

**Village of Lansing
Board of Zoning Appeals
May 16, 2006**

The meeting of the Village of Lansing Board of Zoning Appeals was convened at 7:32 P.M. by Chairperson Mary Sirois. Present at the meeting were Board members Don Eckrich, Patrick Gillespie, David Newman, and John Wisor; Alternate Member Dolores Adler; Code Enforcement Officer Ben Curtis; Village Attorney David Dubow; and members of the public.

Appeal No. 2006-4, Greenstate Properties, 2432 N. Triphammer Rd. Second Office Building:

The first item on the agenda was a Public Hearing for Appeal No. 2006-4, Greenstate Properties, to construct an 8,147 sf office building on Parcel B of the subdivision of the lot formerly known as 2432 North Triphammer Road in the Commercial Low Traffic District, Tax Parcel No. 43.1-1-43.1. A variance is required because the proposed building will be located in the Commercial Low Traffic District along North Triphammer Road and is set back approximately 199' from the front property line where Section 145-42(e)(4)(b) of the Village of Lansing Code requires that 25% of the façade of all buildings developed in the CLT District along North Triphammer Road be located within one foot either side of, and parallel to, a line located a distance of 25 feet from the front line.

Rob Colbert, owner of Greenstate Properties, 301 E. State St., made the presentation requesting a variance from the 25 ft. front yard build-to line requirement for 2430 N. Triphammer Road. Colbert stated the first one-story building is now under construction. When the first building went through the approval stages, the siting of the building parking lots and the driveway was configured to meet the CLT Guidelines. The outcome was a single driveway to serve the two buildings with the first building on the build-to line and parking in the rear. The site has been designed to accommodate drainage, road cuts, and parking requirements for both buildings. By the time the first building is built he expects a tenant will be identified for the second. Colbert stated the project has complied with the spirit of the CLT Guidelines because parking is now out of the front yard, road cuts have been minimized, traffic will be slowed, and landscaping and green space remain along North Triphammer Road. Colbert stated he developed the Mold Flow Office Building which was the first building to comply with the CLT Guidelines. Both of the proposed new buildings at 2430 & 2432 N. Triphammer Road will be of the same quality as the Mold Flow Office Building.

Sirois asked if this would be a single curb cut for both buildings and Colbert responded there would be one driveway and curb cut with a shared driveway and maintenance agreement which the Village Attorney has approved.

Sirois stated that the Planning Board adopted a resolution approving the project subject to the approval of the BZA.

Newman asked if there was always a plan to build a second building. Colbert stated this was always provided for and anticipated. All Village requirements were met for two buildings except locating the second building on the build-to line. Colbert stated the first building will be owner occupied. Colbert was always up front that this site could accommodate two buildings. The unique shape of the lot is conducive to locating the second building further to the rear where the lot widens out and offsetting the driveway for traffic calming and enhancing the landscaping in the front along North Triphammer.

Eckrich asked if adjoining properties were notified. Curtis responded that he has received Proof of Mailings from both Appeals to be heard tonight.

Sirois opened the Public Hearing.

As there was no one who wished to speak, Eckrich moved to close the Public Hearing. Seconded by Gillespie. Ayes by Eckrich, Gillespie, Newman, Sirois and Wisor. Motion carried.

Dubow noted that since this is a single lot line area variance no formal SEQRA review is required.

Eckrich stated the plan is enhancing of the neighborhood and he likes the single curb cut idea. Eckrich feels this would be very desirable.

Newman was unclear why the Planning Board would approve a site plan that would require the applicant to go before the BZA with the second building. Dubow stated the Planning Board was very clear to Colbert that the second building would require a variance from the BZA before it could be built where he indicated he wanted to build it. Dubow stated Colbert was very aware of this when proceeding with the first building and driveway. Dubow stated the Planning Board felt the spirit of the law was met with the first building. Planning Board Chairman Ned Hickey who was in the audience concurred with Dubow and stated the applicants were well aware that the second building was dependent upon the BZA granting the variance. The Planning Board felt jamming two buildings up front to meet the 25 ft. build-to line requirement would create a narrow alleyway and crowded look which would actually detract from the appearance the Village was trying to encourage with the CLT Guidelines. Having the second building in the rear would allow for better landscaping as well as a sidewalk up front. Sirois stated there is probably a safety issue with having an alleyway. Hickey stated having only one curb cut is an advantage as well. With the North Triphammer reconstruction, plans are to combine driveways where possible to reduce the number of curb cuts.

After some discussion of findings of fact with respect to specific criteria for an area variance as set forth in Section 145-74 A(1) of the Village Code, Eckrich moved the following resolution, second by Newman:

**VILLAGE OF LANSING BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS RESOLUTION FOR APPEAL
NO. 2006-4 ADOPTED ON MAY 16, 2006**

WHEREAS:

- A. This matter involves consideration of the following proposed action: Appeal No. 2006-4, Greenstate Properties, to construct an 8,147 square foot office building on parcel B of the subdivision of the lot formerly known as 2432 North Triphammer Road in the Commercial Low Traffic District, Tax Parcel No. 43.1-1-43.1. A variance is required because the proposed building will be located in the Commercial Low Traffic District along North Triphammer Road and is set back approximately 199' from the front property line where Section 145-42(E)(4)(b) of the Village of Lansing Code requires that 25% of the façade of all buildings developed in the CLT District along North Triphammer Road be located within one foot either side of, and parallel to, a line located a distance of 25 feet from the front line; and
- B. On May 16, 2006, the Village of Lansing Board of Zoning Appeals held a public hearing regarding such action, and thereafter thoroughly reviewed and analyzed (i) the materials and information presented by and on behalf of the applicant(s) in support of this appeal, (ii) all other information and materials rightfully before the Board, and (iii) all issues raised during the public hearing and/or otherwise raised in the course of the Board's deliberations; and
- C. On May 16, 2006, in accordance with Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law - the State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQR), and 6 NYCRR Section 617.5, the Village of Lansing Board of Zoning Appeals determined that the proposed action is a Type II action, and thus may be processed without further regard to SEQR; and
- D. On May 16, 2006, in accordance with Section 712-b of the Village Law of the State of New York and Village of Lansing Code Section 145-74 A(1), the Village of Lansing Board of Zoning Appeals, in the course of its deliberations, took into consideration the benefit to the applicant if the area variance is granted as weighed against the detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood or community by such grant;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED AS FOLLOW:

- 1. The Village of Lansing Board of Zoning Appeals hereby makes the following findings with respect to the specific criteria for such area variance as set forth in Section 712-b of the Village Law of the State of New York and Village of Lansing Code Section 145-74 A(1):

Whether an undesirable change will be produced in the character of the neighborhood or detriment to nearby properties will be created by granting the area variance.

Finding: **No, it would be an improvement and no one has come forward to speak against it.**

Whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by some method feasible for the applicant to pursue other than an area variance.

Finding: **Yes, the two buildings could be built side by side on the build-to line, but the result would be far less desirable than the project as proposed.**

Whether the requested area variance is substantial.

Finding: **Not really, because it complies with the intent of the Commercial Low Traffic District Guidelines.**

Whether the proposed area variance will have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district.

Finding: **No, the project meets all environmental regulations as documented in the Planning Board's review and as a result actually improves this area.**

Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created.

Finding: **Yes, but the positive factors offset the negative ones.**

2. It is hereby determined by the Village of Lansing Board of Zoning Appeals that the following variance is **GRANTED AND APPROVED** (with conditions, if any, as indicated), it being further determined that such variance is the minimum necessary and adequate to grant relief and at the same time preserve and protect the character of the neighborhood and the health, safety and welfare of the community:

-
Description of Variance:

-
The proposed building shall be permitted to be constructed as shown on the plans submitted with the application, approximately 199' from the front property line where Section 145-42(E)(4)(b) of the Village of Lansing Code requires that 25% of the façade of all buildings developed in the CLT District along North Triphammer Road be located within one foot either

side of, and parallel to, a line located a distance of 25 feet from the front line.

-
-
-

Conditions of Variance:

- a. **In granting the area variance, the Board accepts, endorses and incorporates the conditions attached by the Planning Board in its approval of the Special Permit for this project granted on April 25, 2006, one of which conditions required this Board granting such variance.**

The vote on the foregoing motion was as follows:

AYES: John Wisor, Don Eckrich, Mary Sirois, David Newman and Pat Gillespie

NAYS: none

The motion was declared to be carried.

Appeal No. 2006-5, Colonial Veterinary Hospital New Building:

The second item on the agenda was a Public Hearing for Appeal No. 2006-5, Colonial Veterinary Hospital to replace the existing 3830 sf veterinary hospital with an 18,255 sf veterinary hospital at 2369 North Triphammer Road in the Commercial Low Traffic District, Tax Parcel No. 47.1-2-17. A total of three variances are required. Two variances are required because the proposed development does not meet the requirements of Section 145-24 of the Village of Lansing Code for a buffer between commercial development and residential properties because the intensity of development is greater than that permitted in Section 145-24(G)(2) and because the proposed buffer has no width in places where Section 145-24(F) requires that it be at least 25' wide; and the third variance is required because there is no side yard parking setback on the north side where Section 145-42(E)(7)(b) requires a minimum of 15'.

Rod Kearn, Landscape Architect, living at 172 Benson Road, Freeville, made the presentation on behalf of Tom and Nancy Ross, owners of Colonial Veterinary Hospital. Kearn stated the parcel is .95 acres plus there is an arrangement to purchase .3 acres from an adjoining property. The applicant will be requesting 3 variances. The first is because the intensity of the development is greater than that permitted under the buffer strip requirements. Kearn stated the building footprint is sized to meet the expanding needs of the Colonial Vet Hospital. The amount of impermeable surface is more than allowed. Kearn stated there is also a second requested variance pertaining to the variable buffer strip. Because the lot is so small, they must use a variable width buffer strip which must be at least 25' wide.

On the north side it is technically zero, because they are purchasing land north of the boundary in a Residential zoning district to use as a buffer. That land will be landscaped with berms and plantings to meet the requirements of the bufferstrip. This area will be given to Village as part of the Greenway Trail. The Rosses plan to purchase this area and then gift it back to the Village. The third variance is for the parking setback on the northern property line which again is zero where a 15 foot setback is required, and again will be mitigated by the addition of park land to the north.

Dubow explained that when the Commercial Low Traffic district abuts a Residential district there must be a 75 ft. buffer within the CLT District unless the Planning Board approves a variable width buffer strip which must be at least 25' wide. This is what the Planning Board has done for the easterly boundary. For the northerly boundary, there is also the requirement for a minimum 25 ft. buffer which must be located on the commercial property. A variance is therefore required to substitute the parcel to the north for this buffer strip. This property would then be conveyed to the Village to maintain as parkland and as a buffer strip. Dubow stated this is a creative solution by the Planning Board, Village Engineer, applicant and others to accommodate the spirit and needs of the applicant as well as those of the neighboring residents and the Village. Hickey pointed out that the northerly parcel will be owned by the Village and will remain a park with vegetation. This will act as a buffer and the nearest house or residence which may be affected is over 200 ft. away from the parking area. Hickey stated the 200 ft. space would be in place of the required 75 ft. buffer.

Kearl explained the buffer plan to the Board and the plantings proposed. The berming and plantings would block the headlights. The embankment on the east side would be higher than the parking area and additional vegetation would be planted there. Sirois asked if the 3 ft. berm along the northern edge would interfere with snow removal. Kearl stated the snow would be pushed to that area, but he had left room between the berm and parking lot to accommodate it. Sirois was concerned about the berm blocking the headlights from a truck or SUV. Kearl confirmed that the berm as well as vegetation would serve the purpose. Dubow stated if this does not work, the applicant has agreed at a Planning Board meeting to erect a fence if there are any problems, but would like to see if this is satisfactory first.

As noted by Curtis earlier in the meeting, proof of mailings have been received.

Dubow recapped the three variances: 1. Parking will be right to the northerly property line. 2. The variable width buffer strip will be zero width on the north side where minimum 25' is required on the commercial lot and will be augmented with parkland to be dedicated to the Village. 3. The site plan with the 25 ft. variable buffer must not have more impermeable surface than the site with a full 75 ft. buffer could accommodate. Dubow stated it is impossible to meet the criteria for the building size as proposed. The applicants previously distributed a site coverage chart for Planning Board members to review with calculations for impermeable and permeable surfaces for the site.

Sirois asked about the size of the building. It was noted it is 2 story. Hickey stated that the building will be built to the 25 ft. front build-to line and all parking would be in the rear as required by the CLT

Guidelines.

Sirois opened the Public Hearing.

Eckrich asked about the doors on the rear. It was noted these are fire doors.

Gillespie asked if this is 5 times the current size of the existing building. Tom Ross responded that his business is currently in two locations and he would like to combine in one building. This new building would allow him to meet his need for additional space and to have it all under one roof. This would provide for the expanded care needed by the community. Ross stated he feels this building will enhance the main street atmosphere and would be a nice addition to the Village with the park area as well as the sidewalks

Kathy Ross stated they are currently renting space and need to recombine in one location. Renting another space was a temporary solution as this is a long process.

Sirois asked about garbage pickup. Kearl responded that trucks would come in the access drive and there would be a dumpster. Dubow stated this was evaluated carefully by the Planning Board. Dubow stated Ross has agreed to discontinue deliveries with large semis and receive them with UPS trucks instead. Hickey stated Ross has also agreed to have pickup of trash in late morning or early afternoon hours rather than the very early hours necessitated now by the cramped parking.

Eckrich asked why the entryway into the building was so far from the parking area. Richard Hautaniemi, Architect, residing at 213 Town Line Rd., Groton, responded the offices are near the front so this is the natural place for a traditional entryway and it works with the flow of their business. Ross also noted there is a back door for emergencies if needed. Kearl also noted the driveway is 24 ft. wide in case someone occasionally stops at the front door and another car needs to get around them.

Eckrich asked about the number of parking spaces. Curtis responded that spaces as required under the Village zoning provisions, are based on the number of doctors and employees which anticipates the number of patients that may require parking. Sirois asked about number of employees. K. Ross responded that a maximum was 17 at one time with numbers varying from 9 to 17. Sirois asked if the facility is open 24 hours a day and K. Ross stated it is.

Newman asked about the size of the new building. Ross stated the existing facility is 3830 square feet plus space being rented elsewhere although she was not sure how big the rented space is. Newman commented that the percentage of increase in size from 3830 sf to 18,255 sf seemed like a lot. Ross stated much of the second story will not be finished but is for future growth and storage. K. Ross stated the business began with 2 doctors and now has 6 doctors. It is generally set up so each doctor has two examining rooms and presently there is no space for even one room per doctor. The business might like to hire an internal specialist in the future but not grow beyond that. Hautaniemi stated that

the footprint for the building is 6000 sf. with the basement as storage as well.

Wisor asked about the property to the east and how close it was to the hospital. Kearl responded it is a residence and is about 75 ft. away. Curtis stated the side yard setback in that residential district is 20 ft., but the residence predated the Village.

As there was no one else who wished to speak, Wisor moved to close the Public Hearing. Seconded by Gillespie. Ayes by Eckrich, Gillespie, Newman, Sirois and Wisor. Motion carried.

The Board then reviewed potential environmental impacts on the SEQR short form Part II. Eckrich moved the following resolution, seconded by Newman:

**VILLAGE OF LANSING BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS RESOLUTION FOR SEQR
REVIEW OF APPEAL NO. 2006-5 ADOPTED ON MAY 16, 2006**

WHEREAS:

- A. This matter involves consideration of the following proposed action: Appeal No. 2006-5, Colonial Veterinary Hospital to replace the existing 3830 sf. veterinary hospital with an 18,255sf veterinary hospital at 2369 North Triphammer Road in the Commercial Low Traffic District, Tax Parcel No. 47.1-2-17. A total of three variances are required. Two variances are required because the proposed development does not meet the requirements Section 145-24 of the Village of Lansing Code for a buffer between commercial development and residential properties because the intensity of development is greater than that permitted by Section 145-24(G)(2) (“Variance 1”) and because the proposed buffer has no width in places where Section 145-24(F) requires that it be at least 25’ wide (“Variance 2”); and the third variance is required because there is no side yard parking setback on the north side where Section 145-42(E)(7)(b) requires a minimum of 15’ (“Variance 3”); and
- B. This proposed action as it applies to Variance 1 and Variance 2 is an Unlisted Action for which the Village of Lansing Board of Zoning Appeals is an involved agency for the purposes of environmental review; and
- C. On May 16, 2006, the Village of Lansing Board of Zoning Appeals, in performing the lead agency function for its independent and uncoordinated environmental review in accordance with Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law - the State Environmental Quality Review Act (“SEQR”), (i) thoroughly reviewed the Short Environmental Assessment Form (the “Short EAF”), Part I, and any and all other documents prepared and submitted with respect to this proposed action as it applies to Variance 1 and Variance 2 and its environmental review, (ii) thoroughly analyzed the potential relevant areas of environmental concern to determine if the proposed action as it

applies to Variance 1 and Variance 2 may have a significant adverse impact on the environment, including the criteria identified in 6 NYCRR Section 617.7(c), and (iii) completed the Short EAF, Part II;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED AS FOLLOW:

1. The Village of Lansing Board of Zoning Appeals, based upon (i) its thorough review of the Short EAF, Part I, and any and all other documents prepared and submitted with respect to this proposed action as it applies to Variance 1 and Variance 2 and its environmental review, (ii) its thorough review of the potential relevant areas of environmental concern to determine if the proposed action as it applies to Variance 1 and Variance 2 may have a significant adverse impact on the environment, including the criteria identified in 6 NYCRR Section 617.7(c), and (iii) its completion of the Short EAF, Part II, including the findings noted thereon (which findings are incorporated herein as if set forth at length), hereby makes a negative determination of environmental significance (“**NEGATIVE DECLARATION**”) in accordance with SEQR for the above referenced proposed action as it applies to Variance 1 and Variance 2, and determines that neither a Full Environmental Assessment Form, nor an Environmental Impact Statement will be required; and:
2. The Responsible Officer of the Village of Lansing Board of Zoning Appeals is hereby authorized and directed to complete and sign as required the Short EAF, Part III, confirming the foregoing **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, which fully completed and signed Short EAF shall be attached to and made a part of this Resolution.

The vote on the foregoing motion was as follows:

AYES: John Wisor, Don Eckrich, Mary Sirois, David Newman and Pat Gillespie

NAYS: none

The motion was declared to be carried.

The Board considered the findings of fact with respect to specific criteria for area variances as set forth in Section 145-74 A(1) of the Village Code. Dubow noted that the Board can make findings for the variances as a whole or separately and can either approve or deny any or all of the variances. Dubow noted that the Board must balance the benefit of the applicant against the detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood. After some discussion, Newman moved the following resolution, seconded by Wisor:

VILLAGE OF LANSING BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS RESOLUTION FOR APPEAL

NO. 2006-5 ADOPTED ON MAY 16, 2006

WHEREAS:

- A. This matter involves consideration of the following proposed action: Appeal No. 2006-5, Colonial Veterinary Hospital to replace the existing 3830 sf. veterinary hospital with an 18,255sf veterinary hospital at 2369 North Triphammer Road in the Commercial Low Traffic District, Tax Parcel No. 47.1-2-17. A total of three variances are required. Two variances are required because the proposed development does not meet the requirements Section 145-24 of the Village of Lansing Code for a buffer between commercial development and residential properties because the intensity of development is greater than that permitted by Section 145-24(G)(2) (“Variance 1”) and because the proposed buffer has no width in places where Section 145-24(F) requires that it be at least 25’ wide (“Variance 2”); and the third variance is required because there is no side yard parking setback on the north side where Section 145-42(E)(7)(b) requires a minimum of 15’ (“Variance 3”); and
- B. On May 16, 2006, the Village of Lansing Board of Zoning Appeals held a public hearing regarding such action, and thereafter thoroughly reviewed and analyzed (i) the materials and information presented by and on behalf of the applicant(s) in support of this appeal, (ii) all other information and materials rightfully before the Board, and (iii) all issues raised during the public hearing and/or otherwise raised in the course of the Board’s deliberations; and
- C. On May 16, 2006, the Village of Lansing Board of Zoning Appeals determined that the proposed action as it applies to Variance 1 and Variance 2 is an Unlisted Action for which the Board is an involved agency, and in performing the lead agency function for its independent and uncoordinated environmental review in accordance with Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law - the State Environmental Quality Review Act (“SEQR”), the Board (i) thoroughly reviewed the Short Environmental Assessment Form (the “Short EAF”), Part 1, and any and all other documents prepared and submitted with respect to this proposed action and its environmental review, (ii) thoroughly analyzed the potential relevant areas of environmental concern to determine if the proposed action may have a significant adverse impact on the environment, including the criteria identified in 6 NYCRR Section 617.7(c), (iii) completed the Short EAF, Part 2; and (iv) made a negative determination of environmental significance (“Negative Declaration”) in accordance with SEQR for the above referenced proposed action and determined that an Environmental Impact Statement would not be required; and
- D. On May 16, 2006, in accordance with Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law - the State Environmental Quality Review Act (“SEQR”), and 6 NYCRR Section 617.5, the Village of Lansing Board of Zoning Appeals determined that

the proposed action as it applies to Variance 3 is a Type II action, and thus may be processed without further regard to SEQR; and

- E. On May 16, 2006, in accordance with Section 712-b of the Village Law of the State of New York and Village of Lansing Code Section 145-74 A(1), the Village of Lansing Board of Zoning Appeals, in the course of its deliberations, took into consideration the benefit to the applicant if the three area variances are granted as weighed against the detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood or community by such grant;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED AS FOLLOW:

1. The Village of Lansing Board of Zoning Appeals hereby makes the following findings with respect to the specific criteria for such area variances as set forth in Section 712-b of the Village Law of the State of New York and Village of Lansing Code Section 145-74 A(1):

Whether an undesirable change will be produced in the character of the neighborhood or detriment to nearby properties will be created by granting the area variances.

Finding: No, it has been a veterinary hospital for more than 30 years and will continue to be one, only much improved. Aesthetically the impact will be a big improvement as the property is brought into compliance with the Commercial Low Traffic Guidelines.

Whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by some method feasible for the applicant to pursue other than area variances.

Finding: No, not in this location and not that are feasible.

Whether the requested area variances are substantial.

Finding: Yes, but the applicants and the Planning Board have been successful in mitigating the adverse impacts.

Whether the proposed area variances will have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district.

Finding: The net impact will be beneficial particularly when taking into account the parkland to the north.

Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created.

Finding: **Yes, but the applicants have done a great deal to mitigate any adverse impacts.**

3. It is hereby determined by the Village of Lansing Board of Zoning Appeals that the following variance or variances is/are **GRANTED AND APPROVED** (with conditions, if any, as indicated), it being further determined that such variance or variances is/are the minimum necessary and adequate to grant relief and at the same time preserve and protect the character of the neighborhood and the health, safety and welfare of the community:

Description of Variances:

(i) the substitution of approximately .306 acres of an adjacent subdivided parcel (in the Medium Density Residential District) as the variable width buffer strip required for the proposed commercial development, such buffer strip otherwise required to be located in the Commercial Low Traffic District property of applicant upon which the proposed improvements are to be constructed, (ii) relief from the requirement under subsection G(2) of Section 145-24 of the Village of Lansing Code with respect to the variable width buffer strip that the total lot area in impervious surface (including the total area of enclosed floor space, total parking and loading area and number of parking space) not exceed the area of such impervious surface that would be permitted if the standard 75' buffer strip were required, such variance to permit an increase in the total lot area of such impervious surface of no greater than 336 % of the amount otherwise so permitted consistent with the site plan submitted as part of the special permit approval, and (iii) reduction of the required side yard parking setback on the north side to 0' where Section 145-42(E)(7)(b) requires a minimum of 15'

-
-
-
-

Conditions of Variances:

- a. In granting the area variance(s), the Board accepts, endorses and incorporates the conditions attached by the Planning Board in its approval of the Special Permit for this project granted on May 8, 2006, two of which conditions required this Board granting such variance(s).

The vote on the foregoing motion was as follows:

AYES: John Wisor, Don Eckrich, Mary Sirois, David Newman and Pat Gillespie

NAYS: none

The motion was declared to be carried.

Approval of Minutes – March 1, 2006:

Gillespie moved to approve the minutes of March 1, 2006. Seconded by Eckrich. Ayes by Eckrich, Newman, Gillespie, Sirois and Wisor. Motion carried.

Adjournment:

Eckrich moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:05 P.M. Seconded by Gillespie. Ayes by Eckrich, Gillespie, Newman, Sirois and Wisor. Motion carried.