

BAY HEAD PLANNING BOARD

November 18, 2013

The meeting of the Bay Head Planning Board was held on Monday, November 18, 2013 at 7:30 PM.

Mr. Furze read the following statement: "Pursuant to the applicable portions of the NJ Public Meetings Act, adequate notice of this meeting was mailed to the Ocean Star and posted in the corridor of the Borough of Bay Head and filed with the Bay Head Borough Clerk."

Roll Call: William Furze, Verity Frizzell, Kathleen Tell, Peter Harrington, William Curtis, Bart Petrillo, Patricia Wojcik, Edward Convey, Kathleen Wintersteen, Frederick Applegate.
Absent: Brian Magory, William Tubbs, Robert Hein.

The August 26, 2013 minutes were approved on a motion by Bart Petrillo and seconded by Patricia Wojcik, with all in favor.

Roll call:

YEAS: William Furze, Verity Frizzell, Kathleen Tell, William Curtis, Bart Petrillo, Patricia Wojcik, Edward Convey, Kathleen Wintersteen.

Mr. Furze stated the Board had for review the **Resolution** for Atlantic Pier Company, Inc. A motion was made by Patricia Wojcik and seconded by Kathleen Wintersteen to approve the Resolution as corrected. Roll Call YEAS: William Furze, Verity Frizzell, Kay Tell, Peter Harrington, Bart Petrillo, Edward Convey, Kathleen Wintersteen. ABSTAIN: William Curtis, Patricia Wojcik and Frederick Applegate.

Mr. Furze stated the Board had for review the **application** for Alison Amelchenko, 126 Osborne Avenue, Bay Head, a/k/a Block 1, Lot 47.

Mr. Furze recused himself as he is within 200 feet of the property.

Robert A. Burcz, Esq., attorney for the applicant, appeared before the Board. The application is for a new home, detached garage and pool. The applicant seeks to remove the existing structure and two sheds, one of which is non-conforming, and eliminate the preexisting non-conforming 2-family use in a single family zone. Ms. Burcz stated that in 1965, the parcel to the east of the property and the parcel to the west of the property on Osborne Avenue were subdivided off from the premises, and so the Board actually created this uniquely shaped lot with only 25 feet of road frontage on Osborne Avenue. She further stated the Board also created the non-conforming lot to the west which is owned by Brian Shore and his wife, 75' deep, and a non-conforming lot to the east of the premises. In a subsequent application, the Board apparently split the 2 properties to the east of the premises to 2 more non-conforming lots which are owned by Blonsky and Burkhart.

Ms. Burcz states the applicant is giving up the non-conforming 2-family use and eliminating the rear yard non-conformity. When Ms. Burcz came before the Board earlier, the issue was raised of whether adjoining property owners wanted to purchase the premises. All adjoining property owners were asked if they wanted to purchase the premises. Shore and Burkhart were also asked if they wanted to sell a portion of their properties to the applicant; only Shore and Burkhart responded, both initially responding they were interested in purchasing the premises. Therefore, Ms. Amelchenko obtained an appraisal of \$418,000.00, and a copy of the proposed contract reflecting that price, as well as the appraisal, were sent to each Shore and Burkhart. Both responded in writing that they did not want to purchase the premises.

Ms. Burcz went on to detail what the new proposed home would have construction-wise.

Mrs. Tell wanted clarification that the Burkhart's had responded in writing and wanted to see a copy of same; it will be later marked as an exhibit.

The following items were marked into evidence:

- A-1 Application, prior Resolution and subdivision map
- A-2 Survey dated 1/2/12
- A-3 Architectural plans for residence
- A-4 Review letter from Board Engineer
- A-5 Affidavit of Service dated 8/8/13
- A-6 Affidavit of Publication dated 8/8/13
- A-7 Affidavit of Service dated 10/15/13
- A-8 Affidavit of Publication dated 10/11/13
- A-9 Updated survey dated 1/2/13
- A-10 Letter from Ms. Burcz dated 11/11/13 with drainage plan, appraisal and sample of contract provided to adjacent property owners
- A-11 Letter from Ms. Burcz dated 11/15/13
- A-12 Aerial view of property and immediate area
- A-13 Marked-up version of part of plans that were already submitted, CS1 page 1 of 4 with tree locations
- A-14 Colored rendering of proposed structure
- A-15 Property record card from Borough of Bay Head showing property listed as a duplex
- O-1 through 5 Pictures taken by Brian Shore of his backyard and back porch

John C. Amelchenko, licensed architect with Aquatecture Associates, Inc., 421 River Avenue, Point Pleasant Beach, and brother-in-law to the applicant, was sworn in by Mr. Zabarsky.

Mr. Amelchenko testified he prepared the plans marked into evidence as A-3. He stated the property in question is on the north side of Osborne Avenue and has 25 feet of frontage which is approximately 100 feet away from the railroad right-of-way; the property to the south is 3 non-conforming lots; the property to the west is a single-family home; and to the north is the border of Point Pleasant Beach. There are 3 single-family structures and to the east, the property is bordered by the railroad right-of-way.

He further testified that the square footage of the lot area is approximately 12,534 square feet, which is substantially greater than the minimum requirement of 5,000 square feet. Because the subject property is located in the R-50 zone, the requirement for lot frontage and width is 50 feet at the setback from the road. He stated that the lot, as configured and platted on the subdivision map, has a shape that runs east to west. The railroad right-of-way is to the east, the developed lots to the south, west and north. Those are the adjacencies.

The existing one-story structure is approximately 3,000 square feet and at its longest dimension is 116 feet in length from east to west. At present, there is a pre-existing, non-conforming use of two 2-families in this structure. In addition, there are existing, non-conforming bulk conditions of a rear yard setback on the northern property line of 2.3 feet wherein 10 feet is required; on the west where at its closest 7.39, the side yard where 6 feet would be required, a combination of 16; the structure to the railroad right-of-way is approximately 34 feet; and a front yard setback of 19.03 feet wherein 20 feet minimum is required.

Mr. Amelchenko testified both of these pre-existing, non-conforming bulk conditions will be eliminated and the structure will completely conform to all the requirements of the Land Use Ordinance of the Borough of Bay Head, except for the pre-existing non-conforming condition of the lot itself which is 25 feet in width and frontage on Osborne Avenue.

He further stated there is a pre-existing, non-conforming shed located to the northeast portion of the property which actually encroaches over the property line onto the adjacent property. Furthermore, there is a shed which exists east of the existing structure. Both of these sheds will be demolished based upon the new plans submitted to the Board. Due to Superstorm Sandy, the structure has been substantially and severely compromised and made uninhabitable. There was approximately 40" of water inside the structure after Sandy.

Mr. Amelchenko stated that no variances are needed to elevate the house and renovate the structure as it exists. If the applicant chooses to do this, the house would remain a pre-existing, non-conforming, two-family structure in a single-family zone. The applicant desires to bring the house into conformity with the zoning requirements of the Borough, and construct a single-family residential structure complying with all the bulk requirements except for the pre-existing, non-conforming lot. The new single-family residential structure will be two stories, 4 bedrooms and approximately 2,600 square feet. It will have an elevation of 12 feet in the proposed AE 10 zone which meets FEMA requirements. They are also proposing a detached, 1-car garage, and there will be a swimming pool at the west end of the property which does conform to the zoning requirements. The front door will face east as it is his belief that is the nature of the layout of the lot, and therefore will not face the neighbors. Upon approaching the house from the driveway, however, the front door will be visible. The western portion of the property will be for outdoor living space, with doors and windows facing the pool area. The proposed structure will be 20 feet from the property line of the adjacent owner of Lot 49.

Mr. Amelchenko stated the building coverage is presently 24% and will be reduced to 15.5% which conforms to the zoning requirements. The density and intensive nature of the use of the property as a 2-family structure will be reduced and conform to the zoning requirements of a single-family residential structure.

Mr. Amelchenko stated that Robert Burdick, a local professional Engineer, prepared a drainage plan for the site, with a dedicated drainage system for the site.

Mrs. Tell wanted to know to where it would feed out and Mr. Amelchenko said it would go out to the railroad right-of-way. She pointed out that the railroad right-of-way was actually a culvert, to which Mr. Amelchenko agreed. Mrs. Tell questioned whether that led out to a pipe that empties directly into Twilight Lake and it was confirmed that it would eventually do so. Mr. Amelchenko acknowledged that the applicant was in agreement with A-13 in evidence which was marked up during the hearing as to which trees will remain on the property throughout the construction of the new house. He described the layout of the house as well as the 12 x 21 single-car garage. Mr. Amelchenko testified that in furtherance of the request for a variance, the Board should note that the lot has a unique shape.

Mr. Applegate questioned whether there was room to get aerial apparatus fire trucks through the trees in the flag section, or whether they would be low hanging. Mr. Amelchenko acknowledged that the tree canopy he drew was probably not representative, that it is probably a lot larger and taller and could be driven under, and stated that certainly if that becomes an issue, the trees can be pruned to comply with emergency vehicle access.

Mrs. Tell wanted to know the length from Osborne Avenue to the house for the purpose of hoses, to which Mr. Amelchenko responded the existing home is just about 95 feet from the right-of-way at Osborne to the closest part of the home.

Ms. Frizzell asked if any of the public had questions for this witness.

Mr. Brian Shore questioned whether the applicant is moving into the house or selling it. Mr. Amelchenko stated the applicant is not sure what she is going to do at this point; her first objective would be to stay in the property, whether or not that is possible would be a financial issue.

Alison Amelchenko, 126 Osborne Avenue, Bay Head, was sworn in by Mr. Zabarsky.

Ms. Amelchenko is the owner of the property and stated she originally rented the house from 1994 to 2000, then purchased the house in 2000 from Jean Tyler.

Ms. Burcz questioned Ms. Amelchenko about speaking with Mr. & Mrs. Shore about purchasing the property. Ms. Burcz produced documentation and evidence that adjacent property owners Shore as well as Burkhart were contacted by the applicant and asked whether they wished to purchase the applicant's property for fair market value as if the variance is granted, or sell a portion of their property to help the applicant's property conform as to lot width/frontage.

Ms. Frizzell asked if there was any public comment.

Brian Shore, 128 Osborne Avenue, Bay Head, was sworn in by Mr. Zabarsky.

Mr. Shore represented that he was not interested in purchasing applicant's property for the fair market value as if the variance was granted, or had the ability to sell any of his property to

applicant. In addition, Mr. Shore represented that likewise, the adjacent property owner did not wish to purchase the subject property or sell part of their property.

His concern is his privacy. His house is directly to the south of applicant's property. His house will be 30 feet from the proposed home. He believes that allowing the new structure to be built would allow the occupants of the proposed home to look down upon his property and violate his light, air and open space. He presented pictures in support of this statement and went on to describe each picture taken from his own property.

He had a concern for the house not yet being mitigated due to mold. He wanted the house torn down by a certain date.

There being no further public comment, Ms. Frizzell polled the Board members.

Mr. Petrillo: Mr. Petrillo stated these lots were created by a Planning Board subdivision in 1966 before the zoning laws. When these lots were created, West Railroad Avenue existed to the border of Point Pleasant Beach. At that point, this lot which applicant owns had 69.16 feet frontage on W. Railroad Avenue, which was considered a street and which made it a conforming lot. The town vacated W. Railroad Avenue which has now created the non-conformity to applicant's lot. This is not a hardship created by Ms. Amelchenko, it was created because the street was vacated. He felt this lot has more than the maximum square footage required for the zone, applicant is putting a completely conforming house there, and he sees no reason for the application to be denied.

Ms. Wojcik: Ms. Wojcik agreed and thinks it is a very nice house.

Mrs. Tell: Mrs. Tell agreed and given the recent Mauro decision, is not sure we can find grounds to reject this application even if we wanted to. While sensitive to issues of privacy, she felt that in order for applicant to raise her house to meet FEMA standards, the house will obliterate the view Mr. Shore has anyway, even if its only a one-story house. She didn't feel we have the right to impose that kind of burden on a lot with a hardship, and felt the applicant showed sensitivity to her neighbors by not building a three-story house and not building to the maximum.

Mayor Curtis: Mayor Curtis had no objections to the house or the design of same, but he wanted to address what Mr. Shore brought up. If this application is approved, he would strongly wish a condition be made that if this application is approved, the current dwelling be torn down before December 31, 2013 and that it be protected when it is torn down so that mold cannot spread. He stated that is a major concern to him; he is amazed the Health Department will not act on a mold situation. He felt we need to protect the neighborhood and if it is to be razed, it be done before December 31, 2013.

Ms. Burcz stated the appeal period would have to expire. Mr. Zabarsky explained that any interested party has 45 days from the date of the publication of the decision of the Board to take an appeal. If the party is successful, then they tore down the house for no good reason because they're saying maybe they would have raised it. Mr. Zabarsky said if the applicant is willing to agree if no one takes an appeal and 45 days run, then they'll tear it down, then we're not looking past January 1, 2014 anyhow. Ms. Burcz stated we would have to pass the Resolution and then it would have to be published.

Mr. Amelchenko stated that given the holidays and the dearth of contractors in the marketplace, it is their full intention to demolish the house and they would agree to that with a hard, firm date. He further stated that if they had another month or so, say February 1, 2014 to allow them to contract with the appropriate people to schedule that, the applicant would greatly appreciate that. Mr. Zabarsky said that would be if there was no impending appeal.

Ms. Wintersteen: Mrs. Wintersteen agreed with what was said. She felt it is an improvement to the property and with all houses being raised, everyone will be faced with this. Everything is going up and she sees no reason to hold this project back.

Mr. Harrington: Mr. Harrington stated that light, air and open space have definitely taken on a new meaning since October 29, 2012 and he can't find a reason not to move forward with the application.

Mr. Applegate: Mr. Applegate was in favor with the stipulation the driveway be kept clear for fire apparatus. He would expect nothing less than a 16 foot clearance.

Mr. Convey: Mr. Convey approved the application. Unfortunately, the discussion about privacy is not unique to these discussions, and will be less unique as we go forward.

Ms. Frizzell: Ms. Frizzell agreed with everything said. She appreciated the drainage plan in place to take care of drainage issues with which some of the neighbors had expressed concern, as well as the buffers put in place, the compact floor plan, and that it wasn't any larger than it needed to be.

Mr. Zabarsky wanted to know if there was any issue of the minimum 16 foot clearance of the driveway, and the other condition of February 1, 2014 tear down as long as there is no pending appeal.

A motion was made by Bart Petrillo and seconded by Patricia Wojcik to approve the application. Roll Call: YEAS: Verity Frizzell, Kathleen Tell, Peter Harrington, William Curtis, Bart Petrillo, Patricia Wojcik, Edward Convey, Kathleen Wintersteen, Frederick Applegate.

Absent: Brian Magory, William Tubbs, Robert Hein

Recused: William Furze

Mr. Furze stated the Board had for review the **application** of Henry P. Bristol, II regarding the intersection of Strickland Street and Main Avenue, a/k/a Block 78, Lots 6,7 & 8.

The following items were marked into evidence:

- A-1 Application
- A-2 Proposed property survey
- A-3 Review letter from Board Engineer
- A-4 Affidavit of Publication
- A-5 Hearing Notice Affidavit

Henry P. Bristol, II, P.O. Box 619, Rocky Hill, NJ, local address 800 East Avenue, Bay Head, NJ, was sworn in by Mr. Zabarsky.

Mr. Bristol stated he was there to try to realign 2 internal property lines slightly, to make them orthogonal to Route 35/Main Avenue, and not oriented and parallel to Strickland Street. He stated he had 3 lots in question. He stated he did a minor subdivision in 2008 (Memorializing Resolution #2008-07) in order to make the driveways safer and to work better, but did not reorient 2 internal lines, instead keeping them parallel to Strickland Street.

He further stated this does not work and is not typical to Bay Head; usually the lines are perpendicular to the access street. He would like the buildings and driveways to be orthogonal (a 90 degree right angle) to the street. He stated there are no structures on the lots, just trees, and he understands any structures built on the lots must conform to the Borough of Bay Head Land Use Ordinance.

There being no public comment, Mr. Furze caucused the Board members.

A motion was made by Kay Tell and seconded by Patricia Wojcik to approve the application. Roll Call: YEAS: William Furze, Verity Frizzell, Kathleen Tell, Peter Harrington, William Curtis, Bart Petrillo, Patricia Wojcik, Edward Convey, Kathleen Wintersteen, Frederick Applegate.

Absent: Brian Magory, William Tubbs, Robert Hein

Mr. Furze stated that the Board had an **application** for Joseph & Nancy Mignon, 61 Johnson Street, a/k/a Block 82, Lot 5.

John P. Doyle, Esq., attorney for the applicant, appeared before the Board.

Mr. Doyle stated that applicants were looking to construct a new single-family dwelling which will face the water as did the prior home. They would like a front yard set-back of 22.5 feet wherein 35 feet is the minimum required, as well as a variance for height of approximately 34.4 feet wherein 32.5 feet is the maximum allowable.

The following items were marked into evidence:

- A-1 Application
- A-2 Plot plan
- A-3 Boundary and Topographic map
- A-4 Sealed architectural plans
- A-5 Review letter from Board Engineer
- A-6 Affidavit of Service
- A-7 Affidavit of Publication
- A-8 Survey of prior existing home, prior to Superstorm Sandy

John N. Ernst, P.E., of Ernst, Ernst & Lissenden of Toms River, NJ was sworn in by Mr. Zabarsky.

Mr. Ernst testified as to the setbacks on Johnson Street, more particularly the southern side of Johnson Street and west Main Avenue. He surveyed the front yard setbacks of the adjacent houses on Johnson Street, which range from 10.2 feet to 25 feet setback from Johnson Street. He stated that on the north side of Johnson Street, they range from 6.9 feet to 20.7 feet, with an

average of 13.6 feet. Mr. Ernst further testified it was his opinion that the request for a front yard setback of 22.5 feet from the Johnson Street right-of-way line is conforming to the existing neighborhood and consistent with the streetscape. He stated that the former structure had a “skewed” front yard setback of 20.5 feet to 27.5 feet, with an average of 24 feet.

Mr. Ernst further stated that the lot is considered oversized for the area as it has approximately 12,800 square feet wherein only 10,000 square feet is required. He felt the Mignon’s application for development would not be detrimental to the public good nor have an adverse impact on the homes in the immediate area or the zone plan and zoning Ordinance.

Ms. Frizzell questioned Mr. Ernst about whether the flood elevation was shown on the plans and relative to the finished floor of the house, and he stated it is elevation 8 per the preliminary maps and the proposed finished floor is at 12.9. She further questioned the grade, and Mr. Ernst stated the ground floor/garage floor under the home is at 2.9 and the outside grade is 2.8.

Mrs. Tell questioned if there was a reason you couldn’t subtract the 1.8 from the 12.9 finished floor, to which Mr. Ernst stated they are trying to have the garage underneath and you therefore need clearance for the garage, headroom, and structure of the home.

Ms. Wojcik questioned the directions on the plans, seeing as how they are ready-made plans for someone else. Mr. Ernst referred to the top sheet on A-4, and said the top view is the elevation as if you were looking from Johnson Street, coming down from Lake Avenue.

Mr. Petrillo questioned the plans for fencing along Johnson Street; he pointed out that the prior home had a 6 foot high stockade fence, the reason being the car lights coming down Lake Avenue. Mr. Petrillo stated he believes the prior owners received a variance for same. Ms. Wojcik confirmed they did. Mr. Petrillo asked Mr. Ernst if applicants were going to require the same type of fencing because if so, the Board would need to know.

Mr. Ernst stated that by raising the house up, there were minimal windows on that side of the house which would eliminate that issue.

Mrs. Tell and Ms. Frizzell questioned the justification for the height variance, and wanted to know the heights of the other homes on the street to which Mr. Doyle stated they did not measure them. Mr. Convey asked Mr. Doyle to clarify shaving inches to get the height. Mr. Doyle said you would lose some of the headroom and the look that the house has. He stated that the storage above the first floor is not a living area.

Ms. Frizzell wanted to clarify that there would be no living space below the first floor, on the ground floor where it was listed on the plans as “Joe’s shop” and “playroom”, which sounded like habitable space which is not allowed. Mr. Ernst agreed it should just be the garage/storage area. Ms. Frizzell stated there would be a Deed restriction in the way the Land Use is written.

Mayor Curtis asked if the mechanicals would be under the house, to which Mr. Doyle replied that would be Mr. Mignon’s preference. They have to be above elevation 8. Ms. Frizzell stated they could be hung from the floor joists. Mr. Doyle stated applicants would make such adjustments as are necessary to meet the height.

Mr. Furze asked about the front yard setback, to which Mr. Doyle replied that the front yard setback is a function of the overall layout of it and Mr. Mignon spoke to the neighbors.

Mr. Furze asked if there was any public comment.

Louis John Dughi, Jr., attorney practicing in Cranford, NJ and local address of 56 Johnson Street, Bay Head, NJ was sworn in by Mr. Zabarsky.

Mr. Dughi stated he was not representing anyone, and that he does a lot of Land Use law. He stated no one on Johnson Street is conforming. His home is 3 stories and probably will still be higher after applicants raise their house. He stated applicants shared a copy of the plans with him and he feels it is very attractive and beautifully designed. He didn't feel the roofline should be touched because it is set as a plantation house, and if you try to push the setback back, you'd have to squeeze the house and it just won't work or look right.

David Kellogg, 70 Johnson Street, Bay Head, NJ was sworn in by Mr. Zabarsky.

Mr. Kellogg stated he's a neighbor and very much in favor of the application.

Stan Niedzwiecki, 42 Johnson Street, Bay Head, NJ was sworn in by Mr. Zabarsky.

Mr. Niedzwiecki had a question about parking. He thought the plans showed there were 5 bedrooms and felt that would be a lot of cars. Mr. Furze stated there were 2 stalls and a driveway. Mr. Niedzwiecki asked what was on the 2nd floor and Ms. Tell advised him the plans meet the required parking spots. Mr. Petrillo advised there is a requirement of 2 off-street parking spaces. Mr. Furze said applicants satisfied that requirement.

There being no further questions from the public, Mr. Furze caucused the Board members.

Mr. Harrington: Mr. Harrington was in favor of the application as presented.

Mr. Applegate: Mr. Applegate was basically in favor but questioned if applicants are starting with a new house, why can't they comply with the Codes, to which Mr. Furze replied they could conform without architecturally compromising the integrity of the building.

Mr. Convey: Mr. Convey felt there should have been an architect there to whom the Board could direct these questions.

Mrs. Tell: Mrs. Tell said she understood from the applicants' attorney that they were prepared to fit within the height limitations and that being the case, there wasn't the necessity for an architect to be present.

Mrs. Wintersteen: Mrs. Wintersteen liked the plan, approved it very much, agreed with the applicants' neighbors as to what Johnson Street looks like. She would not require a 2 foot setback.

Ms. Frizzell: Ms. Frizzell didn't have a problem with the front yard setback because of the way the building steps in and the portion of the building that encroaches so far into the setback is not the full height of the building; its just the ground floor and the first floor for the porch. She was not opposed to the extra 22" because the entire house isn't at that height. The portion of the

house that is at that height is set back far enough from the street that she didn't think you would feel that 22".

Mr. Furze: Mr. Furze was generally in favor though he did have an issue with the front yard setback. He felt the Board will be seeing a lot of requests for relief in height. He agreed with Ms. Frizzell that only a small portion is an encroachment.

Mayor Curtis: Mayor Curtis was in favor of the application. He had two things: He assured Mr. Niedzwiecki that the applicants have more than adequate parking off the street and didn't feel it would add anything to the neighborhood with extra cars. His other concern, and one to which he felt he did not receive an answer, was he wanted to be sure where the mechanicals would be located. He wanted it confirmed they would be under the building but raised above the BFE. He was in favor of the plan.

Mrs. Tell: Mrs. Tell felt the setback will work very well with the streetscape. The height looks good to her also so she was in favor. She said it looks like a one-story house as you're driving down Lake Avenue.

Ms. Wojcik: Ms. Wojcik was in favor. She felt it is a very nice looking house. She stated we can't avoid the height as everything has to be raised.

Mr. Petrillo: Mr. Petrillo had no problem with the application. He felt with the location, the minimal distance above the height because it sits next to the railroad property, is not going to make any impact to the area. As far as the setback, he didn't have any problem so he was in favor of the application.

A motion was made by Kay Tell to approve the application as submitted, and seconded by Bart Petrillo to approve the application.

Roll call: YEAS: William Furze, Verity Frizzell, Kathleen Tell, Peter Harrington, William Curtis, Bart Petrillo, Patricia Wojcik, Edward Convey, Kathleen Wintersteen, Frederick Applegate.

Absent: Brian Magory, William Tubbs, Robert Hein

The following was discussed under **New Business**:

Mr. Furze asked the Board if they would like to revert back to the Wednesday evening meetings. Mr. Zabarsky and Ms. Brasfield both indicated availability. All were in favor.

A motion was made by Kathleen Wintersteen and seconded by Verity Frizzell to approve the **voucher**. All in favor.

The meeting adjourned on a motion by Mrs. Wintersteen and seconded by Ms. Frizzell. All in favor.

Respectfully Submitted,

Claire S. Hense