

TOWN OF PARMA
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
August 17, 2006

Members Present: Patrick Buskey (alternate)
Frank Lucisano
Veronica Robillard
Stephen Shelley
Tim Thomas

Members Excused: Dean Snyder

Others Present: Jack Barton

Public Present: See attached list

The meeting was called to Order by Chairperson, Veronica Robillard, at 7:00 p.m. She explained the function of the ZBOA and the decision-making process. She stated that this is a five-member board, with one member absent, and alternate Board Member, Patrick Buskey in attendance. She noted that a quorum of three is required to pass a motion. Chairperson Robillard offered hearing aid devices for anyone who required them.

TABLED PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. RICH IUPPA – 503 PARMA CENTER ROAD

Application was received of Rich Iuppa, owner, for area variances at 503 Parma Center Road. Applicant is constructing a new home and is proposing to construct a 40 feet by 50 feet accessory storage building with a rear setback of 5 feet and a side setback of 10 feet from the westerly property line. Applicant is requesting relief from Town Zoning schedule 1 which requires a side setback of 15 feet and a rear setback of 23 feet. This property is currently zoned Agricultural Conservation (AC).

Chairperson Robillard recalled that this application was tabled at the July meeting due to lack of required notifications.

Thomas and Brenda Saporito explained that they will be living in the home on this property. They are proposing a pole barn in back to be placed 5 feet from the south lot line and 10 feet from the west side. The house is being built right now. He explained that they have two vehicles and a boat to store. He stated that he could place the building more forward but preferred the proposed placement to keep it away from the septic system. Brenda noted they were also trying to place this storage building away from areas that flood.

Public Comment: None. The public hearing was closed.

Board Discussion: Chairperson Robillard reported that notifications were in order and the request was returned by Monroe County as a matter of local determination. Jack Barton reported this is a Type II SEQR with no further action required.

Jack Barton expressed concern that the distance between the house and the proposed storage building would be too close if it were constructed at the required setback. Tom stated he would consider a 40 x 40 feet steel structure building which would allow him to comply with the 23 feet rear setback.

Following discussion, a **Motion** was made by Tim Thomas to approve the application of Rich Iuppa, owner, for an area variance at 503 Parma Center Road to construct a 40 feet by 50 feet accessory storage building with a rear setback of 20 feet and a side setback of 10 feet from the westerly property line. This grants relief from Town Zoning schedule 1 which requires a side setback of 15 feet and a rear setback of 23 feet. This property is currently zoned Agricultural Conservation (AC). In reaching this motion to approve, I don't believe the benefit can be achieved by other means feasible to the applicant. The size requirement of the structure is needed for show vehicles and other equipment yet to be purchased. There will be no undesirable change in neighborhood character or to nearby properties. The request is not substantial, with the agreement to a 20 feet rear setback. There will be no adverse physical or environment effect. The alleged difficulty is somewhat self-created, but mitigated by the location of the septic system. Using the balancing test, the benefit to the applicant outweighs any detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the community. Seconded by Frank Lucisano. **Motion Unanimously Carried (5-0)** (Ayes: Patrick Buskey, Frank Lucisano, Stephen Shelley, Tim Thomas, Veronica Robillard; Absent: Dean Snyder)

PUBLIC HEARINGS

2. CONCAL, LLC – 549 MANITOU ROAD

Application was received from CONCAL, LLC, owner, for an area variance at 549 Manitou Road. Applicant is proposing to subdivide lot 37 of the Mercy Flight Subdivision into 3 lots and is requesting relief from Town Zoning schedule 1 for proposed lots 37A, 37B and 37C for lot depth. Lot 37A is proposed to have a lot depth of 110.70 feet, lot 37B is proposed to have a lot depth of 100.40 feet, and lot 37C is proposed to have a lot depth of 100.67 feet. These lots will meet minimum width and area requirements. This property is currently zoned High Density Residential (HD) which requires lots to be at least 120 feet deep.

Tom Lucas, representative from Concal, described the location of the lot off Manitou Road on the west side. It is the first lot on the north side of the subdivision road. He provided a survey map of the property. He pointed out lot 37, which is currently under construction. He stated it is 360 feet in length, parallel to the road. He stated they are looking to divide this lot into 3 separate parcels. He noted that all three lots will meet the area requirement and will be wider than required. It is the depth of all three that requires a variance, which he felt was not substantial. He stated that the houses built on these lots will be the same as the other lots. He stated that Concal is looking for a higher return on their investment. He noted the following impact to the community which would result from selling 3 lots versus 1 lot for this property, as follows:

Detriment to the neighborhood: only the purchasers of the lots will notice the difference.

Undesirable change in the neighborhood character: This will not create a visible change. The houses will be similar to those built on the remainder of the subdivision. There are 57 lots planned. This will make it 59 lots. The lot size for all three will be similar.

Can the benefit be achieved by other means feasible? No. They are restricted by the size of the subdivision. No additional land is available to purchase.

There will be no adverse physical or environment effect.

This alleged difficulty is self-created but restricted by boundaries of the subdivision land.

Frank Lucisano referred to lot #36, questioning if that lot has been established yet. He suggested the lot line be moved on lot #36. Tom replied that this lot isn't large enough to be made smaller. Tom stated that there are no possible ways to enlarge to lots into the adjoining properties. Tom stated this is the only area variance that is required for this subdivision, for Phase I, which will be 14 houses. The majority of the lots meet the 12,000 square feet minimum. Lot 37C is not on Manitou Road.

Public Comment:

James Quick – 553 Manitou Road: Noted the mention of 57 parcels. He thought it was reduced to 52.

Jack Barton offered to clarify this, stating that there were 55 lots established. If granted, the number of lots will be increased to 57.

Bob Apsey – 547 Manitou Road: Expressed concern about access to these lots.

Tom explained that if this variance is granted, the Planning Board would address this and other issues.

The public hearing was closed.

Board Discussion: Chairperson Robillard reported that notifications were in order and the request was returned by Monroe County as a matter of local determination. Jack Barton reported this is a Type II SEQR with no further action required.

Following discussion, a **Motion** was made by Stephen Shelley to approve the application received from CONCAL, LLC, owner, for an area variance at 549 Manitou Road to subdivide lot 37 of the Mercy Flight Subdivision into 3 lots, which grants relief from Town Zoning schedule 1 for proposed lots 37A, 37B and 37C for lot depth. Lot 37A is proposed to have a lot depth of 110.70 feet, lot 37B is proposed to have a lot depth of 100.40 feet, and lot 37C is proposed to have a lot depth of 100.67 feet. These lots will meet minimum width and area requirements. This property is currently zoned High Density Residential (HD) which requires lots to be at least 120 feet deep. In making this determination, I don't believe the benefit can be achieved by other means feasible to the applicant. There will be no undesirable change in neighborhood character or to nearby properties. The request is not substantial. The area requirement is met and the width requirement is met. There will be no adverse physical or environmental effect. The alleged difficulty is somewhat self-created but I recognize there is a limited depth. Using the balancing test, the benefit to the applicant outweighs any detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the community. Seconded by Frank Lucisano. **Motion Unanimously Carried (5-0)** (Ayes: Patrick Buskey, Frank Lucisano, Stephen Shelley, Tim Thomas, Veronica Robillard; Absent: Dean Snyder)

3. ROBERT PICKERING – 101 CRIMSON WOODS COURT

Application was received from Robert Pickering, owner, for area variances at 101 Crimson Woods Court. Applicant is proposing to construct a 12 feet by 16 feet accessory storage shed in the side yard with a side setback of 10 feet from the westerly property line and is requesting relief from Town Zoning Article 10 subsection 165-82.C.3 which states in part that all detached accessory buildings shall be located in the rear yard. This parcel is a corner lot which is defined as having two front yards, two side yards, and no rear yard. Applicant is also requesting relief from schedule 1 which requires a 20 feet side setback. This property is currently zoned Rural Residential (RR).

Robert stated that they are new residents to this property. He provided a sketch map of the property. He explained they want to build an accessory storage shed to house his new \$10,000 John Deere tractor and snow removal equipment on this 3 acre lot. He noted that one half of the lot is wooded so he believes he does have a back yard on this corner lot. He stated that this corner lot is wide. He does not have any other possible location of the shed. The proposed location is behind the house and in the woods which in this location will not be visible to the neighbors.

Also, he noted there are wet areas on the other side of his lot. The proposed location is the best possible location and the most convenient for him to access his equipment. He stated his lot line does not allow him to place this shed at 20 feet – it would be in the middle of his back yard and be visible to the neighbors and take up valuable lawn area. Bob noted that the property drops off considerably to the south. He will not have to take down any trees. The septic system is right behind the house. Also, if the shed was moved in at 20 feet, it would encroach on his septic system.

Public Comment: None. The public hearing was closed.

Board Discussion: Chairperson Robillard reported that notifications were in order and the request was returned by Monroe County as a matter of local determination. Jack Barton reported this is a Type II SEQR with no further action required.

Jack Barton stated that he personally felt that this is a unique property layout because of the leach field location and design of the lot drainage.

Following discussion, a **Motion** was made by Frank Lucisano to approve the application received from Robert Pickering, owner, for area variances at 101 Crimson Woods Court to construct a 12 feet by 16 feet accessory storage shed in the side yard with a side setback of 10 feet from the westerly property line and to grant relief from Town Zoning Article 10 subsection 165-82.C.3 which states in part that all detached accessory buildings shall be located in the rear yard. This parcel is a corner lot which is defined as having two front yards, two side yards, and no rear yard. Applicant is also requesting relief from schedule 1 which requires a 20 feet side setback. This property is currently zoned Rural Residential (RR). In making this determination, I don't believe the benefit can be achieved by other means feasible to the applicant. If the shed were moved farther from the westerly property line, it would encroach on the leach field. To move it farther back on the lot, it is wooded and wet. There will be no undesirable change in the neighborhood character or to nearby properties. The shed will be embedded in a wooded area. The request is not substantial. This is a corner lot with two side yards and no rear yard. There will be no adverse physical or environmental effect. The alleged difficulty is self-created. He purchased the lot knowing it had wet areas and two side yards, but using the balancing test, the benefit to the applicant outweighs any detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the community. Seconded by Stephen Shelley. **Motion Unanimously Carried (5-0)** (Ayes: Patrick Buskey, Frank Lucisano, Stephen Shelley, Tim Thomas, Veronica Robillard; Absent: Dean Snyder)

4. BRIAN AND ELIZABETH BRYCE – 377 HUFFER ROAD

Application was received from Brian and Elizabeth Bryce, owners, for an area variance at 377 Huffer Road. Applicants are proposing to construct a 1200 square feet accessory storage structure on this vacant parcel and are requesting relief from Town Zoning Article 5 which requires a permitted principal use, a single family home, prior to constructing any accessory structure. Applicants reside on property located at 369 Huffer Road. This property is currently zoned Agricultural Conservation (AC).

Brian stated he purchased this property in 1994 as an investment with the idea of building a home on it for the purpose of selling it. He noted that in 1994, zoning allowed him to put a pole barn on it. Since then, in 1998, zoning changed and does not allow this. He noted that he owns and lives on the property next door. He explained his plan to build a 30' x 40' pole barn on the property with the idea of building a home at a later date. He stated this is why he does not want to combine the two properties. The pole barn is needed to store his vintage cars, travel van and yard tools. He stated that the proposed building would be 90 feet away from his residence and west of the swimming pool in his back yard.

Public Comment: None. The public hearing was closed.

Board Discussion: Chairperson Robillard reported that notifications were in order and the request was returned by Monroe County as a matter of local determination. Jack Barton reported this is a Type II SEQR with no further action required.

Jack Barton noted that this lot is a pre-existing lot and grandfathered in. The home will need to meet the current requirements when built.

Frank Lucisano questioned the applicant why he couldn't build this barn on the lot he lives on. Brian explained that he had a treed lot and the only good place would be at the end of the driveway next to the swimming pool and would not fit well there because there are a lot of pine trees. He noted that his neighbor would object to placement there. The proposed location would be visible to only one neighbor. Brian stated that the very back of his lot has a natural drainage collection. He wants to avoid putting anything back too far on the property which might interfere with this drainage. Making room for this barn on the west or east side would require changing the lot by taking down trees.

Following discussion, a **Motion** was made by Tim Thomas to deny the application received from Brian and Elizabeth Bryce, owners, for an area variance at 377 Huffer Road to construct a 1200 square feet accessory storage structure on this vacant parcel and to deny the request for relief from Town Zoning Article 5 which requires a permitted principal use, a single family home, prior to constructing any accessory structure. Applicants reside on property located at 369 Huffer Road. This property is currently zoned Agricultural Conservation (AC). In making this determination to deny: I believe there is ample evidence that the benefit could be achieved by other means. As exemplified by combining the two lots into one or placing the accessory structure on the principal lot at 369 Huffer Road. There will be undesirable change in the neighborhood character and to nearby properties. This would change the character as it would create a direct conflict to zoning by creating a lot with an accessory structure without a primary residence. The request is very substantial. It will have a negative physical effect but no environmental effect. The alleged difficulty is 100% self-created. Using the balancing test, the benefit to the applicant does not outweigh any detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the community, and would have a negative impact on the community. Seconded by Frank Lucisano. **Motion Unanimously Carried to Deny** (5-0) (Ayes: Patrick Buskey, Frank Lucisano, Stephen Shelley, Tim Thomas, Veronica Robillard; Absent: Dean Snyder)

Chairperson Robillard polled the Board to provide their reasons to deny:

Tim Thomas: My motion speaks for my reasons. The main points being that there are two immediate alternatives which could be pursued. It would create an undesirable change as it would create a lot with an accessory structure in direct conflict with Town Zoning.

Frank Lucisano: The benefit can be achieved by other means, such as building this accessory structure on the applicant's property at 369 Huffer Road or combine two lots into one. Town Zoning article 5 requires a single family home to be constructed prior to any accessory structure.

Patrick Buskey: The applicant has other options. He can build on the primary lot or combine the two lots.

Stephen Shelley: Agreed that there were alternatives available to the applicant other than the proposal which would create a lot with an accessory building and no primary structure.

Chairperson Robillard: Stated she concurred with the Board's reasons for denial. The benefit can be achieved by other feasible means, as evidenced by other options stated in the motion.

Approving this application could potentially change the character of the neighborhood because of the significant divergence from zoning ordinances.

5. ROBERT J. GADRA, SR., - 32 PEASE ROAD

Application was received from Robert J. Gadra, Sr., owner, for area variances at 32 Pease Road. Applicant has constructed an entrance porch with a side setback of 7 feet from the northerly property line and an accessory storage shed in the front yard and is requesting relief from Town Zoning schedule 1 which requires a minimum side setback of 10 feet and Article 10 subsection 165-82.C.3 which states in part that all detached accessory buildings shall be located in the rear yard. This property is currently zoned Medium Density Residential (MD).

Robert stated he purchased this property in 1999 at the request of his son. His son has lived at this property and has paid the mortgage all of these years. He explained that he gave his son this property, but it still remains in his name and that is why he is here tonight. Robert stated he lives in Florida in the winter and in West Seneca, a suburb of Buffalo, the rest of the year. He stated that his son lives in a trailer on this property. Robert stated he purchased a package from 84 Lumber and constructed a porch onto the front doorway of the trailer to provide easy access. He then built a shed for storage, since storage space was limited in the trailer. He noted the porch is on the north side of the trailer. Robert reported he is an electrical engineer and chose the placement for the porch and shed based on the lay of the land. The lot is sloped and wet. The shed was placed at an angle so that it looked better esthetically. Jack Barton reported that there is an open permit for the home and shed which was taken out prior to 1999. No permit was obtained for the porch. Robert stated he never had to get a permit before. He noted there are two sheds on the property. A metal shed was pre-existing his purchase and is used to store tools. The shed that he built is used to store clothes and needs to be easily accessed from the trailer. He stated that the back area is very wet and not suitable for this shed. He noted that the front porch was built raised up to protect it from water.

Public Comment: None. The public hearing was closed.

Board Discussion: Chairperson Robillard reported that notifications were in order and the request was returned by Monroe County as a matter of local determination. Jack Barton reported this is a Type II SEQR with no further action required.

Jack Barton confirmed the poor drainage on this property. He stated that neighbors had to put a swale in, but water still collects in the back yard.

Following discussion, a **Motion** was made by Frank Lucisano to approve the application received from Robert J. Gadra, Sr., owner, for area variances at 32 Pease Road. Applicant has constructed an entrance porch with a side setback of 7 feet from the northerly property line and this grants relief from Town Zoning schedule 1 which requires a minimum side setback of 10 feet. This property is currently zoned Medium Density Residential (MD). In making this determination to approve, I don't believe the benefit can be achieved by other means feasible to the applicant. There will be no undesirable change in the neighborhood character or to nearby properties. There are other trailers in the neighborhood with similar porches. The request is substantial; however, the applicant needs to have a porch to access the mobile home. There will be no adverse physical or environmental effects. The alleged difficulty is self-created, but using the balancing test, the benefit to the applicant outweighs any detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the community. Seconded by Stephen Shelley. **Motion Unanimously Carried** (5-0) (Ayes: Patrick Buskey, Frank Lucisano, Stephen Shelley, Tim Thomas, Veronica Robillard; Absent: Dean Snyder)

A **Motion** was made by Frank Lucisano to approve the application received from Robert J. Gadra, Sr., owner, for area variances at 32 Pease Road for an accessory storage shed in the front yard and this grants relief from Article 10 subsection 165-82.C.3 which states in part that all detached accessory buildings shall be located in the rear yard. This property is currently zoned Medium Density Residential (MD). In making this determination to approve, I don't believe the benefit can be achieved by other means feasible to the applicant. There is no room on the north side, and on the south side, the septic system prevents placement there. The area in the back yard is wet. There will be no undesirable change in the neighborhood character or to nearby properties. The request is substantial. It is placed in the front of the house instead of the rear. There will be no adverse physical or environmental effect. The alleged difficulty is self-created; however, using the balancing test, the benefit to the applicant outweighs any detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the community. Seconded by Stephen Shelley. **Motion Carried (3-2)** (Ayes: Frank Lucisano, Stephen Shelley, Veronica Robillard; Nays: Patrick Buskey, Tim Thomas; Absent: Dean Snyder)

6. DONALD HRANOWSKY – 460 HUFFER ROAD

Application was received from Donald Hranowsky, owner, for area variances at 460 Huffer Road. Applicant is requesting relief from Town Zoning Article 11 subsection 165.87.A.2 which requires rear property line setbacks to be a minimum of 17.6 feet for accessory structures. This request is for an existing shed with a rear setback of 10.6 feet and an existing wood deck with a rear setback of 13.6 feet. This property is currently zoned Rural Residential (RR).

Donald stated he purchased this property in May of 2004. This shed was pre-existing his purchase. He just sold the home and needs a variance to close the deal. He stated he wasn't aware of the need for a variance when he purchased this property. He described the property as having pine trees in back and three acres of blueberries. There is a wood walkway that goes to a gazebo-like structure. Donald stated that no permits were obtained for these structures, so he doesn't know how long they have been there.

Public Comment: None. The public hearing was closed.

Board Discussion: Chairperson Robillard reported that notifications were in order and the request was returned by Monroe County as a matter of local determination. Jack Barton reported this is a Type II SEQR with no further action required.

Following discussion, a **Motion** was made by Tim Thomas to approve the application received from Donald Hranowsky, owner, for area variances at 460 Huffer Road to grant relief from Town Zoning Article 11 subsection 165.87.A.2 which requires rear property line setbacks to be a minimum of 17.6 feet for accessory structures. This request is for an existing shed with a rear setback of 10.6 feet and an existing wood deck with a rear setback of 13.6 feet. This property is currently zoned Rural Residential (RR). In making this determination to approve both variances, I don't believe the benefit can be achieved by other means feasible to the applicant. These two structures have been in place for a number of years and, as stated by the applicant, when he purchased the property in May of 2004 they were in place. When he recently sold the property, it was discovered that variances were needed. There will be no undesirable change to the neighborhood or to nearby properties. The structures are in the rear yard, low and screened by vegetation. The back yard is three acres of blueberries. The request is not substantial. There will be no adverse physical or environmental effect. The property owner has a responsibility to determine if anything needs a permit, therefore, the alleged difficulty is self-created, but using the balancing test, the benefit to the applicant outweighs any detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the community. Seconded by Frank Lucisano. **Motion Unanimously Carried (5-0)**

(Ayes: Patrick Buskey, Frank Lucisano, Stephen Shelley, Tim Thomas, Veronica Robillard;
Absent: Dean Snyder)

7. KENNETH BRONGO – 58 PEASE ROAD

Application was received from Kenneth Brongo, owner, for area variances at 58 Pease Road. Applicant is proposing to demolish all existing structures on the property and construct a 900 square feet, single story home without a garage and is requesting relief from Town Zoning Article 5 subsection 165-33-E-2a which requires a minimum of 1,200 square feet of living area and subsection 165-33-E-3 which states in part that each principal dwelling shall have a garage. This property is currently zoned Medium Density Residential (MD).

Kenneth referred to the site map, stating he owns property to the north with a trailer on it and shares a joint driveway. He stated his son lives in the trailer, but he is planning to demolish the trailer and the rotting shed. He plans to clean up the property. He noted the drainage problem on Pease Road which affects his sloped property and drainage. He stated he is confident that if he builds anything larger than what is proposed, it will create more drainage problems. He recalled that he has remodeled the house on the lot next door, which has no garage. He felt that a house built as a mirror image of the one next door would fit best on this 60 feet wide lot. The house would be 900 square feet with no garage, with a front leach field. He felt that adding a garage would impact the drainage problem.

Tim Thomas asked if the dimensions or style of the house could be changed to accommodate a garage. Ken pointed out the joint driveway location and a garage would need to be located to access this driveway. Ken questioned if he could put up an unattached garage that would be raised up to allow water to flow underneath. Jack Barton informed Ken of the minimal size for a garage.

Public Comment: None. The public hearing was closed.

Board Discussion: Chairperson Robillard reported that notifications were in order and the request was returned by Monroe County as a matter of local determination. Jack Barton reported this is a Type II SEQR with no further action required.

Discussion was held on the various alternative options suggested, and the applicant agreed to table this application to allow him time to research other alternatives.

A **Motion** was made by Tim Thomas to table the application of Kenneth Brongo for area variances at 58 Pease Road, without prejudice, to the September ZBOA meeting to allow the applicant time to pursue options for a garage. Seconded by Patrick Buskey. **Motion Unanimously Carried** (5-0) (Ayes: Patrick Buskey, Frank Lucisano, Stephen Shelley, Tim Thomas, Veronica Robillard; Absent: Dean Snyder)

8. FRANK LUCISANO – 1317 HILTON PARMA CORNERS ROAD

Application was received from Frank Lucisano, owner, for an area variance at 1317 Hilton Parma Corners Road. Applicant constructed an accessory storage shed with a side setback of 6 feet from the southerly property line and requesting relief from Town Zoning Article 11, subsection 165-87.A.1 which requires a 10 feet side setback. This property is currently zoned Agricultural Conservation (AC).

Frank Lucisano recused himself from voting on this application. Frank stated his wish to withdraw this application. He explained that during the process of selling his property, he had an

instrument survey done and the shed in question has a 10.5 side setback which meets setback requirements.

A **Motion** was made by Tim Thomas recognizing Frank Lucisano's wish to withdraw his application. A variance is not needed for this structure per the instrument map provided by the applicant to the Building Department. Seconded by Stephen Shelley. **Motion Carried** (4-0) (Ayes: Patrick Buskey, Stephen Shelley, Tim Thomas, Veronica Robillard; Abstain: Frank Lucisano; Absent: Dean Snyder)

MINUTES OF JULY 20, 2006

The following changes were recommended: Page 1, #1, Para 1, line 3, change "4 foot setback" to "1 foot setback"; page 2, Para 2, line 4, change to "The brick piers will set back 2 feet to the face..."; #2, Para 2, line 6, delete the last line.; page 3, last Para, change "Rich" to "Same Saporito. A **Motion** was made by Frank Lucisano to approve the July 20, 2006 ZBOA meeting minutes with the recommended changes. Seconded by Stephen Shelley. **Motion Unanimously Carried** (5-0) (Ayes: Patrick Buskey, Frank Lucisano, Stephen Shelley, Tim Thomas, Veronica Robillard; Absent: Dean Snyder)

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, a **Motion** was made by Frank Lucisano, seconded by Tim Thomas, to adjourn the meeting at 10:20 pm. **Motion Unanimously Carried** (5-0) (Ayes: Patrick Buskey, Frank Lucisano, Stephen Shelley, Tim Thomas, Veronica Robillard; Absent: Dean Snyder)

Respectfully submitted,
Diane Grundon, Recording Secretary