

**Charter Township Of Lyon
Planning Commission Meeting
Meeting Minutes
May 8, 2006**

Approved as written on June 24, 2006

Date: May 8, 2006
Time: 7:00 PM
Place: 58000 Grand River

Mr. Barber called the meeting to order at 7:01 P.M.

Roll Call

Present: Barber, Mike (Chair)
Dome, Jim
Hamilton, Jim
Hicks, John (Board Liaison)
James, Laura (Secretary)
Williams, Laura

Absent:
Soper, Ted

Also present: Philip Seymour, Township Attorney
Chris Doozan, Township Planner
Alexis Marcarello, Township Planner
Michelle Aniol, Township Planner
Al Hogan, Building Official
Chris Olson, Twp. Superintendent

Guests: 60

Ms. James made the motion "that we excuse Mr. Soper due to illness." Mr. Hamilton supported the motion.

Voice vote:
Ayes: all
Nays: none

Motion approved unanimously.

Approval of Agenda:

Mr. Hamilton made the motion "that we approve the agenda for Monday May 8th, 2006."

Ms. Aniol commented that "there are two amendments to the meeting minutes. The header on page two and three need to be changed to today's date." She also asked that Research Federal Union be added to the agenda.

Mr. Hamilton amended his motion "to incorporate what has been said." Ms. Williams supported the motion.

Voice vote:
Ayes: all
Nays: none

Motion approved unanimously.

Approval of Consent Agenda: April 10, 2006

Mr. Hicks moved “to accept the meeting minutes for April 10, as submitted.” Ms. Williams supported the motion.

Voice vote:

Ayes: all

Nays: none

Motion approved unanimously.

Comments from public on Non-Agenda Items:

John Bell 23113 Currie Road – On behalf of the Library Board he requested that in the next meeting, the Library Board be able to present a 10 to 15 minute presentation on the millage that the Library will be seeking in August.

Public Hearings:

- 1. AP-06-11, Josh Haron Paintball Facility Continue public hearing to consider a special use request for a privately owned and operated outdoor recreation facility (paintball) located on the north side of Pontiac Trail, east of Silver Lake Road; discussion and action on the special use and site plan would follow the public hearing.**

Mr. Doozan explained that this is a continuation of the public hearing from the last meeting. There was a site visit on May 3rd and it involved two of the Planning Commissioners. Mr. Doozan commented that he observed that there were two fields that were proposed for the paintball facility. One is farther from the neighbors, and the second is up close to Glynn Lee and Towne Square. He commented that the one field did not seem like it would be in sight of the neighbors and the rear field would give a filtered view of the field from the neighbors, particularly on Glynn Lee. Overall Mr. Doozan felt that the problem was not going to be the view; the critical issue was noise. The gun firing could be heard on Towne Square and Glynn Lee in spite of background noise. One of the participants that came out for the demonstration went to their house on Towne Square and or Glynn Lee and reported that when the gun was fired they could hear it from their house. There was some discussion about moving the fields into the wetlands. After Mr. Doozan looked at the map, he thought that possibility that would not be a good idea. The critical issue was noise. Besides the firing of the guns, there would be voices that could be heard.

Mr. Hamilton commented that the participants were Chris Doozan, Chris Olson, Laura Williams, Jim Hamilton, Josh, and some neighbors and friends of Josh’s. “The fields were not laid out so we could not tell exactly where the fields were going to be put.” Mr. Hamilton’s conclusion was that this is not the right location for paintball because of the intersection, the driveway that comes out on Pontiac Trail, and the location. It is not isolated enough from the neighbors. Mr. Hamilton concluded that he could not support it.

Ms. Williams mentioned that she spoke with Ted Powell and he operated a paintball facility in Salem Township that was shut down due to zoning issues. Ms. Williams spoke with a person in the zoning office at Salem Township to get some more information. It was on a 19.5 acre parcel and there were neighbors on both sides of the parcel and across the street. It was not as residential as this area. Salem Township actually ended by suing the owners of the parcel because they had complaints of noise from the neighbors and had a signed affidavit from a real estate agent about loss of property value for real estate in the area. That concerned Ms. Williams because the Haron property is in a less rural area. Ms. Williams commented that she could not support it.

Open public hearing at 7:13

Bob Myers 60492 Lamplighter – He has lived here for 14 years and enjoys the quiet. He does not want the noise. He opposes it.

Ms. James commented that the Planning Commission has had a lot of public feedback already and the “sub committee’s report makes this cut and dry.” It is not looking good for Mr. Haron, but she encouraged him to try and find some place in the Township that would be appropriate to have paintball.

Public hearing closed at 7:15

Ms. Williams made the motion “that we recommend to the township board to deny AP-06-11 Josh Haron Paintball Facility based on the findings of the subcommittee, comments from the public, and information in the McKenna special land use letter dated March 31. Also, there was no site plan submitted.”

Voice vote:

Ayes: all

Nays: none

Motion approved unanimously.

2. **AP-05-08, Windridge, Public hearing to consider an average lot size development located on the west side of Napier, north of Eight Mile Road; discussion and action on the special use and site plan would follow the public hearing.**

Mr. Doozan reviewed the comments in the McKenna Associates letters dated May 8, 2006.

Ray Cousineau (representing Mr. Harris) – Mr. Cousineau commented that this is not the first review for this piece of property. This is their third review. Mr. Cousineau said he had little time to react to the review letter because they received it the day of the meeting. Some of the comments were repeated from the earlier reviews, which they thought had been addressed. They felt that they were moving along fine and felt they were ready for approval. The critical issue is density. McKenna’s letter on many occasions indicates that many of the lots are unbuildable. He said that was addressed a long time ago. They went as far as to do a detailed analysis of all the lots in question. They employed Ivanhoe Huntley to do an independent evaluation of all the lots. Ivanhoe has indicated that all lots are buildable. Several lots will require architectural attention, but are buildable. They have prepared a parallel plan that they believe complies with all the provisions of the Townships standard ordinance. It is 120 units and does comply with Township ordinances. Mr. Cousineau commented that he thought it came down to which plan the Planning Commission would like. He also feels that all the comments in Mr. Doozan's letter have been addressed or can easily be addressed without significant change to either plan. Mr. Cousineau asked that the Planning Commission act on the adjusted lot size option. If the Planning Commission denies, they ask that they be given specific reasons for denial. They would like to move ahead with a plan to the Township Board. Mr. Cousineau also commented that 1. he has a MDEQ permit in hand for the adjusted lot size plan and also when it comes to creativity of design, prefers the adjusted lot size plan. This site is impacted by 15 acres of wetlands and 9 acres of open space. That is 24 acres of the site being set aside for open space on an 80 acres site. 2. he has a permit in hand from the Road Commission of Oakland County for access on to a major road.

Ms. James asked if Mr. Cousineau was interested in working with the Planning Commission. Mr. Cousineau answered yes, but they have gone through three reviews now. Ms. James commented that he has never gone before the Planning Commission before.

Open public hearing 7:46

Vick Squires 52001 9 Mile – Mr. Squires commented that his concern is the subdivision across the street. The entryways do not line up. He thought the two subdivisions’ entrances should line up.

Close public hearing 7:48

Mr. Olson commented that the Township has received strong reactions to one plan within the Township that did have gas mains cut in across lots. It was approved as a part of a PD many years ago and when they came in with their third phase there was some concern in regards to the gas mains. This site does have a 24-inch high-pressure gas main running on the west and southwest corner of the property. Mr. Olson also commented that he did not know of any recent meetings where they sat down and looked at the design of the plan. The gas main should be separated from the lots based on the reactions the Township has received as it relates to another development.

Mike Warren - Mr. Warren has spoken with gas companies and they have no problem with the lots the way they are. “They could have stated and put restrictions on us when we reworked the easements, but they did not.” They recently granted easements with defined locations. They could have placed restrictions at that time. People will be able to put up fences and use their property.

Mr. Olson asked if that was submitted for review from the utility companies. Mr. Warren answered yes.

Ms. James commented that a subcommittee was the best way to go. Mr. Cousineau commented that he could do that. The subcommittee will be made up of John Hicks, Laura James, and Mike Barber.

Ms. James made the motion “that we table AP-05-08 for up to 60 days to allow the applicant to meet with the subcommittee of the Planning Commission to develop a better site plan.” Mr. Hamilton supported the motion.

Voice vote:

Ayes: all

Nays: none

Motion approved unanimously.

3. AP-06-13, Miles Christi, Public hearing to consider a special use request for a religious house and family center, located on the east side of Johns Road, north of Ten Mile Road; discussion and action on the special use and site plan would follow the public hearing.

Mr. Doozan reviewed the comments in the McKenna Associates letters regarding the special land use and the site plan dated April 24, 2006.

Ms. James asked Mr. Doozan if he still suggested that they table the site plan review even though the Planning Commission received a packet regarding that issue. Mr. Doozan said yes.

Father Patrick Wainwright, MC P.O. Box 701200 Plymouth – Father Wainwright gave a slide show on the proposed Miles Christi Religious House and Family Center. He explained that their religious order is a Catholic community of priests and brothers, and they intend to serve the faithful and spiritual needs of the people in area. Since 2000 they have been working in Plymouth Township and Northville. As they continue to grow, they provide spiritual growth for the faithful, families, and high school/college students. Father Wainwright continued that their ideal site is in Lyon Township and is 19.4 acres. According to the amount of people they plan on serving and the Township zoning, they plan on building a small center with a chapel and the main part would be the religious house and the retreat house. The location is on Johns Road off of Ten Mile Road. There are around 4 acres of wetland and wooded areas, which they intend to respect. Father Wainwright showed various pictures and diagrams of the area and proposed site. There are four phases for the site within a 5-year period. The first phase is the chapel and parking lot. The second phase is the religious house and family center. The third phase is the gym. The fourth phase is the retreat house. Father Wainwright continued to show pictures of proposed site.

Open public hearing at 8:19

Josif Arpasi 24800 Johns Road – Mr. Arpasi is south of the development. He says that everything looks okay, except that they are almost on his property. His house is about 100 feet from the chapel. It is 50 to 60 feet from the driveway. His other concern was in regards to the lighting. He would like a berm or something to keep lights from shining on his property. Mr. Barber commented that the Township has a lighting ordinance that requires all the light to go down. No light will leave their property. Ms. James commented that it could be discussed to put in some screening. The Planning Commission looked at the picture that had Mr. Arpasi’s house in proximity to the development.

Susan Hastings 61782 Fairland Drive – Ms. Hastings is concerned with the car issue. She is for it and thinks that it will improve the quality life in the area.

Linda Pesonen 61472 Tayberry Circle – Ms. Pesonen has been a resident of Lyon Township for 18 years and has seen a lot of changes and growth. She thinks that this is a fantastic use of this property. This will benefit the families and also the community. She appreciates Mr. Arpasi’s concerns but has personally been on a silent retreat and no one says a single word. She also said that the people coming to this would respect other people and their surroundings.

Leonard Lenersky 10165 Marshall Road – Mr. Lenersky took notes during Mr. Doozan’s presentation and found that there were many reasons why the Township should let Miles Christie build and 3 items for there to be an issue and table the proceedings. He urged the Planning Commission to deny Mr. Doozan’s recommendation to table and allow the men to pursue their goals. Mr. Doozan clarified that there were two issues before the Planning Commission one is the special land use and one is the site plan review. Mr. Doozan recommended approval for the special land use and he recommended that the site plan be tabled. This is because the site plan review is incomplete at this time. Mr. Olson commented that it does not have dimensions and other requirements.

William Nobel 275 Eagle Way – Mr. Nobel has seen a lot of development in the area and along 10 Mile. He looks forward to seeing Miles Christi proceed.

Nancy Chenery from Wisconsin – Ms. Chenery commented that although she lives in Wisconsin, she would give anything to have Miles Christi in her town.

Close public hearing 8:35

Ms. James made the motion “that we recommend that the Township Board approve the special land use permit for this institution with the support of the planner, public, and the Planning Commission with specifics to the correspondence from McKenna Associates.” Ms. Williams supported the motion.

Voice vote:

Ayes: all

Nays: none

Motion approved unanimously.

Ms. James made the motion “that we table the site plan for up to 60 days to allow the applicant to button up some housekeeping matters that were outlined in the McKenna review letter. The applicant must also notify the neighbor to the south of the date that they plan on coming back.” Mr. Hicks supported the motion.

Voice vote:

Ayes: all

Nays: none

Motion approved unanimously.

Steven Deak 2045 Baker Road Suite 1 – Mr. Deak commented that a site plan was submitted. At this point there are only four outstanding items. There was further clarification on the architecture. In regards to utilities, Giffels Webster recommended approval of the site plan. Mr. Deak also commented that there are some minor comments outstanding from the letter.

Ms. James asked to be excused at this time.

4. AP-06-16, Twelve Mile Road and Milford Road rezoning, public hearing to consider a Township initiated rezoning of parcels 21-15-101-039, 21-15-101-040, and 21-15-101-041 from RM-1, Suburban Townhouse District to R-0.3. Single Family Residential District, located on the south side of Twelve Mile Road and east of Milford Road; discussion and action would follow the public hearing.

Ms. Aniol reviewed the comments in the McKenna Associates letter dated May 3, 2006.

Open public hearing at 8:50

Robin Allen 28550 Tindale Trail – Mr. Allen attended the meeting on behalf of his parents John and Deloris Allen. His parents own one of the pieces of property being affected by the rezoning. Mr. Allen’s parents feel that this property should be grandfathered. They also own property on the north end of Lake Angela, which is multiple family. They are concerned that may be rezoned as well. They also feel that if it is rezoned, it will result in reduction of their property value. Mr. Allen also read a letter that his father wrote.

Mr. Barber asked what would happen if in 5 or 10 years the property owners want their property to be RM- 1. He asked if they could rezone it? Mr. Doozan commented that they could petition to have it rezoned back. It would be treated as any rezoning.

Caroline Karnafel 56205 12 Mile Road – Ms. Karnafel would like the area to be rezoned because the Township does not need duplexes sitting on small lots. Ms. Karnafel has 3 acres of land and that is what she was required to build on. It does not fit with the plan of the area. Mill River is going to create enough traffic.

Close public hearing at 8:55

Mr. Olson commented that he did not know historically why the property would have been zoned multiple family or rezoned from single family to multiple family. It would be very difficult to develop these lots as multiple family due to right-of-ways, easements, and pervious surface requirements. Mr. Olson also recommended that the Planning Commission define what a medium sized lot is.

Ms. Marcarello commented in regards to sanitary sewer, each parcel would eventually be serviced by a gravity sewer that is under construction right now along Spaulding Road. It would have to be extended down Twelve Mile to service the properties.

Ms. Williams made the motion “that we recommend approval of this proposed rezoning of the three parcels outlined in AP-06-16 21-15-101-039, 21-15-101-040, and 21-15-101-041 from RM-1 suburban townhouse to R-0.3 single family residential.” Mr. Hicks supported the motion.

Voice vote:

Ayes: all

Nays: none

Motion approved unanimously.

Ms. Williams added to her motion “that the reason for the rezoning is stated in the McKenna letter dated May 3, 2006.” Mr. Hamilton supported the motion.

Voice vote:

Ayes: all

Nays: none

Motion approved unanimously.

Old Business:

5. AP-06-09, Meadowcreek of Lyon Planned Development, located on the south side of Ten Mile Road, between Milford and Griswold Roads, Tree replacement plan review.

Ms. Aniol reviewed the comments in the McKenna Associates letter.

Ms. Williams commented that she thought that the Planning Commission and Mr. Goldberg agreed that Mr. Goldberg would start on Phase 1 while a subcommittee was formed and worked on the tree replacement issues.

David Goldberg – Mr. Goldberg commented that when he was last in front of the Planning Commission there was a discussion on procedural issues. He said the question is who is it that has the final authority on the tree replacement plan? Since that time, Mr. Seymour has written a legal opinion that says the body that approves the tree protection plan is the body that has the ultimate say on the proposed site plan. If either one of those bodies is uncomfortable with resolving that it may go to the Zoning Board of Appeals. In the letter it also said that when dealing with a planned unit development it is strictly between the developer and the Township Board. Mr. Goldberg is before the Planning Commission to get some form of recommendation from the Planning Commission to go before the Township Board. Mr. Goldberg also said that it was suggested by the Planning Commission to start on Phase one and follow the existing ordinance because it did not have many trees. Mr. Goldberg’s development is the result of

three sets of developers that have collectively brought a PD together. Due to the fact that their whole planned development was approved together and analyzed together they decided to approach this as a team. It would be unfair to have two people move along and leave the third behind. The subcommittee that the Planning Commission formed has been working on the tree replacement issue, and from what he has seen they are “putting a band-aid on a leg break.” The problem with the Township ordinance is not if the tree is 6 inches or 8 inches. It is the 40-inch trees that are the problem.” He does not think that following the revised ordinance will be beneficial. Mr. Goldberg also said that McKenna’s letter stated that the economic hardship of the sewer is a benefit shared by both the Township and Mr. Goldberg. “This has been a well thought out and negotiated plan and they have spent countless hours with the Planning Commission and Township.” They were told that they got the benefit of having sewer run through their project, and that is cost that Mr. Goldberg would not have to spend. The problem is that they do not have that benefit anymore. They still have the 14% density increase, but do not have the sewer route that was discussed. The sewer has been changed by the Township engineer to go outside the confines of their roads. A lot of the SAD sewer that was going into the project that they were supposed to get the benefit of, they no longer get the benefit of.

Mr. Olson commented that when bids came in for sewer, it came in at 2 million higher than estimated. There are provisions being made at the SAD to provide some measure of relief in initial cash outlay.

Mr. Barber commented that he was not interested in if a project makes money. The Planning Commission’s job is to protect the residents and keep density down. “If you choose not to go ahead after we told you to, that is your choice.” We are trying to work on our ordinance.

Mr. Hicks commented that he was involved in the last tree subcommittee and felt that Mr. Goldberg’s conclusions were very premature.

Mr. Goldberg replied that they are operating within a PD, and when they submitted their planned development plans they stated on the plans, which were approved, the fact that they were never planning on putting replacement trees in there. This problem has derived from a comment that McKenna wrote in one of their response letters. He felt that the comment was not as clear as it could be. Mr. Goldberg continued that he negotiated a deal that was based on economics, and that number has changed. He does not feel the way the current ordinance or standards apply to their property is fair and it does not take into consideration the trees that they are not disturbing.

Ms. Williams commented that we were not here to argue the tree ordinance. “We have a subcommittee set up. We came up with a way for you to proceed with your development, and you do not want to do that.” Ms. Williams also said that in McKenna’s letter, they suggested that we look at some of the trees affected by the SAD and take that into account.

Mr. Hicks commented that they expect the new ordinance soon. The subcommittee is considering many options and had input from several developers. Mr. Goldberg’s company was represented. Mr. Doozan said that in 30 days, we will have better criteria on which to make a decision.

Mr. Barber commented the Planning Commission wants to work with him.

Mr. Hicks asked if Mr. Goldberg had to replace the trees in the construction envelope with sewer. Ms. Aniol explained that in the case of the sanitary easement, the places where he has to put his own sewer, not the SAD, he has to replace. There is a substantial benefit to him because a great majority of where the sanitary sewer SAD is traveling is in the same place where his road is going. Ms. Aniol also clarified that “the issue about tree replacement, regardless of whether there was a notation on the plan that they were replacing or not replacing, in more than one letter prior to the approval of the preliminary PD plan, McKenna stated the requirements for tree protection, preservation, and replacement. It did not come up at the end or at approval.” Mr. Olson also added that the tree protection ordinance is part of the regular code of the Township, as opposed to the zoning ordinance. The Board is the one that deals with the issue. Regardless of what was put on the preliminary PD plan, that is a decision that is not made at this point. The Board would have to make a specific vote to waive that requirement.

Mr. Doozan commented that two weeks from tonight, the Planning Commission will have in their hand the amendments to the tree protection ordinance. The purpose is to discuss them and make a recommendation to the

Township Board. Mr. Doozan suggested that Mr. Goldberg wait for the meeting and set up a subcommittee to meet the day after the meeting. This is because there are little details that need to be worked out.

Mr. Goldberg asked what waiting for the subcommittee would do. Mr. Goldberg commented that it has been roughly 3 years, and he has not seen the Township Board. Mr. Goldberg asked if he went to the May 22nd meeting, would he be guaranteed that a recommendation is going to be made? He also asked if he could go straight to the Board and jump the gun. Mr. Doozan commented that the only thing the Planning Commission has to base information on this evening is the existing ordinance.

Mr. Goldberg also made the statement that they are the only development in the sewer project that has a SAD going through their property. Mr. Olson commented that was not true. Mr. Goldberg commented that his entire project was designed around the sewer. He recognizes the fact that the sewer project does not happen until it runs through his property. The problem that Mr. Goldberg has is when he goes and develops phase one based on the existing ordinance and has no answer on what is going to happen in phase two, he would have had to let the Township develop sewer through his project. That would leave the people in phase two with no leverage to work with the Township. If the Township does not believe that running sewer through his project and the fact that a lot of trees are impacted by the sewer, then maybe Mr. Goldberg's project and the SAD are things that need to be reconsidered. He and his partners have been willing to go along with this in order to have the SAD go along, but they are not prepared to allow the SAD to precede and not their development. "The SAD goes forward when we go forward. Until we can get resolution on what is going to happen on our project, we are just going to have to sit tight on the SAD."

Ms. Aniol commented that there are 564 protected trees to come out in the construction limit and building envelope. The comments in the McKenna letter stated that the sanitary sewer in the area could be up to 100 feet wide, and that is confirmed by the Township engineer. The amount of trees in that area could be significantly reduced. The Township will only reduce based on the existing ordinance. If Mr. Goldberg is not willing to go that way, then he has to go by what Mr. Doozan has said and wait for the amended ordinance. We are trying to work with Mr. Goldberg. Those are the two options.

Mr. Goldberg commented that all he wants is a recommendation to go to the Township Board.

Mr. Hicks asked if Mr. Goldberg could go to the Board without a recommendation. Mr. Seymour said that he has to have a recommendation.

Ms. Williams commented that without numbers that reflect the trees affected by the SAD it is hard to tell. There may not even be a hardship.

Mr. Dome commented that he does not know his new numbers. He commented that Mr. Goldberg is getting upset with the wrong people. The trees on his property did not grow in the three years he has been working on the plan.

The Planning Commission discussed the option of sending Mr. Goldberg to the Board or having Mr. Goldberg come back to the Planning Commission on May 22nd.

Mr. Barber asked Mr. Goldberg to sit down so the Planning Commission could discuss the issue.

Mr. Dome commented that he did not understand how coming on May 22nd was going to help Mr. Goldberg. He is not going to be able to identify the cost savings.

Ms. Williams made the motion "that we table AP-06-09 Meadowcreek of Lyon Planned Development until May 22nd." Mr. Hamilton supported the motion.

Voice vote:

Ayes: all

Nays: none

Motion approved unanimously.

New Business:

6. AP-06-15, T-Mobile Wireless Co-location, North side of Ten Mile Road, west of Johns Road in the Woodwind Development, site plan review.

Ms. Aniol reviewed the comments in the McKenna Associates letter dated April 21, 2006.

Mr. Hicks made the motion “to approve AP-06-15 as long as the criteria in McKenna’s April 21, 2006 is meet.” Mr. Dome supported the motion.

Voice vote:

Ayes: all

Nays: none

Motion approved unanimously.

7. Research Federal Credit Union.

Mr. Doozan explained that the Research Federal Credit Union is a business that would like to be located in the Lyon Towne Center. They do have some architectural plans that they wanted to show to the Planning Commission informally to get some input and guidance.

Paul Regretta – Mr. Regretta explained that he has met with the developer and McKenna to show them the architectural development. It was explained that this would be the middle out lot between Discount Tire and Liberty Chevrolet.

Mark Zimmerman – Mr. Zimmerman explained that the building is 5,000 square foot, brick, a single story, and 14 feet high with a flat roof. He also explained that they are trying to build something unique. He showed to the Planning Commission various diagrams of the proposed building.

Mr. Barber asked if this is how all Research Federal Credit Unions look. Catherine Roberts answered that this is their prototype design that they are going to do to all of their facilities.

Ms. Williams commented that it did not seem to look like anything in Lyon Town Center.

Mr. Dome asked about their intensions of signage. Mr. Zimmerman answered that signage would likely occur on the frontage/south elevation of the building and on the rear of the building facing the freeway.

Mr. Dome commented that he liked it because it is different.

The Planning Commission discussed materials that will be used on the building.

Mr. Dome commented that he thought something needed to be done with the drive through canopy.

Ms. Williams commented that she was concerned with how it would look in the area and with the other buildings. Mr. Hicks agreed and commented that the tall wall exposed made the building look incomplete.

The Planning Commission discussed changing the color of the wall that was exposed.

Mr. Barber adjourned the meeting at 10:25 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Catherine Culver

Catherine Culver
Recording Secretary

