

**PRINCETON ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT**  
**Minutes of SPECIAL Meeting**  
**Wednesday, March 5, 2014– 7:30pm**  
**Main Meeting Room**  
**400 Witherspoon Street, Princeton, NJ 08540**

**PRESENT:** Penelope Baskerville, Louisa Clayton, Michael Floyd,  
Barrie Royce, Sara Segal, Doreen Blanc-Rockstrom,  
Steven Cohen

**ALSO PRESENT:** Karen Cayci, Attorney; Derek Bridger, Zoning Officer;  
; and Debra Rogers, Secretary

**ABSENT:** Richard Kahn and Harlan Tenenbaum

There were fifteen (15) members of the public present.

The meeting commenced at 7:32 p.m. with Chairman Royce reading the Open Public Meetings Act statement.

**1. APPLICATIONS:**

**a) CARLPARKS LLC**

141 Linden Lane

Block 7302, Lot 2, R-8

**C1/C2 – New House and a demo & rebuild of an existing garage**

File No. Z13 13-119V

Present for the application was Marina Rubina, architect for the applicant.

Attorney Cayci said that all of the noticing documents were in order and the Board was in a position to entertain jurisdiction of the application. She also noted that the applicant has requested that the Board take jurisdiction and then carry the application to the March 26, 2014 meeting. She said that under Municipal Land Use Law a corporation must be represented by an attorney and the applicants' attorney was unable to make the meeting.

Chairman Royce noted that the application would be carried to the March 26, 2014 meeting.

**b) TENACRE FOUNDATION**  
1036 Great Road  
Block 1901, Lot 11, R-A  
**C2 & D4 – to permit a 2-family residence**  
File No. Z13 113-116UV

Present for the hearing were William Bell, CFO Tenacre Foundation; Mark Solomon, Attorney for the applicant; and William Schwenker, FORD3 Architects.

Attorney Cayci said that all of the noticing documents were in order and the Board was in a position to entertain jurisdiction of the application.

Chairman Royce asked Mr. Bridger to give his report pertaining to this application.

Attorney Cayci swore in Derek Bridger, Princeton Zoning Officer.

Mr. Bridger said that the applicants have applied for a use variance to permit the conversion of an existing single family residence to a 2 unit residence and this is not permitted in the zone. He said the lot is located in the R-A zoning district and the lot is non-compliant with respect to the lot area requirement. He said the applicant is proposing to convert the existing three bedroom home into a 2 family dwelling that will have 1 – 2 bedroom apartment and 1- 1 bedroom apartment. He said all of the work done to the structure will be interior with the exception of closing off 2 exterior doors at the rear of the house. He also noted that the conversion will require 2 parking spaces for each unit that will be 9 feet X 19 feet. He noted that if the structure was not owned by a corporation, they would comply with the former Township Flat ordinance whereby part of the dwelling must be occupied by the owner. He suggested that if the Board is inclined to approve the variance, the Board should impose a Deed Restriction stating that if Tenacre Foundation ever sells the lot, it must be converted back to a single family residence.

Mr. Solomon stated that he is the attorney for Tenacre Foundation and they have purchased the structure at 1036 Great Road and would like to use it for employee housing. He said they cannot comply with the Flat ordinance because they are a corporation. He also stated that in previous applications to the Planning Board and Zoning Board, Tenacre was recognized as a place of worship. He said they are not however seeking a conditional use permit for this. He said the cleanest and easiest option is to apply for a use variance to permit the 2 family structure. He said he would like to bring Bill Bell up to testify.

Attorney Cayci swore in William Bell, CFO for Tenacre Foundation.

Mr. Solomon asked Mr. Bell various questions and his answers are as follows.

Mr. Bell said that Tenacre Foundation has been in existence since 1921 and its mission is Christian Science Nursing. He said he is the CFO for Tenacre and has been employed with them for over 20 years. He said Tenacre owns 5 lots on Old Great Road and 4 lots on Great Road that are utilized for staff housing. He said the property located at 1036 Great Road is a bit larger than the other homes that they have purchased and can easily be divided into 2 units.

Mr. Bell stated that Tenacre purchased the property in October 2013 – the existing structure is approximately 3,600 square feet. He said FORD3 designed the plans from them to convert the single family dwelling into 2 separate units. He said this structure will be used exclusively by Tenacre staff. He said the staff will walk across the street to the main campus for Tenacre and will not have to utilize a vehicle. He stated that this house is really too large for once family, and that is the reason that they would like to have 2 units. One 1 bedroom apartment and one 2 bedroom apartment. He said Tenacre would support a deed restriction returning the structure to single family if the Board was inclined to approve the application. He said there would be no more than 4 cars on the lot and the lot would also be provided with lawn care.

Member Floyd asked what the maximum number of people would be in each unit.

Mr. Bell stated that there would be 1-2 in the one bedroom apartment and 2-4 people (2 adults/2children) in the two bedroom apartment.

Member Floyd asked if the living space would be open to all of Tenacres' employees.

Mr. Bell said it would be open to fulltime staff in good standing that are members of the Christian Science Ministry.

Member Blanc-Rockstrom asked if there is a term limit on the time the residents would be in the units.

Mr. Bell said it would be a condition of employment. As long as they are employed in good standing they would be eligible to the living space.

Chairman Royce asked if the timing would be days, years or months.

Mr. Bell said that it could be a short period or it could be 20 years, it would depend on the employment of the individual.

Attorney Cayci swore in Mr. Quinn Schwenker, Architect.

Mr. Schwenker referred to sheet A-1 Floor Plan of the plans that were submitted to the Board. He said the older section of the house was built in the late 1880's and then a newer section was built in the late 1990's early 2000's. He said the applicant would like to divide the house basically between the older/newer sections and then place a firewall there for the separate dwelling units. He said they would also add a kitchen and laundry facilities on the second floor. He said the only changes to the exterior would be the removal of a pair of doors. He said all of the entrances currently exist and they would not have to do any exterior changes. He referred to sheet A-2 which were pictures of the existing structure and he showed how the exterior would be remaining the same.

Member Segal asked if there would be separate mechanical systems for each unit.

Mr. Bell said right now there are 2 heating and cooling systems, the electric and water will remain as is and will not be separated. He noted that the sanitary sewer is already separated and will not be changed.

Chairman Royce asked if there were any members of the public who wanted to comment on the application. Hearing none, he closed the public portion of the application.

Mr. Solomon said the applicant are requesting a d-1 variance to permit the use of a 2 family structure. He noted that this is an inherently beneficial use and noted that this use is particularly suited for the proposed use based on its location to the main campus of Tenacre. He said this use will cut down on vehicular traffic and preserve the environment. He said with regards to the negative criteria, there is no substantial detriment to the general welfare and no substantial impairment to the zone plan or zoning ordinance. He said this use will not be any more intense than that of a single family use. He noted that with a deed restriction in place, the “use” can only be utilized by Tenacre; if the property is sold, the home will be converted back to a single family structure. He humbly requested that the Board support the variance requests.

Member Cohen asked if the property would be tax exempt.

Mr. Solomon noted that issue cannot be part of this application.

Mr. Bell said right now Tenacre is paying taxes on the property but it will be requested that the property become tax-exempt. He said Tenacre does not pay taxes, but they make an “in lieu of taxes” contribution to the town.

Mr. Solomon noted that the lot size is non-conforming to the zoning standards and because of that he sent letter to the adjacent property owners asking if they wanted to sell any land or purchase the lot. He said he received one response saying the party was not interested and did not hear from the other 2. He asked the Board for approval of the proposal as it has been presented.

Member Segal made a motion to approve and it was seconded by Member Cohen.

Attorney Cayci there are two issues; if the property is particularly suited for the use and whether or not this is an inherently beneficial use. She asked the Board which one they would be approving.

Member Segal and Cohen agreed that it would be both.

Member Floyd said he struggles with the inherently beneficial use because the function of the lot is not a key function for Tenacre.

Member Clayton said the fact that the lot is “particularly suited” for the use works, but she said the other homes in the area are not.

Chairman Royce noted that if Tenacre were a regular homeowner they would not need the variance, it would be permitted under the Flat ordinance.

**Upon motion made** by Sara Segal and seconded by Steven Cohen, a motion was made to approve the variance requests of Tenacre Foundation as it has been presented with the condition that there is a deed restriction stating that if Tenacre ever sells the property, it would revert back to a single family residential use.

**ROLL CALL:**

<b>Aye</b>	<b>Penelope Baskerville</b>
<b>Aye</b>	<b>Louisa Clayton</b>
<b>Aye</b>	<b>Steven Cohen</b>
<b>Aye</b>	<b>Michael Floyd</b>
<b>Aye</b>	<b>Sara Segal</b>
<b>Aye</b>	<b>Doreen Blanc-Rockstrom</b>
<b>Aye</b>	<b>Barrie Royce</b>

- c) **GESSNER, Joseph**  
30 Race Street  
Block 6902, Lot 55, R-9  
**C1/C2 and “D” Far for addition**  
File No. Z14 14-007UV

Present for the hearing was Joseph Gessner, applicant and his architect Joseph H. Weiss.

Attorney Cayci said all of the noticing documents were in order and the Board was in a position to entertain jurisdiction of the application.

Mr. Bridger presented his report saying that the applicant is applying for an FAR variance to permit the first and second floor additions to the existing single family structure. He said additionally the applicant is seeking c1 and in the alternative c2 variance relief for side and front yard variances to permit the additions. He said the applicant is also seeking a parking setback variance to permit 2 parking spaces in the front yard. He also noted that the existing shed requires setback relief as well. He said the property is located in the r-9 zoning district and the single family use is permitted as of right. He said the lot is non-conforming with regards to lot area, side yard setback, rear setback for the shed, side yard setback for the shed and parking setbacks. He said the applicant is proposing to construct a one story addition on the front eastern and northern elevation of the property to accommodate a mudroom and entry foyer. He said the second story addition will have 3 bedrooms and two bathrooms. He also noted the addition calls for a terrace off the master bedroom. He said the applicant is also applying for variance relief for the existing shed which does not conform to the setbacks and the two existing parking spaces in the front yard which also do not comply with the zoning requirements. He said the applicant is proposing to remove the concrete patio and construct a wood deck instead. He said the current FAR is 24% or 1004 sf, the maximum permitted FAR is .4775% or 1969 sf and the applicants are proposing an FAR of 57% of 2386sf.

Mr. Gessner said that when he purchased the property he was a bachelor and the structure suited him well. He said now he is married with 2 children and ill parents with whom he would like to reside with him. He said he would like to make changes to the house that would allow him to move his parents into the house. He said his first thought was to build straight up but as they got deeper into making the plans he realized that there would not be much “common area” where the whole family could gather. He said the next phase of the planning consisted of a 1<sup>st</sup> floor addition with a handicap ramp. While trying to design this addition they quickly realized that the only way they could design this without variances would be to build out of the back or tear down the house and start all over. He said final design consisted of a design on the northeastern corner which put the addition closer to the park and away from the closest neighbor to mitigate any impacts. He said the plan that he is presenting will suit his needs and will fit well within the community. He said he likes his home and does not want to move and he wants his parents to be with him. He said this design will be very efficient and will allow room for everyone to be together. He said the parking is located in the front of the house because there is no room for a driveway and it is much safer and easier to get his parents in and out of the car in this location. He said by keeping the cars on the lot, there is less parking on an already parking deficient street. He addressed the shed saying that if they moved the shed so it complies with the zoning requirements, it would be smack in the middle of his backyard and would not look good to the neighbors. He said there was a variance granted to 174 Birch where the FAR was 19% over the allowable. He said he would appreciate the Board favorable consideration of this request.

Attorney Cayci swore in Joseph H Weiss, architect.

Mr. Weiss stated that he was the architect for the applicant and he is also a neighbor to the applicant. He marked his PowerPoint presentation as exhibit A-1. He discussed the tax map and showed the Board the wide range of property sizes in the neighborhood. He also showed the typical setback in the neighborhood and how few homes actually comply with the front yard setback requirement. He also showed the Board other 2 story homes in the area. He said the parking is very diverse because there are restaurants in the area and many sporting events at the park. He noted that most people don't know have off-street parking and if they do, it is located in the front yard. He said residents that have sheds are located to the rear of their properties and rarely comply with the setback requirements. He also noted that it is a common occurrence in the neighborhood to have porches, some open, some enclosed but it is the character of the neighborhood. He said the subject lot is located at the end of Race Street and backs up to park and there is a large buffer area and fencing located between this property and the park. He said the closest neighbor is located at 165 Birch Ave., approximately 49 feet between the subject property and the neighbor. He also reviewed the existing floor plan and the proposed floor plan with the Board saying that the existing first floor has a kitchen, living room, bathroom and 2 bedrooms. He said the proposal is to preserve the same floor plan and add a dining room, mud room, closet and entry ramp; and the second floor will consist of 2 bedrooms, a master bedroom and 2 bathrooms. He said he believes that the improvements are without detriments, it will be kept as a single family home, it will maintain the open air and light space, it created a better street presence, reuses almost of the structure and its well screened and in keeping with the character of the neighborhood. He noted that without the variance relief the owner will not be

able to live there. He also stated that the lot is very narrow and is what causes the variance relief that is being requested.

Chairman Royce asked Mr. Weiss to address air conditioning units and the parking in the front yard.

Mr. Weiss said the ac units are located on the plans that the Board has. He also said that the driveway is now narrow and there is no possible way to get the parking in the rear of the property.

Chairman Royce said that the construction of a front porch is what prohibits the parking to be located in the rear.

Mr. Weiss noted that even if the porch was not there, there would still be no way to get the parking in the rear. He also noted that a driveway would add more impervious coverage to the lot.

Chairman Royce verified that the applicant is planning on building right up to the town property line.

Mr. Weiss said with the roof overhang it will be 1 foot away from that property line.

Member Cohen asked the applicant if he could acquire the room he needed by only adding a second floor.

Mr. Gessner said there are several issues with that. He would not have a place for everyone to gather for meals and “family time”.

Member Segal inquired about building out towards the rear instead of the front.

Mr. Weiss said that the applicant could build out to the rear instead of the front, but if they do that, they would have to reconfigure the whole downstairs and relocate the kitchen.

Chairman Royce asked the applicant to address the roof drainage and the exterior lighting.

Mr. Weiss said they will be meeting with the engineering dept. to discuss storm water runoff – perhaps rain barrels or a drywell. He said the entrance lighting on the front porch will throw the light downward.

Chairman Royce asked about light pollution of the first floor into the park.

Mr. Weiss noted that there is a large buffer between the lot and the park and that there will be no direct light spillage.

Member Baskerville noted that this lot is located next to a lighted parking lot.

Member Clayton asked if the park can ever be developed.

Mr. Gessner said that the park is designated as “green acres” and can never be developed.

Member Cohen said the architecture is well done but it’s a lot of house for the lot. He is concerned over the addition to the front of the parking. He also said the parking will be right up against the house and he doesn’t see any justification for the applicant to build so close to the side yard.

Mr. Gessner said it wanted it to be wide enough to have a ramp to get his parents in and out of the house.

Member Cohen said his issue is with the mudroom being in the front yard. He said that parking in the front yard is prohibited and he has a big concern with this. He said he thinks there is too much going on in the front of the house.

Mr. Weiss urged the Board to consider the neighborhood and that parking in the front yard is very common.

Mr. Gessner said that when he purchased this lot, he never anticipated these needs. He said he feels this proposal is not too big, especially for three generations of people living together. He said they tried to find the best scenario and thought it best to build towards the park and not the neighbors.

Member Floyd noted that it was stated that this proposal is “in scale with the neighborhood”. He asked if the applicant was referring to the house or the lot.

Mr. Weiss said he was referring to the house.

Member Floyd said the larger houses seems to have wider/larger lots. He said this is a lot of house for a small lot.

Member Segal said she is concerned about the addition on the first floor.

Mr. Gessner said he can understand how it looks as if he is asking for a lot but it really is not a lot. He said it is very difficult to find homes with a living area for parents. He said he likes his house, the neighborhood and the neighbors and really does not want to have to move.

Chairman Royce asked if there were any members of the public who wanted to comment on the application.

Attorney Cayci swore in Mary Lessard, Birch Avenue.

Mrs. Lessard said this is very admirable for the applicant to do this for his parents and she likes the proposal. She said everyone in the neighborhood is very close and she likes the Gessners and hopes the Board will approve their request.

Attorney Cayci swore in Wilomena Weber, 195 Birch Avenue.

Mrs. Weber said she seconds what Mrs. Lessard said and she has no objection to the proposal.

Attorney Cayci swore in Mr. Carnevale, 178 Birch Avenue.

Mr. Carnevale said that he hopes that the Board favorably considers this request. He said the applicants have the opportunity to expand their house and the board should consider approving it. He said the house is at the end of the street and backs up to a park. He said it is a tight lot but what they are proposing will not affect anyone and he urged the Board to give the variances.

Chairman Royce asked if there were any other members of the public who wanted to comment on the application. Hearing none, he closed the public portion of the meeting.

Mr. Gessner said he is hearing there are issues with the front and side setbacks. He said he loves his home and the neighborhood and would be willing to modify his plans and he is trying to understand the Boards comments.

Member Cohen said the Board seems to be concerned about the front and side yard setback because it created a large “mass” on the lot. He said there is a concern over the aesthetics.

Member Segal said she does not see a good reason to grant the variances for the mudroom in the front.

Member Baskerville said as a member of the subject neighborhood, she feels the house is right next to a large open space and what they are trying to do is very minimal. She said the improvements would be a major asset to the community.

Member Clayton said she thinks the proposal fits well into the neighborhood as others have similar setback issues.

Chairman Royce said this is a difficult zoning issue. He said he understands what the applicant is trying to do and is sympathetic but his desires and the zoning ordinance are two different things.

Mr. Weiss noted that the former township zoning requirements are very different than the character of this neighborhood. He said there were many other times that the Board has considered similar variances in this neighborhood and has granted them.

Chairman Royce asked the applicant if he wanted the Board to vote or if he needed some time to go back and make changes and then come back in front of the Board.

Attorney Cayci noted that if this is denied, the Board can't consider the same variances again. The applicant would need to come back with a significant change to the application.

Mr. Gessner said he is running out of time and has to do something with his parents. He said he would respectfully request that the Board carry this application to the next meeting to give him some time to work out a revised plan.

Chairman Royce stated that the application would be carried to the March 26, 2014 meeting.

Member Blanc-Rockstrom said she shares the applicants' compassion but the massive look of the proposal is a big concern to the Board.

The Board recessed for 5 minutes.

- d) BRONZAN, Ruth**  
50 Murray Place  
Block 51.01, Lot 22, R-3  
**C2 & D for secondary senior residence**  
File No. Z13 13-105UV

Present for the hearing were Ruth Bronzan and James Bronzan, applicants; Mark Solomon, Attorney; and Frank Falcone, Engineer/Planner.

Chairman Royce recused himself from hearing this application and left the meeting.

Member Cohen took over as Chair of the meeting.

Attorney Cayci said all of the noticing documents were in order and the Board was in a position to entertain jurisdiction of the application.

Mr. Bridger presented his report saying that the applicant is applying for a d-4/FAR variance to convert the detached garage into a secondary senior residence. He said the applicant is seeking a C-2 variance for the parking stall dimension and the lot width requirement. He said the parking will be located in the front of the garage and there is 1 space required for the main house and 1 space for the secondary residence. He said if the Board is inclined to approve this request, he would suggest that the Board place a deed restriction on the approval limiting the use of the garage space to persons over the age of 62.

Acting Chair Cohen asked if the senior residence needs to be attached to the main house.

Mr. Bridger said no, it does not.

Member Floyd asked if the long driveway satisfies the parking requirement.

Mr. Bridger said it could have, but it needs to be 4 feet from the property line.

Mr. Solomon said he is the attorney representing the applicant. He said the applicant is really seeking a lot area variance for the senior secondary residence. He said it is a permitted use and the ordinance refers to the R-1 standards for an accessory use. He said the proposal meets all of the standards with the exception of the lot area requirement. He noted that all of the lots in the neighborhood are undersized. He said one of the variances is because you can see the garage door from the driveway; he noted the door can be relocated so that you cannot see it from the street. He said if the Board requires it, the applicant can make the parking space 9 X 19 but it will be tight. He noted that all of the other variance requests are for existing conditions. He said this proposal will allow Mrs. Bronzan to live in the secondary residence while her son, his wife and her grandson live in the main house.

Attorney Cayci swore in Mrs. Ruth Bronzan.

Mrs. Bronzan said she is very excited about this proposal. She said she is grounded in the community and would like to stay here. She said the house is much too large for her right now – she would like to downsize but has no intention of moving outside of Princeton.

Attorney Cayci swore in James Bronzan.

Mr. Bronzan said they have been working on the design and said that they will be keeping the garage the way it is except for adding some glazing. He said the garage door will be eliminated and an entrance will be constructed. He also noted that the attic space will not be converted to living space. He said they could move the entrance to side if the Board desires but it makes sense to keep it where it is now. He said he wants to live close to his mother and she doesn't want to leave the community and this seemed to be the best solution. He said he wants his mother to be a part of his life and would like her to be able to age in place and not have to leave the town she loves.

Attorney Cayci swore in Frank Falcone, Engineer/Planner.

Mr. Falcone marked exhibit A-1 titles the Old Borough tax map sheet 51. He showed the Board that there are 28 undersized lots in the neighborhood and having an undersized lot is within the character of the neighborhood.

Mr. Solomon marked exhibit A-2 which are the letters that were sent to the adjacent property owners asking to sell a portion of their lot or to purchase the subject lot. He said that although this is not a teardown he still sent the letters. He said he sent 3 letters and only received one letter back declining to sell or purchase land.

Mr. Falcone discussed the FAR variance. He said the conversion of the garage puts the FAR over the allowable amount. He said the proposed FAR is 49.4% which is 94 square feet over the allowable.

Mr. Solomon said with regards to the FAR standards, the lot can accommodate the FAR because it is already there. He also noted that the applicant complies with the number of parking spaces (2) and if the Board thinks it is necessary they will comply with the 9 x 19 requirement.

Mr. Falcone marked exhibit A-3 titled the variance plan which showed the existing and proposed conditions of the lot.

Acting Chair Cohen asked if the parking could be shifted closer to the street.

Mr. Falcone said no, the second car would not clear the porch.

Acting Chair Cohen suggested angling the spaces to make it easier.

Mr. Bronzan stated that they designed the parking to avoid the feeling of a parking lot. He said this plan is still better than what currently exists.

Mr. Falcone said he does not feel that that there will be any problems that will arise from this proposal. He said he thinks it is a good design for the existing conditions.

Mr. Solomon asked Mr. Falcone if this proposal was in keeping with the goals of the Master Plan and if he felt that the benefits would outweigh any detriments.

Mr. Falcone said this proposal will provide housing needs for the handicap/senior residents as stated in the Master Plan. He also stated that there is no substantial detriment. He said this promotes the positive criteria. He said most importantly this proposal is not adding anything to the site; it is using the site as it exists now. He said he feels it is an appropriate use for the property.

Member Segal asked how many bedrooms are in the main house.

Mr. Bronzan said there are 4 bedrooms.

Acting Chair Cohen asked if there were any members of the public who wanted to comment on the application. Hearing none he closed the public portion of the meeting.

Mr. Solomon said the increase in the FAR is increasing by way of the use of the garage – it's an existing condition – they are not adding anything to the lot. He said the aesthetics of the proposal makes this lot more appealing to the neighborhood. He humbly requested that the Board approve the application.

Member Segal said she sees no reason not to approve the requested variances.

Acting Chair Cohen said this proposal will have a positive effect on the community and he thinks the parking will sort itself out. He said he likes what the applicants are proposing.

Attorney Cayci reiterated the variance requests saying the applicants are seeking variances for c1/c2 & d – far, parking space size and the view of the entrance door.

Acting Chair Cohen said the applicant has provided proof for both the granting of the variances.

**Upon motion made** by Sara Segal and seconded by Louisa Clayton, a motion was made to approve the application of Ruth Bronzan as it was presented with the condition that there is a deed restriction placed on the lot limiting the use of the garage to any persons over the age of 62.

**ROLL CALL:**       Aye   **Penelope Baskerville**  
                          Aye   **Louisa Clayton**  
                          Aye   **Michael Floyd**  
                          Aye   **Sara Segal**  
                          Aye   **Doreen Blanc-Rockstrom**  
                          Aye   **Steven Cohen**

**2. ADJOURNMENT:**

**Upon motion made** by Michael Floyd and seconded by Louisa Clayton, a motion was made to adjourn the meeting at 10:45 p.m.

**ROLL CALL:**       Aye   **Penelope Baskerville**  
                          Aye   **Louisa Clayton**  
                          Aye   **Michael Floyd**  
                          Aye   **Sarah Segal**  
                          Aye   **Doreen Blanc-Rockstrom**  
                          Aye   **Steven Cohen**

**Respectfully Submitted,**



**Debra Rogers, Secretary**

**Date Approved:** March 26, 2014