

**SUDBURY EAST PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES
Thursday, August 10, 2017 at 5:30 p.m.
Sudbury East Planning Board Office
39 Lafontaine Street, Warren, Ontario**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Michel Bigras, Greg Hunt, Heide Ralph, Ginny Rook, Jim Rook, Paul Schoppmann, Denny Sharp, Ned Whynott

MEMBERS ABSENT: Carol Lemmon, Jim Stankovich

OFFICIALS PRESENT: Matthew Dumont, Director of Planning/Secretary-Treasurer
Karen Beaudette, Administrative Assistant

PUBLIC PRESENT: Normand Beaulieu, Philip Boivin, Pierre Boivin, James Dorland, Jeff Johnson, Cathy Lubke, Frank Lubke, Nancy Roy, Ray Sabourin, Doreen Thompson

1. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

Chair Bigras called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Resolution: 17-047

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the agenda for the Sudbury East Planning Board regular meeting of August 10, 2017 be adopted as distributed

MOVED BY: Heide Ralph

SECONDED BY: Jim Rook

Carried.

3. DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST AND GENERAL NATURE THEREOF

No disclosures of Pecuniary Interest.

4. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

a) Sudbury East Planning Board – Regular meeting of June 15, 2017 be adopted as distributed.

Resolution: 17-048

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the minutes of the Sudbury East Planning Board's regular meeting of June 15, 2017 be adopted as distributed.

MOVED BY: Heide Ralph

SECONDED BY: Paul Schoppmann

Carried

5. PRESENTATIONS/DELEGATIONS

a) Philip Boivin – Final Consent Fee

Philip and Pierre Boivin asked for reconsideration for an application fees for Consent. Pierre Boivin stated that errors had been made at the beginning of the application process and that surveys did not have to be done, according to his lawyer. The property should have been a natural split as the newly severed property in the middle belongs to another party now. There should only have been one application and the Boivin's are looking for leniency from the Board in respect to application fees as the second consent has lapsed because the conditions were not fulfilled. The Director of Planning distributed a sketch to the Board members from the original application. The Director of Planning described to the Board the original application, the process taken and the reasons that the second application lapsed.

Mr. Boivin stated that the previous planner had made an error when the application process started. The Director of Planning stated that the no error was committed by the previous planner. The original sketch submitted by the applicant showed the intent to sever two 80 acre parcels. Mr. Boivin n suggested that errors occurred on both sides and that the previous planner added irrelevant conditions including Parkland Dedication. Mr. Boivin was adamant that they would not be submitting another application.

Member Hunt and Member Whynott both agreed with Mr. Boivin and that this was not major issue and that this should be easily resolved. The Director of Planning stated that the property description of the second severed lot does not have any relation to parts on a plan of survey. The new pin numbers do not indicate a plan of survey. Mr. Boivin said that his father was told to let it lapse by the current Director of Planning and he does not understand why he has to have two surveys done. Member Whynott stated that he agreed with Mr. Boivin and if the middle lot was surveyed, that should be sufficient. The Director of Planning stated that the parts of the survey would have been conveyed to the PIN. The two lots to be severed on the original application should have both been surveyed instead of only the one lot.

Member Hunt referred to the application sketch which shows two 80 acre parcels and one 40 acre parcel, with the severed lot in the middle, indicating three separate parcels. Member Ralph said that there were still two consent applications. Mr. Boivin said that the original parcel already had a survey done. The Director of Planning agreed but also said that the original survey was not included in any of the property descriptions when the original applications were submitted. Member Hunt asked what the Board needs to come to an agreement with Mr. Boivin. Member Whynott also stated that this issue has to be resolved somehow and perhaps just an administration fee be charged to the Boivin's for a new application.

Member Ralph stated that the severances the Boivin's are requesting now are not what they initially asked for in the original applications. The newly severed lots require a survey and the initial consent application cannot be changed. Member Schoppmann reminded the Board that there is not a lot of room in the Planning Board budget and the members should always be mindful of the application fees. Member Hunt stated that the Boivin's had already paid for two consent applications but were told to let the second application lapse. The Director of Planning stated that he had suggested the application

lapse because the final consent requests were submitted at the last minute, there was not enough time for the Boivin's to fulfill the conditions for final consent on the second lot. Member Schoppmann agreed that the change in the Planning Board's staff might have played a role in the issue but that there should not be any discounts on fees. In this case the application fee should be at least half.

Member Whynott said that the Board has discussed this issue enough and the Boivin's should be charged an administration fee. The entire application was not handled properly and the second final consent should have been allowed. Member Ralph stated that this is not a problem originating with the Planner and that she agreed with Member Schoppmann. The Planning Board has had discussions regarding reduction of application fees in the past. There was obviously a misunderstanding on the part of the applicants and that the fees should be at least half for any new application. Chair Bigras asked the Director of Planning what the recirculation fee would be. The Director of Planning said \$200.00. Mr. Boivin said that the applications were already circulated. The Director of Planning stated that the new application would have to be circulated again. Member Hunt recommended an application fee of \$200.00 be charged. Member Ralph recommended an application fee of be \$400.00. The Director of Planning said that \$300.00 would be agreeable and asked if it would include the Final Consent fee in that amount. It was agreed that the final consent fee be included in the \$300.00. Mr. Boivin thanked the Board for their time discussing the matter.

Resolution: 17-049

BE IT RESOLVED THAT cost of a new application for the lapsed B/14/16/MW be for administrative costs of \$300.00.

MOVED BY: Ned Whynott

SECONDED BY: Greg Hunt

Carried

6. ZONING CONFORMITY PERMITS

a) Second Quarter 2017

The Zoning Conformity Permits issued for the Second Quarter of 2017 were presented to the Board.

7. ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENTS

The chair advised that a Public Hearing will be held before the Planning Board makes a decision on a zoning by-law amendment. Also that the analysis and discussion serves two purposes: first, to present to the Planning Board and the public the details and background to a proposed Zoning By-law Amendment; and second, to receive comments from the public and agencies before a Planning Board decision is made.

The Director of Planning Advised that Notice of the Public Hearing was posted in the Planning Board office and sent by First Class Mail to assessed owners within 120 metres of the property subject to the Zoning By-law Amendment Application and to those persons and agencies likely to have an interest in the application. The Notice was sent on July 19, 2017, being over twenty (20) days prior to this

evenings meeting (ZBA 16-01BRW and B/02-03/16/BRW – Jeff and Cindy Johnson) (ZBA 17-09BRW – Raymond Sabourin and Doreen Thompson). Included with the Notice was an explanation of the purpose and effect of the proposed Consent and a key map showing the location of the property. The circulation was provided in accordance with the provisions of the Planning Act, R.S.O., Chapter P.13.

a) ZBA 16-01BRW and B/02-03/16/BRW – Jeff and Cindy Johnson

Mr. James Dorland, agent, and Mr. Jeff Johnson, owner, were present for questions or comments from the Board.

The Director of Planning summarized the application. The subject property is located at 26 Chamberland Road in the Unincorporated Township of Burwash. The purpose of the applications for consent and zoning by-law amendment are to sever two (2) Residential Rural (RR) lots off of Nepewassi Lake Road as well as to rezone the lands to recognize the proposed use.

The proposed severed lots are to be approximately 0.81 hectares each in area with frontages ranging from 67.0 metres to 69.0 metres. The proposed retained lands are to be approximately 4.6 hectares with a frontage of 60.0 metres and contain an existing dwelling and a wood shed.

The two lots will have frontage on Nepewassi Lake Road and have separate entrances. The Ministry of Transportation (MTO) has deemed the entrances to be acceptable from the Local Roads Board point of view. If these entrances are used, the owner must be prepared to purchase a culvert that will be installed by MTO as per the Local Roads Board specifications.

The Official Plan allows for limited lot creation in the Rural Policy Area and sets priorities for development outside of settlement areas provided that certain criteria are met as outlined on pages 2 and 3 of the staff report.

With respect to zoning, the subject property will no longer meet the requirements of the Rural (RU) Zone therefore the subject property will be rezoned to Residential Rural (RR) to recognize the proposed lot creation as well as the retained lot.

The Ministry of Transportation (MTO) commented that they have no concerns regarding traffic issues. The Sudbury and District Health Unit (SDHU) provided supportive comments for a septic tank and leaching bed system on the severed lots.

No other comments were received through agency circulation.

Planning staff recommend that the by-law amendment be passed to recognize the intended use of the subject lands and that consent application be approved to create two (2) Residential Rural (RR) lots.

Member Schoppmann reinforced the one year time period for the application to lapse.

Resolution: 17-050

BE IT RESOLVED THAT By-law Number 17-04 being a By-law for the purpose of amending Zoning By-law No. 14-01 of the Sudbury East Planning Board, in respect of application ZBA 16-01BRW, submitted by Jeff and Cindy Johnson be read a first and second time this 10th day of August, 2017.

MOVED BY: Ginny Rook

SECONDED BY: Heide Ralph

Carried

Resolution: 17-051

BE IT RESOLVED THAT By-law Number 17-04 being a By-law for the purpose of amending Zoning By-law No. 14-01 of the Sudbury East Planning Board, in respect of application ZBA 16-01BRW submitted by Jeff and Cindy Johnson be read a third and final time this 10th day of August, 2017.

MOVED BY: Heide Ralph

SECONDED BY: Ginny Rook

Carried

Resolution: 17-052

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Consent Application B/02-03/16/BRW submitted by Jeff and Cindy Johnson be recommended for approval as per the report prepared by the Director of Planning.

MOVED BY: Paul Schoppmann

SECONDED BY: Jim Rook

Carried

The Chair advised that there is a 20 day appeal period during which time any person or public body may, not later than 20 days after the giving of notice under Section 53(17) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, Chapter P.13 is completed, appeal the decision or any condition imposed by the Planning Board or appeal both the decision and any condition to the Ontario Municipal Board by filing with the Secretary-Treasurer a notice of appeal setting out the reasons for the appeal, accompanied by the fee prescribed under the Ontario Municipal Board Act. During this appeal period, no building permit may be issued or other work commenced.

The Chair advised that there is a 20 day appeal period during which time any person or public body may appeal the decision or any condition imposed by the Planning Board by filing an appeal with the Secretary-Treasurer as prescribed by the Ontario Municipal Board Act.

The applicants have one year to fulfill the conditions of this provisional consent or the approval will lapse.

b) ZBA 17-09BRW – Raymond Sabourin and Doreen Thompson

Mr. Sabourin and Ms. Thompson, owners, were present for questions or comments from the Board.

The Director of Planning summarized the application. The subject property is municipally known as 83 East Shore Road in the Unincorporated Township of Burwash. The application proposes to rezone the subject lands from the current Waterfront Residential (WR) Zoning to Waterfront Residential (WR) Zoning with Special Provisions. The Special Provisions to be implemented permit the construction of a seasonal dwelling, a sewage disposal system and protect the natural vegetation along the shoreline from the Optimal Summer Water Level setback which is 20.0 metres. The aerial photography shows that the subject lands have water frontage owned by the Crown. Due to the undersized parcel of land, these regulations must be enforced prior to issuance of a zoning conformity permit. The application generally complies with the policies of the Official Plan as per page 2 in the staff report.

With respect to agency circulation no comments were received. No comments or concerns were received from the public.

It is recommended that the by-law be passed to recognize the Optimal Summer Water Level restriction to permit a seasonal dwelling and a septic system.

Member G. Rook asked if the lot was large enough to accommodate a dwelling and septic bed. The Director of Planning stated that under the current by-law it is not large enough but that provision 6.26 acknowledges the legal non-complying undersized lot. Member Ralph asked if it was possible for the owners to purchase the Crown waterfront. The Director of Planning said that there is a long waiting list for owners to purchase Crown property. The process could take a lot of years to complete. Member Schoppmann asked if the septic bed was approved. Mr. Sabourin stated that he had approval from the Sudbury and District Health Unit (SDHU) for the septic bed and would still have to apply for a permit to have one installed.

Resolution: 17-053

BE IT RESOLVED THAT By-law Number 17-05 being a By-law for the purpose of amending Zoning By-law No. 14-01 of the Sudbury East Planning Board, in respect of application ZBA 17-09BRW, submitted by Raymond Sabourin and Doreen Thompson be read a first and second time this 10th day of August, 2017.

MOVED BY: Jim Rook

SECONDED BY: Denny Sharp

Carried

Resolution: 17-054

BE IT RESOLVED THAT By-law Number 17-05 being a By-law for the purpose of amending Zoning By-law No. 14-01 of the Sudbury East Planning Board, in respect of application ZBA 17-09BRW submitted by Raymond Sabourin and Doreen Thompson be read a third and final time this 10th day of August, 2017.

MOVED BY: Heide Ralph

SECONDED BY: Ned Whynott

Carried

The Chair advised that there is a 20 day appeal period during which time any person or public body

may, not later than 20 days after the giving of notice under Section 53(17) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, Chapter P.13 is completed, appeal the decision or any condition imposed by the Planning Board or appeal both the decision and any condition to the Ontario Municipal Board by filing with the Secretary-Treasurer a notice of appeal setting out the reasons for the appeal, accompanied by the fee prescribed under the Ontario Municipal Board Act. During this appeal period, no building permit may be issued or other work commenced.

8. CONSENT APPLICATIONS

a) B/15/17/KL – Estate of Genevieve Bateman

Mr. James Dorland, agent, was present for questions or comments from the Board.

The Director of Planning summarized the application. The subject property is located at 53 Ontario Street in the Municipality of Killarney. The application proposed to sever 0.16 hectares in lot area with a lot frontage of approximately 18.3 metres from the subject property which contains a mobile home. The proposed retained lot which forms part of the existing right-of-way (known municipally as Ontario Street) is to be 0.20 hectares in lot area with a lot frontage of 10.0 metres and is the travelled portion of the road that will be transferred to the Municipality of Killarney as a condition of approval.

With respect to the Official Plan policies, Section 4.5.1 allows for separating existing legal uses. The lot was transferred without obtaining planning consent in 1977 creating a contravention to Section 50 of the Planning Act.

With respect to zoning, the severed lot will continue to meet the provisions of the Residential One (R1) Zone. The retained lot is to be transferred to the Municipality of Killarney because it is an existing right-of-way and is not considered a buildable lot for residential purposes.

With respect to agency circulation, staff of the Municipality of Killarney had no comments or concerns. No other comments were received through agency circulation or from the public.

There were no other comments or questions from the Board.

Resolution: 17-055

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Consent Application B/15/17/KL submitted by the Estate of Genevieve Bateman be recommended for approval as per the report prepared by the Director of Planning.

MOVED BY: Heide Ralph

SECONDED BY: Jim Rook

Carried

The Chair advised that there is a 20 day appeal period during which time any person or public body may appeal the decision or any condition imposed by the Planning Board by filing an appeal with the Secretary-Treasurer as prescribed by the Ontario Municipal Board Act.

The applicants have one year to fulfill the conditions of this provisional consent or the approval will lapse.

b) B/16/17/SC – Lise Barbe

No member of the public was present for questions or comments from the Board.

The Director of Planning summarized the application. The subject property is located at 466 Turcot Road in the Municipality of St. Charles. The application proposed to sever 5.0 hectares in lot area with a lot frontage of approximately 153.0 metres from the subject property which is vacant. The proposed retained lot is to be 4.49 hectares in lot area with a lot frontage of 125.0 metres and contains a single detached dwelling and detached garage.

With respect to the Official Plan policies, Section 4.5.1 allows for separating lots that have merged on title. In this case, both lots have inadvertently merged on title due to pattern ownership.

With respect to zoning, the severed lot will continue to meet the provisions of the Rural Zone (RU) Zone. The retained lot is already zoned Residential Rural (RR) and will continue to meet these requirements.

With respect to agency circulation, staff of the Municipality of St. Charles had no comments or concerns. The Sudbury and District Health Unit (SDHU) stated that both the severed lot and retained lot are capable of development for installation of a septic tank and leaching bed system. Bell Canada had no concerns or easement requirements.

No other comments were received through agency circulation or from the public.

There were no other comments or questions from the Board.

Resolution: 17-056

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Consent Application B/16/17/SC submitted by Lise Barbe be recommended for approval as per the report prepared by the Director of Planning.

MOVED BY: Heide Ralph

SECONDED BY: Denny Sharp

Carried

The Chair advised that there is a 20 day appeal period during which time any person or public body may appeal the decision or any condition imposed by the Planning Board by filing an appeal with the Secretary-Treasurer as prescribed by the Ontario Municipal Board Act.

The applicants have one year to fulfill the conditions of this provisional consent or the approval will lapse.

c) B/17/17/MW – Barbara St. Germain

No member of the public was present for questions or comments from the Board.

The Director of Planning summarized the application. The subject property is located at 191 McKerral Road in the Municipality of Markstay-Warren. The application proposes a lot addition of approximately 0.7 hectares to be severed from the subject lands and added to the adjacent undersized parcel. This lot addition will ensure that the enlarged lot has sufficient area to be developed for residential purposes and meet the minimum requirements of the Residential Rural (RR) Zone.

This application was similar to B/33/15/MW which was approved by the Planning Board in 2015 but lapsed prior to all of the conditions being satisfied.

An application for zoning by-law amendment was approved by the Municipality of Markstay-Warren on December 21st, 2015 to ensure the entire enlarged lot is zoned Residential Rural (RR). The retained lands are to be 25.0 hectares in area with a lot frontage of 278.0 metres and will continue to meet the requirements of the Rural (RU) Zone.

Staff and Council of the Municipality of Markstay-Warren had no comments or concerns.

Bell Canada confirmed that they have an existing easement over the subject property and that their rights must be maintained. Bell did not have any additional concerns or easement requirements. The Sudbury and District Health Unit (SDHU) provided supportive comments for the application.

No other comments were received through agency circulation or from the public.

There were no other comments or questions from the Board.

Resolution: 17-057

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Consent Application B/17/17/MW submitted by Barbara St. Germain be recommended for approval as per the report prepared by the Director of Planning.

MOVED BY: Heide Ralph

SECONDED BY: Greg Hunt

Carried

The Chair advised that there is a 20 day appeal period during which time any person or public body may appeal the decision or any condition imposed by the Planning Board by filing an appeal with the Secretary-Treasurer as prescribed by the Ontario Municipal Board Act.

The applicants have one year to fulfill the conditions of this provisional consent or the approval will lapse.

d) B/18/17/FR – Normand and Pauline Beaulieu

Mr. Normand Beaulieu was present for questions or comments from the Board.

The Director of Planning summarized the application. The subject property is located at 3126 Highway 64 in the Municipality of French River. The application proposed to create one (1) Rural (RU) lot. The lot will be approximately 5.0 hectares in lot area with a lot frontage of approximately 146.0 metres and contains a single detached dwelling and accessory structures including a detached garage and barn. The retained lot will have approximately 60.0 hectares in lot area with a frontage of 256.0 metres and is presently vacant.

With respect to the Official Plan policies, limited lot creation in the Rural Policy Area is permitted and sets priorities for development outside of settlement areas, provided that certain criteria are met as outlined on pages 2 and 3 of the staff report.

With respect to zoning, the severed lot and retained lot will continue to meet the provisions of the Rural (RU) Zone.

With respect to agency circulation, staff of the Municipality of French River had no comments or concerns. The Ministry of Transportation (MTO) had no objections with the proposed severance, but stated that a land use permit will be required for any proposed buildings, septic systems, etc. located within 45.0 metres of the limit of the highway or 180.0 metres of any intersection along Highway 64. An MTO permit will also be required prior to the construction of any new entrances. Bell Canada had no concerns or easement requirements. The Sudbury and District Health Unit (SDHU) provided supportive comments.

No other comments were received through agency circulation or from the public.

There were no other comments or questions from the Board.

Resolution: 17-058

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Consent Application B/18/17/FR submitted by Normand and Pauline Beaulieu be recommended for approval as per the report prepared by the Director of Planning.

MOVED BY: Heide Ralph

SECONDED BY: Ginny Rook

Carried

The Chair advised that there is a 20 day appeal period during which time any person or public body may appeal the decision or any condition imposed by the Planning Board by filing an appeal with the Secretary-Treasurer as prescribed by the Ontario Municipal Board Act.

The applicants have one year to fulfill the conditions of this provisional consent or the approval will lapse.

e) **B/19/17/SC – Sixty-Four Ltd.**

Frank and Cathy Lubke, owners, were present for questions or comments from the Board.

The Director of Planning summarized the application. The subject property is located at 2648 Highway 535 in the Municipality of St. Charles. The application proposed to create one (1) Waterfront Residential (WR) lot. The lot will be approximately 0.12 hectares in lot area with a lot frontage of approximately 55.0 metres and contains a single detached dwelling with an attached garage. The retained lot will have approximately 3.2 hectares in lot area with a frontage of 281.0 metres and contains a Waterfront Commercial Tourist (WCT) establishment, known as the West Arm Lodge.

With respect to the Official Plan policies, Section 4.5.1 allows for separating lots that have merged on title. In this case, both lots have inadvertently merged on title due to pattern ownership.

With respect to zoning, the severed lot will be required to be rezoned to Waterfront Residential (WR) as a condition of approval to recognize the intended use. The retained lot will continue to meet the provisions of the Waterfront Commercial Tourist (WCT) Zone.

With respect to agency circulation, staff of the Municipality of St. Charles had no comments or concerns

The Ministry of Transportation (MTO) had no objections with the proposed severance, but stated that a land use permit will be required for any proposed buildings, septic systems, etc. located within 45.0 metres of the limit of the highway or 180.0 metres of any intersection along Highway 535. An MTO permit will be required prior to the construction of any new entrances. Bell Canada had no concerns or easement requirements. The Sudbury and District Health Unit (SDHU) provided supportive comments.

No other comments were received through agency circulation or from the public.

There were no other comments or questions from the Board.

Resolution: 17-059

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Consent Application B/19/17/SC submitted by Sixty Four Ltd. be recommended for approval as per the report prepared by the Director of Planning.

MOVED BY: Ned Whynott

SECONDED BY: Paul Schoppmann

Carried

The Chair advised that there is a 20 day appeal period during which time any person or public body may appeal the decision or any condition imposed by the Planning Board by filing an appeal with the Secretary-Treasurer as prescribed by the Ontario Municipal Board Act.

The applicants have one year to fulfill the conditions of this provisional consent or the approval will lapse.

9. NEW BUSINESS

a) DIRECTOR OF PLANNING ANNUAL EVALUATION

The Director of Planning will have been employed by the Sudbury East Planning Board for one year on August 29, 2017 and it is now time to implement the new annual evaluation process.

Member J. Rook suggested that Chair Bigras and one other member complete the evaluation forms on behalf of the Planning Board. Chair Bigras suggested that each Board member receive a copy of the evaluation forms via e-mail, fill the forms out and submit to him to tabulate. Member Sharp stated that she does not deal with the Director of Planning as much as other members and asked if a fair evaluation would be given because of this. Member Hunt asked if the evaluation process would be completed prior to the next SEPB meeting.

Chair Bigras advised that all Board members and the current Administrative Assistant should fill out the evaluation forms and submit to him or Member Whynott by August 25. Member Whynott and Chair Bigras will then review and tabulate the evaluations and set up an appointment with the Director of Planning to discuss the evaluations.

b) ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANTS POSITION

Chair Bigras introduced Ms. Nancy Roy to the Planning Board Members. Ms. Roy is the successful applicant for the Administrative Assistants position. Ms. Roy will start at the Planning Board office on September 5, 2017.

10. BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

No new business

11. NOTICES OF MOTION RECEIVED BY THE SECRETARY-TREASURER PRIOR TO THE CLOSING OF THE MEETING

No Notices of Motion were received

12. PAYMENT OF VOUCHERS

a) June and July 2017

Resolution 17-060

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the statement of disbursements for the month of June 2017 in the amount of \$18,983.81 and the month of July 2017 in the amount of \$11,931.50 to be distributed and is hereby approved for payment.

MOVED BY: Ginny Rook

SECONDED BY: Jim Rook

Carried

13. ADJOURNMENT

Resolution: 17-061

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Meeting be adjourned at 7:08 P.M.

AND THAT the next regular meeting be held on October 12th, at 5:30 P.M. at the Sudbury East Planning Board Office in Warren.

MOVED BY: Jim Rook

SECONDED BY: Paul Schoppmann

Carried.



CHAIR



SECRETARY-TREASURER

