

**BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MINUTES**  
**TOWN OF OCEAN VIEW**  
**April 16, 2026, 3:00pm**

1. The Board of Adjustment Chair Greg Neuner called the meeting to order at 3:00pm with the Pledge of Allegiance. In attendance were Board Members Ron Galey, Susan Kerwin, Preston Coppels and Eric Thornton. Planning, Zoning and Development Director Ken Cimino, Solicitor Max Walton, Town Engineer Jim Lober and Planner Jill Oliver. Town Clerk Donna Schwartz was not present. The meeting was being held at 32 West Avenue.

2. **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

*A motion was made by Mr. Coppels, seconded by Mr. Thornton, to approve the agenda. The motion was carried unanimously 5/0.*

3. **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

*A motion was made by Ms. Kerwin, seconded by Ms. Galey, to approve the minutes for the meeting March 19, 2026. The motion was carried unanimously 5/0.*

4. **NEW BUSINESS**

A. V-467 & 468 95, 97, & 101 Atlantic Avenue (PIDN:094.410, 094.400, 094.380/CTM's:134-12.00-2089.00,134-12.00-2088.00,134-12.00-297.00)  
V-467: A request for a Special Exception in accordance with Article XVIII, §140-128 of the Town Code in order to establish a fast-food restaurant with drive-through.

**APPLICATION V-467 – Town Comments**

The required findings for special exceptions included in §140-116A are listed below along with our comments for each.

1. Is in harmony with the purposes and intent of the Comprehensive Plan;
  - a. Restaurants were identified as one of the types of commercial businesses residents would like to see in Town during the community survey issued as part of the public engagement process during the comprehensive plan update of 2020.
  
2. Will be in harmony with the general character of its neighborhood considering density, design, bulk, and scale of proposed new structures;
  - a. The structures as currently depicted in the renderings provided are of similar scale and design to other commercial retail establishments through the Route 26 Corridor.

3. Will not be detrimental to the use, peaceful enjoyment, economic value, or development of surrounding properties;
  - a. The proposed use is consistent with the future land use map included in the 2020 Comprehensive Plan update, and additional criteria specifically associated with this use are included in §140-128C, which are addressed below.
4. Will not cause objectionable noise, vibrations, fumes, odors, dust, glare, or physical activity;
  - a. The proposed use is consistent with the future land use map included in the 2020 Comprehensive Plan update, and additional criteria specifically associated with this use are included in §140-128C, which are addressed below.
5. Will have no detrimental effect on vehicular or pedestrian traffic;
  - a. The design as currently depicted honors the pedestrian improvements along the Route 26 corridor constructed by DelDOT, and provides a link from those improvement to the internal pedestrian network. DelDOT has determined that the use as proposed does not meet the warrant for an individual traffic impact study (TIS). The applicants will be required to pay a fee in lieu of the TIS to contribute to off-site improvements at DelDOT's discretion.
6. Will not adversely affect the health, safety, security, or general welfare of residents, visitors, or workers in the area; and
  - a. The proposed use is consistent with the future land use map included in the 2020 Comprehensive Plan update. The site design will require Delaware State Fire Marshal (DSFM) and DelDOT approval. The buildings will also require DSFM and Sussex County approval to ensure building code compliance, and Division of Public Health approval will be required prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.
7. Complies with all other applicable standards, laws, and regulations in addition to the provisions of this chapter.
  - a. Final development plan approval through the Town review process will ensure compliance with the Town code and require all applicable outside agency approvals.

The additional criteria associated with fast-food restaurants with drive-through from §140-128C are listed below along with our comments for each.

- 1) The use at the proposed location will not create a traffic hazard or traffic nuisance because of its location in relation to similar uses, necessity of turning movements in relation to its access to public roads and intersections, or its location in relation to other buildings or proposed buildings on or near the site and the traffic patterns from such buildings or cause frequent turning movements across sidewalks and pedestrian ways, thereby disrupting pedestrian circulation within a concentration of retail activity.
  - a) The proposed use will be the only one of its type within the subject parcel. The site layout is being designed around the requirements associated with this use. Traffic specifically associated with the proposed use will not disrupt pedestrian traffic.
  
- 2) Applications for such uses shall provide whatever traffic analysis is required by DelDOT for the review and consideration of the Town or shall provide documentary evidence from DelDOT stating that no analysis is required.
  - a) The applicant has provided correspondence from DelDOT stating that they have determined that the use as proposed does not meet the warrant for an individual traffic impact study (TIS). The applicants will be required to pay a fee in lieu of the TIS to contribute to off-site improvements at DelDOT's discretion.
  
- 3) Such uses shall be located on an arterial or collector street, as depicted on the DelDOT Functional Classification Map. Such uses shall only take access from an arterial or collector street, as depicted on the DelDOT Functional Classification Map.
  - a) The proposed use is located on and takes access from Route 26, which is an arterial street as depicted on the DelDOT functional classification map.
  
- 4) When such uses abut a lot in a residential district, any lot upon which there is a dwelling as a permitted use under this chapter, or a right-of-way that serves a residential district, the use shall be screened, along the entire length of the property boundary abutting the residential district, dwelling, or right-of-way by a solid wall or a substantial, slightly, solid fence, not less than eight feet in height, together with a 20 feet wide planting strip on the outside of such wall or fence, which shall be maintained in good condition. Screening requirements within this planting strip shall be as provided for in other sections of these regulations.

- a) The plan as updated since its original submission provides the buffering required as noted here on all three sides of the parcel abutting residential uses and zoning.
- 5) When a drive-through facility is placed adjacent to the public right-of-way or other public access thoroughfare, the drive-through cartway shall be screened from view with a combination of structures and landscaping as determined by the Board of Adjustment.
- a) The plan as depicted provides the required buffering against the public right of way.
- 6) Such uses shall be limited to one drive-through pre-order board, one order board and one associated stacking lane.
- a) The plan as depicted includes one drive-through order board and one stacking lane.
- 7) Stacking lanes for such uses shall be at least 180 feet in length measured from the point of ordering and shall not block any parking spaces or drive aisles.
- a) The stacking lane currently depicted is approximately 300 ft. long.
- 8) There shall be a bypass lane of at least 10 feet in width along the entire length of the drive-through lane.
- a) The plan currently depicts a 10 ft. wide bypass lane.
- 9) Drive-through lanes shall be separated from other aisles by a mountable curbed island.
- a) The plan currently depicts a mountable curb separation between the drive through lanes
- 10) The allowable dimensions of the order board and any associated canopy shall be as provided for in other sections of these regulations.
- a) The details provided for the order board and the canopy meet the requirements as listed in §140-65
- 11) Such uses may install an overhead clearance bar to warn of over height vehicles. The bar shall only include the words "maximum height" or "clearance" and the height measurement. No logos or advertisement are allowed. The bar must be placed within the developable area of the site outside of any required buffering, within the drive through lane, and be attached to the Pre-Order Board if one is to be installed. The bar shall be a single arm pivoting or break away

type and may have no hanging appurtenances and may not be illuminated.

- a) The overhead clearance bar currently depicted on the plans complies with these requirements.

12) Hours of operation for such uses shall be limited to 5:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. for the indoor portion of the restaurant and 5:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. for the drive-through.

- a) The application as provided commits to operating hours within these parameters.

13) Such uses shall not share dumpsters within developments with multiple uses. Separate dumpsters shall be provided for such uses. Screening for these facilities shall be as provided for in other sections of these regulations.

- a) The plan as depicted provides multiple dumpsters so that the proposed use will not be required to share.

14) Outdoor aboveground grease traps are prohibited.

- a) The application as provided commits to no outdoor above ground grease traps.

15) Any revisions, modifications, changes, or additions to an approved application shall be approved by the Board of Adjustment and shall be subject to all applicable sections of this Land Use and Development code.

- a) This provision is not currently applicable. Should the application be approved and changes proposed in the future, the applicant will be required to appear in front of the Board for approval.

Ms. Pam Scott, of Saul Ewing, introduced her team and the applicants from Nistazos Holdings LLC. She stated that the multi-use building on 3 consolidated lots would be a farm-stand, retail store, and a fast-food restaurant named Dunkin Donuts. Development began over a year ago. Ms., Scott showed the site plan which included landscape screening, an 8ft tall fence and 8,000 sqft of retail space. The lot is a unique size and shape. She noted that they will minimize adverse conditions with limited operating hours. She also stated that DelDOT did not require a traffic impact study. DelDOT will limit right-out only, so they will add a right turn only to improve traffic flow. Mark Heeley stated that the drive-up lane usually holds an average of 13 vehicles, this site will stack 22 vehicles.

Mr. Copples commented on the traffic and back up problems created by Lord Baltimore Elementary School. He encouraged having a conversation. Ms. Scott confirmed that no traffic study was needed because the property didn't meet the threshold based on traffic generation. Atlantic Avenue is considered a minor arterial. She noted that the stacking lane will be 450ft from the point of ordering can hold 22 cars. There will be two dumpsters in a single enclosure. There will be no outdoor above ground grease traps. Ms. Scott also noted that lighting will not shine on adjoining properties.

Mr. Nick Nistazos, property owner, clarified the screening ordinances. Ms. Scott said the center is not overly large and will be financially viable. She said the shape and size of the lot is an exceptional practical difficulty. Lot coverage, lot is a narrow site, however, consistent with that stretch of Route 26. Mr. Gale asked for clarification on lot coverage. Ms. Scott stated that they are not generating new traffic, just using pass-by traffic. Mr. Lober noted that they will need to get documents from DelDOT allowing screening.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Mr. Thomas Taglienti, Woodland Ave, commented on the plan.

Ms. Patty Mallon, Columbia Ave, commented on the traffic and deed restrictions for the Cottages.

Mr. Gerald Mikesell, Sally Lane, stated the Cottages is a quiet neighborhood and he is concerned about light pollution, exhaust fumes, traffic concerns and the impact on property values.

Mr. Paul Norris, Port Royal Road, submitted a letter in opposition to the Dunkin Donuts. He is concerned about traffic congestion and left-hand turns.

Ms. Ann Lautney, Sally Lane, commented about EV Hybrids.

Ms. Cindy Szlasa, White's Creek Lane, stated she was against fast food restaurants and noise pollution like car horns. She also noted that the bike lanes would be negatively impacted.

Mr. Terry Mulkins, Port Royal Road, said he was concerned with run-off and suggested the board table their decision for more information from the HOA.

Mr. Cimino spoke to everyone about Atlantic Avenue or Route 26. Ms. Scott noted that lights will have baffles during peak periods, and the speaker decibel is 65 won't cross into Columbia Ave.

**PUBLIC COMMENT CLOSED.**

*A motion was made by Mr. Galey, seconded by Mr. Copples, the variance relates to a specific parcel of land, and the hardship is not shared generally by other properties in the same zoning district and vicinity; the variance can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good; the benefits from granting the variance would substantially outweigh any detriment; approval of the variance would not substantially impair the intent and purposes of the Comprehensive Plan or Chapter 140; With regard to the Special Exception (V-467), for the reasons stated on the record, all of which are incorporated into this decision by reference, the Board granted the request by a vote of 4-1. Mr. Thornton was not in agreement. The Board found:*

- (1) The Applicant has provided sufficient information that the project is in harmony with the Comprehensive Plan;*
- (2) The Applicant has demonstrated that the proposed project will blend with the general characteristics of the surrounding properties;*
- (3) The Applicant has demonstrated that the proposed project will not be detrimental to the enjoyment, economic value, or development of the surrounding properties;*
- (4) The Applicant has demonstrated that the proposed project will not cause objectionable fumes or physical activity disruption;*
- (5) The proposed special exception will have no detrimental effect of pedestrian traffic;*
- (6) The project is in compliance with the Town Code;*
- (7) Since Delaware Dept. of Transportation decided a traffic impact study is not needed, this provides evidence that this will not negatively impact traffic congestion.*
- (8) The submitted plan meets or exceeds all requirements in the Code related to drive-through requirements.*

**V-468 Variance requests from the following sections of the Town Code:**

1. From Article V, §140-31 to develop the property with a proposed lot coverage of 61%, which exceeds the maximum allowable lot coverage of 50%.
2. From Article XI, §140-73B(3)(b) in order to reduce the width of the required screening along the frontage of Atlantic Avenue (SR26) from 15 feet to approximately 6 feet.

The applications are submitted by Mackenzie Sindelar, Esquire, of the law firm Saul Ewing, LLP, on behalf of the property owner, Nistazos Holdings, LLC, for properties zoned GB-1 General Business District 1, located at 95, 97, & 101 Atlantic Avenue (PIDNs 094.410, 094.400, 094.380 / CTMs 134-12.00-2089.00, 134-12.00-2088.00, 134-12.00-297.00).

The applicant wishes to consolidate the three subject parcels into one and develop the site as a commercial retail use. The plan, as currently presented,

would result in a total lot coverage of approximately 61%, exceeding the maximum allowable lot coverage of 50% by 11%. The screening width provided along the frontage of Atlantic Avenue would be approximately 6 ft., 9 ft. less than the required 15 ft.

A Variance is outlined in Article XVII, § 140-108 with the following definition:  
A “variance” is relief from the strict application of the provisions of this chapter when, owing to special conditions or exceptional situations, a literal interpretation of this chapter will result in exceptional practical difficulties to the property owner.

Article XVII, § 140-108-G lists the Required Findings for the granting of a Variance.

- G. Required findings. Pursuant to Title 22, Section 327, of the Delaware Code and applicable law, the Board of Adjustment shall determine whether each variance application meets the following criteria:
1. The variance relates to a specific parcel of land, and the hardship is not shared generally by other properties in the same zoning district and vicinity;
  2. The variance can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good;
  3. The benefits from granting the variance would substantially outweigh any detriment;
  4. Approval of the variance would not substantially impair the intent and purposes of the Comprehensive Plan or this chapter; and
  5. All requirements for the grant of a variance under Delaware law.

#### Town Comments

As of April 15, 2026, the Department is in receipt of four (4) letters of opposition to the Special Exception and/or the related variance requests. These letters are included as part of the Board’s packets. We will provide copies of any new correspondence directly to the Board for their consideration.

***A motion was made by Mr. Copples, seconded by Mr. Thornton, to approve the variance for lot coverage. The Board unanimously granted the request.***

***The Board found:***

- (1) The reduction in lot coverage from its current percentage is beneficial to the Town and surrounding properties;***
- (2) The Applicant has demonstrated that the proposed project will not negatively impact the nature of the zone in which the property is located;***

- (3) The Applicant has demonstrated that the proposed project will not negatively impact the character of the immediate vicinity;*
- (4) The Applicant has demonstrated that if the lot coverage restriction is removed, such removal would not seriously affect the neighboring properties;*
- (5) The Applicant has established exceptional practical difficulties based on the shape of the lot and the testimony provided by the Applicant. The motion carried unanimously 5/0. All voted yes and stated they were in favor and their reasons.*

*A motion was made by Mr. Thorton, seconded by Mr. Neuner, to approve the variance for screening. The variance can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good; the benefits from granting the variance would substantially outweigh any detriment; approval of the variance would not substantially impair the intent and purposes of the Comprehensive Plan or Chapter 140; and all requirements for the grant of a variance under Delaware law. The Board here also find that the nature of the zone where the property lies is commercial; 2) the character and uses of the immediate vicinity are similar; 3) the removal of the restriction on the applicant's property would seriously affect the neighboring property and its uses; and the applicant has established exceptional practical difficulty by establishing the irregular shape of the lot, combined with the need to meet required parking space dimensions and circulation standards, significantly constrains the ability to provide compliant screening without impairing the reasonable use of the property. Regarding the 6 ft. area for screening, as stated on the record, the Town requires additional documentation from DelDOT stating that they would indeed allow the screening plantings to be placed within the right of way. If DelDOT does not provide such permission, the Applicant is required to either obtain a new variance or revise the plans to satisfy the terms of the variance granted. The motion carried unanimously 5/0. All voted in favor to incorporate comments.*

**B. V-469 32793 Cedar Drive (PIDN :078.000/CTM:134-12.00-422.00)**

Application V-469, a request for a variance from Article V, §140-32, which sets the maximum height of a detached accessory structure to 14 feet. The property owners wish to construct a detached accessory structure (pole building) with a proposed height of approximately 18 ft.

The application is submitted by Mackenzie Sindelar, Esquire, of the law firm Saul Ewing, LLP, on behalf of the property owners, George H. Wright & Gary W. Wright, for property zoned R-1 (Single-Family Residential), located at 32793 Cedar Drive (PIDN 078.000 / CTM 134-12.00-422.00)

Application V-469, submitted by the applicant Mackenzie Sindelar, Esquire, of the law firm Saul Ewing, LLP, on behalf of the property owners, George H. Wright & Gary W. Wright requests relief from Article V, §140-32, with regard to the maximum allowable height for detached accessory structures, on property zoned R-1 (Single Family Residential), located at 32793 Cedar Drive (PIDN 078.000 / CTM 134-12.00-422.00)

The property owners wish to construct a detached garage to a height of 18 ft. The maximum allowable height for detached accessory structures, as established in Article V, §140-32 of the Town Code, is 14 ft. The proposed garage will exceed the maximum allowable height by 4 ft.

A Variance is outlined in Article XVII, § 140-108 with the following definition: A “variance” is relief from the strict application of the provisions of this chapter when, owing to special conditions or exceptional situations, a literal interpretation of this chapter will result in exceptional practical difficulties to the property owner.

Article XVII, § 140-108-G lists the Required Findings for the granting of a Variance.

- G. Required findings. Pursuant to Title 22, Section 327, of the Delaware Code and applicable law, the Board of Adjustment shall determine whether each variance application meets the following criteria:
1. The variance relates to a specific parcel of land, and the hardship is not shared generally by other properties in the same zoning district and vicinity;
  2. The variance can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good;
  3. The benefits from granting the variance would substantially outweigh any detriment;
  4. Approval of the variance would not substantially impair the intent and purposes of the Comprehensive Plan or this chapter; and
  5. All requirements for the granting of variance under Delaware law.

#### **Town Comments**

The Department is in receipt of one letter from an adjacent property owner in opposition to the application, which has been included in the Board’s packets.

The Department would like to note that the Wrights purchased this property in October of 2024. Based on a review of Town and County records, the existing detached garage located at the rear of the property was constructed in or around 1998 by previous owners. This two-story garage is considered an existing non-conforming structure.

Should the Board choose to grant the variance, the Department recommends that the Board inform the applicant that §140-25-A(5) prohibits overnight lodging in accessory structures, which would include both the proposed pole building, and the existing garage.

Ms. Mackensie Sindelar, of Saul Ewing, represented the property owners George H. Wright & Gary W. Wright who are requesting a variance for 18ft for the height of a garage. She provided handouts for the Board of the garage elevation, which will have a door height of 12 feet. The garage will be approximately the same height as the house, with the same roof pitch. Ms. Sindelar stated that the lot is very narrow, they are trying to stay with the character of the neighborhood. The garage will house a contractor's office. She said they will screen the property with approximately 50 evergreens. The existing garage on the property would be used for woodworking.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Ms. Beverly Scott, Lake Village Circle, stated she was concerned with the tranquility of the neighborhood. The Preserve is a year-round community.

Ms. Cindy Schaub, Lake Village Circle, questioned the woodworking being noisy. She wondered if it was a hobby or a commercial business.

Mr. James Zanzinger, Lake Village Circle, suggested they use green giant evergreens.

Mr. Wayne Rogers, Lake Village Circle, asked if the appraiser was certified.

Ms. Sindelar and Mr. Wright explained the garage would be used for storage and the existing garage would be for woodworking.

**PUBLIC COMMENT CLOSED.**

*A motion was made by Mr. Neuner, seconded by Ms. Kerwin to approve the variance request for height of 18ft with the condition that a buffer be planted. The planting of the buffer should include at least 50 green giants of at least 5*

*feet in height and should limit the visibility of the new structure, and any remaining trees would be distributed along the sides of the property to limit the visibility of the existing structures. The motion carried unanimously 5/0. Mr. Thornton stated that the screening is better than what is currently there. All agreed on the buffer for approval.*

**C. V-470 N. Horseshoe Drive (PIDN:004.200/CTM#134-12.00-668.00)**

Application V-470 requests the following variances:

1. From Article V, §140-32 to allow a proposed attached accessory structure (3-season room addition) to project 12 ft. into the required 30 ft. rear yard setback.
2. From Article V, §140-28 to allow all existing and proposed structures to have a lot coverage of 37%, which exceeds the maximum allowable lot coverage of 35%.

Mr. Lober read the following: The application is submitted by the property owners, Jeffrey and Elizabeth Byrd, in conjunction with their contractor, Tyme Builders, Inc., seeking variances on property zoned R-1 (Single Family Residential), located at 19 North Horseshoe Drive (PIDN: 004.200 / CTM# 134-12.00-668.00).

Application V-470, submitted by the property owners, Jeffrey and Elizabeth Byrd, in conjunction with their contractor Tyme Builders, Inc. requests relief from Article V, §140-32, with regard to the maximum allowable projection of an attached accessory structure into the required rear yard setback, and from Article V, §140-28 with regard to maximum allowable lot coverage on property zoned R-1 (Single Family Residential), located at 19 North Horseshoe Drive (PIDN: 004.200 / CTM# 134-12.00-668.00).

The property owners wish to construct a three-season room addition on the rear of their home that will project 12 ft. into the required 30 ft. setback. The additional impervious associated with the project increases the overall lot coverage to 37%, which exceeds the maximum allowable lot coverage of 35% by 2%.

A Variance is outlined in Article XVII, § 140-108 with the following definition:

A “variance” is relief from the strict application of the provisions of this chapter when, owing to special conditions or exceptional situations, a literal interpretation of this chapter will result in exceptional practical difficulties to the property owner.

Article XVII, § 140-108-G lists the Required Findings for the granting of a Variance.

G. Required findings. Pursuant to Title 22, Section 327, of the Delaware Code and applicable law, the Board of Adjustment shall determine whether each variance application meets the following criteria:

1. The variance relates to a specific parcel of land, and the hardship is not shared generally by other properties in the same zoning district and vicinity;
2. The variance can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good;
3. The benefits from granting the variance would substantially outweigh any detriment;
4. Approval of the variance would not substantially impair the intent and purposes of the Comprehensive Plan or this chapter; and
5. All requirements for the grant of a variance under Delaware law.

#### **Town Comments**

The Department is in receipt of two letters from adjacent property owners in support of the application. These letters are included in the Board's packets.

As part of their submission, the applicant has provided a copy of a Notice of Decision from variance application V-200, which was submitted by a previous property owner, Immanuel Queen, and heard by the Town of Ocean View's Board of Adjustment on October 19, 2006, concerning the property at 19 N. Horseshoe Drive. At the hearing, the Board granted a variance for an existing 12x12 deck to encroach 12 feet into the rear yard setback. The Board then denied a variance for the same deck to be enclosed. Their reasons for both are cited in the Notice of Decision.

It is the Department's interpretation that, should the property owner wish to maintain the existing deck or reconstruct it in-kind within the existing footprint, they would be able to do so based on the previous variance. However, the property owner desires to remove the existing 12x12 deck associated with Variance V-200 and replace it with a 3-season room (12x18) which qualifies as a new attached accessory structure and therefore requires a variance of its own. The encroachment of 12 feet into the required 30' rear yard setback would be the same.

A survey of the property prepared by Miller Lewis Land Surveying and dated 3/17/26 shows that the existing lot coverage is 36%, including the 12x12 deck associated with variance V-200. The removal of the deck and construction of the 3-season room would result in an overall lot coverage of 37%, which exceeds the maximum of 35% by 2%.

Mr. Jeffrey Byrd property owner stated that he bought the house in 2012, he has been fulltime since 2023, said his overall goal is to improve the aesthetics.

**PUBLIC COMMENT: none**

**PUBLIC COMMENT CLOSED.**

*A motion was made by Mr. Thornton, seconded by Mr. Galey. To approve a variance from V, §140-32 to allow a proposed attached accessory structure, a 3-season room addition, to project 12 ft. into the required 30 ft. rear yard setback; and 2) a variance from Article V, §140-28 to allow all existing and proposed structures to have a lot coverage of 37%, which exceeds the maximum allowable lot coverage of 35%. The motion carried unanimously 4/0. Ms. Kerwin had recused herself.*

**5. ADJOURNMENT**

*A motion was made by Ms. Kerwin, seconded by Mr. Copples, to adjourn the meeting at 6:09pm. The motion was carried unanimously 5/0.*

Respectfully submitted, Donna M. Schwartz, MMC, Town Clerk

