

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

INCORPORATED VILLAGE OF LAUREL HOLLOW
BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
PUBLIC HEARING
October 25, 2017
7:30 p.m.

VILLAGE HALL
1492 Laurel Hollow Road
Syosset, New York 11791-9603

PRESENT: RUSSELL MOHR, CHAIRMAN
NEWTON J. BURKETT, MEMBER
LOUIS LEBEDIN, MEMBER

ALSO PRESENT:
HOWARD AVRUTINE, village Attorney

ZV10-2017: Boutis

RONALD KOENIG
OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

Proceedings

1 MR. AVRUTINE: The next application is case
2 ZV10-2017, the public hearing on the application of
3 Loukas and Nicole Boutis to install a swimming pool and
4 patio at 45 Cedarfield Road where:

5 The accessory structures are not set back at
6 least 40 feet from every lot line not abutting a street
7 in violation of Section 145-5(B)(2) of the Laurel Hollow
8 Village Code. The patio setback is 20.8 feet. The
9 swimming pool setback is 25.9 feet.

10 In addition, the total surface coverage shall
11 not exceed 20 percent of the lot area according to
12 Section 145-5(A)(1)(d) of the Laurel Hollow Village
13 Code. 23.6 percent is proposed.

14 The property under application is designated
15 as Section 14, Block A, Lot 1116 on the Land and Tax Map
16 of Nassau County.

17 The exhibits in connection with this
18 application are as follows:

19 First, notification from the Nassau County
20 Planning Commission dated September 12, 2017 that the
21 matter under application is referred to the Laurel
22 Hollow Board of Zoning Appeals to take action as it
23 deems appropriate.

24 The next exhibit is the legal notice of public
25 hearing dated September 22, 2017.

1 The next exhibit is an affidavit of posting
2 from Nick Porcaro that the notice of public hearing was
3 posted conspicuously on the bulletin board at the main
4 entrance to the Office of the Village Clerk on
5 October 13, 2017.

6 The next exhibit is an affidavit of
7 publication from the Oyster Bay Guardian stating that
8 the legal notice was published in the Oyster Bay
9 Guardian on October 13, 2017.

10 The next exhibit is an affidavit from the
11 Deputy Clerk stating that the notice of public hearing
12 was mailed to other interested parties on October 6,
13 2017.

14 The next exhibit consists of documents
15 confirming that the notice of public hearing was
16 published to the Village of Laurel Hollow website and
17 sent to Village website NEWS subscribers on October 6,
18 2017.

19 And the final exhibit is an affidavit of
20 mailing from the applicant indicating that the notice of
21 public hearing was mailed on October 6, 2017 to the
22 individuals set forth in the affidavit.

23 Do we have a representative here on behalf of
24 the applicant?

25 MR. MARNIKA: Yes. Good evening.

Proceedings

1 MR. AVRUTINE: Please give your name and
2 address.

3 MR. MARNIKA: Hrvoje Marnika, P.E., Licensed
4 Professional Engineer, State of New York. First name
5 H-R-V-O-J-E. Last name M-A-R-N-I-K-A.

6 I'm here this evening to present to you the
7 plan here, make a request for three variances, area
8 variances, associated with a proposed patio and swimming
9 pool.

10 The property is two acres, located on the
11 south side of Cedarfield Road approximately 1,000 foot
12 east from Elizabeth Drive. The property is a
13 one-and-a-half story frame residence with an attached
14 garage. And the proposed improvements is a 24-by-40
15 in-ground swimming pool along with a masonry pool patio.

16 Additional site improvements include a 4-foot
17 high barrier fence around the pool area in accordance
18 with the New York State Code, as well as a dry well
19 pursuant to the Village Code.

20 The proposed pool and patio setbacks are 25.9
21 and 20.8 feet respectively. Lot coverage, the maximum
22 allowed is 20 percent, while 23.6 percent is proposed.

23 I feel it's important that I mention to the
24 Board tonight here, there was a small oversight that
25 came to our attention here during the review process,

1 okay. There is an existing shed on the property that
2 was installed. It's under 144 square feet. It's about
3 80 square feet. We realize that it needs to be a
4 minimum of 40 feet from the boundary. It is not. It is
5 21 feet per the survey. So we realize that has to be
6 addressed. Like I said, it was an oversight. It was
7 not listed on the disapproval letter.

8 Additionally, the homeowner has taken or begun
9 to take the necessary steps to file the necessary
10 paperwork to address the issue.

11 MS. BOUTIS: If I can -- Nicole Boutis,
12 homeowner, 45 Cedarfield Road, Laurel Hollow.

13 So regarding that matter, regarding the shed,
14 I will be back here again seeking a variance for that.
15 I have filed the necessary paperwork to start the
16 process to legalize the shed, and I have filed for a
17 permit. I just recently received the notice of
18 disapproval, so I do plan on coming back to legalize it
19 to request a variance.

20 MR. AVRUTINE: And just for the Board's
21 edification for clarity on the record, it is my
22 understanding, and I think this has been verified, that
23 the shed is counted in the coverage variance that is
24 before the Board this evening. So it will not be a
25 further variance for lot coverage when the shed comes

Proceedings

1 before you. It will only be a setback issue before the
2 Board. So, I just want to make sure that was clear on
3 the record, and that the Board had the full picture.

4 MS. BOUTIS: Thank you.

5 MR. MARNIKA: So, the reason for the request
6 variance here, okay, is basically if you look at the lay
7 of the property and the existing improvements, there is
8 an existing tennis court in the rear of the property.
9 The setbacks are delineated on the plan. The tennis
10 court and the patio here prohibits the, you know,
11 locating the pool in a reasonable location in the rear
12 yard and within the setbacks.

13 The location of the pool was strategically
14 located where it is now. There's many reasons why to
15 locate the pool here, one of which is a very important
16 one. You know, basically, this area here is the
17 sunniest area during the day, particularly in the
18 afternoon where statistics really show that the pool is
19 used mostly in the afternoon. This area gets the most
20 sun. So that was an important reason to locate it
21 there.

22 It also does not require any clearing of trees
23 to locate it there, which we felt was important as well.

24 And providing a reasonable setback here from
25 the existing patio to the edge of the pool at 12 feet,

1 we feel it's a safe distance from the paver patio here
2 to step down and have an area just to get around and,
3 you know, walk around it.

4 And lastly, it's also more visible here from
5 the inside of the home than if you put it anywhere in
6 this area. It's kind of out of sight and not really
7 favorable in that area. It would require additional
8 clearing, and it wouldn't be in a sunny portion of the
9 yard.

10 So in conclusion, this variance will not
11 create an undesirable change into the character of the
12 neighborhood. The area variance requested is minimal.
13 There's no adverse impact to the physical environmental
14 conditions of the neighborhood. It's not self-created
15 to the extent that, you know, that the tennis court and
16 everything is already there without relocating that.
17 And there's no other reasonable method to achieve this
18 improvement and keeping everything intact.

19 I would like to urge the Board to grant the
20 approval, close the hearing tonight. My client would
21 like to proceed with the excavation and the work
22 November 1st, if it's at all possible. And that's
23 basically it.

24 If you have any questions, I will be happy to
25 answer them for you.

1 MEMBER LEBEDIN: With regard to the pavers, I
2 guess my concern -- I appreciate the configuration of
3 the property and obviously the sun and the whole bit, I
4 can understand your location. Just, I'm more concerned
5 about the lot coverage and how much of a savings it
6 would have on your proposal if we were to remove some of
7 the pavers around the house.

8 MR. MARNIKA: The proposed pavers?

9 MEMBER LEBEDIN: Yes.

10 MS. BOUTIS: Which portion are we --

11 MEMBER LEBEDIN: I mean, you are roughly
12 17 percent over the allowable amount. So I believe the
13 idea being, recognizing it is important to try to keep
14 lot coverage at the required amounts obviously for a
15 host of reasons, seeing whether or not you can kind of
16 limit the amount of pavers you use to achieve the
17 20 percent or so guideline.

18 MEMBER BURKETT: I think the suggestion would
19 be to try to dial that back as much as you can without
20 creating something that you don't want to have in your
21 yard within reason.

22 CHAIRMAN MOHR: I don't think we want to
23 redesign your plan, but I do think that, you know, it's
24 the Board's obligation to try to see if we can minimize
25 the variance request. I mean, you do have setback

1 variances that were already granted significantly for
2 the tennis court, and we're asking for a setback
3 variance here.

4 We didn't ask anyone from the public. I would
5 like to see, before we go on, if there is anyone from
6 the public here who would like to comment on this file?

7 MS. BOUTIS: I actually have a letter from my
8 neighbor.

9 MR. AVRUTINE: Let the record reflect there
10 are no responses.

11 MS. BOUTIS: I also have a letter from my
12 neighbor at 35 Cedarfield stating he has no objection to
13 the application.

14 MR. AVRUTINE: Would you like to submit that?

15 MS. BOUTIS: Yes. Thank you.

16 MEMBER LEBEDIN: That's the house adjacent to
17 that side of your property?

18 MS. BOUTIS: Right. That's 35 Cedarfield.

19 CHAIRMAN MOHR: Conceptually, if you could
20 consider maybe, because if you look at the pool and
21 patio calculations and the coverage analysis, you have
22 approximately --

23 MR. MARNIKA: So, the proposed pool patio is
24 1,366 square feet. That's part of the surface coverage
25 analysis.

Proceedings

1 I would like to turn this board over to have a
2 conceptual rendering. And when I say conceptual, the
3 alignment is, in fact, intact. It's exactly where
4 everything would go. It's just that there's no trees
5 shown exactly where they are. So the darker area is
6 natural. I overlaid aerial so you can see the buffer
7 here.

8 In terms of the orientation, the design of the
9 patio, I would just like to say, you know, 17 or
10 18 percent, whatever the number is, the overage, for
11 when I look at it and advised my client in the
12 beginning, I feel that under 20 percent is just -- it's
13 a good starting point for a variance. You know, if my
14 client came to me and said can we put a larger patio,
15 you get in over 20 percent, I feel that's not minimal
16 when you ask for it in terms of compliance with SEQRA
17 and granting the variance for New York State
18 requirements. I feel that 17, 18 percent is reasonable.

19 You'll notice here, the alignment. There's
20 two staircases when you come down. The first one is
21 here. The second one is here. So there's a small
22 walkway to get into this area. This here area is really
23 meant to be a sun deck for lounge chairs. This area
24 here is really not, you know, useable per se.

25 MS. BOUTIS: I tried to just put a small

Proceedings

1 amount here just so that we weren't stepping on the
2 grass. I tried to actually keep it very minimal on this
3 side and on this side. I was actually going to do a
4 little less on this side, but the problem was, because
5 of the steps here, I needed to have something, otherwise
6 when you're stepping down you are stepping down onto
7 grass to walk to this area. So I'm not certain which
8 area I would be cutting into.

9 Do you know what I mean?

10 MR. MARNIKA: This area is minimal here. It's
11 about 3 foot just to get around if you have to do a
12 manual skimmer or get around the pool.

13 MS. BOUTIS: If I try and make this less on
14 this side, what happens is I have steps here, so --

15 MR. MARNIKA: We align here with the steps.

16 MS. BOUTIS: Right. So if I go inward here,
17 let's say, I'm starting my patio in the middle of the
18 step. So, I'm not really certain where to cut.

19 MEMBER LEBEDIN: I'm not sure why on the
20 grass, but you can also put a paver or some type of
21 steps without having the whole area patio'd. There are
22 other options you can explore. I just believe the 17
23 percent over the allowance, despite your thoughts, is
24 excessive.

25 MEMBER BURKETT: I don't see it as a hardship

1 you need our help with. It's just a situation where, it
2 would seem to me and it's my opinion, that you could
3 dial that back and be within the code or even close to
4 the code. But I don't accept your arguments that, you
5 know, it's in the margins or it's de minimus. I don't
6 accept that, with respect.

7 MR. MARNIKA: Understood.

8 what would be a reasonable percentage?
9 Because I'm a numbers guy when I look at calculations.

10 MEMBER BURKETT: My name is Newton, so I'm
11 definitely.

12 CHAIRMAN MOHR: If you could take a look at
13 it, and obviously using a similar type of stepping stone
14 that you have in your tennis court, transition it. If
15 you can use that as transition down to the pool patio,
16 you can bring it down to somewhere around 15 percent,
17 between 12 and 15 percent. I think that would be
18 something that would be more palatable to the Board.
19 There is a lot of patio there already, between the house
20 and the tennis court.

21 MEMBER BURKETT: You've got two acres of
22 property, but you've got a lot going on.

23 CHAIRMAN MOHR: It's also a very unusual lot.
24 It's a pie-shaped lot.

25 MEMBER BURKETT: Otherwise, we wouldn't be

Proceedings

1 discussing it if it were a simple case.

2 MR. MARNIKA: would it be acceptable to the
3 Board if we look at other areas, for example -- and I
4 have to again check with my client, I'm just trying to
5 get an idea here -- something that is not so useable
6 that's existing, if we'll be able to pull some of that
7 out and --

8 MEMBER BURKETT: Remove that and grass it
9 over?

10 MR. MARNIKA: Yeah.

11 MEMBER LEBEDIN: Of course.

12 MR. MARNIKA: Not that it's this area.

13 MEMBER LEBEDIN: It's just the overall usage.

14 CHAIRMAN MOHR: That's probably 150 square
15 feet over here.

16 MEMBER BURKETT: I don't care how you get to
17 the number, we need to protect the code where we can.

18 MS. BOUTIS: That's fine. That's doable.

19 MEMBER LEBEDIN: You are asking us for a
20 concession. We are asking for one in return.

21 MS. BOUTIS: Absolutely.

22 CHAIRMAN MOHR: And understand, the tennis
23 court is over 8,000 square feet of your coverage. So
24 that creates a separate problem for you to come to the
25 calculation to make it --

1 MS. BOUTIS: I know. And we've only been in
2 that house for a few years, so obviously the court was
3 already there. It's just kind of in an awkward position
4 on the property. You know, you look at it and you can't
5 help but think to yourself, gee, I would have, and I'm
6 not even a designer, but I would have designed it and
7 placed it differently. But, you know, it is what it is,
8 and we don't want to rip it up. But I'll be more than
9 happy to work with that, absolutely, and trim it down,
10 yes.

11 MEMBER LEBEDIN: I appreciate it.

12 CHAIRMAN MOHR: Thank you.

13 MR. AVRUTINE: I would just like to mark the
14 letter dated October 9, 2017 from the resident at
15 35 Cedarfield Road that the applicant submitted as
16 Applicant's Exhibit Number 1 for the record.

17 MEMBER BURKETT: And I would state for the
18 record that there is no biased on the Board against
19 tennis players or tennis courts.

20 CHAIRMAN MOHR: In order to continue to move
21 this case along, we have no issues with the setbacks,
22 correct?

23 MEMBER BURKETT: I think it is what it is.

24 MEMBER LEBEDIN: Recognizing the configuration
25 of the property, we are fine.

Proceedings

1 CHAIRMAN MOHR: Would the Board consider
2 approving the application if they're able to put it at
3 15 percent or less?

4 MEMBER BURKETT: Fifteen percent is kind of
5 high, actually.

6 CHAIRMAN MOHR: I think based on the
7 circumstances, and understanding you certainly want to
8 have chairs around the patio and you need that space, I
9 don't think it's unreasonable, again, based on
10 proximity.

11 MEMBER BURKETT: If you think it's not
12 unreasonable, I'll defer to you.

13 CHAIRMAN MOHR: I think if we do 15 percent,
14 it's a reasonable --

15 MEMBER BURKETT: From 17 percent?

16 CHAIRMAN MOHR: It's closer to 18.

17 MR. MARNIKA: I believe it's actually
18 18.3 percent.

19 CHAIRMAN MOHR: Taking all the things into
20 consideration, I think that it works for me.

21 MEMBER BURKETT: I'll defer to you.

22 MEMBER LEBEDIN: Okay.

23 MR. AVRUTINE: May we have a motion to close
24 the public hearing?

25 MEMBER BURKETT: Moved.

Proceedings

1 MR. AVRUTINE: By Member Burkett.

2 May I have a second?

3 MEMBER LEBEDIN: Second.

4 MR. AVRUTINE: Member Lebedin.

5 All in favor?

6 CHAIRMAN MOHR: Aye.

7 MEMBER BURKETT: Aye.

8 MEMBER LEBEDIN: Aye.

9 MR. AVRUTINE: Let the record reflect that
10 this matter is deemed Type II under the New York State
11 Environmental Quality Review Act.

12 And a motion on the application?

13 CHAIRMAN MOHR: Motion to approve.

14 MR. AVRUTINE: On the condition that the lot
15 coverage be reduced --

16 CHAIRMAN MOHR: Is no greater --

17 MR. AVRUTINE: Is no greater than 15 percent.

18 MEMBER LEBEDIN: You're saying approving --

19 MR. AVRUTINE: A maximum of --

20 MEMBER LEBEDIN: Twenty-three percent.

21 CHAIRMAN MOHR: If you are not in favor -- I'm
22 taking all the conditions into consideration. It's not
23 just -- Lou's a numbers guy. I look at these land
24 issues all the time, and I feel that based on the lot
25 conditions, while there is a lot of coverage, the tennis

1 court is 8,000 square feet, they are trying to put a
2 pool in, and the place is reasonable, the neighbor has
3 no objection.

4 MEMBER LEBEDIN: I don't have an issue with
5 that. I worry about the precedent setting of getting
6 something where the lot itself doesn't, I think,
7 exacerbate the coverage issue to the point where such an
8 allowance should be provided.

9 I guess what I was prepared to do is allow
10 them to come back with a suggestion. I'm not sure, does
11 our deferring that element, assuming you proceed to go
12 forward with the pool in that area, slow down the
13 effort, if that's a concern to you?

14 MEMBER BURKETT: Can you go ahead and build
15 the pool while we figure out --

16 MEMBER LEBEDIN: Is the landscaping and the
17 decking going to affect your ability to move forward at
18 this point?

19 MR. AVRUTINE: I don't --

20 CHAIRMAN MOHR: I don't think the pool and not
21 the patio and all the site plan that ties into it.

22 MEMBER LEBEDIN: So you can't?

23 CHAIRMAN MOHR: I would think not.

24 MR. AVRUTINE: I'd have to consult with the
25 building inspector, but I don't believe so.

1 MEMBER LEBEDIN: Right now the pool pool patio
2 is 1,366 square feet out of the 20,000 square feet of
3 usage. So that's approximately 6 and-a-half percent of
4 the total usage. So you're willing to shave --

5 MEMBER BURKETT: Just over three percent.

6 MEMBER LEBEDIN: So you're basically saying
7 50 feet, 43 feet.

8 CHAIRMAN MOHR: Right. I'm looking at the
9 areas where they could possibly shave, which it could be
10 in the west side of the pool, if you can just eliminate
11 that. And this looks like it's a 12-foot measurement on
12 the south side.

13 MEMBER BURKETT: What about the pavers near
14 the tennis court entrance?

15 CHAIRMAN MOHR: If you remove that, it takes
16 care a lot of their issue as well. It's probably
17 another 150 --

18 MEMBER BURKETT: Right. I think that's kind
19 of what we were discussing. That's what she seemed to
20 be open to doing. That gets us closer to 10 percent. I
21 just think that 3 percent is not much of a concession.
22 You say okay, well, 3 percent.

23 CHAIRMAN MOHR: I understand.

24 MEMBER BURKETT: To me, that seems a token
25 concession, where I think Lou and I would prefer to have

Proceedings

1 something more substantial, as much as I would like to
2 defer to you.

3 CHAIRMAN MOHR: Do you want to make it subject
4 to removing of the patio pavers as well as a reduction
5 or do you want to see another plan?

6 MEMBER BURKETT: I don't want to tell them how
7 to get to 10 percent.

8 CHAIRMAN MOHR: Then 10 percent is a number?

9 MEMBER LEBEDIN: That's fine.

10 MR. AVRUTINE: That would be 22 percent
11 coverage.

12 MEMBER LEBEDIN: Right.

13 As long as it's 22 percent or less, they can
14 go forward with the approvals. To the extent it exceeds
15 that, we need to have another conversation.

16 MR. AVRUTINE: If the Board is going to act on
17 the application, it would be granting it with a maximum
18 of 22 percent. Anything other than that, could not be
19 approved. So it would be 22 percent or less, whatever
20 configuration the applicant chooses.

21 MEMBER LEBEDIN: I'm happy with that.

22 Are you?

23 MEMBER BURKETT: Yes.

24 MR. AVRUTINE: So, there's a motion to approve
25 the side yard variances as submitted, as well as a

Proceedings

1 motion to grant the total surface coverage provided it
2 does not exceed 22 percent of the lot area.

3 MEMBER LEBEDIN: Correct.

4 MR. AVRUTINE: And who is making that motion?

5 MEMBER LEBEDIN: Yes.

6 MR. AVRUTINE: Member Lebedin.

7 MEMBER BURKETT: I'll second.

8 MR. AVRUTINE: Second by Member Burkett.

9 All in favor?

10 CHAIRMAN MOHR: Aye.

11 MEMBER BURKETT: Aye.

12 MEMBER LEBEDIN: Aye.

13 MR. AVRUTINE: Application approved.

14 MR. MARNIKA: We have a small issue.

15 If we dial this back to 22 percent, unless I'm
16 doing something wrong with the calculator, that means
17 the whole patio has to come out.

18 MS. BOUTIS: Unless we put in the numbers
19 wrong.

20 MR. MARNIKA: We are trying to get this
21 percentage dialed back from 23.6 to 22. So the number
22 is 1.6 in percent form. When you put it in decimal
23 place and you divide that, when you times it over the
24 lot area --

25 CHAIRMAN MOHR: What is the square footage?

Proceedings

1 MR. MARNIKA: It's basically the whole patio.

2 CHAIRMAN MOHR: 1,300 feet?

3 MR. MARNIKA: Yes.

4 CHAIRMAN MOHR: What he's saying is -- this is
5 probably only 150 feet here, the tennis court patio?

6 MR. MARNIKA: You know, I have that tied
7 together into the tennis court.

8 CHAIRMAN MOHR: If you had to estimate it
9 based on the scale, what would you say?

10 MEMBER LEBEDIN: You would be allowed 19,180
11 versus 20,588 is what is currently requested. So the
12 difference would be 1,400, which is your patio.

13 MR. MARNIKA: The original proposal would have
14 taken out about 523 square feet, the initial Board's
15 reaction to get it from 23.6 to 23 percent, that's
16 23 percent. So that would take out about over
17 500 square feet of the patio from the current proposal.

18 MS. BOUTIS: I'll be glad to lessen this
19 portion of the patio. You know, I can shave off. I'll
20 be glad to do that to make this smaller.

21 CHAIRMAN MOHR: Just remember, Newt, that
22 500 square feet is like, it's almost a third. I'm
23 trying to be a practical approach, not a numbers
24 approach, because when you factor in the numbers,
25 sometimes it's not achievable.

Proceedings

1 MEMBER BURKETT: We understand.

2 (Pause in the proceedings.)

3 MR. AVRUTINE: As a legal matter, what the
4 issue is, the Board has already voted on the
5 application, so it was approved with a maximum of
6 22 percent surface coverage.

7 Since you're coming back anyway, you can, as
8 part of that application, file it at the same time and
9 request to reopen this case to consider whatever amended
10 plan you are going to submit or whatever percentage it
11 comes in, presumably lower than you have today but not
12 as low as 22 percent, and then the Board can consider
13 it. But as of now, the Board already acted on the
14 application and approved it as the Board stated it. So
15 it's done, essentially.

16 MEMBER BURKETT: The point is, we are willing
17 to listen to an alternative suggestion on your part, and
18 when you come back on the shed, then, as Mr. Avrutine
19 explained, you can bring up that issue as well.

20 MR. AVRUTINE: You can speak to Nancy Popper
21 about it. It will be an application to reopen this
22 matter. And if you have any questions, you can call me.

23 CHAIRMAN MOHR: If you choose to do so. If
24 you can work it out, you can work it out. If not,
25 Howard is giving you an alternative on how to present a

Proceedings

1 new plan, essentially.

2 MS. BOUTIS: Okay.

3 MEMBER BURKETT: As a practical matter, could
4 they begin work on the pool because they already have
5 the approval?

6 That just means that how much of the lot that
7 you cover with the pavers is really what remains to be
8 decided. So again, as a practical matter, of course as
9 a legal matter, you have now the authority, the variance
10 to go and build the pool. So that's not going to hold
11 you up, if you were questioning that.

12 MR. AVRUTINE: I think as a practical matter
13 what's going to happen is that they're going to have to
14 submit a revised plan even to get a permit for the pool,
15 because it would have to comply with the condition of
16 the 22 percent maximum surface coverage. So they would
17 not be allowed to.

18 And then what essentially that would require
19 is them preparing that plan and yet another plan to come
20 back before the Board. But that's the applicant's
21 choice as to how they want to handle that.

22 *****
23 CERTIFIED THAT THE FOREGOING IS A TRUE AND
24 ACCURATE TRANSCRIPT OF THE ORIGINAL STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES
25 IN THIS CASE.

RONALD H. KOENIG
Official Court Reporter