

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS  
MEETING MINUTES OF WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 11, 2023

The Zoning Board of Appeals held a meeting on Wednesday, October 11, 2023 at 3:00 pm. Executive Session started at approximately 2:45 pm. This meeting was held both in person as well as a hybrid manner.

Audio Recording of this meeting can be found here: <https://fairfieldct.org/meetingrecordings>

MEMBERS PRESENT: Kevin Coyne, Chairman; Terry Keegan, Vice Chair; Jane G. Nishball, Secretary, Katie O'Grady, Brian Avallone

EXECUTIVE SESSION

1. Approval of Minutes of Thursday, September 7, 2023: Terry Keegan moved and Jane G. Nishball seconded to approve the minutes as presented. Motion passed unanimously.
2. Approval of Secretary's Fees: Terry Keegan moved and Jane G. Nishball seconded to approve the secretary's fees as presented. Motion passed unanimously.

Executive Session started at approximately 2:45 p.m.

CONTINUED DOCKET:

**11. 599 Kings Highway West, Map 243, Parcel 129. Petition of Geraldine M. Carlson and Joseph C. Bertini for a variance of the Zoning Regulations Section 12.7.2 to reduce the minimum lot size from 10,000 sq. ft., currently 13,098 sq. ft., proposing 5,019 sq. ft., Section 12.7.3 to reduce the required square from 75 feet, currently 65 feet, proposing 65 feet; and Section 12.4.18 to allow 100% of the total floor area to be used as residential. Permission to allow for the existing single-family dwelling to be on a separate lot. Premises: DCD Zone**

*The proposed application is Continued to 11/2/23*

**12. 3300 Post Road, Map 243, Parcel 129. Petition of Geraldine M. Carlson and Joseph C. Bertini for a variance of the Zoning Regulations Section 12.7.2 to reduce the lot size from 10,000 sq. ft., currently 13,098 sq. ft., proposing 8,079 sq. ft., Section 12.7.3 to reduce the required square from 75 feet, currently 65 feet, proposing 65 feet; and Section 12.7.6.3 to reduce the rear setback from 10 feet, proposing 5.5 feet. Permission to allow for an existing commercial building on a separate lot. Premises: DCD Zone.**

*The proposed application is Continued to 11/2/23*

**14. 4185 Black Rock Turnpike, Map 118, Parcel 41. Petition of Fairfield Medical LLC for a variance of the Zoning Regulations Section 29.8.2 to permit a sign that will abut a right of way to the Merritt Parkway, Section 29.10.1 to increase the size of two wall signs from 3 feet in height and overall size of 72 sq. ft., proposing 4'4 3/4 " in height and overall size of 174 sq. ft. and to allow two wall signs above the ground floor; and Section 29.11 to permit a side wall sign that is greater than 3.5 feet long and wider than a foot within 300 feet of a residential district. Permission to approve a new sign plan for a new medical building. Premises: DCD Zone**

*The proposed application is Continued to 11/2/23*

**9. 38 Lighthouse Point, Map 184, Parcel 19. Petition of 38 Lighthouse Point, LLC for a variance of the Zoning Regulations Section 11.3 to reduce the minimum lot area from 9,375 sq. ft., proposing 3,647 sq. ft., and to reduce the minimum lot square from 50 feet, proposing 49.9 feet. Permission to establish a building lot for a FEMA-compliant single-family dwelling. Premises: BD Zone.**

Attorney Chris Russo presented on behalf of the petitioner.

The house at 38 Lighthouse Point which is not FEMA compliant and has no parking is being raised up with a garage under, there are nonconformities that are getting reduced and parking added. The dwelling that exists at 28 Lighthouse Point is physically being moved to 46 Lighthouse Point. It is being placed in a placed in a location that is fully compliant with regards to setbacks, coverage and will be FEMA compliant.

*GRANTED: Jane G. Nishball moved and Terry Keegan seconded to approve the proposed application. Motion passed unanimously.*

**GENERAL DOCKET:**

**1. 46 Lighthouse Point, Map 184, Parcel 18. Petition of 46 Lighthouse Point, LLC for a variance of the Zoning Regulations Section 11.3 to reduce the lot size from 9,375, proposing 4,186. Permission to re-establish and legalize a pre-existing building lot. Premises: BD Zone**

Attorney Chris Russo presented on behalf of the petitioner.

The Applicant requests waivers to reestablish and legalize a preexisting lot at 46 Lighthouse Point and locate a fully conforming house on the Site. The Site abuts the property at 38 Lighthouse Point. The properties have been separated for decades and they are currently owned separately. The Site is pre-existing non-conforming as to lot area in the Beach District ("BD") under the Regulations. The Applicant seeks to legalize the lot as its own building lot. In fact, all the Lighthouse Point lots which do not border Long Island Sound are pre-existing nonconforming as to lot area. Some properties, such as 6 & 28 Lighthouse Pt. are significantly more nonconforming than the Site.

The Application actually represents an opportunity to reduce non-conformities on the whole of Lighthouse Point. The Applicant proposes to relocate an existing single-family at 28 Lighthouse Point, which is nonconforming as to setback. The relocated dwelling on the Site will be completely conforming as to setback and, therefore, eliminate that nonconformity in the area. The reduction in a nonconformity can

#### 46 Lighthouse Point (continued)

serve as a separate basis for the granting of a variance. The relocated residence will be over 20' beyond the minimum setback in the Zone, which is a considerable buffer, especially in the BD Zone, where many properties on Lighthouse Point are nonconforming as to street line setback. The side property line setbacks also exceed requirements. While the Regulations have no rear yard setback that applies to the Site, the proposed rear yard setback doubles the requirement in the BD Zone for similarly situated properties. This residence much more appropriately fits the Site than its current location. Even with the proposed relocated dwelling conforming to all setback requirements, the Applicant is still able to provide Four (4) off-street parking spaces within an outdoor parking area on the Site with an additional 2 spaces under the residence. The outdoor parking area will provide 2 parking spaces for the proposed residence on the Site and 2 parking spaces for the neighboring property at 38 Lighthouse Point. This parking arrangement currently exists on the Site.

Granting the applicant said variance will not substantially affect the comprehensive zoning plan of the Town of Fairfield and adherence to the strict letter of the Fairfield Zoning Regulations will cause an unusual hardship to the Applicant as the Applicant is proposing to re-subdivide two (2) properties which were historically separate until the Zoning Department determined that the use of the parking area by the property at 38 Lighthouse Point merged the Site with 38 Lighthouse Point. The Applicant disputes that action merged the properties, but seeks to legalize the lot as a separate building lot through this variance. All historical maps of the properties have the Site as its own separate building lot. The lots were never formally merged and a building was never constructed over the property line. The property lines of the Site have remained intact throughout its existence and the Site and 38 Lighthouse Point have been in separate ownership for much of their history as it is currently. The Town's own GIS system shows them as separate lots.

In addition, the Applicant is eliminating a nonconformity on a nearby property, which will have a positive impact on the neighborhood. The elimination of a nonconformity can serve as a separate basis for the granting of a variance. While the dwelling currently located at 28 Lighthouse Point is nonconforming, it will become fully conforming when it is placed at the Site. It will even be conforming as to lot coverage in the BD Zone, which is notoriously difficult in the BD Zone due to undersized lots and pre-existing nonconforming coverages. In addition, the Site will be able to provide ample parking for the new residence with a remainder to continue supporting the existing dwelling at 38 Lighthouse Point. The property at 38 Lighthouse Point essentially held an easement over the Site for parking. Similar parking situations between separate properties exist in other parts of Town with the properties not being considered merged.

*GRANTED: Terry Keegan moved and Brian Avallone seconded to approve the proposed application. Motion passed unanimously.*

**2. 118 Myren Street, Map 138, Parcel 18. Petition of Robert and Jennifer Burgess for a variance of the Zoning Regulations Section 5.2.5 to increase the lot coverage from 20%, currently 25%, proposing 21%. Permission to construct a new FEMA-compliant, single-family dwelling with front and rear porches. Premises: A Zone.**

Don Fairbanks, Architect, presented on behalf of the petitioner. Robert Burgess was also present.

We wish to request a lot coverage variance of 21% which represents an increase of 70 sq. ft. above the 20% allowable. This requested lot coverage represents a significant reduction to the previous home's existing lot coverage which was 25%. With the new home being constructed to meet current (and future) FEMA standards, there is a need for additional stairs and larger landings. Due to the designed elevation of the home and in order to safely reach the existing grade from the first floor, a fair amount of building lot coverage is required to build egress stairways to safely exit the home in case of an emergency; we feel this presents us with a hardship.

Jackie Davis who resides at 282 Pine Creek Avenue spoke in favor of the application.

*GRANTED: Katie O'Grady moved and Jane G. Nishball seconded to approve the proposed application. Motion passed unanimously.*

**3. 55 Mariners Way, Map 139, Parcel 385A. Petition of Stacey & Lucas Swineford for a variance of the Zoning Regulations Section 5.2.4 to reduce the rear setback for unenclosed decks from 25 feet, proposing 18 feet; Section 5.2.4.3 to reduce the side and rear setbacks for an accessory structure from 10 feet, proposing 4 feet; and Section 5.2.5 to increase the lot coverage from 15%, currently 13.9%, proposing 16.3%. Permission to construct a shed and two covered rear decks. Premises: R-3 Zone.**

Owners Lucas and Stacey Swineford presented.

We wish to replace the current decks behind our house with covered patios and add a 12' x 12' shed in the back corner of our lot.

Similar to *Whitehead v. ZBA 37 Conn. L. Rptr. 177*, the previous owner of our house built the current deck too close to the back property line, did not seek a variance, and did not disclose to us at the time of purchase that the deck was not compliant with zoning regulations thus causing our hardship. We would like to make our replacement structure, which would retain the same distance from the back property line, compliant by seeking this variance.

We are seeking to cover the back patio, which would increase our total coverage to 16.3%, which is 1.3% over the regulation. It is important for us to cover the patio because this area, the back of our house, is exposed to sun nearly all daylight hours. Lucas has skin cancer and can't risk continued sun exposure. In addition, our elderly/handicapped mother lives in the accessory apartment and can't endure sun exposure. She has trouble walking and we will be building a more accessible structure to get in and out of the house.

We would like to build the majority of the covered areas in the back of the house for privacy concerns and keep the side yard for play, since it gets used often by the kids in our community. We need the shed as we have three cars with two full-time working adults and our retired school teacher mother. With kids and sports, our garage is overwhelmed with cars, bikes, sports, lawn care, etc. and we need the storage. The proposed location of the shed is conspicuous, hidden behind a tree in a back corner, but easily accessible from the apartment and garage.

55 Mariners Way (continued)

Christopher Filiberto, a neighbor at 36 Bay Edge Court spoke in favor of the application.

*GRANTED: Terry Keegan moved and Katie O'Grady seconded to approve the proposed application. Motion passed 4 to 1 (Jane G. Nishball opposed).*

**4. 282 Pine Creek Avenue, Map 238, Parcel 24. Petition of Jacqueline D. Davis for a variance of the Zoning Regulations Section 11.1.4.1 to allow a detached accessory structure to contain finished livable floor area with plumbing and heat; Section 11.10 to increase the total lot coverage from 20%, currently 20%, proposing 25.4%; and Section 11.13.1 to reduce the setback from the center of Pine Creek Avenue for a lot bounded by Long Island Sound from 45 feet, currently 35.7 feet, proposing 18.1 feet. Permission to construct a FEMA-compliant, detached garage with finished space above. Premises: BD Zone.**

Attorney John Fallon presented on behalf of the petitioner.

While the Davis's very much enjoy their home it does not allow a separate workspace that will allow them a private area to tend to their daily business obligations while at home. The nature of Mr. and Mrs. Davis' work is such that they do not see clients on a face-to-face basis at their home and their work in the home office area will be limited to phone conferences, virtual meetings and the like. To make the space reasonably functional they are requesting approval of a half bath in the home office area as shown on the plans.

A variance of Section 11.1.4.1 is requested to allow a detached accessory structure in this District to contain finished livable floor area, plumbing fixtures and heat. A variance of Section 11.10 is also requested to increase the allowable lot coverage from 20% to 25.4%. Finally, a variance of Section 11.13.1 to reduce the minimum setback from the center line of the street for a lot bounded by Long Island Sound is requested to reduce that setback to 18.1'. With reference to the request of a variance of Section 11.1.4.1 to allow use of the area above the garage as a home office including a half bath it is pointed out that the purpose and intent of this section of the Zoning Regulations is to ensure that an accessory dwelling in the Beach District will not be utilized as a residence in violation of the provisions of the Regulations. In the present instance the floor plan makes no provision for any cooking or sleeping facilities and in addition requests approval of only a half bath with no shower facilities. This is consistent with the purpose and intent of the Regulations with regard to avoidance of utilization of the accessory structures in the Beach District as a dwelling. Ms. Davis would most certainly agree to a condition of approval that the new garage structure will be maintained as approved and not be utilized, converted or occupied as a dwelling in the future. Concerning the variance with regard to Section 11.13.1 regarding the reduction of the street line setback this variance is required due to the narrow shape of the lot and the impact on that portion of the lot bordered to the north by Pine Creek Avenue caused by the bifurcation of the lot by Pine Creek Avenue. With regard to the coverage variance that is requested with regard to the accessory structure it should first be noted as previously referenced that the portion of the lot bordered by Long Island Sound and where the principal dwelling is located is compliant with the 20% coverage provision. Strict enforcement of the coverage regulation to the portion of the lot located to the north of Pine Creek Avenue would contribute little to the

282 Pine Creek Avenue (continued)

goal that the regulation is intended to achieve in terms of preventing unsightly development out of character with the surrounding neighborhood. See *Mayer-Wittmann v. Zoning Board of Appeals of City of Stamford*, 333 Conn. 624 (2019). In this instance, the immediately adjacent properties and properties located up and down Pine Creek Avenue have garage structures located on those portions of the lot situated to the north of Pine Creek Avenue. These structures have positive aesthetic benefits relative to providing for the internal storage of vehicles rather than exposed parking. In *Verrillo v. Zoning Board of Appeals of Town of Brandford* the Appellate Court noted in sustaining the appeal from the granting of variances that "The Defendants have not alleged in this appeal, nor does the record substantiate, that the application of the regulations destroys the value of the property "for all reasonable uses". It is respectfully suggested that in the present case, even applying the standard of the *Verrillo* case, granting of the variance with regard to coverage is appropriate in that the utilization of the vacant portion of the parcel located to the north of Pine Creek Avenue for an accessory structure consistent with the character of the neighborhood and similar structures adjacent thereto is reasonable.

Chairman Coyne entertained a motion to approve this application with the condition that it will be maintained as approved through the plans and not to be utilized or occupied as a dwelling.

*GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS: Brian Avallone moved and Terry Keegan seconded to approve the proposed application. Motion passed 4 to 1 (Jane G. Nishball opposed).*

**5. 475 Lockwood Road, Map 47, Parcel 117. Petition of Polepalli Roshan for a variance of the Zoning Regulations Section 5.2.5 to increase the total lot coverage from 15%, currently 15%, proposing 18%. Permission to construct a rear deck. Premises: R-3 Zone.**

Polepalli Roshan, homeowner, presented on her own behalf.

They wish to construct a 24' x 20' deck 2 feet above ground. They have an undersized lot; lot size is required to be 20,000 sq. ft., actual lot size is 14,527 sq. ft.

*GRANTED: Katie O'Grady moved and Terry Keegan seconded to approve the proposed application. Motion passed unanimously.*

**6. 86 Chatham Road, Map 28, Parcel 281. Petition of David and Jacqueline Rosu for a variance of the Zoning Regulations Section 5.2.5 to increase the lot coverage from 15%, currently 15%, proposing 18.2%. Permission to construct a rear deck and stairs. Premises: R-2 Zone.**

Kristion Marku, contractor, presented on behalf of the homeowners.

They wish to construct a 20' x 25' -8" deck in the backyard. The plan is to increase the surface area from 15% to 18%. This is a topography-challenged lot. There is an existing patio with a small deck. They would like to remove the patio at the lower grade and build the elevated deck over it. The elevation has a significant grade change from the back of the house to the rear of the property.

*GRANTED: Terry Keegan moved and Jane G. Nishball seconded to approve the proposed application. Motion passed unanimously.*

**7. 624 Center Street, Map 243, Parcel 186. Petition of Angela Benzan for a variance of the Zoning Regulations Section 5.2.4 to reduce the side and sum of two side line setbacks from 5 feet and 20 feet, currently 3 feet and 19 feet, proposing 3 feet and 19 feet; and Section 5.2.5 to increase the lot coverage and the total floor area from 30% and 50%, currently 26.8% and 28.68%, proposing 33.13% and 54.48%. Permission to construct a two-story addition with 2<sup>nd</sup> floor and attic additions and new front porch. Premises: B Zone.**

Angela Benzan, homeowner, presented.

She would like to construct a two story addition to the front left and right rear portions of my home along with a new open front porch.

The home was built in 1900, prior to the town of Fairfield adopting their zoning laws in 1925 and is legal non-conforming. My hardship is that we are located in the Residential B zone which requires a lot size and lot frontage of 6,000 sq. ft. and 60' respectfully. The lot is currently 4,567 sq. ft. in size and frontage only being 50.11'. Currently the house is non-conforming to the side line setback of 3.0' when it's required to be 5' and a sum of 19' with a required sum to be 20'. The additions would not require a variance if the property were conforming in size and square.

Neighbors Nikolai and Daniella Zlatarev at 654 Center Street spoke in opposition.

*GRANTED: Katie O'Grady moved and Jane G. Nishball seconded to approve the proposed application. Motion passed unanimously.*

**8. 604 Hillside Road, Map 174, Parcel 30. Petition of Eykyn Susannah for a variance of the Zoning Regulations Section 5.2.4 to reduce the side setbacks for an accessory structure greater than 100 square feet from 30 feet, proposing 19.6 feet. Permission to construct an inground pool. Premises: AAA Zone.**

Tim Meehan, contractor, presented.

Construction of swimming pool to extend into the side set back to 19'6" from side property line. The property is an existing non-conforming lot. The existing house is within the same setback with the corner of the pool extending into the setback just 3'1" beyond the existing house. The property is an existing non-conforming lot. The entire rear of the lot is reserve area and septic field. The septic tank is forward so there is no way to put a pool in the backyard.

*GRANTED: Terry Keegan moved and Jane G. Nishball seconded to approve the proposed application. Motion passed unanimously.*

**9. 33 Longdean Road, Map 183, Parcel 235. Petition of Elizabeth Lanna for a variance of the Zoning Regulations Section 5.2.4.3 to reduce the rear and side setbacks for an accessory structure greater than 15 feet in height from 10 feet, currently 5.3 feet and 5.3 feet, proposing 5.3 and 2.3 feet; and Section 6.0 to allow for an accessory apartment in a detached structure on a non-conforming, single-family parcel in the residential B Zone. Permission to construct a 2<sup>nd</sup> floor addition with exterior stairs to the existing detached garage for an accessory apartment. Premises: B Zone.**

Alina Rodescu-Pitchon, designer, presented. Lisa Lanna, owner was also present.

33 Longdean Road (continued)

I wish to build a 19'9" x 22'-4" studio on top of my existing garage. This is an undersized lot; in order to minimize impervious area, it would be best to build over the existing structure rather than connect the house to the garage.

Donald Sherman, representing his daughter who resides at 21 Longdean Road, spoke in opposition. She retracted her support of the application after she originally signed.

*GRANTED: Katie O'Grady moved and Jane G. Nishball seconded to approve the proposed application. Motion passed 4 to 1 (Jane G. Nishball opposed).*

**10. 184 Lota Drive, Map 76, Parcel 36. Petition of John and Sara Taxiltaridis for a variance of the Zoning Regulations Section 5.2.4 to reduce the street setback from 40 feet, currently 30.6 feet, proposing 20.5 feet; and Section 5.2.5 to increase the lot coverage from 15%, currently 12.6%, proposing 18.6%. Permission to construct a two-story addition. Premises: R-3 Zone.**

Attorney John Fallon presented on behalf of the petitioners.

The Taxiltaridis's wish to continue residing there but with an active and growing family they need to make modifications that will provide additional space to address the needs of the family. This need is dramatically exacerbated by the fact that John's elderly parents are in poor health and it is anticipated that it will soon be necessary for them to move in with John and Sara so that they can benefit from the care and attention that they need and that John and Sara want to provide to them.

This application intends to convert the existing garage into a family room that will include renovation of the existing dining and kitchen areas. A three-car garage is proposed with additional habitable space above that will provide in the immediate future much needed space for the twins. Most importantly, this additional space will provide the family with the flexibility in the future to provide an accessory apartment to meet the needs of John's parents.

The property is located at the end of the Lota Drive cul-de-sac. The street line due to the cul-de-sac configuration curves significantly and directly toward the property creating a unique property line from which the street setback is measured. The existing structure is already nonconforming to the street line setback being situated at 30.6 ft. from the street. To facilitate the proposed one story addition two variances are requested. First a variance of Section 5.2.4 to reduce the setback from the street line to 20.5 ft. As previously indicated the existing structure is already nonconforming to the street line setback at 30.6 ft. A variance of Section 5.2.5 is also requested to increase the allowable lot coverage from 15% to 18.6%. It should be noted, however, that notwithstanding the requested increase in coverage the maximum building floor area after the addition is completed will be only 17.8%, well under the 30% allowed in the zone.

From a legal perspective, this request meets the requirements established by Connecticut General Statutes 8-6(a)(3) in that, 1) the variance does not substantially effect the Comprehensive Zoning Plan, and; 2) adherence to the strict letter of the zoning ordinance does cause unusual hardship, unnecessary to the



184 Lota Drive (continued)

carrying out of the general purposes of the zoning plan. The addition as proposed will not change the use of the structure, which will remain as a single-family residence. The granting of the variances as requested will not change the use of the property which will remain as a single-family residence explicitly permitted in the zone.

A hardship that justifies a zoning board of appeals to grant variance, must be one that originates in the zoning ordinance, and arises directly out of the application of the ordinance to unique circumstances pertaining to the property in question. The applicant must demonstrate that because of some particular factors, strict application of the zoning regulations results in unusual hardship.

With regard to the variance requested concerning the street line setback, it has been held by our Connecticut courts that the historic location of a pre-existing nonconforming structure on a lot creates a proper basis for a finding of hardship. As previously indicated, the existing structure is nonconforming to the street setback at 30.6 ft. and it is the preexisting nonconforming location of this structure that creates the need for the variance that is requested with regard to the street setback in order to accommodate the proposed addition. In addition, case law recognizes that the irregular shape of a lot provides a proper basis for a finding of hardship to support the granting of a variance. These cases are applicable to the current situation where the circumference of the Lota Drive cul-de-sac significantly affects the shape of the lot and directly implicates the ability to conform to the street line setback.

Concerning the coverage variance that is requested it should first be noted that even after the proposed addition is constructed the FAR will only be 17.8% well under the 30% allowed in the zone. Thus, strict enforcement of the coverage regulation does not contribute to the goal that the regulation is intended to achieve in terms of preventing over-intense development, out of character with the surrounding neighborhood. In this instance, although a modest coverage variance is requested, the needs of the Taxiltaridis family concerning additional space to address the needs of their family and the future needs of John's parents can be accommodated without over intensified development of the parcel. The FAR will remain well within the limitations imposed under the zone.

*GRANTED: Terry Keegan moved and Jane G. Nishball seconded to approve the proposed application. Motion passed 4 to 1 (Jane G. Nishball opposed).*

**11. 36 Bay Edge Court, Map 130, Parcel 15. Petition of Christopher and Lia Filiberto for a variance of the Zoning Regulations Section 5.2.4 to reduce the sum of two side line setbacks from 25 feet, currently 23.2 feet, proposing 20'. Permission to construct a 2-1/2 story FEMA compliant single family dwelling with front porch and rear deck. Premises A Zone.**

Owners, Lia and Christopher Filiberto presented.

They would like to remove their non-FEMA compliant home and construct a 2-1/2 story FEMA compliant single family dwelling with front porch and rear deck with stairs.

36 Bay Edge Court (continued)

This is a pre-existing legal non-conforming lot. The required lot size and square are 9,375 sq. ft. and 75 feet; this lot is 8.499 sq. ft. and only has a square of 50 feet. They are seeking a variance for only the sum of two sideline setbacks for a two story dwelling. The setback sum of two side lines is required to be 25 feet, they are seeking to reduce that to 20 feet. For a single story the sum of two side line setbacks are required to be 20 feet, currently they have 23.2 feet and would need a setback variance for two side lines even if they were to put a second floor over the existing footprint.

*GRANTED: Katie O'Grady moved and Terry Keegan seconded to approve the proposed application. Motion passed unanimously.*

There being no further business to come before the Commission, at 5:30 p.m. Chairman Coyne adjourned the meeting.

---

Jane Gitlin Nishball, Secretary

---

Jodi Karagianes, Clerk

**KEVIN COYNE, CHAIRMAN**

**JANE GITLIN NISHBALL, SECRETARY**

**JODI KARAGIANES, CLERK**