

**TOWN OF HADDAM
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
PUBLIC MEETING/HEARING
TOWN HALL
21 FIELD PARK DRIVE, HADDAM, CT
THURSDAY, 19 OCTOBER 2017
UNAPPROVED MINUTES
*Subject to Approval by the Commission***

ATTENDANCE

X	Steven Bull, Vice Chairman
A	Arthur Kohs
X	Michael Lagace
X	Jamin Laurenza, Chairman
X	Wayne LePard
X	Carmelo Rosa
X	Edward Wallor, Secretary
A	Robert Braren, Alternate
X	Raul de Brigard, Alternate
X	Frank (Chip) Frey, Alternate
X	Liz West Glidden, Town Planner
X	Bunny Hall Batzner, Recording Clerk

1. Call to Order

Mr. Laurenza, chairman, called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. Attendance/Seating of the Alternates

Attendance was taken and all regular and alternate members were seated.

3. Additions/Corrections to the Agenda

None.

4. Public Comments

WFS, Inspection - Ed Schwing reported there have been a number of trucks from WFS on Beaver Meadow Road; and asked if an inspection will be conducted. Mrs. Glidden reported an inspection is held every year - flyover in December and material analyzed in January. Mr. Schwing thanked Mrs. Glidden.

Higganum Pharmacy Public Hearing - Mark Lundgren commended the Commission and Attorney Mark Branse on their work at the hearing, but voiced concern over the perception the audience felt from it. Mr. Lundgren felt there were surprises by the applicant's and Commission's staff, the audience being overwhelmed by the hearing, and the Commission appearing to be anti-business. Mr. Lundgren also felt there wasn't a need for Attorney Branse's presence, that a phone call to and/or letter from him may have handled the matter; and suggested Mr. Branse conduct a land use workshop for the Commission (money better spent). Mr. Lundgren stated items such as landscaping are usually done by professionals and prior to a hearing; and the appearance was that there was no pre-planning. Mr. Lundgren suggested a discussion be started in regard to understanding the regulations and how they affect current/future applicants.

Mrs. Glidden thanked Mr. Lundgren for attending the meeting and sharing his thoughts. In response to his comments, Mrs. Glidden asked what Mr. Lundgren meant by staff surprises. Mr. Lundgren stated he knows Mr. Benjamin quite well and his body language indicated he was taken by surprise. A number of Commissioners asked surprised by what. Mr. Lundgren stated he felt by suggestions of changes to what he thought were already agreed upon for landscaping, but he may be wrong. Mrs. Glidden explained what took place from the time the application was submitted, through the Architectural Review Committee's (ARC) meeting, and P&Z's hearing/meeting. Mr. Laurenza showed Mr. Lundgren a set of plans from a previous application and stated the applicant came in with a complete set of plans and his professional representatives allowing the Commission time prior to the hearing to review; and during the hearing, to ask questions and make an informed decision in a timely manner. However, in the case of Mr. McKenna's application, plans were not complete and it was not the Commission's doing that the hearing was so lengthy.

Discussion followed in regard to the existing building and increasing the size of the pharmacy by 50 percent. Mr. Lundgren asked if the Commission is looking for the same level of application for a 25 percent addition to a building as opposed to a new building with the Commission and Mrs. Glidden responding yes. Mr. Bull noted the Commission received wonderful plans as well as landscaping from the liquor store. Mrs. Glidden stated when Mr. McKenna approached the town in regard to the addition; he was given the ARC criteria sheet, and, therefore, was well aware of what was required, but submitted a site plan that was devoid of the basic criteria. Mrs. Glidden also stated the applicant was made aware the plans were subpar, but chose to move forward to ARC; and then came before P&Z with new plans that ARC had not seen. Mrs. Glidden explained the Connecticut General Statutes (CGS) outlining the time frame once an application is submitted and that every applicant has to play by the same rules, especially within the Village District. Mrs. Glidden stated she felt the Commission was extremely accommodating especially given the quality of the submittal and that she had multiple conversations with Pat Benjamin to try to raise the bar. Mrs. Glidden further explained the need for plans and development to be in conformance with the design guidelines; because when they're not, a standard will be set indicating the town will take whatever is submitted. Mrs. Glidden stated the town has been allowing developers to come in and set the rules for too long and it's time the design guidelines, the regulations, and village regulations are absolutely the right tone to say, "This is what we expect and we are going to raise the bar." Mr. Lundgren thanked Mrs. Glidden and appreciated the information given.

Mr. Lundgren asked if ARC is working as smoothly as P&Z would like it too. Joe Bergin, Chairman, ARC, stated there have only been three applications and two have been Mr. McKenna; and there have been two hiccups. Mr. Bull stated the Commission will be discussing the matter with ARC later in the meeting.

Mr. Frey stated due to a conflict of interest (works for Mr. McKenna), he wasn't in attendance at the hearing; however, after the ARC meeting, he spent countless hours trying to rectify the problem as this was something neither P&Z nor ARC wanted and no one is anti-business. Mr. Frey explained how he handled the matter (photos, potential revisions, discussion) and noted that Mr. Benjamin was not contracted to put together a landscape plan. Mr. Frey defended the members of ARC noting they "bent". Mr. Lundgren stated he meant no criticism, he appreciates volunteerism, and that perhaps he came on the wrong night.

Mr. de Brigard stated he was glad Attorney Branse was present at the P&Z meeting as he felt it made the hearing/meeting move more smoothly noting Attorney Branse did not attend the ARC meeting and Mr. McKenna's attitude at the meeting was uncooperative and he had his mind set before he stepped into the door as to what he wanted to do. Mrs. Glidden stated she asked Mr. Branse to provide legal advice and to let the hearing play out.

Mr. Bull stated the intent of tonight's meeting (agenda item #6a) is to try to make the process better. Mr. Laurenza stated comments will be accepted at that time.

Mr. Lundgren thanked everyone. Mrs. Glidden provided Mr. Lundgren with a copy of the ARC Overall Goals of the Design Guidelines.

5. Public Hearing/Public Meeting: Special Permit Application to Allow an Accessory Apartment on Property Located at 90 Christian Hill Road and Shown on Tax Map 15, Lot 012-A

Gene Melanson, applicant, Melanson Builders, LLC, and Maura Wallin, owner, were present.

Hearing: Mr. Melanson reported the proposal is for a 20 by 35 foot attached in-law apartment to an existing house. The addition will include bathroom, one bedroom, kitchen, and will match to the existing house.

Mr. Laurenza asked if the health department had submitted a letter in regard to the septic system. Mrs. Glidden stated yes, that a new subsurface sewage disposal system is needed, the applicant is aware of this, and the permitting process has begun.

Mr. Laurenza asked about the proposed garage. Mrs. Glidden stated no garage is proposed, an existing plan was used and the garage was not crossed off.

Mr. LePard asked if there were living quarters in the upper part of the garage. Ms. Wallin stated it's finished, but not livable. Mr. Melanson stated there's sheetrock and carpet and that's about it. Mrs. Glidden asked if there was plumbing in the garage. Ms. Wallin stated just a hose.

Mr. Laurenza asked if this was for the parents. Ms. Wallin stated yes.

Mrs. Glidden stated this is an attached accessory apartment that's less than 800 square feet (proposal is 700 square feet), it has one bedroom, and meets all the guidelines in the special permit criteria. As previously stated, the health department has reviewed the proposal, additional septic work is required, and the applicant is willing to do so. Mrs. Glidden she has no objection to the proposal.

Mr. Frey asked if the roofline will be similar to the existing house. Mr. Melanson stated the proposal is a single story and will match what is existing. Mr. Bull stated it won't be visible from the road.

MOTION: Ed Wallor moved to close the public hearing and open the meeting at 7:25 p.m. Wayne LePard second. Motion carried unanimously.

Meeting: Mr. Laurenza asked if there were any questions/comments from the Commission. Mr. Bull asked if the septic system should be added as a condition. Mrs. Glidden stated no, as they cannot obtain their permit with the additional system.

MOTION: Steve Bull move to approve a special permit to allow an accessory apartment measuring 20 by 35 feet (700 square feet). **Conditions:** None. **Exhibits:** 1. Application dated September 21, 2017. 2. Site Plan dated drawn by applicant and date stamped September 19, 2017 by the Land Use Office. 3. Plan Review dated October 12, 2017 by CRAHD and signed by Ryan Grenon. Carmelo Rosa second. Motion carried unanimously.

6. New Business

a. Discussion of Architectural Review Committee (ARC) Review for Properties within the Village District

Joe Bergin, Chairman, ARC, Lorraine Riess, Secretary, ARC, and Wayne Ritty, Vice Chairman, ARC, were present.

In light of the last P&Z hearing, Mrs. Glidden stated she felt this would be a good opportunity to sit down with ARC to have a conversation in regard to the Commission's intent, what the process is going to be moving forward, and how to handle these reviews.

Mrs. Glidden stated in this particular case, Mr. McKenna was attempting to get his construction done before the freeze. Mrs. Glidden explained that the application was accepted, the clock was ticking, and it went to ARC prior to P&Z and in the interim between the two meetings, the plans changed. Mrs. Glidden took responsibility for recommending the applicant go directly to ARC rather than being referred to ARC via P&Z. Mrs. Glidden stated by doing so it backfired noted things did not go smoothly because two different sets of plans were submitted. Mrs. Glidden stated a possible fix to the problem would be for all applications to come before P&Z resulting in the same plans being presented to both P&Z and ARC.

Mr. Bergin stated if 15 copies of plans are submitted to P&Z and automatically refer to ARC, there's going to be a discussion and revisions are bound to come out of that. Mrs. Glidden stated there shouldn't be a discussion if there's no hearing, it would merely be P&Z deeming the application accepted and referring it to ARC with a hearing scheduled later. Mr. Bergin spoke in regard to cost to the applicant in terms of plans (original and revised). Mrs. Glidden asked is it the intent of the Commission that an applicant revise between ARC and P&Z; and should the applicant be going back to ARC. Mr. Bergin stated this particular applicant maneuvered the system. Mrs. Glidden agreed.

Mr. Bergin spoke in regard to his response to an email exchange he had with someone who had a misapprehension about what happened. In his response, Mr. Bergin explained what took place at the ARC review; P&Z taking the matter on themselves and not referring the applicant back to ARC with the revised plans (probably in the interest of time); that ARC is an offshoot of P&Z and ARC's recommendation for approval is not required for a P&Z approval; and that a P&Z approval should not be construed to mean the applicant earned a recommendation for that approval through the ARC. Mr. Wallor stated he thought the Commission was out of time on the application and that's why it wasn't sent back to ARC. Mrs. Glidden stated P&Z could have asked the applicant for an extension in order to send it back to ARC; and if the applicant denied, the Commission would have had to either approve or deny the application.

In response to Mr. Bergin's concern about the cost to the applicant, Mr. Laurenza stated he felt plans should be reviewed by ARC with a punch list being returned to P&Z stating this is the same plan and noting what items have been met and what needs to be addressed. Mr. Wallor stated only one original would be needed to send to ARC. Mrs. Glidden stated the idea would be for all members to have a copy for review or the Commission can go to digital. A brief discussion followed.

Mr. Lundgren suggested a check off box on the P&Z application indicating the plans have gone before ARC prior to submission to P&Z. Mr. Bergin stated it would only be that it had come before ARC. Mr. Lundgren suggested making a report from ARC a part of the application. Mrs. Glidden and Mr. Laurenza stated that's how it currently works. Discussion followed as to how the applicant handled the matter.

Discussion followed in regard to flexibility, time constraints, revising plans to meet the regulations, and not feeling comfortable when revised plans are brought to the table without sufficient time to review prior to a hearing (the Commission agreed) and a decision is expected that night. Mrs. Glidden stated she felt it's courtesy and good practice to provide plans 72 hours in advance to allow time for review. Mr. de Brigard touched on ARC and P&Z not being responsible for designing someone's plans whether it be architecturally or landscaping. Mr. Bergin stated an applicant needs to come with an effort to meet the guidelines and he senses that no one looks at the guidelines. Mr. de Brigard stated the applicant knows what's required and what they're doing by providing the minimum and the commissions have to push for more.

Mr. Bull asked how P&Z can recommend revised plans go back to ARC for review prior to P&Z approval. Mr. Bull apologized to ARC for not making that recommendation prior to the close of the hearing as it was his intent. Mr. Bull stated a plan shouldn't come before P&Z to change. Mr. Bergin stated he would like the Commission to recognize when there is no effort made by an applicant to meet the town's Village District regulations and guidelines and send it back to ARC. Mrs. Glidden stated the Commission could deny. Discussion followed with Mr. Laurenza stating the Commission needs to be able to say whether or not a print is acceptable or not; and if not, it needs to be denied. Mr. Bergin asked if this is something that can be denied administratively. Mrs. Glidden stated she will speak to Attorney Branse about this; however, if someone comes in with an application and payment, she has to accept it. Discussion followed.

Mrs. Glidden stated other options could be: does the Commission want applicants to go back to ARC until a positive recommendation is received; should ARC be given more authority; or P&Z receives guidelines from ARC as to what still needs to be or should be met. Mr. Bergin stated there's the possibility for miscommunication or misinterpretation - if ARC writes or says something, it may not be understood and P&Z wouldn't have full knowledge of what was asked for; therefore, it would make sense to have it return to ARC.

Mr. Frey asked what towns other than Haddam and Madison have ARC - Middletown, Old Saybrook, Stonington, East Haddam (an Historic District), Chester (guidelines), and Colchester. Mr. Frey stated Haddam has problems and he's trying to understand how much money the Commission should ask an applicant to spend, especially a startup business. Mr. Bergin stated that's a key question. A brief discussion followed with Mr. Frey asking if ARC is necessary noting Essex and Chester do not have an ARC and everybody loves those communities. Mr. Bergin stated it's remarkable Essex doesn't have anything, but due to an established fabric, they police themselves. Mr. Frey asked if Haddam could do the same thing as these two towns. Mrs. Glidden stated the Commission could hire a third party architect to review plans (Portland does this) and P&Z would receive a comment letter, still leaving the decision on P&Z. Mr. Bull stated ARC is free, all members live in the Town of Haddam (vested interest), and all three members are either architects, designers, or involved in building. Mrs. Glidden stated if the Commission wants a place that people are attracted to or in; the standard has to be set.

Mr. de Brigard explained what took place at the ARC meeting, that the applicant didn't care about the guidelines, and that the applicant was planning on coming straight to the Commission (stated as much). Mr. Bull stated P&Z didn't give ARC any formal authority due to P&Z overriding ARC by doing their job; therefore, the perception is ARC doesn't have authority. Mr. Bull stated P&Z did not support ARC; and P&Z either needs to change their ways or disband ARC. Mr. Frey stated the Commission needs to put teeth into the regulations and defend/support ARC or disband them; but do so by considering cost and time. Discussion followed in regard to an application's time frame; how much authority the Commission wants ARC to have; whether P&Z wants to refer plans back to ARC; and a public hearing not being held until a positive recommendation is received by ARC.

Mr. LePard spoke in regard to the following: 1) P&Z filtered out what ARC should have been able to do; 2) Attorney Branse speaking as a Commissioner and not as the Commission's attorney by calling the applicant's engineer up to the table; and 3) a comment by a resident who stated she would not attend another meeting. Mr. LePard stated the last application gave an impression of the Commission being business unfriendly, which the Commission is not, and this may have spread out around the town. Mr. LePard also stated he always felt the Commission was very fair and responsive, but somehow some of the items being argued over were picayune. Mrs. Glidden clarified a comment made by Mr. LePard in regard to plantings at the Hi-Way Package Store. Mr. LePard stated ARC and P&Z need to acknowledge the regulations, but use some latitude (not worry so heavily on plantings, parking spaces). Mr. Bergin stated no one is asking for a full renovation of the Center, but that the process needs to be done incrementally. Mr. Bergin also stated this process isn't being done for us, but for the next generation.

Mr. Rosa stated he has been before a number of commissions and time and money is not their concern and should not be the concern of this Commission. Mr. Rosa also stated designing and developing pursuant to the regulations is the Commission's concern. Mrs. Glidden stated Mr. Rosa would be aware of what those towns' standards are. Mr. Rosa stated yes.

Mr. Wallor stated the Commission will be doing a disservice not only to themselves, but to other commissions should they disband ARC. Mr. Bull agreed. Mr. Rosa stated in his opinion, the threat that if the application wasn't approved, the applicant would leave town is what got the application approved as well as all of the support for the applicant and there was no one from the town who had the other view point. Mr. Laurenza noted that Liz Bazazi stated at the hearing it was not the Commission's job to design the prints.

Mr. Frey stated the Commission doesn't need to discuss the previous applicant, but the process and future applicants need to be aware of the process. Mr. Bergin stated the applicant needs to come with a

good faith effort. Discussion followed in regard to what needs to be done when an applicant brings forward subpar plans – continue to schedule ARC first; and how do you control what happens between ARC and P&Z, especially if the plans change between the two commissions (Mr. Bergin asked if different plans between the two commissions could be deemed moot; or at least let it be known to the applicant not to change anything between the two meetings; or update the drawings and return to ARC.) Mr. Bergin stated the determination as to whether or not an applicant comes back before ARC can be made in the ARC memo – if it reaches a certain threshold its o.k.; but if serious revisions are required, it needs to come back. Mr. Bull and Mr. Rosa suggested a representative from ARC attend the P&Z public hearing. Mr. Rosa stated the Commission would want an applicant to revise their plans. Discussion followed in regard to the Commission opening the hearing, but continuing it until a positive workable recommendation is received from ARC; and if a negative recommendation is received, an ARC representative doesn't need to attend the hearing. Mrs. Glidden asked the ARC members if they were agreeable to meet again in regard to an application. Ms. Riess stated since there are only three ARC members, it makes it easier to coordinate a meeting. Mr. Bergin and Mr. Ruty agreed.

Mrs. Glidden will speak to Attorney Branse in regard to this matter. Mrs. Glidden doesn't believe the regulations need to be changed as she believes it's implicit in the regulations, but will confirm.

Mr. Bull thanked Mr. Bergin, Ms. Riess, and Mr. Ruty for attending the meeting to discuss the matter.

Mr. Laurenza asked if there was anything else the ARC members would like to address. Ms. Riess stated she had written some recommendations (copies distributed, dated 17 October 2017; copy with minutes in the Town Clerk's Office) and reviewed with the Commission. Recommendations include: the property owner be required to have their architect/designer attend meetings; landscape plans be done professionally and that architect/designer be present at the meetings. Ms. Riess stated by having professionals attend it keeps the personal out of the meeting. Mrs. Glidden reviewed the ARC sheet with the Commission. Mr. Rosa felt Item #2 was appropriate, but didn't know the legality of Item #3. Discussion returned to revised plans coming before P&Z. Mr. Bergin stated if the drawings are an egregious situation it would return to ARC; and if the plans substantially meet the guidelines, ARC would provide caveats (a punch list) and it can go to P&Z. ARC members were agreeable.

Mrs. Glidden will modify the ARC sheet, send it to ARC, and if ARC is agreeable, will forward to Commission. Mrs. Glidden will speak to Attorney Branse in regard to "deemed accepted" and report back.

Item continued until Thursday, 2 November 2017.

b. Discussion of Public Act 17-155 Temporary Health Care Structures (THS)

Mrs. Glidden reported she had sent information to the Commission regarding this matter; and explained these structures, called "Granny Pods", are basically mobile homes/trailers typically equipped with some medical equipment associated with them. Mrs. Glidden stated these structures are temporary, not on a foundation, and can be parked on a property for a family member or dependent under the property owner's care. Mrs. Glidden also stated there are strict statutory requirements that are attached to these structures such as conforming to local zoning, meet setbacks, no more than 500 square feet, occupied by an impaired person, present documentation that the person has medical issues/impairment and has to live in this THS, and caregiver has to live on property. Mrs. Glidden reported some towns are concerned about this; the option to opt-out or to uphold the decision (allowing the structures by right). Discussion followed at length.

Mr. Bull asked if this issue would change Section 13 of the regulations. Mrs. Glidden stated no, but would more than likely fit into Section 23. Mr. LePard stated a camper could be brought into someone's yards. Mrs. Glidden stated yes; and that it would be difficult to regulate. Discussion followed.

Mrs. Glidden stated the State has taken on a directive for mental health care and they would like this to be done by right so people can age in place, people who have health needs to be close to their care provider rather than offsite, and this would eliminate the permitting process. Mr. Wallor stated his under-

standing is that if the town opts-out, the structure will never leave. Mrs. Glidden stated no, it's the other way around, the person leaves the structure and 90 days of their departure the structure needs to be removed. Mr. Wallor stated if the town opts-out, the structure never has to leave and it can be converted into whatever. Mrs. Glidden stated yes, it would be by right. Mr. Bull stated P&Z would need to approve it (special permit). Mr. Laurenza asked how long is considered temporary. Discussion followed.

Mr. de Brigard questioned whether the elderly and/or their caregivers will be able to cope with regulations, obtaining an engineer/architect, financial backing, etc., while trying to deal with an illness/recuperation. Mr. Rosa asked if the Commission could still allow THS, even if they opted-out. Mrs. Glidden stated something would have to be written into the regulations allowing THS by special permit. Mrs. Glidden read the definition of a THS and a caregiver (providing unpaid care). Mr. Rosa stated the State Building Code requires a foundation. Mr. Bull read a portion of an article, Temporary Residences for Disabled Now a Permitted Use, written by Steven Byrne, Esq. in the Connecticut Federation of Planning and Zoning Agencies Quarterly Newsletter (Fall 2017, Vol. XXI, Issue 4) regarding THS.

Mrs. Glidden will review what needs to be added to Section 23, set up a hearing to discuss the matter further (7 December 2017), and speak to Attorney Branse in regard to opting-out and the scheduling of a public hearing, and report back to the Commission.

Item continued until Thursday, 2 November 2017.

7. Approval/Correction of the Minutes

MOTION: Steve Bull moved to approve the 7 September 2017 public hearing/meeting minutes as submitted. Ed Wallor second. Motion carried with Mr. Lagace and Mr. LePard abstaining.

Mr. de Brigard asked if the motion was written appropriately within the minutes as he felt it was critical especially if a mistaken was made. Mrs. Batzner stated she copied the motion as emailed to her (not cut and paste); however, the motion is on file in the Town Clerk's Office and that would be the legal document. Mrs. Glidden stated if the matter should go to some type of hearing, there would be a transcript.

8. Chairman's Report

None.

9. Scheduling of Hearings

POCD, 7 December 2017 – Hearing to adopt the document will be held on this date.

P&Z, 2 November 2017 Meeting – There are no applications at this time; however, the Commission will meet to further discuss ARC review for properties with the Village District and P.A. 17-155 Temporary Health Care Structures (THS). At this meeting the Commission will determine whether to hold their 16 November 2017 meeting.

10. Town Planner's Report

Discussion of WFS Closure Plan – Mrs. Glidden reported that Doug Anderson, owner, WFS, contacted her as he is looking at his closure plan (sunset per the settlement is 12/30/2019), he anticipates being finished mining the site prior to that, and he would like to think about what his next steps will be. Mr. Anderson approached the town to see if there's a development the town would support or is there something the town is looking at that would be amenable. Mr. Wallor stated solar farm. Mrs. Glidden stated she suggested a solar farm and Mr. Anderson indicated he's contacted Eversource and there's a problem in transporting the energy to the appropriate line; however, he has not ruled this option out. Mrs. Glidden also stated Camoin and Associates has been contacted to get some ideas; however, Mr. Anderson may or may not retain Camoin for his own marketing research. Mr. Anderson is open to working with the town to redevelop the site after the closure in some way that would be positive. Mr. Bull commended Mr.

Anderson. Mrs. Glidden stated this is an opportunity for the town to be proactive and work with Mr. Anderson rather than be reactive when a plan is submitted.

Mr. Frey stated Eversource isn't the only utility company and Mr. Anderson should be looking in another direction as there are a lot of companies who would be happy to assist even though Eversource would be the end user. Mr. Bull asked what value a solar farm would be to the town. Mr. Frey stated if the town gets involved it can pick out five of the town's largest consumers to be recipients of the energy and then earmark up to 50 percent of that energy to be used and resold at a reduced rate to people who live in town and the rest of the energy can be sold for profit. Mr. Frey noted he may be slightly off on the numbers. Mr. Frey stated the State of Connecticut is now allowing municipalities to do Requests for Proposals (RFPs) for solar farms. Mr. Bull asked if there was sufficient land. Mr. Frey stated it depends on how many kilowatts can be put there. Mr. Frey also stated regulations are constantly changing; it's a big industry; and it would be a benefit to the town.

11. Adjournment

MOTION: Steve Bull moved to adjourn. Chip Frey second. Motion carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:18 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Bunny Hall Batzner

Bunny Hall Batzner
Recording Clerk

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, 2 November 2017.