PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES - CITY OF INVER GROVE HEIGHTS

Tuesday, December 3, 2019 – 7:00 p.m.
City Hall Chambers - 8150 Barbara Avenue

Chair Maggi called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Commissioners Present:	Pat Simon Tony Scales Joan Robertson Brett Kramer Jonathan Weber Elizabeth Niemioja Armando Lissarrague Annette Maggi Dennis Wippermann
Commissioners Absent:	
Others Present:	Heather Botten, Associate Planner Heather Rand, Community Development Director

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the November 19, 2019 Planning Commission meeting were approved as submitted.

1ST CLASS AUTO SALES - CASE NO. 19-47CV

Reading of Notice

Commissioner Simon read the public hearing notice to consider a request for a variance to allow a structure to be located within the rear yard setback and a conditional use permit amendment to expand the auto sales business, for the property located at 6370 Concord Boulevard. 13 notices were mailed.

Presentation of Request

Heather Botten, Associate Planner, explained the request as detailed in the report. She advised that the applicant is requesting an amendment to the existing CUP to allow for the construction of a new building south of the existing building. A variance from setbacks is also being requested as the building would be set five feet from the rear property line. She noted that the subject property is located between Concord Boulevard and the railroad right-of-way and is zoned B-3, General Business. The applicant is requesting the same five-foot rear yard setback line as the existing structure. Staff supports this variance request as the property is very narrow and limits the buildable area, the five foot setback for structures on this property has been in place since prior to the zoning ordinance, and the proposed building would be a reasonable use and would not impact abutting properties. Staff recommends approval of both requests with the conditions listed. Staff did not hear from any abutting property owners.

Opening of Public Hearing

James Krumble, 6370 Concord Boulevard, advised he was available to answer any questions.

Chair Maggi asked the applicant if he read and understood the report.

Mr. Krumble replied in the affirmative.

Commissioner Robertson asked what the applicant planned to use the proposed building for.

Mr. Krumble replied it would be used to detail their vehicles.

Chair Maggi closed the public hearing.

Planning Commission Recommendation
Motion by Commissioner Weber, second by Commissioner Wippermann, to approve the request for a variance to allow a structure to be located within the rear yard setback and a conditional use permit amendment to expand the auto sales business, for the property located at 6370 Concord Boulevard, with the conditions listed in the report and the practical difficulty as stated by staff.

Motion carried (9/0). This item goes to the City Council on December 9, 2019.

CITY OF INVER GROVE HEIGHTS (HOME OCCUPATIONS) – CASE NO. 19-27ZA

Reading of Notice
Commissioner Simon read the public hearing notice to consider the request for an ordinance amendment to Chapter 10-15-26 Home Occupations, to allow the use of accessory buildings as part of a home occupation. No notices were mailed.

Presentation of Request
Heather Botten, Associate Planner, explained the request as detailed in the report. She advised that the Planning Commission discussed this item on July 16, 2019 and provided many different viewpoints. Subsequent to that meeting staff brought the item back to a City Council work session. At that meeting they provided direction to focus on the use of accessory buildings in large lot residential; to maintain the current ordinance of not allowing outside employees; and require Interim Use Permits (IUP's)for home occupations that are operated out of accessory buildings. Currently home occupations are allowed if you comply with Chapter 10-15-26 of the City Code. This includes requirements such as the home occupation being engaged in by only the person living on the property and only when the business is conducted entirely within the principle structure and not in any attached or detached accessory structures. This includes all aspects of a business, including the storage of commercial or industrial related equipment or materials. The code has a special provision that allows for somebody to bring home their business vehicle to be stored overnight. When discussing a possible amendment to the home occupation ordinance staff pointed out several things to consider, including minimum lot size, hours of operation, greater setbacks for structures housing home businesses, and a public review process such as licensing or IUP. Staff continues to not support a change to the home occupation ordinance to allow the use of accessory buildings for business purposes based on the fact that businesses located in accessory buildings in residential areas are deemed incompatible and could compromise the quality of life in residential neighborhoods. They could also have adverse impacts to neighborhoods such as higher traffic volumes, noise and a change in aesthetics. It would also conflict with the City's comprehensive plan policy to maintain the rural character of established neighborhoods in the Agricultural and Estate residential districts. If the Planning Commission is looking to support an ordinance amendment to allow the use of accessory buildings as part of a home business staff suggests the following conditions: 1) an IUP would be required for all home occupations that utilize an accessory building, including the storage of business equipment, 2) the lot must be 2.5 acres or more and located in the E-1 or Agricultural zoning district, 3) outdoor storage would not be allowed relating to the home business, including trailers, and 4) the use would be clearly incidental and secondary to the residential use on the property.

Ms. Botten noted that she included home occupation ordinances in the packet for the neighboring cities of Eagan, West St. Paul and South St. Paul, all of which prohibit home occupation activity in accessory buildings. She also included the cities of Plymouth (who allows an accessory building to be used for storage in relation to a home business), Bloomington (who allows home business activities in accessory buildings with approval), and North St. Paul (who allows home occupations with an IUP).

Commissioner Scales asked for clarification of allowed usage in attached versus detached garages.

Ms. Botten replied that home occupations are currently not allowed in any accessory structure, whether it be attached or detached. The same rules apply to both.

Opening of Public Hearing

Mark Engen, 9255 Courthouse Blvd, questioned why staff had so much power regarding home occupations and stated many people in town did not feel good about staff.

Chair Maggi explained that tonight's public hearing process was an opportunity for residents to speak on this issue. She noted that the Planning Commission is a body of appointed volunteers who hear staff's recommendation but make their own independent recommendation; however, ultimately City Council is the body that makes the decisions.

Mr. Engen stated it was a struggle going through the public process earlier this year when he asked for a zoning code amendment to allow indoor storage of a tree trimming and removal business as an accessory use, and he hoped this ordinance amendment would be approved.

Commissioner Lissarrague asked Mr. Engen what he would like to see happen for his specific situation.

Mr. Engen advised that he always kept his property tidy and never had a problem. Now, however, he keeps one piece of equipment off-site and it was tampered with. He would like to see more people be able to have home occupations out of their accessory buildings because it allows them to save money, protect their equipment, and save gas by not having to drive to another location.

Chair Maggi closed the public hearing.

Planning Commission Discussion

Chair Maggi asked for a show of hands and determined that it was a split vote between those who generally supported an amendment change and those who opposed an amendment change. She asked Commissioners to discuss their thoughts, starting with those opposed to an ordinance amendment.

Commissioner Wippermann stated he was not in favor of amending the ordinance as the activities and noise associated with home occupations do not seem consistent with residential home ownership.

Chair Maggi asked Commissioner Wippermann if there were any constraints they could add that would make him support it.

Commissioner Wippermann replied they would be so restrictive that it would be essentially the existing ordinance.

Commissioner Lissarrague stated that people often purchase larger lots because they want to

enjoy peace and quiet and he was very concerned about the noise associated with having a home occupation next door. The code compliance coordinator has warned that it is difficult to monitor violators and by the time someone is able to respond there is no longer a problem. He did not think that people living on larger lots should suffer consequences that a smaller lot would not should this amendment go through.

Chair Maggi asked Commissioner Lissarrague if there were any constraints they could put in place that would make him be willing to move the amendment forward.

Commissioner Lissarrague stated it would be opening a can of worms that they would have a hard time closing. The length of time it takes the City to get violators into compliance could disrupt the neighbors for months or years and he had issue with that.

Commissioner Robertson believed that compliance enforcement was pertinent to home occupations but believed it to be a separate issue. She was concerned about the impact home occupations would have on larger lot neighborhoods and the people who chose to live there.

Commissioner Simon agreed with all three commissioners, stating enforcement was a major issue throughout the Twin Cities. Often the larger the lot the more things people bring in, and people often purchased large lots to enjoy nature rather than a neighbors' business activities. She would prefer they leave the ordinance as is.

Chair Maggi asked Commissioner Simon if there were any conditions that could be put in place that would make her support it.

Commissioner Simon replied perhaps if they could come up with a serious consequence for violators. It is too easy to write a check to pay for someone else to clean up the mess; there needs to be a tougher consequence.

Commissioner Kramer supported figuring out a way for residents to continue operating their businesses from their home while not impacting their neighbors. He did not see an issue with allowing an accessory building for a home occupation if it met the other criteria. He stated there will always be a bad apple, but it did not seem fair to penalize everybody as most people are going to abide by the rules. Therefore, he would prefer to make the ordinance broad and open-ended rather than focusing on the one bad apple.

Commissioner Scales stated there are currently home businesses in garages throughout the city. We are not going to be able to stop it; we are only going to be able to control it. He stated that most companies start in a garage, not a manufacturing facility. Some of the conversation has been about what things look like on the outside but what we are talking about are businesses internal to the building. If something looks bad outside that is the same issue we have right now; we have not created a new issue. He wants people to be able to start businesses out of their homes and hopefully grow enough to where they can eventually move to a commercial site. Although he understands needing some control, he does not want to limit people's ability to do that.

Chair Maggi asked Commissioner Scales if there were specific conditions he would want applied.

Commissioner Scales believed it was important to keep business-related items inside rather than being stored outdoors. He stated not all people purchase large lots to enjoy nature; many do so to enable them to build a large accessory structure, run a farm, be a contractor, etc. He agreed that noise was a concern; however, that is controlled by the City's noise ordinance. If a person driving by a property cannot tell there is a business on the property, he questioned why the City would care.

Commissioner Niemioja agreed with Minneapolis's position that if you do not know a business is there then it is not really a problem. She knows of many home businesses in the City that are in violation of the ordinance as it stands, but no one minds because they are not impacting their neighbors. There will always be exceptions that the City cannot regulate, but she thinks there are a couple things to think about regarding realistic home business situations. She supported some type of licensing to control and monitor home occupations and hopefully help with enforcement. She thinks the City should encourage entrepreneurship, stating IGH is an aging community and she would like to see seniors and others creating new businesses and trying to stay in IGH. She believes our community is different from those surrounding it and IGH is a city where there is a feeling of entrepreneurship. She would support the same hour restrictions as those approved for the industrial park off Courthouse Boulevard which she believed to be 11 PM to 6 AM.

Commissioner Weber stated good points were made on both sides of this issue. He advised that he chose to live on a larger lot because he wanted more land and the ability to store what he wanted to on his property. He does not see an issue with an individual running a business and storing their supplies on their property if they are storing it inside. If they impact their neighbors by making a lot of noise that should be handled as a noise ordinance violation. He would like to promote entrepreneurship by not overly restricting home occupations and allowing people to store equipment on their own property where it is safe, and they can tend to it as needed with low overhead. He supported a 2.5 acre minimum and approval by an IUP or preferably a license as it was a less daunting process. He has an issue with prohibiting trailers relating to the home business to be stored outside, stating he has personal trailers stored outside on his property.

Commissioner Scales stated there are many large employers in IGH that started in residential areas.

Chair Maggi believes that the nature of work is changing, and more people are running their own businesses and working from home. She would like to be progressive and look at home occupations as the future of our culture rather than saying no to protect our city. Her concern is the potential for residents to come in requesting variances for larger accessory buildings to have more room for their home business; therefore, she would recommend that no variances be allowed for home occupations.

Commissioner Lissarrague stated that just because businesses are currently violating the ordinance does not make it right, he was concerned about the noise issue as it is almost impossible to monitor and enforce, and he was opposed to allowing dog kennels, machine shops, and woodworking shops. He asked what the setback was for accessory buildings.

Ms. Botten advised that in the E-1 zoning district on a 2.5-acre lot the side setback for an accessory building is 10 feet. If the accessory building is larger than 1,000 gross square feet, the required setback is 50 feet from the property line.

Commissioner Lissarrague stated he purchased a large lot for the peace and quiet and does not want to hear barking dogs from a kennel or a machine shop running 50 feet from his property line.

Chair Maggi asked if dog kennels were currently allowed.

Ms. Botten replied that commercial dog kennels were allowed in the Agricultural zoning district with a conditional use permit.

Commissioner Robertson asked what the minimum lot size was in the Agricultural zone.

Ms. Botten replied five acres but noted there were non-conforming lots all over the city.

Commissioner Lissarrague was not opposed to someone being able to park their truck on their lot if it was sheltered from their neighbors, but he was concerned about anything that could negatively impact their neighbors' lifestyle.

Commissioner Niemioja stated perhaps Commissioner Lissarrague' s concerns would be alleviated if there was a review process that included the applicant coming before the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Weber asked if IUP's needed to come before the Planning Commission.

Ms. Botten replied in the affirmative.

Commissioner Scales sees this as a step process in which the City determines what type of businesses would be allowed.

Commissioner Robertson asked what implications were associated with obtaining a license to operate a home business.

Community Development Director Rand advised that it would likely impact their home insurance policy and property taxes.

Commissioner Robertson does not think the primary rationale for approving something should be that it is happening already. In her opinion if the City moves forward with an ordinance amendment it should include a minimum lot size. She was opposed to operating on a case-by-case basis because applicants could say a precedent was already set and they want approval as well for a similar use. She was also concerned that property owners would park their trailers, snowmobiles, cars, etc. outside because their accessory structure was filled with business vehicles/supplies.

Ms. Botten clarified that she believed the Bloomington ordinance divides it into three different categories: Type 1 is similar to our current ordinance, Type 2 are businesses that have the potential to adversely affect the neighborhood and need a special permit or approval from the Planning Commission or City Council, and Type 3 are prohibited home occupations.

Commissioner Lissarrague stated he would support a Bloomington-type ordinance amendment.

Commissioner Robertson thinks they need to know the impacts of licensing on taxes, etc. before recommending a licensing program.

Commissioner Weber stated those impacts were not a responsibility for this body but rather for the small business owner. From the insurance companies' eyes there is due diligence and paperwork on the part of the business owner to get a business policy to cover the business equipment at their business location, while still maintaining a homeowner's policy for the residence. The taxes are a responsibility of the business owner as well. The City's responsibility is to determine whether small business owners need to get an IUP, which is only temporary, or require licensing where the City can benefit from an annual license fee. This would also give the City an idea of what businesses are operating out of our City. He likes the idea of the Bloomington ordinance and opposes telling business owners they cannot store their own equipment in their own accessory structures. If a person has an accessory structure on their property that can facilitate their needs, he does not think the City should be hindering that.

Commissioner Niemioja stated she realizes that many home businesses exist within our city and she would like to find a way to give the City a funding source and some control over what is

allowed. She would like to see the City impose a stiff penalty for violators. She was in favor of adopting something similar to Bloomington in which violators received a civil injunction, then a fine, and then criminal misdemeanor prosecution. She does not want to prevent small businesses from being created; just allowing the City to have some control.

Commissioner Wippermann commented that if a contractor does well, they will then have to hire additional employees, and those employees will need to go to the contractor's home to pick up supplies; this generates additional business traffic that changes the character of neighborhoods.

Commissioner Kramer likes the Bloomington and North St. Paul ordinances and does not believe there needs to be restrictions on the lot and accessory building size. If the business owner is not negatively impacting his neighbors, he does not understand why it is a problem and does not think this needs to be restricted to larger lots.

Chair Maggi listed off the topics she believes need to be addressed, including setbacks, business occurring only internal to a building, noise, prohibited businesses, and controlling or prohibiting variances on properties with home occupations. She asked what other categories should be added.

Commissioner Robertson added lot size.

Commissioner Weber clarified that existing accessory structures should be grandfathered in.

Chair Maggi added they should discuss interim use permit versus license.

Commissioner Weber stated he supported licensing.

Chair Maggi asked Commissioners' opinion on a 2.5 acre minimum.

Commissioner Scales did not agree with having a minimum lot size, stating if the business owner was not bothering anyone they should be able to run their business there.

Chair Maggi asked what staff's recommendation was on the percentage of the structure to be used for personal use, noting that some cities had a set amount.

Ms. Botten replied that staff did not recommend a specific percentage and noted that it would be very difficult to enforce.

Chair Maggi stated if a business owner used their entire accessory structure for business, they would then have nowhere to park their personal vehicles and equipment.

Commissioner Scales replied they could park them in the driveway like many residents without businesses did.

Chair Maggi said the problem is that some people park on the street, which impacts the neighborhood. She thinks they need to stress that the primary use of that structure must be residential, and they must not negatively impact their neighbors.

Commissioner Scales stated that is no different from someone filling their garage with personal items and parking their vehicles outside.

Commissioner Kramer stated the City already has codes in place for accessory buildings (i.e. maximum size allowed, etc.).

Commissioner Weber asked if the City had always referred to attached garages as accessory structures.

Ms. Botten replied that when looking at the number of accessory buildings allowed on a property attached garages are not counted towards your total number allowed; however, for the home occupation ordinance it includes both attached and detached accessory structures.

After having a show of hands, it was determined that it was a split vote on whether there should be a minimum lot size.

Commissioner Robertson stated she could not support an ordinance amendment that does not include a minimum lot size as she sees no way neighbors would not be impacted by the associated activities of a home occupation in standard city lot neighborhoods.

Commissioner Scales stated this would be no different from a neighbor having a camper parked outside their house; it is a code enforcement issue.

Commissioner Robertson disagreed with using the argument that there are already existing problems.

Commissioner Scales clarified that his point was that the City needs to enforce existing codes before creating more restrictions.

Commissioner Niemioja stated she would support a licensing process as it would expedite the penalty process for violators.

Commissioner Robertson stated she would support something that required the absolute necessity of enforcement of licenses.

Chair Maggi asked staff if there was a benefit to the City from a financial or enforcement perspective of a license versus an IUP.

Ms. Botten replied that both processes have fees associated with them and would have to be periodically renewed. Without doing more research, at this point she does not necessarily prefer one method over the other. She noted that even the licensing process is different for the various licenses in the City.

Commissioner Lissarrague recommended that they have very strict enforcement associated with the license; perhaps monetary consequences and then ultimately license revocation.

Ms. Botten advised that both IUP's and licenses could be revoked but a license revocation may be an easier process.

Commissioner Weber asked if a license would be less labor intensive than an IUP from staff's standpoint.

Ms. Botten replied that it would depend on whether Planning staff would be processing the licensing.

Commissioner Scales noted that the City already processed numerous types of licenses.

Ms. Botten agreed, but stated they are handled by different departments.

Commissioners agreed that if the amendment were to move forward they would recommend an IUP or license process, whichever was determined to be the most appropriate.

Prohibited Uses of an Accessory Structure for a Home Occupation
The Commission recommended that the home businesses listed as prohibited in an accessory building in the Bloomington ordinance be adopted, with the addition of woodworking and/or lumber mill. This list includes motor vehicle or boat repair, service or painting; small engine and major household appliance repair; firearm or ammunition sale, lease or trade; manufacturing; taxidermy; unlicensed massage; escort businesses; body art establishments; and animal kenneling.

Noise
Chair Maggi asked if there should be hours of operation limitations.

Commissioner asked what the City's current quiet hours were.

Ms. Botten believed the noise ordinance requires quiet hours between the hours of 7 PM and 7 AM seven days a week.

Commissioner Robertson noted that residents are also prohibited from creating noise over a certain decibel level, regardless of the time of day.

Commissioner Kramer questioned whether the noise ordinance applied in all zoning districts.

Chair Maggi summarized that the Commission recommends some sort of noise ordinance relating to time and volume.

Internal vs. Outdoor
It was agreed that business storage and operation must occur internal to an accessory structure.

Lot Size
Chair Maggi asked if there needed to be a minimum lot size if all the recommended restrictions were met.

Commissioner Weber did not want to restrict the lot size and thereby handcuff viable businesses. Rather they should look at each situation from a common sense and licensing perspective.

At Commissioners' request Ms. Botten restated the three classifications of home businesses listed in the Bloomington ordinance. Type 1 are home businesses that have been found to not adversely affect the neighborhood, Type 2 are businesses that could potentially impact neighboring properties and therefore must go through a review process, and Type 3 are prohibited businesses.

After a show of hands, it was a split vote on whether to have a lot size minimum.

Setbacks
Commissioners were comfortable with retaining the existing setback requirements.

Variances
Chair Maggi asked if they could draft stronger language prohibiting variance requests for home occupations in an accessory structure.

Ms. Botten replied that if the applicant had a valid practical difficulty it would be hard to deny a variance request.

Chair Maggi asked if there was a maximum variance that could be requested regarding the size of an accessory structure.

Ms. Botten replied there was not.

Chair Maggi said her concern is that someone running a home business would ask for and receive a variance to have an enormous accessory building to store all their business equipment as well as their personal vehicles.

Commissioner Weber stated they could not speculate on what Council would or would not approve.

Commissioner Niemioja would like to hear a legal opinion from the city attorney on whether the City can prohibit residents from asking for a variance. She would like people to be able to ask for a variance as it may be for personal use rather than the business use and she would like something in the licensing that explains what the license is for.

Chair Maggi stated that as businesses grow, they are going to ask for even bigger accessory structures, and in her opinion, they need to then get an appropriate piece of property to run their business from because this is primarily a residential property.

Commissioner Robertson stated she would like it clearly stated in the business license application that the City will enforce its current ordinances and codes. If it is determined that the business owner seeks to deviate from those codes, we have a process in place to get a variance and the Planning Commission will be consistent and thoughtful in determining whether to recommend approval of said variance.

Percentage of Floor Area

Chair Maggi asked staff in the cities that allow it, what percentage of the accessory structure is the home business allowed to occupy.

Ms. Botten did not have all the information available but knew that Plymouth allows up to 50% of the total floor area of an accessory structure not to exceed 500 square feet.

Chair Maggi asked if Commissioners agreed that there should be some limit of that space because the primary use of this property is residential.

Commissioner Niemioja stated that would be difficult to enforce, but she would support allowing up to 50%. If a license were required that would allow for an inspection it would facilitate enforcement and penalization of a violation.

Commissioner Weber stressed that he did not want to allow only 25% of the accessory structure for home occupations because that would handcuff people from using the space like they want to.

Chair Maggi stated it is a residential property though; not a commercial property.

Commissioner Weber questioned how they would calculate the percentage.

Commissioner Scales questioned why a contractor storing three trailers in a building was different from someone having a lot of personal vehicles parked in the building.

Chair Maggi replied because if a contractor has three trucks it is likely because they have

employees and then it is no longer being used primarily as a residence.

Commissioner Niemioja stated it was important to differentiate between the accessory structure and the house. She would not want to further restrict what is going on in the house and if they were to put maximums on both she would like it to be generous. She was worried about the implications of having an overall percentage of both the house and the accessory structure.

Chair Maggi summarized that Commissioners agreed there should be a limit on the amount of space in an accessory building for a business. How that is to be calculated is yet to be defined.

Ms. Botten asked if Commissioners agreed that no outside employees would be allowed.

The Commission replied in the affirmative.

Chair Maggi clarified that no signs would be allowed as well. She summarized that the ordinance amendment would have to include a list of prohibited businesses as primarily detailed in the Bloomington ordinance with some additions to be determined, there would be a review of the current noise ordinance to ensure everyone is in agreement with that, all business usage must be internal to the accessory structure, no signs, no outside employees, a specified percentage of the accessory structure would be allowed for business use with the methodology of determining that yet to be determined, and a license or IUP process would be put in place.

Commissioner Lissarrague recommended that woodworking shop and lumber mill be added to the list of prohibited uses.

Chair Maggi noted that the Commission was undecided on lot size at this point. She asked if this would come back to the Planning Commission should City Council decide to move forward on an amendment.

Ms. Botten replied that it would not necessarily come back to the Commission.

Commissioner Robertson suggested they include current city code and ordinances related to setbacks and maximum size accessory structures.

Commissioner Weber replied those codes already must be enforced and should not be part of this ordinance amendment.

Commissioner Robertson questioned why noise was being included in the motion.

Chair Maggi replied because they did not have confirmation of the details of the current noise ordinance.

Commissioner Simon asked about the discussion regarding the prohibition of variances.

Chair Maggi advised that was now a moot point.

Planning Commission Recommendation

Motion by Commissioner Weber, second by Commissioner Scales, to approve the ordinance amendment with the condition that it include a list of prohibited businesses as primarily detailed in the Bloomington ordinance with the addition of woodworking shop and lumber mill, there would be a review of the current noise ordinance to ensure everyone is in agreement with that, all business usage must be internal to the accessory structure, no signs allowed, no outside employees allowed, a specified percentage of the accessory structure would be allowed for business use with

the methodology of determining that yet to be determined, and a license or IUP process would be put in place.

Commissioner Wippermann advised he would be voting no as he does not support an ordinance change without further discussion.

Motion carried (8/1 – Wippermann). This item goes to the City Council on January 27, 2020.

OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Botten advised that the December 17, 2019 Planning Commission meeting has been cancelled.

The meeting was unanimously adjourned at 9:51 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kim Fox
Recording Secretary