

Date Filed/Village Clerk:

Item #3 146, 150, 160 Main St. 233 Midland Avenue

Mr. Null, attorney for the applicant indicated that there have been no changes to the plans since the last meeting.

Chairman Gallo motioned to re-open the public hearing, was seconded by Member DiSalvo and unanimously carried by the Board.

No Public Comments

Member Alfasi motioned to close the public hearing was seconded by Member DiSalvo and unanimously carried by the Board.

Frank Fish, Village Consultant noted that his May 21 memo included a review of studies conducted by the International Engineers Association on parking ratios in low-rise apartment buildings throughout the U.S. The ratio for this development is acceptable according to the International Engineers Association. This applicant offers 177 parking spaces for 108 units, which is a 1.6 ratio. The Crestwood project is all studios; their ratio is 1.25, which is reasonable with studios. The 100 Main St. project offers a ratio of 1.83 spaces per unit, which include two-bedroom units. It was Mr. Fish's conclusion that this application offers a ratio that should be sufficient parking.

The ITE studied over 70 different sites throughout the U.S. It gives a conservative view of low-rise apartments with a distribution mix.

Chairman Gallo stated that under the current code, a five bedroom home requires only two parking spaces. The size of the applicant's variance is not substantial.

Mr. Raffiani indicated that his property on 110 Main Street is fully occupied and has 6- two bedroom units and 8- one-bedroom units. He provided two parking spaces per unit as per the code requirement and he has never needed more than 16 parking spaces. He has under a 2% vacancy rate. It was his experience that the demand for parking spaces is a ratio of 1.15.

Mr. Fish cited the Town of Mamaroneck as an example. They changed their zoning code to allow one parking space per studio, 1.25 ratio for one-bedroom apartments and 1.5 ratio for two-bedroom apartments. The Glenmark project would exceed the requirements for the Town of Mamaroneck ratio for parking. The parking requirement in the Village of Tuckahoe's code has to be updated by the number of bedrooms.

Chairman Gallo noted that it is important to look at other municipalities to research how they are dealing with these issues.

Member Palladino asked if Larchmont and Mamaroneck were as densely populated as Tuckahoe. Mr. Fish noted that there are 6-story buildings close to the train station. It was his opinion that they were slightly denser than Tuckahoe in the vicinity of the train station.

Chairman Gallo introduced and welcomed, David Scalzo, a new ad hoc member to the Zoning Board. Mr. Scalzo has been a resident of Tuckahoe since 2002.

Member DiSalvo offered A RESOLUTION DECLARING A NEGATIVE DECLARATION UNDER THE STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW ACT AS IT CONCERNS CERTAIN AREA VARIANCES FOR THE PREMISES 150 AND 160 MAIN STREET AND 233 MIDLAND AVENUE, TUCKAHOE, NEW YORK

At a regular meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Village of Tuckahoe, New York (the "Zoning Board") held at Village Hall, 65 Main Street, Tuckahoe, New York on June 13, 2012.

WHEREAS, the Zoning Board of the Village of Tuckahoe is considering the grant of certain area variances for the premises commonly known as 150 and 160 Main Street and 233 Midland Avenue, Tuckahoe, New York; and

WHEREAS, the project consists of the development of the site with residential and mixed-use buildings consisting of 108 residential units (plus two units for 146 Main Street) and 3,500 square feet of commercial space with 188 off-street parking spaces; and

WHEREAS, based on the Environmental Assessment Form ("EAF"), submitted by the Applicant, and any supplemental materials thereto, the Zoning Board has determined that there will be no significant environmental impacts from this action as it concerns the proposed Project.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED

Section 1. Based on the information included in the EAF, submitted by the Applicant, and any supplemental materials thereto and the criteria contained in the State Environmental Quality Review Act and its implementing regulations, the Zoning Board hereby adopts the attached Negative Declaration for this Unlisted Action under the State Environmental Quality Review Act.

Section 2. That this resolution shall take effect immediately.

Member Alfasi seconded the motion and was carried with a vote of 5 – 0.

Chairman Gallo offered the following Resolution as a motion: In the matter of the Application of Midora Corp./Glenmark Property, LLC, 150 and 160 Main Street and 233 Midland Ave. Tuckahoe, New York

Background and Findings of Fact

The Applicant is the record owner of the premises commonly known as 150 and 160 Main Street and 233 Midland Avenue, Tuckahoe, New York, and known on the tax map of the Village of Tuckahoe (the "Village") as Section 29, Block 4, Lots 1, 3-8, 13, 17, 33, 36, 39 and 40 and Section 29, Block 9, Lot 1 (the "Premises"). The

Premises is located within the Business/Residential zoning district and consists of approximately 2.26 acres of land, which is located on the south side of Main Street nearby to one of the gateways to the Village.

Prior Approvals

On March 28, 2008, this Zoning Board of Appeals (the “Zoning Board”) granted a Special Use Permit and certain area variances so the Premises may be developed with four buildings that would improve the Premises with two live/work loft units at 146 Main Street; commercial space and 18 residential units at 150 Main Street; and 70 residential units at 160 Main Street and 233 Midland Avenue (hereinafter referred to as the “Prior Project”). In connection with the Applicant’s then proposal, it sought area variances, a Special Use Permit and approval to park off-site, which was granted by the Zoning Board.

On April 14, 2010, this Zoning Board by way of a Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision filed with the Village Clerk on April 15, 2010 extended for a two-year period the Special Use Permit and area variances then granted to the Applicant.

On April 25, 2012, this Zoning Board again extended the Special Use Permit and area variances that were granted to the Applicant through and including April 24, 2013. On April 25, 2012, the Applicant was also granted an area variance to permit residential uses on the ground floor in the Business/Residential zoning district.

Specifically, the previous approvals granted for this Project by the Zoning Board (the “Prior Approvals”) were:

1. A Special Use Permit to allow residential units in the BR district; and
2. An area variance for an additional story; and
3. An area variance for an increase in the allowable FAR from 1.2 to 1.48; and
4. An area variance to exceed the height limitation from 42 feet to 43 feet, 9 inches; and
5. To permit parking on an adjacent lot having a similar owner; and
6. An area variance permitting residential uses on the ground floor in the Business/Residential zoning district.

The Current Application

The present application seeks to develop the Premises with 108 residential units and 3,500 square feet of commercial space. This development would consist of three buildings and would share off-street parking provided in a combination of service parking lots and a parking structure integrated into the design of two of the buildings and accessed off Midland Place. The parcel east of Midland Place would be developed with two buildings, 233 Midland Avenue and 160 Main Street. The parcel west of Midland Place would be developed with one building on the site of the former industrial building at 150 Main Street. The Project, as revised, would consist of a total of 108 dwelling units (plus two units for 146 Main Street), 3,500 square feet of commercial space and 188 off-street parking spaces.

233 Midland Avenue would be a three story apartment building containing approximately 27 dwelling units with the address of 233 Midland Avenue. Pedestrian access would be from Midland Avenue with vehicular access from Midland Place. Residents parking their cars in the parking structure would have direct access from the parking structure into 233 Midland Avenue. 160 Main Street would be a four story residential apartment building containing 51 dwelling units with an address of 160 Main Street. Pedestrian and vehicular access would be from Midland Place with parking provided in a 138 space parking structure. The parking structure would include one level of above-ground parking and one level of below-ground parking. 150 Main Street would be a three story apartment building containing 30 dwelling units and approximately 3,500 square feet of commercial use in the ground floor fronting on Main Street. Off-street parking would be provided in an at-grade parking area (19 spaces) and below the building (31 spaces) would be accessed off Midland Place.

In connection with the development of the Project as an 108 residential unit project with 3,500 square feet of commercial space, the Applicant seeks an additional three area variances from this Zoning Board of Appeals as described herein. The 150 Main Street building will have three stories facing Main Street and its height will not exceed the 42-foot height limitation. However, along Midland Place, the residential portion of the building will have a portion that rises to four stories but no more than 42 feet in height. This proposal requires an area variance for the additional fourth story. An area variance is being sought from Section 4-5.3.3 and Section 4-6.4 of the Zoning Code of the Village of Tuckahoe (the "Zoning Code"). At 150 Main Street, 160 Main Street and 233 Midland Avenue, the development is proposed to be 108 residential dwelling units with 3,500 square feet of commercial space, for which 234 parking spaces would otherwise be required. The Applicant has proposed a number of parking spaces that would comply with the Institute of Traffic Engineers for this development that would be sufficient to meet the parking demands of this Project. That number of parking spaces is 188 parking spaces. Thus, the Applicant seeks an area variance from Section 5-1.2.1.4 to reduce the number of parking spaces by 46 parking spaces from 234 parking spaces to 188 parking spaces. The Applicant also seeks an additional area variance to reduce the size of the parking space length. Under the Zoning Code, it is required that all parking spaces be 9-feet by 20-feet. Rather, the Applicant proposes parking stalls measuring 9-feet by 18-feet. This proposal would require an area variance from Section 5-1.2.1.5(e) of the Zoning Code.

In connection with the area variances sought and pursuant to Section 7-1.4 of the Zoning Code, the Applicant appeared before the Planning Board. At that time, the Applicant indicated that with reference to 150 Main Street, it would be seeking an area variance to exceed the number of stories where along Midland Place, the

residential portion of the building will have a portion that rises to four stories, which requires an area variance for this additional story. The Applicant explained that its area variance was sought under Section 4-5.3.3 and Section 4-6.4 of the Zoning Code. Moreover, the Applicant further explained to the Planning Board that the Project now proposes 108 dwelling units (plus two units for 146 Main Street) with 3,500 square feet of commercial space for which 234 parking spaces would be required. The Applicant proposed a plan of 188 parking spaces, which is a 46 parking space reduction from that required by Section 5-1.2.1.4 of the Zoning Code. Finally, the Applicant further explained before the Planning Board that under the Zoning Code at Section 5-1.2.1.5(e), it is required that parking spaces be 9-feet by 20-feet in size. However, the Applicant proposes a parking space reduction for its parking stalls that measures 9-feet by 18-feet. The Planning Board made a preliminary review of the application as required by Section 7-1.4(d)(3) and referred the application to the Zoning Board with respect to the area variances. In connection with the referral to the Zoning Board, the Planning Board issued a positive recommendation with respect to the variances sought. The Planning Board found that the benefits to the Applicant outweigh the detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the surrounding community as it concerned the application. The Planning Board finally noted that, with respect to the parking space size variance, the parking aisle should be at least 24 feet wide and the overall parking bay should be at least 60 feet wide.

Conclusions of Law

In granting an area variance, the Zoning Board must consider the following five factors in drawing a conclusion from its analysis:

1. Whether an undesirable change would be produced in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties?
2. Whether the benefit sought by application can be achieved by a feasible alternative to the variance?
3. Whether the requested variances are substantial?
4. Would the variances have an adverse impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood?
5. Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created?

When considering the above factors, the Zoning Board must determine whether the benefit to the Applicant outweighs the detriments to the health, safety and welfare of the adjacent and greater neighborhood and/or community. After applying the above five factor test to this Application, the Zoning Board has resolved to grant this Application because the Applicant's proposal satisfies the above analysis. In considering the nature and scope of the Applicant's proposal, the Zoning Board has concluded that the grant of the variances sought herein will not have appreciable negative impacts on adjacent lots or those in the greater community.

1. *Whether An Undesirable Change Would Be Produced In The Character Of The Neighborhood Or A Detriment To Nearby Properties?*

As this application is concerned, the Applicant seeks a parking space variance reducing the required number of parking spaces from 234 parking spaces to 188 parking spaces; a 46 parking space reduction. In connection with this particular area variance, this Zoning Board finds that the reduction in the number of parking spaces from 234 to 188 would not have an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties. According to certain memorandum submitted by BFJ Planning, the Village's planning consultant, the accepted standard in the field of transportation planning is the ITE Parking Generation Handbook, fourth edition. The table of parking ratios for low or mid-rise apartments indicates an 85th percentile, with 1.61 parking spaces per unit. The 85th percentile is the goal for any parking lot and is the standard "designed to" level. BFJ Planning concluded that with 108 residential units (plus two for 146 Main Street) and 177 residential parking spaces, the parking ratio for the Project would be 1.63. A ratio of 1.61 is, in fact, the 85th percentile for low or mid-rise apartments. BFJ Planning concluded that, under the circumstances, the request for the parking variance was reasonable.

Based on the submissions by BFJ Planning and a finding that the sought-after area variance was reasonable, this Zoning Board concludes that undesirable changes would not be produced in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties. This Zoning Board has weighed the parking considerations offered by the Applicant, and on this record, finds that detrimental negative effects would not be produced as this area variance is concerned.

With respect to the area variance sought for number of stories, it is important to point out that the proposed building at 150 Main Street would comply with the 42 foot height requirement. The building will only have three stories facing Main Street and its height will not exceed 42 feet. However, along Midland Place, the residential portion of the building will have a portion that rises to four stories but no more than 42 feet in height, thus triggering the requirement for the area variance sought herein. Bearing in mind that this Project was given a previous area variance for number of stories, from three to four, this Zoning Board finds that, based on the fact that the height requirement is being complied with and only a portion of the building will rise to four stories, that a undesirable change will not be produced in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties.

Finally, as the area variance sought for parking space size is concerned, the Applicant seeks to decrease the parking space length size from 9-feet by 20-feet to 9-feet by 18-feet. Similar to other prior applications, BFJ Planning has recommended that a parking space size of 9-feet by 18-feet is sufficient to meet the parking space size for vehicles to be parked at the Project. In fact, BFJ Planning recommended to the Village Board of Trustees that the Zoning Code be amended and modified to reflect that the parking space size be only 9-feet by 18-feet as compared to

June 13, 2012

9-feet by 20-feet. Based on the foregoing, this Zoning Board finds that reduction of the parking space size to 9-feet by 18-feet would not produce an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties.

2. *Whether The Benefits Sought By the Applicants Can Be Achieved By A Feasible Alternative to the Variances?*

As the number of parking spaces is concerned, the Applicant always has the option of reducing the number of units, thus reducing its parking demands. However, BFJ Planning has found that the proposed 188 parking spaces would be sufficient to meet the demands of the 108 proposed residential units along with the commercial space. It is important to point out that as the 108 dwelling units are concerned, no more than 54 units will be 2-bedroom units and there will be no 3-bedroom units provided on site, thus reducing the demands for two parking spaces per unit. At a ratio of 1.61, BFJ Planning found that the parking demands would be met and satisfied with the proposed 188 off-street parking spaces. As this Project is concerned, it appears that no feasible alternative exists for the Applicant because the economic feasibility of the Project is based on a development of 108 residential units. It is also important to point out that, based on the Article 78 Proceeding commenced by certain opponents of the Project, the Applicant agreed by way of a stipulation of settlement to provide for a development of no more than 108 dwelling units.

With respect to the number of stories variance, it is important to note that only a portion of the 150 Main Street building will rise to a level of four stories. Staying within the 42 foot height requirement, this Zoning Board finds that a feasible alternative does not exist for the variance sought for number of stories in that the number of stories variance allows the Applicant to meet its design goals and unit requirement to provide for the Project's economic feasibility.

Finally, with respect to parking space size, in order to design the Project with 188 off-street parking spaces, the parking space size would need to be reduced from 9-feet by 20-feet to 9-feet by 18-feet. As such, no feasible alternative exists for the parking space size variance absent the granting of the instant variance.

3. *Whether The Requested Variances Are Substantial?*

The reduction in the number of parking spaces from 234 to 188 (a 46 parking space reduction) represents a 19% deviation from the requirements of the Zoning Code. On its face, this variance appears to be a substantial variance but under applicable law, the Zoning Board must take into consideration the context of the Project as a whole and not rely solely on mathematical calculations. With that said, and with the finding that there is sufficient off-street parking for the Project, as found by BFJ Planning, this Zoning Board finds that the requested variance for number of parking spaces is not substantial. The context of the Project must be taken as a whole and expert

June 13, 2012

testimony, uncontested on this record, has concluded that sufficient parking will be provided sufficient to meet the demands of this Project.

With respect to the area variance sought for the number of stories, this deviation represents a 25% deviation from the requirements of the Zoning Code. However, only a portion of the building will rise to four stories at 150 Main Street and the overall height of the building will remain compliant with the 42 foot height limitation. In this context, this Zoning Board finds that the requested variance for number of stories is not substantial under the circumstances.

Finally, this Zoning Board finds that the reduction of parking space size from 9-feet by 20-feet to 9-feet by 18-feet represents a *de minimus* decrease in the size of the parking spaces and a substantiality finding is not warranted on this record. BFJ Planning has consistently recommended that parking space size be reduced legislatively from 9-feet by 20-feet to 9-feet by 18-feet. On this record, this Zoning Board finds that the reduction of two feet is not a substantial reduction under the provisions of the Zoning Code.

4. Would The Variances Have An Adverse Impact On The Physical Or Environmental Conditions in the Neighborhood?

The reduction in the number of parking spaces from 234 to 188 would not produce adverse impacts on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood. The traffic study submitted by the Applicant in its Environmental Assessment Form makes no finding that the reduction in the number of parking spaces from 234 to 188 would result in adverse impacts on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood. On this record, there are no other studies or expert submissions to contradict the findings of the Applicant's traffic study.

The requested area variance for number of stories would not create any adverse impacts on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood. Although an increase in one story is being granted so a portion of the 150 Main Street building can be increased to four stories, the 150 Main Street building remains compliant with the 42 foot height limitation set forth in the Zoning Code. As such, adverse impacts on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood would not be produced because a similar building of a similar height having three stories could be erected as of right under the terms of the Zoning Code. The additional one story will not add to any additional height requirements and will not negatively impact the use or aesthetics as it concerns the development of this Project.

Finally, as the parking space size is concerned, a reduction in the size of parking space length from 20-feet to 18-feet will not produce negative environmental impacts in the neighborhood or surrounding community. By reducing the parking space length to 18-feet, the Applicant is able to add more parking spaces on site and reduce the

June 13, 2012

demand, if any, for parking off site. Thus, the reduction in parking space length to 18-feet will better the environmental conditions by providing for more off-street parking spaces.

The Zoning Board has determined that the requested area variances will produce no adverse impacts on the physical or environmental conditions in the surrounding neighborhood such as poor aesthetics, increased traffic congestion, hazardous traffic rerouting, noise pollution, exhaust fumes or noxious odors, increased surface runoff, an increase in impervious surface coverage, poor drainage, sewerage problems, steep slope erosion, or any other negative environmental consequences.

5. *Whether The Alleged Difficulty Was Self-Created?*

While it is possible to construct smaller buildings at the development site, the development goals under this Project will create and contribute to a more uniform pattern of development along the mixed-use corridor in the downtown area of the Village. Moreover, any self-created difficulties arising from or accompanying this Project are not fatal to the application.

Based on the submissions of the Village's planning experts, BFJ Planning, there is a finding that the variance for the number of parking spaces is reasonable and that parking demands will be satisfied for this Project with the development of 188 off-street parking spaces. Arguably, this area variance was self-created because the Applicant can develop a project with a lower number of residential units, thus decreasing its parking demands. The Applicant has represented that at 108 residential units, the Project remains economically feasible and any further reductions may result in the Project not being economically feasible.

With respect to the number of stories variance, the Applicant has proposed a fourth story at the 150 Main Street building. Arguably, this area variance can also be said to be self-created in that the Applicant can reduce the number of units, thus eliminating the fourth story at the 150 Main Street building. However, by reducing the number of units any further, the feasibility of the Project may not be achievable. Thus, the number of stories variance is not fatal to this application.

Moreover, the parking space length variance is arguably self-created in that the Applicant can develop a project with parking space size being 9-feet by 20-feet. However, by an acceptable reduction of parking space size to 9-feet by 18-feet, the Applicant and the Village benefit in that an increased number of off-street parking spaces are provided for, thus decreasing the demands, if any, for on-street parking spaces.

Although the Applicant's area variances can arguably be said to be self-created, this Zoning Board finds that such self-created difficulties are not fatal to this application in that the Applicant has proposed area variances that are reasonable in nature and in conformity with the harmony of the surrounding community and neighborhood.

The above area variances would have no appreciable impacts on the community and would establish consistent precedent for future developers in the area. Thus, this Zoning Board has resolved to grant the area variances sought herein for this Project consistent with the terms and conditions set forth in this Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision.

Conditions

This Zoning Board's grant of the variances herein for the Project are subject to the conditions set forth on Schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof and incorporated by reference herein. This Zoning Board finds that the conditions set forth on Schedule A are reasonable conditions imposed on the Applicant in an effort to make the Project more harmonious with the Village's laws and ordinances, in addition to further reducing a perceived negative environmental impact from the Project. The conditions set forth on Schedule A are applicable to and binding on the Project.

SEQRA

Based on the foregoing, the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Village of Tuckahoe finds and determines that:

1. The action taken herein is an Unlisted Action subject to the requirements of SEQRA.
2. This Zoning Board of Appeals is in possession of all information reasonably necessary to make the determination as to environmental significance of the application for area variances.
3. The action taken herein shall not have any significant impacts upon the environment and declare that a Negative Declaration be adopted with respect to this action.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, it is resolved that the area variances referenced herein are hereby granted to the Applicant subject to the terms and conditions of this Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision. The Applicants and/or interested third parties are notified of their respective rights to appeal this decision or any part thereof in accordance with the New York Civil Practice Law and Rules.

SCHEDULE A

CONDITIONS TO A CERTAIN GRANT OF AREA VARIANCES GRANTED TO MIDORA CORP./GLENMARK PROPERTY, LLC FOR THE PREMISES 150 AND 160 MAIN STREET AND 233 MIDLAND AVENUE, TUCKAHOE, NEW YORK FROM THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS OF THE VILLAGE OF TUCKAHOE

1. In no event shall the number of residential units associated with the Project exceed 108 residential units (plus 2 units for 146 Main Street). In the event the Applicant seeks to increase the number of residential units, such increase shall require the further approval of this Zoning Board of Appeals.
2. In no event shall the commercial/retail space on the ground floor of the Project exceed 3,500 square feet. In the event the Applicant seeks to increase the square footage of the commercial/retail space, such increase shall require the further approval of this Zoning Board of Appeals.
3. In no event shall the number of off-street parking spaces associated with this Project be less than 188 parking spaces. In the event the Applicant seeks to decrease the number of off-street parking spaces to less than 188 parking spaces, such decrease shall require the further approval of this Zoning Board of Appeals.
4. In no event shall the number of stories for the subject portion (along Midland Place) of the 150 Main Street Building exceed four. In event the Applicant seeks to increase the number of stories for the subject portion of the 150 Main Street Building, such increase shall require the further approval of this Zoning Board of Appeals.
5. In no event shall the off-street parking space size be less than 9-feet by 18-feet. In the event the Applicant seeks to decrease the parking space size, such decrease shall require the further approval of this Zoning Board of Appeals.
6. In no event shall the floor area ratio for the Premises and proposed buildings exceed 1.48. In the event the Applicant seeks to increase the floor area ratio for the proposed building and/or the Premises, such increase shall require the further approval of this Zoning Board of Appeals.
7. The residential component of the Project shall be limited to 108 residential units (plus 2 units for 146 Main Street) with no more than 54 two-bedroom units and no three-bedroom units other than 146 Main Street. Any deviation from this condition shall require the further approval of this Zoning Board of Appeals.
8. In no event shall the parking aisles associated with this Project be less than 24-feet wide and the overall parking bays associated with this Project shall not be less than 60-feet wide.
9. The Conditions of the April 25, 2012 Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision of this Zoning Board of Appeals shall continue.

Member DiSalvo seconded the motion.

Discussion: Chairman Gallo thanked the Planning Board for their positive recommendation and noted that he looked forward to working with them on future projects.

Member Alfasi noted that the Planning Board's recommendation was unanimous in support of these variances. He stated that there is both excitement and trepidation for a project this size. He noted that Mr. Raffiani has done successful projects in the Village in the past and he is confident that he will make this project as beautiful as his others.

Upon roll call, motion was carried with a vote of 4 – 1 with Member Palladino voting 'No'.

Next meeting July 11, 2012

There being no further comments from the public or business before the Board, upon motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried, the meeting was adjourned.