

**Village of Upper Nyack
Planning Board Meeting
Wednesday, June 17, 2020, 7:30pm**

Minutes

A meeting of the Planning Board of the Village of Upper Nyack was held on the above date via videoconferencing in accordance with the Governor's Executive Order 202.1 due to the COVID-19 emergency and called to order at **7:30pm** by the Chairman, William Pfaff.

Other Board members present: Ellen Simpson, Karen Olson and Cynthia Turner. **Also present:** Dennis Letson, Village Engineer; Noelle C. Wolfson, Esq., Consulting Attorney; and Jillana Sinnott, Secretary.

7:30pm: The Chairman opened the meeting and read the Notice of Public Hearing, which was published in The Journal News on June 10, 2020. The Chairman also reviewed how the Zoom meeting would take place due to the COVID-19 emergency in accordance with the Governor's Executive Order 202.1.

7:32pm: Approval of Minutes: Member Karen Olson moved to approve the minutes from May 20, 2020 as submitted; SECOND: Ellen Simpson; unanimously APPROVED.

7:37pm: Lewis Maresca, 505 Spook Hollow Road, County Map No. 60.09-02-25.

Said Property is located in Residential Zoning District R-4.

This APPLICATION submitted to the clerk the Certificate of mail receipts of neighbor notification.

The APPLICANT was represented by Kier Levesque, Architect.

The APPLICANT reviewed the submitted revised Maresca site plan dated May 22, 2020 site plan to add a second floor single room to an existing single family residence. He noted that information on all the open building permits have been added to the site plan. He also indicated that per the revised site plan, the shed will be relocated from the north to the east side of the property, the barbeque pit will be removed and the proposed second floor addition will require an area variance from the minimum livable area (second floor) and side yard setback requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

The Chairman read the Building Inspector's letter regarding this application dated June 8, 2020 into the record. This letter identified the status of building permit #1536, #1555 and #1731 for this property.

The BOARD read and reviewed the report from Dennis Letson, Village Engineer, whose comments were entered into the record as follows:

State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR)

Under the provisions of 6NYCRR Part 617.5(c)(9), the project is a Type 2 action. No further review under SEQR is required.

Site Plan

1. *This application has been previously reviewed several times.*

2. Zoning

- a. *Variance is required for the size of the second floor addition and for existing side yard as noted on the plan. Additional variance for extension of existing non-conforming setback for second floor addition is needed and should be shown on the plan.*
- b. *The firepit is shown to be removed, the need for an additional variance is removed.*
- c. *Architectural elevation shows the building height to be 25'-5", this should be used in the bulk table, not the <35.*
3. *The Building Inspector's letter of June 8, 2020 seems to indicate that the issued or pending permit applications can be amended to bring those permits into coordination work performed and/or approved by the Planning Board.*
4. *The BI letter indicates 8 items of comment under BP 1731:*
 - a. *Bullet 1 – now moot, fire pit shown to be removed.*
 - b. *Bullet 2 – Garage conversion is now indicated on the site plan.*
 - c. *Bullet 3 – Generator installation is now shown on the site plan.*
 - d. *Bullet 4 – Widening the driveway is now shown on the site plan.*
 - e. *Bullet 5 – the outdoor shower has been removed from the site plan.*
 - f. *Bullet 6 – Wood deck is now indicated on the site plan*
 - g. *Bullet 7 – The sunroom is shown on the architectural drawing, a note should be added to the site plan indicating the conversion to interior space, the area is shown on the site plan as part of the block of the house.*
 - h. *Bullet 8 – Interior renovation would not require action by the Board.*
5. *Drain outlets may require level spreaders to prevent concentrated flow to downhill properties to the east.*
6. *The trench drain to daylight at the paver patio should be shown on the plan.*
7. *It appears the site plan now shows the work which the Board must approve before the Building Inspector may amend or issue permits.*

The BOARD reviewed the report. The two decks shown have already been constructed. There was a discussion of the overall plan. The Chairman suggested the applicant go to the Zoning Board of Appeals first for the variances needed for the second floor and have the drawing cleaned up. The Village Engineer agreed.

There were no comments from the public.

MOTION: Member Karen Olson moved to Continue the public hearing to September 16, 2020:
SECOND: Ellen Simpson; Unanimously APPROVED

The BOARD had no further comments.

7:55pm: Comito Homes LLC, 205 Wanamaker Lane, County Map No. 60.13-02-94. Continuation from May 20, 2020.

Said property is located in Residential Zoning District R-2.

The APPLICANT was represented by Jay Greenwell, Land Surveyor, Kier Levesque, Architect and Marc Comito, property owner.

The APPLICANT reviewed the submitted revised Comito site plan dated May 26, 2020. The previously approved dwelling is under construction and the utilities have been installed. The owner felt that a third garage would be a good selling point. There are no variances needed. This will not be used as a main garage. The west to east yard is fairly steep. The garage is designed with a barn door on the north and south sides. There is no change to the proposed driveway shown on the previously submitted site plan dated February 21, 2020. The proposed landscaping has been revised per the Planning Board comments at the May 2020 meeting.

The Chairman inquired whether the encroachment of the Greenberg driveway had been resolved. The Applicant stated that there has been no resolution and the encroaching macadam will be removed.

The BOARD read and reviewed the report from Dennis Letson, Village Engineer, whose comments were entered into the record as follows:

State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR)

Under the provisions of 6NYCRR Part 617.5c12, the project is a Type 2 action. No further review under SEQR is required.

Site Plan

1. Zoning
 - a. *Proposed garage addition complies with zoning.*
2. *The site plan has been revised to show the retaining wall located away from the garage wall, and the architectural drawing shows the same separation.*
3. *Retaining wall design and detail drawing have been provided. These will be reviewed in detail and if needed may be revised and finalized prior to issuance of building permit for the proposed garage.*
4. *The landscape plan shows 5 Norway Spruce to be planted 16 ft o.c. at the west side of the driveway. These are added to address the Menschik comments, they should be moved closer to provide better screen from that vantage point. The 8'-10' height will be adequate and provide initial screening and more rapid growth.*
5. *The Board should decide if additional screen planting should be provided on the site.*
6. *Additional architectural elevations have been provided per the Board's request.*
7. *It appears the chain link fence at the west property line has been removed, please confirm.*
8. *A railing should be provided at the top of the proposed walls.*
9. *An easement for the driveway encroachment is indicated on the plan.*
10. *The drywell gallery is being installed, provide the infiltration test result to verify the original design per note 24.*
11. *Revised drainage calculation was not received.*
12. *The site erosion and sediment controls have not been properly installed nor maintained, these are to be immediately corrected and maintained in the future.*

Member Olson inquired whether the retaining wall will affect the roots of the trees mentioned in item #4 of the Engineer's report. The Village Engineer said it would not but the first three trees should be brought closer together. The landscape plan was reviewed the first time the application was in front of the Board for the construction of the house and additional trees have been added for screening because of this application for the proposed third garage.

The Applicant noted that the additional chain link fence at the west property line was removed because the Greenberg's did not feel it was necessary. There has never been a fence at the property line. The Village Engineer discussed that possibly the potential owner could put a rail in for protection of going off the slope. The Applicant noted that the trees will also be a shield for a car coming down. The Chairman inquired whether a barrier was required. The Village Engineer stated that he was not aware of any requirements.

Item #8 of the Village Engineer's report was discussed. Kier Levesque noted that a minimum 36"H railing for a grade separation is necessary.

The drywell gallery was discussed. The applicant stated that the results of the perk test were good. The Applicant will provide this information to the Village Engineer.

The site erosion and sediment controls were reviewed. The Building Inspector has submitted photos of the site erosion and sediment controls taken on June 16, 2020. The Village Engineer noted the following items to be addressed:

1. North/East is clogged
2. Hay bales are deteriorating,
3. Construction entrance is not correct,
4. Silt fence needs inlet protection
5. On the east side stones have rolled down the hill
6. Site does not look like it has been maintained since it was installed.

The applicant agreed that there are some issues that need to be addressed and it will be done within two weeks. The Village Engineer stated that the above must be corrected within 48-72 hours and that he will inspect it on the afternoon of Friday, June 19th.

The Board had no other comments at this time.

The Board listened to comments from the public.

Patricia Greenberg, 207 Wanamaker Lane, stated that the contract of sale in November 2018 openly discussed the driveway. Ms. Greenberg does not think a fence will stop a car from coming down. The slope being discussed was never an issue.

The Applicant stated that a building permit for the original house was obtained from an approved site plan.

The Chairman asked the Village Consulting Attorney about the driveway encroachment. The Village consulting Attorney advised that the private covenant should not be considered as part of site plan review, and that if the applicant receives approval for something that it does not have the legal right to complete, in that event future modification to the site plan may be required.

The Village Engineer noted that there is no substantial grade change from what was previously approved for the site plan of the original house.

Jerome Greenberg, 207 Wanamaker Lane, noted that it is not just a few feet of asphalt that would be removed it is also 6' of landscaping. The Applicant purchased the property as is.

Beth and Greg D'Auria, 203 Wanamaker Lane live on the east side of the property and are concerned about the runoff from the property which has gone into their shed and at their mailbox. They inquired what landscaping will be done between the retaining wall and hill on the east side of the property.

The Village Engineer replied that the plantings shown on the landscape plan should break up the view of the wall.

The Applicant discussed the grey cobblestone wall. The Applicant will fix the damage done by the runoff to the D'Auria's property as mentioned.

Felicity Marinello, 202 Wanamaker Lane, complained that the construction needs to stop because the noise is too much and the road has been destroyed. The original road was never completed. There are other issues to be discussed and the house is too big.

The Chairman noted that the house is at 9% lot coverage which is smaller than what they are allowed to build. This Zoning district allows a maximum of 12% lot coverage by the primary building.

The Village Engineer will look at the road to see if it has been damaged by construction.

The Applicant showed a drone photo taken of the area, showing that the house is not out of scale with the rest of the neighborhood.

The Applicant stated that they usually start construction work at 8am and end by 4pm.

Patricia Greenberg had Bart Rodi, Engineer do a site inspection and he stated that the grade on the west side was excavated as a vertical cut to the ground.

The Village Engineer will go to the site on Friday and check the condition of Wanamaker Lane, corrective work to the site erosion control, and the excavation on the west side. He noted that this excavation was a vertical cut as shown on the previously approved site plan and there is no sign of failure or damage. If there had been a problem he is sure Mr. Rodi would have contacted him.

Patricia Greenberg inquired whether the soil that was brought to the site was certified and did they have permits.

The Village Engineer noted that this application is for a third proposed garage and any other concerns Ms. Greenberg has should be taken up with the Building Inspector.

The Chairman read into the record an email from Joe Menschik, 209 Wanamaker Lane dated June 16, 2020 regarding the planting of the additional trees and noted that this has been addressed by the Village Engineer's report.

The Chairman read into the record a letter from Comito Homes, LLC dated June 15, 2020 stating that the encroachment of the Greenberg's driveway on the subject property will be revised to conform to the original approved site plan.

The Chairman read into the record an email received from Patricia and Jerry Greenberg, 207 Wanamaker Lane dated June 9, 2020 regarding concerns which have been addressed previously.

MOTION: Member Ellen Simpson moved to close the public hearing: **SECOND:** Cynthia Turner; Unanimously **APPROVED**

The GML responses have been previously discussed.

MOTION: This is a Type II action therefore no further SEQRA determination is required. The site plan final approval is based the following:

- The following plans, referred to collectively below as the "Site Plan"
 - Site Plan for Attached Garage, Comito – Wanamaker La., prepared by Jay A. Greenwell, PLS, LLC dated February 21, 2020 last revised May 26, 2020, Job #21847;
 - Comito Homes LLC 3rd Garage Elevations (A-11), prepared by Kier B. Levesque, R.A., dated January 29, 2019, last revised May 26, 2020;
 - Landscape Plan (L-701), prepared by Yost Design Landscape Architecture, dated February 26, 2019, last revised May 26, 2020; and
 - Retaining Wall Details (C-200.00), prepared by Krypton Engineering, dated May 28, 2020.
- Engineer Report for retaining wall: by Krypton Engineering, Jorel J. Vaccaro dated June 2, 2020, Project name: 205 Wanamaker Ln. Retaining Walls

The following general conditions apply:

1. This final site plan approval authorizes the applicant to undertake only the activities specifically set forth herein, in accordance with this resolution of approval and as delineated on the Site Plan endorsed by the Planning Board Chairman. Any changes or modifications to such plan require amended site plan approval from the Planning Board.

2. This approval shall be void and of no effect if a building permit for the work proposed herein is not issued within 3 years of the date of this resolution.
3. The Applicant shall comply with the comments of the Rockland County Department of Planning's GML 239-M letter on this application dated April 8, 2020 as follows:
 - A review must be completed by the Rockland County Health Department to ensure compliance with Article XIX (Mosquito Control) of the Rockland County Sanitary Code.
 - Prior to the start of construction or grading, all soil and erosion control measures must be in place for the site. These measures must meet the latest edition (November 2016) of the New York State Standards for Urban Erosion and Sediment Control.
 - There shall be no net increase in the peak rate of discharge from the site at all design points.
 - Map Note 5 must specify Section 239L & M of the NYS General Municipal Law, as this is a site plan application, not a subdivision proposal.
4. The applicant shall address to the reasonable satisfaction of the Village Engineer the following comments set forth in the memorandum from the Village Engineer to the Planning Board dated June 17, 2020, which are specifically set forth herein as conditions of approval, #3; #4 - trees 2 and 3 should be moved closer together; #8; #10; #11; #12 – inspection on June 19, 2020 and to be maintained through to completion.
5. This approval is subject to review and approval of the Architectural Board of Review.

MOTION BY: Karen Olson

SECOND: Ellen Simpson

VOTE: Unanimously **APPROVED**

9:09pm: Brookfield Nyack, LLC, 519 North Midland Avenue, County Map No. 60.09-03-48.

Said property is located in Residential Zoning District R-3.

This APPLICATION submitted to the clerk the Certificate of mail receipts of neighbor notification.

The APPLICANT was represented by Marc Mallow, Homeowner.

The Application is before the Board for approval to demolish the existing house which is greater than 50 years old.

The Applicant purchased the property with the intention of renovating the house. They had the asbestos removed and ripped off the roof. Further environmental remediation was needed because of mold and

damage to the roof. The house is well constructed but windows have been broken and it has been exposed to the elements for over 18 years. The previous owners were granted a demo permit.

The BOARD read and reviewed the report from Dennis Letson, Village Engineer, whose comments were entered into the record as follows:

State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR)

Under the provisions of 6NYCRR Part 617 the project is an Unlisted action. A short EAF should be submitted for the Board's review.

Site Plan

1. Zoning

- a. Planning Board approval is required by Section 15:7 of the code.*
- 2. The submitted narrative would appear to provide the financial information required under Section 15:7a.*
- 3. If the applicant intends to retain ownership of the property and construct a new residence, Section 15:7b and c would appear to be not applicable to this application.*
- 4. It would be good to have some information as to whether the existing structure has any inherent historical significance.*

The Board discussed the application. Board member Turner inquired how future subdivision of the property can be prevented. The Applicant stated that he is not interested in subdividing and they will be rebuilding a two story single family residence.

The Chairman noted that he had discussed the proposed demolition of the house with the Upper Nyack Village Historian, Win Perry. Mr. Perry stated that the house was not architecturally or historically significant and that he took no exception to the proposed demolition application.

The Board listened to comments from the public.

Louis Tharp, 515 North Midland Avenue, completely endorses the demolition of the home.

Village Consulting Attorney noted that an EAF needs to be done and reviewed at a meeting. The Village Engineer agreed and was able to send the applicant the required documents by email from the DEC website.

The Board had no further comments.

MOTION: Member Karen Olson moved to continue the public hearing to July 15, 2020; SECOND: Ellen Simpson; Unanimously APPROVED

9:31pm: Brookfield Nyack, LLC, 519 North Midland Avenue, County Map No. 60.09-03-48.

Said property is located in Residential Zoning District R-3.

This APPLICATION submitted to the clerk the Certificate of mail receipts of neighbor notification.

The APPLICANT was represented by Marc Mallow, Homeowner.

The Applicant is before the Board for permit to cut down trees. The property is 4.24 acres and has been neglected. They are not clearing the trees for a better view but for the safety of the property. The trees requested to be cut down are dead and dying. Some of the trees have been topped off over the years. Most of the trees are in the back or by the pool. The Village arborist looked at the trees in question and has submitted a report.

The Village Arborist report was discussed.

The Chairman would like a better version of the site plan with the trees identified and numbered. The trees to be removed on the property should be tagged so that the Board can walk the property and identify them.

The applicant noted that trees #26 and #27 are additional and on opposite sides of the yard. Tree #28 had been cable tied but now the trunk has cracked. The trees are not numbered but they are tagged. The report should be updated with the additional trees and identify them.

Jay Greenwell, Land Surveyor is working on a plot plan. The tree plan will have no bearing on the site plan. The new house will be almost in the exact area of the house requested to be demolished. The eastern part of the property will not be disturbed.

Board Member Olson noted that these are not trees that are pleasing to the eye. The Village has retained a specialist for their arborist. The Village arborist does not see any significant value of the trees requested to be cut down. There are enough other trees on the property and perhaps when the new house application is submitted something healthier can be planted.

Board Member Simpson noted that white pine is easy to replace.

Further discussion led to a better understanding of the existing conditions of the trees proposed to be removed and alleviated the need for a further walk thru of the site.

The Chairman noted that a landscape plan being submitted for replanting when the site plan showing replanting is to be included when the site plan application for the new house is submitted.

The BOARD read and reviewed the report from Dennis Letson, Village Engineer, whose comments were entered into the record as follows:

State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR)

Under the provisions of 6NYCRR Part 617.5c20 the project is a Type 2 action. No further review under the provisions of SEQRA is required.

Site Plan

1. Zoning

- a. Planning Board approval is required by Section 6:5 of the code.*
- 2. The additional trees noted by the Village Forester should be added to the tree Plan.*
- 3. From the Forester's report, it appears the trees have been topped previously to provide views from the house.*
- 4. It would most likely, be better to remove and replace those trees to provide a better aesthetic for the site.*
- 5. Perhaps, if the Board grants the tree removal permit, it could be conditioned on the provision of a landscaping plan to be submitted and reviewed at the time of site plan application for a new residence on this parcel.*

The Board listened to comments from the public.

Louis Tharp, 515 North Midland Avenue is in support to remove the trees as they are not significant trees.

MOTION: Member Karen Olson moved to close the public hearing: **SECOND:** Cynthia Turner;
Unanimously **APPROVED**

The Board had no further comments.

MOTION: This is a Type II action therefore no further SEQRA determination is required. The approval for cutting down the requested trees are as follows:

- The applicant shall address to the reasonable satisfaction of the Village Engineer the following comments set forth in the memorandum from the Village Engineer to the Planning Board dated June 17, 2020, which are specifically set forth herein as conditions of approval #2 and #5.
- Site plan submission for the next application review must include a landscape plan to supplement the removal of the trees that have been approved.

MOTION BY: Karen Olson

SECOND: Ellen Simpson

VOTE: Unanimously **APPROVED**

10:12pm: 645 North Broadway LLC, 645 North Broadway, County Map No. 60.06-01-06; 647 North Broadway LLC, 647 North Broadway, County Map No. 60.06-01-05.02; 649 North Broadway LLC, 649 North Broadway, County Map No. 60.06-01-05.01.

Said property is located in Residential Zoning District R-1.

This APPLICATION submitted to the clerk the Certificate of mail receipts of neighbor notification.

The APPLICANT was represented by Jay Greenwell, Land Surveyor; Tom Rybak, Architect; Dana Prastos, TMS Waterfront designer of dock.

The Applicant submitted the following documents for the meeting:

1. Site plan (dated May 26, 2020) and Existing Conditions Plan (dated June 19, 2019) prepared by Jay A. Greenwell, PLS, LLC.
2. Perimeter fence drawings (dated May 26, 2020) prepared by T.M. Rybak and Assocs.
3. Renovation and alteration – Guest house – Rivercliff, 645 North Broadway showing proposed fountains, plaza, walkways and landscaped gardens drawings (dated September 19, 2019) prepared by T.M. Rybak and Assocs.
4. Existing site views and proposed site views (undated) prepared by T.M. Rybak and Associates.
5. Renovation and alteration – Guest house – Rivercliff, 645 North Broadway Architectural drawings (dated September 19, 2019) prepared by T.M. Rybak & Assocs.
6. Joint permit application documents to NYS DEC for floating dock and seawall (dated May 15, 2020) prepared by TMS Waterfront.

The Application for site plan approval is for an upper and lower level fountain plaza area, landscaped gardens, renovations and additional miscellaneous site work across three tax lots of single family residences. The application has received the variances requested for 649 North Broadway and 645 North Broadway from the Zoning Board of Appeals maximum coverage of buildings and structures.

Dana Prastos of TMS Waterfront gave an overview of the proposed floating dock, pier and repair work to the seawall. She noted the seawall has three areas consisting of 55 linear feet that require immediate attention and will largely be replaced in kind. The dock has two parts. The pier will be fixed and a floating dock will be added to have provide access for a larger vessel. Joint permits have been submitted and the applicant is awaiting approval.

The Chairman reviewed the scope of work as shown on the drawings. The seawall on the northeast area of the site was discussed. There are two different walls shown on the plans and it should be coordinated and noted which areas are proposed for repair. Site rendering #1 doesn't coordinate with the site plan or the architectural plan. The west side walkway with grass area was discussed, is it double walkways or single. The fountain rendering shows a solid wall, but the rendering doesn't agree with the site plan. Jay Greenwell noted that the site plan is correct, there is no upper walkway or pavilion. The rendering is an older conceptual drawing.

The Chairman asked if the paver walkway was existing. The fence should be on the site plan.

Jay Greenwell said the applicant will be removing the macadam driveway at 647 North Broadway after construction is complete.

The Chairman stated that the submitted drawings must be consistent across the entire drawing set and the proposed rendered site views must be consistent with what is show on the site drawings.

The BOARD read and reviewed the report from Dennis Letson, Village Engineer, whose comments were entered into the record as follows:

State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR)

Under the provisions of 6NYCRR Part 617.5c8 and 617.5c12, the project is a Type 2 action. No further review under SEQR is required.

Site Plan

1. Zoning

- a. One variance is still required as shown on the bulk table.*
- b. If application is made to the ZBA, variances should also be requested for the existing non-conforming bulk items.*
- 2. The application package contained several site plans prepared by different consultants. These plans must be coordinated and one site plan become the final plan approved by the Board. I would suggest that all information be consolidated onto the Greenwell plan for Board review and subsequent endorsement by the Chairman.*
- 3. We will need a complete full size set of the TMS Waterfront drawings for review of the required floodplain development permit.*
- 4. The TMR fence and gate drawing requires clarification of the portion already installed.*
- 5. The site renderings appear to show retaining walls which do not appear on the site plan.*
- 6. The renderings were to have been photo-simulations, but appear to have different vantage points than the existing site photographs, this should be discussed.*
- 7. The layer containing the outline of the structure on lot 6 appears to be turned off on the plot.*
- 13. Top and bottom of seawall elevations should be added to the site plans.*
- 14. The Board should review and discuss if the visual information submitted meets with the request made by the Board. The area proposed for steps, fountain pool etc may be visible from the surrounding area as was observed on the site inspection. Visual studies should be performed from the north (Nyack Beach parking area) and south (adjacent residence) to evaluate this and determine if screening will be needed.*
- 15. Drainage report should be provided for the additional construction areas.*
- 16. Construction details (elevated walkway, walls, stairs, pavers, etc.) should be added to the plan set.*
- 17. The proposed grass areas (6) with perimeter walkways appear to be landscaping which would not require Board approval. Additional areas are now shown on the TR plans which are not shown on the Greenwell plan. The applicant should describe in more detail for the Board to agree or disagree with this.*
- 18. If additional landscaping is contemplated, a landscape plan should be prepared.*
- 19. We will provide additional comments once the visual studies and details are added to the drawing set.*

Mr. Rybak requested that the Planning Board permit certain aspects of the proposed site plan to be reviewed by the Architectural Board.

The Board reiterated that all new scope of work items need to be coordinated and consistent on all the plans. At the Applicant's request, the Board is considering one site plan covering the three lots. Because this is one consolidated review, portions of the application cannot be segmented and sent to the Architectural Review Board for review. The site plan and all supporting plans and documents must be corrected and coordinated so that they accurately and consistently depict the improvements proposed. Once such corrections are made and reviewed by the Planning Board referral to the Architectural Review Board can be considered.

MOTION: Member Karen Olson moved to continue the public hearing to September 16, 2020:
SECOND: Ellen Simpson; Unanimously **APPROVED**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Jillana Sinnott, Secretary