

**Town of Bolton
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
MINUTES
Tuesday, January 19, 2016
6:00 p.m.**

SEQR = State Environmental Quality Review
PB = (Town of Bolton) Planning Board
WCPS = Warren County Planning Staff
APA = Adirondack Park Agency
LGPC = Lake George Park Commission
DEC = Dept. of Environmental Conservation

Present: Jason Saris, Tom McGurl, John Whitney, John Famosi, Holly Dansbury, Joy Barcome, Alternate Lorraine Lefevé, Zoning Administrator, Pamela Kenyon and Counsel Michael Muller

Absent: Jeff Anthony

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 pm.

Jason Saris asked if there were any corrections or changes to the December 15, 2015 minutes.

RESOLUTION:

Motion by Tom McGurl to approve the December 15, 2015 minutes as presented. Seconded by, Lorraine Lefevé. All in Favor. Motion Carried.

1. **V15-51 O'KEEFE, ROBERT & DAWN. (THE HUDDLE RESTAURANT).** To alter existing structure, specifically to allow a 4'7" x 4'7" enclosed entry to remain in its present location, seek area variance for 1) a deficient front yard setback. 30' is required, 18' is proposed from the reserved driveway strip; and 2) to alter a non-conforming structure in accordance with Section 200-57B1b. Section 171.15, Block 1, Lot 59, Zone GB5000. Property Location: 4947 Lake Shore Drive. Subject to WCPS review.

Robert O'Keefe presented the following:

- He apologized to the Board for putting on the entryway prior to coming for approvals, stating he had put it on to secure the weather from entering the building.

Jason Saris asked the applicant if this benefit could be achieved this by any other means. Mr. O'Keefe stated there is nothing that can be done to keep the weather out without adding a second doorway. The way the building is set up on the inside it is impossible to make the alterations in there. This is the only place it was feasible to do this. He tried to keep it as small as possible.

No County Impact

RESOLUTION

The Zoning Board of Appeals received an application from Robert & Dawn O'Keefe,

(V15-51) for an area variance as described above.

And, due to notice of the public hearing of the ZBA at which time the application was to be considered having been given and the application having been referred to the Warren County Planning Staff;

And, whereas the Warren County Planning Staff determined that there was no County impact;

And, after reviewing the application and supporting documents of the same, and public comment being heard regarding the application; this Board makes the following findings of fact:

The application of the applicant is as described in Item#1 of the agenda.

- 1) The benefit could not be achieved by any other means feasible to the applicant besides an area variance: It is a benefit to the structure. It is a small structure and there was not an interior option to achieve this. It is minor in the terms of the extent of the variance.
- 2) There will be no undesirable change in the neighborhood character or to nearby properties.
- 3) The request is not substantial;
- 4) The request will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district; It will not change any drainage or other issues.
- 5) The alleged difficulty is self-created; this is not a sufficient reason to deny the variance. The benefit to the applicant is not outweighed by the potential detriment to health, safety and welfare of the community.

Now, upon motion duly made by John Whitney and seconded by John Famosi, it is resolved that the ZBA does hereby approve variance request as presented. **All in favor. Motion Carried.**

2. **V15-49 24 ANCHORAGE ROAD HOLDINGS, LLC.** Represented by C. Raymond Davis & Sons Inc. and Charlie Spinella. **1)** To alter single family dwelling, seeks area variance for a) Deficient setbacks. Front: 30' is required, 19.9' is proposed. Shoreline: 50' is required, 48' is proposed. Rear: 15' is required, 13.6' is proposed; and b) to alter a non-conforming structure in accordance with Section 200-57B1b. **2)** For the construction of a garage/storage, seeks area variance for a deficient shoreline setback. 50' is required, 37' is proposed. **3)** For the construction of proposed retaining walls, seeks area variance for deficient setbacks. Shoreline: 50' is required. 8' is proposed. Side: 15' is required, 0' is proposed. Section 171.19, Block 2, Lot 24, Zone GB5000. Property Location: 24 Anchorage Road. Subject to WCPS review.

Guy Williams of C. Raymond Davis & Sons, Inc. and Charlie Spinella presented the following:

- He handed out an amended sheet to the Board.
- They have taken off the garage portion of the variance request this evening.
- They are looking to update the older home and make room for their growing needs.
- There underlying theme has been the least invasive path throughout the design process.
- They are staying within the existing footprint for the livable areas.
- They stayed at 29'8" on the roof line as opposed to going for the maximum allowable height allowed by the Town of Bolton.
- They worked diligently to guard the existing views of each neighbor.

- He detailed the photos to the Board.
- He went over the now proposed requests.
- The relief they are asking for is only on what is existing.
- The HOA and Mr. Essler have reached an agreement.
- They shall remove the second floor plan bathroom and bedroom and depict the area as storage.
- They will also remove the balcony and replace the door with a window.
- They have finished sketches of the garage completely attached to the home as a request of the HOA.
- They will come back to the Board for this as a separate application.
- They are looking for approval of relief on the existing front setback and the existing side setback.

Charlie Spinella presented the following:

- He detailed the site plans to the Board.
- They will be replacing an existing timber frame stairway from the existing asphalt with a stone slab as the timber is rotted.
- Slope will stay the same, they may add some rock to rip rap.
- The back yard gradient facing the lake is quite irregular.
- They would like to use the soil from the excavation to fill in the irregularities on the back slope.
- They will add a stone stairway to the docks to make it safer.
- In order raise the grade on the back yard they will have two seating walls to raise the grade.
- He detailed the planting and rain garden areas on the site plan.
- All the soil would stay on site.

Jason Saris asked how much they would be bringing the grade up. Mr. Spinella detailed it on the plans. Jason Saris asked what the greatest amount of change in the elevation would be on the whole plan. Mr. Spinella stated 12” tops. He stated there would no soil leaving or added to the site, it would just be redistributed.

Holly Dansbury asked if they would be changing anything with the existing retaining wall. Mr. Spinella replied no. He then stated that a stone step wall would be the only change he would like to add.

Lorraine Lefevre asked if they would be incorporating these changes in the plans when they come back to the Board. Mr. Spinella replied that he could and also add the detail of the plantings on the plan.

John Whitney asked what the total area of the seating wall was if it was one continuous wall or two separate walls. Mr. Spinella detailed them on the plan and stated the seating wall was just 18”. He replied he could not tell him the total area off the top of his head. John Whitney asked how deep they would have to dig down for the wall. Mr. Spinella stated they would dig a 1’ deep trench and explained how dry stack walls were built. He stated there were no issues with

bedrock. He said the face of the wall is 103 sq. ft. John Whitney asked if this would be considered a structure. Jason Saris stated it would if it was over 100 sq. ft. Mr. Spinella stated he could lose 4 sq. ft.

Tom McGurl asked the height of the wall on the left. Mr. Spinella said it was different in various segments. It is to keep the soil from washing on the steps and would tie into an existing wall.

Jason Saris asked if the garage would require more of this type of work when it was brought before them. Mr. Spinella stated they would have a detention trench to percolate water in but that is it.

Josh Silver from the audience stated the following:

The garage was some concern to him as it would affect his grandparent's view of the lake. He asked if the footprint is staying the same and the second floor height does not require a variance. Mr. Williams stated this was true and stated they would be increasing the volume of the building to 29' 8" tall. Mr. Silver asked if this would alleviate the need for a variance for this. Jason Saris explained that a variance was required because the home is a pre-existing, non-conforming structure. Mr. Williams stated that he stood on Mr. Silver's property and they have not hindered the view from their patio

Chris Navitsky, Lake George Waterkeeper questioned the necessity of the wall on the south side. He stated that there does not appear to be any erosion.

Mr. Williams stated that the south yard is very high with the vegetation and the wall is meant to shore it up.

Jason Saris stated it was nice to see an applicant soliciting neighborhood input and he commended them for bringing them into it.

Holly Dansbury asked how high they were raising the roof. Mr. Williams stated 4'3".

Mr. Williams detailed the photo of the home to the Board.

No County Impact

RESOLUTION

The Zoning Board of Appeals received an application from 24 Anchorage Road Holdings, LLC,

(V15-49) for an area variance as described above.

And, due to notice of the public hearing of the ZBA at which time the application was to be considered having been given and the application having been referred to the Warren County Planning Staff;

And, whereas the Warren County Planning Staff determined that there was no County impact;

And, after reviewing the application and supporting documents of the same, and public comment being heard regarding the application; this Board makes the following findings of fact:

The application of the applicant is as described in Item#2 of the agenda.

- 1) The benefit could not be achieved by any other means feasible to the applicant besides an area variance: it is a fairly reasonable request as the footprint of the building is really not changing and a small increase of the height with great attention to detail for the neighbors views.
- 2) There will be no undesirable change in the neighborhood character or to nearby properties.
- 3) The request is not substantial; the south wall will be visible but will be keeping the slope in place.
- 4) The request will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district;
- 5) The alleged difficulty is self-created; the property was purchased as it was but these are fairly minimal alterations.

The benefit to the applicant is not outweighed by the potential detriment to health, safety and welfare of the community.

Now, upon motion duly made by John Whitney and seconded by Tom McGurl, it is resolved that the ZBA does hereby approve variance request as presented with the following amendments:

1. 19' 9" front setback for the single family dwelling.
2. 13' 6" rear setback for the single family dwelling.
3. South side retaining wall which includes a 0' side setback.
4. 8' shoreline setback for a retaining wall.
5. The smaller seating area is to be resized so it is not considered a structure.
6. The garage is not included.
7. The south side stair is upgraded to stone.
8. There will be a cut in the existing wall on the south side along the shoreline for stairs.

All in favor. Motion Carried.

- 3. V15-53 MEFFORD, ROGER & LISA.** Represented by C. Raymond Davis & Sons Inc. For the construction of a proposed single family dwelling with an attached 3 car garage, seek area variance for overall length. 120' is allowed. 129'6' is proposed. Section 185.00, Block 2, Lot 35.4, Zone LC25. Property Location: Alpine View Drive. Site Plan Review is required but has not yet been applied for.

Guy Williams of C. Raymond Davis & Sons Inc. presented the following:

- There is a need for a larger home for the applicant due to a growing family.
- The lot is a short walking distance from their current cabin on Millstone Drive.
- Alpine View is an approved 3 lot subdivision by the Town of Bolton.
- The applicants will be building at the end of Alpine View Drive.

- Tom Jarrett will be preparing the stormwater plans.
- Barry Kincaid will be doing the tree cutting and view enhancement.
- They wanted to enhance lake views with minimum removal of vegetation.
- They took advantage of clearings by the previous owner when they positioned the home.
- The previous owner had a site for the home much higher on the hill which would require much more clearing and disturbance to the site along with poor aesthetics.
- It would also create an unnatural tree line.
- The position of the home was to follow the topo of the land to have the most natural siting of the land.
- They designed the home to fall right along with the topo of the land to take advantage of the views.
- There is a lot of ledge so they tried many different ways for the least amount of disturbance and blasting.
- This is the best possible home for this site in the best possible location.
- The whole goal for this plan was to have the least disruption as possible to this site.
- They wanted a full basement but decided not due to the amount of ledge.
- They will be pinning the building to the ledge.
- They did not exceed the height restrictions for the Town of Bolton or the A.P.A.
- All the living areas are to be on one level due to the homeowners progressing illness.
- This is a log and timber frame.
- They will be using all earth tones to camouflage the home.
- The home is at the end of a dead end street with no possible way for the length of the home to be seen by the neighbors or from the road.
- You would need binoculars to pick out the house from a boat in the Narrows.
- They could detach the porch and meet the letter of law, but not the spirit of the law.
- This would not need a variance if they did this, but it would also make the house much longer.

Barry Kincaid of KLC Enterprises, LLC stated the following.

- Detailed his handout to the Board stating they would be maintaining as many trees as possible.
- If they detached the patio, they would avoid the variance, but the house would become that much longer and need that much more screening.
- If you look at the topo, the house lays perfectly with it.
- They are concerned for the neighbors, so they have decided to plant some native evergreens for screening in the area cleared for the septic.
- They also are screening in the driveway areas, to eliminate headlights in neighboring homes.

Jason Saris asked the dimensions of the covered patio. Mr. Williams stated the patio was 21' x 20'. He stated that it was 15' sticking out on one side and 12' on the other side. Jason Saris

asked if they were asking for 9.5' of relief. Mr. Williams stated this was correct. He explained to the Board how it was written on the plans.

Tom McGurl stated it was a beautiful home that fits within the landscape, but the 9'5" would make this home require a variance for anything they would like to alter in the future. He doesn't see why they can't reduce this. He understands their logic of the "spirit of the law", but this is a very large home and he can't see how reducing it 9' cannot be accomplished. Mr. Williams stated they would actually have to shrink it 15' to bring that back into the 9'. Tom McGurl replied it would not come off one end if they if they shrank the entire design. Mr. Williams replied it is a 4 bedroom home. Barry Kincaid stated they were not blasting either to add another floor. Tom McGurl stated that he understood that.

John Whitney said if they took 6" of each room from one end to the other they would fit within the setback without changing the design. Tom McGurl agreed, stating this would avoid the variance. Mr. Williams said they could make it fit within the box and alleviate the variance by detaching it by one inch, but this would make the house 2' longer. Jason Saris stated the Board is struggling with the question of "can the benefit of the applicant be achieved by some means other than an area variance". He said they have already told them it can be. Mr. Williams stated they would lose the utility of that covered porch. He said the rooms in the home are not oversized rooms.

Jason Saris stated that Mr. Williams had already told them they did not need an area variance if they detach it, so it can be achieved by some way other than an area variance. Mr. Kincaid stated that it could be achieved, but is that really better for the environment.

John Famosi asked if they had looked at any other way to avoid the variance other than detaching the patio. Mr. Williams stated they had, but there were not a whole lot of options due to the topo of the lot. Tom McGurl detailed ways to reduce the area. Mr. Mefford stated that the rooms were on an angle and this is what is extending it. They are not overly big it's that the dimensions are going catty-corner on the rooms. He said the slope from the end of the garage to the patio is an elevation of 1'. The great room is larger than they wanted but in order to keep the angle to use the existing ledge, it had to be this size. This is actually cost him money. There is really not an opportunity. He explained if the variance is not accepted their next option is to detach the patio which will extend the patio roof out another 2'1" which does not make sense to him. The whole purpose of this application is to try and blend the home in as best they can.

Barry Kincaid stated they are keeping the amount of clearing down by doing it the way requested. He stated detaching it will create more clearing and more stormwater. He stated they are minimizing all the impacts to the environment and the benefit of this design out ways the harm.

Tom McGurl stated if the Board does not approve it they will do it anyway that they can. Mr. Mefford stated they would not be doing it anyway they can, they would be doing it within the requirements of the code. They are taking the time to come before the ZBA to try to minimize the impacts to the environment. Mr. Kincaid stated this is just a length issue due to the

circumstances of the site. Mr. Mefford detailed the view coming up the driveway and the lake and stated it does not like a big house from these spots.

Holly Dansbury asked about length variances. Zoning Administrator, Pamela Kenyon replied that the Board looks at each variance on its own merits.

Jason Saris asked Atty. Muller about the application of the standards. Atty. Muller stated the Board would need to balance the needs of the code and the needs of the applicant. They need to listen carefully to the argument and are there feasible alternatives. Some Board Members may feel that there are, one of them being; don't build the house longer than 120'. The applicant comes back and suggests that they have considered other feasible alternatives, one that would lawfully allow them to build a 120' long home and still accomplish it with a separate or detached structure for the covered patio. Mr. Kincaid comes up with the excellent point that the Board needs to take into account that ordinance seeks to protect the environment and they want to restrict clearing and basically blend into the site. Although they asked for the extension beyond 120' they are gaining something. They are affording the applicant the opportunity to clear less and be less obtrusive. This is a balancing test and the Board should not summarily dismiss it. They need to do a very studied balance; what are they going to get in exchange for what they applicant has proposed; are they protecting the ordinance and the neighborhood, are they doing any detriment to the environment. He believes if they put that all together he believes they can come up with the answer.

Guy Williams stated he wanted to clarify the issue of the Great Room. He explained that pulling in the Great Room, would not help their case at all.

Chris Navitsky, Lake George Waterkeeper stated the following:

- They support the design concept of the building along the contour.
- They have questions of the extent of the clearing that will be down gradient of the structure.
- The Town's Comprehensive plan should be considered for visible hillside development.
- They agree with the Board's question about the alternative of the potential reduction of the project.

Barry Kincaid detailed the trees on the site which would be used to block the view from the lake, stating there were 30 mature, large canopy trees that would be left. They will be pruning to adequately screen the home. He stated the pruning would be designed so that the home would not be seen from the lake. They will be pruning after the home is built.

Joy Barcome asked about the blasting and pinning. Mr. Williams stated they had drilled 40 holes and they are going to try to drill it as opposed to blasting. He detailed the process they hoped to use. He explained they would be pinning part of the home to the ledge.

RESOLUTION

The Zoning Board of Appeals received an application from Roger & Lisa Mefford, (V15-53) for an area variance as described above.

And, due to notice of the public hearing of the ZBA at which time the application was to be considered;

And, after reviewing the application and supporting documents of the same, and public comment being heard regarding the application; this Board makes the following findings of fact:

The application of the applicant is as described in Item#3 of the agenda.

- 1) The benefit could not be achieved by any other means feasible to the applicant besides an area variance: As discussed this is the most well thought out plan in terms of siting of the home, and will be less disruptive to the environment than doing it other ways.
- 2) There will be no undesirable change in the neighborhood character or to nearby properties. It is clearly a beautifully designed, Adirondack style home using natural color schemes.
- 3) The request is not substantial; it is only 120 sq. ft. box and is not significant.
- 4) The request will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district; this has been very well thought out with minimizing blasting, visibility and will fit in very nicely.
- 5) The alleged difficulty is self-created; in terms of design it minimizes what could be done on the site.

The benefit to the applicant is not outweighed by the potential detriment to health, safety and welfare of the community.

Now, upon motion duly made by Holly Dansbury and seconded by Lorraine Lefevre, it is resolved that the ZBA does hereby approve variance request as presented. Tom McGurl and John Famosi opposed. **All others in favor. Motion Carried.**

4. **V15-52 BLUMENTHAL, CHARLOTTE.** Represented by Atty. Michael O'Connor. To demolish single-family dwelling and storage building and replace with a single family dwelling/garage, seeks area variance for a deficient shoreline setback. 75' is required, 24' is proposed. Section 186.15, Block 1, Lot 35, Zone RM1.3. Property Location: 191 Homer Point Road. Subject to WCPS and APA review.

Atty. Michael O'Connor presented the following:

- This is an existing lot created before Bolton adopted their zoning.
- They have owned and occupied the property for the last 20 years.
- The cabin is becoming too small for their growing family.
- They will be demolishing the existing house and replacing it with a new one.
- They were before the Board in 2000, and this new plan is much different than the previous one.
- They are only looking for one variance this time which has to do with the shoreline setback.
- They would need an area variance for anything they applied for on this lot.
- They have tried to propose the least obtrusive structure they could to the lake and the neighbors.
- They will not increase any of the variances that are presently in place.

- They have designed a home that improves the setback on the north and south property line.
- They have not violated the back setback.
- They improved the front setback as much as they could without encroaching on the back line.
- They think they have looked at the alternatives and have added significant improvements to the environment.
- They will discontinue use of the raised mound septic system and replace it with holding tanks, which remove the entire septic from Homer Point.
- They have implemented stormwater which is non-existent.
- They will minimize any tree removal and he detailed the tree removal to the Board and distributed color photos.
- There are no undesirable changes to the neighborhood as the character is residential.
- The request is not substantial as they already have a structure on this property, which is pretty well camouflaged.
- There will not be significant impact.

Devin Dickinson of Dickinson & Sons Engineering presented the following.

- The current site does not have any stormwater controls and the new plan will treat all stormwater on the entire site.
- They will have overflow parking with a grass system.
- This will not reduce the green space.
- They will not be removing any trees for the parking.
- They will step back the retaining wall to maintain as many trees as they can.
- They are proposing to add some vegetation in a small depression to contain stormwater as an extra precaution.
- He detailed on the plan the vegetation and the stormwater.
- This plan will be safeguarding the environment much more than what exists.
- The holding tank system will need to go before the Bolton Board of Health.

Jason Saris inquired if they had received this variance yet. Mr. Dickinson replied that they need to get the Zoning Boards approvals first.

Holly Dansbury asked if the tank was in the driveway. Mr. Dickinson replied it would be a traffic rated tank and cover.

Atty. O’Conner stated this variance request was and was not a self-created difficulty. This cabin has become obsolete and was set up before zoning. It is need of substantial repairs and does not meet the needs of the family.

Atty. O’Conner stated that they had taken the plans to the neighbors and he read letters in favor from Anthony & Norma Bustamante and Irvin Metzgar.

Atty. O’Conner said this will be a cedar sided structure with dark stain.

Jonathan Bunker of Michaels Group Homes

- This is a 2 story home with 4 bedrooms with an attached garage.
- One of the proposed bedrooms is above the garage to minimize the footprint.
- The home itself is not excessive.
- The exterior of the home will be cedar clapboard siding with natural stone accents.
- There are 0 eave overhangs on the home.

Holly Dansbury asked the height of the home. Mr. Bunker replied that it was below the allowed 35' limit. The height of the chimney is 32' and the structure at its highest point is 29'.

Atty. O'Conner detailed the layout of the existing structure and the proposed structure.

Jason Saris stated this was subject to APA review and asked what the practical difficulty was. Atty. O'Conner stated the practical difficulty was that anywhere they placed a decent size structure would need a variance, and they have improved the existing shoreline variance. They picked the least obtrusive site for the structure. He stated that they went back as far as they could without encroaching on the back setback. There is no way for them to alleviate the shoreline setback without encroaching on the back setback, and they have neighbors who do not want them over that setback. They are trying to be considerate to the neighbor. They are right to the back setback line. If they push the house back parking would need to be in the front of the home.

Jason Saris asked what the setback requirements were for the holding tanks. Mr. Dickinson stated 10' from the sideline, 10' from a basement 50' from neighbors and 50' from the shoreline. Jason Saris stated that if they moved the home back it becomes tighter for this. Mr. Dickinson stated the small lot is the reason they went to the holding tanks.

Atty. Muller read an email from Brad & Chris Irvine in opposition of the project.

Chris Navitsky, Lake George Waterkeeper reviewed the following;

- Questioned the increase of impervious cover.
- Increase of building coverage by 16% in the shoreline setback.
- Stormwater will only address the increase and not what presently exist there.
- Tree removal.
- The stormwater for the impervious area driveway.
- There are concerns and things that need to be balanced.
- There are alternatives available to possibly increase the shoreline setback.
- Questioned overhangs by garage and entryway.

Mr. Bunker replied to that the flat roof is not actually flat and stated that there will be gutters and down spouts which will capture the runoff.

Atty. O'Connor refuted the letter submitted by the Irvine's and addressed some of the Waterkeeper's concerns about vegetation removal, stormwater and disturbance.

Devin Dickinson stated that the stormwater design takes into consideration the all of the impervious area and not just the proposed.

No County Impact

RESOLUTION

The Zoning Board of Appeals received an application from Charlotte Blumenthal, (V15-52) for an area variance as described above.

And, due to notice of the public hearing of the ZBA at which time the application was to be considered having been given and the application having been referred to the Warren County Planning Staff;

And, whereas the Warren County Planning Staff determined that there was no County impact;

And, after reviewing the application and supporting documents of the same, and public comment being heard regarding the application; this Board makes the following findings of fact:

The application of the applicant is as described in Item#4 of the agenda.

- 1) The benefit could not be achieved by any other means feasible to the applicant besides an area variance: the building envelope on the lot is unusable; they are not increasing the existing variance for the shoreline.
 - 2) There will be no undesirable change in the neighborhood character or to nearby properties. It will be in keeping with character and improve the natural theme.
 - 3) The request is somewhat substantial; the proposal does not increase the shoreline variance and they are not requesting anymore variances.
 - 4) The request will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district; there is some additional clearing, but the stormwater management and change to the septic system will mitigate this.
 - 5) The alleged difficulty is not self-created; this is a result of a pre-existing non-conforming structure that was built before zoning. The size of the lot and the various setbacks present a practical difficulty for any other reasonable remedy.
- The benefit to the applicant is not outweighed by the potential detriment to health, safety and welfare of the community.

Now, upon motion duly made by John Famosi and seconded by John Whitney, it is resolved that the ZBA does hereby approve variance request as presented. **All in favor. Motion Carried.**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:01.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Kate Persons

