

**PRINCETON ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT**  
**Minutes of Regular Meeting**  
**Wednesday, March 26, 2014– 6:30pm**  
**Main Meeting Room**  
**400 Witherspoon Street, Princeton, NJ 08540**

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

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

**ABSENT:** Sara Segal

There were twenty-five (25) members of the public present.

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

**1. MINUTES:**  
**a) February 26, 2014**

**Upon motion made** by Penelope Baskerville and seconded by Louisa Clayton, a motion was made to adopt the minutes of February 26, 2014 as written and amended.

**ROLL CALL:**     **Aye**   **Penelope Baskerville**  
                  **Aye**   **Louisa Clayton**  
                  **Aye**   **Michael Floyd**  
                  **Aye**   **Richard Kahn**  
                  **Aye**   **Doreen Blanc-Rockstrom**  
                  **Aye**   **Barrie Royce**

**b) March 5, 2014**

**Upon motion made** by Steven Cohen and seconded by Penelope Baskerville, a motion was made to adopt the minutes of March 5, 2014 as written and amended.

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

**2. RESOLUTIONS OF MEMORIALIZATION:**

- a) Tenacre Foundation**  
1036 Great Road  
Block 1901, Lot 11, R-A  
**D – 2 Family Residence**  
**File No. Z13 13-116U**

**Upon motion made** by Penelope Baskerville and seconded by Steven Cohen, a motion was made to adopt the resolution for Tenacre Foundation as written and amended.

**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>Doreen Blanc-Rockstrom</b>
<b>Aye</b>	<b>Barrie Royce</b>

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

**Upon motion made** by Steven Cohen and seconded by Louisa Clayton, a motion was made to adopt the resolution of Ruth Bronzan as written and amended.

**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>Doreen Blanc-Rockstrom</b>
<b>Aye</b>	<b>Barrie Royce</b>

- c) Chabad Lubavitch of Greater Mercer County**  
645 State Road  
Block 2701, Lot 3, R-A & R-2  
**Major Site Plan/Place of Worship – D Variance/C Variances/Conditional Use**  
**File No. Z13 13-030PUV**

**Upon motion made** by Doreen Rockstrom and seconded by Penelope Baskerville, a motion was made to adopt the resolution of Chabad Lubavitch of Greater Mercer County as written and amended.

**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>Doreen Blanc-Rockstrom</b>
<b>Aye</b>	<b>Barrie Royce</b>

**3. APPLICATIONS:**

- a) **CARLPARKS 141 LLC**  
141 Linden Lane  
Block 7302, Lot 2, R-8  
**C1/C2 – New House and SYSB for Garage**  
File No. Z13 13-119V

Present for the hearing were Marina Rubina, Architect; and Christopher Costa, Attorney.

Attorney Cayci reminded the Board that they took jurisdiction at the previous meeting and are in a position to continue the application.

Attorney Cayci swore in Derek Bridger.

Mr. Bridger discussed his report with the Board. He said the applicants are seeking a C1 variance for a single-family structure because the lot is non-conforming when it comes to lot area. He said they are also seeking a C2 variance in order to rebuild an existing non-conforming garage in its current location. He said the applicants will try to repair the garage, but if they can't, they would like to rebuild it in the same location. He noted that the house is in disrepair and the applicants are proposing to demolish the existing house and rebuild a new one that will meet all of the zoning requirements. He said the applicants will need to demonstrate that they have contacted the adjoining property owners in regards to purchasing land from them to make this lot conforming.

Mr. Costa said he is the attorney representing the applicant Carl parks 141 LLC. He said they are requesting 2 variances. He said the first variance is a C1 hardship variance to rebuild the existing house because the lot is non-conforming regarding the lot area. He said the existing house is approx. 2300 sf and the proposed house is approximately 2400. He noted that the new house will be better oriented on the lot so there will be no encroachments into the side yards. He noted that all of the lots in the neighborhood are non-conforming and there is no opportunity to purchase any land to make this lot conforming. He said the second variance is for a C2 variance and they are only requesting this variance in case they cannot repair the existing garage. He said

they will try to repair it, but he doesn't know what problems they may run into and rather than having to come back, the applicants would rather obtain the variance now, if possible. He noted that the garage lines up with the driveway and that is why they would like to keep it in the same location.

Attorney Cayci swore in Marina Rubina.

Ms. Rubina discussed the plans that were submitted to the Board by presenting them in a PowerPoint presentation. She showed the Board where in the R-8 zoning district the property is located and stated that the property is 0.18 acres where 0.195 is required. She went over the plot plan with the Board saying that the new house will meet all of the zoning requirements and will not need any variances for the structure.

Chairman Royce noted that the existing plot plan shows a large deck area and asked the applicants if they would be keeping it.

Ms. Rubina said she is not sure because the final plans for the house have not been designed. She said the applicants wanted to see if the variances were approved first. She said the existing structure is made of concrete and makes it virtually impossible to bring up to code and said it is much more cost effective and easier to knock it down and rebuild a complying structure. She also noted that the other homes in the neighborhood average 2200-2400 sf.

Mr. Costa said the neighbors are being represented by an attorney Mr. Peter O'Neill and they have voiced some concerns and asked for some concessions. He said they are asking for the new house to be moved further away from them. He said the applicant has their other concerns under consideration but is unwilling to commit to them until there is a final design for the house. He said they would like the applicant to move the air conditioning unit to the rear of the property, right now it is on the side closest to them; they are requesting that the cherry tree in the rear be removed and they would like the applicant to move their fence closer to the applicants lot. He again stated that the applicant will consider these requests but cannot commit at this point.

Chairman Royce stated that if the fence was moved closer to the applicants' property, the neighbors would need to come onto the applicants' property in order to maintain it.

Mr. Costa said that was correct.

Mr. Costa said he does not feel that the applicant's requests are detrimental to the neighborhood and the proposal will bring the structure into compliance with the zoning requirements and be more consistent with the other homes in the neighborhood. He said he feels that the applicant has met the positive criteria and asked the Board to approve the application.

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

Mr. Peter O'Neill said he is representing the adjacent property owners to the north. He said the new house will shadow his client's house and as a result they would like to have a cherry tree removed to allow more light onto their lot.

Chairman Royce asked Mr. Bridger if this proposal conforms to the height to setback ratio.

Mr. Bridger noted that the design is not final yet, but there is not a height to setback requirement in this zoning district.

Member Clayton inquired about the combined side yard setback requirement.

Mr. Bridger said it is 20 feet between the 2 side yards.

Ms. Rubina stated that the side with the greater setback would be given to the neighbors to the north to help with their concerns.

Mr. O'Neill stated that the neighbors would also like to see the ac unit at the rear of the property in order to alleviate some of the noise.

Chairman Royce noted that the noise level requirement will be the same where ever it is located on the lot.

Ms. Rubina said the applicant is very conscience of the ac unit noise level.

Member Floyd asked where the applicant is proposing to put the new ac units.

Ms. Rubina said the current ac units violate the setback requirements but the new units will comply.

Mr. Costa said the new design will improve all of the pre-existing non-conformities.

Mr. O'Neill said that they his clients house sits sideways on their lot and they look south onto this lot.

Chairman Royce stated that the applicants have said that their new design will comply with all of the zoning requirements.

Mr. O'Neill again stated that his clients would like to see the cherry tree removed and the ac units located to the rear of the property.

Member Kahn stated that it is not in the Boards jurisdiction to be part of the negotiations between the neighbors. He said the applicants should speak to the neighbors and their plans and work something out amicably.

Mr. Costa stated that they will have open discussions with the neighbors once they have a final design but at this point the applicant would rather not commit to anything without a design.

Chairman Royce asked if there were any other members of the public who wanted to comment on this application. Hearing none, he closed the public portion and the Board went into deliberative session.

Chairman Royce said the request for a C2 variance sounded reasonable.

Member Clayton asked if the applicant would be re-using the slab for the garage.

Ms. Rubina said if they are able to, they will re-use the slab.

**Upon motion made** by Richard Kahn and seconded by Penelope Baskerville, a motion was made to approve the application of Carlparks 141 LLC as it has been presented to the Board.

**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>Richard Kahn</b>
<b>Aye</b>	<b>Doreen Blanc-Rockstrom</b>
<b>Aye</b>	<b>Barrie Royce</b>

b) **GESSNER, Joseph**  
30 Race Street  
Block 6902, Lot 55, R-9  
**C1/C2 and D FAR for an addition and FY Parking**  
File No. Z14 14-007UV

Present for the hearing were Mr. Gessner, applicant; Mr. Joseph Weiss, Architect; and Mr. Mark Solomon, Attorney.

Chairman Royce noted that this application has been carried from the March 5, 2014 meeting.

Chairman Royce asked Mr. Bridger to describe the revisions that were made to the original proposal.

Mr. Bridger noted that the applicant reduced the front-yard setback request, reduced the side-yard setback request and has eliminated the roof terrace. He noted that the applicants also reduced the FAR from 57% to 53% wherein the maximum proportional FAR is 47%.

Mr. Solomon said that he is the attorney representing Mr. Gessner. He said while he did not represent Mr. Gessner at the March 5, 2014 meeting, he was in the audience and heard the comments and concerns from the Board. He said Mr. Gessner reached out to him for guidance and he is hopeful that the Board will find that the applicant has made a good faith effort to address the concerns and the will find this to be a good design. He said the applicant went back

and considered all of the comments from the Board and realized this is primarily about the FAR. He said he feels that any problems with the FAR can be accommodated and will have no substantial detriment to the general welfare. He said with regards to the side yard located near Community Park, the applicant will be willing to remove the concrete patio that encroaches into the setback. He also noted that the applicant's property is uniquely situated on the street where the house sits at the end of the street and backs up to the park. He noted that at the end of the day, the applicant is proposing this application so that his parents can come and live with him and he can oversee their care. He said the applicant listened to the Board comments and concerns and is prepared to present a plan that he thinks will work well.

Attorney Cayci swore in Joseph Gessner.

Mr. Gessner thanked the Board for allowing him the time to go back and look at his proposal. He said he listened to the Boards concerns about the original plan that it was too big, too close to the street, too close to the park and also the concerns over the front-yard parking. He said he tried to make some adjustments to the plans however he said the plan needs to work economically and environmentally. He said they took a serious look at the rear of the property but they would like to keep the kitchen where it is so that they have space to sit and eat together as one unit. He said they pulled the front of the house in 3 ½ feet. He said they were able to cut back and still have enough room to get a wheelchair around the dining room table. He said they reduced the sides so that they are able to walk around the parameter of the property and they have removed the terrace and reduced the size of the master bedroom. He also noted that they will be removing the concrete slab at the rear of the property. He also noted that by doing all of this they have reduced the FAR by approximately 4%. He said he thinks this new design fits well in the neighborhood. He said with regards to the parking issue, he said he needs to be able to get his parents in the house safely and said perhaps the Board may consider allowing him to park on the side of the house. He said he tried very hard to address all of the issues, and the he also noted that he is very lucky to have the support of his neighbors.

Chairman Royce said that it appears there is a parking space in the South side-yard; however the applicant asked for 2 parking spaces in the front-yard and is now asking for a parking space on the side. He asked if 1 car disappeared or will the cars be stacked on the side.

Mr. Solomon stated that the applicant is suggesting that he can live with one space. He said this is a unique area and there is very little detriment to the neighborhood by having a front-yard parking space and stated that the Board could approve it.

Mr. Gessner said he would like to have 2 parking spaces but that he can live with one if that is what the Board desires.

Chairman Royce said the question is if the cars will be cascaded on the side-yard and also asked if that area could be screened.

Mr. Gessner said yes, it could be screened.

Attorney Cayci swore in Joseph Weiss.

Mr. Weiss noted for the record that the area on the side of the house being considered for the parking is a space that is 8 X 19 and the parking space requirement is 9 X 19; the Board would have to grant a variance for the size of the parking space.

Chairman Royce said a side-yard variance may be easier to consider than a front-yard – but asked where the other car would go.

Mr. Weiss said there will be just enough room to stack the cars in the side-yard, but the end of the car will still be in the front-yard.

Member Clayton said essentially the applicant is proposing to use what is currently being used.

Mr. Weiss said the driveway would be pulled more along the southern property line.

Chairman Royce noted that people at the park would see a vehicle parked there as well as the people walking down Race Street.

Mr. Solomon noted that the mudroom on the original plans is now a very small storage area.

Mr. Weiss noted that the applicant has really pulled back this design to a functional minimum.

Mr. Weiss presented a PowerPoint for the Board and that was marked as exhibit A-2. He went over the original design and showed how the applicant made changes to accommodate the Board's concerns.

Mr. Solomon said that the applicant has presented his case and he would like to reserve comment for after the public comment.

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

Attorney Cayci swore in Stephanie Chorney.

Ms. Stephanie Chorney, Race Street, said she has met with Mr. Gessner regarding his proposal and she was very happy that he hired a local architect to work with him on the project. She said she enjoys having Mr. Gessner as a neighbor and would like him to be comfortable in his house with his family. She said everyone parks in the front-yard, most homes are 2 stories and he is asking to expand his house for a specific reason so he can take care of his aging parents. She said he approves of the design and asked the Board to do so as well.

Attorney Cayci swore in Ronald Lessard.

Mr. Lessard, Birch Avenue, noted that safety is a concern in this neighborhood when parking on the street. He asked the Board to approve the front-yard parking to keep the cars off the street. He said the more cars that are on the street, the more dangerous it is.

Attorney Cayci swore in Soren Hastrup.

Mr. Hastrup, Birch Avenue, said he received variances for his home on Birch Avenue. He noted that all of the lots in this neighborhood are non-conforming. He said everyone knows each other and he said Mr. Gessner has a beautiful family and he would love to see the Board consider this request. He said the people in this neighborhood live close and is close knit.

Attorney Cayci swore in Patrick \*\*, 31 Race Street.

Patrick said he has no objection to this design and he urged the Board to grant the front-yard parking spaces to Mr. Gessner. He noted that the improvements to the house will be a great improvement to the neighborhood.

Attorney Cayci swore in Tracey Young.

Ms. Young said she is the neighbor to the southside and she supports the parking, because it will be less of an impact than if it was on the street. She said she supports his whole application.

Attorney Cayci swore in Carol Knigge, Birch Avenue.

Mrs. Knigge said she has lived in the neighborhood for 20 years and she herself has been through the variance process. She said with regards to the parking, everyone parks in front of their homes. She noted that in Mr. Gessner's case, it will be dangerous to have a handicap person on the street. She said what Mr. Gessner is trying to do is very commendable and goes with the character of this neighborhood. She also noted for the record that people are always parking illegally in front of his house during sporting events at the park. She asked the Board to approve his application.

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

Mr. Solomon said that the applicant is asking for an FAR variance and there will be no detriment to the general welfare. He said this is a great neighborhood and the whole point of this application is to be able to bring his elderly parents to live with him. He said that supports the goals in the Master Plan. He said he thinks granting the variance will have no substantial detriment to the public good, zone plan or zoning ordinance. He said he hope the Board finds this adjustments acceptable and acts favorably on the application.

Member Kahn said this is a simple application that is consistent with other applications that the Board has heard in this neighborhood.

Member Clayton said this lot is unique and the proposal is in keeping with the neighborhood. She noted that she thinks the front-yard parking makes for a safer situation for all concerned.

Member Baskerville said she supports the front-yard parking and the improvements to the house will be a benefit to the neighborhood.

Member Cohen said he feels the overall project will be a benefit to the community.

Ms. Blanc-Rockstrom said she is satisfied with how the applicant has scaled back the plan and she is in favor of the front-yard parking because the reasons are compelling.

Chairman Royce said with regards to the parking, he thinks it's a necessity to get both cars on the lot.

**Upon motion made** by Penelope Baskerville and seconded by Louisa Clayton, a motion was made to approve the application of Joseph Gessner as it has been revised and granting the front-yard parking request.

**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>Richard Kahn</b>
<b>Aye</b>	<b>Doreen Blanc-Rockstrom</b>
<b>Aye</b>	<b>Barrie Royce</b>

- c) **NASSAU PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH**  
61 Nassau Street  
Block 45.01, Lot 40, E-1/E-2  
**C&D Variances, Minor Site Plan & Preservation Plan Approval**  
**Central Historic District**  
File No. Z13 13-108PUV

Present for the meeting was William Wakefield, Nassau Pres. Church; Dan Haggerty, Attorney; Thomas O'Shea, Engineer/Planner; and Michael Mills, Architect.

Mr. Bridger went over his report saying the applicant is applying for a d4 – FAR variance, as well as “C” variances, preservation plan approval and was classified a minor site plan. He said the property is located in the E-1 & E-2 zone in the former Princeton Borough and also has frontage along the Kings Highway Historic District. He said the applicants are proposing to add to classrooms to the third floor along with an entire renovation of the third floor. He said prior renovations to the church eliminated the classrooms and this will enable the church to regain the classroom space. He said the addition will not be visible from the west side and will only be visible from the east side on Nassau Street when the trees are bare. He said the applicants are seeking variances for parking – with the additional square footage the applicant is required to have 7 more parking spaces; and the applicant is also seeking variances for side yard setbacks for

the addition. He said there is no new structure being built therefore no site plan review is required because nothing is changing on the site. He also discussed the HPC report saying the commission recommended approval of the variances and that they would have a subcommittee that would work with the applicant.

Mr. Haggerty said he brought three witnesses with him; William Wakefield, Church representative; Thomas O'Shea, Engineer/Planner; and Michael Mills, Architect. He said this is a plan that the applicant has been working on for years. He noted that the first two renovations did not require any zoning relief.

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

Attorney Cayci swore in William Wakefield.

Mr. Wakefield said the phase 1 plan consisted of expanding the restrooms in order to make them handicap accessible and by doing so they lost 3 classrooms. He said phase 2 was an upgrade to the HVAC and Fire Protection Sprinkler System of the building. He said with this phase, phase 3, they would like to regain the classrooms by adding space to the third floor of the church. He said there have only been 5 additions to the church since it was organized. He said right now they have 19 parking spaces and it seems to work well. He said the church also offers a van service for its patrons at Stoneridge and there are people who walk to the church and others who use the meters on Nassau Street. He said this phase is very important as it will help the church provide Christian education for its youth.

Attorney Cayci swore in Thomas O'Shea.

Mr. O'Shea noted that this application has no site plan however they do have one site issue and that is to change the heads on the fire connection at the front of the church. He submitted exhibit A-1 which is the site plan for the church. He noted that all of the "C" variances for setbacks are due to existing conditions. He said the east side is 8 feet from the property line, the west is 27.6 and the rear is 11.7 feet from the property line. He said all of the additions are within the existing footprint and will promote the public good. He said the additions will be screened and there will be no impairment to the zone plan or zoning ordinance. He said the use is already there and the parking variance will have no detriment to the public good. He said this application is exempt from D&R Canal Commission review and the Mercer County Planning Board was not interested in hearing this.

Attorney Cayci swore in Michael Mills, Architect.

Mr. Mills said the existing building is of great historic significance. He submitted exhibit A-2 which are photo's of the existing building. He said it is a masonry building with framing and there are newer sections are metal trusses that are covered with stucco. He submitted exhibit A-3 which shows the historic growth of the church. He said the church was built in 1836, in 1876 it was extended, in 1907 a wing and second story were added, 1940-1953 the side wings were added, 1988 music room was added. He said now they would like to add two 700 square feet

classrooms and renovated the remaining areas of the third floor. He noted that the additions would be built on the roof. He submitted exhibit A-4 which is the third floor plan. He submitted exhibit A-5 which is a rendering of the proposed additions. He showed the view from Princeton University and the view from Nassau Street. He said they spoke to Princeton University and to the Historic Preservation Commission and the only concern was the color of the glass, they would like to see something that is not too reflective.

Mr. Haggerty asked Mr. Mills if there was any other place to put the addition.

Mr. Mills said he thinks this proposal works; there is no other place to put the addition. He said there has been one design change and that consisted of us cutting back the cornice. He said they are not making and non-conforming issue worse – this is the only logical place to put the addition. He said this addition will have a very minimal impact on the streetscape. He submitted exhibit A-6 which is a view from Nassau Street and noted that one will only be able to see about 4 feet of the addition from Nassau Street.

Chairman Royce asked about the visibility with the illumination at night.

Mr. Mills said they will use indirect lighting and there will be no spillage onto the adjoining properties.

Mr. Wakefield noted that the classrooms are used primarily Sunday mornings and a church group may use them in the early evenings.

Member Blanc-Rockstrom asked if the parking would be eliminated with this addition.

Mr. O'Shea stated that everything will remain the same; there will not be any parking eliminated.

Member Cohen asked if there would be an elevator to the third floor.

Mr. Mills said that will be included in the next phase of renovations.

Mr. Cohen said the ADA requires an elevator.

Mr. Wakefield noted that a classroom can be temporarily relocated in order to accommodate a handicap youth.

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 and the Board went into deliberative session.

Member Kahn said he thought this was a nice application that was carefully thought out. He said there will be no impacts on the site, the FAR is a moot point and he thought this proposal was very well done.

Member Cohen said also stated that the application was well done and thought the applicants did an excellent job on the additions.

**Upon motion made** by Richard Kahn and seconded by Steven Cohen, a motion was made to approve the application of Nassau Presbyterian Church as it has been presented with the condition that the applicant meets the conditions as stated in the staff reports and the memo from the Historic Preservation Commission.

**ROLL CALL:**       Aye    **Penelope Baskerville**  
                      Aye    **Louisa Clayton**  
                      Aye    **Steven Cohen**  
                      Aye    **Michael Floyd**  
                      Aye    **Richard Kahn**  
                      Aye    **Doreen Blanc-Rockstrom**  
                      Aye    **Barrie Royce**

**4. ADJOURNMENT:**

**Upon motion made** by Michael Floyd and seconded by Louisa Clayton, a motion was made to adjourn the meeting at 10:40 p.m.

**ROLL CALL:**       Aye    **Penelope Baskerville**  
                      Aye    **Louisa Clayton**  
                      Aye    **Steven Cohen**  
                      Aye    **Michael Floyd**  
                      Aye    **Richard Kahn**  
                      Aye    **Doreen Blanc-Rockstrom**  
                      Aye    **Barrie Royce**

**Respectfully Submitted,**



**Debra Rogers, Secretary**

Date Approved: April 23, 2014