicant or a member of the public that isn't happy with our decision, the narrative is
there for judicial review if that comes to it.

MS. HOEG: Does the applicant have a right to speak?

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I thought the public hearing was closed.

MS. HOEG: The public hearing was closed, but in your minutes of the last meeting the Board decided to give us at least 62 days until there was a five member board.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: No, no, what we said was --

MS. HOEG: I have the transcripts. It says that.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: We said we have up to 62 says to make a decision.

MS. HOEG: Right. And it says
that the applicant can request
additional time, and then the Board voted to grant that additional time.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: No, we never
voted to grant the additional time.
MS. HOEG: It says right on page
50, page 51, and page 52 where you
specifically said I was going to ask since we did close the public hearing and we agreed not to vote until the fifth member was present, does that preclude us from having any discussion on the application? And Attorney Connelly said yes. It's right here in the transcript of the last meeting. CHAIRMAN SALADINO: What does that have to do with 62 days? MS. HOEG: It doesn't have anything to do with 62 days. The conversation --

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: So your contention is that we should hold this decision until the fifth member is able to attend?

MS. HOEG: That's what we had requested and that's what the Board granted at the last meeting in

November. It's in the transcript. The Board voted on it.

MS. GORDON: Was it that we granted it for a month or forever?

MS. HOEG: So the conversation
went on and it said that we agreed not to vote until the fifth member was present, and then the conversation was that the applicant can request additional time if need be.

MS. GORDON: So it was for more than one month. That $I$ was not sure of.

MS. HOEG: Yes, that is correct.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I think we made a mistake, and I'm willing to admit it. I think we made a mistake. To leave this open ended until a member can attend $I$ think is unfair to the neighborhood, it's unfair to this Board.

MS. HOEG: That's not fair to the applicant. You agreed to it.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Well, why is it unfair? In your experience as a Zoning attorney, is it usual that a full board gets to vote on -- you've never had the experience where a quorum got to vote on an application?

MS. HOEG: If an applicant made
the request for the extension on $a$ decision, and the Board granted it, then yes, my experience is that that decision prevails. I'm sure Mr. Connelly can attest to that as well. The Board made the decision in the prior meeting. CHAIRMAN SALADINO: To ask for an extension is not the same as saying to hold a decision until a member can attend or a new member is appointed. That's not the same. MS. HOEG: But that was what was asked for and that was what was granted by the Board. ATTORNEY CONNELLY: There's no case law on it. The case that I was thinking of wasn't specific to -CHAIRMAN SALADINO: That was my next question, do you have case law that says that we're obligated to do this? I'm willing to make a motion here that we take up this application. It's obvious that one of our members hasn't been able to attend and might
not be able to attend. Nothing in New York State Village Law, Chapter 700 of New York State Village Law says that we need five members to make this
decision. We have a quorum. What is your applicant's -- what is your concern for your applicant?

MS. HOEG: The request was made to the Board --

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I understand.
You keep repeating that.
MS. HOEG: Right. And well, I am repeating myself because we asked for it at the last meeting for the opportunity to have the other board member review the testimony and make a decision and weigh in on that as part of the Board discussion, and the Board granted it. Every member of the Board said yes, that they agreed to that. CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Perhaps every member of the Board thought that we would have a full Board within a month or so. MS. HOEG: But it wasn't limited
to a month at the last discussion. CHAIRMAN SALADINO: But don't you think being reasonable that it would be unreasonable to keep this proceeding open until there's a fifth member, especially when there's nothing in New York State Law that says we're obligated to do that? Well, I understand we agreed to that, but I'm thinking we have the option to -ATTORNEY CONNELLY: I think the fear is that if it's a $2-2$ vote it's a denial.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: We understand the fear. We understand the concern, but we also understand there's a need to discuss this application while the information is fresh in our minds, while the neighbor's testimony is fresh in our minds, while the applicant's narrative is fresh in our minds. To bring this up in six months or four months or whatever you think is reasonable I think is unreasonable. MS. GORDON: Rob, were you about
to suggest a sort of straw poll?
ATTORNEY CONNELLY: That's what I was going to say, if you wanted to poll the --

MS. GORDON: I thought of that too, but it seems a little disingenuous. CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I'm not sure what you're suggesting. MS. GORDON: A sort of straw poll on how to -- I mean, obviously if we're sort of in agreement on this application then there wouldn't be the problem, but -CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I have a question for the attorney. What would prevent us from having the discussion? What would prevent us from having the discussion since there is -- since the member is not here. If the member shows up next month, the way she would be privileged to the discussion is via minutes or video tape, which if we have the discussion, the member could review the video tape and the minutes.

ATTORNEY CONNELLY: You're not voting, you're not talking about voting on it, you're just talking about having a discussion?

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I'm not sure we can't vote. I'm not sure I agree with either one of you that we can't vote. I don't see anything that prevents us from voting. But I think to progress an application -- to hold back an application because -- well, let me ask you this: We have 62 days to make a decision. The applicant has the right to ask for additional time. The Zoning Board has to agree to it. That's the way the law is written, I have it here if you want to read it.

ATTORNEY CONNELLY: I don't need to read it. I know it.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: The Zoning Board has the right to say no, we're not going to grant you additional time. If the applicant wants to wait until the member shows up and it goes past 62 days, doesn't that become a default
decision?
ATTORNEY CONNELLY: No, there's no default decision with the Zoning Board. It's only in subdivision review are there default decisions.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Don't you hate when there's, like, a dispute between the Zoning Board and their attorney in front of the public?

MS. GORDON: I wouldn't call it a dispute.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I think it's unreasonable to carry this forward. I think it's unreasonable to do that. I think the only reason we're doing it is because the applicant is concerned about a 2-2 vote. I think that --

MS. GORDON: Well, if we took this straw poll idea, and it wasn't a 2-2 vote I suppose then if the applicant lost then the applicant has another -CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Well, the applicant's attorney's contention is regardless how the vote goes or what the narrative is is that we agreed to
wait for the fifth member. I think that's unreasonable.

ATTORNEY CONNELLY: If you do the straw poll, I think that's a good suggestion because then it's --

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: It's what?
ATTORNEY CONNELLY: Well, then you would know where the votes would come down, it's going to be a $3-1$ vote, or a 4-0 vote, or a $2-2$ vote.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: That's not
what the applicant is asking for. The applicant is asking for the fifth member. There was no mention of a $2-2$ vote. We all know that's the reason, but there was no mention of that.
ATTORNEY CONNELLY: I think
that's --
MS. HOEG: If I may, why don't I propose you give us the 62 days and at the next month's meeting we'll see whether the other board member is here or not?

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Because the next meeting is after 62 days.

MS. HOEG: Okay.
MR. REARDON: Isn't the next
meeting on the 62 nd day or the 61 st day?

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: No, I thought it was the 65 th day $I$ thought, but $I$ could be wrong. My suggestion to the applicant is that the Board -- that the Board have its discussion. You listen to the discussion --

MS. GORDON: It's like guessing what the Supreme Court is going to do. You listen to the discussion, you think it's going to go one way and it goes the other way.

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: Well, what I was going to say is you listen to the discussion and the Board takes a straw poll after the discussion, and then perhaps the application can either sit or be progressed tonight.

MS. GORDON: Well, isn't the applicant going have a good idea of how the vote is going to go if we have just the discussion?

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: My point exactly. But what -- and $I$ just said, that's not -- that's not what $I$ hear from the applicant's attorney that -all I'm hearing from the applicant's attorney is that they want the fifth member. There's no mention about a vote. We're assuming that's the reason that they would rather have the -- I personally think, and I'm going to say it here and now, I personally think that we made an enormous mistake by considering that. We've never done it before. I don't know any Zoning Board that's ever done it. I think we made a mistake and now we should try to correct that mistake. We shouldn't let a bad decision or a mistake play forward is what I'm saying. But again, I'm only one vote.

MS. GORDON: Well, John, I think you have to lead us in this. What should we do?

CHAIRMAN SALADINO: I think we should take two and hit the right. I
expressed my opinion. I don't think anybody swore under oath. I think if the applicant's attorney feels that us voting now to take this application under consideration, have a discussion, and vote, if they feel that's cause for judicial review then by all means they should be able to do that. I would find that since there is no case law requiring us to do that and since we have the opportunity to correct the mistake, we'll -- that's my opinion. MS. HOEG: I'd like to withdraw the application. CHAIRMAN SALADINO: The applicant withdraws the application. Item number 6. Item number 7 is any other Zoning Board of Appeals business that might properly come before this Board. Anybody? This is your shot. No? Item number 8 is a motion to adjourn. So moved. MR. KAUFMAN: Second. CHAIRMAN SALADINO: All in favor?
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MS. GORDON: Aye.
MR. REARDON: Aye.
MR. KAUFMAN: Aye.
CHAIRMAN SALADINO: And I'll vote aye.

Folks, thank you for coming. Have a Merry Christmas.
(The meeting was adjourned at 7:17
p.m.)
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