



CITY OF DANBURY
155 DEER HILL AVENUE
DANBURY, CONNECTICUT 06810

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
(203) 797-4525
(203) 797-4586 (FAX)

MINUTES

February 8, 2007

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Richard S. Jowdy at 7:03 pm.

Present were Chairman Jowdy, Herbert Krate, Michael Sibbitt, and Alt. Rodney S. Moore. Also present were Zoning Enforcement Officer Sean P. Hearty and Secretary Patricia Lee. Absent were Joseph C. Hanna, Alternatives Jack Villodas and Richard Roos.

Krate made a motion to hear tonight's agenda as presented. Sibbitt seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

Mr. Jowdy explained the Public Hearing procedure to the audience for those who may want to speak either for or against an application tonight.

CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC HEARINGS:

#07-03 – Daniele Amelia, 8 Melrose Avenue, Parcel A (J12212), Sec.4.A.3., to reduce minimum required lot area from 20,000 sq.ft. to 9431 sq.ft.; to reduce minimum square side dimension from 100 feet to 72 ft. x 83 ft. (RA-20 Zone). This continuance was heard together with **#07-04**. The motion to **approve** carried unanimously.

#07-04 – Daniele Amelia, 8 Melrose Avenue, Parcel B (J12212), Sec.4.A.3., to reduce minimum required lot area from 20,000 sq.ft. to 7356 sq.ft.; to reduce minimum square side dimension from 100 feet to 56 ft. x 88 ft. (RA-20 Zone).

Chairman Jowdy introduced these two continuances, and Attorney Ward Mazzucco came forward to the mic. Krate said we will hear these two together. It's "your ball game", Krate said to Mazzucco. The clarification is that these were two lots, as Sean Hearty discovered in his research. Krate said you are asking for these within the jurisdiction of this board. Mazzucco said these are just minimal requests. Dufel said, for the record, he'd reviewed all the minutes and is up to speed. Also, when I read these, Dufel said, what is the hardship? Mazzucco replied OK; it's pre-existing lots that had been upzoned. Dufel said thank you. I wanted that for the record. Krate asked can we go into voting session on this now? Can we have a motion? I'll act as Chairman, Krate said. Jowdy made a motion to **approve #07-03** and **#07-04**; it's just to make better use of the two lots. Sibbitt seconded the motion. Jowdy said this is per plans submitted, for the same reason for both approvals. The variances will bring the lots into conformity with the rest of the neighborhood with regard to lot size. The motion carried unanimously. Krate said Mr. Jowdy is now Chairman again.

NEW BUSINESS:

#07-05 – WITHDRAWN 2/6/07: Domenico Chiera, Agent, 20 Virginia Avenue (J11168), Sec.4.C.3., to reduce minimum required front yard setback from 20 ft. to 19.4 ft.; Sec.8.C.2.b.(2)., to reduce required parking space aisle width from 24 ft. to 23.4 ft. for 3-family residence conversion (R-3 Zone).

#07-06 - WITHDRAWN 1/31/07: Vytis L. & Algute M. Virbickas, 55 Forty Acre Mountain Road (K04197), Sec.4.A.3., to reduce req'd. minimum lot area previously varied from 74,700 sq.ft. to 62,800 sq.ft. for property conveyance to City of Danbury (RA-80 Zone).

#07-07 - Efrain Romero, 14-16 Franklin Street (H13029), Sec.4.C.3., to reduce the minimum lot area for dwelling unit for two-family dwelling from 3, 750 sq.ft. per unit to 3,605 sq.ft. per unit (R-3 Zone). Attorney Neil Marcus identified himself at the dais, his firm, and said he is her on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Romero is here with me. This property, as you can see from maps submitted, fronts on Franklin and the rear is the railroad. The application before you, Marcus continued, is to allow construction of multi-family house on a lot which for years was thought to have been a multi-family lot. When the survey was done, it appeared that a portion of the lot is in the Maybrook Railroad Company right of way. So if you look at map prepared by Paul Fagan of Surveying Associates, you will see that it actually encroaches on the railroad. The Zoning Enforcement Officer is going to notice that the lot is short by 290 sq.ft. of land that we and my client thought would be included in his lot. The hardship, not adverse possession in this case, as more than 15 years have past; but you cannot adversely possess against a municipality nor a railroad company. This is kind of unique. This doesn't happen very often, Marcus said. I told my client, normally you would not have any problem, but the railroad has protection by statute. We can't acquire the title to the land we always thought was part of this property. So the variance request is simple, Marcus said: reduce the lot area for a dwelling unit. The total would of course be 7210 sq.ft. It's unique, but we do think it qualifies under the term of a hardship. So that's our problem, Marcus said. Why would you want to do this, Marcus asked. My client, I think, intends to improve the neighborhood. Marcus discussed the improvements to northern area of Main Street and Franklin Street, new proposed police facility, the gateway to Danbury, earmarked for improvement. To improve it, he needs a very slight variance, and I think it makes sense, Marcus said. A two-family is again consistent with all the houses in the neighborhood; there are two, three and four family houses there. I can't imagine that you are really going to offend anybody's sensibilities by so doing. Marcus asked are there any questions? Krate said you say it's a hardship, but there is nothing saying it's a two family home. You have reasonable use of that property. Marcus replied everything else in the neighborhood is a two-family dwelling, and with that strange notch in the Maybrook Railroad property line, a two-family is reasonable use of the property. It's consistent with the neighborhood. Romero has owned it seven years, Marcus said. Jowdy said when Romero bought the property he thought he could make it a two-family. It wasn't something intentional. This was done by somebody. Marcus said it's unique as to the railroad, and the adverse possession issue. Here's somebody who wants to improve this property. It's a travesty that we are in this position, Marcus said; I think it will benefit the neighborhood. Beauty is in the eyes of the beholder, Marcus said. Dufel asked is this an active railroad. Marcus replied maybe three trains a week. Marcus gave the history of the Maybrook Railroad lines: it used to be a very active line. Dufel asked, secondly, spend some time describing what's there now. Marcus replied a somewhat deteriorating home in need of improvement. Dufel said I'm struck with, in a perfect world they would take the land, but because they aren't allowed to sue anybody, it's a hardship? Marcus said you're stating it differently than me. Dufel said, but for the fact that the law doesn't allow this; I've got two

ears and it's double-speak. Jowdy discussed that it is another way to look at it, and in affecting the back person's property, a variance of such a few square feet, so it's not quite a detriment to the health, welfare and safety of the community. Krate added, the sidewalk, the City sidewalk, is in the railroad right of way, for whatever reason, and it was not straight, and it was ill-configured when the railroad had it's cut. By the track, Krate said, for whatever reason, there are parts of that railroad right of way that take out the sidewalk. Dufel said our regulations say that the hardship cannot be created by the applicant, so does not this tie our hands? Marcus said the lack of a survey is what led my client not to know about this, and led him into the position that he cannot build a two-family home. Nobody knew that this situation existed, Marcus said. He's not here to see if he can pull a quick one. I have a suggestion, Marcus said, hearing Mr. Dufel and Mr. Krate's's concerns: continue this and take a look at it on Franklin Street. Look at what could be the result of your decision, where the actual railroad right of way is. This just makes a lot of sense to grant this variance, Marcus said. Dufel said I did not have an opportunity to drive by this, although I try to see all sites. Moore asked what he called a dumb question: what are the odds of buying back that property from the Maybrook Railroad Company? Marcus said it's very difficult to buy; it's a nightmare. Jowdy said they will tell you they are not going to sell it to you. Marcus said be assured, it really does not impact the use of this, and we have shown on this map sufficient parking for a two-family home. Jowdy asked if any members of the audience wished to speak for or in opposition to this request. Please come up and tell us your oppositions, Jowdy added. Richard Erhardt, of 18 Franklin Street, came forward and signed in. I vehemently oppose a two-family in this section of house, Erhardt said. There are too many multi-family houses, too many people, too many vehicles; they park on the sidewalk, it is too congested, all the way down to Horn's Variety, all traffic funnels down there. Every morning four to five vehicles stop to pick up passengers here to go to work. A school bus picks up 14 kids every school day. They (the kids) are brought there in cars. There's a crosswalk straight across to

St. Joseph's parking lot, and the cars don't stop; they are so busy trying to beat that light. Mr. Romero wants to move his house 8 feet closer? Jowdy said I concur with you about the congestion; they have no place to park those cars. Romero has enough parking at his property, Jowdy. Erhardt continued, Efrain Romero and I have had many discussions about the volleyball games. This variance will not necessarily do away with the volleyball games. Erhardt said there are 100 people playing volleyball, carrying on, drinking, smoking, with no toilet half the time. Erhardt said he certainly can rent to people with children, but it's hazardous down there. Jowdy asked can they still have volleyball games there with the proposed construction? Erhardt said they still will pay volleyball, 50 to 100 people. In that recent warm spell, 51 people were over there playing volleyball; do you know the noise that generates, Erhardt said. Erhardt said thank you, and took his seat. Jowdy asked is there anyone else who wishes to speak in either for or in opposition to this? Marcus said I'm not sure you can judge this by school bus traffic on the street. This property does not have massive room for volleyball games. I guess you can play on the parking areas. Krate asked what assurances do we have that Mr. Romero will not continue this public nuisance. Marcus said I know the City has taken steps to reduce the volleyball activity. Krate said I would like to actually walk this property, and postpone this decision to March 8th. Jowdy said, if a variance, is given it could be stipulated that the lot could be used only for parking, not volleyball. Krate asked who's going to enforce that, Dick? Marcus interjected that could be enforced by the gentlemen sitting right behind me. Mr. Erhardt suggested that parking on the street is a problem. It addresses one of his concerns, so I would have no objection. Marcus added. Dufel said I've got to assume there's quite a large house on the property. Marcus said the contiguous property he owns is in the wrong zone. Marcus and Romero consulted looking at the plan. Marcus said, to answer you, the volleyball games take place now in the back, I think on the railroad's property. Krate said so there's no way we can

restrict this. Marcus said they can't play on the tracks. Krate said I want to look at this. I may even want fencing. Dufel said the parking will eliminate parking anywhere else. Marcus said the chain link fence has to be moved anyway. Jowdy said the people have a legitimate complaint; every time I go by it's a circus back there, so a fence would maybe prevent volleyball games. Krate said, for me personally, if I grant this, I want to see some physical impediments that will not allow those games to take place. Marcus agreed, I'm on the same page with you here. Romero's son spoke to Atty. Marcus. Marcus said, my client agrees if he builds the two family, he'll eliminate the games. It's reasonable for two reasons: it corrects this mistake out into the future, and my client agrees. Mr. Erhardt returned to microphone. Dufel had a question: you're a resident of this street. Yes, 30 years, Erhardt replied. Dufel said some of what I heard you say is germane; I try to consider the neighbors and the town. Is it better for you to have a two -family and no volleyball, or a one-family house plus volleyball? The volleyball is the nuisance, then, Dufel concluded. Jowdy said I'm a neighbor; I own two condos down there and I'm down there all the time. Krate suggested, if you feel we can go forward tonight, it's fine with me. Dufel indicated it's fine with him, as well as Sibbitt and Moore. Marcus said, well, thank you; I appreciate it. During the voting session, Krate said I would like to **approve** the variance on **#07-07** to reduce minimum lot area for a two-family dwelling. As part of this variance as **astipulation**, the applicant is to construct a fence on the rear property line, to put abutments on the front under the cars, to remove any excess blacktop except what is necessary for the driveway and parking of the vehicles, and to refrain from using the side or rear of the yard from playing volleyball. Sean Hearty said you strike out the word volleyball, as that's not a violation. Krate said amend that to say we will keep the driveway and parking area unencumbered at all times, per plan submitted. This is not a detriment to the welfare, health and safety of neighborhood. Sibbitt seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

#07-08 – Nejame Development, LLC, 10 South Cove Road (I09149), Sec.4.A.3., to reduce minimum square side dimension from 100 ft. to 45 ft.; to reduce front yard from 30 ft. to 24 ft.; to reduce rear yard from 35 ft. to 7 ft.; to increase building coverage from 10% to 26% for new single-family residence and lot line revisions (RA-20 Zone). See minutes **#07-10**. Krate recused.

#07-09 – Nejame Development, LLC, 12 South Cove Road (I09150), Sec.4.A.3., to reduce minimum square side dimension from 100 ft. to 80 ft.; to reduce minimum lot size from 20,000 sq.ft. to 10,226 sq.ft. for expansion of existing single-family residence and lot line revisions (RA-20 Zone). See minutes **#07-10**. Krate recused.

#07-10 – Nejame Development, LLC, 13 South Cove Road (I09140), Sec.4.A.3., to reduce minimum square side dimension from 100 ft. to 62 ft.; to reduce minimum front yard from 30 ft. to 23 ft.; to reduce minimum side yard from 15 ft. to 12 ft.; to reduce minimum rear yard from 35 ft. to 29 ft. for new single-family residence and lot line revisions (RA-20 Zone). Chairman Jowdy introduced this item at 7:45 pm. Krate said he must recuse himself on this one, the next three, actually, so you have a four-man Board. Jowdy said, so be aware if there is one "no" vote, the application is turned down; Jowdy explained you may want to postpone this. I knew you'd need some time for Neil Marcus, Ward Mazzucco joked. Can we hear all these three at once? And I would like to proceed, said Mazzucco. Mazzucco said the property in question is on South Cove Road. Jowdy noted that these are each different dimensions. Mazzucco said the property in question lies at end of a small cul de sac. I've highlighted three lots on these maps, and, as you can see, they come at the end of the cul de sac, and the lots at that point show a home in the middle lot and two vacant lots which abut it. The two side lots are both vacant today, Mazzucco continued. All other lots in the neighborhood have been built up, Mazzucco said, as he held up photos for the

Commissioners to see to clarify the vicinity. The old home shown in the middle lot is depicted in the photograph which I'll leave with you. When I first met with the Nejame's, I said how do we approach this? Sec.9.B.1. says they can be used provided that (Tape flipped to side B at 7:40 pm), and Ward Mazzucco read the regulations to the Commissioners. If you look at the two vacant lots, they are obviously smaller, they are tight lots, but you could put a house on each of those two lots, Mazzucco said. I talked to Sean (Hearty) about this a little bit, and to steal some land from the middle lot and add it to the two vacant lots is a better idea. Mazzucco showed a copy of the old subdivision map highlighted to show where the new three lots would be. Dufel said he had a question for Mazzucco: which lot is which application? It may become important to reference them. What's the address for the existing house? If you don't know you don't know. Dufel and Mazzucco and Sibbitt clarified which lot is which variance request. Mazzucco said so what we did was, turning to the specifics of each individual lot, you can see that that gets bigger on the side lot, and Mazzucco described what variance you still need. There's a proposed addition; reduced lot area is requested, and minimum square reduction is requested. The middle lot, even after losing some land, fulfills all the side line requirements. I'll leave this if it helps you to visualize this, Mazzucco said. These variances will make the lots more functional, give everybody more room, and allows them to build a more valuable home. I should mention that the frontage does not change on any of these, Mazzucco added. Jowdy reiterated what in essence Mazzucco is asking: adding some land, and you are trying to make it more conforming. Sibbitt asked don't you need 50 ft. of road frontage for each lot. We are not changing those frontages; no we don't have to ask for those variances. Mazzucco continued, if the Board approves this, we still have to go to the Planning Commission for a lot line revision. Dufel had a question about parking in the street. Mazzucco explained that they all have garages underneath. Mr. Nejame added that the addition on the middle lot is for a garage. So cars would be off the street, Mazzucco said Secretary Lee said we have three separate applications. Rod Moore distributed the additional files. The maps are all the same. Dufel asked would bringing sewers in make these be buildable? They have stayed vacant because of no room for the septic? They put the sewers in 10 years ago or something? Jowdy said thank you.

Jowdy reviewed the three requests in the voting session: they are trying to make the lots buildable, making them a little more conforming and adaptable to the neighborhood. Jowdy said this is open for a vote. Jowdy added they are going to build on those sites anyway. We not adding any problems; are there reasons not to approve it? That's my rendition of the presentation, Jowdy concluded. Moore made a motion to approve, per plans submitted #07-08I #07-09 and #07-10, and Moore read the addresses and requests. Sibbitt seconded the motion to approve. Dufel said I am voting no. Jowdy said add a reason for your "no". Dufel said the existing lot lines were screwed. There were three "yes" votes (Moore, Jowdy and Sibbitt), and one "nay" vote (Dufel). The motion to approve is **denied**, Chairman Jowdy concluded.

#07-11 – Jeffrey & Karla Mortara, 18 Hillside Road (108040), Sec.4.A.3., to reduce minimum rear yard setback for dwelling from 35 ft. to 1.0 ft.; Sec.3.G.3.c., to increase total ground floor area of all accessory buildings on the lot from 50% to 63% of the total ground floor area of all principal buildings on said lot (RA-20 Zone). Chairman Jowdy introduced this at 7:59 pm and read the requests into the record. Karla Mortara, Jeff Mortara, Paul Harris, architectural designer, with Gabriel Zayas, all signed in. Jeff Mortara said they like us because we're improving the neighborhood. Paul Harris, architectural designer of Westport and Simsbury CT, took the mic saying he represents the Mortara's at 18 Hillside Road on Candlewood Lake. The site is located, Harris said, in the RA-20 Zone. Fire destroyed their house, a couple of storage buildings and garage, and 75% of the trees on the property, plus all their belongings. They are currently renting in Danbury. Harris described each variance

request. This site plan shows the property before the fire. Harris described the streets and vicinity, the retaining wall, the second driveway, the elevation changes of about 60 some odd feet over roughly 30 feet, a rather steep sloping rock face. Moore asked is this the former Carlson property? Jeff Mortara answered, "Correct". Harris said there were also two storage sheds and he described an easement. Krate asked do you have that easement? Jeff Mortara said yes, it's part of our legal description, and he discussed the easement below the 440 line from Candlewood Lake, allowing them to construct the sea walls, docks, etc. Krate asked so you're not putting anything there? Oh, you had it in yellow. I just wanted to clarify that, Krate said. Harris said there's also a dock toward the north which is located right here. Harris declared we are proposing to do two things. Jeff Mortara identified the previous variances. Harris continued describing proposals for the stone floor, the overhang, and the auxiliary structure. This site is very long, in the RA-20 zone; this site is 34,000 some odd sq.ft., roughly 400 feet long. Jeff Mortara added, .79 acre roughly. The red rectangle shows the buildable area if this was a new lot. Harris discussed the square footage that could be built. The Mortara's have rebuilt their house and their garage after the fire. Krate had a question on rebuilding the house, what you now have was it part of the original house plan? It's a wooden deck, Jeff Mortara and Harris said. My question, Krate said is now is do you need EIC approvals? Secretary Lee answered Mr. Krate that they had EIC approval for the residence (EIC #644). Jeff Mortara said we talked to Dan Baroodly and he said to go to the ZBA first, and then come back to the EIC for this structure. We did talk to Dan and City Hall, and he said let's see if you can get the zoning first. Jeff Mortara said he would be able to modify the existing EIC permit. Secretary Lee said they'll get an amended

EIC permit. Krate said okay, but they tell us something else: we were instructed very carefully not to act on anything on Candlewood Lake without coming before the EIC first. Moore said I have a simple question: what is the terrace made of? Jeff Mortara replied it's a stone terrace. Krate asked is there EIC approval on that? Harris continued discussing the new home floor plan, the terrace, the proposal to cover a small portion of this, and he discussed the area highlighted in yellow, the entry vestibule and the open cover. The existing deck is 8 feet in depth, so there is not a great deal of space to put a table out there. The bump out allows a table with some chairs outside so you could eat outside under a covered roof. Harris showed the existing front and the proposed front elevations of the house (Sheet A-2), then Sheet A-3, the left side elevation, with red lines showing the actual rear setback line on the property; from the south elevation, Sheet A-4, shows the elevation. Krate said it's a builder's dream. Harris responded it's a challenge. The Mortara's are looking to provide some shelter from the sun, rain and breezes, and Harris described the access for homeowners and guests. It is an open structure; we are not proposing a closed one. The hardship is the pre-existing, nonconforming location of the dwelling on the property; it is in keeping with the neighborhood, and also their rear setback line to the Lake is probably an additional 20 feet, so it does not appear to be right on the Lake. The second issue to discuss is an auxiliary structure to be located more toward the center, between the boat dock and the main house, about 198 sq.ft. of auxiliary structure which conforms to all setback regulations; only the coverage requires a variance, Harris explained. The auxiliary structure is driven by the size of the main building also. All combined, Harris said, we are looking at approximately 2552 square feet; we're building approximately 37% of what could be put on this lot. Krate had a question for Sean on counting the garage as some of the auxiliary structure. Harris responded. Krate asked why is accessory building quite as large as it is? The Mortara's have a lot of stuff, being boaters, and being on the Lake. That top building, Harris explained, allows one car and some garbage receptacles. Jeff Mortara gave the size of the garage. Two-car, Harris clarified. Dufel said I don't need to be sold because they have a lot of stuff. That's insulting to me. Let's just drop that; you were doing fine, let's go back. Harris said okay. We believe the structures are modest in scale, and he continued describing the proposed storage building, no kitchen, no bathroom, maybe only a wood burning stove

in the winter time, and a storage loft open to below. Krate asked how open is client to reducing the scope of that building. Are you building that already? This is their property, Harris said, as seen from the water, indicating a photograph. The property to the south is also owned by the Mortara's. This illustrates the house; Harris continued to describe the scale of the storage building. It interferes with no neighbors' sight lines. Here's a letter from north neighbor, Pat McCauley, stating no objection. Jowdy posed a question on the actual living space in the house. 1570 square feet is footprint of main house, Harris said, so roughly 3000 sq.ft. Harris said again the hardships: the porch, the pre-existing, nonconforming issue; it's an irregular lot and the buildable area down the front of it is pretty much the face of a cliff. The attic space allows them to walk out at an upper level, so there's less outside stairs for the Mortara's. Another hardship is the extreme slope and terrain. It is not easy to move stuff up the hill from the Lake. If this house was enlarged by only 400 sq.ft., we could actually build this without a variance. It's a difficult site, Harris concluded, and he turned the mic over to Mortara. Jeff Mortara said I would just say we have tried to work with all the committee; we were one of the first people to come before the EIC Commission first. The fire was devastating for the old-growth trees, and we will now have an exacerbated sun issue. My mother Sally is a school nurse here in Danbury for years. It's a real hike between the existing garage and the house. We are giving up both sheds. We will not build below the 440 line, Mr. Mortara continued. We did an extensive planting plan as part of our approval from the EIC. We kept density of the main house down. April of 2006 was the fire, in answer to Krate question. My brother is a Danbury policeman here, Mortara said, and we have all the kids over; there's "a lot of stuff" in there, but it's just my wife and I and people who come over to visit. Mortara described the rest of the neighborhood on the Lake, relatively undeveloped; we'd like to get our life back. We recovered nothing from the fire, and we would ask for your approval. Jowdy said the literal enforcement of the enforcement code is the hardship. Dufel said there are a couple of things I'd like to ask: I have a lot of empathy for building on a lot like this. Did you start to look at options of putting this house, the thought process to avoid all variances: did you do any of that? Harris replied to Dufel that there were no real practical spots to build on this terrain. Dufel said even though the site's big? Jeff Mortara said we were approached by someone who wanted to subdivide. We are losing a significant amount of money on this; we did think about other options to recoup some of our lost economics: a bigger house to resell it to recoup our loses, but I think smaller has its own beauty to it, Mortara said. Dufel asked is this a summer home? Jeff Mortara said I work in New York. I have an apartment in New York. We have a 2-bedroom apartment in New York. Krate said I just want to clarify, since this has obviously been very difficult for your wife and you. Mortara said I grew up on the Lake when I was a teenager. I'm at the bottom of a big hill; we tried to mitigate the runoff. We're trying to restore it after a tremendous fire, and we're trying to make it aesthetically pleasing. Dufel had a question for staff, Sean Hearty, about the access, the use regulations and the 50% rule. Krate said he had no further questions. Jowdy asked if there were any members of the audience who wish to speak for or in opposition to this request. Jowdy reviewed the request at 8:49 pm in the voting session, saying the enforcement of the actual code may be inappropriate. Dufel said, point of order, must we vote on each one of the variances requested by the Mortara's? Krate said I made a motion to **approve** to reduce rear yard setback, per plans submitted, in the RA-20 Zone. Sibbitt seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously. Krate then made a motion to **approve** increase of total ground floor area for all accessory buildings on the lot, per plans submitted, in the RA-20 Zone. Sibbitt seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously at 8:50 pm

ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES: Krate made a motion to accept the minutes from the meeting on January 11, 2007, as presented. Sibbitt seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT:

Motion to adjourn by Krate. Second by Sibbitt. Motion carried unanimously at 8:50 pm.

NOTE: THE NEXT REGULAR MEETING IS SCHEDULED FOR **3/8/07** at 7 pm.

There will be no meeting on 2/22/07.

Respectfully submitted,
Patricia M. Lee, Secretary