

MINUTES

**Town of Wappinger
Zoning Board of Appeals
February 26, 2013**

**Town Hall
20 Middlebush Road
Wappinger Falls, NY**

Summarized Minutes

Members:

Mr. Prager	Member
Mr. Della Corte	Absent
Mr. Casella	Member
Mr. Johnston	Member
Mr. Galotti	Member

Others Present:

Mrs. Roberti	Zoning Administrator
Ms. Rose	Secretary
Mr. Horan	Attorney

Summary

Danny & Anna Leone	Pool Granted-Shed Tabled until March 18th
Ronald Ferris	Variance Granted
Verizon Wireless	Variance Granted

Mr. Prager: First item on the agenda is to approve the minutes from January 8, 2013 and February 12, 2013 (with typo correction)

Mr. Casella: I make a motion to approve the minutes from January 8, 2013 and February 12, 2013.

Mr. Johnston: Second.

Mr. Prager: All in favor?

Board: Aye.

Mr. Prager: The next item on the agenda is a Public Hearing on:

Appeal No. 13-7482

Ronald Ferris-Is seeking an area variance of Section 240-37 of Zoning Regulations in an R-20 Zoning District.

-Where **20 feet to the side yard is required for a two car garage addition**, the applicant **can only provide 17 feet**, thus requesting a **3 foot side yard variance**. The property is located at **5 David Loop** and is identified by Tax Grid No. **6157-02-976678**.

Mr. Prager: Are all the mailings in order?

Ms. Rose: Yes, sir.

Mr. Prager: Can I have a motion to open the Public Hearing?

Mr. Galotti: I make a motion to open the Public Hearing.

Mr. Johnston: Second.

Mr. Prager: All in favor?

Board: Aye.

Mr. Prager: Please come up and state your name and the reason for the variance.

Mr. Ferris: My name is Ronald Ferris and I live at 5 David Loop. I would

like to make a 2 car garage which will be attached to my existing garage. The garage will be 2 cars deep. The variance I need is because I only have 17 feet to my side property line and I need 20 feet.

Mr. Prager: We did have a site inspection. Does anyone have any questions?

Mr. Galotti: Will the siding be the same as is on the house?

Mr. Ferris: It will be exactly the same.

Mr. Prager: Is there anyone in the audience that would like to speak for or against this variance?

Mr. Prager: Let the record show there is no one in the audience for or against this variance. Can I have a motion to close the Public Hearing?

Mr. Casella: I make a motion to close the Public Hearing.

Mr. Johnston: Second.

Mr. Prager: All in favor?

Board: Aye.

Mr. Prager: Do I have a motion to grant the variance?

Mr. Johnston: I make a motion to grant the variance. It is not an undesirable change to the neighborhood and it will not change the character in any way. It is only a 3 foot variance which is not substantial and it will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood.

Mr. Casella: Second

Mr. Prager: Roll call vote.

**Ms. Rose: Mr. Casella: Aye
Peter Galotti: Aye**

Bob Johnston: Aye
Howard Prager: Aye

Mr. Prager: The motion has been granted for the variance.

Mr. Ferris: Thank You.

Mr. Prager: The next item on the agenda is another Public Hearing:

Appeal No. 13-7478

Danny & Anna Leone-Is seeking an area variance of Section 240-37 of Zoning Regulations in an R-15 Zoning District.

-Where **15 feet to the rear is required for an existing 15' X 30' above ground pool and a 6' X 8' deck**, the applicant **can only provide 6.2 feet**, thus requesting a **an 8.8 foot rear yard setback**.

-Where **6 feet to the side yard is required for a 10' X 12' existing shed**, the applicant **can only provide 0 feet**, thus requesting a **6 foot side yard variance**.

The property is located at **1 Amherst Lane** and is identified by **Tax Grid No. 6057-02-700568**.

Mr. Prager: Sue, are all the mailings in order?

Ms. Rose: Yes sir.

Mr. Prager: Can I have a motion to open the Public Hearing?

Mr. Johnston: I make a motion to open the Public Hearing.

Mr. Casella: Second.

Mr. Prager: All in favor?

Board: Aye.

Mr. Prager: Please state your name and the reason you would like this variance.

Mr. & Mrs. Leone: Danny Leone and Anna Leone. I need a variance for the existing shed that is right on the property line. It has been there for a while. The existing pool is where the old one was I just turned it. Now I need a variance because I am to

close to the other property.

Mr. Prager: If I remember correctly, we had a discussion about this a couple of weeks ago. You said you installed that shed in 1994?

Mr. Leone: Yes, in 1994.

Mr. Prager: Barbara, do we have a permit for it?

Mrs. Roberti: No, not for the shed.

Mr. Prager: Did I notice an electrical cord coming out of the shed?

Mr. Leone: No, I was just using a vacuum cleaner in the shed.

Mr. Prager: We did have a site inspection. Does anybody have any questions?

Mr. Johnston: Do you still have 2 fences?

Mr. Leone: Stockade fences?

Mr. Johnston: Wasn't there stockade fencing up against the fence by the shed.

Mr. Leone: On the side.

Mr. Prager: Where the boat is?

Mr. Leone: Yes.

Mr. Prager: The 2 stakes that you put in the ground I noticed aren't up against the shed.

Mr. Leone: It's about 4 inches away from the shed.

Mr. Prager: One is a little more than the other; maybe 3 feet.

Mr. Leone: One is about a foot and a half. The one all the way down is in line with the fence and the other one is about 4 inches away from the fence.

Mr. Prager: Is there anyone in the audience that has anything to say about this variance.

Mr. Prager: Let the record show there is no one in the audience for or against this variance. Can I have a motion to close the Public Hearing?

Mr. Johnston: I make a motion to close the Public Hearing.

Mr. Galotti: Second.

Mr. Prager: All in favor?

Board: Aye.

Mr. Prager: I would like to vote separately since they are both different.

Mr. Prager: Let's do the pool first. I need a motion to grant a 6.2 foot variance for the pool.

Mr. Galotti: I make a motion to grant the variance for the pool. It cannot be achieved any other way. It does not have an undesirable change to the neighborhood. There are no adverse effects to the environment.

Mr. Johnston: Second.

Mr. Prager: Can I have a roll call vote?

Ms. Rose: This is for the pool?

Mr. Prager: Yes.

Ms. Rose:	Al Casella	Yes
	Peter Galotti	Yes
	Bob Johnston	Yes
	Howard Johnston	Yes

Mr. Prager: Can I have a motion to grant the -0- foot variance for the shed?

Mr. Casella: **I make a motion to grant the variance. It is not an undesirable change to the neighborhood. It has been there since 1994. They would have to physically have to take it down. There have been no complaints from any of the neighbors. It is not a detriment to the neighborhood. It is self created. The variance is substantial.**

Mr. Galotti: **Second.**

Mr. Prager: **Roll call vote.**

Mr. Horan: Mr. Chairman one modification with that. It is my understanding that the shed is located on an easement shown on the subdivision plot which existed long before the property owners here. In essence there is a water main underneath or very close to the shed. The condition should be for the life of this shed. In the event this shed should be taken down, the new one should be erected that it be erected outside the easement.

Mr. Casella: Sue, please make the modification.

Ms. Rose: **Yes, (Please note above modification to Mr. Casella's motion).**

Mr. Galotti: **Second.**

Mr. Prager: **Roll call vote.**

Ms. Rose:	Al Casella	Yes
	Peter Galotti	Yes
	Bob Johnston	No
	Howard Prager	No

Mr. Prager: Basically, that it is on the property line we always keep a distance from that line just in case there is a problem and we have to get on that property. Being that it is 2 to 2, it is going to be denied.

Ms. Murphy: Can I say something.

- Mr. Prager: It is a little too late since we voted on it.
- Ms. Rose: Can I have your name and address?
- Ms. Murphy: Theresa Murphy and I live at 10 Cameron Lane. I didn't know when I could speak but I live next door and we do not have a problem with the shed.
- Mr. Horan: If I may Mr. Chairman, I think we should probably give the applicant the ability to adjourn this variance to another meeting with a full board.
- Mr. Prager: I go along with that.
- Ms. Murphy: I think the water line you are talking about is actually on our property.
- Mr. Horan: It is on both.
- Mr. Prager: (Looking at the map) Yes it is on both according to the map. If you could move it, it would be fine. I didn't realize that we would not have our 5th person here. It may or may not help you.
- Mr. Horan: For parliamentary purpose, motion to table the resolution for the next meeting.
- Mr. Prager: We need to table this portion of the variance since they are being treated separately.
- Mr. Horan: Yes.
- Mr. Prager: Do I have a motion to table this portion of the variance until the next meeting.
- Mr. Galotti: I make a motion to table this portion of the variance.**
- Mr. Johnston: Second.**
- Mr. Prager: All in favor?**
- Board: Aye.**

Mr. Prager: The next item on the agenda is another Public Hearing:

Appeal No. 12-7477

Verizon Wireless- Is seeking an area variance of Section 240-81 (G)(3)(c)[1] of District Zoning Regulations in a COP Zoning District.

-Where **1,500 feet on a horizontal plane to any structure which is to be occupied by a public or private school**, the applicant **can only provide -0- feet.**

-Where a **minimum distance of 750 feet on a horizontal plane from any daycare center, church or place of worship**, the applicant **can only provide -0- feet.**

The property is located at **155-179 Myers Corners Road** and is identified by **Tax Grid No. 6258-03-350303.**

Mr. Prager: Sue, are all the mailings in order?

Ms. Rose: Yes, sir.

Mr. Prager: Do I have a motion to open the Public Hearing?

Mr. Johnston: I make a motion to open the Public Hearing.

Mr. Galotti: Second.

Mr. Prager: All in favor?

Board: Aye.

Mr. Olsen: My name is Scott Olsen and I represent Verizon Wireless. The gentleman hanging up the map is Michael Orchard for Techtronic Engineering. We are proposing installing a new wireless communication facility at 155 Myers Corners Road. There will be 12 antennas on the roof of the building and a 12 x 30 equipment shed at the base of the building. In our application we provided a RF analyzes which explains why we need this new site. We have a gap in service in this area. We have been able to negotiate a lease with the landlord of which you have in your records. Having this will prevent us from having to build new towers. One of the most important thing in the record is we have certification

from a NYS licensed engineer. In which he states, our facility that we are proposing will be in full compliance with all FCC regulations. We will not accede any single threshold that is permitted by law. We will be in the neighborhood of 500 less of what we could do legally. There is an interference study in the records that show these antennas will not interfere with any of the neighboring telephone, cable, and tv. They operate different frequencies. We utilize all FCC approved equipment that we use. In doing so it is guaranteed not to interfere. There is additional information in the material but I think these are the most important. If you have any questions, I will be more than happy to answer them.

- Mr. Galotti: We were there a Saturday to physically see what is going on.
- Mr. Johnston: Is the shed on the east side of the building or the west side?
- Mr. Orchard: (Pointing to the map) it is on the west side.
- Mr. Prager: Why that building? You have 3 buildings there.
- Mr. Olsen: This is Rick Andras. He is the engineer for Verizon Wireless.
- Mr. Andras: It is RF driven. The building to the west is 10 feet lower.
- Mr. Johnston: How many pounds are they?
- Mr. Andras: 15 pounds. 3 sectors of 5. The reason the front part of the building was not utilized is because one of the tenants for security reasons did not want a lot of traffic in the front part of the building. We kept all our improvement to the rear of the building.
- Mr. Prager: At the last meeting, you had mentioned that they are safe. How far away from the antennas do you have to be safe? Did you ever find out the distance? The fire department does go on the roofs often. Will there be signage up there?
- Mr. Olsen: There will be signs. There will be signs going up to the roof. There will be warning signs with a telephone number on it so people will not enter without full knowledge. Your

questions before was what if the fire department has to go up there. What I was told is that you call that number if you have to go up there.

Mr. Prager:

24 x 7.

Mr. Olsen:

Yes and if for some reason you need to be in front of the antennas, they would turn it down.

Mr. Prager:

What is the distance if they were on?

Mr. Andras:

It is very similar to a flash light. The game is in the forward direction, so if you are standing behind it the energy is projected up and down the road.

Mr. Prager:

What if I am standing in front of it.

Mr. Andras:

Typically 2 feetish. Not to say it is not safe if you are closer. You wouldn't be allowed to stay there days on end.

Mr. Olsen:

Under OSHA regulations, they say you can't.

Mr. Prager:

To say, there is no big radiation beyond 2 feet.

Mr. Andras:

It is a very low power operating system.

Mr. Johnston:

You are going to make it astatically similar to the building?

Mr. Olsen:

We will paint it with a RF transparent paint to match the building.

Mr. Horan:

That is also a requirement in the Town Code. When they get to the Planning Board, one of the requirements will be of a color material that matches the exterior of the building.

Mr. Prager:

Is there anyone in the audience that would like to ask a question?

Mr. Mosley

My name is Louis Moseley and I live a 9 Schnabl Court. My only point would be we have a regulation that is pretty specific here. We have to stay away from schools. I cannot debate the public health aspects of RF frequencies. I am not

sure if anyone can conclusively but if we have this specific rule. If this rule is antiquated, I think the rule should be changed for everybody.

Mr. Prager: I am going to turn this over to Mr. Horan.

Mr. Horan: This is noted in the decision of the ZBA which I prepared in consultation with the board. The code provision book says no tower or personal wireless service facility shall be located closer than 1500 on a horizontal plane. The key here is horizontal plan. As the RF engineer stated, the frequency are directional in nature. This code section says horizontal plan which means at the elevation. In this case, the antenna array is 39 feet above the ground level. The town code requirement says you cannot be at that height at 750 feet. In this instance, the school that is located in that building is below the antennas. After doing some research on the issue, we did not catch the horizontal plan issue. Technically, the variance notices went out saying -0- feet but that was incorrect because anything below the antenna in that building is not in the same horizontal plane. What you would do is a plane in 39 feet in the air and sees where that would intercept. Such as houses and things and in this case the next closes house is about 650 feet away. It is unclear as to whether any part of that structure is in the horizontal plan. The issue is respect to health issues. The Telecommunication Law of 1996 prohibits us from considering that. Basically, we can only view this as astatically pleasing.

Mr. Moseley: You are not on the plane with Myers Corners Elementary?

Mr. Prager: I went up there this morning and it is actually above.

Mr. Horan: We cannot get into the health and safety issues. The applicant has conceded we can do it for astatic reasons.

Mr. Moseley: Actually it is not -0- feet.

Mr. Prager: Correct.

Mr. Moseley: In reality the horizontal plan is going above both of the

schools.

Mr. Prager: I'm glad you asked that because that should be brought out.

Mr. Horan: Frankly, it was so technical before we got into the nitty gritty of the application we didn't realize what the code said. This is the only thing in the Wappinger Code that takes a setback measurement high above the ground.

Mr. Moseley: Thank you.

Mr. Prager: Anybody else in the audience have any other questions?

Mr. Prager: Let the record show no one else in the audience has any questions. Do I have a motion to close the Public Hearing?

Mr. Galotti: I make a motion to close the Public Hearing.

Mr. Johnson: Second.

Mr. Prager: All in favor?

Board: Aye.

Mr. Prager: Mr. Horan was nice enough to research this and to write this up for us.

**TOWN OF WAPPINGER
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
APPLICATION FOR A USE VARIANCE
FINDINGS & DECISION**

Appeal No.	12-7477
Application Date:	December 4, 2012
Applicant	Orange County-Poughkeepsie Ltd Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless
Premises Located at:	155-179 Myers Corners Road
Tax Grid No.:	6258-03-350303

Zoning District(s): COP
Record Owner of Property: Mycor Holdings, Inc.
Variance of Code Sections: § 240-81 (G)(4)(c)[1]

Evidence Presented

- 1) Application of Orange County-Poughkeepsie Ltd Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless dated December 4, 2012 with Exhibits;
- 2) Long Form EAF

Description of the Premises & Proposed Variance

The premises that is the subject of this application is a 22.5 Acre Parcel located at 155-177 Myers Corners Road in a COP. The applicant is in the business of providing wireless telecommunications service. The applicant seeks to put three cellular telephone antennae arrays on the roof of a commercial building on the site pursuant to a lease option.

The applicant is seeking to construct a non-tower mounted personal wireless service facility as such is defined under § 240-81 of the Town of Wappinger Code. The applicant meets all of the siting requirements set forth in § 240-81 except those set forth at § 240-81 (G) (4) (c) which provides

No tower or personal wireless service facility, with the exception of repeaters, shall be located:

[1] Closer than 1,500 feet on a horizontal plane to any structure existing at the time of application which is or is able to be occupied or habitable, on the property of any school (both public and private).

[2] Closer than 750 feet on a horizontal plane to an existing dwelling unit or day-care center, hospital, nursing home, church, synagogue or other place of worship.

The building that shall mount the proposed antennae contain a day care center, however the day care center is below the horizontal plane of the antenna.

The Myers Corners Cell Site Radio Frequency Analysis provided by the applicant as Exhibit 3 to the application credibly demonstrates that the proposed site fills the gaps in coverage and that alternative sites do not fit its needs or the needs of the Town. § 240-81 of the Town Code states that collocation on an existing tower is preferred and where that cannot be met, antenna installation on an existing commercial building is preferred.

Public Hearing

A public hearing on the application was held on February 26, 2013 and Scott Olson Esq, made a presentation on behalf of the applicant and all in attendance were given an opportunity to speak for or against the application.

SEQRA Review

The instant application is for an individual setback variance and is therefore a Type II pursuant to 6 NYCRR 617.5(c)(12) which is not subject to SEQRA Review.

Review of Area Variance

The determination of the ZBA in granting an variance is guided by Town Law §267-b(3)(b) which states:

(b) In making its determination, the zoning board of appeals shall take into consideration the benefit to the applicant if the variance is granted, as weighed against the detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood or community by such grant. In making such determination the board shall also consider: (1) 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; (2) whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by some method, feasible for the applicant to pursue, other than an area variance; (3) whether the requested area variance is substantial; (4) whether the proposed variance will have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district; and (5) 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.

The proposed non-tower mounted personal wireless service facility is a public utility and it is subject to review under public utility standards.

Federal Telecommunications Act

It should be noted that the Town of Wappinger in limiting the placement of personal wireless facilities pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 332(c)(7)(iv) which states:

(iv) No State or local government or instrumentality thereof may regulate the placement, construction, or modification of personal wireless service facilities on the basis of the environmental effects of radio frequency emissions to the extent that such facilities comply with the Commission's regulations concerning such emissions.

This section means that the Town of Wappinger cannot restrict the location of a personal wireless service facilities because of health concerns regarding RF emissions. On its face § 240-81 (G)(4)(c) may well be considered a regulation which is pre-empted by federal law since there is no indication that the regulation is adopted for aesthetic rather than health reasons.

The applicant is required to receive an FCC license for the antennae installation and is required by the terms of the license.

The ZBA determines that the evidence presented result in the following determinations regarding the above noted factors.

Undesireable Change in Character of the Neighborhood

No change in the character of the neighborhood will be produced as there are other structures on the roof and the antennae are required to be of a color or material that matches the exterior of the building or structure under § 240-81.

Benefit by Other Feasible Method

The applicant has demonstrated in its siting study that it cannot receive the benefit by another feasible method.

Substantial Nature of Variance

The initial variance requested is for a 100% variance; however, this is in error as the daycare center in the building is not in the same horizontal plane as the antennae. The antennae are located approximately 40 feet above ground level. The closest nearby residence is approximately 650 feet away and it is likely that the house is located below the horizontal plane of the antennae.

In the instant case, there appears to be no aesthetic reason to require a 1500 foot setback so the request variance is not substantial.

Adverse Effect or Impact on Physical or Environmental Conditions

The intent of § 240 81 (G)(4)(c) seems to be to protect residents from adverse health effects from the location of personal wireless service facilities. 47 U.S.C. § 332(c)(7)(iv) prohibits the Town from considering health effects of the RF emissions. The FCC has conclusively determined that there are no health risks from such installations and has pre-empted the ZBA from looking at that issue.

The maximum transmitting power proposed for use at the site is 40W. According to the FCC publication A Local Government Official's Guide to Transmitting Antenna RF Emission Safety: Rules, Procedures, and Practical Guidance, Appendix B, the safe distance at 50W per channel is 34.1 feet. There are no structures within 34 feet of the antennae.

Hardship Self-Created

The hardship is not self-created as the applicant has to fill in the service gaps where necessary. Siting of a tower is not preferred under the Town Code.

Decision

Applying the standards of Town Law §267-b (3) (b), an area variance should be granted.

Application for Variance **GRANTED**. The variance is subject to site plan approval by the Planning Board.

The foregoing is the decision of the ZBA.

Mr. Horan: May the record reflect that the decision be amended prior to the decision of the ZBA to put in a note that the purported area variance is a Type II action under SEQRA because it is a setback variance for which a single setback variance for which no SEQRA review is required.

Mr. Prager: Can I have a motion to close the Public Hearing?

Mr. Galotti: I make a motion to grant the variance.

Mr. Johnston: Second.

Mr. Prager: Roll call vote.

Ms. Rose:	Al Casella	Yes
	Peter Galotti	Yes
	Bob Johnston	Yes
	Howard Prager	Yes

Mr. Prager: This will be filed within 5 days.

Mr. Olsen: Thank you.

Mr. Prager: The next item on the agenda is:

Appeal No. 13-7483

Mousa Nesheiwat-Is seeking an area variance of Section 240-3 of Zoning Regulations in an R-40 Zoning District.

-Where **50 feet to the front yard** is required for the construction of a house on an existing non-conforming footprint, the applicant can only provide **32.3 feet**, thus requesting a **17.7 foot front yard variance**.

-Where **50 feet to the rear yard** is required for the construction of a house on an existing non-conforming footprint, the applicant can only provide **18.1 feet**, thus requesting a **31.9 foot variance**.

The property is located at **94 Robinson Lane** and is identified by Tax Grid No. **6459-03-070409**.

Mr. Morris: My name is Jason Morris from Day Engineering. The applicant bought this existing run down house which is on Robinson Lane. He demolished the existing house and the understanding was to rebuild on the existing footprint. The original structure had a square taken out of the back side of the house; towards the rear lot line. He poured the foundation in a perfect box and that square is now removed. With the change, it forces us to come in for the rear lot line variance. Even though the foundation was continuous, the structure over hung that area. The front yard variance that we are requesting is for the construction of a porch with steps. The first floor door needs steps to get out of. We need to construct steps to get down to grade. That is the reason for the front yard variance.

Mr. Prager: Is he going to live here or is he going to rent it?

Mr. Morris: I am not sure of his intentions.

Mr. Prager: I see there is a shed that is going to be removed. It looks like the septic system is already in there.

Mr. Johnston: There is a conflict between this map and this map regarding the septic tank.

Mr. Morris: This is the existing and this is the proposed and that is the dry well. (Reviewing map with board members)

Mr. Prager: We will have a site inspection.

Mr. Galotti: The actual footprint is the same?

- Mr. Morris: Yes, with the exception of the front steps. I believe there was something there previously but I don't have any dimensions of that.
- Mr. Casella: Where is the fill for that? Is it in the back of the property?
- Mr. Morris: I believe when he excavated for the foundation he pushed it up in that area.
- Mr. Prager: Barbara, do we have any record of the old house?
- Mrs. Roberti: In the assessor's record and from what I can remember the original owner John Paul had taken out a permit to repair the existing foundation walls. While he was out there repairing it, I was told the house collapsed. He proceeded to go ahead and put in the foundation with the thought he had a permit to fix the foundation wall not to start a new house. That is where it was stopped and they had to come in with a whole new plot plan for a new house. It is no longer the repair of an old existing house it is now a new home.
- Mr. Prager: Jason do you know if this is exactly the same footprint? Do we have a record of the last footprint?
- Mr. Morris: It does follow the footprint.
- Mrs. Roberti: These are the records from the assessor's office and it shows the jog. It doesn't show anything over it. This is the footprint by which it was taxed.
- Mr. Prager: I would like a copy of that.
- Ms. Roberti: It is in your variance application. The original house was 1176 square feet according to the assessor's records and the new house is 1287 square feet.
- Mr. Horan: In some respects the other variance corner is further away. The other corner is 18 feet.
- Mr. Morris: The other corner is more of a violation.
- Mr. Horan: The other corner doesn't matter a whole lot.

- Mr. Casella: Was this a short sale because they only paid \$10,000 for the property.
- Mr. Morris: I don't know.
- Mr. Casella: They only paid \$10,000 and back taxes. How did they manage to buy that for that price?
- Mrs. Roberti: It was probably a foreclosure. It might have been in auction.
- Mr. Prager: We will have a site visit and have a Public Hearing at the next meeting on March 12th. Please mark the property lines.
- Mr. Prager: Can I have a motion to adjourn this meeting?**
- Mr. Galotti: I make a motion to adjourn this meeting.**
- Mr. Johnston: Second.**
- Mr. Prager: All in favor?**
- Board: Aye.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Sue Rose, Secretary
Zoning Board of Appeals