

A **REGULAR MEETING** of the **ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS** of the Village of Cooperstown was held in the Village Office Building, 22 Main Street, Cooperstown, New York on **JULY 2, 2019 at 5:00 p.m.**

IN ATTENDANCE:

- **Members Present: (4):** Susan Snell (Chair) / Marcie Schwartzman / Frank Leo/ Denise Hollis (alternate)
- **Members Absent: (1):** Dave Wood / Joe Perdue
- **Others Present:** Zoning Enforcement Officer, Jane Gentile (ZEO) / Mikal Sky-Shrewsberry (Clerk PT) / **(8)** Member(s) of the Public

MEETING OPENED: by **SUSAN SNELL** at **5:02 PM**

PUBLIC HEARING(S): (4) ITEMS

- Note: Agenda originally had (5) public hearings listed but the application for 28 Elm Street (Ellen Pope) was withdrawn

1. 13 Railroad Avenue (Terracentia Properties / Jon McManus)

(a) Zoning variance from Section 300-33 Requirements for minimum off-street parking

- **PUBLIC HEARING OPENED: BY SUSAN SNELL AT 5:03 PM**
- **THE 2 ROLES OF THE ZBA AT TONIGHT'S HEARING**
 - o Area variance for parking
 - o SEQR
- **PARKING PLAN**
 - o Jon McManus
 - 2 plans were submitted
 - o Plan 1: Has the required number of 13 spaces but the spaces are too tight for practical use
 - o Plan 2: Has the same footprint of parking area as Plan 1 but only has 9 spaces designated by striping making it more usable
 - Recapped the situation
 - o Proposed building addition meets all setbacks
 - o **New addition is primarily being used to store aging liquor**
 - Tasting area has been reduced by 2/3 of original
 - o Actual use for retail sales has been much less than originally expected
 - Primarily a long term storage and manufacturing facility rather than an active warehouse
 - o Product is not constantly being moved
 - o Minimal handling means limited number of employees are required at any one time
 - Maximum of 9 employees required during each of 2 shifts
 - o Actual parking required = 13 spaces
 - 8 spaces for addition
 - 5 spaces for existing building per planning board approval
 - Jon McManus agrees with Jane Gentile (ZEO) that total parking required by code is 13
 - o 13 space plan
 - Can fit all 13 spaces but it is extremely tight in back and spaces will be very difficult to use
 - o Elements shared by both parking plans
 - Post "Employees Only" parking sign for spaces in back
 - Keeping the handicap parking spot
 - Traffic flow will be improved because of changes to stairs / entries from lot
 - Overhead garage door being added to building addition (by spaces 6 and 7 on the plan)

- o Will only be used a couple of times a month for moving a limited number of barrels
- o Susan Snell
 - Confirmed that the only difference between the 2 plans is striping
 - Stated she has often seen 6 cars stacked
 - o Jane Gentile (ZEO) stated that stacking was probably due to the heavy amount of contractor work being done
 - Parking Plan Feedback
 - o Plan 1:
 - Meets the law in terms of the required number of spaces
 - Does NOT meet the law in terms of maneuverability
 - o Goal is to allow the smallest variance from the number of legally required spaces
 - Would like to approve a number spaces that falls between the numbers in the 2 proposed plans
- o Final Plan
 - 11 spaces
 - o Spaces will be 9 feet x 18 feet
 - o Jon McManus will provide a sketch of the layout
 - Not sure if surface will start out being asphalt or gravel
- **PUBLIC COMMENTS**
 - o None

2. 10 Main Street (010 Main St LLC / Jon McManus)

- (a) Zoning variance from Section 300-24 Waterfront Overlay District requirement to allow for an addition to the existing garage as submitted
 - **PUBLIC HEARING OPENED: BY SUSAN SNELL AT 5:15 PM**
 - **JON MCMANUS DESCRIBED PROPOSED PROJECT**
 - o Distributed copies of site plan
 - o Existing garage
 - 49.9 feet from property line
 - Almost entirely located in the waterfront overlay district (75' from the river)
 - o Proposed Mitigation Plan
 - 2 forms of infiltration
 - o Underground infiltration
 - o Rain garden infiltration
 - Proposing to pick up and filter runoff from the entire roof (not just the addition)
 - o Runoff will be funneled to the back of the building
 - o Will use DEC size and construction specs to design the system
 - Property is classified as **Group A**: well infiltrated, mostly gravel and sand
 - o Infiltration system will handle about 4 inches per hour maximum
 - Designed to catch all the runoff caused by the equivalent of a *one year storm event* (major summer storm)
 - o All the water will pass through the system and get filtered
 - o Improvement over existing situation because none of the water from the existing garage currently gets filtered
 - 3 Other Local Townships (including Middlefield) have approved similar mitigation for construction within a waterfront overlay district
 - Rain Garden
 - o 6 inch deep depression
 - o Filter in bottom
 - o Specific types of approved plants
 - Maintenance
 - o Very low maintenance
 - o Owner knows what is involved

- o Jane Gentile (ZEO) will enforce the plan
- Description of the ground below the garage
 - o All wooded
 - o Steep
 - o NOT eroding
- **PUBLIC COMMENTS**
 - o **Nancy Northrop (17 River Street-directly across the river from the applicant's property)**
 - Only runoff is being mitigated
 - Concerned about impact on the dramatic embankment
 - Referred to answer 4 on the application
 - o No Anticipated Impact is NOT the same as No Impact
 - o Allowing the variance increases the risk of negative impact even if there is already an existing building within the setback
 - o One tree fell across the river this month
 - o Wants to be assured that stability of the bank will not be compromised by allowing the addition
 - o It's easier to move a building than a river
 - o **Response: Jon McManus**
 - Building / Addition does not and will not touch any steep slopes
 - Will NOT touch the bank at all
 - o **Susan Snell - Inquired About Possible Alternative Design**
 - Why is the plan to build off of 2 side of the existing building instead of just off of one side?
 - o North side encroaches closest to the lake
 - o South side is less of a variance
 - **Response: Jon McManus**
 - o Building only on one side of the existing structure
 - Would not be a practical design for their needed use
 - Would also require a change in the roof pitch and result in a much greater visual impact
 - Proposed plan changes the existing structure the least amount possible
 - o Building an entirely new structure elsewhere on the property would also have a much greater visual impact
 - o Proposed design improves overall water quality over its current state because runoff from existing building will be treated
 - Runoff from the existing building is NOT currently treated at all
 - **Delancy Webster (11 River Street)**
 - o Has a birds eye view of the bank
 - o Has noticed there has recently been an increase in the number of trees that have come down
 - o Believes current tree loss is due to mother nature but is concerned that manmade work will increase the natural progression
 - o **Response: Jon McManus**
 - Mitigation system will retain water so it will decrease the amount of runoff that causes erosion
 - o **Response: Frank Leo**
 - Clarified the location of the structure in relation to the setback
 - o Setback is 75 feet
 - o Existing building is located fully in the setback
 - o Building is remaining in the exact location it is currently in
 - o Existing building is set on a concrete slab
 - o Proposed additions to the building will also be set on concrete slab
 - **Jane Gentile (ZEO)**
 - o Existing structure was built between 1989-1990

3. 82 Beaver Street (Sydney and Anthony Scalici)

- (a) Home Occupation special use permit per Section 300-17B
 - **PUBLIC HEARING OPENED: BY SUSAN SNELL AT 5:32PM**
 - **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**
 - o **Sydney Scalici**
 - Mental health counseling
 - 1 client at a time - NO groups
 - Building already exists
 - Parking requirements are met
 - o Only one additional parking space is required, and the property can already accommodate it
 - o **Susan Snell**
 - The issue is that it is a home occupation, which requires a Special Permit
 - o **Sydney Scalici**
 - She is currently preparing to take the licensing exam
 - Expects to serve 12-16 clients/week
 - Expects to work 3-4 days/week
 - Both neighbors on either side of the property know what is being proposed
 - **PUBLIC COMMENTS**
 - o None

4. 36 Delaware Street (Luke Wyckoff)

- (a) Zoning variance from Section 300-12C(3)(b) requirement of five (5) foot side yard for the replacement of an 8'-4"x10'-4" shed with a 12'-0"x11'-10" shed which is 3'-6" from property line
 - **PUBLIC HEARING OPENED: BY SUSAN SNELL AT 5:35 PM**
 - **EXISTING SHED**
 - o Existing shed sits on existing concrete pad
 - Concrete pad is 12'4" x 12'4"
 - Existing shed is 8'5" x 10'6"
 - East /West: Concrete pad has 3 feet of open space in front of the shed and 1 foot of open space behind the shed
 - North/South: Concrete pad has less than a foot of open space on one side and is pushed to the edge on the other
 - Slab is 3'6" from property line
 - Length of the pad/shed runs along the property line
 -
 - **NEW SHED**
 - o New shed will be on skids
 - It will just sit on the existing slab
 - New shed will be
 - o 3 feet longer than existing on the Delaware Street side
 - o 1 foot longer than existing on the along the side
 - o Sketched the location of the slab/shed
 - **SETBACKS**
 - o Is in compliance with rear setback
 - Rear Setback is 10 feet
 - o Only issue is the side
 - **PUBLIC COMMENTS**
 - o Sydney Scalici
 - Has seen that Luke Wyckoff is doing nice work on his property
 - o She frequently walks by his house

5. ALL (4) Public Hearings Closed: by Susan Snell at 5:38 pm

REGULAR AGENDA: (5) ITEMS

- Note: Items were heard in a different order from the Public Hearings to get the simpler items out of the way first and minimize wait time for the applicants

1. 82 Beaver Street (Sydney and Anthony Scalici)

(a) Home Occupation special use permit per Section 300-17B

- **REPRESENTATIVE PRESENT**
 - o Sydney Scalici
- **DISCUSSION**
 - o None
- **MOTION**
 - o **Made by:** Marcie Schwartzman / **Seconded by:** Frank Leo
 - o **Motion To:**
 - Grant a **SPECIAL USE PERMIT** for a **HOME OCCUPATION** at **82 BEAVER STREET - AS SUBMITTED**
 - o **Vote:**
 - **AYES (4):** Snell / Schwartzman / Leo / Hollis
 - **ABSTENTIONS (0):**
 - **NAYS (0):**
 - **MOTION APPROVED**
- **NEXT STEPS**
 - o None

6. 36 Delaware Street (Luke Wyckoff)

(a) Zoning variance from Section 300-12C(3)(b) requirement of five (5) foot side yard for the replacement of an 8'-4"x10'-4" shed with a 12'-0"x11'-10" shed which is 3'-6" from property line

- **REPRESENTATIVE PRESENT**
 - o Luke Wyckoff
- **DISCUSSION**
 - o **Letter from Neighbor**
 - Jim Kevlin submitted a letter stating he had no objections to the proposed shed
 - o He lives immediately adjacent to the property on the impacted side
 - o Luke Wyckoff stated he suspects that his property and Jim Kevlin's property had matching back to back sheds at one time
 - o **Application Responses**
 - Susan Snell read (out loud) all answers on the application
 - o Board agreed with all the answers given
- **MOTION**
 - o **Made by:** Marcie Schwartzman / **Seconded by:** Frank Leo
 - o **Motion To:**
 - Grant an **AREA VARIANCE** giving **1 FOOT 6 INCHES OF RELIEF FROM THE 5 FOOT SIDEYARD SETBACK REQUIREMENT** for **CONSTRUCTION OF A SHED** at **32 DELAWARE STREET - AS SUBMITTED**
 - o **Vote:**
 - **AYES (4):** Snell / Schwartzman / Leo / Hollis
 - **ABSTENTIONS (0):**
 - **NAYS (0):**
 - **MOTION APPROVED**

- **NEXT STEPS**

- o None

2. 13 Railroad Avenue (Terracentia Properties / Jon McManus)

(a) Zoning variance from Section 300-33 Requirements for minimum off-street parking

- **REPRESENTATIVE PRESENT**

- o Jon McManus / Gene Marra

- **PART 1: AREA VARIANCE**

- o **Revised Drawing**

- Jon McManus submitted revised sketch showing 11 parking spaces as discussed during the Public Hearing held during tonight's meeting
 - o Will create and submit a formal drawing showing the 11 spaces to the ZBA and the Planning Board
 - o Jane Gentile (ZEO) stated
 - The number of spaces can't be changed but they can be relocated

- o **Marcie Schwartzman**

- Perfectly happy with 11 spaces because there will only be 9 employees at any one time
 - o Would have been OK with 9 spaces
- If applicant put in 13 spaces there would be no need for a variance
 - o Inquired why 13 spaces are problematic
 - o Response: Susan Snell and Jon McManus
 - It would be very difficult to back up safely
- Would like to impose condition that PUBLIC PARKING IS NOT ALLOWED in the lower section

- o **Jane Gentile (ZEO)**

- Another possible alternative is to allow stacking spaces in the upper area (as allowed with houses)
- SEQR review will need to be done regardless of which option is decided on

- **MOTION #1: AREA VARIANCE**

- o **Made by:** Marcie Schwartzman / **Seconded by:** Denise Hollis

- o **Motion To:**

- Grant an **AREA VARIANCE** requiring **11 PARKING SPACES** (rather than 13 spaces) for **13 RAILROAD AVENUE** as **SHOWN ON THE REVISED PLAN** dated **7/2/2019**
- *With the following CONDITION*
 - o **SPACES #6-#11 ON THE PLAN WILL BE DESIGNATED AS EMPLOYEE PARKING ONLY**
 - **AN EMPLOYEE PARKING ONLY SIGN WILL BE INSTALLED TO INFORM THE PUBLIC**

- o **Vote:**

- **AYES (4):** Snell / Schwartzman / Leo / Hollis
- **ABSTENTIONS (0):**
- **NAYS (0):**
- **MOTION APPROVED**

- **SEQR: LEAD AGENCY AND ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT**

- o **SEQR Lead Agency**

- Board discussed how to identify ZBA as lead agency
- **Jane Gentile (ZEO)**
 - o SEQR can be handled by any board as a delegate of the Trustees
 - Trustees / HPARB / Planning Board have all agreed ZBA will be the lead agency for this project
 - o SHPO gets involved in grants
 - Applicant needs to notify SHPO of the results of the SEQR review
- **Jody Zakrevsky (Otsego Now) - interested party**
 - o Working on grant application on behalf of the Village

- o Will require results of SEQR review to fill out various necessary forms including for Fish/Wildlife and DEC
 - o Timeline is extremely tight - needs to start the process this week
 - o **SEQR Assessment**
 - *Short Environmental Assessment Form - Part 2*
Read out loud / Determination of impact was made for each item
 1. Conflict with Zoning Regs: **No impact**
 2. Change in land use / Change in intensity of land use: **Minimal Impact**
 - No change in use
 - Some change in intensity
 3. Character of community: **No impact**
 4. Critical environmental areas: **No impact**
 5. Transit/Traffic flow: **No impact**
 6. Increased energy use: **No impact**
 7. Water supplies / Wastewater treatment: **No impact or Minimal Impact**
 8. Historical / Archaeological / Architectural resources: **No impact**
 9. Natural resources: **No impact**
 - Jon McManus
 - o Creek not trout designated
 - o No environmental impact if it goes into the stream
 - Everything already slopes into the stream now
 - Existing grass filter strip is being maintained
 10. Erosion / Flooding / Drainage: **No impact**
 11. Hazard to environmental resources or Human health: **No Impact**
 - o **Part 3 of the SEQR Environmental Assessment: NOT NEEDED**
 - Part 3 is only needed when a project will have a moderate or large impact on any of the 11 items considered in SEQR Part 2
 - There were NO moderate or large impacts for any of the 11 items considered in
- **MOTION #2: SEQR**
 - o **Made by:** Susan Snell / **Seconded by:** Marcie Schwartzman
 - o **Motion To:**
 - Make a **DETERMINATION OF NON-SIGNIFICANCE / NEGATIVE DECLARATION** regarding the proposed work at **13 RAILROAD AVE**
 - o **Vote:**
 - **AYES (4):** Snell / Schwartzman / Leo / Hollis
 - **ABSTENTIONS (0):**
 - **NAYS (0):**
 - **MOTION APPROVED**
- **NEXT STEPS**
 - o None
- 7. 10 Main Street (010 Main St LLC / Jon McManus)**
- (a) Zoning variance from Section 300-24 Waterfront Overlay District requirement to allow for an addition to the existing garage as submitted
 - **REPRESENTATIVE PRESENT**
 - o Jon McManus
 - **DISCUSSION**
 - Setback Requirements for Waterfront Overlay District
 - o Setback requirements in this district are much more restrictive than in other districts

- o 75 feet from river or 100 feet from lake
- o Law says NO type of manmade structure can be built in the setback (buildings, decks, fences etc)
 - Historically ZBA has granted some variances
 - o At least one case variance granted for extension to existing building (similar to this application)
 - o Have also been granted for structures such as stairs or docks
- Distance of proposed structure from river
 - o 49.5 feet to the closest corner
 - o All of one side and most of the other side of the proposed expansion is within the setback
- Discussion: Concerns
 - o Concerns about erosion voiced by speakers at the public hearing
 - Natural erosion could impact the building and cause it to fall down the bank
 - Building could impact the steep bank and impact
 - Water runoff from building could have a negative impact on water quality
 - o Marcie Schwartzman
 - Concerned that the bank may be failing after hearing comments
 - Wants to make sure that the building is not in danger of toppling down the bank due to erosion
 - o Jon McManus addressed
 - No intention of touching any steep slopes
 - All work will be done on flat ground
 - Expanded building as proposed will sit a good 20 feet from the bank
 - Did not see anything he felt would indicate the bank was failing (example: he did NOT see 2 big trees next to each other that have both fallen over)
 - o But he wasn't really looking at the bank for erosion problems so cannot be certain
 - Flat area has good healthy tree growth with deep roots- can see in photos
 - o The flat area is natural (as opposed to manmade)
 - Applicants own the embankment down to the river
 - o Jane Gentile (ZEO)
 - Met with Nancy Northrop prior to the public hearing
 - o The more trees that fall down the less protection there is from erosion
 - o She is NOT saying the building is causing the problems
 - o Also concerned about runoff from the building
 - Explained that the proposed system is designed to alleviate problems caused by runoff
 - o How Runoff from Roof will be Handled
 - Jon McManus
 - o Use DEC calculations to determine volume of water that needs to be collected within a depression
 - o Rain Garden is created using these calculations
 - o In this case Garden will be a 6 inch depression spread across approximately 6 feet x 20 feet=
 - Owner knows and understands the plan
 - o Owner is also the owner of Cooperstown Dreams Park - storm water detention system was also implemented there so he is familiar with it
 - Intent is to incorporate into the landscape of a residential home
 - o Create a small detention over a larger area and then dig out 2 feet and replace with engineered fill
 - o Type of soil below the engineered fill makes a difference
(In this case soil is Type A- sand and gravel which is a naturally draining soil)
 - o Once the water passes through the fill it is clean and is dispersed into the ground -
 - Surface runoff will actually be decreased because the water is being absorbed rather than running down the hill in sheets
 - This type of filtration is very common throughout NYS and used all the time in NYC watershed

- o Rain Garden is typically required of every subdivision or lot located within a water overlay district
 - o If no Rain Garden then ALL the water must be collected and treated in a central location
 - Biggest concern is Nitrogen and Phosphorus which comes off roofs and asphalt
 - o Not a lot comes off of residential homes
 - o Phosphorus does NOT go away-it gets caught in the depression and then very slowly (possibly over 100 years) it makes its way to the stream incrementally (rather than all at once)
 - o Over time the filter system can stop working but the timeline is typically 50-100 years
 - ALL roof runoff will be collected
 - o Will require very minor grading down to the detention area
 - Will be at least 8 feet between the edge of the rain garden and the top of the steep drop-off
 - o Can't be exact because exact location will be taped off during when the foundation is laid out
 - Jon McManus and Susan Snell both agreed
 - o The bank and the associated root systems within it will NOT be disturbed at all
 - **Rain Garden Design**
 - o No trees will need to come down
 - o Rain garden can be reshaped as long as volume remains
 - o Will look like a plant bed - similar plants to those used in the rain gardens on Main Street in the Village
 - **Denise Hollis**
 - o Asked if there an official impact assessment is ever done
 - o Response: Susan Snell
 - Never have had one done before
 - Not sure who could do something like that
- o **Possible Consequences/Benefits of Approval**
 - **Jon McManus**
 - o Could be beneficial by providing a model for mitigation for other applicants
 - o Could be detrimental by setting precedent
 - Does not believe it will be an issue that comes up often
 - o Will improve water quality
 - Will end up providing twice as much water quality treatment as required because will be catching runoff from the existing building as well as the new additions
 - o Only required to address the additions
 - o Will reduce runoff down the hill because it will retain and absorb the water rather than having it run down the surface of the hill in big sheets
 - **Jane Gentile (ZEO)**
 - o Doesn't think a precedent is being set because this is about expanding a building that is already located within the water district setback
 - o Similar situations will be extremely rare if they exist at all
 - **Frank Leo**
 - o if the lake rises and the channel can't handle it the corner will be where the erosion problems occur
- o **2 Critical Elements of the Application**
 - Susan Snell
 - o This is an expansion of an existing structure that is already primarily located within the setback
 - At least 75% of the existing structure is within 75 feet of the river
 - o Rain garden not only mitigates the new additions to the structure but the existing roof as well
 - Any issues that have been caused by the existing roof will also be fixed

- o **Design Revision**
 - **Frank Leo**
 - o Only concern is that on one side the design of the addition will cause it to encroach slightly more into the setback than the existing building
 - o Believes everything else possible has been done to handle the situation appropriately
 - **Response: Jon McManus-Proposed Revisions**
 - o Proposed shaving off the corner by stepping it in
 - Expansion on North side will NOT encroach any closer than the existing garage (54 feet)
 - **Board agreed this was a good idea**
 - o Jon McManus revised existing drawings showing the stepped in corner and dimensions in relation to the setback
 - Revised drawings dated 7/2/2019

- **MOTION**

- o **Made by:** Marcie Schwartzman / **Seconded by:** Frank Leo
- o **Motion To:**
 - Grant an **AREA VARIANCE** to CONSTRUCT AN ADDITION ON THE EXISTING GARAGE WITHIN THE 75 FEET OF THE WATER OVERLAY DISTRICT at 10 MAIN STREET - AS REVISED ON 7/2/2019
 - *With the following CONDITIONS*
 - o **RAIN GARDEN** WILL BE CONSTRUCTED TO MITIGATE RUNOFF FROM THE ENTIRE ROOF (INCLUDES RUNOFF FROM BOTH THE ADDITION AND THE EXISTING ROOF)
 - o **ENCROACHMENT INTO THE SETBACK WILL NOT BE ANY CLOSER THAN THE EXISTING BUILDING** AS PER PLANS LABELED REV 2 /DATED 7/2/2019
- o **Vote:**
 - **AYES (4):** Snell / Schwartzman / Leo / Hollis
 - **ABSTENTIONS (0):**
 - **NAYS (0):**
 - **MOTION APPROVED**

8. MINUTES REVIEW: Zoning Board of Appeals REGULAR MEETING: JUNE 4, 2019

- **(1)** Error(s) / Correction(s) Requested
- Total Meeting time should be 1 hr 47 min (Not 1 hr 12 Min)
- **MOTION:**
 - o **Made by:** Marcie Schwartzman / **Seconded by:** Denise Hollis
 - o **Motion To:**
 - **APPROVE** the minutes of the **REGULAR ZBA MEETING** held on **JUNE 4, 2019 - AS REVISED**
 - o **VOTE:**
 - **AYES (3):** Schwartzman / Leo / Hollis
 - **ABSTENTIONS (1):** Snell (not present at the meeting being voted on)
 - **NAYS (0):**
- **MOTION APPROVED**

NEXT MEETING

- o Scheduled for **TUESDAY, AUGUST 6, 2019**

MOTION TO ADJOURN

- **MOTION MADE BY: FRANK LEO / SECONDED BY: DENISE HOLLIS**
- **VOTE**
 - o **AYES (4):** Snell / Schwartzman / Leo / Hollis

- o **NAYS (0):**
- o **ABSTAINED (0):**
- **MOTION APPROVED**

MEETING CLOSED 6:55 PM (1 HR 55 MIN)

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

Mikal Sky-Shrewsberry (Clerk, PT)

Addendum: Guidelines for Public Comment To Be Read Out Loud at Beginning of Public Hearings

Intro

- Although the Board is interested in hearing all perspectives and believes every idea and concern has weight, Board decisions can only be based on those that fall within the scope of what is allowed/disallowed by law
- In addition to giving everyone a voice, the Board is listening for relevant points they may not have already thought of

Guidelines

1. The chair will recognize each speaker
2. Each speaker is asked to stand and give your name and your organization if you are representing one
3. Each will have (1) opportunity to comment and I ask you to limit your comments to (5) minutes
 - In order to use the time efficiently we ask that no one repeat points that have already been made.
4. Please address your comments to the entire Board
5. Board members may only speak for the purposes of information and clarity during the public hearing
6. At the Chair's discretion a speaker may be granted a second opportunity to add new comments
7. Speakers and Board members shall observe commonly accepted rules of courtesy, decorum and respect
8. After the close of the public hearing, the Board will discuss the application and make a decision either tonight or within (62) days