

**CITY OF GLOVERSVILLE PLANNING BOARD
AUGUST 2, 2016
7:00 P.M.
CITY HALL**

MEETING NOTES

PRESENT:

**JAMES ANDERSON, CHAIRMAN
GEOFFREY PECK, VICE CHAIRMAN
MATTHEW DONDE
JONATHAN KLUSKA
PETER SEMIONE, ALTERNATE**

**CINDY OSTRANDER, SECRETARY
BRANDON MYERS, CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER
SEAN GERAGHTY, SENIOR PLANNER**

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

II. APPROVE MINUTES OF LAST REGULAR MEETING:

MOTION : To approve the minutes to the July 5, 2016 meeting.
MADE BY : Peter Semione
SECONDED : Jonathan Kluska
VOTE : 5 in favor, 0 opposed

III. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD:

A. Purpose:

The City of Gloversville Planning Board offers a public comment period at the beginning of each of its meetings in an effort to allow the community an opportunity to comment or provide insight on a particular land use planning and/or zoning issue in the City. This comment period is not a public hearing and the Planning Board asks that you save comments regarding a particular project that is before the Board until the actual public hearing on the specific application itself. The Planning Board also asks that you not use the public comment period as a question and answer session since Board members will not enter into a dialogue regarding any particular issue.

There was no one to speak during the public comment period.

IV. ANTHONY MONGATO – CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC HEARING ON A SPECIAL PERMIT FOR MULTI-UNIT APARTMENT BUILDING:

A. Background:

Anthony Mongato would like to take a former manufacturing building he owns at 15 James Street in the City of Gloversville and convert it into a 6-unit multi-family residence (Tax Map Parcel No. 134.14-21-12). In 2004, a Certificate of Occupancy was issued for a single-family residence on the second floor of the building. Mr. Mongato would now like to renovate the entire structure and create five (5) additional apartments.

B. June 7 and July 5, 2016 Meetings:

During its June 7, 2016 meeting, the Planning Board began reviewing Anthony Mongato's Special Permit Application for a multi-unit apartment at 15 James Street. At that time, the Planning Board asked that the information identified below be provided on a revised Special Permit application prior to the public hearing. As of the Public Hearing date on July 5, 2016, the information was not provided to the Planning Board and consequently, the Public hearing on the application was left open.

1. A scaled drawing showing the exact location of all off-street parking spaces must be provided. The specific location and dimensions of each of those spaces must be shown.

STATUS: The same parking layout has been submitted.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty noted that Mr. Mongato's original submittal indicated that there were 20 off-street parking spaces available in his private lot. He noted that the applicant is showing eight (8) parking spaces on the revised drawing.

The Planning Board did not ask for any additional information regarding the availability of off-street parking.

Planning Board Chairman Jim Anderson indicated to the applicant that the Planning Board expects to have the parking lot cleared up of any junk or materials that are currently there.

Mr. Mongato agreed to clean up the parking lot and indicated that he would eventually like to sealcoat the parking area.

2. The location and widths of all access driveways to the property must be identified.

STATUS: Not Provided.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Mongato explained that the access to the off-street parking lot along Union Street is essentially wide open and is approximately 50' in width. He noted that the access to the property along the upper end of Union Street and on James Street is also wide opened and is approximately 25' and 30' in width respectively.

The Planning Board briefly discussed the idea of having the driveway access reduced in width and better defined on the property but eventually decided to leave the driveway openings in their current state.

3. The proposed location of a dumpster on the property must be identified. The Planning Board has asked that a stockade fence be provided around the dumpster for screening purposes.

STATUS: A Fenced in Dumpster location is labeled on the drawings.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Mongato explained that he intended to use a small dumpster that would be enclosed with a stockade fence. He stated that he didn't want to use a full-size dumpster for fear that everyone in the neighborhood would begin throwing garbage into the receptacle.

4. The location and design of any new outdoor lighting on the property should be identified.

STATUS: No new exterior lighting has been identified.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Mongato indicated that he would not be providing any new outdoor lighting but would be changing the flood lights to motion sensor lights on the garage.

5. A notation should be made on the drawing indicating that the only exterior changes to take place on the building will be painting, caulking and replacement of windows and doors.

STATUS: Not Provided.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Mongato explained that he would need to replace some of the siding tiles that have either fallen off or have been damaged.

Mr. Anderson indicated that the Planning Board expects him to make the building look presentable. He stated that the Planning Board wants the quality of the City's housing stock to be improved and expects this project to improve the appearance of the property.

Mr. Mongato noted that he will need to replace several of the windows in the building because of vandalism. He speculated that once the structure is occupied, the level of vandalism will be reduced.

Mr. Anderson indicated that the City Planning Board would also like a Knox Box placed on the building. He indicated that Mr. Mongato could get an application on how to obtain a Knox Box from the Fire Department.

Planning Board Member Geoff Peck asked if any signage would be erected on the property?

Mr. Mongato indicated that he did not intend to have any signage on the property.

Planning Board Member Peter Semione asked if there were common areas on the property for the tenants to use?

Mr. Mongato pointed out that, in his original submittal, he noted that there are two (2) lawn areas on his property for use by the tenants.

C. State Environmental Quality Review:

During its June 7, 2016 meeting, the Planning Board authorized the filing of a negative declaration under SEQR for this proposed action. Consequently, unless new additional information has been provided, no further SEQR action is necessary.

D. Public Hearing:

1. The public hearing was reconvened at 7:07 P.M.

2. Speakers:

There was no one to speak regarding Mr. Mongato's Special Permit Application.

3. The public hearing was closed at 7:08 P.M.

E. Planning Board Action:

In accordance with Section 300-87 of the City of Gloversville Zoning Ordinance, the Planning Board shall approve, approve with modifications or disapprove the application for Special Permit approval within forty-five (45) days after the public hearing. Consequently, does the Planning Board wish to issue its decision on Anthony Mongato's Special Permit application at this time?

DISCUSSION: Mr. Anderson indicated that he would like to see Mr. Mongato provide a final revised drawing for his project before the Planning Board takes final action on his Special Permit Application.

Mr. Geraghty suggested that the Planning Board could conditionally approve Mr. Mongato's application pending receipt of the final drawing. He indicated that this way if Mr. Mongato is able to prepare a final submittal in the next few days, he can actually get to work renovating the property.

After a brief discussion, Board members agreed that Mr. Mongato will need to put together a final drawing for his Special Permit that outlines the exact work he has agreed to undertake on the property. The Planning Board felt that, in the absence of a final submittal showing all of the work Mr. Mongato has agreed to undertake, a Special Permit should not be issued.

MOTION: To conditionally approve Anthony Mongato's Special Permit for an apartment building at 15 James Street pending receipt of a final Site Plan drawing outlining all of the improvements that the applicant has agreed to make to the property.

MADE BY: Geoffrey Peck
SECONDED: Peter Semione
VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

V. HARRY PHELPS - CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC HEARING ON A SUBDIVISION ALONG WEST ELEVENTH AVENUE:

A. Background:

Harry Phelps owns a piece of property along the south side of West Eleventh Avenue in the City of Gloversville. Mr. Phelps' parcel is approximately 7 acres in size and there is an existing house and garage on the lot. Mr. Phelps would like to create an additional building lot from the parcel by subdividing the property into a 3+/- acre lot to be retained with the existing home and a new 4.2 acre building lot.

B. June 7 and July 5, 2016 Meetings:

During its June 7, 2016 meeting, the Planning Board began reviewing Harry Phelps' subdivision application for a piece of property along West Eleventh Avenue. At that time, the Planning Board asked that the information identified below be provided on a final subdivision plat prior to the public hearing. As of the Public Hearing date on July 5, 2016, the information was not provided to the Planning Board and consequently, the Public Hearing on the application was left open.

1. A metes and bounds description of the dividing line separating the two (2) parcels needs to be shown.

STATUS: ?

2. Percolation and pit tests for the new building lot will need to be provided along with an approximate location of a well and septic system to service the new building lot.

STATUS: ?

3. The location of public utilities servicing the new building lot should be identified.

STATUS: ?

4. A construction specification for the proposed driveway should be identified on the subdivision plat along with a driveway profile showing the approximate slope of the driveway. If a culvert pipe needs to be installed along West Eleventh Avenue, its location and size should be shown on the plat.

STATUS: ?

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty explained that Mr. Phelps has not resubmitted a final subdivision plat for his application.

City Building Inspector Brandon Myers noted that a local attorney called his office on behalf of Mr. Phelps and questioned why the Planning Board needs to see percolation and pit test results for the property. Mr. Myers indicated that he told the attorney that the Planning Board has the right to require the applicant to show that a property is buildable and can support an adequate on-site septic system.

C. State Environmental Quality Review:

During its June 7, 2016 meeting, the Planning Board authorized the filing of a negative declaration under SEQR for this proposed action. Consequently, unless new additional information has been provided, no further SEQR action is necessary.

D. Public Hearing:

The Planning Board agreed that, in the absence of a submittal from the applicant, the public hearing did not need to be reconvened. The Planning Board agreed to leave the hearing open until the Board's September meeting.

E. Planning Board Action:

In accordance with Section 32 of the General City Law of New York State, the Planning Board must approve, with or without modification, or

disapprove the subdivision plat within sixty-two (62) days after the public hearing.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty indicated that he would send another letter to the applicant indicating that if a final subdivision plat is not submitted prior to the Board's September meeting, then the Planning Board will take final action based on the submittal it has received.

MOTION: To table any additional action on Mr. Phelps' subdivision application pending receipt of a final subdivision plat.

MADE BY: Geoffrey Peck

SECONDED: Matthew Donde

VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

VI. ASHLEY TAUSS – SITE PLAN FOR BAKERY AND CAFÉ AT 87 WEST FULTON STREET:

A. Background:

Ashley Tauss would like to open Cravings Bakery & Café at 87 West Fulton Street in the former Choo Choo's Ice Cream Shop. Along with an assortment of baked goods, the applicant will also serve ice cream and made from scratch sweets.

DISCUSSION: Ashley Tauss told Planning Board members that she grew up in Gloversville and has always dreamed of opening her own bakery. She explained that although she recently completed her college education, she loves to bake and has many family recipes passed on to her by both her grandmothers. She indicated that her bakery and café will not only serve an assortment of baked goods, ice creams and sweets, but will also include an assortment of coffees, teas, lattes, cappuccinos etc. She indicated that, although the building isn't very large, she would like to provide 12-15 seats inside the café. She noted that there is a deck that could provide some additional seating. She noted that she has very limited parking on the property, but could possibly put together three (3) off-street parking spaces.

B. County Planning Department Review:

The County Planning Department has reviewed the application in accordance with the City's Site Plan regulations and would like to offer the following comments:

1. The boundaries of the property should be clearly shown on a site plan drawing.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty explained that in order for the Planning Board's records to be complete, an accurate Site Plan drawing of the property needs to be completed. He indicated that the drawing provided with her submittal does not clearly show property boundaries. Mr. Geraghty indicated that it's important that the drawing in the Planning Board's files clearly shows the building's position on the property and how the space can be used for the proposed business.

2. An inventory of the off street parking spaces that are available on the applicant's property must clearly depicted on a site plan drawing.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty indicated that he would forward a letter to the City Department of Public Works requesting a parking recommendation for the project.

Mr. Peck noted that there is a City lot across the street from the business that could easily support her customer base.

Ms. Tauss noted that there is really no available space next to her building for off-street parking. She also noted that all of the off-street parking spaces on her property will be located on the opposite side of the creek.

3. The location and widths of the access driveways to the property must be clearly represented on the site plan drawing.

DISCUSSION: After a brief discussion, the Planning Board felt that the widths of the access driveways did not need to be shown on a Site Plan drawing.

4. The location of any outdoor storage areas must be identified.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Tauss indicated that she was unsure if she would need a dumpster for garbage.

Mr. Peck asked if she would be using the walkup windows? Mr. Peck noted that, when the former ice cream shop was open, there was always a trash problem on the deck, as well as a problem with bees.

The Planning Board briefly discussed some options for dealing with trash receptacles on the property. One of the ideas that was offered was to have a small dumpster placed on the opposite side of the creek near the off-street parking spaces.

Ms. Tauss indicated that she would come back to the Board with a more definitive idea of how she intends to handle garbage collection.

5. The location and design of all new signage on the property should be identified.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Tauss indicated that she simply intends to replace the old Choo Choo's lettering on the building with Cravings Café & Bakery.

Mr. Geraghty indicated that she should check with City Building Inspector Brandon Myers as to whether or not the property is located within the City's Historic District buffer zone and needs to be forwarded to the Historic District Review Board for its consideration.

6. Are there any easements or covenants that go along with this parcel?

DISCUSSION: Ms. Tauss indicated that there are no easements or covenants to go along with the property.

7. The location and design of any new outdoor lighting should be identified.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Tauss indicated that she did not intend to change any of the existing lighting.

8. The hours of operation for the business should be identified.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Tauss explained that, initially, she would like to open the business 10:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. but may change the hours based on customer traffic.

Mr. Geraghty asked Board members if there were any concerns with the hours of operation? There was a general consensus among Board members that the hours of operation were not a concern since the project is located in the City's Commercial District.

Mr. Anderson asked how many employees would be working in the business?

Ms. Tauss indicated that she and her partner will initially begin operations and she eventually hopes to have two (2) additional part-time employees.

Mr. Donde indicated that the Planning Board will also be asking that a Knox Box be provided for the building.

C. State Environmental Quality Review:

In accordance with Section 617.5 of 6 NYCRR, the applicant's proposal to open a café/bakery in a former ice cream shop at 87 West Fulton Street represented the rehabilitation of an existing structure for a similar purpose and should be classified as a Type II Action under SEQR.

D. Planning Board Action:

In accordance with Section 300-79 of the City of Gloversville Zoning ordinance, the Planning Board must fix a time within forty-five (45) days from the day the Planning Board determines an application for Site Plan Review to be complete, for a public hearing on the application for Site Plan approval. Consequently, does the Planning Board feel that a public hearing should be scheduled on Ashley Tauss' site plan for Cravings Bakery & Café at this time?

MOTION: To schedule a public hearing on Ashley Tauss' Site Plan Application for Cravings Bakery & Café for 7:00 p.m., Tuesday, September 6, 2016.

MADE BY: Geoffrey Peck

SECONDED: Matthew Donde

VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

VII. CROWN COURT, LLC.- SITE PLAN FOR RETAIL STORE (SHOE SHOW, INC.) ALONG HALES MILLS ROAD:

A. Background:

Crown Court LLC., would like to construct a 10,000 square foot retail building along Hales Mills Road, adjacent to the Walmart Super Center in an M-1 Manufacturing District. The new retail building will be occupied by SHOE DEPT. ENCORE. The applicant's property is approximately 1.56+/- acres in size. Along with the new building, forty-nine (49) parking spaces and landscaping improvements will be provided as part of the project.

DISCUSSION: Joe Bianchine, P.E., ABD Engineers, representing Crown Court, LLC, explained to Board members that the company would like to construct a 10,000 sq. ft. shoe store on property that was created during the development of the Walmart Supercenter Project. Mr. Bianchine gave a brief overview of the project and indicated that the company would like to have three (3) access points to the property, including one (1) directly across from the Credit Union's driveway, another access point directly on the traffic circle for exiting vehicles and a connection to the Walmart Supercenter parking area. He indicated that his client is currently in negotiations with Walmart over that driveway connection.

Mr. Bianchine indicated that the stormwater plan for the site will likely include a bioretention area.

Mr. Peck asked if the Stormwater Management System would include a pond?

Mr. Bianchine indicated that the bioretention area is essentially a pond that incorporates a sand filter and has specific plantings that are used for Stormwater Management Systems. Mr. Bianchine indicated that the

company has performed test borings on the site and has determined that most of the property is made up of tightly packed sand and cobble. Mr. Bianchine indicated that LED lights will be installed in the parking area similar to those in the Walmart Supercenter parking lot. He indicated that the new retail building will be finished on three (3) sides.

B. Planning Department Review:

The Fulton County Planning department has reviewed the application in accordance with the City's Site Plan Regulations and would like to offer the following comments:

1. The site plan drawings identify a 4-unit, 10,000 SF building.

DISCUSSION: William Cranford, Crown Court, LLC, talked a little bit about the company's experience in developing these types of retail buildings. He pointed out that, typically, the shoe retailer occupies 5,000 or 6,000 sq. ft. of the building and some other fashion retailers lease the remaining space. Mr. Cranford noted that the "Encore Store" that Shoe Show, Inc. is proposing to occupy the 10,000 sq. ft. retail space is the company's top-of-the-line shoe store. Mr. Cranford explained that the building will still be compartmentalized into four (4) possible units with utilities stubbed into each of those areas in case the company wishes to reduce its size and not occupy all 10,000 sq. ft. of the building at some future date.

2. The access driveway directly into the Circle may not be allowed. Also, the Planning Board will need a letter from Walmart indicating that access from the adjacent Super Center parking lot has been authorized.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty explained that when the building lot was approved by the Planning Board in August of 2010, he believed that the access to the site was shown directly across from the Credit Union driveway on Hales Mills Road. Mr. Geraghty also noted that when the traffic circle was constructed, it was within the NYSDOT right-of-way and the plans that were submitted to NYSDOT for a work permit did not include any additional ingress or egress points on the circle. Mr. Geraghty indicated that he would be corresponding with NYSDOT as part of the State Environmental Quality Review process. He noted that the circle is now within the City of Gloversville and may be outside the jurisdiction of NYSDOT in which case it will be the Planning Board's responsibility to determine if an exit point on the circle into the building lot can be allowed.

Mr. Cranford indicated that the discussions with Walmart over an access point directly into the Supercenter parking lot are at an impasse. He indicated that he did not believe his company and Walmart would be able to reach an agreement to allow traffic to flow from one parking area to the next.

Mr. Geraghty pointed out that if Crown Court, LLC is able to negotiate a deal with Walmart, Inc., there may be some internal traffic circulation issues that have to be addressed because individuals leaving the Walmart parking lot in their vehicles may decide that it is faster to go through the shoe store parking lot to get to Hales Mills Road. He suggested that the applicants may need to consider some traffic calming measures within the site to discourage thru traffic.

Planning Board Member Peter Semione asked if there was adequate site distance at the access driveway directly across from the Credit Union driveway?

Joe Bianchine noted that there is sufficient site distances and he pointed out that there is also a center turning lane at that location along Hales Mills Road.

Mr. Geraghty reminded the Board that this was a point of contention when the road was originally constructed as part of the Walmart Supercenter Project. He indicated that the road was reconfigured to provide the additional sight distance.

3. Elevation drawings showing the magnitude of the height of the retaining wall must be provided.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty noted that the retaining wall to be constructed behind the building will be substantial. He asked that some type of elevation drawings be provided to give Planning Board members an idea of what the retaining wall will look like when the project is completed.

Mr. Anderson noted that there are sidewalks in the vicinity of the project site and he felt that sidewalks should be provided along the front property line.

There was then a brief discussion concerning the location of crosswalks on the circle. Eventually, the Planning Board decided that the applicant should be required to provide sidewalks for pedestrian access since this was an issue that was discussed when the Walmart Supercenter Project was being developed.

4. A stormwater management plan for the site needs to be provided.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Bianchine confirmed that a complete Stormwater Management Plan for the site needs to be finalized.

5. Specifications for Concrete Buffer Slab, Concrete Walkway, Stormtech Infiltrator Units, Masonry Dumpster Enclosure and any other site improvements need to be included on a details sheet.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Bianchine indicated that all of the specifications will be added to the detail sheets.

6. A snow removal plan for the site needs to be discussed.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Geraghty pointed out that there is very limited area on the site for snow removal since access must be maintained to three (3) sides of the structure.

Mr. Bianchine agreed and noted that the bioretention area may be one location that snow can be stored on the site. He agreed that, eventually, the property owner may need to have snow removed during the winter months because there is limited space on the property for snow storage.

7. The location, size and design of all signage on the property needs to be shown.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Bianchine indicated that the company would like to have a pylon sign on the front part of the property and would also like to have signage on the building. He indicated that he would have details regarding the signage on the revised submittal.

Mr. Geraghty suggested that he contact City Building Inspector Brandon Myers to verify the signage limitations for the property.

8. The location and design of all exterior lighting must be shown.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Bianchine indicated that he would provide specifications for the lighting on the detail sheets.

9. Will a sprinkler system be provided for the building?

DISCUSSION: Mr. Bianchine indicated that the company did not intend to provide a sprinkler system for the building. He stated that he believed the building was under the size limit that would require a sprinkler system.

Mr. Geraghty, once again, urged Mr. Bianchine to speak with City Building Inspector Brandon Myers regarding this issue.

C. State Environmental Quality Review:

Section 617.1 of 6 NYCRR states that, the basic purpose of SEQR is to incorporate the consideration of environmental factors into the existing planning, review and decision making processes of state regional and local government agencies at the earliest possible time. To accomplish this goal, SEQR requires that all agencies determine whether the actions they directly undertake, fund or approve may have a significant effect on the environment, and if it is determined that the actions may have a significant

effect, prepare or request an Environmental Impact statement. Under these terms, the review of a site plan application is subject to SEQR. Therefore, the following issues must be addressed:

1. Does the Planning Board feel that the Short Environmental Assessment Form has been completed adequately?

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board felt that the Short Environmental Assessment Form had been completed adequately.

2. Does the Planning Board feel that any additional information should be provided as part of the SEQR process?

DISCUSSION: The Planning Board did not ask for any additional information.

3. Section 617.6 (b) (3) of 6 NYCRR states that, when an agency proposes to directly undertake, fund or approve a Type 1 or Unlisted Action undergoing a coordinated review with other agencies, it must, as soon as possible, transmit Part 1 of the Environmental Assessment Form completed by the project sponsor or a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and a copy of any application that has been received to all involved agencies and notify them that a Lead Agency must be agreed upon within thirty (30) calendar days of the date the Environmental Assessment Form was transmitted to them.

MOTION: To classify the proposed project as an unlisted action and to propose that the City of Gloversville Planning Board act as the Lead Agency for the purpose of issuing a determination of significance under SEQR and to offer the other agencies twenty-five (25) calendar days to comment on the proposed action or the City planning Board's proposal to act as lead Agency.

MADE BY: Peter Semione
SECONDED: Jonathan Kluska
VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

D. Planning Board Action:

In accordance with Section 300-79 of the City of Gloversville Zoning Ordinance, the planning Board must fix a time within forty-five (45) days from the day the Planning board determines an application for site plan review to be complete, for a public hearing on the application for site plan approval. Consequently, does the planning Board feel that a public hearing should be scheduled on William Cranford's Site Plan Application for a Retail Store (Shoe Show Inc.) at this time?

MOTION: To schedule a public hearing on Crown Court, LLC's Site Plan Application for a retail store along Hales Mills Road for 7:00 p.m., September 6, 2016.

MADE BY: Matthew Donde
SECONDED: Peter Semione
VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed

VIII. OTHER BUSINESS:

A. Code Enforcement Update:

Mr. Myers expressed some concerns with the Site Plan review process and how it affects individuals looking to open a small business in the City. He indicated that he didn't feel it was necessary for applicants looking to establish a business in an existing building to have to go through a public hearing process with the Planning Board.

Mr. Geraghty pointed out that, unfortunately, the way the City's Zoning Regulations have been drafted, if Mr. Myers determines that an applicant requires a Site Plan review, then there is a process that the Planning Board has to follow.

Mr. Myers indicated that Greenman Pedersen, Inc., the firm that recently helped the City of Gloversville complete its work on updating the City Zoning Regulations would like to eventually meet with the Planning Board to discuss the new provisions in the Zoning Ordinance.

IX. CLOSE OF THE MEETING;

MOTION: To close the meeting at 8:05 p.m.

MADE BY: Matthew Donde
SECONDED: Geoffrey Peck
VOTE: 5 in favor, 0 opposed