

*Town of Farmington*

1000 County Road 8  
Farmington, New York 14425

**ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**

*Established July 15, 1957*

**Monday, May 23, 2022, 7:00 p.m.**

**MINUTES—Approved**

*The minutes are written as a summary of the main points that were made and are the official and permanent record of the actions taken by the Town of Farmington Zoning Board of Appeals. Remarks delivered during discussions are summarized and are not intended to be verbatim transcriptions. An audio recording of the meeting is made in accordance with the Zoning Board of Appeals adopted Rules of Procedure. The audio recording is retained for four months.*

**Board Members Present:**

Jeremy Marshall, *Chairperson*  
Thomas Yourch  
Tod Ruthven  
Kelly Cochrane  
Jody Binnix

**Staff Present:**

Ron Brand, Town of Farmington Director of Development  
Dan Delpriore, Town of Farmington Code Enforcement Officer

**Applicant’s Present:**

Matthew Fox, 5842 Tweed Trail, Farmington  
James Russell, 5040 Herendeen Road, Farmington

**1. MEETING OPENING**

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Mr. Marshall.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Mr. Marshall said that the meeting would be conducted according to the Rules of Procedure approved by the Zoning Board of Appeals on March 28, 2022, as amended above.

This meeting was held both in person at the Farmington Town Hall and virtually on Zoom. The safety measures were implemented in accordance with the Governor’s relevant Executive Orders regarding the COVID-19 pandemic. A sign-in sheet was not used to avoid

contact with pens, pencils and papers. The names of those attending tonight's meeting is available for public tracing should it be deemed necessary. Hand sanitizers were available throughout the building. Public access was restricted to the lobby, the main meeting room, and the public restrooms.

## 2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MARCH 28, 2022

■ A motion was made by MS. COCHRANE seconded by MR. YOURCH, that the minutes of the March 28, 2022, meeting be approved.

Motion carried.

## 3. LEGAL NOTICE

The following Legal Notice was published in the *Canandaigua Daily Messenger* newspaper on Sunday, May 15, 2022:

### **ZB #0501-22, MATTHEW FOX, 5842 TWEED TRAIL, FARMINGTON, NEW YORK 14425:**

Request an Area Variance to the provisions contained within Chapter 165, Article V, Section 61 A of the Town of Farmington Codes. The applicant wishes to erect a fence six (6) feet in height to be located within the front yard portion of a lot. Per Town Code fences may be permitted that are four (4) feet or lower in height within the front yard portion of a lot. The lot is located at 5842 Tweed Trail and is zoned IZ Incentive Zoning.

### **ZB #0502-22, JAMES RUSSELL, 5040 HERENDEEN ROAD, FARMINGTON, NEW YORK 14425:**

Request an Area Variance to the provisions contained within Chapter 165, Schedule 1, Attachment 1, of the Farmington Town Code. The applicant wishes to erect an 8-foot x 47-foot porch to be attached to the front of a residence, with a proposed front setback of 40.6-feet. The Town Code requires a minimum front setback of sixty (60) feet. The property is located at 5040 Herendeen Road and is Zoned A-80 Agriculture.

**SAID BOARD OF APPEALS WILL MEET** at said time and place to hear all persons in support of, or having objections to, such matters.

By order of:  
Jeremy Marshall, Chairperson  
Zoning Board of Appeals  
TOWN OF FARMINGTON

## 4. PUBLIC HEARINGS

### **ZB #0501-22, MATTHEW FOX, 5842 TWEED TRAIL, FARMINGTON, NEW**

**FARMINGTON, NEW YORK 14425:**

Request an Area Variance to the provisions contained within Chapter 165, Article V, Section 61 A of the Town of Farmington Codes. The applicant wishes to erect a fence six (6) feet in height to be located within the front yard portion of a lot. Per Town Code fences may be permitted that are four (4) feet or lower in height within the front yard portion of a lot. The lot is located at 5842 Tweed Trail and is zoned IZ Incentive Zoning.

Mr. Marshall opens the public hearing on this application.

Matt Fox presented the above application. Mr. Fox first asks the Board if everyone has had the chance to see the survey he provided. He then passes around copies of the draft survey and a picture he took with a mockup of how the fence would look if approved. He explains that the fence will be located eight feet off of the sidewalk and twenty-six feet off of the road. As you can see in the picture his house is not there it is all the side of his house and the only reason it is considered the front setback is because of the curve. With the normal setback it is about twenty-five feet and that would require a six-foot fence to be forty-three feet off the road. Instead, he is hoping to put one twenty-six feet off the road. A few of the concerns that are outlined in the draft findings, one being snow removal which does not make any sense because it is eight feet off the sidewalk. He believes that when the snowplow comes through it is not an issue with the fence being eight feet off the sidewalk. If it is an issue, he would not mind compromising if there is a place where he can put it that is in front of the twenty-five feet setback then he is not opposed to finding some difference in there. The other main concern was the sightline. Could the traffic coming through, which traffic is a broad term there with all of ten to twenty cars coming through a day, can they effectively see around where he wants the fence? Is it creating an obstruction that creates a safety concern for kids playing in the neighborhood? Which he is friends with all his neighbors, and he does not want to see any of their kids get hurt of course but that is why he moved it off the sidewalk. He is hoping that is far enough, so it becomes less of a safety concern for everyone here. He knows that there was a call-in concern about the sightline, but he feels they were under the impression that he wanted to put the fence all the way up to the sidewalk which is not the case. He will be moving off the sidewalk by eight feet. He did bring a couple letters from his neighbors, and he is aware that one of his neighbors called in and were opposed to it. The two letters, from neighbors, were submitted to the board. One letter is from the neighbor across the street and the other is the neighbor at 5844 which is the neighbor that he borders with on the curve. In one of the findings, it says that this is a substantial variance request and it suggested that this was a 100% variance. He is not sure where that measurement comes from because he thinks that if you are thinking of terms of fence height, he can put a four-foot-high fence where he is suggesting but instead, he wants to put a six-foot high one. So, if he is doing six feet then that's 50% more than a four-foot fence. So, it would be a 50% not the 100% which would not make it the substantial variation. Or if you are looking at how far off the setback line then you could look at some other percentages. It is saying what is allowed right now is twenty-five feet off the sidewalk and he is looking for eight feet it's a different percentage from 100% also. Again, he is open to working with the Town to see if there is somewhere in between they could set it.

Mr. Marshall then asks if anyone else would like to speak for or against this project.

Hearing none. Mr. Marshall then asks for questions from the board members.

Mr. Yourch says that he has a question for the applicant. You said that you were willing to compromise, and it looks like the Town has offered somewhat of a recommendation.

Mr. Fox says there was no recommendation.

Mr. Ruthven then shows the applicant the instrument survey depicting where the Code Officer has given his interpretation of where a six-foot fence would be allowed and asks the applicant if he has seen that.

Mr. Fox says that he has not seen that.

Mr. Marshall asks Mr. Delpriore if the instrument survey was given to the applicant.

Mr. Delpriore says absolutely and tells the applicant that the survey was emailed to him and that he has seen it.

Mr. Ruthven asks Mr. Delpriore if the instrument survey he provided was for a six-foot fence.

Mr. Fox says this shows the twenty-five-foot setback line.

Mr. Delpriore says correct.

Mr. Fox says that is not a compromise. That is where it is required right now. A compromise would be somewhere in front of that verse what he has suggested.

Mr. Marshall then asks for any further questions from the Board.

Hearing none. Mr. Marshall then asks for staff comments.

Mr. Delpriore explains that this is a very interesting situation because this is not what is considered a corner lot because it is on a curve. A corner lot, by definition, has two roads that intersect. A corner lot is much more restrictive, as this board is aware, since they have seen these variance requests come before this Board. When this application was first brought to him for his interpretation there were straight lines drawn so the instrument survey in front of you is a compromise from his original interpretation. This compromise is allowing a six-foot fence further into the front than what we normally would see in relation to a corner lot which would be similar to a curved lot. He allowed the fence to go all the way up to the build line which is twenty-six feet from the sidewalk. He also spoke to the Highway/Parks Superintendent, and he was in agreement with the distance from the sidewalk with a tall fence like that on the curve for the additional sightline. This is the

compromise and he explained to the applicant that if he wanted more than that then he would need to apply for variance.

Mr. Delpriore stated that we the Town, did receive a letter that was not in support of this application. Up to this point we have not seen or been able to verify the letters that we were given tonight. There were definitely things that the Zoning Officer tried to work with the applicant on and they feel that they have offered a good compromise.

Mr. Fox thanked Mr. Delpriore for the extra insight.

Mr. Marshall then asked the applicant not to read into his question but if the Board were to approve his fence when he was looking to get started on it.

Mr. Fox states that he will probably start at the end of summer depending on supplies.

Mr. Marshall then says that he is going to keep the public hearing open, and they will not be making a decision on it tonight. He will not be putting it to a vote because there are too many variables that just got added tonight including letters of support and discussions of compromise. Mr. Marshall advises the applicant to schedule a meeting with the Town to see if there is something he can work out. He explains that the Board has to grant the minimal relief possible. He states that he will leave the public hearing open until next month.

Mr. Fox agrees.

Ms. Binnix asks Mr. Delpriore if the applicant could put a four-foot fence in instead of a six-foot fence and if that would change the boundary of what he was recommending.

Mr. Delpriore says absolutely.

Mr. Fox then states then the fence could go all the way to the sidewalk.

Mr. Delpriore says that it would still need to be about a foot off the sidewalk due to the plow equipment. A four-foot fence has always been allowed in a front yard.

Mr. Marshall advises the applicant to be sure that he gets all his questions answered during his meeting with Town Staff.

Mr. Fox says he is sorry that he didn't realize the Board would want to see the letters beforehand. He got the letters after he realized there was a recommendation for denial.

Mr. Delpriore explains that he just needs to verify the letters received tonight and that will be taken care of before the next meeting.

Mr. Marshall then leaves the public hearing open and moves on to the next application.

**ZB #0502-22, JAMES RUSSELL, 5040 HERENDEEN ROAD, FARMINGTON, NEW YORK 14425:**

Request an Area Variance to the provisions contained within Chapter 165, Schedule 1, Attachment 1, of the Farmington Town Code. The applicant wishes to erect an 8-foot x 47-foot porch to be attached to the front of a residence, with a proposed front setback of 40.6-feet. The Town Code requires a minimum front setback of sixty (60) feet. The property is located at 5040 Herendeen Road and is Zoned A-80 Agriculture.

Mr. Marshall opens the public hearing on this application.

James Russell presented the above application. He states that he has lived at this residence for forty years. He explains that he is unsure why the setback where he is is sixty feet verse other places in the Town that are only thirty feet. He says that his house was there before the road and has been there since 1860. When he bought his house there was only a dirt road. The road has been widened twice on his side of the road and is unsure what that is. They are just looking to upgrade and put a porch on the front of the house. They are also doing their siding and putting a sunroom off the back. They are just trying to upgrade the house for the long term.

Mr. Marshall then asks for questions from the Board.

Hearing none. Mr. Marshall then asks for staff comments.

Mr. Brand states that they have prepared two resolutions for the Board consideration. A SEQR resolution for a Type II action and a resolution of approval with conditions. The issue that they wanted to ensure here is that this will indeed remain a porch and not something that will provide interior living space in the future.

Mr. Russell explains that is not their intension it is really just a porch.

Mr. Brand explains that once a variance is granted it runs with the property. So, if Mr. Russell no longer lived there the new owner could not enclose the porch area to create additional living space.

Mr. Delpriore states that they have received a letter in support of this variance. Mr. Weidenborner had also previously requested that Mr. Delpriore mention that this type of variance request is increasing and questions if the Board would like staff to start looking into the code for possible modifications. He explains that on the agenda for the next meeting there is another area variance for a front porch. He adds that he agrees with Mr. Brand that we do not want to see these turned into living spaces, so we do need to be careful. In the case of the application before the Board tonight the road has been widened and the distance from the house to the road has decreased. So, he does have a hardship. He adds that he feels there is some good justification here.

Mr. Marshall says that they can talk about possible code modifications during other board matters.

Mr. Marshall then asks for any other questions or comments from the Board. Hearing none. Mr. Marshall then closes the public hearing for ZB #0502-22.

**5. BOARD BUSINESS—DELIBERATIONS AND DECISION**

<b>ZB #0502-22</b>	<b>James Russell 5040 Herendeen Road Shortsville, N.Y. 14548</b>	<b>Area Variance</b>
--------------------	--	----------------------

■ A motion was made by MR. YOURCH, seconded by MR. RUTHVEN, that the reading of the following State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) resolution be waived, and that the resolution be approved as submitted by the Town staff:

**FARMINGTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS RESOLUTION  
SEQR RESOLUTION—TYPE II ACTION**

**ZB #0502-22**

<b>APPLICANT:</b>	<b>JAMES RUSSELL 5040 HERENDEEN ROAD, SHORTSVILLE, NEW YORK 14548</b>
-------------------	---

<b>ACTION:</b>	<b>Area Variance to erect a 40.6 x 8’ deck to be attached on the front of the residence, creating a proposed front setback of 40.6 feet.</b>
----------------	--

**WHEREAS**, the Town of Farmington Zoning Board of Appeals (hereinafter referred to as the Board) has reviewed the criteria, under Part 617.5 (c) of the State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) Regulations, for determining the Classification associated with the above referenced Action; and,

**WHEREAS**, the Board finds that the Action is classified a Type II Action under Section 617.5 (c) (16) of the SEQR Regulations.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the Board does hereby classify the Action as a Type II Action under the SEQR Regulations.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** Type II Actions are not subject to further review under Part 617.

**BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED THAT** the Board in making this Classification has satisfied the procedural requirements under SEQR and directs this Resolution to be placed in the Town file upon this Action.

The above resolution was offered by MR. YOURCH and seconded by MR. RUTHVEN at a regularly scheduled meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals held on Monday, May 23, 2022. Following discussion, the following roll call vote was recorded:

Kelly Cochrane	Aye
Jody Binnix	Aye
Tod Ruthven	Aye
Thomas Yourch	Aye
Jeremy Marshall	Aye

Motion carried.

■ A motion was made by MR. YOURCH, seconded by MS. COCHRANE, that the reading of the complete Area Variance Findings and Decision resolution be waived, and that the Chairperson read aloud the Determination of the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Motion carried by voice vote.

**TOWN OF FARMINGTON  
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS  
AREA VARIANCE FINDINGS AND DECISION**

<b>APPLICANT:</b> James Russell 5040 Herendeen Rd Shortsville, N.Y. 14548	<b>File:</b> ZB #0502-22 <b>Zoning District:</b> A-80 Agricultural <b>Published Legal Notice on:</b> May 23, 2022 <b>County Planning Action on:</b> N/A <b>County Referral #:</b> N/A <b>Public Hearing held on:</b> May 23, 2022
---	--

**Property Location:** 5040 Herendeen Road, Farmington, New York 14425

**Applicable Section of Town Code:** Chapter 165A, Schedule 1, Attachment 1.

**Requirement for Which Variances are Requested:** The applicant wishes to erect an eight-foot-wide (8 foot) by forty-seven-foot (47 foot) long porch, to be attached to the front of the residence located at the above address, with a proposed front setback of 40.6-feet. The Town Code requires a minimum front setback of sixty (60) feet.

**State Environmental Quality Review Determination:** The granting of an Area Variance for an a 160-square-foot accessory structure is classified as a Type II Action under Part 617.5 (c) (16) of the State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) Regulations. Type II Actions have been determined, under the SEQR Regulations, not to have a substantial adverse impact upon the



environment or are otherwise precluded from further environmental review under article 8 of the State Environmental Conservation Law (ECL).

**County Planning Referral Recommendation:** N/A. Exempt Action by Ontario County Planning Board Bylaws.

**FACTORS CONSIDERED AND BOARD FINDINGS**

1. Whether an undesirable change will be produced in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties will be created by the granting of the Area Variance.

Yes  No

**Reasons:** The Zoning Board of Appeals (hereinafter referred to as the Board) finds that the character of this neighborhood is predominantly agricultural lands with low density single-family dwelling lots fronting along both sides of Herendeen Road. The Board further finds that there are other properties in the district having single-family dwellings which have had similar variances granted for front yard setbacks to accommodate porches. The Board finds that the porch is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood noting there are other structures in the area with front porches. The Board, based upon these findings, determines that the granting of the requested Area Variance will not create an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood; or create a detriment to nearby properties.

2. Whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by a feasible alternative to the requested variance.  Yes  No

**Reasons:** The Board finds there are no other options available to install a porch attached to the front of the residence without requiring a variance from this setback. Therefore, based upon these findings, the Board determines that the benefit to the applicant cannot be achieved by a feasible alternative design

3. Whether the requested variance is substantial.  Yes  No

**Reasons:** The Board finds that the requested encroachment into the front yard setback involves a variance of thirty-three percent (33%) from that required by town code. The Board has consistently found that a variance involving fifty percent (50%) or more is a substantial variance.

4. Whether the proposed variance will have an adverse effect or impact upon the physical environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district.  Yes  No

**Reasons:** The Board has given consideration to the criteria for determining significance, as set forth in Section 617.7 of the SEQR Regulations. The Board finds that the proposed Action is classified as a Type II Action under Section 617.5 (c) of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law (ECL), Article 8. The Board finds that Type II Actions have been determined not to have a significant adverse impact upon the environment and has thereby satisfied the procedural requirements of the ECL.

5. Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created which consideration shall be relevant to the decision of the board of appeals, but shall not necessarily preclude the granting of the Area Variance.

X  Yes      \_\_\_ No

**Reasons:** The Board finds that the alleged difficulty is self-created due to the applicant’s choice of wanting to attach a porch on the front of the residence.

**DETERMINATION OF THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS  
BASED UPON THE ABOVE FACTORS**

The Zoning Board of Appeals, after reviewing the above five proofs, finds:

**The Board based upon its review of the record on this application finds that the benefit to the applicant does outweigh any known detriment to the community or neighborhood; and, therefore, the requested area variance to erect a porch 45.2 feet from the front lot line instead of the required sixty (60) foot front setback is **AP-PROVED** with the following conditions:**

- 1. The porch addition is to match, to the extent practical, the exterior treatment of the existing structure.**
- 2. The porch addition shall not be enclosed.**
- 3. Any light fixture to be installed as part of the proposed porch addition shall comply with the Town’s Dark Sky lighting regulations contained in Chapter 165 of the Town Code.**
- 4. A Building Permit shall be acquired by the applicant prior to the start of construction.**

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Board in making this Determination has satisfied the procedural requirements under New York State Town Law and the Town of Farmington Town Code.

**BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED** that the Board directs this Resolution be placed in the public file upon this Action and that a copy hereof be provided to the applicant.

The above resolution was offered by MR. YOURCH and seconded by MS. COCHRANE at a regularly scheduled meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals held on Monday, May 23, 2022. Following discussion, the following roll call vote was recorded:

Kelly Cochran	Aye
Jody Binnix	Aye
Tod Ruthven	Aye
Thomas Yourch	Aye
Jeremy Marshall	Aye

Motion carried.

## 6. OTHER BOARD MATTERS

Mr. Marshall agrees that with an increase with the front porch area variance applications that staff should begin to look at the code for possible updates and to bring suggestions to the next meeting.

Mr. Marshall reminds the Board members to keep up with and to keep tracking their training credits.

## 7. PUBLIC COMMENTS—OPEN FORUM DISCUSSION

None

## 8. DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT UPDATE

- Tomorrow night's Town Board meeting there is a Local Law for their consideration regarding changes to Chapter 165 definition updates for conditioned and unconditioned building for mini warehouse purposes, update to the size of an accessory structure due to new industry standards, and sign regulations for the Limited Industrial District.
- Town Board is also working on the Incentive Zoning Application for the Farmington Market Center. They are currently waiting on the traffic study information from the owner of the plaza.
- They are also hoping to move forward with some other code revisions
- Still waiting on word from the Department of Transportation for the sidewalk grants
- We have received the Final Site Plan application for the apartments at Hathaway's Corners.
- We are waiting to hear what project is coming to the corner of County Road 41 and State Route 332
- Lloyd Twitchell received a Special Use Permit for his operations on Shortsville Road
- Conservation Board is working on signs to identify the drumlins in Hickory Rise

## 10. CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER UPDATE

- Code updates for the Town Board meeting we are adjusting the allowable size for a shed from 200 square feet to 300 square feet. Truly this is just a definition update because we do allow an 800 square foot detached garages, which means you have to have a concrete floor and a roll up door. The industry and our residents have been applying for sheds just over 200 square feet and we were requiring concrete floors. The new code will allow a 300 square foot shed with the understanding that no motor vehicles will be parked in the shed.
- Next Meeting will be June 27, 2022, for an area variance for a front porch on Coachlight Circle
- Open Clerk of the Board of Position
- Hired an additional Clerk in the Building Department, Carol will start on June 1, 2022
- Looking for a Code Officer as well

- Encourages the Board members to read the PRC Minutes and the Town Ops report Mr. Brand puts out twice a month

## 11. TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES

### ■ 2022 Municipal Bootcamp:

Hancock Estabrook and MRB Group are offering a free annual training program to assist local governments, municipal officials, and planning and zoning boards. The program will include 10 hours of remote training designed to provide a comprehensive education that encompasses all aspects of municipal governance. Each program in the series will be provided remotely on the fourth Thursday of each month with subject matter experts from MRB Group and knowledgeable attorneys from Hancock Estabrook LLP. Topics will be lively, useful and—potentially as important—qualify for the education requirements for members of planning boards and zoning boards of appeal.

Sessions in 2022:

*Thursday, June 23, 2022, 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.*

How it All Fits Together: Long-Range Plans and Near-Term Challenges

*Thursday, July 28, 2022, 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.*

Ask Us Anything: Hot Topics in Planning, Zoning and Community Development

*Thursday, September 22, 2022, 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.*

What Not to Say and What Really Not to Do: Avoiding Sexual Harassment

*Thursday, October 27, 2022, 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.*

A History Lesson: Managing Projects with Historic Significance

*Thursday, December 22, 2022, 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.*

Santa's Nice and Naughty List: The Best and Worst of 2022

*Select this link for the 2022 Municipal Bootcamp information page. RSVP and registration tab are at the bottom of the website page.*

<https://www.hancocklaw.com/events/the-2022-municipal-bootcamp/>

### ■ New York Planning Federation Recorded Webinars:

For information: (518) 512-5270 or nypf@nypf.org

#### *The Essentials of Planning and Zoning:*

Introduction to Planning, Zoning and Land Use

Everything You've Ever Wanted to Know About Preparing a Comprehensive Plan

Understanding and Applying SEQRA (NY State Environmental Quality Review Act)

The What, Why, and How of Site Plan Review

Common Mistakes and Mishaps in Site Plan Review

**Meeting Process and Communication:**

Enhancing Transparency Effectiveness in Planning Proceedings  
Innovations and Best Practices for Planning/Zoning Boards  
Engaging Diverse Communities and Dealing with Difficult People  
Working with Elected Officials and Understanding Everyone’s Role in Planning  
The Open Meetings Law for Zoning and Planning Boards, Part 2  
Working with Developers to Foster Investment in the Community  
Communication, the Media and Social Media  
Open Government and Planning and Zoning Decision Making

■ **General Code e-Code**

Daily drop-in lunchtime training Q&A sessions plus webinars in several categories.  
Information:

<https://www.generalcode.com/training/>

■ **Future Training Opportunities Online:**

Ontario County Planning Department website now lists upcoming training:

<https://www.co.ontario.ny.us/192/Training>

**12. NEXT MEETING**

The next regular meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals will be held on Monday, June 27, 2022, at 7:00 p.m. at the Farmington Town Hall, 1000 County Road 8.

**13. ADJOURNMENT**

■ A motion was made by MS. BINNIX, seconded by MS. COCHRANE, that the meeting be adjourned.

Motion carried by voice vote. The meeting was adjourned at 7:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

\_\_\_\_\_  
Sarah Mitchell L.S.  
Clerk *Pro Tem* of the Zoning Board of Appeals