

**ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING  
TUESDAY – OCTOBER 24, 2023  
7:00 PM – TOWN HALL  
1529 NYS RTE 12  
BINGHAMTON, NEW YORK 13901**

**Present:** James Brewster, Chairperson  
Aleta Kinne, Vice Chairperson  
Scott Smith, Board Member  
Jon White, Board Member  
Ed Miller, Board Member  
  
Dan Wolters, Alternate Board Member

**Also Present:** Gavin Stiles, Ordinance Officer  
Lindsey Fey, Zoning Secretary  
Nathan VanWhy, Planning/Zoning Attorney

---

**Brewster -** OK, it is a little after 7 o'clock, so I will call the Town of Chenango Zoning Board of Appeals meeting for October to order. I will ask, let's all welcome Lindsey, our new clerk, to call her first attendance roll call.

**Fey -** Mr. Wolters – Here  
Mr. Miller – Here  
Mr. White – Here  
Mr. Smith – Here  
Ms. Kinne – Here  
Mr. Brewster – Here

**Brewster -** Alright, we have a quorum. And introducing our new legal counsel, Nate VanWhy. So, we have a quorum, and we will continue. So, welcome everybody to the meeting and we'll just go over a couple of things. We start off with new business, we have a couple of new applications tonight. We'll address those applications and move them forward most likely for a public hearing and then we have two public hearings to go through tonight. So, that's kind of how it works, and we do environmental review on the public hearings and hopefully move forward to discussion and the resolution, depending on how that goes. So, the next order of business is to approve our minutes from September, anybody have any comments, questions, concerns on that?

**White -** They're good.

**Kinne -** Yes, they're good.

**Brewster -** If that's what you desire I'll seek a motion to approve the minutes from September.

**White -** So moved, Mr. Chairman

**Miller -** I'll second.

**Brewster -** And now you may do the vote roll call for the minutes.

**Fey -**  
Mr. Miller – Aye  
Mr. White – Aye  
Mr. Smith – Aye  
Ms. Kinne – Aye  
Mr. Brewster – Aye

**Brewster –** OK, the September minutes are approved and may be published accordingly. On to new business tonight, we have application 2023-V10, Cindy Lou Picciano, an area variance to construct a front porch with less than required front yard set back from 50ft to 26.83ft or also 50ft to 28.79ft to the porch, the first number was to the steps. That's in an agricultural zone. Is Ms. Picciano here tonight? OK. Tonight you wont be telling us about the project or anything, that'll be next month so, unless we have questions for you. Did everyone go through the application?

**White -** Yes, it appears to be complete from what I see.

**Brewster -** OK.

**Kinne -** The project is already started.

**Picciano -** The porch isn't started; I'm having a foundation wall replaced.

**Kinne -** Yes, it's all dug out because they're replacing a foundation wall. That's not part of our...

**Brewster -** I'm just listening.

**Kinne -** Got a big hole there.

**Picciano -** Yeah, it's a big step out the front door.

**Smith -** Probably good to get that finished before building anything.

**Brewster -** Alright, well if we do think the application is complete so far as being able to be moved onto Planning and to our November meeting then, I seek that motion.

**Kinne -** So moved.

**Brewster -** And a second?

**White -** I'll second it, Mr. Chairman.

**Brewster -** I've got a motion and a second, any further discussion? OK, roll call then.

**Fey -** Mr. Miller – Aye  
Mr. White – Aye  
Mr. Smith – Aye  
Ms. Kinne – Aye  
Mr. Brewster – Aye

**Brewster –** Alright, so we'll move your application on to Planning and then you'll see us in roughly a month, whenever the November date is, and you'll pick up the ball with that now and start moving it through the process.

**Smith -** You may see some of us looking at it over the next month, some of us may drive by.

**Fey -** That sounds creepy.

**Picciano -** You won't see me behind the dirt pile so you can wave but I can't wave back.

**Brewster -** OK, next application for preliminary review is 2023-V11, Jared T. O'Brien, an area variance from 1500sqft to 2016sqft for a pole barn in a residential zone. How's the application look?

**White -** Well, several things. One, on this application you put AG on it even though it's residential zone, which is a simple change but, he didn't submit a site plan or a short EAF form unless I didn't get it in an email.

**Fey -** That was probably my bad honestly.

**White -** OK, well if it's all there, and I see his letter of intent then it's a pretty complete application.

**Fey -** Does the short EAF go with the 239 Review? Because I did submit for a 239 Review.

**White -** No that's a separate form. Mr. O'Brien would have to fill out and submit to us only part one, we do part two and part three.

**Fey -** OK.

**Brewster -** The short EAF does have to go to the county though as part of a 239.

**Fey -** OK.

**White -** I know he's described in his letter of intent here about kind of where it's going to be located on the property, but we're supposed to have a site plan that's hand drawn.

**VanWhy -** For the SEQR form it's good practice to have everybody submit short form SEQR at the very least. If it's a big project then they should do longform part one, but

a lot of times an applicant for like a variance for a home, and I'm assuming that's what this is, would be a type two action so the SEQR form might be submitted but you don't actually need to review it in any depth because it's automatically deemed by the state as having no significance.

**White -** This is an accessory structure. For the most part those are the questions that I had. With what information we have how do we want to proceed?

**Kinne -** Is it for equipment or horses?

**O'Brien -** Equipment, tools, and hobby stuff. She should have the site plan.

**White -** As long as everything has been filed. That's the bigger thing. We have the information to be able to review it.

**Fey -** So, I did have it but I didn't realize you guys needed that, sorry.

**White -** That's alright.

**Brewster -** I sent Lindsey an email the other day, a little bit in the 11<sup>th</sup> hour but, just kind of a list of things that we normally get to hopefully streamline things but to also reduce her workload because we got everything under the sun.

**Fey -** I was literally just sending you guys everything. He did come in on the day that it was going to be closed so I was also rushed to get everything in on that same day.

**Stiles -** We shoe-horned him in hoping it could be ironed out.

**White -** As long as we've got the information, I'm good with it. I would accept the application as long as it's on file. Did Mr. O'Brien do a SEQR?

**Fey -** No, I didn't know, that part I forgot about.

**White -** Are we alright to accept it if he does the part one after the fact?

- Fey -** I mean I can go grab one right now.
- Brewster -** I would feel comfortable with that if he was able to produce it before the planning board.
- White -** That's what I feel I don't want to deny him because of a technicality. But I think we should have all of those forms in place in order to accept it tonight or at least have an agreement that Mr. O'Brien can fill it out and file it before the Planning Board, which he'll have to do anyways for the 239. He could come in tomorrow and do it, we're all good.
- Brewster -** So I guess to that end, whoever makes a motion either way can condition in that action. It would be specific to the SEQR, the site plan is filed, we just don't have it in our packet. I'd be ok with that. Is there anything else that was maybe missing?
- White -** I'll motion to accept it with the condition that part one, short EAF is filled out before the Planning Board meeting and before the 239 is sent to Broome County.
- Fey -** Now I already did send the 239 to Broome County without that form so I'll send that tomorrow.
- Brewster -** Oh, and how about to forward the site plan to us. So that's your motion.
- White -** That's my motion.
- Brewster -** Do I have a second?
- Smith -** I'll second it sir.
- Brewster -** So let me just recap. We'll approve by motion, this application 2023-V11 to move along to the Planning Board and then on to the ZBA, our regularly scheduled November meeting with the conditions that a short EAF will be filled out before the Planning Board and submitted to the county 239 Review and also to forward the site plan to the ZBA. Anything else? OK. We'll take a roll call vote on that.

**Fey -**  
Mr. Miller – Aye  
Mr. White – Aye  
Mr. Smith – Aye  
Ms. Kinne – Aye  
Mr. Brewster – Aye

**Brewster -** OK, moving forward. OK, next we'll move on to our public hearings for tonight. We currently have application 2023-V08, Luke Tokarz, 667 Brooks Rd, requesting an area variance for an accessory office building placed in front of the principle use in an agricultural zone. So, at this time I will open the public hearing. Mr. Tokarz, we have the five factors to cover, I think you've been down this road before, so I will address those with you. Just give us a brief overview of the project, and we'll cover the five factors as well. You have the floor to tell us what you're looking to do and why we're here tonight.

**Tokarz -** So, we are looking to put in an office building towards the entranceway of our property. The main reason behind it is to help keep a better sense of security on the site. So, during the day when we're operating at our business from time to time, we have people wander in in their cars and drive around, and it's not an open site to the public, so we'd like to put the office in front, near the driveway so that people accessing the site could stop into the office and we could at least speak to them and say 'hey, you know, all visitors must check in'. As part of that project, we were looking to put a gate at the entryway for overnight security and things like that. The main point of the office is to house our office staff. Business has been growing the last few years and as that office staff increases, we need more space to house them to operate our business. The reason we chose that position for the office is because number one for security to have visitors or people accessing the site stop in at the office. Number two was to create a house or a home for our employees during the day. That's really the extent of it. I know there was a couple of questions about environmental stuff and I think we cleared that up with the Planning Board as far as the location of the building, the site plan layout of where that building would be. And then obviously to get further into the details of the building that would be at the time a building permit would apply for a full site plan design, septic, and all of that stuff.

**Brewster -** Thank you. So, in asking for this variance are you going to be creating an undesirable change to the character of the neighborhood, or negatively affecting properties in your opinion?

**Tokarz -** No, sir.

**Brewster -** OK. So, the next factor we look into is, do you really need this variance to accomplish your project, can this be done any other way, why or why not? You may have already touched on that so, if you feel like you have you can say 'asked and answered'.

**Tokarz -** No, that's fine. The main reason is to have the sense of security for the site. So to gain access to the site a person would need to check in at the office so we don't have people back in the business.

**Brewster -** OK. Do you feel like you're asking for a big change over the existing zoning? Meaning you've got a primary principle use building and now you want to put something in front, is it in your opinion a big ask?

**Tokarz -** I don't believe so.

**Brewster -** And will your project be tearing up the physical environment in the neighborhood, affecting others for years to come? So you're building an office building, not terribly huge right, 1500sqft something like that?

**Tokarz -** Yes. So, my house and property is directly next door. And then there's a large distance between the next nearest neighbor which we have great relationships with all of our neighbors, so it shouldn't be an issue.

**Brewster -** The last factor that the board considers is, is your request for relief self-created, and typically 99% of the time the answer is, it is.

**Tokarz -** I mean, like I said if trying to grow our business and house office staff and as a sense of security, is a hardship then it is what it is.

**Brewster -** And just for everyone's clarity, these five factors that we address for an area variance are collective decision points, they're not, if someone 'failed' one it doesn't negate the whole project. We take them under advisement as a whole. Is there anyone here from the public to comment on the project? Going once, going twice, no. Board, do you have any questions?

**Wolters -** Currently do you have office staff in a different building?



**Tokarz -** We have a temporary, basically a shed, that we turned into an office. That will be removed once we construct the office.

**Brewster -** I guess just to paint the picture in my head, you've been through here and planning and everything for quite some time, off and on. So, your primary building is, is there just one large primary building with the shed attached?

**Tokarz -** Currently we have two structures on the property. We have an accessory and a primary.

**Brewster -** OK. And he can technically have up to two, right?

**White -** Technically the shed itself is an accessory structure but if we approve him to build this and he agrees to remove it then he's down an accessory structure.

**Brewster -** That should be a condition on approval, right?

**White -** Right.

**Brewster -** OK, I have a few items that are typical correspondence from various agencies to go through and I'm just going to paraphrase them, but our Planning Board sent back a favorable advisory for this project, our drainage coordinator submitted an approval form, our engineer has stated the 239 is required, most of the other comments he had were focused on the site plan, which doesn't necessarily apply here, otherwise he had no engineering objections. Ordinance Department?

**Stiles -** Permits.

**Brewster -** Building permits and whatever other permits required. Are there any other besides the building permit?

**Stiles -** No, it'll be just apply for the building permit.

**Brewster -** Previous variances had to go through the SWPPP's and stuff.

- Stiles -** We're under an enormous SWPPP and it's all impervious, you're working within the SWPPP.
- Tokarz -** So, the office building is being constructed in the bounds of the previously approved SWPPP. It's in an area that's already been considered an impervious area. So, it's already been accounted for storm water design in our runoff so really Alex was pretty good with other than we had to go through the process of a building permit just like anybody else.
- Stiles -** Yeah, a building permit to build inside an already great big SWPPP that you're already inside of.
- Brewster -** And lastly, so I do not have in my possession - the 239 Review. I can't find it online either. Did anybody see that come in?
- Fey -** I have a 239 from before I worked here on September 6<sup>th</sup>. So, I should have done another one?
- Brewster -** Looks like I've got the county DPW, NYSDOT.
- Stiles -** No 239 from Lora Zier?
- Brewster -** I just see parts of it, I'll read those, but I don't see the Lora Zier yet. 'Proposed structures outside of the watershed area, analyzed by the provided SWPPP, a drainage study or narrative completed and signed by a licensed engineer demonstrating that a post development storm water outflows to the county right of way will not exceed the pre-development condition that is required, nothing may be placed within the county right of way including gates, fencing, or any other storage, additionally any existing items will need to be removed, there are no other apparent impacts from Broome County infrastructure therefore Broome County DPW engineering has no additional comments related to the project. NYSDOT has no comments on the SWPPP, our other comments on this site remain in effect. OK, the last thing is the Department of Transportation formal letter – we reviewed the materials for the above referenced proposal – the proposed structure will add over 2,000sqft of impervious surface to the site, therefore the applicant will be required to provide a drainage study or narrative completed and signed by a licensed engineer demonstrating a post development storm water outflows to the state right of way will not exceed the pre development condition, drainage study requirements can be found at the website. No items may be placed within the state right of way.' And, I do not have anything from Lora Zier on county-wide impacts.

- VanWhy -** My recollection was that 239 comments were back for this project; I think you can assume it's been done because those comments wouldn't have come in unless it was sent out.
- White -** We can just throw a condition in that way it covers us, that way Mr. Tokarz is good to go.
- Brewster -** Yeah, I'm just a little concerned because this is a much smaller project, so I'm not overly concerned but the fact that we don't have it and the fact that some of their other 239's were not favorable but of course that didn't matter. We just don't have their current comments. Let me pause that discussion. Anyone have anything else? Otherwise, I'll close this public hearing and we can move on to the next public hearing.
- VanWhy -** I was just thinking I'll look through my emails and see if I can find something from the Planning Board files.
- Stiles -** I'm just curious would we be here talking now if there wasn't a 239?
- VanWhy -** Yes because it was scheduled. The public has a right to comment on the entire project so without the 239 comments available the public doesn't have a fully informed opportunity to comment on the project. I appreciate your thought on the condition but if we don't find it then we'll have to review it again at the next meeting. The more appropriate process would be to keep the public hearing open for another month unless we can find it.
- Tokarz -** So you want to delay another month because there's no 239 in your records?
- Brewster -** That's the technicality, yes.
- VanWhy -** To his point though, we know it was sent in and they have 30 days but 30 days has passed so we can still move forward even if we don't have the comments back right now.
- Fey -** Should I go check my email, because it would have been sent to me or Diane. I don't want to delay him for another month if it was a mistake that I made

**VanWhy -** OK, we can address the other applicant and come back to this once Lindsey's had a chance to double check.

**Stiles -** Go down and look for Lora's stuff.

**Fey -** Alright.

**Brewster -** Scott and Ed on a motion to table the public hearing. If we can get to it, if we can find it then we will re-open it. So I need a roll call.

**Fey -**  
Mr. Miller – Aye  
Mr. White – Aye  
Mr. Smith – Aye  
Ms. Kinne – Aye  
Mr. Brewster – Aye

**Brewster -** OK, so we'll table that public hearing for application number 8 and carry on. We've got other stuff, so we'll go ahead and carry on. The Vantassel's, there you are. So, with that I will open application 2023-V09. Bruce VanTassel, 10 Hoffman Drive for an area variance to reduce the front yard set back from 30ft to 22ft for an attached garage, in a residential zone. So, I'm opening the public hearing. Tell us first what you're looking to do and then we'll go on with the factors.

**VanTassel -** It's not necessarily an attached garage as much as it is more of a carport. It would be symmetrical to the other side of the house. I think we have addressed the criteria for an area variance in my letter of intent. I tried to provide detailed drawings as to how it'll look. We wanted to do a new roof at the same time as this addition, so it'll tie in and look very symmetrical with the whole house. It will not impact any of the neighbors, we already have water drainage at the front part of the house, it goes towards the one neighbor, by adding the new structure the water will actually drain another way farther away from that property as well as ours. We have received some support from our neighbors, I didn't bring any letters from my neighbors, but I have names if you need to reach out to them. That's the extent of it. And actually, it says 20x20 which sounds much larger when you envision it because the other side of our house comes out 12ft towards the house so it really is only going to be 8ft farther than what the other structure is. It's not going to impact anything visual for the neighbors to see, but that's the extent of the project.

**Brewster -** Yes, you did have a pretty detailed write up. So, I'll just go through a couple of simple points here. You addressed the undesirable change, any other way you can do this?

**VanTassel -** No, there's no other place that we can do it off the driveway.

**Brewster -** Will you be tearing up the physical environment affecting the neighborhood for years to come?

**VanTassel -** No.

**Brewster -** And do you believe this is a big change to the existing zoning? I think you addressed that already by comparing it to the front of your house. Anybody else want me to go into more detail with that? Anybody from the public want to speak on Hoffman Road project? OK, I'm not seeing anybody, so I'll move on to correspondence. The Planning Board sent back a favorable advisory, drainage coordinator sent an approval, the engineer has no objections to the project, ordinance?

**Stiles -** Building permit.

**Brewster -** OK. And the county 239 for this said no significant impacts to county-wide structures. Questions from the board at all?

**White -** No, I'm good.

**Brewster -** Then I think I covered everything, and I can close this public hearing. So, I will do so. Closing the public hearing for application number 9.

**Stiles -** I'm going to go down and see how she's making out.

**VanWhy -** Tell her that I emailed it to her. I did find in the packets circulating the Planning Board that the 239 Review request was sent in on September 6<sup>th</sup>. I think we can feel comfortable that even if Lindsey can't find their response...

**Brewster -** OK, we have that too, I was looking for the response.

**White -** A motion to close VanTassel?

**Brewster -** OK, the next thing would be the SEQR. And on the VanTassel matter on Hoffman Drive it is noted to be a Type II Act so therefore we will not be undertaking any part II or part III. Therefore, we can move directly on to the application and discussion at this time. The floor is open to the board members on the project so who wants at it if we need to?

**White -** There's no other alternatives with the sides and the building in general is not going to stick out like a sore thumb. It's going to give them the coverage that they need that their current garage can't handle right now.

**Smith -** There are some similar structures in the neighborhood.

**Brewster -** The most comfortable thing for me is the fact that they already have an extension into their yard from their house. It shortens the actual requirement. I think it's minor asking for 8ft the other way.

**White -** It's symmetrical with the rest of the house, appearance wise, it fits in with the rest of the neighborhood. So I'm good with things.

**Brewster -** OK. Well, if we're there I can take us through the factors and the resolution.

1. The requested variance ~~will~~/~~will not~~ produce an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or cause a detriment to nearby properties.
2. The benefit sought by the Applicant ~~can~~/~~cannot~~ be achieved by another method, other than the grant of an area variance.
3. The requested area variance ~~is~~/~~is not~~ substantial.
4. The requested variance ~~would~~/~~would not~~ have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district.
5. The hardship giving rise to the variance request ~~is~~/~~is not~~ self-created.

Therefore, the entire record of this proceeding supports the conclusion, benefit to the applicant by the granting of the area variance ~~outweighs~~ or does not outweigh any potential detrimental to health, safety, or welfare of the

neighborhood or community posed by such grant. Therefore, the applicant's application 2023-V08 for an area variance to reduce the front yard setback from 30ft to 22ft for an attached garage in a residential zone is granted, granted with the following conditions, or denied.

**Board Members -** Granted

**Brewster -** OK, I will seek a motion to adopt this resolution as stated.

**Smith -** So moved Mr. Chairman.

**White -** I'll second it Mr. Chairman.

**Brewster -** Let me just write that down since Lindsey's not here.

**Stiles -** I got it.

Mr. Miller – Aye  
Mr. White – Aye  
Mr. Smith – Aye  
Ms. Kinne – Aye  
Mr. Brewster – Aye

**Brewster -** So, you have your variance.

**Stiles -** Come on down and see us and get a permit.

**Brewster -** So, I guess we've determined that it's beyond 30 days, we could press on.

**Smith -** Before we get back into that, they're all set?

**Brewster -** You're all set. (To VanTassels)

**VanTassel -** Thank you so much, I appreciate it.

**VanWhy -** I think we can trust that Diane did send the 239 form in, that's the obligation of the town. I have every reason to believe that the town did what it's supposed to do. I'd say you could re-open the public hearing, close it, and proceed with the SEQR.

**Fey -** OK, so it looks like I didn't work here on September 5<sup>th</sup> or 6<sup>th</sup>, so did it get sent to Diane's email. She was the one who sent it on September 6<sup>th</sup>, and I do not have access to her email.

**Stiles -** We'll figure it out tomorrow.

**VanWhy -** That actually wouldn't surprise me if that's what happened.

**Stiles -** Presumably it's been handled but it's somewhere in cyberspace.

**Brewster -** So, with that I think we can move forward on those conditions. So, did someone motion to re-open?

**White -** So moved.

**Stiles -** On the table.

**Brewster -** Mr. Smith with the motion to re-open the public hearing. A second anyone?

**White -** I'll second.

**Fey -** Mr. Miller – Aye  
Mr. White – Aye  
Mr. Smith – Aye  
Ms. Kinne – Aye  
Mr. Brewster – Aye

**Brewster -** OK, we're back open. Now that we're re-opened and moving forward with this application I will close the public hearing on application 8. And now we can move into the SEQR.

**\*\*See attached SEQR\*\***



OK, having answered no or small impact on all of these questions I presume that I'll receive a vote for a negative declaration pertaining to the SEQR for this project.

**White -** I'll motion to declare a negative declaration on the SEQR.

**Kinne -** I'll second.

**Fey -** Mr. Miller – Aye  
Mr. White – Aye  
Mr. Smith – Aye  
Ms. Kinne – Aye  
Mr. Brewster – Aye

**Brewster -** Alright, so we have a negative declaration. OK, we can discuss the application now. Anything from the board?

**Kinne -** Well I feel that it's very important, almost a necessity, for that situation there of people entering the work area. I think it's a good idea.

**White -** I also want to say too, where Mr. Tokarz wants to put the building, I want to say it's still going to be behind his house and the neighboring houses too. There again, it's a unique situation for what he's doing there. I don't think it would look out of sorts and he hit it right on the head, the safety, I mean someone could get hurt or killed by just poking around there where they shouldn't be. At least this is more proactive to stop them. His business is doing well, and he needs the office space. This is a well needed thing for him and it's not going to effect anybody.

**Brewster -** Yeah, it makes sense to me on all the factors. Anything else? Otherwise, I will take you through the factors and conclusion.

1. The requested variance ~~will~~ **will not** produce an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or cause a detriment to nearby properties.
2. The benefit sought by the Applicant ~~can~~ **cannot** be achieved by another method, other than the grant of an area variance.

3. The requested area variance ~~is~~/**is not** substantial.
4. The requested variance ~~would~~/**would not** have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district.
5. The hardship giving rise to the variance request ~~is~~/**is not** self-created.

Therefore, the entire record of this proceeding supports **the** conclusion, benefit to the applicant by the granting of the area variance **outweighs** or does not outweigh any potential detrimental to health, safety, or welfare of the neighborhood or community posed by such grant. Therefore, the applicant's application 2023-V08 for an area variance to construct an accessory structure office building from the principle use in an agricultural zone is granted, granted with the following conditions, or denied.

Granted with conditions – once the new structure is built the old structure must come down.

- VanWhy -** So he can't get a Certificate of Occupancy until the old building is down.
- Stiles -** That's a great condition. No Certificate of Compliance until that thing's gone.
- Tokarz -** Yep.
- Brewster -** OK, so it's granted with that condition on the resolution. And the resolution will take effect immediately on our vote. So, I will call a roll call.
- Fey -**  
Mr. Miller – Aye  
Mr. White – Aye  
Mr. Smith – Aye  
Ms. Kinne – Aye  
Mr. Brewster – Aye
- Brewster -** You have a variance.
- Tokarz -** Thank you very much.
- Smith -** Thank you for your patience.

**Tokarz -** Anytime.

**Fey -** I will email Lora tomorrow and once I have the 239, I will email it to all of you.

**Brewster -** That's fine. And keep it in his file. Alright then, this meeting is adjourned.

Respectfully submitted

Lindsey Fey

A handwritten signature in blue ink, consisting of a large, stylized 'L' and 'F' intertwined.

---

11/29/2023