

Town of Clarence  
One Town Place, Clarence, NY 14031  
**Planning Board Minutes**  
Wednesday April 22, 2015

**Work Session 6:30 pm**  
Status of TEQR Coordinated Reviews  
Review of Agenda Items  
Miscellaneous

**Agenda Items 7:30 pm**  
Approval of Minutes

**Item 1**

Multiple-Family Law Amendment

Discussion to recommend small-scale retail in conjunction with mixed-use development in the Restricted Business Zone.

**Item 2**

Simon Yu/The Hollow Bistro  
Traditional Neighborhood District

Requests recommendation of Site Plan and Architectural Approval for an addition to an existing restaurant at 10641/10647 Main Street.

Chairman Robert Sackett called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. Councilman Peter DiCostanzo led the pledge to the flag.

Planning Board Members present:

Chairman Robert Sackett  
2<sup>nd</sup> Vice-Chairperson Wendy Salvati  
Richard Bigler  
Steven Dale

Vice-Chairman Paul Shear  
Timothy Pazda  
Gregory Todaro  
Jeffrey Buckley

Planning Board Members absent: none

Town Officials Present:

Junior Planner Jonathan Bleuer  
Deputy Town Attorney Steven Bengart  
Councilman Peter DiCostanzo  
Councilman Patrick Casilio  
Councilman Robert Geiger

Other Interested Parties Present:

Carol Conwall  
Roy Olsen  
Jason Krull  
Sue Reinecke

Ryan Joal  
Katie Yu  
Courtney Krull

Chairman Sackett noted that the Planning Board does not have approval authority for the two agenda items, therefore they will make recommendations, if appropriate, to the Town Board, on both items. Mr. Bleuer will introduce each project and the applicant will have the opportunity to add comments if he wishes. The Board members will then ask questions of the petitioner. The Planning Office is the petitioner for Item number 1, therefore Mr. Bleuer will answer any questions the Board may have on that item. The public will have an opportunity to voice their questions/concerns. The applicant or Planning Board will answer questions and/or address concerns voiced by the public.

**Item 1**

Multiple-Family Law Amendment

Discussion to recommend small-scale retail in conjunction with mixed-use development in the Restricted Business Zone.

**DISCUSSION:**

Mr. Bleuer provided the background on this agenda item saying the amendment would affect three (3) major areas of the Town, the first being Sheridan Drive. The second area is the northern portion of Transit Road where there is not much development, however long term it is zoned Restricted Business for the future if there is potential in that area. The major area that is being looked at is on Transit Road between Clarence Center Road and Miles Road. This was designated as Restricted Business in the Master Plan Future Land Use Map, much of the property is currently zone Major Arterial, however, on a project by project basis the land is being rezoned to Restricted Business as per the Town's Future Land Use Map. The potential amendment to the code would specifically be in the exception of the Multi-Family Residence Special Exception Use Permits. It would consider small-scale retail development in a mixed-use format under the conditions listed.

Chairman Sackett noted that the Planning Office has recommended that the commercial units be a ratio in section (a) of the code that is being considered. The Planning Board discussed the option of a number rather than a ratio for section (a), that number centered around 2,000 square feet. Some members of the Board feel further documentation is needed before they can come up with a definite number. The proposed amendment showed two options for (a); the first indicating a ratio be used and the second indicating a specific number be used. There was also discussion for the need of definition. Some members were not ready to move forward with this amendment because they felt there were words in it that needed to be defined more distinctly before making a recommendation.

With reference to the power point presentation, it is clarified that everything highlighted in yellow is proposed by the Planning Office.

Mr. Bleuer said this agenda item was referred from the Town Board to the Planning Board. When the original Multi-Family Law was created, the commercial component was required for Restricted Business. In that process certain members of the Town Board stated that they felt this may have been a missed opportunity or an oversight that the commercial component in Restricted Business could not be a retail component. Chairman Sackett said the nature of the Planning Board's discussion did not reject small-scale retail in Restricted Business, but they struggled with numbers and definitions in the work session.

Mr. Bigler thinks a number gives the applicant a better guide than a ratio. Mrs. Salvati agreed.

Mr. Shear said the Board discussed the fact that there are a number of small plazas in the Town. It may be appropriate for the Board to look at the average size of those retail facilities and small coffee shops and restaurants within those kinds of buildings to determine what an appropriate size would be. This has not been done yet, Mr. Shear thinks this information should be acquired so the Board will be in a better position to quantify and support their decision on the square footage.

Deputy Town Attorney Steve Bengart said along the line of definition, they could determine uses that they want to see as part of those exceptions, similar to what has been done in other sections of the law. He went on to say that it is possible for the Planning Board to send this back with concept and allow the Town Attorney's Office and the Town Board to work through the details. The other side of the argument is that it should not be sent to the Town Board if it is not complete. It is the Planning Board's decision.

Mr. Pazda would like to see more examples of factual information on current sizes.

Mrs. Salvati voiced her concern saying if they don't give the Town Board enough information they will send it back to the Planning Board again and it will be bounced back and forth between boards. She has an issue with proposed section B(1) and traffic. She reads the current Restricted Business Zone code with regards to generating traffic, she referenced section B(1) again and said it is confusing and needs to be thought through better. She referenced the Town of Hamburg's code which limits it to 2,000 square feet, it listed a host of small businesses and other specifications.

Robert Blood, from the Architecture Firm of Lauer-Manguso, noted that they currently have a project before the Town that falls directly under the criteria of this proposed amendment. That project is the second phase of development for Cobblestone Center. The initial phase was the Doodlebugs Childcare Center. This property is located in the Restricted Business Zone along Sheridan Drive. The second phase of development is proposed to be a mixed-use building with multi-family residential on the second floor and some component of retail on the first floor. Mr. Pazda clarified that the project is not before the Board at this meeting for review, it is strictly for informational purposes only. Mr. Blood understands and noted that the project is in limbo until there is a resolution on the code amendment.

Anthony Insinna, a Clarence resident, understands the intent of this amendment is to preserve the character of the Town with smart growth development, but also as a developer of this project he needs to do what makes sense for him as well. They looked at the projects on Transit Road and North French where there is mixed-use. He referred to the proposed amendment where it indicated "twice the size of the largest residential unit" and said that is an issue for them. His units are 1,000 square feet, so that means a maximum of 2,000 square feet but in the retail business there are not many people who would want just 2,000 square feet. It is difficult for him as a landlord to take the risk of putting up two (2) buildings and being limited to 2,000-2,500 square feet per tenant. He understands the intent of the proposed amendment if it was a walking neighborhood like Clarence Center and Goodrich Roads but this is Sheridan Drive, it is more of a destination, he will have to attract a retailer that needs a certain amount of space and he is not sure 2,500 square feet is enough. He asked what defines small-scale retail. He would like to find a business that works well with his current building, such as a dance studio or martial arts studio but 2500 square feet would not be enough for those uses. He thinks more research needs to be done prior to approving this amendment. Mr. Insinna asked what the definition of recreational use space is. Chairman Sackett said, with regards to the Multi-Family Law, in the past people have provided greenspace or walking paths.

Chairman Sackett noted that the Board does not want to zone for projects, they want to zone for consistency with Master Plans and public input.

Michael Metzger, of 4090 Clardon Drive, would like to see the definition of small-scale retail include certain things such as food service businesses like a café or a bistro. He thinks this type of use would be valuable for the mixed-use concept. Mr. Metzger referred to the section of Transit Road between Clarence Center and Miles Roads and said a lot of these properties are intermixed with existing properties. He thinks the Board needs to look at the development standards themselves such as the setbacks or greenbelt requirements, as they may be too restrictive. Prohibition on parking is another issue because currently within the Restricted Business zoning classification parking is prohibited within the setback areas. Parking would not be allowed in front of buildings that are already pushed back due to other setback requirements. Mr. Metzger submitted a document with suggestions about what he would like to see amended in the code. The document is on file.

Mr. Pazda asked if there are any other pockets of Restricted Business areas in the Town. Mr. Bleuer explained that there are no large areas but specific parcels within the Town, off Main Street and at the Brothers of Mercy property.

Mr. Shear asked Mr. Insinna what he suggests for allowable square footage for the commercial portion of the mixed-use development. Mr. Insinna said he would like to see 4,000-5,000 square feet, this could be for a use such as a dance studio or martial arts studio. A landlord is going to want a tenant that works well with the area.

**ACTION:**

Motion by Paul Shear, seconded by Gregory Todaro, to **accept** the Part 2 and 3 Environmental Assessment Form as prepared by the Town Planning Department.

Steve Dale	Aye	Gregory Todaro	Aye
Richard Bigler	Aye	Timothy Pazda	Aye
Wendy Salvati	Aye	Paul Shear	Aye
Robert Sackett	Aye		

MOTION CARRIED.

Motion by Paul Shear, seconded by Richard Bigler, to **table** agenda item number 1, to allow the Planning Board an opportunity to review both the public comment and the concerns of the Board in terms of the specifics of this action.

**ON THE QUESTION:**

Mrs. Salvati reiterated the previous discussion by saying the Board needs to do a better job in defining what is meant by small-scale. The Board needs to remember what the original intent of Restricted Business was, it wasn't to have another Commercial District.

Steve Dale	Aye	Gregory Todaro	Aye
Richard Bigler	Aye	Timothy Pazda	Aye
Wendy Salvati	Aye	Paul Shear	Aye
Robert Sackett	Aye		

MOTION CARRIED.

**Item 2**

Simon Yu/The Hollow Bistro  
Traditional Neighborhood District

Requests recommendation of Site Plan and Architectural Approval for an addition to an existing restaurant at 10641/10647 Main Street.

**DISCUSSION:**

Mr. Bleuer provided the background on the project noting that it is located on the south side of Main Street, east of Ransom Road, west of Sawmill Road. The existing Bistro is located at 10641 Main Street. There was a demolition permit previously granted for the structures 10647 Main Street so that property is currently vacant. The addition being requested is approximately 2,000 square feet of added space to the existing Bistro. This proposal is under 4,000 square feet, therefore considered a Type II Action under the State Environmental Quality Review Act, no further environmental review is necessary. This project is being and will continue to be coordinated with the NYS Department of Transportation (DOT), any such recommendations or approvals would be subject to approval by the DOT with final authority as per engineering review. The proposal on the screen is dated 4-3-15, an updated plan has since been received and is dated 4-21-15. The difference in the two plans, at the request of the Planning Board Executive Committee, is the removal of the rear most two (2) parking spots in favor of additional greenspace to meet the minimum required greenspace of 15%. A hard copy of that plan has been submitted to the Planning Office. The project site is in the Clarence Hollow Traditional Neighborhood District, as such it was submitted to the Clarence Hollow Community Character Protection Board for review. Comments have been received from each individual, but not from the Committee as a whole. Positive comments such as “attractive building”, “ample parking”, and “good addition to the Hollow” were received from two (2) of the members of the Committee. The third member commented on the glass pane window above the door seeming to not fit the historical context of the Hollow, as well as the tempest torches not being historical in nature.

Chairman Sackett said the reason the Planning Board Executive Committee suggested that more greenspace be created is because the applicant was told that the Board did not want to put an item on the agenda that did not meet code. How they reached code was up to them.

Tim Arlington, of Apex Consulting, is the engineer on the project and is present along with Dave Sutton, the architect on the project. Representatives are present who own the restaurant and the Clarence Deli. Mr. Arlington said the addition is 2,000 square feet including a patio. Since the parcel is linked to the Clarence Deli they are showing six (6) common parking spaces between the two. There will be a new entrance with angled parking, there will be more parking spaces at the rear of the property. They removed two (2) parking spaces so now they meet the 15% greenspace. It also gives them a larger area for storing snow. There is a one-way traffic pattern because the width of the property would not allow two-way. The vehicles will enter near the addition, travel through the site and exit onto Ransom Road. Other improvements to the plan include landscaping, which would be out front, and a common dumpster corral.

David Sutton, of Sutton Architecture, explained that they planned the addition in such a way that it respects the historic character of the Hollow and its street presence. They want to bring some life to the street by introducing an outdoor patio at the front, creating some transparency, and a new welcoming front entrance. With the demolition of the prior building on the property, it was requested to re-use the brick from that building whenever possible. That brick will be used for the architectural piers as well as a two-sided fireplace that will be appreciated both inside the restaurant and out on the patio. A lot of the architectural elements are being pulled off of the character that the building originally had and they are

refurbishing it. They are going to blend the addition in with the existing building and bring a pedestrian friendly feel to this part of Main Street. Mr. Sutton explained that the tempest torches make a comment about the nature of the business, it is rooted in history but also is a little progressive and has a contemporary feel to it. The tempest torches are not modern in any way, they are compatible with the historic nature of the street as well as the building. They are an indicator of the refinement of the restaurant that the applicant is trying to create. The store front glass is there to make it as welcoming as possible, encouraging a pedestrian friendly environment. Mr. Sutton addressed the comment/concern about all the parking being at the back of the building by noting that there is a secondary entrance toward the back of the building, near the parking. The handicap entrance is located in the back of the building.

Mrs. Salvati voiced her concern about people parking in the back and walking to the front of the building through a driveway, with no sidewalk for pedestrian safety. Mr. Sutton said the back entrance could end up being the primary entrance to get into the building but they don't want to discourage the appearance of a primary entrance on Main Street.

Mrs. Salvati asked if there are banquet facilities in the addition. Mr. Sutton said there is a small 400-500 square foot private room.

Mrs. Salvati said some of the landscaping is in the right-of-way and the applicant is going to need permission from the DOT for those plantings. Mr. Arlington said they know that, they have discussed their plan briefly with the State and they seem to be ok with it as long as it is minimal. The applicant understands that the State would have to approve any landscaping in the right-of-way.

Mr. Pazda asked what you enter into when you enter into the rear of the building. Mr. Sutton said currently the small private room is there, but based on the comments they may be redesigning a more defined entrance to the rear.

Mr. Arlington said the width of the property does not allow them to put a sidewalk in or they certainly would have. The applicant's want their customers to be safe, too.

Mr. Sutton said the original concept design intended that the primary entrance was to be at grade level. After the site was developed, they realized there was a substantial change in grade, so they will now have two steps up going into the new primary entrance and the rear will be the grade level entry. Another change from the original plan is that the entire restaurant will be handicap accessible, not just portions of it. With regards to the open space between the brick pier and the entrance, it has been minimized to allow the applicant a more controlled access to the patio for the sake of managing the restaurant and for the sake of the liquor authority; there will be no ingress or egress through that gap.

Mr. Dale asked if the applicant is planning on using the existing entrance of the existing building. Mr. Sutton said the use of that entrance will be discouraged because of its location, however it may still be used as an emergency exit. The new entrance will have a vestibule-like quality to it. Mr. Dale suggested the applicant remove the concrete in an effort to persuade people that it is no longer an active entrance. Mr. Sutton said they would not do that because it is still an effective means of egress and they would not want to pull the stairs off because they feel that would disrespect the architectural character. Mr. Dale said he is not suggesting that the stairs be pulled out, he is suggesting that people are subtly discouraged from going up the sidewalk to that door. Mr. Sutton would also like to keep the concrete sidewalk in tact because it may be important for their exiting and keeping it as safe as possible. Mr. Pazda suggested taking the door handle off the door to discourage entry.

Mr. Dale voiced his concern over where the snow from the parking lot will be stored. Mr. Arlington said the fact that they added more greenspace provides a larger area to the rear for snow storage. Currently, if there is too much snow on the site it is removed, they will continue to remove the snow if it necessary in the future.

Mrs. Salvati asked if there will be directional signs within the site to aid in traffic flow, such as “no entrance” and “enter only” signs. Mr. Arlington said yes.

Carol Cornwall, of Meadowbrook Road, is a member of the Clarence Historic Preservation Commission and she said they would like to see the addition architecturally compliment the historic charm of the bistro; the new fits with the old, so that it is seamless. The current rendering is a mix of new and old and is not in keeping with the character of the Hollow. The windows and the entrance don't compliment the old.

Roy Olsen, of 4888 Sawmill Road, thanked the Yu's for all they have done for the Hollow, they are awesome neighbors. He is reservedly for this project. He is a direct neighbor and, with the exception of the commercial businesses, he is the first to be impacted by this, directly. He sees it every morning. He saw the plans just this evening and said there has been a lot done to the front of the project site, but nothing has been done for the front of his property. He distributed copies of photos showing what he looks at every day. The photos are on file. He referred to the first photo in which he describes it as a mini forest. Even when the deciduous trees did not have their leaves on, all those properties were screened. It is a reasonable argument to say that he is currently next to a parking lot for the existing restaurant facility, however, when he purchased the property he full well knew that that parking was there. It was not a reasonable expectation on his part that three (3) structures would be removed. His house was originally built by Asa Ransom and was due to be slated for demolition and the County was not going to allow the house to be occupied. He was able to get it so he could occupy the house because of the sewers that were going in there, he has made a huge investment in the Hollow. Without something being done about the landscaping, he will be detrimentally affected by this project; he is sure this is not something the Yu's are looking to achieve. He referred to the photos which show an orange fence and what he sees out of his kitchen, bedroom and side door windows. He is requesting substantial landscaping in the back of the project site, not a fence, he suggested a reasonable amount of 8' conifers, not deciduous trees, in a staggered pattern along the property lines to seclude the new parking from the residential atmosphere.

Jason Krull, owner of the Cornerstone Bar and Grill, shares a property line with the new project. He is in favor of this new project. He is concerned with traffic patterns and how close the new parking spots come to the property line. Another concern is snow removal. There is a fire hydrant where the driveway is proposed. Mr. Krull noted that there is a substantial grade decrease from the front of the parcel to the back, it is a 6' or 8' difference so drainage is a concern for him. He also mentioned landscaping or fencing.

Jeff Ferger, of 4870 Sawmill Road, said presently he sees cars come down Bank Street. Since the three (3) structures have been taken down, all he sees at night are cars coming down Bank Street. All the headlights go into his kitchen and the back foyer of his home. He would like to see some natural barrier to calm that light. He is aware that two (2) parking spots have been eliminated in the back of the project site but he does not think that is enough. Mr. Ferger said there is a substantial grade difference, it is a 12' to 15' drop on those last two (2) parking spots. His concern is with the run-off, there is a tremendous amount of water that comes off Sawmill Road. Chairman Sackett noted that before the applicant can

obtain any building permits, engineering looks at code which includes regulations for stormwater, the applicant has to design a system that contains the stormwater on their property.

Mr. Arlington said there is an 8' grade change on the property. There will be a retaining wall around the parking lot. The parking lot in the back will be 4'-5' below the existing grade. When cars come into the parking lot their lights will hit the retaining wall not the homes behind the property. The height of the retaining wall varies from 1'-2' to 4'-5'.

Mr. Arlington referred to the stormwater questions and said the stormwater on the property is all being retained within the property, it will drain down, there will be two (2) structures, there will be underground detention that will control the rate of run-off off this property and will connect to the existing storm sewer that is on Main Street. A new catch basin will be installed and will meet DOT standards. All stormwater requirements will be met.

Mr. Arlington said the retaining wall will be made of timber because it would be a more natural look and be more appropriate in the Hollow. There would be a concrete foundation, then the timbers would be stacked and pinned together. Mr. Arlington said they are willing to put landscaping back there and agreed to make that a condition of the approval. Mr. Sutton suggested putting some screening on the property that abuts the retaining wall, that property is higher and would provide a better buffer for the neighbors, that property is not owned by the Yu's. Mr. Arlington said they could put landscaping on their property but it will be at a lower grade. Mrs. Salvati referred to the discussion about storing snow at the back of the property, if landscaping is installed there, it will be destroyed with the snow storage or it will make it unavailable for snow storage.

Mr. Sutton said they can re-evaluate the entrance way but they want to have it transparent. They still want a glass entry door. He does not think the glass has a harsh contrast to the historic look of the building, he thinks it compliments it. Some windows are sliding so that on good weather days they can bring the street life into the building, and the building out onto the patio, this cannot be achieved as successfully with a double-hung window.

Mrs. Salvati asked how the entrance will be lit. Mr. Sutton explained that the intent is to light the entrance from internal, so that the door will be welcoming and have a glow from the internal. The transparency would only require the light to be on the inside and it would light up the street. At this section of Main Street there is ample street lighting. Mrs. Salvati suggested adding something so it doesn't look like a doctor's office. Mr. Sutton said they will look into it and suggested maybe a goose neck lamp or lantern style element.

Chairman Sackett asked for details on the back parking lot lighting. Mrs. Salvati said the lighting standards are 16' high and LED lights. Mr. Arlington said they went with lower poles and lower wattage. He referred to document U-1 of the plan dated 4-21-15 and noted there are three (3) light poles on the easterly most portion of the site, they will have cut-off shields and will face west.

Mr. Arlington said they will have to move the fire hydrant 5' so it does not impact the entrance.

Mrs. Salvati suggested using shields the completely drop down the back of those parking lot lights, so the neighbors will not see any light. The light will project forward and down onto the parking lot. Mr. Arlington said they will incorporate that into the plan.

Mr. Dale asked how high above the Cornerstone property does the timber wall extend. Mr. Arlington said the wall itself will come up 6" above existing grade. Mr. Dale is concerned that there will be a ledge that a car could drive off of. Mr. Arlington said the difference in grade will vary but the wall would be 6" above that grade.

Mr. Bigler asked about lighting on the building and what can be done so there will be no glare into the neighbor's homes. Mr. Sutton said there will be limited lighting on the exterior back of the building, any lighting there would be to identify the rear entrance and it would be all down-lighting. There will be no wall packs or signage with glaring lights.

Mr. Arlington said the parking is two feet (2') away from the property line, there will be curbing put there to clearly define where the applicant's property is.

Mrs. Salvati asked if the applicant will be seeding the new lawn area that is shown on the plan, which is to the east side of the property. Mr. Arlington explained that is the neighbor's property, they cannot seed the neighbor's property. There is an existing stone area there. Mrs. Salvati suggested removing that section from the plan since it is not part of the applicant's property. Mr. Arlington said he will do that.

A member of the audience asked if the parking lot is going to be level with Main Street on an actual natural grade. Chairman Sackett said the Town Engineer will review various items including the grading plan. Mr. Arlington said the grade of the parking lot slopes towards the road. The slope across the parking lot is less than 5%, which is what they want to make sure it is safe for their patrons. They went out and shot the topography of the property and put together a grading plan which was part of the submittal. Mr. Arlington said they will mostly be removing dirt. Chairman Sackett reminded everyone that the Town Engineer will have to review and approve the plans for the proposal.

#### **ACTION:**

Motion by Wendy Salvati, seconded by Timothy Pazda, to **recommend** to the Clarence Town Board to approve the site plan and architectural style of the proposed restaurant addition at 10641-10647 Main Street as per the submitted drawing from Apex Consulting, dated 4-21-15, with the following conditions:

1. Subject to review and approval of the Town Landscape Committee on final landscape details prior to final Certificates of Occupancy.
2. Subject to review and approval of the Town Engineering and Town Building Departments for storm water management and building permits on the property.
3. Subject to NYS Department of Transportation approval for drainage, curb cuts, and right-of-way plantings or other encroachments.
4. Subject to the use of dark sky compliant lighting fixtures with full shielding to eliminate glare to neighboring properties.
5. Existing garage to be made to architecturally match proposed building addition and the evaluation of modifications to the main front entrance to enhance the historic character and design.

- 6. Provide vehicular directional signage, both on the pavement and in the form of vertical signage for the drive lanes.
- 7. Modification of the rear building entrance to better accommodate patrons who enter from the rear parking lot and to improve pedestrian safety.
- 8. To investigate and determine if landscaping can be installed in the Town right-of-way to the south or on the property owned by the adjacent neighbor to the east for visual screening.

**ON THE QUESTION:**

Mr. Arlington said they understand the conditions and agree to them.

Mr. Bigler asked if the applicant is going to modify the front entrance or is it going to be left the same. Mr. Sutton said he will follow the wishes of the Board. What he has taken from this meeting is that he will go back and redesign and be more respectful to the historic character of the original building. Mr. Bigler said it is up to the applicant to decide what to do. Mr. Sutton understands. It is clarified that the applicant is to evaluate the modifications and present that to the Town Board.

Mr. Todaro said the applicant indicated he would be willing to investigate whether trees could be planted in the right-of-way near the bike path to the south side of the property. Mr. Todaro suggested this be an added condition to the approval. Mrs. Salvati agreed to amend the motion to include condition number 8, Mr. Todaro agreed as well.

Mr. Arlington said it would be easier for them to work with the Town from a liability standpoint. He will investigate and report to the Landscape Committee. Mr. Arlington said he understands the condition.

Steve Dale	Aye	Gregory Todaro	Aye
Richard Bigler	Aye	Timothy Pazda	Aye
Wendy Salvati	Aye	Paul Shear	Aye
Robert Sackett	Aye		

MOTION CARRIED.

Meeting adjourned at 9:13 p.m.

Carolyn Delgato  
Senior Clerk Typist