

CHATHAM BOROUGH ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

December 15, 2021

7:30 p.m.

Chairman Michael Cifelli called this Regular Meeting of the Chatham Borough Zoning Board of Adjustment to order at 7:30 p.m. This was a virtual meeting. Board members, Attorney Dwyer, and witnesses were present by way of Zoom. Chrmn. Cifelli stated that adequate notices for this Board of Adjustment meeting were given as required by the Open Public Meetings Act.

Names	Present	Absent
Michael A. Cifelli, Chrmn.	X	
Frederick Infante	X	
Douglas Herbert	X	
H.H. Montague	X	
Jean-Eudes Haeringer		X
Patrick Tobia	X	
Joseph Treloar		X
David Degidio	X	
Peter Hoffman		X
Patrick Dwyer, Esq.	X	

Our thanks to Steve Williams, Borough Administrator, for serving as Zoom host for tonight's meeting.

Public Comment

There was none.

Resolution #ZB 2021-01

The minutes of the November 17, 2021 Zoning Board of Adjustment meeting will be reviewed and voted on at the January 2022 meeting.

Resolutions

Application ZB 21-009

Zeliff

192 Hillside Avenue

Block: 98 Lot: 42

Building Coverage

Lot Coverage

Attorney Dwyer summarized this application proposed to remove a rear car port and side porch from an existing dwelling. A new attached garage was also proposed. There will be an addition at the rear of the home. The Board granted variance relief. A roll call vote was taken to approve the resolution confirming the Board's approval of Application ZB 21-009:

Chrmn. Cifelli	-	yes
Mr. Montague	-	yes
Mr. Infante	-	yes
Mr. Herbert	-	yes

The resolution passed.

Application ZB 21-014: Kettles

Kettles

49 Weston Avenue

Block: 58 Lot: 18

Minimum Front Yard Setback (Weston)

Minimum Front Yard Setback (Center)

Attorney Dwyer summarized that this application, involving a corner lot, had and proposed to add a second story over a side porch to add a master bathroom measuring 9 ft. by 12 ft. A roll call vote was taken to approve the resolution confirming the Board's approval of Application ZB 21-014:

Chrmn. Cifelli	-	yes
Mr. Herbert	-	yes
Mr. Infante	-	yes
Mr. Montague	-	yes

The resolution passed.

Returning and New Applications

Chrmn. Cifelli announced the following applications will be heard tonight, time-permitting:

Application ZB 21-013: Cedrone – 13 Duchamp Place

Application ZB 21-012: Ciro – 13 Lincoln Avenue

Application ZB 21-006: Androski – 17 Yale Street

Application ZB 21-013

Nicholas & Katelyn Cedrone

13 Duchamp Place

Block: 61 Lot: 11

Side Yard Setback Left

Side Yard Setback Right

Building Coverage

Benjamin Lindeman, Esq., introduced himself as the attorney for the applicant.

Attorney Dwyer swore in the following:

Nicholas & Katelyn Cedrone, the applicants

Kevin Spink, the architect for the applicants

Mr. Spink submitted his professional credentials to the Board. The Board accepted them.

Attorney Lindeman stated that Mr. and Mrs. Cedrone are looking to modify their home to make it more comfortable for their growing family. They are seeking variance relief for their proposed

addition. Their house was built in the 1940s. It is currently a Cape Cod style home. He reviewed the three C-2 variances that are being sought. The proposed addition will make the house more colonial in style, with more efficient and functional living space on the second floor. Also, the kitchen will expand and become more modern.

On the Zoom screen, Attorney Lindeman put a photo of the applicant's home as it currently stands today. Additional photos were put up on the Zoom screen showing the left and right sides of the home. Mr. Cedrone testified that he, his wife, and three young children currently live in the home. He stated that there are two existing bedrooms on the first floor. Two bedrooms exist upstairs. There is one small living room. The dining room can barely contain his family for a meal. There is a small enclosed kitchen. A small full bathroom exists on the second floor, and a narrow bathroom exists on the first floor.

Attorney Lindeman asked Mr. Cedrone to give the reasons for why he would like to modify his home.

Mr. Cedrone stated that he and his wife feel that the existing house is outdated and inefficient. Presently he cannot cool the second floor during the summer. Also, it's difficult to heat the second floor during the winter unless the windows downstairs are open. Mr. Cedrone stated that he and his wife enjoy their neighborhood and feel vested in the community. If their application is approved, four bedrooms would be created upstairs. A family room will be created at the rear, similar to the neighbors' homes on either side. The proposed plans would allow for the whole family to sleep on one floor. The heating and cooling situation will improve, plus the children will have more room to play.

Mr. Cedrone testified that the proposed plans will uphold the aesthetics of the neighborhood. He noted that an existing window in his kitchen will be eliminated since it looks directly into his next door neighbor's dining room. The existing HVAC will be moved to the other side of the house.

Attorney Lindeman submitted Exhibit A-1: two Google photos of the applicant's home.

Mr. Cedrone identified the first photo as his current home with the two neighboring homes on either side. He explained that his goal is to bring his house up to the standards of the neighborhood, especially in regard to the neighboring home on either side of his house.

Mr. Cedrone identified the second photo of Exhibit A-1. It showed his existing Cape Cod home, looking south, with the next door neighbor on either side. The proposed plans will give a colonial style to his home and bring it up to the standards of the neighborhood. Mr. Cedrone testified that the proposed roof-line of his home will be in line with the neighboring homes. His goal is to have his home blend in nicely with the rest of the street. Mr. Cedrone testified that the front yard setback will remain the same.

Chrmm. Cifelli and Mr. Cedrone discussed the garage arrangements of the next door neighbors. Mr. Cedrone was not sure if all three homes were originally Cape Cod homes, constructed by the same builder.

Answering a question from Mr. Infante, Mrs. Cedrone testified that on the right hand side of the home, the kitchen is currently in line with the garage. She pointed out the kitchen bay window that would be eliminated to give more privacy to the next door neighbor's dining room. Currently they just keep the shades down.

Mr. Infante confirmed with Mr. and Mrs. Cedrone that the proposed plans will remove the existing dormers.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked if the public had any questions for the witnesses who just testified.

There were none.

Mr. Spink, the applicant's architect, put the floor plans up on the Zoom screen. He testified that the current kitchen measures 10 feet wide by 12 ½ feet deep. The proposed plans will extend it out an additional 5 feet out the rear. The kitchen will become U-shaped with an island in the middle. A new family room will be added on to the rear of the home. It will sit over what is currently a dining area and rear deck. The stairs inside the home will be moved slightly over to create a better center hall. Mr. Spink explained that the two existing bedrooms on the first floor will be re-worked to create a mudroom at the front, and a study at the back. The existing living room will remain. The dining room will open directly into the new family room.

Mr. Spink reviewed the plans for the second floor. A master suite will be constructed at the rear over the proposed family room. Three other bedrooms will be added to the home. Three full bathrooms will be created in the home: one in the master suite and one larger bathroom on the second floor for the other 3 bedrooms. The bathroom on the first floor will remain the same.

Mr. Spink discussed the application's light and air situation with regard to the neighbors. He pointed out that the existing home to the left of the applicant's house has its garage on that side. This garage is only one story. The applicant's proposed addition will be constructed on the left had side of his home and won't be affecting this particular neighbor. Mr. Spink pointed out that the neighbor to the right has his two-story section facing the applicant's house. An effort is being made to balance these proposals out with the rest of the neighborhood. There will be adequate light and air between the applicant's home and his neighbors. Mr. Spink pointed out the similarities of the neighboring homes with what the applicant is proposing.

Mr. Spink put the proposed elevations of the home up on the Zoom screen. He reviewed the proposals for the back of the house. A double gable at the rear will be constructed to add to the attractiveness of the rear elevation. Mr. Spink put the proposed site plans on the Zoom screen. He testified that the existing deck at the rear will be removed. A blue stone patio will be created as an outdoor dining area.

Mr. Spink testified that all of the proposed additions will align with the existing walls of the first floor. The addition to the kitchen will project out in line with the existing wall of the house. The 6 ft. setback of the existing house will remain as a 6 ft. setback at the side of the house. A

variance is needed for this situation since 12 feet is required. The left hand side of the house will not be expanded. It will align with the pre-existing non-conformity.

Mr. Spink testified that the A/C unit will be re-located to the other side of the house. It will be screened from the front. It will also be adjacent to the neighbor's garage, so the noise from the compressor will not affect the neighbor.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked why is the shed necessary as opposed to having a garage.

Mr. Spink explained that the garage is small and is a very tight fit for any car. It is not accessible from the rear yard. Using the elevations, Mr. Spink pointed out that the proposed shed will be below the kitchen windows. It will not reach the full height of the roof. The shed will give a little more storage space.

Referring to the right elevation, Chrmn. Cifelli asked Mr. Spink if he could architecturally achieve what he is proposing if he complied with the ordinance regulations pertaining to the second story setback.

Mr. Spink answered no. On the plans, he showed if the right side of the home were to be pulled on the right side, the bedrooms would only be 6 feet wide.

Chrmn. Cifelli and Mr. Spink discussed the building coverage variance. Mr. Spink testified that the building coverage will be approximately 328 sq. ft. beyond what is allowed. The plans will add 318 sq. ft. of building coverage to the house.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked Mr. Spink how much building coverage will come from the proposed additions – the shed, the expansion of the kitchen, the family room. Mr. Spink answered those entities will be contributing 400 sq. ft. of building coverage. Chrmn. Cifelli confirmed with Mr. Spink that the house sits on is an undersized lot. Mr. Spink clarified that the lot width is undersized. Chrmn. Cifelli also confirmed with Mr. Spink that anything the applicant proposes to add to his house will ultimately need a variance.

Mr. Herbert asked if the existing garage was staying.

Mr. Spink clarified that the existing garage will stay at the front of the house. The kitchen area will be added at the rear and also the proposed shed. The shed will be only 4 feet deep times the width of the house.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked if the renovations were finished, would the applicant be able to access the house through the garage.

Mr. Spink answered no. The applicant would have to leave the house to access the garage. Mr. Spink pointed out that valuable space would be lost in the kitchen if a door to the garage was inserted.

Mr. Spink testified that a seepage pit will be put in to handle the drainage from all the new roof surfaces from the house.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked if the homeowners had any difficulties with run-off on their property.

Mr. Cedrone answered there are no drainage issues on the property. He has worked on the grading in the back yard to correctly handle the run-off.

Mr. Spink submitted Exhibit A-2: a Google map giving an aerial view of the applicant's home and the neighboring homes.

Using Exhibit A-2, Mr. Spink pointed out the similarities of the applicant's home with the neighboring homes. Mr. Spink believed that the proposals, if constructed, would help make the applicant's home achieve closer conformity with the surrounding houses. The proposed addition at the back of the resident's home will make the house line up with the home to the right.

Mr. Herbert asked what would be the proposed height of the house in relationship to the homes on either side.

Mr. Spink answered that the home will have a height of 31.79 feet to the maximum ridge. This height is under the required measurement. The height will also match up with the neighboring homes on either side.

Mr. Spink submitted Exhibit A-3: a colored rendering of what the proposed home would look like. He pointed out that the garage will be placed at a lower elevation. The current bay window on the right side will be removed. The A/C unit will be relocated to lessen any noise to the neighbors. Shingle style siding will be put on the home's exterior.

Chrmn. Cifelli brought up any bulk concerns. He asked if there were any photos of the homes across the street.

Mr. Spink answered that he didn't have any photos of across the street.

Chrmn. Cifelli noted that spaces in between homes are very similar on the applicant's side of the street. How does it look on the other side of the street.

Mr. Cedrone felt the homes across the street could be set back a little farther. The lots may be slightly larger than those on his side of Dunbar Street. However, they are in keeping with the traditional colonial style, probably constructed in the 1930s or 40s. Directly across the street from the Cedrones' home are two colonial homes.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked what would be the proposed roof elevation for the addition to the kitchen.

Mr. Spink answered approximately 2 ½ feet taller from where the current ridge line runs.

Chrmn. Cifelli felt that arrangement will not impact the light and air situation between the applicant's home and the neighbor next door.

Referring to the front elevation of the home, Chrmn. Cifelli confirmed with Mr. Spink that the proposed bulk will be on the left hand side on the second floor which would be next to the neighbor's one-story, single car garage. No real invasion of space will result.

Mr. Williams offered Chrmn. Cifelli a street view. It showed the applicant's home and the neighboring homes up and down the street. Mr. Williams put it up on the Zoom screen.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked if the Board members had any questions so far.

Mr. Degidio asked if the garage would count towards the Floor Area Ratio (FAR).

Chrmn. Cifelli answered that if the garage was attached to the house it counts as FAR.

Mr. Degidio pointed out that the stamped plans reveal 1600 sq. ft. on the first floor, including the garage, and the 1194 sq. ft. on the second floor thus making the FAR come out to 2794 sq. ft., not 2671 sq. ft.

Mr. Spinks noted that there were issues with the drawing he had before him. The garage had not been included. He accepted Mr. Degidio's calculations for 1600 sq. ft. for the first floor and 1194 sq. ft. for the second floor. Therefore, the FAR would total 2794 sq. ft.

Chrmn. Cifelli and Mr. Herbert concluded that a FAR variance was needed. Chrmn. Cifelli and Mr. Spink agreed that the proposed FAR is approximately 118 sq. ft. over the allowable. Attorney Dwyer added the FAR variance to the list of variances being sought for this application. He reminded Attorney Lindeman that at least 5 affirmative votes were needed to grant the FAR variance.

Chrmn. Cifelli and Attorney Lindeman reviewed the options that Mr. and Mrs. Cedrone could now pursue with this application, with the Floor Area variance now included.

Attorney Dwyer asked Attorney Lindeman if the notice for this application had included "catch-all" language for all variances that may arise.

Attorney Lindeman was not sure.

Attorney Dwyer suggested this notice situation be checked on before the Board takes a poll. He pointed out that the notices have changed their language since the Board meetings have become virtual. The notice for the virtual meetings have the catch-all language.

At Chrmn. Cifelli's request, Ms. Holler read aloud the Zoning Bd. notices that have been published during the Covid months when virtual meetings were, and still are being held.

Mr. Williams and Chrmn. Cifelli asked if that language had been used for the Cedrone application notices sent to the newspaper and the 200-ft. residents.

Ms. Holler answered that she would have to go down the hall and check Ms. Boardman's desk. She asked for a minute or two.

Chrmn. Cifelli noted that this would be a good time to take a brief break in the meeting.

At 8:45 p.m. a break was taken in the meeting.

At 9:00 p.m. the meeting resumed.

Attorney Lindeman reported that he did not find the catch-all language in the notice sent out by the applicants. Also, Mr. and Mrs. Cedrone have consulted with Mr. Spink about making some minor changes to their drawings, and presenting a condition to the Board to take away the need for a FAR variance.

Chrmn. Cifelli confirmed with Attorney Lindeman that the applicants would like to make drawings to reduce the FAR by 118 sq. ft.

Chrmn. Cifelli clarified to Attorney Lindeman and the Cedrones that if the FAR variance remained in the application, they would have to re-notice. They should be ready to address the proposed FAR, should they decide to keep the FAR and carry the application.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked if the Board had any further questions for Mr. and Mrs. Cedrone or Mr. Spinks.

There were none.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked if the public had questions for any of the witnesses.

The public had no questions.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked if the public had any comments on the application.

Mark Visco, 11 Duchamp Place, was sworn in by Attorney Dwyer. Mr. Visco testified that he lived next door to the Cedrone residence. He pointed out that Mr. and Mrs. Cedrone will be keeping their addition well within the boundaries that Mr. Visco had done with his own addition. Mr. Visco was appreciative that the Cedrones were removing their existing deck and putting in a lower patio; thereby giving the Visco Family more privacy. Mr. Visco believed that the proposed plans are in keeping with the neighborhood. Mr. Visco did not consider the proposed FAR would be a major impact. He asked the Board to please approve the application.

There were no further comments from the public.

Chrmn. Cifelli pointed out that this application will be carried to next month's Board meeting with the correct notices going out to the public.

Chrmn. Cifelli took an informal poll of whether Board members supported this application thus far:

Mr. Herbert - yes, he supported it; however he wanted to hear testimony on the FAR situation.

Mr. Infante - yes, he supported it. The requests were not overly excessive. The air, light, and open space of the neighbors will not be affected.

Mr. Montague – stated that he would like to hear more about the proposed FAR before deciding on the application.

Mr. Tobia - yes, he supported it thus far. However, he would like to hear testimony on the FAR variance.

Mr. Degidio - yes, so far he supported it. The plans improved the property and he was glad the neighbor supported it. The FAR testimony would be appreciated.

Chrmn. Cifelli - he agreed with the comments made so far by the Board members. The bulk being proposed will have a minimum impact because of the shape of the neighboring homes on either side. However, the proposed FAR still has to be examined.

Chrmn. Cifelli announced that Application ZB 21-013: Cedrone – 13 Duchamp Place will be carried to the January 26, 2022 Zoning Board of Adjustment meeting. The applicants must do a re-notification for this second hearing.

Application ZB 21-012

Thomas & Melissa Ciro

13 Lincoln Avenue

Block: 86 Lot: 25

Side Yard Setback (Left)

Exterior Side Yard Setback (Right) Walnut St.

Rear Yard Setback

Building Coverage

Attorney Dwyer swore in the following:

Thomas & Melissa Ciro, the applicants

Seth Leeb, architect for the applicants

Mr. Leeb submitted his professional credentials to the Board. The Board accepted them.

Mrs. Ciro gave an introductory statement on the application. She testified that their current home is modest-sized with 3 bedrooms with 1 ½ baths. Mrs. Ciro and her husband would like to live in this home for a long time. They do not want to diminish the design of this house. They would just like to make the home a little more functional.

On the Zoom screen, Mr. Leeb showed 4 different views of the applicant's home. Mr. Leeb testified that the applicant's home is a non-conforming house built in 1941. He stated that the applicants are proposing to add and renovate the home. Mr. Leeb put the existing and proposed drawings side by side on the Zoom screen.

Mr. Leeb testified that a one story addition will be constructed over the garage in the front. On the Zoom screen, he pointed out where more additions are being proposed over the house. The existing kitchen will be expanded. The dining area will be re-located. A new master bedroom and master bathroom will be created.

At this point in the meeting, Chrmn. Cifelli announced that the Androski application: Application ZB 21-006: 17 Yale Street will be carried to the January 26, 2022 Zoning Board of Adjustment meeting.

Using the floor plans on the Zoom screen, Mr. Leeb explained the proposed addition at the front of the house and the moving of the garage forward in order to create a mudroom and a powder room at the back. A front covered porch is also being proposed.

Mr. Leeb reviewed what will be constructed on the second floor where the rear additions and kitchen expansion on the first floor will be created.

Mr. Leeb put the proposed front and side elevations of the home, with the on the Zoom screen. An addition will be constructed over the existing one car garage. The existing roof will be raised a little bit to accommodate the proposed additions. Mr. Leeb showed the right rear elevation of the home with the proposed addition.

Mr. Leeb submitted and explained Exhibit A-1: eleven photos giving different views of the neighborhood in relationship to the applicant's home. He explained the similarities of many of these neighboring homes to the applicant's home. All of the homes, on the same side of the street as the applicant, have garages built on the left-hand side of the house. Some of them have a second floor.

Mr. Leeb testified that 4 variances are being sought. He reviewed the data for the left side yard setback. Because of the corner setbacks, Mr. Leeb felt a hardship was created. Mr. Leeb discussed the exterior side yard setback situation.

Regarding the C-2 variance, Mr. Leeb testified that the benefits outweigh the detriments. This variance is triggered by the height of the house. Mr. Leeb noted that the fourth variance is a building coverage variance. The plans will exceed the allowable existing coverage by 113 sq. ft.

Chrmn. Cifelli suggested Mr. Leeb to not present the argument that a corner lot is a hardship. The Board is well aware, however, of the challenges that corner lots face when variances are being sought.

Mr. Leeb acknowledged Chrmn. Cifelli's advice. He will instead testify as to the benefits outweighing the detriments, rather than presenting a hardship situation.

Mr. Leeb explained that the first floor plan was re-configured to create a little office. Following a recent trend, the dining room will become slightly larger and informal. He noted that the living room will become more of a living family space. Mr. Leeb discussed a 2 ½ inch jog that will be created on the first floor. It will be maintained on the second floor. This jog will give depth and help break up the massing on the house.

Mr. Leeb testified that the second story being constructed over the garage will conform with side yard setback regulations. He reviewed the proposed changes to the existing roof pitch.

Mr. Leeb testified that many of the neighboring homes have similar additions constructed at the rear. A number of them have additions over their garages.

Mr. Leeb stated that there is a storm drainage easement at the rear of the property.

Mr. Leeb that the proposed building coverage is 113 sq. ft. over the allowable. He believed that the proposed additions were modest in size. No Floor Area Ratio variance is needed.

Regarding the right sideyard overage, Chrmn. Cifelli noted the benefit of having a street run on that side. It will not be impacting a neighbor. Chrmn. Cifelli and Mr. Leeb reviewed the left side yard that is being proposed, first floor, second floor, with the moving forward of the garage. Chrmn. Cifelli confirmed with Mr. Leeb that the bulk being proposed at the rear of the house will be 12 feet from the rear property line. Mr. Leeb stated that in order to do this, the roof of the garage has to be re-built.

Mr. Leeb testified that the existing character of the home will not change. The proposed front porch will break up the facade of the front of the home, as well as provide functionality for the owner. The porch will give visitors coverage from the elements. Mr. Leeb testified that the proposed additions will not create any light or air hazards for the adjacent neighbors. The proposed additions will give functional space to the house and increase the value of the property. Mr. Leeb did not believe there would be any detriment to the public good. The benefits of this application outweigh any detriments. If the variances were granted, there would be no impairment to the Borough's zoning plan.

Chrmn. Cifelli confirmed with Mr. Leeb that the current garage has no access to the house. Mr. Leeb pointed out that a detached two-car garage would not work well on this property. The property is too narrow and such a proposal would require more variances. Chrmn. Cifelli confirmed with Mr. Leeb that the proposed mudroom would allow now someone from the garage to take off coats and boots before entering the house.

Chrmn. Cifelli and Mr. Leeb reviewed the sizes of the proposed bedrooms.

Summing up, Mr. Leeb felt that the proposals will be in keeping with the neighborhood. These will be modest additions to a modest-sized house.

The Board had no questions for Mr. Leeb.

Mr. and Mrs. Ciro had nothing more to add to tonight's presentation. They thanked the Board for their time and consideration.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked if the public had any comments on the application.

Gordon Ballard, 9 Lincoln Ave., was sworn in to testify by Attorney Dwyer.

Mr. Ballard stated that he lived two homes to the north of the applicant's home. He has lived on Lincoln Ave. for 21 years. Mr. Ballard believed the proposed additions were tasteful and in keeping with the neighborhood.

Jo-Ann Soroczynski, 3 Lincoln Ave., was sworn in to testify. She testified that she has lived at this address for over 40 years. Mrs. Soroczynski was glad that a knock-down was not happening. She felt the Ciro's have created a beautiful design for their home.

There were no further comments from the public.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked for comments from the Board. Mr. Tobia felt that the application was a proposing a nice design, and a modest request. He believed the variances were acceptable. Mr. Herbert agreed with Mr. Tobia's comments. The 113 sq. ft. of overage will not really infringe on the neighbors. Mr. Montague pointed out that none of the neighbors object to these plans, so he will vote in favor of it. Mr. Degidio believed none of the requests were excessive. Mr. Infante agreed with Mr. Tobia and Mr. Herbert's comments on the application. Chrmn. Cifelli explained why he could accept both the left and right sideyard variances. He felt the proposed rear yard extension is not a problem. Chrmn. Cifelli believed the house needed the additional 113 sq. ft. for much needed modernization.

Chrmn. Cifelli made a motion to approve Application 21-012: Ciro – 13 Lincoln Avenue with the applicant to follow any stipulations made by the Borough Engineer regarding stormwater. Mr. Infante seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken:

Mr. Herbert	-	yes
Mr. Tobia	-	yes
Chrmn. Cifelli	-	yes
Mr. Montague	-	yes
Mr. Degidio	-	yes
Mr. Infante	-	yes

Application 21-013 was approved.

Before adjourning, Chrmn. Cifelli reminded Board members that the next meeting will be the Board's Reorganization Meeting for 2022. He appointed Mr. Haeringer and Mr. Tobia to serve on the Search Committee to organize a Slate of Officers for the Zoning Board of Adjustment for 2022.

At 10:20 p.m. the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted:

Elizabeth Holler
Recording Secretary