

November 7, 2013
7:15 PM

Petition #462

Mazur, Paul Jr.
Boston Colden Road

PRESENT: Kathy Praczkajlo Acting Interim Chairman
Tracy Hirsch
Beverly Kent
Bethany Pryor

ABSENT: Dennis Mead

ALSO PRESENT: Kelly Vacco Deputy Town Attorney
William Ferguson Code Enforcement Officer
Thelma Faulring Secretary to the Boards and Committees
Paul Mazur, Jr. Applicant – 7443 Boston Colden Road
Paul Mazur, Sr. 9245 Cole Road
(Allithea Killeen Attorney for Mazur – not on sign-in list)
Dennis Lindell 7556 Boston Colden Road
Joanne Lindell 7556 Boston Colden Road

Mrs. Praczkajlo called the meeting to order at 7:15 PM; read the Public Hearing notice and Town Engineer report:

- This action will not have significant impact of the environment
- The action is not subject to review under Part 617
- No further action with respect to SEQRA is necessary or recommended

Mrs. Praczkajlo asked the applicant to come forward and state his reasons for requesting the variance.

Mr. Mazur: I like to build a run in shed for horses. I bought two acres of property because that's what I thought I had to do and evidently that's not what I had to do.

Allithea Killeen: I'm here with Mr. Mazur. The deeds fell behind in the recording, the applications and I just wanted the Board members to know that the initial deed of four acres has been supplemented and with an additional two acres. It's a three sided run in shed that is the subject of the 384 square feet application. It is no longer on the flank or parcel that was definition of the law when the variance was granted in 2009, it is now six acres and Mr. Mazur has pastured the additional acreage and at the back of the property built a three sided protection shed for the animals to get in out of the ...it's not a full enclosed barn.

Mr. Hirsch: So you have a building that has already been constructed?

Mrs. Killeen: Yes.

Mr. Hirsch: So you're coming here for an application for the building?

Mrs. Killeen: We're coming here for an application for a building...

Mr. Hirsch: That's already constructed...

Mrs. Killeen: Because my client didn't realize that a run in shed required a Building Permit and for that he's apologetic obviously. But now we've started anew, the deed was recorded because the property transaction was subject to a land contract that took almost a year to make a payment and close out. But I submitted the deeds as recorded and the RP Affidavits so to join the SBL #'s onto a single lot, only in the last some weeks.

Mr. Hirsch: Mrs. Vacco would comment on that?

Mrs. Vacco: That fact that it is now a different parcel doesn't change the fact that it is still in violation of the Code because it's 5+ acreage, 2500 square foot maximum building, so it would require a variance regardless of the building that's already on there.

Mrs. Killeen: Absolutely and that's why Mr. Mazur has filled out the application for variance.

Mrs. Vacco: The fact that the deed is back logged – that's not a problem for this Board.

Mrs. Killeen: I only explain it because Mr. Mazur was aware that his variance was limited to the four acres, when he bought the additional two acres and put this barn on the two acres, he wasn't knowingly or actually in violation of the variance that this Board generously granted in 2009. This is, if you will, a separate piece of property.

Mr. Hirsch: We still have another accessory building though.

Mrs. Killeen: Absolutely, which needs a variance, yes.

Mrs. Vacco: For purposes of this application it is the piece of property that currently, the SBL# will be the one that currently houses the 4000 square foot building.

Mr. Killeen: It will be because we've made a request to join the parcels under a single SBL#.

Mr. Hirsch: Is there anyone else that wants to speak relative to that?

Mrs. Vacco: If this Board decides, determines that a variance should be approved now you have an additional accessory building on one parcel with no principal building there.

Mrs. Killeen: Actually, the rest of Mr. Mazur's property in across the road and the County has now changed its rulings About SBL#'s you can't extend under current 2010, you can't extend SBL#'s across the road. However there were on two different occasions the RP Affidavits were missed; they weren't recorded here in the Town so there was a gap in the recording. I'm working with the Town assessor...we realize the initial combined deed was actually filed before the law changed in 2009; so now we have an application no longer in the Town of Boston it's now in the County to have a single parcel, a single SBL# so there will be a primary residence and a barn and a small structure that we're now asking for a variance.

Mrs. Vacco: Regardless the principle building being there, that's why you came here originally and that variance was granted. But under the Town Code Section 123-125 you cannot have two accessory buildings on one single property and if the ZBA determines that a variance was proper in this case you still have to go to the Town Board and get permission for the second accessory building.

Mrs. Killeen: We're aware of that. Absolutely. I said that about the SBL's because of the primary building..

Mr. Hirsch: It's going to be three accessory buildings if they combine them.

Mr. Hirsch: There was some mention about the Right to Farm. Are there any questions that you had relative to that, that needed to be clarified because that was brought up in the letter?

Mr. Mazur: Well I was under the impression that Boston was a Right to Farm town. So that's why I put the building up. It was \$3,000.00 building which now with the property I have \$20,000.00 spent and I'm no farther ahead with you than I was when I started. Do you see what I'm saying? I tried to rectify the problem by buying additional acreage which wasn't explained to me from Mr. Ferguson the last time I was here.

Mrs. Vacco: Right to Farm, Boston is a Right to Farm community but the Right to Farm statute allows agriculture to flourish and not be hindered; so what that does is give duties and responsibilities to the Town Boards within the municipality to under the Right to Farm statute make the least obstructive property to operate. You still have to go through the permit process...

Mr. Mazur: I understand that.

Mrs. Vacco: So the permit would have had to been acquired anyway and then we would apply the different criteria, we have to do so under the Right to Farm statute in the least obtrusive way possible.

Mrs. Killeen: With respect to Right to Farm there, and as a neighbor I'm in favor of the application because if this does not go through I will get his two cows on my farm, and I don't want two more cows.

Mrs. Prackajlo: Is there anyone else that has anything to say? If not then I will close the Public Hearing and ask for a motion.

Mr. Hirsch: I will make a motion to table at this time so that we have a chance to take a look into it a little bit more.

Mrs. Kent: I'll second that motion

Secretary Faulring: The motion is to table:

Mr. Hirsch	yes	Mrs. Kent	yes
Ms. Pryor	yes	Mrs. Prackajlo	yes

Mr. Mazur asked that the Public Hearing be set for the spring as he will be leaving for Florida the day after Thanksgiving and not returning until spring.

Mrs. Prackajlo: Will that be satisfactory with you?

Mr. Mazur: Yes.

Mrs. Prackajlo: Just contact the secretary and let us know when you're back.

Katharine Prackajlo, Acting Interim Chairman

Dated: November 7, 2013

November 7, 2013
7:30 PM

Petition #463

Pelkey, Keith & Debra
Vacant – Boston State Road

PRESENT: Kathy Prackajlo Acting Interim Chairman
Tracy Hirsch
Beverly Kent
Bethany Pryor

ABSENT: Dennis Mead

ALSO Kelly Vacco Deputy Town Attorney
PRESENT: William Ferguson Code Enforcement Officer
Thelma Faulring Secretary to the Boards and Committees
Keith Pelkey Applicant – 9124 Boston State Road
Debra Pelkey Applicant – 9124 Boston State Road

Mrs. Prackajlo called the meeting to order at 7:30 PM; read the Public Hearing notice and Town Engineer report:

- This action will not have significant impact of the environment
- The action is not subject to review under Part 617
- No further action with respect to SEQRA is necessary or recommended

Mrs. Prackajlo read a letter for Dr. & Mrs. Paul Ziarnowski who did not oppose the variance being granted.

Mrs. Prackajlo asked the applicant to come forward and state his reasons for requesting the variance.

Keith Pelkey – 9124 Boston State Road

- Had a fire in the existing building, lost the top two floors
- Decided not to replace the to the height that it originally was
- I want a place for my woodworking hobby and antiques cars

Mr. Hirsch: Where is the principal building?

Mr. Pelkey: It's right next door; I own the house next door.

Mr. Hirsch: On the same lot?

Mr. Pelkey: No they're two separate lots. Where I want to put this building I own free and clear and I obviously don't want to join it with the house with a mortgage, because who wants to give to the bank.

Mrs. Prackajlo: What's the house number?

Mr. Pelkey: 9124.

Mrs. Prackajlo: The accessory building will be on the vacant lot next to 9124?

Mr. Pelkey: Yes.

Ms. Pryor: How close to the house would it be?

Mr. Pelkey: About 300 feet away, 200, 300 feet away.

Ms. Pryor: In the back?

Mr. Pelkey: It sets in back it's 75 feet back from the road.

Mr. Hirsch: So that's the reason you're not joining them together, the bank?

Mr. Pelkey: Yes because I own that one free and clear and I don't to join that with the house with the mortgage.

Mrs. Kent: Just to clarify the two properties are adjoining each other right?

Mr. Pelkey: Right. The driveway to my house comes across this land.

Mr. Hirsch: What is the future intent of the rest of the property?

Mr. Pelkey: When I pay the mortgage off on my house we plan on joining the two properties together then, that might be ten twelve years off. The reason we bought the lot was that we were going to build a home on it, then old turkey farm went up for sale and I bought that and now am trying to restore that, it was ready for the wrecking ball. So that's when we decided not to build the house on the lot.

Mr. Hirsch: Part of it is that once that building is up that parcel could be sold independently with the accessory building on it. And then we have another piece of property in town with an accessory building on it and no primary residence on it.. So that's part of the reason that it helps to have the accessory on the same parcel.

Mrs. Praczkajlo: Do you need 1200 square feet?

Mr. Pelkey: We lost more than that in the other building. We probably had about 2200 square feet in the upper floors that we lost.

Mrs. Vacco: Situations in the past have significantly different from this as it refers to the accessory building;

Ms. Pryor: Stipulations?

Mrs. Vacco: I believe the conditions are significant enough and different enough than other applications that have become before you, but that is up to you.

Mrs. Praczkajlo: Are there any other questions from the members?

There were none.

Mrs. Praczkajlo: Is there anyone else that would like to speak for or against the application?

Mrs. Praczkajlo: Being none, I will close the public comment portion (4:40 PM) of the Public Hearing and ask for a motion.

Mrs. Kent: I'll make the motion to approve the variance

Mrs. Praczkajlo: Are you making a motion for both variances? There are two variance requests – the accessory prior to principal and excessive square footage.

Mrs. Kent: Yes for both.

- :
- | | | | |
|--|-----|----|---|
| (1) Does it create an undesirable change to the character of the neighborhood? | Yes | No | X |
| (2) Can the benefit sought by the applicant be achieved if the variance is not granted? | Yes | No | X |
| (3) Is the requested variance substantial? | Yes | No | X |
| (4) Will the variance have an adverse effect/impact on the physical or environmental conditions of the neighborhood? | Yes | No | X |
| (5) Is the alleged difficulty self-created? | Yes | No | X |

Ms. Pryor: I'll second it.

Secretary Faulring: The motion is to approve the accessory building prior to a principal building and 360 square feet:

Mr. Hirsch	yes
Mrs. Kent	yes
Ms. Pryor	yes
Mrs. Praczkajlo	yes

Katharine Praczkajlo, Acting Interim Chairman

Dated: November 7, 2013

November 7, 2013
7:45 PM

Petition #464

Rejewski, Martin & Charleen
8424 Back Creek Road

PRESENT: Kathy Prackajlo Acting Interim Chairman
Tracy Hirsch
Beverly Kent
Bethany Pryor

ABSENT: Dennis Mead

ALSO Kelly Vacco Deputy Town Attorney
PRESENT: William Ferguson Code Enforcement Officer
Thelma Faulring Secretary to the Boards and Committees
Martin Rejewski Applicant – 8424 Back Creek Road
(David Cahn Back Creek Road not on sign in sheet)

Mrs. Prackajlo called the meeting to order at 7:45 PM; read the Public Hearing notice and Town Engineer report:

- The action is not subject to review under Part 617
- No further action with respect to SEQRA is necessary or recommended

Mrs. Prackajlo asked the applicant to come forward and state his reasons for requesting the variance.

Martin Rejewski – applicant

- Just proposing to build a utility building
- Level with the front of the existing house to the road

Mrs. Prackajlo: Is that to the left of the driveway?

Mr. Rejewski: Yes.

Mr. Hirsch: Due to the terrain is this the best spot?

Mr. Rejewski: About the only spot.

Mrs. Prackajlo: Is there anyone else that would like to speak for or against?

David Cahn – 8452 Back Creek Road

- I just wanted to know what the use is going to be; what is going to be stored in there

Mr. Rejewski: Storage of basically farm equipment, things that I have – everything.

Mr. Cahn: When you say farm equipment what heavy construction equipment, what?

Mr. Rejewski: Tractors, grader boxes, 4 by 4's, I have all sorts of stuff.

Mr. Hirsch: That is a good question because in the past what we've seen is an accessory building going up to a contractor and then what happens is a lot of the equipment doesn't wind up in the building, it ends up around the accessory building and it keeps increasing and we end up with dumpsters and a lot of construction equipment in lieu of farm equipment, so I think what the gentleman asks is a good question and I think that the Board really needs to get a good idea of whether all the equipment whether it be construction or farm is going into the building or its' going to be all around the building.

Mr. Rejewski: Absolutely not around the building. I don't a messy look to the neighborhood or my property, I don't want a junk yard look, I want to keep it all clean and that's why the building.

Mr. Hirsch: So basically whatever you have is going in the building?

Mr. Rejewski: Right, anything else won't be visible from the road, because there's just not enough space down there for that purpose.

Mrs. Prackajlo: Where is this stuff now?

Mr. Rejewski: I don't have the stuff at the property at the moment, it's stored somewhere else.

Mr. Cahn: How large is the structure?

Mr. Rejewski: 36 by 40.

Mr. Cahn: That would limit that size of equipment that would go in there.

Mr. Cahn: How are going to get back in there?

Mr. Rejewski: The main driveway will service the house and the garage. I don't own large equipment; I'm a residential contractor, carpenter by trade so I don't own large equipment, only small equipment, but I do have tractors and stuff for the property because I do have 30+ acres.

Discussion continued between Mr. Cahn and Mr. Rejewski not relative to the application.

Mrs. Praczkajlo: Is there anyone else? No, then I'll close the Public Hearing (7:53 PM) and ask for a motion.

Mr. Hirsch: I'll make a motion to approve the variance with the stipulation that all equipment is to be stored inside the building, otherwise come back for a larger building or an addition to it; but all equipment is to be inside the building.

- | | | | |
|--|-----|----|---|
| (1) Does it create an undesirable change to the character of the neighborhood? | Yes | No | X |
| (2) Can the benefit sought by the applicant be achieved if the variance is not granted? | Yes | No | X |
| (3) Is the requested variance substantial? | Yes | No | X |
| (4) Will the variance have an adverse effect/impact on the physical or environmental conditions of the neighborhood? | Yes | No | X |
| (5) Is the alleged difficulty self-created? | Yes | No | X |

Mrs. Praczkajlo: I'll second.

Secretary Faulring: Motion to approve the variance request:

Mr. Hirsch	yes
Mrs. Kent	yes
Ms. Pryor	yes
Mrs. Praczkajlo	yes

Katharine Praczkajlo, Acting Interim Chairman

Dated: November 7, 2013

November 7, 2013
7:55 PM

Petition #465

Blizniak, Robert & Czora, Sandra
8812 Cole Road

PRESENT: Kathy Prackajlo Acting Interim Chairman
Tracy Hirsch
Beverly Kent
Bethany Pryor

ABSENT: Dennis Mead

ALSO PRESENT: Kelly Vacco Deputy Town Attorney
William Ferguson Code Enforcement Officer
Thelma Faulring Secretary to the Boards and Committees
Sandra Blizniak Applicant – 8812 Cole Road
Robert Blizniak Applicant – 8812 Cole Road
Phyllis Decker 8859 Cole Road
Barry Decker 8859 Cole Road
Bob Zahm 8809 Cole Road
(Terry Spors 8824 Cole Road – not on sign-in list)

Mrs. Prackajlo called the meeting to order at 7:55 PM; read the Public Hearing notice and Town Engineer report:

- This action will not have significant impact of the environment
- The action is not subject to review under Part 617
- No further action with respect to SEQRA is necessary or recommended

Mrs. Prackajlo asked the applicant to come forward and state his reasons for requesting the variance.

Robert Blizniak:

- I have a piece of information that you may not have
 - This is a letter in support of my variance request from Bill Ferguson, the code Enforcement Officer
 - I received this on November 1st
 - This is a number of violations of the Boston Town Code that was sent to the Spors who are, just happen to be our neighbor
 - Our front yard is their back yard so it's kind of a unique situation

Mrs. Vacco: Is it an actual letter where he is supporting the...

Mr. Blizniak: No, he sent this to the people...

Mrs. Vacco: Then that's a little bit different, but you can submit to the...

Mr. Blizniak brought the letter forward and gave it to Mrs. Prackajlo.

Mr. Blizniak: You have a copy of the survey in front of you?

Mr. Hirsch: Yes we do.

Mr. Blizniak: If you look and see, unfortunately for me and my wife, our neighbor in front of us, their backyard is our front yard; and if they wanted to put up a privacy fence that was six feet high, they could do that and that would be our front yard fence. So I looked at the Code and the Code six feet high from the rear of the house, across the back lot and up; that's what we want to do, we want to duplicate that, we want to put up the fence for them that they could put up. They can put up a fence that is six feet high, but according to the Code we can't, but that's our front yard and they wouldn't be in here looking for a variance, they could just do it. And that's all we're asking to do is duplicate the footprint of the fence that they could put up, so it would be six feet from the rear of their house, and four feet to the front, just like...it's a beautiful fence, it's a \$20,000 fence, it's white vinyl with almond boards, that matches the house and let me tell you something we have been plagued, harassed and haranged by this house and we've had enough. We have to put up a fence.

Mr. Hirsch: How far down Cole Road are you?

Mr. Blizniak: $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile up from Boston Colden Road on the west side of the road.

Mr. Blizniak: There are numerous Code – they are running a business out of there, they have junk yard, it's disgusting and we've had enough of it and I've gone up and talked to these people and they're okay for a couple of days and then they're back to it again, and they get mad at us, they throw stuff down the hill, they brought in and dumped all kinds of crap all over their back yard to make kind of a hill and then what they do is put stuff behind it so you can't see it from the street.

Ms. Czora: And they urinate off of it too.

Mr. Blizniak: They have parties, continual parties up there. The barn that they claim is their barn is actually a residence, junk vehicles, just garbage everywhere. Harassing us continuously. Motor vehicles, four-wheelers, dirt bikes, no mufflers, doing laps around their back yard

(at this point Mr. Blizniak and Ms. Czora were both talking very loudly and at the same time and so neither of their comments were understood)

Mr. Hirsch: Let's move ahead on the variance. It sounds like there is a lot of frustration.

Mr. Blizniak: The fence is going to be beautiful; we don't need to spend \$20,000 on a fence. Also I contracted for a \$5,000 security system with surveillance; we don't know when we come home whether our house is going to be vandalized or whether it's going to be burned to the ground. Already Barney Spors, who is one of the owners of the house, his wife is sitting over there, he – I've had the police over, I've got a report, he destroyed the coach lights on the front of our house, it's just one thing after another, this is protection.

Mrs. Praczkajlo: Have you thought about a natural barrier that would grow higher than a six foot fence? An arborvitae?

Mr. Blizniak: Do you know what they would do to an arborvitae? They would destroy them. Barney Spors has told me that the people before us that owned the house...

Ms. Czora: they killed their trees...

Mr. Blizniak: That what he did was that he spread stuff around the trees to kill some of them.

Mrs. Vacco: That's hearsay.

Mr. Hirsch: Let's go ahead and keep on the subject of the fence.

Mrs. Praczkajlo: Is there anyone else here to speak for or against? And I am going to say that the comments should be directed to the variance.

Bob Zahm – 8809 Cole Road

- I object to granting a variance for a six foot high fence
 - It really doesn't fit the rural characteristics of the neighborhood
- Not objecting to a fence but something more appropriate like a split rail
 - Or a board on post like at 8448 Cole Road
 - Or even a picket fence like the one just installed at 8342 Cole Road
- I don't want to look across the road and see a big high solid fence
 - It's in my view and I pay a lot of taxes for that view
- I do have to admit that the eight or so lights on the front of the house that they refer too are not just distracting or annoying; this summer my daughter visited and couldn't sleep in her bedroom because the lights were so bright; I would like that to stop
- Also I would like to say that in the 26 years that I have lived up on that hill the Spors have been our neighbors and they have been good neighbors
- Barney Spors is not just generous he is benign, he is harmless
- Barney is not what he is being portrayed as
- Thank you

Mr. Blizniak: What about the Police report? He admitted to the police...

Mrs. Vacco: You know what, we're not going to go...

Mr. Zahm: I object to a fence that doesn't

Mrs. Praczkajlo: We're not...

Mr. Hirsch: This neighbor to neighbor thing we have had in the past. The Board takes into consideration comments for the variance. We are not here to settle neighborhood disputes.

Mr. Blizniak: May I respond to him not wanting the fence, and just on the fence itself, if Barney Spors wanted to put up a six foot fence he wouldn't have to apply for a permit he could just do it, and we would have a six foot fence in front of us, so all we're asking to do is what he can do.

Phyllis and Barry Decker – 8859 Cole Road

- Across the street from Barney

- The clarification that I'm looking at says it's a six foot privacy fence and those that shoot up towards the road are those going to be four foot?

Mrs. Decker: What I'm concerned about is our view, we have owned the property there for many, many, many years going back to our family has owned since the early 1900's; we have there ourselves since 1963 long before most of these other people. We enjoy the spot because of the view. There are many fences in the area that are very attractive, as Mr. Zahm pointed out. I don't want a stockade fence, I don't want something that's going to wreck the view, that's my point.

Mr. Decker: Is it going to be six foot all the way around it.

Mrs. Praczkajlo: That's what their asking.

Mr. Blizniak: It will be six foot up to the back of Barney's house.

Mr. Decker: What goes east-west is going to be four foot?

Mr. Blizniak from the audience started to explain the fence.

Mrs. Praczkajlo asked Mr. Blizniak to come forward and explain the fence height(s).

Ms. Czora: It's going to be U-shaped.

Mr. Blizniak: It's going to be six foot back, six feet across, six foot up to the back of Barney's house, then four foot. Exact same thing..

Mr. Hirsch: Where's the four foot?

Mr. Blizniak: The four foot will be from the back of Barney's house to the front to the road. It's a beautiful fence.

Shouted from the audience:

- I don't care
- It's the country, you don't need fences in the country

Mrs. Vacco: Okay, let's get back to order.

Mr. Hirsch: So you're not necessarily as opposed to the height as you are to the type of the fence, correct?

From the audience;

- Both
- I don't want the height because I want to see the sunsets
- And I'd like the type of fence...

Mr. Blizniak interrupted and the rest of the above statement could not be heard.

Mr. Hirsch: Is there anyone else that wants to speak?

Terry Spors -

Arguing started between the applicants and neighbors went on until Mrs. Vacco advised them to sit in the gallery unless you're up at the microphone and have been granted permission to speak or we're going to have ask you to leave.

Terry Spors

- Against the fence being six foot high
- I have a right to a view also
- Do think that it would impact the environment
- Also the wildlife
- It would also affect the snow accumulation

Mrs. Praczkajlo closed the public comment portion of the public hearing at 8:10 PM.

Mrs. Kent asked to see the copy of the violations that was sent.

Mrs. Praczkajlo made a motion to table a decision and suggested that the neighbors get together and discuss this.

Mr. Blizniak: That's not going to happen. We've been trying for five years since we've been there and it's just not the way that it should and so save everybody a lot of aggravation, first of all it is not going to block the Decker's view, because the barn is here of the people in front of us, the fence is going to go here, it's going up...as far as Bob Zahm is concerned - exact same deal, if you go up on Cole Road Bob Zahm has this big red barn off to the side of his house, right near the road, he can't see anything anyway because his house is in back.

Mr. Hirsch: Here's the thing we can't determine as a Board, we listen to each person and if one says that they can't see, then they can't see, if somebody says I'm for it, then they're for it. Everybody is entitled to their own opinion. All we can do is weigh everybody's opinion and try to do the best that we can.

Mrs. Vacco: At this time there is a motion to table, either that has to be seconded, approved or another motion has to be made.

Mr. Hirsch: I second it.

Mr. Blizniak: May I say one more thing.

Mrs. Vacco: The public portion of Hearing has been closed, there is a motion on the table and it has been seconded.

Secretary Faulring: The motion is to table:

Mr. Hirsch	yes
Mrs. Kent	no
Ms. Pryor	yes
Mrs. Prackajlo	yes

Mr. Hirsch: It's tabled for now.

Secretary Faulring: Are we setting a date for the next hearing?

Mrs. Vacco: It tabled until the next meeting unless you set a different date as we did in the last one, because he is going to be out of town. So it's automatically table until the next time the Board meets, whether that's in December or whenever there is another new petition. And you will notified when that meeting.

Mrs. Vacco explained further that the next public hearing for this petition will be scheduled for the same evening when the next new petition is received.

Mrs. Prackajlo: I make a motion to adjourn for this evening.

Mr. Hirsch: I second.

Katharine Prackajlo, Acting Interim Chairman

Dated: November 7, 2013

Please Note: Following adjournment Mrs. Vacco and Mrs. Kent both stated that they would not be available for a December 5, 2013 meeting.