

**MINUTES
VILLAGE OF INDIAN HEAD PARK
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
PUBLIC HEARINGS**

“Pursuant to 5 ILCS 120/2.06 (3) minutes of public meetings shall include, but need not be limited to: a general description of all matters proposed, discussed, or decided, and a record of votes taken.”

Tuesday, October 3, 2006

7:30 P.M.

I. CALL TO ORDER -DENNIS SCHERMERHORN, CHAIRMAN

A public hearing was hosted by the Village of Indian Head Park Planning and Zoning Commission on Tuesday, October 3, 2006, at the Municipal Facility, 201 Acacia Drive, and was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Chairman Dennis Schermerhorn.

II. ROLL CALL: PRESENT (AND CONSTITUTING A QUORUM):

Chairman Dennis Schermerhorn
Commissioner Diane Andrews
Commissioner Noreen Costelloe
Commissioner Denise Ingram
Commissioner Earl O’Malley
Commissioner Jack Yelnick

NOT PRESENT:

Commissioner Brian Bailey

ALSO PRESENT:

Richard Andrews, Zoning Trustee Liaison
Carol Coleman, Zoning Trustee
Matthew P. Walsh II, Building Trustee

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG

Chairman Dennis Schermerhorn and the Planning and Zoning Commission members led the audience in reciting the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag as follows: *“I Pledge Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God indivisible with liberty and justice for all”.*

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS HELD BEFORE THE VILLAGE OF INDIAN HEAD PARK PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION (PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED AFTER DISCUSSIONS BY THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS AND PRIOR TO VOTES)

ZONING AGENDA ITEMS:

1. Petition #155 – An Amendment to the Planned Unit Development and Variation for the Property Located at 6425 Apache Drive, Indian Head Park.

Chairman Schermerhorn convened the public hearing regarding a petition for an amendment to the Planned Unit Development and variation from *Title 17, Zoning*, of the Municipal Code to allow for the construction of an addition to the residence for the property located at 6425 Apache Drive, Indian Head Park. The zoning of the property is R-1 P.U.D. Chairman Schermerhorn noted that Mr. Steven Kehle, the property owner, is present this evening to discuss the proposed plans.

The following exhibits were presented and reviewed by the Commission members concerning Petition #155: (1) the Commission was presented with a petition by Mr. & Mrs. Steven Kehle, the owners of the property located at 6425 Apache Drive. The zoning petition form dated September 8, 2006, was signed by Steven Kehle; (2) a certificate of publication of the legal notice that appeared in the Suburban Life Newspaper on Saturday, September 16, 2006; (3) a copy of the letter sent to adjacent property owners within two-hundred feet (200') of the subject property dated September 14, 2006; (4) a list of adjacent property owners; (5) a memo to the Public Works Department dated September 12, 2006 regarding posting of the zoning sign; (6) a building and zoning code report dated September 18, 2006 prepared by Tim Halik, the Village's plan review consultant; (7) preliminary construction and design plan specifications; (8) a report from Christopher Burke Engineering dated August 17, 2006 regarding a review of the proposed plans for an addition to the residence.

Mr. Steven Kehle, the property owner of 6425 Apache Drive, stated he is present this evening to discuss the proposed plans for the construction of an addition to his residence located at 6425 Apache Drive. Mr. Kehle noted: (1) he is conducting extensive remodeling to the rear of his residence that does not require a variance and a building permit was obtained for this portion of the project. However, he wishes to expand the current two-car garage capacity to a four-car garage while maintaining the total combined side yard setback of twenty-five feet; (2) the proposed garage addition is estimated twelve feet off of the property line which brings the addition closer to the existing residential structure and the total lot depth is approximately two-hundred feet (200').

Forty-percent of the lot depth is eighty-feet (80') where the building line would be for the rear yard setback. Mr. Kehle pointed out that in order to incorporate an additional two car garage,

the structure would encroach into the rear yard setback by approximately sixteen-feet (16'). This would result in a rear yard setback of approximately sixty-two feet (62'); (3) the existing two-car garage is a side-loading garage located beneath the house; (4) the proposed garage addition would be detached but connected with a covered walkway between the primary residence and garage; (5) three or four pine trees and one oak tree that is leaning towards the house would need to be removed to build the addition; (6) the garage was designed so that it would be in architectural harmony with the existing residence and would present the least visible impact on the adjacent neighbors; (7) the rear yard is heavily wooded to minimize the visible impact of the proposed addition on the neighbors. Mr. Kehle stated that the existing residence is constructed of limestone and the proposed garage was designed to match the existing architectural theme by connecting a stone walkway with a copper roof between the rear of the residence and new garage.

Commissioner Costelloe inquired if any letters were received from adjacent property owners with regard to this zoning petition. Chairman Schermerhorn noted that no correspondence either in support of the petition or opposed to the zoning request was received by the Commission. He further noted there were no adjacent property owners present at the hearing this evening. Chairman Schermerhorn inquired about the trees that would need to be removed to construct the addition. Mr. Kehle stated that one oak tree that is leaning drastically towards the existing residence would need to be removed as well as three or four pine trees. Mr. Kehle stated that there is an abundance of trees on his property boundary and is willing to replant additional trees in another location of the property to replace the trees that will be removed. Commissioner O'Malley asked how the garage addition would be placed on the property in reference to the existing residence. Mr. Kehle stated that the garage addition would parallel the property line to the north to minimize the amount of space that would be lost in the back yard. He added that if the addition was square with the residence, it would take up more rear yard usable space. Mr. Kehle stated that the addition would be angled along the driveway which is six-feet from the property line and the adjacent property owner's driveway is at the edge of the property with a divided landscape area between the two drives.

Chairman Schermerhorn stated that the rear yard encroachment for the addition is just over sixteen-feet (16') which is approximately 20% of the rear yard setback. Chairman Schermerhorn asked Mr. Kehle what would prevent him from moving the garage from its present orientation towards the street by ten-feet. Mr. Kehle stated that if he moved the garage addition ten-feet towards the street or to the north, he would not be able to achieve the stone arched walkway between the existing residence and garage addition because it would cut-off the walkway and access to the backyard would have to be around the garage next to the adjacent property owner.

Mr. Kehle stated that it is physically possible to move the addition towards the street; but it would be more courteous to the neighbor to enter and exit the property with the original design plan and it would add more architectural value to the home. Commissioner Yelnick stated the walkway would be limited from the garage to the backyard if the addition is moved up closer to

the street and the current design plan allows for the back yard to be utilized for usable space with the patio areas. Mr. Kehle stated that if he moved the garage addition closer to the north property line; then two variances would be needed. He stated that it would not be in the best interest of the community to ask for two variances. Commissioner Costelloe asked if the covered walkway would be completely enclosed. Mr. Kehle stated that the walkway is open on the sides with stone pillar supports and a cedar roof with copper finish on the roofline connecting the garage addition to the residence that is architecturally designed to match the home. Commissioner Costelloe asked if the overhang would be just over the area between the garage and residence and if there is a separate roof over the breezeway area. Mr. Kehle stated that there is a separate roof over the breezeway area along the back of the house and behind the stone wall shown on the drawings presented to the Commission.

Commissioner Andrews asked Mr. Kehle if the reason for not moving the addition forward is because there would be no access to the backyard with that design. Mr. Kehle stated that if the addition is moved forward it would cut off the walkway, there would be limited access to the backyard and it would be more intrusive to the neighbor. Commissioner Andrews inquired what the distance would be from the front of the addition towards the existing garage to the fireplace. Commissioner Andrews stated there would be enough room for a small pathway to the backyard. Mr. Kehle stated the access would be narrow and the distance in that area would be approximately six-feet (6'). Chairman Schermerhorn asked if the proposed garage is as far to the east as possible and still allow traffic in and out of the existing garage. Mr. Kehle stated there is enough room to back out of the existing garage to exit the driveway and if there was not adequate turn-a-round from the existing garage; the new garage addition would be moved farther north.

Chairman Dennis Schermerhorn and the Commission members reviewed the following Findings of Fact with regard to the residential property at 6425 Apache Drive to evaluate evidence presented in response to the following criteria before recommending a variation, as required by the Village's Zoning Ordinance, ***Title 17 Zoning, Section 17.23.060E***: (1) that the property in question cannot yield a reasonable return if permitted to be used only under the conditions allowed by the regulations governing the district in which it is located (not applicable -- this reference pertains only to commercial properties); (2) the plight of the owner is due to unusual circumstances (all commissioners agree); (3) the variation, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality (all commissioners agree); (4) the particular physical surroundings, shape or topographical conditions of the specific property involved would bring a particular hardship upon the owner as distinguished from a mere inconvenience if the strict letter of the regulation were to be carried out (all commissioners agree); (5) the conditions upon which the petition for variation is based would not be applicable generally to other property within the same zoning classification (all commissioners agree); (6) the purpose of the variation is not based upon a desire to make money out of the property (all commissioners agree); (7) the alleged difficulty or hardship has not been created by any person presently having an interest in the property (all commissioners agree); (8) the granting of the variation will not be detrimental to the

public welfare or injurious to other property or improvements in the neighborhood in which the property is located (all commissioners agree); (9) the proposed variation will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property, or substantially increase the danger of fire, or otherwise endanger the public safety, or substantially diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood (all commissioners agree).

Commissioner Costelloe moved, seconded by Commissioner Ingram, to accept the findings of fact with regard to the zoning matter before the Planning and Zoning Commission this evening. Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote (5/0/1). Commissioner Bailey was absent.

Aye: Commissioners: Andrews, Costelloe, Ingram, O'Malley Yelnick

Nay: None

Absent: Bailey

Commissioner O'Malley moved, seconded by Commissioner Andrews, to present a recommendation to the Village Board of Trustees at the October Board meeting. Motion carried by unanimous voice vote (5/0/1).

Aye: Commissioners: Andrews, Costelloe, Ingram, O'Malley, Yelnick

Nay: None

Absent: Bailey

Chairman Schermerhorn summarized the following: (1) the petitioner is requesting a rear yard variation; (2) the Commission in the past has not granted a rear yard setback variance of more than 10%. The current petition before the Commission is a 20% rear yard setback variance; (3) by granting a 20% rear yard setback variance a precedent may be set for future requests; (4) the Commission members must decide whether the conditions are sufficiently unique to allow a rear yard variance of 20% without establishing a precedent due to the uniqueness of the petition presented to the Commission. Commissioner Costelloe stated that the subject property is very private in the back and the proposed plan would create more privacy to the neighbor to the north.

Commissioner Andrews stated that she agrees there is privacy now; however, once the trees, bushes and vegetation is removed to make way for construction, there may be impact on the neighbors to the north. Chairman Schermerhorn stated that possibly the landscaping could be redefined as part of the addition along the north wall. Mr. Kehle stated that adjacent to his driveway a limestone privacy wall about five-feet tall fell down last year and he has plans to replace the privacy wall. Commissioner Costelloe stated that the design plan for the addition keeps with the current architectural design of the home.

Commissioner Andrews moved, seconded by Commissioner Costelloe, to make a favorable recommendation to the Village Board to grant an amendment to the Planned Unit Development and variance from ***Title 17, Zoning***, of the Village of Indian Head Park Municipal Code to allow

for the construction of an addition to the residence as presented to the Commission. Motion carried by roll call vote (3/2/1).

Aye: Commissioners: Costelloe, Ingram, Yelnick

Nay: Andrews, O'Malley

Absent: Bailey

Chairman Schermerhorn stated that the recommendations for approval of this zoning request will be presented to the Village Board at the next Village Board meeting.

2. Petition #156 – An Amendment to the Planned Unit Development and Variation for the Property Located at 6469 Apache Drive, Indian Head Park.

Chairman Schermerhorn convened the public hearing regarding a petition for an amendment to the Planned Unit Development and variation from *Title 17, Zoning*, of the Municipal Code to allow for a change in use of an existing screened structure to be converted to an addition to the residence for the property located at 6469 Apache Drive, Indian Head Park. The zoning of the property is R-1 P.U.D. The entire existing structure encroaches into the rear yard setback requirement. Chairman Schermerhorn noted that Mr. & Mrs. Bob Jones, the property owners, as well as their contractor from LaMantia Construction are present this evening to discuss the proposed plans.

Chairman Schermerhorn entered the following information into the record regarding this zoning petition that was presented by Tony LaMantia: A form signed by the following property owners who have no objections and agree to the proposed improvements by Bob and Pat Jones at 6469 Apache Drive and approval of any zoning variance which may be required to secure a building permit for the plans submitted to the Commission.

The form was signed by Philip Carlson of 11323 Hiawatha Lane, Jack and Barb Semens of 6465 Apache, Gene Callahan who resides at 6445 Apache Drive and Tom & Peggy Cisar of 6466 Apache.

The following exhibits were presented and viewed by the Commission members concerning Petition #156: (1) a zoning petition form dated September 8, 2006, signed by a representative from LaMantia Construction, the contractor for the property located at 6469 Apache Drive in Indian Head Park;(2) a certificate of publication of the legal notice that appeared in the Suburban Life Newspaper on Saturday, September 16, 2006; (3) a copy of the letter sent to adjacent property owners within two-hundred feet (200') of the subject property dated September 13, 2006; (4) a list of adjacent property owners; (5) a memo to the Public Works Department dated September 11, 2006 regarding posting of the zoning sign; (6) a building and zoning code report dated September 5, 2006 prepared by Tim Halik, the Village's plan review consultant; (7) preliminary construction and design plan specifications; (8) a copy of a Plat of Survey for the

subject property located at 6449 Apache Drive dated July 12, 1999; (9) an updated Plat of Survey of the subject property dated August 16, 2006.

Mr. Tony LaMantia, from LaMantia Construction stated he is present this evening to discuss the proposed plans for an addition to the residence located at 6469 Apache Drive. Mr. LaMantia noted: (1) he is proposing to improve and enclose an existing screened room at the back of the residence in the rear yard setback to convert the addition to a four season room addition; (2) the footprint of the existing structure would not be enlarged; (3) a variance was granted previously for the existing structure in the 1980's; and (4) the existing structure's foundation is eroding and needs attention to improve the structure. Chairman Schermerhorn asked if the existing foundation would be removed to rebuild the structure. Mr. LaMantia stated that the existing structure and foundation will be utilized and will not be expanded from the current square footage. Mr. LaMantia stated that a concrete trench foundation will be used and the inside floor will be removed. Commissioner Andrews stated that the present drainage flows towards the addition and she asked if there are plans to improve the drainage when the new trench foundation is installed. Mr. LaMantia stated that a swale will be installed to divert water away from the addition. Commissioner O'Malley inquired if the plan is to convert the addition to an all season room with heat and air-conditioning. Mr. LaMantia stated that the all season room will have forced air heat with new flooring. Commissioner Yelnick inquired if the all season room will be on a concrete slab. Mr. LaMantia responded, yes.

Chairman Dennis Schermerhorn and the Commission members reviewed the following Findings of Fact with regard to the residential property at 6469 Apache Drive to evaluate evidence presented in response to the following criteria before recommending a variation, as required by the Village's Zoning Ordinance, ***Title 17 Zoning, Section 17.23.060E***:

(1) that the property in question cannot yield a reasonable return if permitted to be used only under the conditions allowed by the regulations governing the district in which it is located (not applicable -- this reference pertains only to commercial properties); (2) the plight of the owner is due to unusual circumstances (all commissioners agree); (3) the variation, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality (all commissioners agree); (4) the particular physical surroundings, shape or topographical conditions of the specific property involved would bring a particular hardship upon the owner as distinguished from a mere inconvenience if the strict letter of the regulation were to be carried out (all commissioners agree); (5) the conditions upon which the petition for variation is based would not be applicable generally to other property within the same zoning classification (all commissioners agree); (6) the purpose of the variation is not based upon a desire to make money out of the property (all commissioners agree); (7) the alleged difficulty or hardship has not been created by any person presently having an interest in the property (all commissioners agree); (8) the granting of the variation will not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to other property or improvements in the neighborhood in which the property is located (all commissioners agree); (9) the proposed variation will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property, or substantially increase the danger of fire,

or otherwise endanger the public safety, or substantially diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood (all commissioners agree).

Commissioner Andrews moved, seconded by Commissioner O'Malley, to accept the findings of fact with regard to the zoning matter before the Planning and Zoning Commission this evening. Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote (5/0/1). Commissioner Bailey was absent.

Aye: Commissioners: Andrews, Costelloe, Ingram, O'Malley, Yelnick

Nay: None

Absent: Bailey

Commissioner Costelloe moved, seconded by Commissioner Ingram, to present a recommendation to the Village Board of Trustees at the October Board meeting. Motion carried by unanimous voice vote (5/0/1).

Chairman Schermerhorn summarized the following: (1) the entire existing structure encroaches into the rear yard setback and will not be expanded; (2) in the 1980's a variation may have been granted to allow for the existing structure and a building permit was issued to the previous owner to construct the addition; (3) Commissioner Andrews noted that the P.U.D. criteria for this development area was a twenty-five foot building line and other properties had variances because some of the properties did not have a forty-foot setback.

Commissioner Andrews stated that this particular property most likely could not have been built at the twenty five-foot setback line because of the drainage pattern on the property. Chairman Schermerhorn stated that there are no adjacent property owners in attendance either in support of or opposed to the requested variation.

Commissioner Andrews moved, seconded by Commissioner O'Malley, to make a favorable recommendation to the Village Board to grant an amendment to the Planned Unit Development and variance from ***Title 17, Zoning***, of the Village of Indian Head Park Municipal Code to allow for an existing addition that encroaches into the rear yard setback to be converted to an all season room as presented to the Commission. Motion carried by roll call vote (5/0/1).

Aye: Commissioners: Andrews, Costelloe, Ingram, O'Malley, Yelnick

Nay: None

Absent: Bailey

Chairman Schermerhorn stated that the recommendations for approval of this zoning request will be presented to the Village Board at the next Village Board meeting.

3. Petition #156 – An Amendment to the Acacia Planned Unit Development and Variation for the Property Located at 73 Westwood Square, Indian Head Park.

Chairman Schermerhorn convened the public hearing regarding a petition for an amendment to the Acacia Planned Unit Development and variation from *Title 17, Zoning*, of the Municipal Code to allow for the construction of a deck for the property located at 73 Westwood Square within the Acacia Townhome Development. The zoning of the property is R-3 P.U.D. Chairman Schermerhorn noted that Marcia Fuhr, the property owner, as well as Mr. Schuster, her contractor, is present this evening to discuss the proposed plans.

The following exhibits were presented and reviewed by the Commission members concerning Petition #157: (1) a zoning petition form dated September 11, 2006, signed by a Marcia Fuhr, the owner of the property located at 73 Westwood Square in Indian Head Park;(2) a certificate of publication of the legal notice that appeared in the Suburban Life Newspaper on Saturday, September 16, 2006; (3) a copy of the letter sent to adjacent property owners within two-hundred feet (200') of the subject property dated September 14, 2006; (4) a list of adjacent property owners; (5) a memo to the Public Works Department dated September 5, 2006 regarding posting of the zoning sign; (6) a building and zoning code report dated September 5, 2006 prepared by Tim Halik, the Village's plan review consultant and; (7) preliminary construction and design plan specifications.

Mr. Schuster noted: (1) he is proposing to remove the existing deck structure at 73 Westwood Square located in the rear yard as well as expanding the deck area to include a lower deck along the rear of the house; (2) a plan was initially submitted for review and approval and the drawings were revised reducing the size of the deck;

(3) based on some recommendations and comments made by Commissioner Andrews, an exhibit was prepared and presented showing the proposed construction indicating that the new deck would not extend farther from the house than the existing deck or beyond the privacy wall area. The new deck is slightly smaller than the existing deck with stairs down to a lower deck and; (3) the Acacia Association Board reviewed the revised plan and approved the request. Mr. Schuster stated that the distance of the deck and stairs from the property line is shown on the plan, the lower deck will be approximately 2.5 feet from the south property line, the west edge of the deck will be approximately 2 feet from the west property line and the modification to the first plan was a modification on the upper deck portion to remove a section that would have extended further to the east. Mr. Schuster stated that the existing deck is in very bad condition and is in need of replacement.

Commissioner O'Malley asked about the removal of the deck extension on the east side. Mr. Schuster stated that there is an air-conditioning unit on the east side of the house and it was decided to leave that area as is without an extension of the deck. Commissioner O'Malley inquired if the deck will be constructed beyond the privacy wall area. Mr. Schuster stated that the deck will not extend beyond the privacy wall and a railing will be installed according to the requirements of Village code. Chairman Schermerhorn stated that he recalled a two-foot required

rear yard setback for the Acacia Planned Unit Development guidelines. Mr. Schuster stated that he received a report from the Village's plan review consultant indicating a rear yard setback distance of forty-feet. Chairman Schermerhorn stated that the property owner is not expanding the dimensions of the deck that was previously approved to be constructed. Commissioner Andrews stated that none of the utility meters will be covered and a letter was received from Acacia approving the revised plans for the deck.

Chairman Dennis Schermerhorn and the Commission members reviewed the following Findings of Fact with regard to the residential property at 73 Westwood Square to evaluate evidence presented in response to the following criteria before recommending a variation, as required by the Village's Zoning Ordinance, **Title 17 Zoning, Section 17.23.060E**: (1) that the property in question cannot yield a reasonable return if permitted to be used only under the conditions allowed by the regulations governing the district in which it is located (not applicable -- this reference pertains only to commercial properties); (2) the plight of the owner is due to unusual circumstances (all commissioners agree); (3) the variation, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality (all commissioners agree);

(4) the particular physical surroundings, shape or topographical conditions of the specific property involved would bring a particular hardship upon the owner as distinguished from a mere inconvenience if the strict letter of the regulation were to be carried out (all commissioners agree); (5) the conditions upon which the petition for variation is based would not be applicable generally to other property within the same zoning classification (all commissioners agree); (6) the purpose of the variation is not based upon a desire to make money out of the property (all commissioners agree); (7) the alleged difficulty or hardship has not been created by any person presently having an interest in the property (all commissioners agree); (8) the granting of the variation will not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to other property or improvements in the neighborhood in which the property is located (all commissioners agree); (9) the proposed variation will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property, or substantially increase the danger of fire, or otherwise endanger the public safety, or substantially diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood (all commissioners agree).

Commissioner Costelloe moved, seconded by Commissioner Yelnick, to accept the findings of fact with regard to the zoning matter before the Planning and Zoning Commission this evening. Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote (5/0/1). Commissioner Bailey was absent.

Commissioner Costelloe moved, seconded by Commissioner Ingram, to present a recommendation to the Village Board of Trustees at the October Board meeting. Motion carried by unanimous voice vote (5/0/1).

Aye: Commissioners: Andrews, Costelloe, Ingram, O'Malley, Yelnick

Nay: None

Absent: Bailey

Commissioner Andrews moved, seconded by Commissioner O'Malley, to make a favorable recommendation to the Village Board to grant an amendment to the Acacia Planned Unit Development and variance from ***Title 17, Zoning***, of the Village of Indian Head Park Municipal Code to allow for the construction of a deck as presented to the Commission with the following conditions: (1) the deck must remain open, unroofed and unscreened; (3) existing utility meters must remain accessible to meter readers; (3) a plan reflecting complete dimensions to scale of the deck must be submitted to the Village for review prior to the issuance of a building permit. Motion carried by roll call vote (5/0/1).

Aye: Commissioners: Andrews, Costelloe, Ingram, O'Malley, Yelnick

Nay: None

Absent: Bailey

Chairman Schermerhorn stated that the recommendations for approval of this zoning request will be presented to the Village Board at the next Village Board meeting.

V. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES.

Minutes of the Planning and Zoning Commission held August 1, 2006

Public Hearing Minutes – Petition #153

Public Hearing Minutes – Petition #154

Upon review of the minutes presented from the public hearings held on Tuesday, August 1, 2006, Commissioner Andrews moved, seconded by Commissioner Costelloe, to approve the August 1, 2006 meeting minutes, as amended. Carried by unanimous voice vote (5/0/1).

VI. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss before the Commission, Chairman Schermerhorn entertained a motion to adjourn the public hearings. Commissioner Costelloe moved, seconded by Commissioner Yelnick to adjourn the public hearings at 8:50 p.m. Carried by unanimous voice vote (5/0/1).

Respectfully Submitted,
Kathy Leach, Recording Secretary

