

APPROVED

APPROVED
Village of Mamaroneck
Zoning Board of Appeals
September 7, 2017 Minutes

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS OF THE VILLAGE OF MAMARONECK, NEW YORK, HELD ON THURSDAY SEPTEMBER 7, 2017- AT 7:30 P.M. IN THE COURTROOM AT 169 MT. PLEASANT AVENUE, MAMARONECK, NEW YORK.

These are intended to be Action Minutes, which primarily record the actions voted on by the Zoning Board at the meeting held September 7, 2017. The full public record of this meeting is the audio/video recording made of this meeting and kept in the Zoning Board's records.

PRESENT: Barry Weprin, Chairman
David Neufeld (Vice Chairman) – Arrived @ 7:46 p.m.
Robin Kramer, Board Member (Secretary)
Kelly Wenstrup, Board Member

Anna Georgiou, Counsel to Board
Lester Steinman, Counsel to Board
Dan Gray, Building Inspector
Jeff Farrell, Assistant Building Inspector

ABSENT: Clark Neuringer, Board Member

CALL TO ORDER Chair Weprin called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m., noted the fire exits and reviewed meeting procedures for the public.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **Application # 2SP-2017, Mucahit (Mike) Arici, 419 Mamaroneck Avenue, Mamaroneck Coffee Roasters** (Section 9, Block 11, Lot 2) Application for a Special Permit to operate a new boutique Coffee Shop in an existing restaurant space. (C-2 District) – Taken out of order

Mr. Mike Arici appeared and informed the Board of what type of business they will be opening as well as the days and hours of operation. He stated that the kitchen would be open 7 days a week 7a.m. to 7 p.m.

Ms. Wenstrup motioned to close the Public Hearing, seconded by Ms. Kramer.

Ayes: Weprin, Wenstrup, Kramer
Recused: None
Nays: None
Absent: Neufeld, Neuringer

2. **Application # 1S-2017, 1202 WBP Realty Associates for Mattress Firm, 1202 West Boston Post Road (Section 9, Block 21, Lot 2B),** Application for variances to install an accessory sign on the side of the building greater than the façade sign. The proposed accessory sign violates Section 286-12 B (3) where the accessory sign shall be 50% or less than the size of the façade sign. The façade sign is 20" in height where the Applicant proposes the accessory sign will be 5'6" in height and the façade sign is 12' 6" horizontally and the Applicant proposes the accessory sign will be 13' 4 3/4" horizontally. (C-1 District)

Ms. Sherri Hillenberg appeared on behalf of Mattress Firm. She had photographs that were giving to the Board. She gave background of the variance that they are applying for. It is the standard corporate logo for Mattress Firm. Ms. Hillenberg also reviewed the sign code. Ms. Kramer stated that they have not seen a rendering or photo of the sign. Ms. Hillenberg g stated that she thought it was with the original application and gave it to the Board. When asked, Ms. Hillenberg stated that the sign would only be lit when the store is open as it was with the sign that was there previously.

Ms. Wenstrup motioned to close the Public Hearing, seconded by Ms. Kramer.

Ayes: Weprin, Wenstrup, Kramer

Recused: None

Nays: None

Absent: Neufeld, Neuringer

3. **Application # 12A-2017, Joe & Danielle LaPadula, 410 Heathcote Avenue** (Section 9, Block 7, Lot 12) Application for an area variance (FAR) to construct a new single family home on a currently undeveloped parcel. The proposed construction is in violation of Section 342-27, Schedule of Minimum Requirements, where the maximum allowed FAR is 0.42 and the Applicants propose 0.5452. (R-5 District)

Mr. Joe Ferazza of Westchester Modular Homes appeared with Mr. Mauro representing the owners. Mr. Ferazza reviewed the application. He stated that the need for the additional Floor Area Ratio is due to the lay of the land. Ms. Kramer asked why the applicant is asking the Board to ignore space in the basement that is viable and can be turned into a bedroom. Ms. Kramer does not see a valid reason to discount the garage as the Village has determined that garages need to be counted in FAR. Ms. Kramer asked if they considered a smaller garage and eliminating the playroom. (Mr. Neufeld joined the meeting). The applications have been before the Board of Architectural Review and neighbors had no issue with the application.

Mr. Petrucci appeared. He lives around the corner on Stanley Avenue. The applicant is his granddaughter. His two great grandchildren will be living in the home as well. He and his wife have lived in the neighborhood for 60 years.

Ms. Wenstrup motioned to close the Public Hearing, seconded by Ms. Kramer.

Ayes: Weprin, Wenstrup, Kramer, Neufeld

Recused: None
Nays: None
Absent: Neuringer

4. Application # 14A-2017, Angelo & Lilianna Morgante, 801 Jefferson Avenue (Section 4, Block 15A, Lot 5) Application for area variances (rear yard setback and FAR) to construct an addition on the east side of the existing house. The proposed construction is in violation of Section 342-27, Schedule of Minimum Requirements, where the rear yard setback required is 25' and the Applicants propose 16.6' and where the maximum FAR allowed is 0.5272 and the Applicants propose 0.54. (R-5 District)

Mr. Mark Mustacato Architect appeared for the applicant. He reviewed the application and the reason for the addition. They did try to comply with the Floor Area Ratio but this could not be done. Ms. Wenstrup printed a photo of the property from Google Earth that she shared with the Board.

Ms. Wenstrup motioned to close the Public Hearing, seconded by Mr. Neufeld.

Ayes: Weprin, Wenstrup, Kramer, Neufeld
Recused: None
Nays: None
Absent: Neuringer

The Board stated that they would be discussing the next two applications together. Mr. Weprin stated that counsel informed him of an issue with the noticing of the applications but that would not preclude the Board from opening the public hearings. Ms. Georgiou stated that there was an amended appeal on 4I that the notice did not include; therefore the hearing would have to be kept open. Mr. Weprin stated that the Board would keep these hearings open.

5. Application # 4I-2017, Donat, Lividini & Colaneri, regarding 1017 Grove Street (Section 4, Block 15, Lot 32) for an appeal of Building Permit #17-0429 issued on 4/24/17 for installation of a fence. APPEAL AMENDED 08/17/17 to include - Appeal of Building Permit #17-0833 issued on 7/27/17 and Building Permit #17-0838 issued on 7/28/17. (R-5 District)

6. Application # 5I-2017, Donat, regarding 1019 Grove Street (Section 4, Block 15, Lot 32.1) for an appeal of Certificate of Occupancy #16-0307 issued on 7/28/17, Building Permit #17-0831 issued on 7/27/17, and Building Permit #17-0840 issued on 7/28/17. (R-5 District)

Mr. Weprin stated that there may be jurisdictional issues and they will address these with counsel before the next meeting.

Ms. Jocelyn Donat of Hampshire Road appeared. She gave background on the applications and the issues with the Grove Street properties. There are concerns with the

interactions with the Building Department and the process that they understood. The applicants made requests during this process with the Building Department putting all of the pertinent information into the building files so that future residents are aware of what has happened during this process. The applicants would like the Building Department to monitor this building so that she does not have to keep appealing and coming before this Board.

Ms. Donat explained why the building permit for the fence at 1017 Grove Street should not have been approved. There were conditions of the subdivision approval, which have not been followed by putting this fence up. She believes that the Board needs to understand what was approved and agreed to. Calls were made and emails were sent to the Building Department before the fence was constructed. These were never answered and a certificate of compliance for the fence was given. The applicants are frustrated and do not believe that they should have to pay to apply for these appeals. The conditions approved need to be upheld.

The initial appeal application has been expanded, as there are additional concerns. Things have been built that are not on the approved site plan. All of these things have been brought to the Building Department's attention. Other issues are violation of the building envelope, the landscape plan and continued re-grading of the lot. Ms. Donat reviewed what has been built that was not on the approved plan. The developer never got approval for revised plans by the Board of Architectural Review. He was asked to get approval of the revised plans, attended a meeting, but left the meeting and never got approval. There are also setbacks that have been violated. There were no egresses shown on the original plan and these were added as well as additional windows. There are also concerns regarding the FAR.

Ms. Donat stated that on August 14, she was informed that there was no Certificate of Occupancy given to the home at 1017 Grove Street. This home has been occupied since August 9. She was told that a temporary C of O was issued when she called the Building Department on August 19.

Ms. Donat then reviewed the issues with 1019 Grove Street. There was a C of O issued and the home does not comply with the approved plan. The landscape plan was not followed. There needs to be a minimum of 20 plantings in the back of that lot. Window wells, egresses built were not on the plan and violate the setback requirement. There was a permit issued allowing a host of things to take place prior to the Certificate of Occupancy being issued. There were changes to and an increase to the number of windows allowed even though the Board of Architectural Review never approved a new plan. The Certificate of Occupancy was given even though the building did not match the approved plan.

Mr. Weprin asked what could be done to address this. Ms. Donat believes that the building should have been done according to plan and this Board needs to understand that there is a process in the Village for building and that this is not being followed. If there are no consequences for not following the processes, it is a mockery. The developer has told her that the Building Inspector does not care about the following of processes. If she were a developer, she would bring her projects here as well. Ms. Donat believes that board members should not be

serving if they do not care that processes and laws are followed. They believe that the developer should be held accountable.

Mr. Weprin is troubled by the allegations. He does not know what this Board could possibly do now that the homes are built and occupied. Ms. Donat asked that the landscape plan be adhered to. Ms. Donat also asked that if what was built requires a variance, get a variance. Don't allow for things to be built with no consequences. She believes the C of O needs to be revoked and the windows be brought into compliance. She has had to revise plans for a build she did on her home and it does not seem fair.

Ms. Kramer stated that this Board gets applications every month for buildings that were not constructed according to their approved plan. The Village needs to come up with a solution for this as it happens time after time. Perhaps at some point, this Board needs to stop giving variances. Mr. Weprin is frustrated that there are no good remedies for these situations. This Board has limited tools.

Mr. Tony Lividini of Wood Street appeared. He had a copy of the landscape plan that he said was approved but not followed. There was a fence built that was not on the plan and you now cannot see the landscaping. He made 20 calls and sent five emails to the Building Inspector. None of these were returned or addressed. Mr. Lividini asked if the water retention systems were inspected; if the grading was increased. Neither of these questions was answered. He believes that things are not inspected and not addressed.

Mr. Klausner appeared on behalf of the developer to address a legal issue. The issues of the appeals deal with compliance or lack of compliance with the plans. This Board spent many hours hearing a prior application brought by Ms. Donat on this property and made a determination that they are not authorized to review compliance with plans approved by the Planning Board. He and the developer also disagree with Ms. Donat's representation of the developments. Mr. Weprin asked that if it is not this Board, who would deal with assuring that developments are built according to the approved plan. Mr. Klausner stated it would be the Supreme Court of the State of New York. Ms. Kramer disagrees as this Board is charged with hearing and making a determination on whether or not permits were issued by the Building Department in compliance with the Code. They may not have the power to amend, but they can determine compliance. Mr. Klausner stated that this Board lacks the authority to make a determination on the compliance with the Planning Department plans. Mr. Weprin stated that their previous resolution is being misread and asked Mr. Klausner for case law on this. Mr. Klausner stated that the Court ruled in an Article 78 that an injunction should have been sought before the buildings were complete. They are now complete.

Ms. Kramer stated that New York law states that if something was built that is not in compliance with either their approved plan or the Zoning Code it would not be grandfathered as it was built illegally. Mr. Klausner reiterated that Ms. Donat did not go to Court to stop the building so that this cannot be raised at this point. He also believes that there is motivation behind Ms. Donat's appeal and that is to go after Mr. Castaldi as she is only appealing two homes. One

is occupied by Mr. Castaldi. The homes were all built the same and a friend of hers occupies the one home that Ms. Donat is not appealing.

Ms. Kramer asked about jurisdiction and should that be addressed before moving forward. Ms. Georgiou stated that past practice has been to hear the entire application first. Mr. Weprin agreed that as this is their past practice, the Board will continue hearing this tonight and will keep it open for counsel to provide advice on the jurisdiction issue before the next meeting.

Mr. Marc Castaldi, developer, appeared. He reviewed the issues brought forward by Ms. Donat. A fence is not and has never been considered an accessory structure. The fence has been installed in accordance with the Zoning Code. Mr. Weprin asked the purpose of the landscape plan if a fence was going to be put in to obscure this. Mr. Castaldi stated that the Planning Board required the landscape plan and the fence was put up, as it is the right of any property owner. Ms. Kramer asked if the fence was on any plan submitted to the Planning Board. Mr. Castaldi stated that it was not. Ms. Kramer asked why he put up a fence if it was not approved. Mr. Castaldi stated that the Planning Board did not discuss it. Ms. Kramer asked Mr. Castaldi if he believes that he can do whatever he wants in addition to the plan because it was not discussed. He stated that he believes that he can do whatever is allowed under the Zoning Code whether or not the Planning Board discussed it. Mr. Weprin is not sure if this is entirely true.

Mr. Castaldi next addressed the window wells. They are governed by the definition of the area of the building as they are a below grade projection and allowable according to the Zoning Code. Ms. Kramer asked why these are not in violation of the setback requirement. Mr. Gray explained the definition of a yard and when measurement starts. He also stated that this does not count as the window well is below ground. If they were on grade or above, they would have to be counted. Mr. Neufeld asked if window wells are structures. Mr. Farrell stated that he has never seen window wells considered structures, as they do not project beyond the ground level. Ms. Kramer stated that they have dealt with the issue of structures in the past. Ms. Wenstrup stated that she has a pool and it is considered a structure. Mr. Farrell said that pools are defined in the Code as an accessory structure. Mr. Gray concurred that anything below grade is not considered a structure and not used in determining setbacks. Mr. Castaldi stated that the approved plan had a topography approved. The as-built plans were overlaid onto the approved plan and the grading matched 100%. The Planning and Building Departments affirmed that.

Mr. Castaldi stated that the patios are on the plans approved by Mr. Gray and they are well within the setbacks. Ms. Kramer asked why he did not get approval from the BAR on the change of windows. Mr. Castaldi stated that there was a scene by those opposing his application at the BAR meeting and he withdrew his application. He took his plan to the Building Department and Mr. Gray understood that there was an error made by the architect. The windows were put in according to plan, approved, and a Certificate of Occupancy issued. After that issuance, Mr. Castaldi changed out the windows and as the cost was under \$10,000 it did not have to go back to the Board of Architectural Review. Mr. Castaldi stated that there might be individuals who do not like the way this was done; however, it was done according to the Village Code. Ms. Wenstrup believes this was clever, but not sure it should have been done. Mr. Neufeld asked how long after he was given the Certificate of Occupancy on this home did he apply for a permit to put in new

windows. Mr. Castaldi was unsure how long after the CO was granted, he applied for the window permit. He understood he needed to close out his original permit by code before he could apply for a permit. Mr. Castaldi said that whether he applied for the permit 5 minutes or 5 years after obtaining the CO made no difference. Ms. Kramer noted Ms. Donat claimed on August a TCO was given for one of the properties. Mr. Castaldi added he has not touched those windows; they match the plan. A permit has not been issued; they are not masked, they were framed in and finished as though they were never there. Ms. Donat stated in her submission the CO and Permit were issued on 7/28/17; the same day. Mr. Castaldi informed the Board that the error was made on the windows for all three homes and the windows on the homes on lot 1 and 2 have been changed. He also stated that Ms. Donat is not appealing the work done on lot 1 even though the windows are the same as the home on lot 2.

Ms. Georgiou suggested that the Building Department have copies of the complete records for these properties available for the next meeting and have these submitted into the record. Mr. Castaldi again reviewed the window modifications made on lots 1 and 2 as well as the window wells and fence. Mr. Castaldi stated that he has gotten zero violations, zero stop work orders. All permits were reviewed and closed out. He did everything according to plan and Code. All the documents submitted by licensed professionals show that those who are against him and this development are wrong. When asked, Mr. Castaldi stated that he planted more plants than were required by the landscape plan. Mr. Castaldi also stated that the plants were looked at and counted before the Certificate of Occupancy was issued. Mr. Gray stated that before the entire site is closed out, all of the plantings would be counted. Mr. Castaldi believes that this is a waste of everyone's time. He never received a violation, was looked at under a microscope and did everything the Building Inspector asked of him.

Mr. Lividini appeared again and stated that this is about following the rules. The landscaping plan is the plan and now all he sees from his window is a white fence. Mr. Weprin stated that the Board understands. Mr. Lividini submitted photos of the fence as seen from his backyard.

Ms. Sue McCrory of The Crescent appeared and asked that the Board look carefully at the definition of structures. She believes that the bottom of the window well is where the structure begins and the setbacks are there for fire safety reasons. These window wells could prevent fire-fighting. She believes that this is a bad practice.

Mr. Stuart Tiekert of Beach Avenue appeared and stated that Mr. Castaldi must have said five times that there are no violations on this property. Mr. Tiekert stated that is because Mr. Gray let him do whatever he wanted on this site. He brought up the issue of the existing home staying up when it should have been taken down immediately with the construction entrance being there. Mr. Tiekert sent pictures and emails several times regarding standing water and the percolation rates being wrong. None of these issues were addressed by the Building Department. He stated that Mr. Castaldi never addressed the issue of the patio being impervious and taken into account for storm water. Mr. Tiekert has requested under FOIL the TCO's and as-built topography plans. He has never received these documents. These records should be on the

website and before this Board. He believes that the Zoning Board is going to be inundated with these types of things. There is a problem in the Village that needs to be figured out.

Ms. Donat appeared again to address some things brought up by Mr. Castaldi. She stated that it is not true that the Building Inspector approved the building as they were on the plan. Also, the permit he received on 1019 Grove Street was to add a window, not five. If there were incremental plans approved after February of 2016, she knows nothing about them. Ms. Donat stated that the window wells were not on the plan. She read the definition of structure, which states on or under the ground level in whole or in part. She also has not seen a topography plan, but Mr. Castaldi did change the grade. She complained five times to the Building Department that dirt was being brought in and the grade changed. She never received a response. Ms. Donat also stated that the property is 6-8 trees shy and this is an easy fix. She has issue with Mr. Castaldi never receiving a violation or stop work order and has raised this to the Board of Trustees.

Mr. Weprin stated that this hearing would be left open to the next meeting.

B. CLOSED APPLICATIONS

1. Application # 1S-2017, 1202 WBP Realty Associates for Mattress Firm, 1202 West Boston Post Road (Section 9, Block 21, Lot 2B), Application for variances to install an accessory sign on the side of the building greater than the façade sign.

Board members discussed the application and the statutory factors were considered. **Ms. Kramer motioned to approve the sign, as it is the same size and dimensions of the previous signs and that there will be no illumination when the store is closed, seconded by Ms. Wenstrup.**

Ayes:	Weprin, Wenstrup, Kramer, Neufeld
Recused:	None
Nays:	None
Absent:	Neuringer

2. Application # 2SP-2017, Mucahit (Mike) Arici, 419 Mamaroneck Avenue, Mamaroneck Coffee Roasters (Section 9, Block 11, Lot 2) Application for a Special Permit to operate a new boutique Coffee Shop in an existing restaurant space. (C-2 District)

Mr. Weprin motioned to approve the Special Permit application with the business hours of 7 a.m. to 7 p.m., seconded by Ms. Kramer.

Ayes:	Weprin, Wenstrup, Kramer, Neufeld
Recused:	None
Nays:	None
Absent:	Neuringer

3. Application # 12A-2017, Joe & Danielle LaPadula, 410 Heathcote Avenue (Section 9, Block 7, Lot 12) Application for an area variance (FAR) to construct a new single family home on a currently undeveloped parcel.

The Board discussed the application and the statutory factors. This appears to be a substantial FAR variance. Ms. Kramer has an issue with this application, as she believes that the homeowner can build out the basement space in the future as habitable space. She asked what would prevent them from doing this. Ms. Georgiou suggested that the variance would be tied to the submitted plans for this application. Ms. Kramer asked if it is possible to approve the variance to facilitate the proposed two-car garage but not for the unfinished space on the basement level. Ms. Georgiou suggested that approval could be conditioned on this additional space remaining unfinished. The Board instructed Ms. Georgiou to draft a resolution stating this for the next meeting for consideration.

4. Application # 14A-2017, Angelo & Lilianna Morgante, 801 Jefferson Avenue (Section 4, Block 15A, Lot 5) Application for area variances (rear yard setback and FAR) to construct an addition on the east side of the existing house.

The Board discussed the application and the statutory factors. **Ms. Wenstrup motioned to approve the application as requested, seconded by Mr. Neufeld.**

Ayes:	Weprin, Wenstrup, Kramer, Neufeld
Recused:	None
Nays:	None
Absent:	Neuringer

5, Application # 6SP-2013, Shore Acres Point Corp., 504 The Parkway, (Section 4, Block 76A, Lot 1) to amend permitted hours for organized events for an existing special permit to operate a club (special permit renewal resolution dated November 5, 2015). (R-10 District)

The Board reviewed the existing hours and the hours requested for SAPC sponsored events and member-sponsored events. Ms. Kramer suggested limiting the number of club-sponsored events. The Board's consensus was to limit the number of club-sponsored events with extended hours to a maximum of five per year and to extend hours for member-sponsored events on Fridays and Saturdays, but not extend those hours on Sunday through Thursday and that the house rules apply. The Board instructed counsel to draft a resolution for their next meeting for review and consideration.

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. MINUTES:

Approval of Minutes from the March 2, 2017, April 6, 2017, May 4, 2017, June 1, 2017 & July 6, 2017.

Ms. Wenstrup and Ms. Kramer both had minor, non-substantive changes to the minutes that they will forward to Ms. Sherer. The Board agreed to approve the minutes contingent on these minor changes being made.

Ms. Wenstrup made a motion to approve the March 2, 2017, April 6, 2017, May 4, 2017, June 1, 2017 & July 6, 2017 minutes, seconded by Mr. Neufeld

Ayes:	Weprin, Wenstrup, Kramer, Neufeld
Recused:	None
Nays:	None
Absent:	Neuringer

At 10:29p.m. Ms. Wenstrup left the meeting as she was recused from review of the Hampshire Club application

OLD BUSINESS (CONTINUED)

6. **Application # 1SP-2014, Hampshire Club, Inc., 1025 Cove Road** (Section 9, Block 72, Lots 1,2,3,11,17B,17C,18D,24,25,28 & 29- Section 9., Block 89B, Lots 15 & 16 - Section 9, Block 89C, Lots 22A & 23 -Section 9, Block 89D, Lots 24,25, 26,27& 28) for renewal of a special permit for Non-Member Events (MR and R-20Districts)

OLD BUSINESS (CONTINUED)

6. **Application # 1SP-2014, Hampshire Club, Inc., 1025 Cove Road** (Section 9, Block 72, Lots 1,2,3,11,17B,17C,18D,24,25,28 & 29- Section 9., Block 89B, Lots 15 & 16 - Section 9, Block 89C, Lots 22A & 23 -Section 9, Block 89D, Lots 24,25, 26,27& 28) for renewal of a special permit for Non-Member Events (MR and R-20Districts)

Mr. Weprin motioned to enter a confidential session at 10:30p.m. for Advice of Counsel, seconded by Ms. Kramer

Ayes:	Weprin, Kramer, Neufeld
Recused:	Wenstrup (not present)
Nays:	None
Absent:	Neuringer

The Board convened an Advice of Counsel session to discuss this application. Mr. Weprin stated that there were no votes taken during the Advice of Counsel.

Ms. Kramer motioned to return from Advice of Counsel session at 11:00p.m., seconded by Mr. Neufeld

Ayes: Weprin, Kramer, Neufeld
Recused: Wenstrup (not present)
Nays: None
Absent: Neuringer

The Board reviewed the draft resolution. The Board agreed to delete the word “prospectively” from p. 3 of the resolution. Ms. Kramer believes that the same restricted hours that the Shore Acres Club holds their events should be used for events held in the portion of the Hampshire Club that is in the Residential zone. The Board agreed. The use of live outdoor music in the residential zone was discussed, and it was agreed to limit to not after 7 p.m. on weeknights and 9 p.m. on Friday and Saturday. Mr. Neufeld also requested that the resolution be amended to require that the applicant comply with all requirements and be subject to all restrictions set forth in the applicable provisions of the Village Zoning Code.

Mr. Neufeld made a motion to adopt the resolution with the above noted changes, seconded by Ms. Kramer

Ayes: Weprin, Kramer, Neufeld
Recused: Wenstrup
Nays: None
Absent: Neuringer

ADJOURN MEETING

On motion of Ms. Kramer, seconded by Mr. Neufeld the meeting was adjourned at 11:15p.m.

In favor: Weprin, Neufeld, Kramer
Opposed: None
Absent: Wenstrup, Neuringer
Abstained: None

Respectfully Submitted,

Betty-Ann Sherer

Betty-Ann Sherer

The next Zoning Board meeting has been set for Thursday October 5, 2017 @ 7:30pm