VILLAGE OF GREENPORT
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

REGULAR MEETING AGENDA
December 18, 2013
5:00 p.m.

Meeting held at the Greenport Firehouse
236 Third Street, Greenport, New York 11944

APPEARANCES:
Douglas Moore - Chairman
David Corwin
Ellen Neff
Charles Benjamin

Joseph Prokop - Village Attorney
David Abatelli - Village Administrator
(Whereupon, the meeting was called to order
at 5:05 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Okay, everybody, I think
we could start.

This is the Regular Meeting of the Zoning
Board of Appeals; 5:05 p.m. And we have a fairly
direct agenda today. I hope we can get through
it quickly.

We have the continuation of the Public
Hearing, which is for the Eastern Long Island
Hospital sign proposal; currently have requested
on their appeal for a variance two signs on Manor
Place.

I should mention, before we ask for any
additional public input, I am hoping we can close
the public hearing tonight and get on with our
discussion.

There is a letter from Mr. Eble to Eileen
Wingate, and this is dated 12/16, which is just
Monday. And this says, "Please be advised that I
am in receipt of the request to include my latest
sign permit, emergency room entry sign, with my
original sign permit. At this time, in hope that
the permit is not further delayed, I ask that the
original paperwork be amended to include the said
above sign, which requires illumination by the
New York State Department of Health Code.

   Once again, I thank you and the Greenport
Village ZBA for assistance and guidance with this
matter. Please feel free to contact me should
you have any additional comments or questions."
And probably we will tonight.

   First of all, I'm trying to think the order
we should take this. As far as public input, is
there any members of the public who haven't
spoken, or would like to speak in addition to
what they've originally said, interested?

   (No Response)

   In that case, Mr. Eble, perhaps you could
come up. I'm not aware that we have an amended
application for variance. I'm not sure what's
going on with this late arrival.

   MR. EBLE: At one of the previous meetings,
I had indicated that I was willing, when we had
conversation about the lighted -- the rear of the
hospital being illuminated for the emergency
room, that I would change the face of that light
in an effort to --

   CHAIRMAN MOORE: Yes.

   MR. EBLE: -- reduce some of the light that
is emitted towards the back and the harbor, that
I would change it to a red or a possibly blue
face from the white face it currently is. And I
was asked to complete another building permit for
that sign specifically, which I have done and
submitted. It was soon after -- it was over a
month ago.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Okay.

MR. EBLE: Soon after our last meeting that
I attended in October.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Yes. And Eileen Wingate
did issue a Notice of Disapproval for the
building permit dated just last Friday, which is
the refacing of the sign. And I think -- I'm not
sure about the technicalities of whether the
appeal for the variance as well was amended to
indicate an additional request. And the other
point is that when it's amended to include an
additional sign, whether or not we would have to
reopen the public hearing and wait for further
public input. We might be able to move forward
in the right direction for you and still make
progress without necessarily hearing that
request.

I understand from one -- maybe it was an
email or a piece of correspondence, that you were
more or less indicating that, at our request, you
were submitting this additional. We haven't
actually requested anything, we're still at the
information-gathering point.

And what I'm going to do tonight is, first,
try and deal with the two signs that you're
interested in.

MR. EBLE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: We may perhaps move in a
direction that we could have those attended to,
as well as the overall picture, as the next step
in the process, but to try not to delay further,
because it's been several months since your
original request to get to the substance of
whether the hospital, as a special situation,
needs the consideration of the extra signage that
you're asking for, since it does exceed the
permitted amount.

So I think that's what I'd like to suggest
we do. And if we're not having any additional
public input, we can close the hearing and have a
discussion, and have a little back and forth with
you about what we might be able to do,
considering your request, you know, for the
variance.

MR. EBLE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: That seemed like the right
direction. I think it's the only way we can move
forward and make some progress.

MR. EBLE: Yeah. I mean, I certainly -- my
indication in that email to Eileen was that I
really don't want to hold up the original
variance or the process any longer, since it's
been since August. But I did, after discussions
with Eileen, submit that second building permit
for that back sign.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: I understand.

MR. EBLE: If we need to carve that out, or
I need to withdraw that, or refile that at a
later date once we completed our business with
the signs on Manor Place, I certainly understand.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Right. We might need to,
you know, address that --

MR. EBLE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: -- a little further down
the road.

And just while we're still at the -- we can
do it at the discussion phase as well. Do you
have a timetable, should we actually look at
approving for a variance, when you would make the
sign changes to the two proposed signs? Is this
in the next weeks or is it months?

MR. EBLE: Well, at this point, with the
ground -- you know, the freeze, we would look to
start some time in February, pending, you know,
the necessary approvals before we start to pour
out. And I don't really see us at this point
being able to move forward with the actual, you
know, construction of the signage because of the
concrete and the other materials that we need and
the weather. I would say, at this point,
February would probably be the earliest that we'd
start.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: So then it would sound
like, if we would require some additional
proceedings in addition to granting of a
variance, that, really, there would be time for
that to occur before you'd actually be starting
with that project.

MR. EBLE: Well, certainly, you know, at
next month's meeting, if that was the case.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: I just have something in
mind that might kind of bring this to the proper
focus. Good. Okay. Well, thank you.
And with -- the public input appears to have been satisfied. I would like to recommend that we close the public hearing. Could I have a motion in that regard?

MS. NEFF: I move to close the public hearing on the matter of the hospital's request for a sign variance.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: And may I have a second on that?

MR. BENJAMIN: Second.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: And any discussion? All in favor?

MR. CORWIN: Aye.

MS. NEFF: Aye.

MR. BENJAMIN: Aye.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Aye.

And the public hearing is closed. So we can now discuss the matter. We may need to get some refreshment of memory on the signs. The signs we're referring to are the one which is replacing the sign at the first entrance to the parking lot on Manor Place, which is currently an elevated interior lighted sign, which may or my not be operational.

MR. EBLE: Yes. It's a sign that's
currently at the westernmost entrance to the
hospital on the grounds now. It is a lighted box
sign. It has not been lit due to a power problem
that keeps it dark at this point. But its height
is about nine-foot-three, and the sign itself is,
I believe, about four-by-eight on its face.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Then the second sign is
the L-shaped or two-part sign which sits at the
-- is it the entrance to the same-day surgery
parking lot?

MR. EBLE: That's correct. The sign that
we'd like to construct to put there actually is
not there at this point. The sign that we do
have is at the entrance. It's approximately
two-foot-by-four-foot, just indicating the
ambulatory entrance on the sign.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: And that's a non-lighted
sign?

MR. EBLE: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Non-lighted.

MS. NEFF: Is this the one?

MR. CORWIN: Show me that on the map.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Okay.

MR. EBLE: May I approach?

CHAIRMAN MOORE: If you could, Ray, also.
MR. EBLE: Yeah. Yeah, that's it.

MS. NEFF: Okay. It's this one that you want to replace?

MR. EBLE: Yes.

MS. NEFF: In the same location?

MR. EBLE: Actually, on the other side of the driveway.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Right here, I think, on this diagram. If you could help Mr. Corwin --

MR. EBLE: Sure.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: -- as far as identifying the location.

MR. CORWIN: Maybe you can go over more, because I get confused very easily. This one, as existing, is going to remain?

MR. EBLE: That sign is not going to remain as is. It's -- but that's the existing sign there. That sign is going to be replaced with the new sign in that same location.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: The 10-foot stone and glass.

MR. CORWIN: Okay, that's what I thought.

MR. EBLE: And then this sign here will replace the sign that's at the driveway here and it will go on the other side of the driveway.
CHAIRMAN MOORE: And are there also signs currently, other -- not traffic control signs but are there other identification signs? There's additional blocks pointed out here. I know there's one at the end of the street as well.

MR. EBLE: Well, yeah. All of these other signs are -- the majority of the other signs on that map, they do include traffic control signs, but we are not doing anything --

CHAIRMAN MOORE: No, no.

MR. EBLE: -- specifically at this time. We are just doing those three or two signs along Manor Place.

MR. CORWIN: I'm sorry to be so dense, but it is what it is.

You got two signs you're asking for. One is at this entrance here, which you call the entrance?

MR. EBLE: It's this entrance here, the west entrance.

MR. CORWIN: I thought this was a -- this is an entrance or an exit?

CHAIRMAN MOORE: It's an entrance.

MR. EBLE: It's an entrance, yes.

MR. CORWIN: That's an entrance.
CHAIRMAN MOORE: Entrance only.

MR. CORWIN: And then the next one up, that's an entrance or that's an exit?

MR. EBLE: That's egress and an entry as well.

MR. CORWIN: So they're both entrances.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: And there's no particular directional sign there?

MR. EBLE: No.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: No.

MR. CORWIN: So what is on your application is this Number One, which is now a lighted box sign --

MR. EBLE: Yes, sir.

MR. CORWIN: -- you're going to request?

MR. EBLE: Yes.

MR. CORWIN: And then this, what I'm calling Number Two, you're not asking for anything right now?

MR. EBLE: No.

MR. CORWIN: And then what you want to do down here at the south end of Atlantic Avenue is have a sign that you see from Manor Place and from Atlantic Avenue? That's the whole idea, right?
MR. EBLE: Yes.

MR. CORWIN: And those are the two we're talking about now?

MR. EBLE: Yes, sir.

MR. CORWIN: And you already have the one --

MS. NEFF: Excuse me. Could you just point to the location of the second one? I think I have it correct, too; it's right here?

MR. EBLE: Yes, that's it right there.

MS. NEFF: Okay. All right.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: It's been drawn in there.

MS. NEFF: Okay.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: By either you or someone else.

MS. NEFF: Yes. Excuse me.

MR. EBLE: And then the sign at the end of Manor Place that we discussed at our meeting in October is currently -- obviously, is in place. It is not -- not this sign, this sign here. At one point, we were looking to replace that. That would indicate access to the boat ramp on the back side for the mariners, but that we are not moving forward with either.

MR. CORWIN: So now I went down there, and
this one you just pointed out at the east end of
Manor Place is a great big lighted box sign --
MR. EBLE: Yes.
MR. CORWIN: -- that has been relit. It wasn't lit?
MR. EBLE: Right. After the meeting, you had indicated at our last October meeting that you would like to see it lit, because we hadn't had it lit in some time. And I believe I mentioned that when that pole had come down due to some construction there, I thought it was a local contractor, but I was corrected by the Village. They told me it was, I believe, by -- the Costello Company had knocked it down, and when they did that, the power for that sign was disconnected and the Village replaced the line actually within days of our last meeting.
MR. CORWIN: And just to be clear, that's on Village property?
MR. EBLE: I believe it is.
CHAIRMAN MOORE: And it is currently lit, then?
MR. EBLE: Yes.
CHAIRMAN MOORE: Okay. And just in case anybody's closely following the agenda, we're
actually on the regular meeting agenda, Item #1.

MR. CORWIN: But I'm just -- I hate to show you how simple I am, but I'm still looking at this one that says Number Two that's crossed off.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: It's probably a stop sign currently. I mean, there's no directional sign at this second entrance.

MR. EBLE: No. At one point in the project, with all of these signs, you know, we would have liked in a perfect world to be able to replace all the --

MR. CORWIN: So that's why that's --

MR. EBLE: -- different directional signs, traffic control signs, and entry into the emergency room, but that sign itself is not part of this process.

MR. CORWIN: So that's why it's X'd off in this sheet I have in front of me. And then the same -- if we go up to number five, which is -- boy, I don't know what you'd call that.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: And there was a new sheet.

MR. CORWIN: Oh, that's a big driveway there. That's the larger driveway.

MR. EBLE: Yeah, that was -- that was -- essentially was a traffic control sign, stop
sign, and I believe a do-not-enter sign on the
back side of it.

MR. CORWIN: Okay. All right. So now I'm
understanding a little better. So we're talking
about this entrance sign, and this entrance sign,
and the others are just extraneous or already
there. All right. Thank you.

MR. EBLE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Now one thing, as far as
discussion on this among the Board members, there
was a lot of public input, some of it was
actually about the signs. It seems a great deal
of public input was about the lighting of the
facility, but that wasn't our issue of focus. I
should note, though, that there have been
improvements in that one light's been
extinguished. I don't know if it's been removed,
but it has been off. And the street light, which
is a Village-maintained light, has been reduced
in wattage from apparently 1,000 to 400 watts.

MR. EBLE: One thousand to 400, yeah,
that's correct.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: People have noted an
improvement in the ambient lighting of the harbor
in the immediate neighborhood, so we thank you
for that.

Considering the proposed signs and also the existing signs, it seems from what I heard was that the current signs, when they were lit, were very bright and offensive to some of the closest neighbors. Some of the Board Members have commented that there are a lot of signs that have been lit or not lit currently, but at some time had been lit and were very bright.

Concerning the new signs, the things that I heard were, one, concern that they would be bright again. We did have a discussion that the brightness can be controlled, it could be regulated on observation if they were to be installed, and the size. There was some consideration for especially the 10-foot. The monolith of rock and sign material seemed out of proportion for the facility.

I know the current sign, which is a horizontal rectangle, is elevated to about nine feet of height, so that the new sign would be 10 feet high, but would be from the ground up, and would start approximately three, three, four feet off the ground, so you would have six or seven feet of lighted sign area.
MR. EBLE: Actual sign itself.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: And so the consideration that I might suggest to the Board, I think everybody recognizes that the facility, which I don't recall if we asked, the acreage of the Eastern Long Island Hospital property is; would you know?

MR. EBLE: Approximately 6.3 acres.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: So we a six, over six acre tract of land that's under, you know, one facility's operation.

It's quite clear that this is a unique situation, and its a public service that we need signs to direct people into the hospital. I know one individual says, "Everybody knows where the hospital is, why would we have signs at all?" But I don't think that's really appropriate when we consider that people do need to find the hospital, especially people that aren't as familiar with the streets.

One thing I might recommend to the Board, as we consider whether we'd approve the signs, is that there could perhaps be a stipulation that the sign, at least the principal sign, Number One, would be reduced in size, or at least in its
height, above the ground.

The second sign, I believe, is six or seven feet high. I didn't hear as much comment about that. I'm not sure, because it faces two streets instead of just the one, the small sign there is not lit currently would be any problem.

So I think that the direction we'd go, should we move to vote on approval, is that perhaps a reduction in size, and then the attenuation of lighting, once the signs are installed, by some inspection and process after, you know, after the fact.

It's always difficult to know just how bright things are going to look, you know, when they are installed. We were reassured by the representative of the company that it would not be very bright, that it's really an illuminated letter, that the field of the sign is actually unlit.

MR. BORSELLA: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Just that the letters are illuminated, so that it would be an improvement.

One of the concerns I have, and it's already been borne out, we mentioned this before, is that even while we're considering the two
signs that at the original indication were the
only signs needed for consideration, we have an
additional request to change a sign, a lighted
sign that's not in compliance to a different
lighted sign, and there are other signs on the
facility that aren't in compliance.

And I don't think the Zoning Board should
really be in a planning process, so what I think
might be appropriate is that if we were to -- the
Board would be willing to consider the two signs
for this interim period, that we would require
that the hospital, on consideration of any new
submissions, submit actually a full sign plan to
the Planning Board. This would be the more
appropriate venue to look at an overall site
plan, is to develop a sign plan. I think it's
important that they could review it, and then
that any signs which are not in compliance with
code could then be referred for a once and final
variance for, you know, the whole facility.

I really don't think the Zoning Board would
like to have one sign, then another sign, then
another sign, we'd like to know the whole
picture. Currently, I think with the two signs
being proposed, those are the probably principal
identification signs and directional signs that most people would need to find the facility, but they're not the only signs that are present. And I think it would be appropriate for the Planning Board to have a look at this, so I would recommend to the Board, when we move forward with the consideration, that we would include that as a stipulation.

The other issue is --

MR. CORWIN: I'll make a note.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Yes.

MR. CORWIN: I would not want to send somebody to the Planning Board.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: For the reason that planning wouldn't be necessary for --

MR. CORWIN: For the reason, is there a Planning Board? There's a new member every two months.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Well, I mean --

MR. CORWIN: If it took him six months, four months to come here, it's going to take the guy six months to go to the Planning Board, and then some.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Well, my suggestion is that we consider the current proposal, but that
any additional requests for changes to the
facility signs be dealt with in a planning
process, and then look at any variances that
might be necessary. We do have a Planning Board,
it's understaffed. I guess we have four members
currently.

MR. ABATELLI: No. As of, I think, on this
coming -- this coming Monday, the fifth member
will be here.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: So we'll have full
membership again. And a Chairperson is going to
be selected; is that correct?

MR. ABATELLI: I think that -- I know
there's an interim Chairperson.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Okay.

MR. ABATELLI: I think they choose among
themselves.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: So we do have a seated
Planning Board. They are charged with dealing
with this kind of process, and I think, you know,
it would be appropriate that if we approve this
variance, that we would not consider any
additional variances until some sort of overall
site plan is developed that would indicate the
overall signage at the facility. It just doesn't
seem like it should be our job to look at every sign and consider each additional sign's impact on what's there, just I don't think we're the Board to do that.

MR. CORWIN: Right. Are they saying -- is the hospital saying they're going to have more signs on Manor Place?

CHAIRMAN MOORE: No, but they've already requested a replacement of a noncompliant sign on the building, which is, as far as I'm concerned, not included in the current proposal. It would have liked to have been, but, you know, I don't know that the original -- and perhaps, Mr. Prokop, we might have to readvertise if the --

MR. PROKOP: You'd have to readvertise any additional --

CHAIRMAN MOORE: We would have to start at square one, and I don't think we want to do that, because we've spent a considerable amount of time on this.

MR. PROKOP: Can I just ask you a question real quick?

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Yes.

MR. PROKOP: On the hearing section,
Hearing #1, it refers to sign by number G201, G202, G101. Are we talking about three signs?

CHAIRMAN MOORE: No. The G201 and 02, as I understand it, are the two parts of the L-shaped sign.

MR. PROKOP: Of the one sign, okay.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Which are being regarded as a single sign location.

MR. PROKOP: So it's really a G2 sign and G1 sign, right?

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Uh-huh.

MR. PROKOP: Okay. Then how does that follow down to the -- when it says the regular meeting agenda?

CHAIRMAN MOORE: That should -- that is essentially a repetition of what's above, but abbreviated, since it's already been stated above. We're dealing with two issues, one which is directly illuminated signs, which are not permitted, and the second is that the allowable sign square footage is 24 square feet per facility, and already, the sign -- one of the signs proposed, I believe, exceeds the limit, and there are two signs being proposed. I think the total, according to these calculations here, are
85-plus square feet. So we're actually looking
at a variance --

MR. PROKOP: Okay.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: -- of 60, of 60 feet.

And, of course, those aren't the only signs
on the facility and that's what complicates
things. You know, the question naturally
follows, "Well, what about all the other signs,
what's going to happen to those?" And, very
clearly, additional things are going to happen to
those signs, and that's why I'm suggesting, if we
can get through the current request, which seems
to me reasonable, since we're replacing a sign
that was described as offensive, and improving
direction for another sign, which is quite small,
that some progress could be made and we could
then, you know, throw it to the Planning Board
and let them deal with the overall plan.

MR. CORWIN: I'm still trying to figure
these signs out. I just can't follow everything
that's in here. I guess a lot of stuff was
thrown in here, possibly at our request.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Not really. This is the
original plan. I think the --

MR. BORSELLA: Can I just jump in?
CHAIRMAN MOORE: Yes, go ahead, sir.

MR. BORELLA: If you don't mind.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: If you want to just identify yourself while you're at it. It's not public testimony, but we are having a discussion.

MR. BORELLA: Hi. I'm Alan from Alley Cat Signs. I was here for the application.

MS. NEFF: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Yes.

MR. BORELLA: What happened is -- this has been haunting me since I made this mistake. I spoke to Eileen. We were talking about the plan of all the signs, so I sent her that. And we only want two signs, and we haven't asked for anything else since, and that plan just keeps coming back at us. And we're not doing anything on that plan, nothing on that, except just the two signs. And I don't think I should have even sent it to her, I really don't think I should have. I should have just sent the survey with the two signs on it and we would have been probably eliminated --

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Well, that's understandable. And, you know, we've had different kind of proposals in the past when
variances are requested. Sometimes the applicant says --

MR. BORSELLA: It wasn't that complicated, though.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Yes, I understand, I understand. I'm just saying that sometimes an applicant will say, "I just want to have this one variance," and then, after they get the variance, they come back and they say, "And, oh, by the way, I want another variance for the next thing."

In other cases, people put the whole plan out and say, "This is what I'm going to ask for, but, right now, this is what I want."

It's quite all right that we may understand that there will be future changes at the facility. Obviously, some of the additional signs need to be changed. And we are in receipt of a building permit request for a third sign now, and that's going to be dealt with at a later time, but I hope, after an overall review of what the facilities needs are going to be.

MR. BORSELLA: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: And then we can have a proposal, if it comes back to us, for perhaps one more variance, or a set of variances.
And, you know, I have -- you know, fully understand that the hospital is a large facility that has unique signage. You know, you're not advertising hot dogs and popcorn, you're advertising how to get your health care. So I see it as an entirely different kind of consideration that doesn't change the commercial district's restrictions on signage.

MR. BORELLA: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: I mean, this is a unique situation.

MR. BORELLA: I just felt like it brought -- it was brought up a lot.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: I understand.

MR. BORELLA: And I keep thinking that I shouldn't have sent it to her, you know.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: It draws a lot of questions as well --

MR. BORELLA: Yeah, that's what happened.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: -- how much more is there going to be, and that's fine, that's fine.

MR. BORELLA: It started opening up like all this future work.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Yeah.

MR. BORELLA: We're not even there.
CHAIRMAN MOORE: Okay. Well, that's fine, and we're dealing with the two that are being requested.

MR. BORSELLA: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: I think we're having a little difficulty with the two as they're being requested. I think the public has stated that they have some concerns about size, and brightness we know we can control, but size was an issue and prominence.

MR. BORSELLA: You mentioned the four-by-six, the sign that's -- yeah, the base, of course, could be lower, right? We can lower the base of the sign without a problem with that. The square footage, I think we're at -- 24 square foot is what is there --

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Yup.

MR. BORSELLA: -- presently.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Right.

MR. BORSELLA: So it's basically the same sign, but turned upright.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Yeah. And I think that there's no existing vegetation or plans for landscaping that would require it to be starting so high. So, if the whole thing could be brought
down to a six or seven-foot-high sign, still have
the same information on it, still be visible from
the street, then it might be less objectionable
to the public.

MR. BORSELLA: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Yeah. So we might want to
add a stipulation, should we approve it, that it
would have a certain size limit.

MR. BORSELLA: Overall height and overall
length.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Overall height, yeah.

MR. BORSELLA: Yeah, seven feet or --

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Okay?

MR. BORSELLA: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: So, Members? You had
another question of the gentleman, did you?

Ellen, you seemed to be asking.

MS. NEFF: Yes. The best representation of
the first sign one encounters going down Manor
Place is this one, Number One --

MR. BORSELLA: Right.

MS. NEFF: -- correct? And is this the
best representation of Two, which you would
encounter if you were going down Atlantic towards
the hospital?
MR. BORSELLA: Is it G2 and G1?
MS. NEFF: Well, see, I have to tell you, the various things have gotten numbered various ways. Is that the one?
MS. NEFF: Here.
MR. BORSELLA: Yeah, G2.
MS. NEFF: Yes.
MR. BORSELLA: Yeah.
MS. NEFF: Okay. Thank you. And I know there's nothing in our material about material, but this representation is stone. Is it actual stone or something like stone?
MR. BORSELLA: Yeah, I think it's -- I don't think it's cultured, right?
MR. EBLE: It's a stone fascia.
MR. BORSELLA: I think you pointed them out to me. They were actual -- like they'd get them at the quarry.
MS. NEFF: Yeah, okay.
MR. BORSELLA: Yeah, right.
MS. NEFF: And if I could just say, if you do get to the stage where there's a discussion with the Planning Board and you talk about all -- particularly new signs, and signs which
completely -- the ones we're being asked to
consider are completely different material than
anything like is anywhere in the Village, really;
am I right about that? Do we have anything like
this?

MR. CORWIN: The foundation of the Red
School House is the same idea.

MS. NEFF: You mean right over here, right
here?

MR. CORWIN: Yeah.

MR. EBLE: And it's very similar to the
sign outside the Fire Department as well.

MS. NEFF: Oh, the stone, yes. But the
light --

CHAIRMAN MOORE: It's like a beach stone,
yeah.

MR. EBLE: What we're looking to achieve
is, if you recall, if you've seen any of the old
photos of the hospital when the mansion was
there, they had the pillars, the stone pillars.

MS. NEFF: Yes.

MR. EBLE: Similar to the front wall of the
hospital currently is certainly left over from
that era. And in between every 10 feet or so are
columns, if you will, that look like -- that's
the look that we're trying to achieve.

MS. NEFF: Okay. Now I'm not talking about
the stone, but the kind of light these signs
represent, these -- there's nothing like it in
the Village.

MR. CORWIN: No.

MS. NEFF: And what I think -- I only got
this idea a moment ago when you were asking some
questions, you know, if you had a video you could
show us of what a sign looks like in the daytime,
in the nighttime, in another location. It is
hard to get a sense of the impact of this. I'm
not an architect. You know, like the impact of
it. It is very different from what we're used
to.

And, yes, we want it -- you want it to be
different to further identify for the occasional
visitor or the frequent visitor. You want it to
be both beautiful and serve its useful function,
but it is hard to get a sense of what kind of
impact it has on the surrounding area.

MR. CORWIN: I'll just note that I think we
kind of discussed exactly what you're asking, and
I think you weren't at the meeting, because both
Mr. Moore and myself said where can he we look at
a --

MS. NEFF: Yeah.

MR. CORWIN: -- sign and there was no place. And, well, finally -- well, it's kind of an experimental thing, and now it's agreed upon that they're kind of trying something new.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Yeah. I don't think this --

MR. BORSELLA: Even the illumination with the LEDs --

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Right.

MR. BORSELLA: -- all that -- all this is new.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Because that's something that's not immediately apparent.

MR. BORSELLA: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: You know, they're not individual LED lights. I mean, we've had an experience with -- I don't know if this sign is LED, but it's a very different style, it's an animated LED sign that the Fire Department displays.

My feeling is that the lighted box signs are somewhat dated, they're not particularly attractive. I think the neighborhood said that
there was a certain amount of light that they
emit that's not necessary. They're not the most
attractive thing, and I think style-wise, the
sign as being described, and I may have seen
these elsewhere at facilities where you have a
very low-lighted, kind of a floating letter on a
black background.

MR. BORSELLA: That's exactly right, like
Stony Brook Hospital.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: And, certainly, I think it
is an attractive improvement. You know, I think
the concerns were are they going to be very
bright and are they -- and they are very big.
You know, some of the neighbors considered them
too big for a facility of this size, why would
they have to be 10 feet tall? So I think that's
something that we might want to make comments out
of if we were to move for approving.

And then the other stuff I think we can
make as a contingent for any new changes that
might be needed in the future, that they go
elsewhere before they come back to us as far as a
zoning request.

Would the Board be inclined to move forward
with consideration of an approval for this
variance? Any further discussion on the issue?

MR. CORWIN: Well, you have said several
times, and I kind of agree with you, that this
sign, G101, which is the first sign, which is,
what, 10 feet, represented as 10 feet high, could
be scaled down. And do we have a specific amount
that it's going to be scaled down? And is that
acceptable to you all to scale it down?

MR. EBLE: I believe at a previous meeting
that I did commit to not to exceed the current
height, which we measured it the day we did our
site visit, was nine-foot-three, so I would not
exceed that height of nine feet, even, or -- it
would depend. I would take direction from the
Board.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Yeah.

MR. EBLE: We are willing to scale it down,
yes, to answer your question.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: You know, the sign, the
active part of the sign, which isn't the
decorative stone, starts perhaps a foot above
grade.

MR. BORSELLA: It is a foot.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: It is a foot. And then
there's about a three-foot, four-foot span, you
know, less than half the length of the active
available lettering area of the sign that's just
blank. It seems to me the whole sign could be
brought down to just the lettering portion that
would start about a foot above the ground and
still be fully visible, you know, from the
street. You know, I don't see the need to have
that boosted up to 10 feet high.

MR. CORWIN: So what you're saying is --
what I'm hearing from you is a sign eight feet,
and what I'm hearing from the hospital is a sign
nine-feet-three-inches.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Because that's what the
current sign's height is.

MR. CORWIN: Right.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: And I believe --

MR. CORWIN: So which is it going to be?

CHAIRMAN MOORE: I believe the overall sign
restriction in the code is 10 feet, but that is
just the elevation above grade that's permitted.

MR. EBLE: Yeah. I believe your code is
anything but a gas station, you know, is 10 feet.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Other than a pylon sign.

MR. CORWIN: But we're trying to --

MR. EBLE: I'm certainly agreeable. If
you're looking for met to commit, I would commit

to not to exceed the eight feet. If that's a

compromise that's acceptable to the Board, I

would agree to that.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: And that would bring it

about there.

MR. CORWIN: About there on that scale.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: So that would all just

come down and still be an attractive balance. I

think it's a, you know, nice enough design that

the lighting I think would be lower.

Okay. So that's one thing we would

consider when we move ahead. Other discussion

on -- the other sign is only six or seven feet,

seven? The other sign, the L-shaped sign is

proposed as something in the neighborhood of

seven feet. It's a very --

MR. BORSELLA: It's four by -- I think it's

four-by-six, right?

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Okay.

MR. BORSELLA: Twenty-four square feet?

CHAIRMAN MOORE: You know, it's hard --

MR. CORWIN: Well, that's where I keep

running into trouble as to which sign is which.

MS. NEFF: No. I see it's bigger.
CHAIRMAN MOORE: It says seven feet in the little red --

MR. BORSELLA: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: So the overall sign height is seven feet. And, again, I mean, the sign is not fully occupied with lettering. It, you know, could be six feet, I think.

MR. BORSELLA: Yeah, because the sign is four-by-six, a foot off the ground, right?

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Yeah. And there's about a foot-and-a-half of sign that's not being used. And I doubt you would be able to change it without changing the whole face of the sign, if you, you know, had an afterthought that you needed more direction.

So, anyway, that's -- just my thought is that if we were to, you know, specify an eight-foot height for one sign and perhaps a six-foot, instead of seven-foot, for the other one, it might be more acceptable to the community.

MS. NEFF: Yeah, to reduce the size to -- of the first to no more than eight and the second to no more than six.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: And I think --
MR. CORWIN: I'm good with that.
CHAIRMAN MOORE: Okay.
MR. BORSELLA: Wait. Can I?
CHAIRMAN MOORE: Yes, go ahead.
MR. BORSELLA: If the sign is approximately -- the one now, the taller one, is approximately four-by-ten, and we would --
CHAIRMAN MOORE: The current proposal
MR. BORSELLA: Yeah. We would reduce the sign itself?
MR. EBLE: No, the height.
CHAIRMAN MOORE: The height.
MS. NEFF: The whole thing
CHAIRMAN MOORE: You just bring the top down and the empty part of the sign on the bottom would disappear.
MR. EBLE: From the base to the bottom of the sign itself.
MR. BORSELLA: Okay.
CHAIRMAN MOORE: You just crank it down. I should ask, these signs don't currently exist, I hope.
MR. EBLE: No.
CHAIRMAN MOORE: They haven't been manufactured?
MR. EBLE: No, no, no.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: So they're still on paper.

Very good, very good. You know, the last lighted
sign we dealt with was already lighted in place,
so this is an improvement, certainly. You know,
it's good to ask before they go in, that's always
a good thing.

MR. EBLE: That's why we're here.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Yeah, thanks. So that's
kind of where we are with that.

MR. BENJAMIN: State your question.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Yes.

MR. BORSELLA: Remember you asked me about
the lumens?

MS. NEFF: Yeah.

MR. BORSELLA: I spent a lot of time on
that, so -- more than you would even want to
know. But, anyway, a fluorescent lamp, one
six-foot, 450 lumens, four bulbs --

CHAIRMAN MOORE: A six-foot.

MR. BORSELLA: -- 18,500 lumens. On an LED
sign, we would have double-sided, 3,240 lumens;
total, 12,960. So it would be less, the actual
emitted light.

MR. CORWIN: But you don't know what's
going to be emitted because you're just --

MR. BORSELLA: I know the numbers that you asked for.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Yeah.

MR. CORWIN: You know what the bulbs are going to produce inside your box.

MR. BORSELLA: Right.

MR. CORWIN: You don't know what's going to be emitted.

MS. NEFF: Passed through the letters.

MR. CORWIN: Passed through your letters, as opposed to the existing box signs you got now, which is just throwing all the light right out.

MR. BORSELLA: Yeah. Let's say that's throwing 18,500, let's say that's correct. Now, if we take the new sign and we reduced the actual square footage of lighting area to less than half, than four -- like, in other words, take a four-by-six sign, we're only routing the letters out and covering them. We're probably reducing the square foot to half of that. We're not lighting four-by-six, we're probably -- we're probably lighting half of that, so the less light would be coming through the sign.

MR. CORWIN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN MOORE: I think one can assume that the current signs are letting most of the light out.

MR. BORSELLA: Most of the light, yeah. So I think this would be better for -- you know, it would be better.

MR. CORWIN: We're in agreement on that.

MR. BORSELLA: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: I believe the gentleman indicated that the LEDs can also either be turned down with a rheostat, or simply remove banks to reduce the amount of light being emitted.

MR. BORSELLA: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Okay.

MR. CORWIN: And just for my clarification --

MR. BENJAMIN: I'd like to -- I'd like to say something.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Charlie, yes.

MR. BENJAMIN: This first sign that you come to, this would be G101, the existing sign. If you come down the street on the right-hand side of the road coming towards the hospital from the main road, there is a property that is west of that property with a bunch of trees and hedges
there. So you can't see this sign until you
almost get up on it; did anybody notice that?
MR. CORWIN: (Nodded yes).
MR. BENJAMIN: I noticed that. So the idea
of making this thing lower, I don't know if
that's a great idea.
CHAIRMAN MOORE: Is the hedge the
hospital's property?
MR. BENJAMIN: I want to see a sign before
I get there, I don't want to see the sign as I'm
passing it, you know.
CHAIRMAN MOORE: You're not going to see it
either way until you get past the hedge,
apparently.
MR. BORSELLA: That's why it's designed as
high as it is.
MR. BENJAMIN: Right.
MR. BORSELLA: Because the hedges are --
MR. BENJAMIN: Right.
CHAIRMAN MOORE: I don't think you're
proposing to put it further out into the street.
That's not possible, so --
MR. BORSELLA: No.
MR. EBLE: No, the hedge is actually --
CHAIRMAN MOORE: I don't see the solution
MR. EBLE: The hedge is -- that you're talking about are actually Village -- on Village property. The Village owns that hedge at that point.

MR. CORWIN: The hedge is at the road end of --

MR. EBLE: The property line for the hospital comes into the middle of that first driveway and runs on an angle just at the northern side of my first light pole there. So then the Levin property on the other side, that parcel there is actually Village property into the canal at that point. And on the far side of the Village property is the Levin property. On my side, my property line is the middle of that first driveway and about a foot or two on the north side of my first light fixture.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: And just to remind us, this sign -- the first sign that we're talking about appears to be directing traffic to the emergency room, that that would be your principal direction of traffic to the emergency room?

MR. EBLE: Yeah. We'd like to redirect -- currently, people go to the back of the hospital
and there is some confusion with the furthest
easternmost entry to the property with people
going into the ambulance bay itself.

MS. NEFF: Into the what?

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Ambulance bay.

MR. EBLE: Ambulance bay.

MS. NEFF: Okay.

MR. EBLE: Where the ambulances pull in --

MS. NEFF: Right.

MR. EBLE: -- to the side, you know, the
side of the hospital there. And we're trying to
direct those people to hit that first driveway
and drive around the back of the hospital to the
ambulatory, what we call the ambulatory, which is
the walk-in entrance to the emergency room, and
the ambulances certainly --

MS. NEFF: Right.

MR. EBLE: -- would continue to use the
entrance where they back in the ambulances.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: And this isn't the last
opportunity to get to the emergency room, but,
like you say, it's the more direct path without
confusion.

MR. EBLE: It would be more direct and
that's what we'd like to see. But, certainly,
with the other entrances to the hospital, you
would be able to access not only the property,
but the emergency room as well.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: And I can imagine, except
for people who are coming for scheduled
appointments at the emergency room, such as blood
draws, when people are either unfamiliar or
somewhat excited about the process.

I think this is kind of a planning process,
which I don't think we should be doing, is
someone should be looking at the overall
direction. If somebody misses the first turn,
how do they find the emergency room? Well, maybe
you need another sign, but we're not talking
about other signs tonight, we're talking about
two signs. So, again, I just think it's better
to have someone else deal with that.

Anyway, what other comments would you like
to have about the signs? Charlie has indicated
he thinks maybe it's a little bigger, it's a
little more visible. I have a feeling, if you
drive by it, you drive by it, you know, if you
don't see it.

MR. BENJAMIN: Well, I'm just, you know,
taking the position of somebody that's in a --
frantic and trying to get to the hospital and you can't see the sign. So, you know, the simple thing is the hedges could be cut down to a reasonable height, or whatever. It's not my --

CHAIRMAN MOORE: That would be --
MR. BENJAMIN: It's not my place, but the thing is, is that when signage is confusing, you want to make sure that when you're all -- it's all said and done, it's not confusing --

CHAIRMAN MOORE: No.
MR. BENJAMIN: -- you can see it. If you can't see it, well, if you haven't been there, then you're confused, so.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Is the emergency part of this sign, is the red portion illuminated as red?
MR. BORSELLA: Yes.
CHAIRMAN MOORE: So the entire emergency part, it's white and red illuminated?
MR. BORSELLA: Yes.
CHAIRMAN MOORE: So that's one part that's fully illuminated.
MR. BORSELLA: Yes.
CHAIRMAN MOORE: That may help, too. Okay? It appears to be a little different in the drawing than just the silver with the dark blue
lettering, which I assume is outline lighting.

MR. BORELLA: Yes, it is different.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Okay. Any other comments from the Board at this point as far as where are we going?

MR. CORWIN: Just for clarification again for myself, internally illuminated, aluminum fabricated can, and when you say fabricated can, you mean one big sheet of aluminum, right?

MR. BORELLA: Yeah.

MR. CORWIN: That's what you're talking about?

MR. BORELLA: Yes.

MR. CORWIN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Okay. So, in that case, is the Board prepared to move ahead on --

MS. NEFF: Uh-huh

CHAIRMAN MOORE: -- consideration? All right.

So our first task is to declare that the Zoning Board of Appeals is the Lead Agency on this proposal. And according to the SEQRA requirements, it is a Type II Action. I'd like to make that motion and ask for a second.

MR. BENJAMIN: Second.
CHAIRMAN MOORE: And all in favor?

MS. NEFF: Aye.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Any discussion, first, on that? Mr. Corwin?

MR. CORWIN: No. No discussion, I'm saying.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: No. I'm sorry. And no discussion. And your vote, Mr. Corwin?

MR. CORWIN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Yes. And Mr. Benjamin?

MR. BENJAMIN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Ms. Neff?

MS. NEFF: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: And I vote yes, so it is done.

And now the questions come from the request, which would be an area variance. There are five questions, and the first is whether an undesirable change will be produced in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties will be created by the granting of the area variance? And I am saying this in reference to our consideration of a reduced size of the signage, only the two signs being considered, and that the brightness will be less
and will be adjustable after installation. With that, would there be an undesirable change?

Mr. Benjamin?

MR. BENJAMIN: No.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Mr. Corwin?

MR. CORWIN: No.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Ms. Neff?

MS. NEFF: No.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: And I vote no.

Whether the benefit sought by the Applicant can be achieved by some method feasible for the applicant to pursue other than an area variance?

Mr. Benjamin?

MR. BENJAMIN: I don't know.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: I'm sorry?

MR. BENJAMIN: I don't know.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Oh. So I'll leave that open. Mr. Corwin?

MR. CORWIN: No.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Ms. Neff?

MS. NEFF: No.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: And I would vote no.

Whether the requested area variance is substantial? Mr. Benjamin?

MR. BENJAMIN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN MOORE: Mr. Corwin?

MR. CORWIN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Ms. Neff?

MS. NEFF: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: And I would say no in reference to the size of the property.

Whether the proposed variance will have an adverse effect or impact on the physical and environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district? Mr. Benjamin?

MR. BENJAMIN: As it stands, no.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: And Mr. Corwin?

MR. CORWIN: Repeat the question, please.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Whether the proposed variance will have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district?

MR. CORWIN: No.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Ms. Neff?

MS. NEFF: No.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: And I would vote no, especially in reference to the fact of what is already there.

Finally, 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 an area variance? Mr. Benjamin?

MR. BENJAMIN: No.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Mr. Corwin?

MR. CORWIN: No.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Ms. Neff?

MS. NEFF: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: And I would also vote yes. And then, finally, in consideration of all of the above questions, whether we could have a motion to approve the requested variance. And I would say now that we would stipulate that the signs would be reduced in height; that the first sign, Number One, at the first entrance to the property would be not higher than eight feet, and the second sign would not be higher than six feet, if that's agreeable to the Board.

And, secondly, that the brightness, while being adjustable, would be adjusted after installation, and I would suggest in consultation with the Building Department, and we could take a look ourselves, if we wish.

With those stipulations in mind, since we're not considering any other request for
variances, we can or cannot indicate the
necessity to go to the Planning Board for future
things. I don't think that's necessary at this
point, but should we have, you know, a request
for additional variances, I think that's a
direction we should follow. So I think we only
need the size and brightness stipulation. And
with that, I would like to make a motion that we
approve the requested variance. And could I have
a second, please?

MS. NEFF: Second.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Is there any further
discussion?

(No Response)

If not, may I have a vote, please, of
Mr. Benjamin?

MR. BENJAMIN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Mr. Corwin?

MR. CORWIN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Ms. Neff?

MS. NEFF: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: And I would also vote yes.
And I'm glad that you will be able to put
in your new signs.

MR. EBLE: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN MOORE: Thank you very much for your patience.

MR. BORSELLA: I'm happy.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Good, good. And we'll have to see how they look.

MR. BORSELLA: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Okay. Now, the next item on the agenda is simply a motion to accept a new application. I will explain it briefly.

MR. EBLE: Good night. Thank you.

MR. BORSELLA: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Good to see you again.

MS. NEFF: Good night.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: This is a request, the application for an area variance, and also to schedule a site visit and schedule a public hearing for Jean Stratton, 424D Fourth Street, Greenport, New York; Suffolk County Tax Map 1001-6-6-16.

The applicant proposes to construct an addition to a nonconforming building. The proposed second floor addition is 14.2 feet from the rear property line, requiring a 15.8 rear-yard variance. Section 150-12A of the Village of Greenport Code requires a 30-foot
rear-yard setback in the R-2 District.

Just as a point of explanation, this is very similar, again, to a request made back late last year for 7 Sandy Beach Road for a dormer construction. And while the measurements here are 14.2 feet off the rear property line, the house is currently in that position.

When I was looking at the plans for the renovation, it appears that the house was bumping out about a foot larger, but that turned out to be on the front of the house, which is well within the buildable footprint. That the front of the house expansion, which is a slight extension, is actually well within the buildable footprint on that property, so it's the rear of the property that's the consideration.

And we may wish to consider, after we hear public comment, that no variance may be required, because, again, it is not causing an increase in the noncompliance of this, or nonconformance of this property.

You know, in the past, we, other than the 35-foot height limit, have not considered going vertical as an increase of nonconformance.

So with that, we'll be having our next
meeting presumably on January 15th, which is the
third Wednesday of the month. If we could, we
could meet at 4:30 at the property. This is
actually off of Fourth Street, I believe, around
the private drive, so we would have to find it.

MR. BENJAMIN: Just over the tracks.
CHAIRMAN MOORE: And it's -- is it across,
just over the tracks?

MS. NEFF: South.

MR. BENJAMIN: Just over the tracks and
then left.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: And then left, okay.

MR. BENJAMIN: Yeah, that's where the road
is.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Yeah. Well, I'll have to,
you know, go find it before so I don't get lost
on the night of the meeting.

So could we schedule a site visit for 4:30
on January 15th? People are available for a
meeting that day, I suppose. Okay? Then we
would ask the Building Department to make
arrangements for the public hearing announcement.

MR. ABATELLI: Is there an issue with the
date here? Are you saying the 15th or the 16th?

CHAIRMAN MOORE: The 15th on my -- uh-oh,
two thousand --

MR. ABATELLI: So the agenda is wrong, then.

MR. BENJAMIN: Is it the 16th or the 15th?

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Okay. I'm looking at I think the calendar for 2014 and the 15th is a Wednesday. Yes, that was a mistake on my part, so we will fix that.

MS. NEFF: It's what day, the 15th?

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Is the 15th --

MS. NEFF: Okay.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: -- of January. Yeah, my mistake. So, if that's agreeable to everybody, that will be it. I don't know if we need to vote on that.

But we do need the vote to accept the application, so I'd like to move that we accept the application that's stated in Item #2, and may I have a second?

MR. BENJAMIN: Second.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: And all in favor?

MR. CORWIN: Aye.

MR. BENJAMIN: Aye.

MS. NEFF: Aye.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Aye. So that motion
carries.

So we will have the site visit at 4:30 p.m., and then we will hear public comment and -- at the meeting at 5 p.m. on the 15th of January.

Item #3 is the motion to accept the ZBA minutes for November 20th, 2013. So moved. May I have a second?

MR. BENJAMIN: Second.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: All in favor?

MR. CORWIN: Aye.

MS. NEFF: Aye.

MR. BENJAMIN: Aye.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Aye. The motion carries. Motion to approve the ZBA minutes for October 17th, 2013. And does anybody have any comments or corrections on those?

(No Response)

If not, I so move, and may I have a second?

MS. NEFF: Second.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: All in favor?

MR. CORWIN: Aye.

MS. NEFF: Aye.

MR. BENJAMIN: Aye.

CHAIRMAN MOORE: Aye. Motion carries.
And now the motion is to schedule the next regular ZBA meeting for January 15th, 2014, at 5 p.m. That's a correction from the agenda so printed. So moved. May I have a second?

MR. BENJAMIN: Second.
CHAIRMAN MOORE: And all in favor?
MR. CORWIN: Aye.
MS. NEFF: Aye.
MR. BENJAMIN: Aye.
CHAIRMAN MOORE: Aye. Motion carries.
And motion to adjourn. May I have a second?
MS. NEFF: Second.
CHAIRMAN MOORE: All in favor?
MR. CORWIN: Aye.
MS. NEFF: Aye.
MR. BENJAMIN: Aye.
CHAIRMAN MOORE: Aye.
The meeting is adjourned right at 6 p.m.
Thank you, everybody, for coming. And, everybody, happy holidays and a happy new year.
MS. NEFF: Yes, you, too.
CHAIRMAN MOORE: We'll be seeing everybody in the next year.
(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 6 p.m.)
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