Borough of Cresskill
Zoning Board of Adjustment
Public Meeting 7:30 pm
Minutes May 23, 2024

Present in Person:, Mr. Kassis, Mr. McCord, Ms. Wehle, Mr. Bancroft, Ms. Westerfeld, Mr. Van Horne Esq.(Board Attorney), Ms. Bauer (recording secretary)
Absent: Mr. Sutera , Mr. Cleary

At 7:30 pm

Mr. Kassis said Good Evening, we are calling the May 23, 2024 Zoning Meeting to order. This meeting had been published as required by the Sunshine Laws of the State of New Jersey. A notice was properly given.

The Roll Call was taken.

The April 25. 2024 minutes were approved by Mr.Bancroft, with no changes.

Please see next page

Borough of Cresskill
Zoning Board of Adjustment
Public Meeting 7:30 pm
Minutes May 23, 2024

Application

1420 Adi Levi 135 4th Street Block 49 Lots 615, 616, 617, 618

Description	**Required**	**Existing**	**Proposed**	**Variance**
Front Yard Set Back	25’	25.1’	25.1’	
Side Yard Abutting/Lot	**15’**	**14.7’**	**14.7’**	**ENC**
Other Side Yard	20’	25.8’	25.8’	
Combined Side Yards	35’	40.5’	40.5’	
Min. Rear Yard	30’	Deck **24.77’** House 37.13’	**24.77’** 37.13	**Deck ENC**
FAR	30.0%	14.73%	14.73%	
Height of Building	28.0’	16’	16’	
Lot Frontage	100’	100’	100’	
Lot Depth	100‘	100’	100’	
Bldg. Coverage %	**20%**		**21.70%**	**1.7%**
Impervious Coverage	**30.0%**		**32.23%**	**2.23%**
Lot Area	10,000 sf	10,000 sf	10,000 sf	

Mark D. Madaio ESQ. is representing the applicant, Adi Levi

The applicant installed a new walkway, driveway, and shed without permits at the above referenced property, requiring the following variances :

	Required	**Proposed**	**Variance**
Fence	**4’ (side yard)**	**6’**	**2’**
Bldg. Coverage %	**20%**	**21.7%**	**1.7%**
Impervious Coverage	**30%**	**32.23%**	**2.23%**

At the request of the applicant, the application was carried from the Feb. 22, 2024 ZBOA meeting .

Mr Kassis called the meeting to order at 7:30 pm.
Mark D. Madaio ESQ. arrived for the meeting at 7:33 pm. He apologized by relating an anecdote.
Mr. Madaio ESQ said we are here to talk about 4th St . And we have some calculations (4:35) for you which we submitted and those are the calculations done by the surveyor of what it was when we bought it

1420 Adi Levi (cont.) 135 4th Street Block 49 Lots 615, 616, 617, 618

Mr. Van Horne Esq said excuse me Mark, before we get to that part of the application, (4:59) just briefly summarize what occurred…..

Mr. Madaio ESQ said in February we presented our application. The first item was the minimum Side-yards, because we moved the shed on one side of the yard to the other. The shed we agreed already to move to a conforming location. So that variance,……. *justified minimal one side-yard….* Secondarily, you recall that the fence was 6' high. It was replaced at 6' high. And of course that does not conform with your code, which requires 4'. We could have replaced the fence, (6:00) we could have repaired the fence, one section at a time, or something else, but we removed and replaced with this 86' fence. The other two issues are Building Coverage and Lot Coverage. We put up homes of 21.7% where 20% is permitted. We propose an Impervious Coverage or Lot Coverage at 32.23%, when 30% is permitted .So those required deviations, you will recall, that the client had put up a …….that reduced the size of the rear gap and created……..

Ms. Stephanie Pantale, architect, was sworn in.

Mr Kassis said we accept you as a witness, you have been here a few times before .

Mr Kassis requested that Ms. Pantale to restrict her testimony to what was germane to the application and keep it as brief as possible.

Ms. Pantale said the owner told them that underneath the deck there was some type of concrete-remains of a patio. And all he did was remove deck and put Blue stone over where there was a patio previously, that was where the deck was removed. So that takes it in a nutshell. So when I was asked to do the Zoning calculation based on the new shed look, the new shed, the shed location, the deck, the size of the deck, …….., the patio ……The calculations……..came in at 32.23%, which is (9:00) 2.23% over. The Building Coverage, which is not part of the Impervious Coverage…….I could not *see* under the deck, so I counted the deck as Building Coverage but not Impervious Coverage.

Mr. Madaio ESQ said so what was taped before we get started……. when we expressed to the Board, what was actually out there……one of the questions was well did he attach, and the question was, essentially, what was it when he bought it. That was what was required to be found out. In order to analyze that question, we obtained from the surveyor the actual 2018 survey. And we had the surveyor do the 2018 calculation. This was the surveyor who did the survey when he bought the house. So we are now able to tell what was it, when we bought it. What is it now. And did he increase it, by virtue of this project, and if so, by how much ? So we are able to testify to those numbers, with some explanation. Because Ms. Pantale, knowing the ordinance the way she does There are things that count, and things that don't count. But if we have the old survey, the 2018 survey (11:01) which is easy to pick out because it is the one that has

(discussion among Board members and Ms. Pantale)

Mr. Madaio ESQ said these are easy to see……..

(discussion among Board members)

Mr. Van Horne Esq said I'm going to mark this A-1 with today's date (11:54)

(discussion among Board members)

Mr. Madaio ESQ said we can now talk about the Board's question was.. What was it when you bought it, versus what is it now. So in order to get that answer, it's not as simple as just taking what the surveyor said which would be in this……Alright ? I wish we could but this would be *favoritism ,* that's not fact …….Stephanie, when you look at this exhibit, do you look into the existing Impervious Coverage ? Meaning the existing in 2018. What does the surveyor (12:55) come off with ?

Ms. Pantale said he calculates 33.4%
Mr. Madaio ESQ said *area* of 3344 square ft. Correct ?
Ms. Pantale said yes (13.06)
Mr. Madaio ESQ said I just wanted to make sure……..So unfortunately, you were doing your examination ……...He counted the wooden steps and the wooden deck as Impervious in 2018. In our system in 2018. Correct ?
Ms. Pantale said correct.
Mr. Madaio ESQ said but that's not how Cresskill does it. So we have to correct this number, which actually makes it worse for us. But we owe you to tell you what it is. Right ? (13.54)
Ms. Pantale said The wood deck and wood steps add 5.8% to the 33.4% .
Mr. Madaio ESQ said *the total is 3344 square ft*. Correct *?*
Ms. Pantale said yes
Mr. Madaio ESQ said I just wanted to make sure .Does everyone sees that …….So, unfortunately, you were doing your examination……..he counted the wood steps and wood deck as impervious in 2018. But that's not how Cresskill does it. So we have to correct his numbers, which actually makes it worse for us …….
Ms. Pantale said……. the wooden steps and the wood deck are 5.8% from the 33.4%. That turns out to be 27.6% Impervious Coverage which is conforming .
Mr. Madaio ESQ said So that means, and the reason I'm saying that 'worse for us' is that when we bought it, it was conforming. I wish when we bought it, it was over, and in fact more than what we are asking for, which is what the *raw* numbers show. But the reality is, we always want to stand……..If you subtract out the wooden deck and the wooden steps from the 2018 calculation, the Impervious Coverage would be only 27.6 .
Mr Kassis said if I may just interrupt at this moment. There was as part of the testimony, that the Impervious Coverage currently does not incorporate decks .When, as far as I know, it does incorporate wood decks in Impervious Coverage in the town of Cresskill.
Mr. Madaio ESQ said if that is the case, then in fact in the 2018, it was 33.4%. I don't have a quick answer to that. I don't know if you ……I don't know if you can't get Coverage…
Mr. Van Horne Esq said as far as I can remember, as long as the Boards are not flush together . and that there is a space, it doesn't have to be much of a space, if there is a gap, it could be (15:50) a nail spacer, then it does not go into the Impervious .it's pervious.
Discussion regarding pervious vs impervious with Mr. Madaio
Mr. Madaio ESQ said I wish that it was so, the way you are saying it, I don't think that in all the years that I've been here that……but I believe that the way this Board has always treated it , is that wood decks that allow water to pass through, are not Impervious. And, I also can say that the reverse, when I was here six months ago, with an application, when the gap was in cement. Once we found that it was cement, it wasn't fully counted…….So, I will stand with the idea that the 2018 survey, we need to subtract out the wooden deck and the wooden steps as Impervious in 2018. That the Coverage in 2018 was 27.6, as testified by Ms. Pantale and *it may be a boon that we are allowed* to view what we did, in red. Just in red change that number……right under there, so that the actual number of Impervious Coverage in 2018 was 27.6. Again I think the surveyor shouldn't make the changes……Okay. So, in 2018, the surveyor, based upon the drawing, the 2018

survey,……was able to ascertain what the Building Coverage was. Yes, they took the house periphery. They took the shed, the old shed square footage. They took the deck and the deck steps, and they calculated 2,317 square ft and they added ……which turns out to be *23.1 Plaster Set* . Building Coverage that was marginally correct. The burnt deck that was there in 2018, that is not counted Impervious Coverage, we just established that…….So, now let's turn to what we are asking for today……..Now when we have those numbers …..at the bottom of the column (18:42) with the 27.6 is the correct number and at the bottom of this column is *13.105,* that is the Building Coverage…….Let's now look at the Building Coverage and the Impervious Coverage in 2024. To do that we are going to go to Ms. Pantale's plans, which are based on the current survey which you also have……*recording very weak* …….Building Coverage of 21.7%.....So, the Building Coverage now is less than it was in 2018. In 2018 it was a variance of 23.15 instead of 20, and right now we are refusing the Building Coverage to 21.7 . So the Building Coverage (20:06) has gone down since we bought it. And with these improvements it's less than when we bought it. And…. again because if we take off that big gap that we count in Impervious but it does count……. Take it off and replace it with a smaller structure, we are bringing our Building Coverage down from the 23.15 to 21.7. And you can do the math on that.....So, this have your attention. There was a reduction in Building Coverage. I can't imagine there is a problem in reduction of Building Coverage. Unfortunately, and again.....the Impervious Coverage in 2018 .....was 27.6. And Stephanie .....

Ms. Pantale said 32.23

Mr. Madaio ESQ said so our Building Coverage went down from 23.15 to 21.7, *and again I call that an arrow point down.* But our Impervious Coverage went up from 27.6 to 32.23.....on what was done on the site. Those are, I think, as accurately as we can detect.....a walkway..... *(21:59)* Lower the Building Coverage, raise the Impervious Coverage, replace the six foot fence, move the shed from one side to another, put it too close to the yard, and then move it back.

Mr. Levi said we moved the shed and built another.....because the shed was a little bit dangerous.

.....discussion about the shed.....

Mr. Levi said what you lose in deck you gain in patio.

Mr Kassis said in regards to the deck and summary of the deck and Impervious Coverage at this point.

Mr. Levi .....*talked about changes made to the house after purchase.*

Mr Kassis said we are looking for *2.23%* on Impervious Coverage and 1.7 frenetic. It's not a change to what is on the application , that is the agenda in front of us.....

Mr. Levi said what you got to know, the building is an actual reduction. Building Coverage was reduced over the years .....

Mr Kassis said Okay, that's clear. Okay, jf we just take that to the fence. If the fence was replaced with a similarly sized fence and I understand the statement made that if it had not been repaired piece by piece, you wouldn't be in front of us for variance. But it was replaced in its entirety. Is that correct ?

Mr. Levi said .....

Mr Kassis said Okay. And since that fence was originally installed, the fence variances in town have changed. Are you familiar with was the transparency requirement at the time.

Mr. Levi said it was 15% over.....
Mr Kassis said we have to issue a variance for the transparency of your fence.
Mr. Levi said would that be for the whole fence ?
Mr Kassis said no, just the forward facing fence.
Mr. Madaio ESQ said this is a distraction. You could allow him to keep the solid portion of the fence; but the forward facing portion.....should be 50% transparency.....*recording is faint*.....
Mr Kassis said if I understood you correctly now, your client is willing to remove the forward facing fence and replace it with a conforming fence for transparency. (26:10)
Mr. Madaio ESQ denied that his client would be willing to replace the fence
Mr Kassis said I thought that is what you said.
Mr. Madaio ESQ said no
Mr Kassis said I may have misunderstood.
***Mr. Madaio ESQ** objected to imposing such a condition.....*
Mr Kassis said okay
Mr. Madaio ESQ said I'm sure that might mean the whole wall. The front part being 50% *transparent* which is often thought of as a safety protection.....people can't hide from police..... *recording very weak*.....
Mr Kassis said Okay. Recuring the 50% , I'm looking at something signed by Bob Rusch, dated February of this year, and the fence requirement there is 75% .....
Mr Kassis and Mr. Madaio ESQ discussed the fence requirement ...**.....***recording very weak*.....
Mr. Van Horne Esq said alright Mark, it might be cleaner and might enhance the application, if you modify, stipulated to the forward facing part of the fence be compliant with the code
Mr. Madaio ESQ said not at the height,.....too open.....I think that my client that the Board has suggested that's the deal *commission*.....
Mr. Van Horne Esq said we can't do it that way.....it's not a quid dot pro. I mean like I said, it will enhance the application. That's my feeling, I don't vote.
Mr. Madaio ESQ said ..... *recording very weak*.....
Mr Kassis said.....safety concerns for our first responders in town, and also conformity with fences in the neighborhood. That we want to make sure that everybody is being required to adhere to the same regulations, and, from time to time, fences are permitted at a slightly higher height. As chairman, I personally objected to variances regarding fence transparency. Some have passed the vote of the Board here, but that's the risk that you should take
Mr. Madaio ESQ said *we wouldn't take ..... recording very weak*.....
Mr. Kassis said okay, thank-you. Alright. Does the Board have any questions or concerns so far ?
Ms. Wehle said..... *recording very weak*..... *(29:20)*
Mr. Madaio ESQ said I think that what it always was and they wanted the uniformity.....so I don't know there is a reason why. Especially .....other than uniformity...anyone can claim that reason but we do understand the concern.
Ms. Wehle said right.....
Mr. Madaio ESQ said there is no special reason.....
Mr Kassis said this is a question for Stephanie regarding the distance from the street. The property line to that fence, the forward-facing fence.

Ms. Pantale said the forward-facing fence is pretty far back in the property.....*described location of fence near the corner of the house.....at the front corner of the home*
Mr. Madaio ESQ said .....let's take the current survey. So they go from the right rear corner of the house, latterly, to the site property line. From the left corner of the house latterly to that property Line. We are nowhere near the front yard, or even the front of the side-yard.
Mr Kassis said I just asked for the number.
Ms. Pantale said probably 55' back.
Mr Kassis said okay**.** Thank-you for the information. Very important....close to the road, different type of issue. That far back, I'm not sure that it will even be seen.
At this point, is there anyone here tonight, for or against this application, that would like to be heard ? Let the record show *that no-one has acknowledged that they were present for this application*. That being said, is there a motion regarding this application from the Board ?
Mr. Bancroft made the motion .
Mr Kassis said is there a second **?**
Ms. Wehle said I'll second it.
Mr Kassis said thank-you. Roll Call please.
Ms. Bauer took the Roll Call:
Mr. Kassis Yes, with the reservation regarding the transparency.
Mr. McCord No
Ms. Wehle Yes
Mr. Bancroft Yes
Ms. Westerfeld Yes
Mr Kassis said okay, you know the drill. The memorialization at the next meeting, on the 4th Thursday of next month.
Mr. Levy said Thank-you. This is much more important. In the 1860's journalist Henry Stanley finds this doctor in Africa, who is in expedition in eastern Africa. Stanley finds them living among the natives and practicing medicine. When Stanley returns to civilization, he explains 'yeah I found them' and he's fine and he's very happy to be living in Africa.....it was Spencer Tracey and it was clear that they wanted to find him. That is history.
Mr Kassis said we appreciate the history.
Mr. Levy said alright guys. Thank-you so much, have a lovely weekend.

Please see next page

Borough of Cresskill
Zoning Board of Adjustment
Public Meeting 7:30 pm
Minutes May 23, 2024

Mr Kassis said the next application tonight is # 1425 78 Hoover Drive. Anyone part of this application please step forward

1425 Ilona Gont 78 Hoover Drive Block 91.07 Lot 8

Description	**Required**	**Existing**	**Proposed**	**Variance**
Front Yard Set Back	50’	55’	55’	
Side Yard Abutting/Lot	**30’**	**29.63’**	**29.63’’**	**ENC**
Front Corner	50’	55’	55’	
Combined Side Yards				
Min. Rear Yard	75’	76.44’	76.44’	
FAR	20.0%	Less than 20%	Less than 20%	
Height of Building	33.0’	Less than 33’	Less than 33’	
Lot Frontage	150’	314’	314’	
Lot Depth	200‘	200’	100’	
Bldg. Coverage %	**12.5%**	**Less than 12.5%**	**Less than 12.5%**	
Impervious Coverage	**35%**	**Less than 35%**	**Less than 35%**	
Lot Area	40,000 sf	40,014 sf	40,014 sf sf	
Front Fence	4’ Height 50% open		6’ Height 50% open	2’ Height 50% open

The applicant, Ms. Gont, would like to install a non-conforming fence at the above referenced address.
Ms. Ilona Gont was sworn in.
Mr. Van Horne Esq said you can be seated, if you are more comfortable.
Ms. Ilona Gont said Thank-you for having me tonight. I’ve been a Cresskill resident since (35.03) I was five. This is the first time I am asking the Board for a variance. And I will also be talking about the .....So the house where we are ..... right now has a very tiny slope and a large Front-Yard. The road goes high. We are on the corner, but the road is very circular, and it’s not a 90 degree angle. It’s a very circular angle and we are turning from the road. So I reached back from.....and they studied the Cresskill Zoning and checked it for a 5 foot 4 inches fence, and I’m hoping that what I will talk to you about today, will actually, you know, improve my request and desire for a 6’ fence. And I’m hoping that it will be without that *fence* obviously to our neighbors, who all received their notices. Many complained that I took too many of them, and hopefully without that..... successful drawing log .

1425 Ilona Gont (cont,) 78 Hoover Drive Block 91.07 Lot 8

Mr Kassis said okay, sorry to interrupt. We can't accept the testimony that you spoke to somebody. The Board is aware that that is not appropriate. (36:19)

Ms. Ilona Gont said I'm happy to tell you my reasons for .....the house is older and has almost two front yards, which I have been unable to use. Therefore I think.....4' *is too low because of the slope of the lot.....the 6' fence on the back is all broken* .....we were hoping to match the back with the sides, and.....

Mr Kassis said just to be clear. There is a little confusion today. Because we have one document that says 75% , and another that says 50%. We are going to proceed as if this 50% is correct. But we are also going to have to consider that if it is incorrect, and you use 75%, without, or either. How the application is judged. It's going to have to be contingent on whatever the actual ordinance is today. And if one of those is wrong, and clearly one of them has to be wrong, either yours is right or wrong. But we do need a clarification from the Building Department. And we will somehow work on this ..... (38:25)

Ms. Ilona Gont said .....*The Building Dept told her at 6' it got rejected and they said 50% open. And that's what they told me.....described property as very very heavy slope, very heavy landscaping which would really heighten the 6' fence.....what else.....described property and repairs/alterations that need to be done.....fence needs to be matched to the neighborhood.....*

Mr Kassis said okay. In front of us have writs which are provided as part of our application. That shows what appears to be a fence line, highlighted in either pink or purple high lighter ink. Is that the proposed location of the plan ?

Ms. Ilona Gont said .....

Mr Kassis said so the corner fence in the rear portion which would be the north and east side of the scratchy lines, that would be the fifth indent

Ms. Ilona Gont said right

Mr Kassis said and that, from your testimony, in disrepair and would be replaced, and according to the Zoning requirements, that would be eligible for a six foot fence. The application before regarding the fence, while every fence and every application is different, we did hear some testimony that the fence location (correct me if I'm wrong) was 55' from the curb. It appears, there are some numbers written here, which seem to be a little unclear, and how close this fence comes, at a six foot height to the front, and appears to be touching the curb . (41:35)

Ms. Ilona Gont said no, and again I asked, was told that it has to be decided by regulation.....so I think that what happened. They presented the number 65 'it has to be 65', 'it has to be 65', 'it has to be 65', but I approve that there is a specific requirement number and that I have to follow it.

Mr Kassis said ordinarily we wouldn't do those, but I would ask you just to confirm what we are looking at. The Board has to vote on what you have already presented to them. And I am looking at my last application, which was received, appear, and while you are going to look at it,

Ms. Ilona Gont *asked to be heard*

Mr Kassis said yes, please step forward. You can have the microphone, if you wish to speak. If you could just explain the part that is 26'. Would be sort of the north side. That appears to be touching the curb

Ms. Ilona Gont said yes, I think that would be the new pantry

Mr Kassis said the .....is labeled 2016. Is that a fence ?

Ms. Ilona Gont said no, I think that they are showing the site from the card.

Mr Kassis said Okay, so they high-lighted , just one thing at a time, the area that is 26'. Its not a fence.

Ms. Ilona Gont said no.

1425 Ilona Gont (cont,) 78 Hoover Drive Block 91.07 Lot 8

Mr. Kassis said so there is a tree-line. And there is a corner, so that section is just a marker.
Ms. Ilona Gont said right.
Mr. Kassis said okay. Let's look at the line that is represented with 105', everybody on the Board see that ? That's also highlighted which comes in contact with the tree line. Is that a fence ?
Ms. Ilona Gont said that shouldn't be the fence
Mr. Kassis said okay. If that isn't a fence, it appears that it is coming within inches of the curb, on the right side, where it says 12'. Which doesn't really make sense, because the material in that corner is touching the fence / curb. Is that your understanding ?
Ms. Ilona Gont said yes. My understanding was that this was going to be here. I think the way it was described : This is the length 105, 100. And I have been told that the 60 may not reflect the numbers .....If you think I should withdraw it.....
Mr. Kassis said Well yeah. So what was presented to us. The highlighted areas are not fence locations. Some of those are fence locations, some are distance locations. And 105 was just a fence, ending the whole front of the property, at six feet tall doesn't come in contact with the curb.
Ms. Ilona Gont said there is a sizing here- John has not the best....I am happy to withdraw
Mr. Kassis said okay. If you could sit down now.
Ms. Ilona Gont said sure.
Mr. Kassis said Thank-you very much.
There is the Set-Back line, that is why I brought this up, according to the dashed line that is listed there or narrowly, was put there as a rough representation, that the defense should not be adding into. Now, there are times and towns, there are people to the left of that. But before the Board votes, we need to know in voting, more clearly what we are voting on. What has been presented to us is very confusing and appears to be confusing to you as well.....Before we vote on this, and unlike some applications, where they are fighting weather before the winter and want to get a foundation in, I understand that you would like to move forward, but if we have to vote, on the way this is drawn now, I'm sure how the application will be if the vote is taken. I think the best bet, and it would be your decision, if you would like to come back, either with an updated, these are very strong lines, showing exactly where the fence is, and in comparison to the house, leaving all the information you have there, but right now it's incomplete for the implementation. But I think we can comment on some other issues regarding transparency, for instance. .By then we will have a definitive answer. You heard the previous application. Where the applicant decided to conform a fence, that unfortunately was already built, conforming with that transparency requirement. Which would mean taking it down and putting it back up. Now, obviously, you haven't started the fence, and are in a different situation. If the Board, and I'm not saying they will go either way about it, was to approve the height, the transparency, and you have heard comments about not having transparency in the front, and safety as well. So when you come back to us, it will be important to delineate where the fence is going and if you were requesting a transparency factor. You are a corner property and will get some clarification of where transparency is required on your unusual property. And whether or not the layout of your property may or may not warrant consideration.....But we do need more information before we can go it on you. While we can't force you to do that.....its something that has to be your own decision.
Mr. Van Horne Esq said Ms Gont are you asking that this application be carried to the next meeting in June ?
Ms. Ilona Gont said yes.
Ms. Ilona Gont *asked if the Board would advise her with the required information.*

1425 Ilona Gont (cont,) 78 Hoover Drive Block 91.07 Lot 8

Mr. Van Horne Esq said we can't provide that. You would have to get your own professionals to advise you. I would suggest that you submit a revised application, at least ten days before the next hearing, which is the fourth Thursday in June.

Ms. Ilona Gont said.....show me on the map**.**

Mr. Kassis said as long as we have the same.....you don't have to re-notify and do all those things. We just need to get proper information. Work with Mr. Rusch, who will guide you on the requirement. We will also reach out to him, but we can't instruct you on how to proceed with your application.

Ms. Ilona Gont said I can work with Mr. Rusch.

Mr. Kassis said yes. . If he is able and willing to act with you, on your application.

Ms. Ilona Gont said I also worked with .....Taylor . She was.....

Discussion between Mr. Kassis and Ms. Gout on the revised application.

Mr. Kassis said Okay, Fair enough ?

Ms. Ilona Gont *agreed.*

Mr. Van Horne Esq said is anybody here, on behalf of this application, either for or against it ?

Mr. Kassis said let the record show that no-one responded nor is present. And Thank-you. We will see you at the next meeting. So if there is any other business before the court, .I will entertain a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 8:20 pm.

Memorializations

None