

## NEWINGTON TOWN PLAN AND ZONING COMMISSION

### Special Meeting

December 10, 2014

Chairman Cathleen Hall called the special meeting of the Newington Town Plan and Zoning Commission to order at 6:00 p.m. in Conference Room L101 in the Newington Town Hall, 131 Cedar Street, Newington, CT

#### **I. ROLL CALL AND SEATING OF ALTERNATES**

##### Commissioners Present

Commissioner Frank Aieta  
Commissioner Carol Anest  
Commissioner Michael Camillo  
Chairman Cathleen Hall  
Commissioner Robert Serra Sr.  
Commissioner Stanley Sobieski  
Commissioner Brian Andrzejewski - A  
Commissioner Anthony Claffey - A (6:10)

##### Commissioners Absent

Commissioner Kenneth Leggo

##### Staff Present

Craig Minor, Town Planner

Commissioner Andrzejewski was seated for Commissioner Leggo

#### **II. REVIEW OF ZONING REGULATIONS**

- A. Section 3 (Zone Use Regulations) continued: Subsection 3.2 (Special Exceptions Permitted in All Zones) through Subsection 3.9 (Uses Permitted in R-D Residential Designated Zone.)

Chairman Hall: Let's continue with the review of the Zoning regulations. We got through a portion of it last meeting, and we'll get through a portion this week. We're going to stop at about a quarter of seven, because we have another special meeting at 6:45. Starting at Section 3.2, "Special Exception Permitted in All Zones".

Craig Minor: Okay, so we're going to pick up at 3.2.6, "Schools and Colleges but not including business schools". I didn't have any suggested changes for this section.

Chairman Hall: And as we go through them, if anybody has a question or clarification or a change that they want to make, just make yourself known, just raise your hand, or get my attention. Section 3.2.7?

Craig Minor: I also didn't have any suggestions to make, because this whole section is sort of moot since around 1997 when the State of Connecticut delegated authority for approving PCS and other wireless towers to the Siting Council, and town planning officials really don't have any jurisdiction over it. You can request a public hearing if you are concerned about

one; in fact, there has been one proposed just over the town line in Wethersfield that I'm a little concerned about given the visual impact on residents, so I've let the consultant for that project know that when they do actually apply that Newington is going to request a public hearing just to give the residents the chance to speak on it. So as a town we really don't have jurisdiction over this, but I'm not going to recommend you remove it because this gives guidance to the PCS tower designers what Newington would like to see. Most of them want to cooperate; they don't want to get into an argument with the local town, so if they can comply with what we want, they will, and how else would we let them know what we want unless it's in the zoning regs? Well, there are other ways, but it's been here all these years and I suggest we just leave it because it is good guidance for the PCS tower designers.

Commissioner Sobieski: Craig, should we put something in there referring to state statutes that would be the primary guidance on this? I'm just asking because of what you said.

Craig Minor: I'm usually reluctant to do that because if the state statute changes and we didn't know about it, or the number changes, it creates a disconnect, so in general I don't like tying our regulations to somebody else's regulations. The state statute would prevail anyway. This regulation is rather long and in fact, the regulation that I wrote for Cromwell back in the day was also very long, because there was a brief window when towns did have jurisdiction, but that window closed a few years later.

The next one is 3.2.8, and as you can see from what I have given you, I suggested a change to this. The current regulation, and you can read a little bit between the lines, the current regulations doesn't include "religious or social". The current regulation is problematic because unless the organization that wants to have an event is a charitable or civic organization, they are not eligible for a permit to operate their activity. Since I have been here we have had a couple of occasions where an organization, I'll say Rotary, although maybe you can make an argument that they are charitable or civic, but a perfectly legitimate organization that everybody knows has asked for a permit to operate a carnival or whatever, but they weren't a charitable group, they weren't a civic group. This would provide a mechanism for a group to come before you and get permission to conduct a two day carnival or a one day carnival or a special event. We could have just brought them in under this regulation anyway even though technically it didn't apply to them, but this would make it apply to any organization that would want to conduct a special event of some sort.

Commissioner Anest: Now I have a question. Like a flea market, would that qualify?

Craig Minor: You mean Kiwanis?

Chairman Hall: They are civic and they are charitable because they give all of that money away. They don't keep any of that.

Commissioner Anest: Right, but it says "in no case longer than ten days".

Craig Minor: And the Kiwanis event is longer than ten days?

Chairman Hall: Well, it's ten consecutive Sundays.

Craig Minor: Okay, this would get around that.

Commissioner Anest: Okay, I just wanted to make sure that they fit into that.

Craig Minor: And there have been organizations that don't really qualify as a charitable or civic group that wanted to conduct an event, let's say like the Radio League. They're not charitable, they're not civic, but they are perfectly nice people and if they want to have an event, why not? This would make it possible for anybody of that sort, with your permission, to get a special permit.

Commissioner Aieta: What kind of groups are you talking about?

Craig Minor: Like I said, the radio group for example.

Commissioner Aieta: Are they for-profit?

Craig Minor: They are a professional organization.

Commissioner Aieta: Like the woman who owned the bowling alley that wanted to put a flea market there? That's what we are trying not to have happen.

Craig Minor: That's a good example. I think she would have a hard time convincing you that she was charitable, religious, social, civic, and in fact would have a hard time convincing me of that, so it probably wouldn't even get to you.

Commissioner Anest: They have volunteers and are social too.

Craig Minor: Who?

Chairman Hall: The American Radio Relay League.

Craig Minor: You will have another opportunity at the public hearing to weigh in on whether this is a good idea or not. Just because you are tentatively approving it tonight doesn't mean that you are committed to it.

Chairman Hall: Any other questions on that.

Commissioner Aieta: Where it says, "and/or conditions that the Commission may impose." Does that interfere with the judge's decision as to whether...

Craig Minor: Good question, let's read it in that light.

Commissioner Aieta: Because it's kind of vague, "where the Commission may impose, and the Commission may determine". That could be anything.

Craig Minor: That's a good point, Commissioner. I can ask the Town Attorney.

Chairman Hall: If they came to us and asked for forty-five days, and we thought that's too long, I think that would fit in there as a "time".

Commissioner Aieta: That's why, with the regulations, you have to tell them what they can and can't do. If it's not in there, they can't do it.

Commissioner Anest: Every petition is going to be viewed on its own merit, and it might be something that might not even be in here.

Commissioner Aieta: That's what the judge is trying to get away from; it's arbitrary.

Commissioner Anest: Or you could have four pages of conditions that we could choose from.

Commissioner Aieta: I don't want to go through this and then leave anything in there that's going to...I mean, we're doing it now.

Craig Minor: I think you raise a good point, and I'll talk to the Town Attorney about it, but I think we will find other places in the regulations where the Commission has discretion, which is different from waiving a regulation by a two-thirds vote, which was the language that the judge struck down. There is a fine line between those two things, so I'll ask the Town Attorney to comment on whether this passes muster.

Commissioner Aieta: I know for some of these regulations you can't put in every nuance of what could possibly come in, but we can't leave it so vague that the Commission could make up their own rules as the people come in. What's good for one is supposed to be good for all.

Commissioner Anest: Right, but this would be like operating hours. Do we control the operating hours of the carnival? I think that's what we want, so maybe there is another way to word it so that we are not in violation.

Craig Minor: Okay, I'm reading it more carefully, "any permit so authorized shall be for such times..." In other words, the hours.

Chairman Hall: Or length of time; days, weeks, months.

Craig Minor: Well, no, I think times.....

Commissioner Anest: Times of the day, hours of operation.

Craig Minor: That's what it should have said, that's what it meant. It's certainly reasonable to give you the authority to tell the event operators that you must stop at ten o'clock, which is different from telling them how many days they can operate. Two different things that you should have control over, but they are merged in one sentence and worded poorly. Let me take a whack at revising this so that it is clearer and won't be a problem with the issue that Commissioner Aieta brought up.

Okay, "day care". I took out Section F, because that is a strange requirement to put in your zoning regulations. I don't know if the Building Inspector is prepared to keep a register of day care. He probably has been, because the regulation has been on the books for a while, but it just seems a strange and arbitrary thing to require to be filed with the Building Department, because they have to get state licenses, and they have to get building permits, they have to get approval from you. It just seems like a strange thing, so I'm suggesting that we delete it.

Chairman Hall: I wonder if that had anything to do with the fact that our Health Department used to be in the Building Department?

Craig Minor: Did it?

Chairman Hall: Yes.

Craig Minor: Well that might be it.

Chairman Hall: Yes, they were together, so possibly that is a result of that period of time. They've been separated now for a good five, six years, but they were together at one point. That might be.

Craig Minor: That might be why. Okay, Paragraph G I reworded because it became confusing when the church on Willard Avenue came in for a day care permit a couple of years ago. It seemed like G1 through 5 applied to her, I say her because she was the

applicant, but these regulations seem to really be talking about an in-home day care in a residential neighborhood, and not an institutional day care. So that is why I changed it from "in a residential zone", because the church was in a residential zone and therefore had to comply with all of these regulations which I don't think was ever the intent. That's why I suggest changing it from "in a residential zone", to "in an existing one-family detached building." That would have to comply with one through five, but not an institutional day care.

Commissioner Claffey: You might want to switch that to one- and two-family.

Craig Minor: Okay. Moving on to 3.3, Uses Permitted in All Residential Zones; I didn't have any changes until we get down to 3.3, so before that, does anyone have any comments on this, page eight?

Commissioner Claffey: The language of one-family detached dwelling doesn't coincide with your Building Department. They are called one- and two-family dwellings. And if you go above one- and two-family, you get into multi-family.....

Craig Minor: I'm sorry, where are you talking about?

Commissioner Claffey: At the top 3.3.1, and anywhere else that you might use that term, it should be one- and two-family.

Craig Minor: No, because we make a distinction between one- and two-family. In certain zones one-family is allowed, and in certain zones two-families are allowed, but not in all residential zones. I don't know why. I guess there are areas of town where the Commission doesn't have a problem with two-families but there are some areas of town where the Commission, per regulations, does not want two-families. In fact, I had a conversation today with a gentleman who bought a two-family house in a zone that doesn't allow two-family, but he's grandfathered.

Commissioner Claffey: Would that coincide with what you just talked about with day care centers? You're telling somebody that they can only have it in one area of town, and not if someone has a house that they want to run a business out of, like day care? If they are not in the right zone, they cannot do it? I'm confused how we are switching legal terms between...

Commissioner Aieta: I think the problem here is it says, "uses permitted in all residential zones: one-family detached dwelling units are allowed in all residential zones", but a two-family house is not allowed in all residential zones. It's not allowed in an R-20 Zone, it's not allowed in R-12 zone, it's only allowed in an R-7 Zone with a special exception for a duplex.

Commissioner Claffey: Unless they are pre-existing; should we add that? Would you have to add pre-existing so that the general public would know it?

Craig Minor: No, that goes without saying, if they are grandfathered. The point that you are bringing up, and it's a good one, is that the Commission should take a second to consider whether they want to allow "as of right" two- and/or three-family houses in all residential zones.

Commission: No.

Commissioner Aieta: If you have an R-20 zone with all single family, 20,000 square foot lots, one hundred foot frontage, and then you are going to allow someone to build a two-family house in the middle of it, a duplex? No. The zones are set up specifically for a reason. Our forefathers had some foresight into how they set up the residential zones and a good example is they put R-20 lots closer to abutting Industrial zones because R-20 lots have deeper lot requirements, and they were farther away than say in an R-12 zone. I would not change the make-up of the zones as they are now, particularly because we don't have that much developable land anyway.

Craig Minor: I think limiting "as of right" to single family protects the character of Newington, but allowing by special permit two-family in the R-7 and the R-12 zone makes sense.

Commissioner Aieta: The R-7 zone is the only one that allows duplex.

Craig Minor: That's right, not even the R-12. Anything else on page 8?

Commissioner Anest: Can you explain why we allow two vehicles like a boat and a trailer or a boat and a camper parked in someone's driveway? You drive down the street and people have these vehicles parked in their driveway that are beyond sixteen feet long, and they will have a boat on the side of the property, and they'll have a trailer in the driveway.

Craig Minor: I'm looking to see where it says more than two...

Commissioner Anest: 3.3.2.C.

Craig Minor: Okay, "no more than two". The only thing I will suggest is if you do change it from two to one, there are probably a lot of people out there that have two now.

Commissioner Anest: I'd just like to know what the philosophy was behind it, because you drive down the street and it looks like a used motor home lot or trailer lot. You have all these trailers in peoples' driveways and boats under cover, and they are definitely longer than sixteen feet that are parked in the driveway, to the point where they cannot put their car in the driveway.

Craig Minor: Well, it can't be in the driveway because Paragraph A says it can't be in the front yard.

Commissioner Anest: I know, but people probably don't know that there are regulations on how large.....

Craig Minor: I know of one location where the neighbor knew about it, and insisted that Art enforce it. I think two is a reasonable number.

Commissioner Anest: I mean it's fine with me; I was just throwing it out.

Commissioner Claffey: As I read it, you can have two. Two fifteen foot trailers seem excessive. I think that is your point.

Commissioner Anest: It's an eyesore.

Commissioner Claffey: It's not more of an eyesore than someone who parks six cars in the driveway.

Craig Minor: We just have to enforce it. If someone is parking a trailer in the driveway, they're violating the zoning regs and we should enforce it. Let us know and we'll enforce it.

Commissioner Claffey: It's not a parking lot, it's a driveway.

Commissioner Anest: They are usually stationary for the winter. I had an issue with it, I'm just bringing it up for discussion.

Chairman Hall: It says you can't park it in the back yard.

Commissioner Claffey: That's over thirty-five feet. You could have a thirty-five footer in your side yard and a sixteen footer in your rear yard. I agree with you.

Craig Minor: Is there a way that we can change it?

Commissioner Anest: Probably not.

Craig Minor: I don't have any problem with changing the rule as to where somebody has to store his recreational vehicle; I just think it would be difficult to reduce it from two to one because there are a lot of people out there who have two. Telling them that they have to move it - I can live with that if that is what the Commission decides is what they want. You are not taking away their right to have it, you're just making them move it to somewhere else on their property if there is an aesthetic goal you are trying to achieve.

Commissioner Anest: It would also impact the sight lines backing out of your driveway.

Craig Minor: Again, you are talking about one that is parked in the front yard.

Commissioner Anest: Right.

Craig Minor: They aren't allowed to be parking in the front yard, so we just need to enforce the regulation, not change it. Look at A.

Chairman Hall: "No parking or storage of such vehicles is permitted in any front yard."

Craig Minor: And the driveway is in the front yard.

Commissioner Claffey: But typically a driveway is not a yard.

Craig Minor: But what we mean is, in front of the house.

Commissioner Claffey: Then let's say, in front of the house.

Craig Minor: "It shall not be parked in front of the house, anywhere". What we mean, and how we have always interpreted this in the context of this sentence, is front yard includes the driveway.

Commissioner Anest: Right, but we don't have a definition of front yard.

Chairman Hall: And some driveways are on the side.

Craig Minor: If it's a corner lot....

Chairman Hall: Not even that; for some of them the driveway goes down and then in and then they park them this way. Do you consider that the side yard? I'm thinking of a raised ranch that has an end-loaded garage instead of a front-loaded garage. The driveway comes down, takes a left into the house.....

Craig Minor: I see what you are saying. Where it is behind the plane of the front wall of the house, it is allowable under our regs now because that's not in the front yard, even though it's on the driveway as it faces the garage. But let me see if the regulations have a definition of front yard. It's not under "yard, front". No, we don't seem to have a definition of front yard.

Chairman Hall: I don't think we have too many definitions.

Craig Minor: We have a junk yard definition, but not front yard.

Commissioner Anest: That would apply if you have a front yard setback that includes a front yard, not the driveway.

Commissioner Claffey: What constitutes your lot coverage in your yard, the driveway or your front yard?

Craig Minor: Impervious. Anything impervious would count towards your coverage.

Commissioner Claffey: So that is not technically a front yard.

Craig Minor: No, that's still a front yard. It's impervious in the front yard.

Commissioner Claffey: So if I take my grass and I concrete it all over and I go over my percentage of lot coverage that's not grass, but if it's connected as my driveway, I can make my driveway go all the way over to my max lot coverage from what you said. It's still a driveway, it's impervious surface, it's not grass.

Chairman Hall: That's Section 6.1.1 B. "The surfaced area shall not exceed fifty percent of the front lawn, the area between the street line to the front exterior wall of the residence. No vehicles shall park between the curb or edge of pavement and the boundary of the Town or State right of way." Page 70 actually gives us a diagram.

Craig Minor: The way that we have always interpreted it is, no recreational vehicle may be parked anywhere in front of the front of the house; that's the front yard in the context of this regulation.

Chairman Hall: You'd have to say in that case, the building line. No cars parked in front of the building line.

Craig Minor: We could say that. It would be the same thing.

Chairman Hall: That's usually a minimum of 35 feet.

Craig Minor: That's right.

Commissioner Claffey: In some houses you might not be able to park your car in the driveway.

Commissioner Anest: We're talking about recreation campers.

Craig Minor: Okay, we could change it to "no parking or storage of vehicles is permitted in front of the building line".

Chairman Hall: Between the building line and the street.

Commissioner Anest: But they could still park it in the driveway.

Craig Minor: No, because that would be between the building line and the street. The conventional driveway is from the street to the house.

Commissioner Anest: If your garage is attached.

Craig Minor: Or detached. Either way.

Chairman Hall: The building line won't change. Here's your building line, here's your lot, they cannot park however the term is going to be.....

Commissioner Aieta: From the street line to the building line.

Commissioner Anest: Right.

Chairman Hall: If your house is set back beyond the building line, beyond the 35 foot.....

Craig Minor: Beyond the arbitrary 35 feet building line.....

Chairman Hall: Then you could go from 35 to the house.

Craig Minor: Yes, which is why prohibiting the storage of vehicles in front of the front of the house is a good way to say it, because then wherever the house is, you can't be in front of it.

Chairman Hall: In front of the footprint of the house maybe.

Craig Minor: In front of the house is pretty specific.

Commissioner Claffey: So if you have a driveway that ends before your house, which happens in a lot of ranches, the actual driveway will end before the corner of the house, in Newington, you won't even be allowed to put anything there.

Craig Minor: No, we're talking about an RV.

Commissioner Anest: You could park it on the side of your property. A lot of people drive up on their grass and pull it behind the house.

Craig Minor: You could do that. It doesn't have to be parked on a hard surface. The driveway has to be a hard surface, I saw that in 6.1.1, but the place where you are parking your RV or your boat trailer doesn't have to be a paved surface. Actually it shouldn't because it can't be in the driveway, so it would have to be in the side or the back which is usually lawn.

Commissioner Serra: My only concern is if you have an RV and you are parking it on the grass and you get an oil leak, now you've got chemical issues, you've got a whole other set of issues parking it on grass. You know, you've got engine oil, you've got rear end fluid, you've got brake fluid, you've got a million things going on there, and now we're creating contamination issues.

Craig Minor: If you let them park in the driveway, all that stuff is going to wash into the street, into catch basins and then into our rivers and streams. It's better that it end up on the lawn.

Commissioner Anest: If we could just, the "front yard" so that people understand.

Craig Minor: I'll talk to Art, he's still around, but we've never had any problems with people not knowing what the regs mean.

Commissioner Sobieski: If we have them park it on a hard surface like a driveway or something, any oil that does leak out will be retained in the bituminous, whereas if you have it on grass, or plain earth surface, it's going to seep into the ground.

Craig Minor: Which is the better place for it. I'd rather it leak into the dirt in my back yard where over time the microbes will break it down than have it wash into rivers and streams where it will contaminate the habitat. If you talk to any Wetlands Commission, if they allow a parking lot in a wetland, they would probably tell you not to pave it, not to direct stormwater to a catch basin, because it's better to let whatever oils or hydraulic fluids soak into the land rather than be directed into a catch basin into rivers and streams.

Commissioner Claffey: If I have an RV that is under sixteen feet, can I park it anywhere?

Craig Minor: Let's see, D: "no boat, trailer, camper over 16 feet", so if it is under sixteen, except in the front yard, may be parked in the side yard.

Commissioner Claffey: I'm saying a fifteen foot RV trailer, the way I'm reading it is I can park it anywhere outside of what is included between A and G.

Craig Minor: Let's take some time to figure this out. It can't go in the front yard, we know that because A prevents it being parked in the front yard. B doesn't apply, C doesn't apply, E talks about trailers and things that are over 35, F talks about condominiums, G talks about parking or storage being temporary, so yes, I would say, if you have a 15 foot RV you can park it anywhere you want except for in the front yard.

Commissioner Aieta: You've got to take out, B, over sixteen feet overall length or ten feet high, take that right out.

Chairman Hall: The purpose of D was to create the fence.

Commissioner Claffey: Well, you can keep the fence there, I can have up to 35 feet long with a six foot fence. For anything over 35 feet long there is a separate regulation of where you can and can't put it.

Craig Minor: Right.

Commissioner Claffey: I'm not saying take away the screening and the aesthetic look; if you are an RV type of family make the requirement of.....

Craig Minor: How about we scratch the "over sixteen feet long or ten feet high", and you're left with, "no boat, trailer, camper or RV may be parked or stored in the side yard without a 6 foot fence."

Chairman Hall: Right, just take out the dimensions.

Commissioner Claffey: So they can put any size in their side yard. You could go to a 50 foot RV.

Commissioner Anest: Oh no, we have to have a max.

Craig Minor: Why? Are there a lot of big luxury yachts out there?

Commissioner Anest: Well, your Class A motor homes.....

Craig Minor: Right, I was thinking of boats. You're right, motor homes can be pretty long.

Commissioner Claffey: Let me ask you, you probably know the answer, what is the largest one I can drive without a special license?

Commissioner Camillo: Forty-two feet.

Commissioner Claffey: And then you get into being a bus.

Commissioner Anest: The motor coaches are forty-two feet.

Commissioner Claffey: I'm just thinking, when I've done tailgating, the length, but there are people in town who have them.

Commissioner Anest: Absolutely. I've seen them.

Craig Minor: And a six foot high fence probably doesn't screen that.

Chairman Hall: No, it comes up to about the windows.

Commissioner Claffey: What kind of fence? Chain link fence, stockade fence?

Chairman Hall: Most of them are stockade, but there is no regulation for it.

Craig Minor: Again, when Art has enforced this, he hasn't had anyone use anything other than a picket fence or a chain link fence with slats in it. Luckily no one has played games with what a fence is.

Commissioner Aieta: So we're hiding like half of it.

Craig Minor: Right, exactly. Six foot is not very high. Should we change it to something to the effect of a fence sufficiently high to screen the vehicle that is being parked there?

Chairman Hall: That's subjective.

Craig Minor: No, it's tied to the vehicle. Whatever the vehicle size is.

Commissioner Serra: The fence could be a bigger eyesore than the unit.

Commissioner Anest: I think you are blocking the tires, wheels, and that stuff.

Commissioner Camillo: All of the junk that people have around it.

Commissioner Sobieski: It has to be five feet away from the property line anyway.

Craig Minor: It doesn't have to be, I don't think. A driveway has to be five feet away from the edge of the property, but I don't think this recreational vehicle has to be five feet from the edge of the property. Shall we move on? Leave it at six feet? And again, you'll have another bite at the apple when the public hearing takes place on these changes. Anything else on page eight?

On Page Nine, I suggest adding another paragraph to the "use of residence for personal business purposes" section. What I'm suggesting to add is, "a proposed business that exceeds these requirements may be permissible under Section 3.4.4, Home Occupation and Professional Office." In Newington we have two different categories of home businesses. They are in different sections of the regs, which makes sense because the uses listed in 3.3.3 are "as of right", anybody can do them; you don't need a special permit because these are usually low key businesses that nobody knows are there. Some people at this table might even be operating some of these businesses. But when you get to the kinds of business that are more intense.....

Commissioner Aieta: Like what?

Craig Minor: A music teacher who does music lessons in her home. It's probably okay, but it's also something that you might want to keep control of, so that person can apply for a "home occupation professional office" under 3.4.4, which is by special permit which means the Commission has the discretion of whether to approve it. It's on page ten, 3.4.4. This is a higher level of home business, more intense. This involves people possibly bringing stuff, like the electronics, or the doctor, the attorney.

Commissioner Claffey: The lawn mower repair guy.

Craig Minor: Yes, the lawn mover repair guy if he even bothered to apply for a permit would probably fall under this more than under 3.3.3.

Chairman Hall: I know of a musical instrument repair business that is a little bit loud on occasion.....

Craig Minor: And do you know if they have a permit?

Chairman Hall: I know they don't have a permit. We've been going around and around on that one. As luck would have it, it is 6:45. We will start at 3.3.4, or 3.3.3.

III. ADJOURN

Commissioner Serra moved to adjourn the first special meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sobieski. The meeting was adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Norine Addis,  
Recording Secretary