

**THE CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF CHESTERFIELD
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**

June 26, 2013

On June 26, 2013, a regular meeting of the Chesterfield Township Zoning Board of Appeals was held at the Township Hall located at 47275 Sugarbush, Chesterfield, MI 48047.

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman Stepnak called the meeting to order at 7:04 P.M.

2. **ROLL CALL:** Present: Marvin Stepnak, Chairman
James Klonowski, Vice-Chairman
Thomas Yaschen, Secretary
Hank Anderson, Township Board liaison
Carl Leonard, Planning Commission liaison
Patrick Militello
Wendy Jones

Mr. Shortt attended the meeting as the representative of the Building Department.

3. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:**

Chairman Stepnak explained the procedures to the audience.

4. **ZBA PETITION #2013-09:** Brian Rivera, 52065 Hickory Drive, Chesterfield, MI 48047. Requesting a variance to build a 12' x 10', 4-post Gazebo in the front yard (waterside) for the home located at 48855 Salt River Drive, Chesterfield, MI 48047.

Brian Rivera, 52065 Hickory Drive, Chesterfield, MI 48047 addressed the board.

Petitioner stated that he was the builder and was requesting to build a gazebo in the homeowner's front yard which is on the Salt River.

Chairman Stepnak stated that basically the back yard is considered the front yard because the home is located on the water.

Petitioner continued that it would be a 10' x 14' structure and he drew up the plans while the home owner actually made a computer concept of what the gazebo would look like.

Chairman Stepnak asked the petitioner if he had discussed the plans with Mr. Shortt and the Building Department?

Petitioner answered he did see the inspector and Mr. Shortt was the one who caught it and informed him that he would need a variance because the home is on the river and the gazebo location would actually be considered the front yard.

Chairman Stepnak asked Mr. Shortt for any comments.

Mr. Shortt stated that structurally the gazebo would be fine and there did not seem to be any drainage issues on the property. The gentleman just needs a variance for the front yard and the Building Department has no problems with it.

Ms. Jones asked if the gazebo would be an open structure?

Petitioner answered yes. It would just be four posts on the corners and a roof.

Mr. Militello stated as far as the structure is concerned the only issue would be the placement in the back yard which would be considered the front yard. Since it does not appear the structure would be any obstruction for the properties on either side and he does not have any issues with it.

Mr. Klonowski concurred with Mr. Militello and because there are no site line issues involved, he has no problem with it.

Mr. Yaschen asked if the petitioner planned to run any power to the structure?

Petitioner answered no. He mentioned that the structure would solely be for shade because they have no trees back there on the property.

Mr. Anderson commented that Mr. Shortt had already answered his questions.

Mr. Leonard stated that he was okay with the structure and as far as putting electrical out there, he would not have a problem if the petitioner's had an outlet out there for maybe in the cooler months an electrical heater. He asked about the four sections of privacy fence that are noted on the plans? He asked if that had anything to do with the requested variance?

Petitioner stated that was another permit that he was going to pull when he gets this one. He explained that on either side of her lot line the petitioner would like a couple of fence panels on the lot line for privacy but that would not have anything to do with the structure.

Mr. Leonard asked Chairman Stepnak that because this is on the water side aren't there some issues about fences being so high?

Chairman Stepnak stated that the petitioner has been to the Building Department on the matter and he would leave the fence up to Mr. Shortt and the Building Department and have them direct the petitioner on that matter.

Mr. Leonard mentioned that the petitioner may want to discuss the fence with Mr. Shortt before proceeding.

Petitioner replied that he planned to pull the permit for the fence which would be a totally different thing from the permit for the gazebo.

Mr. Leonard stated that as far as the fence is concerned the petitioner may have to change something up to avoid another variance.

Petitioner replied okay.

Chairman Stepnak stated that the petitioner has been up front with the board and if he has some issues with the fence, he would have the Building Department handle that matter.

There were no public comments.

Motion by Mr. Yaschen to approve Petition #2013-09. He stated that based on the fact that the conditions and circumstances are unique to this property because the back is considered the front yard. He stated that the variance would not confer any special privileges that are denied to other properties in the same building district.

Supported by Mr. Militello

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Granted

5. **ZBA PETITION # 2013-10**: Michael A. Oberg, 48177 Mallard, Chesterfield, MI 48047. Requesting a variance to allow a 2nd accessory building which is 400 sq. ft. (20' x 20'), for a total square footage of 840 sq. ft. at the above listed address.

Michael A. Oberg, 48177 Mallard, Chesterfield, MI 48047 addressed the board.

Petitioner stated that he was requesting to allow a second accessory building. He stated that he currently has a 12' x 12' shed in the middle of his yard that he would like to remove and replace with this 20' x 20' structure at the rear of the yard. He explained that this structure would put him over the total square footage allowed and would also be considered a second accessory structure on the property.

Mr. Leonard stated that he stopped by the property and it a good size lot. He mentioned that the petitioner planned to put the structure all the way in the back of the lot. He asked the petitioner if he planned to put electrical in the structure?

Petitioner replied no, it was not going to be a garage. He stated that it would be more of a storage building or a place to put all his tools, wheel barrows, riding lawnmower, snow blower, etc. He mentioned that currently he cannot get his riding lawnmower into his shed.

Mr. Leonard asked if the petitioner would like to have electrical in the structure even for general lighting?

Petitioner stated, not at this time, maybe in the future. He commented that due to the cost he does not want to run the electrical out there.

Mr. Leonard mentioned that if the petitioner chose to put in electrical for lighting or whatever he wanted to do, he would not have a problem with it. He noticed that with the existing garage it was very tight with the vehicles and the equipment in there and he does not see any place where the petitioner could put in a third-car garage. He stated that the lot is rather large and pretty deep. He explained that the structure would be about 220' back from the road and tucked behind the home so he does not have any concerns at this point.

Ms. Jones had no questions.

Mr. Anderson had no questions.

Mr. Klonowski stated that Mr. Leonard covered any questions he had about the structure.

Mr. Militello had no comments.

Mr. Yaschen asked Mr. Shortt if there were any concerns from the Building Department?

Mr. Shortt replied that the property would have to be worked on regarding drainage. He asked if the petitioner had put in a sprinkler system?

Petitioner stated that he had a geothermal system put in last spring and when they put that in, they ripped up all the sprinkler lines. So, he explained, before he has the final grade done and before the foundation is done for this structure, he will have the sprinkler lines repaired. He stated that they are open right now, but they will be closed up this weekend.

Mr. Shortt stated that the Township has ordinances that require gutters, a ratwall and a slab for the structure.

Petitioner replied absolutely.

Mr. Shortt explained that if the board approves the variance, he would like them to set a bond amount to hold in collateral to make sure the old shed is removed. He stated that normally it would be a \$500 bond to post to assure removal of the old shed. He explained that after the petitioner finishes out the new shed, he would be able to move the items from the old shed into the new structure and then remove the old shed. He requested that the board add that to their motion.

Chairman Stepnak stated that the issue about electrical in the structure comes up because as the community, they would like to be assured that the petitioner would not run a business out of the garage or shed. He stated that the board has actually had some petitioners sign an affidavit that they would not run a business out of the structure. He stated that there are sheds in this area and due to the depth of the lot, and since structure cannot be seen from the street, he does not really have a problem with it. He mentioned that he would like to make sure the petitioner complies with the regulations of the Building Department and remove the old shed upon completion of the new structure.

Petitioner stated that he was aware of all the specs and codes for the structure and has a copy of the affidavit that there would not be any residential living or business run out of the structure. He stated that he has no problem complying with any of that.

Chairman Stepnak asked the petitioner if he planned to build the structure himself or get a builder?

Petitioner stated that at this time he was looking into purchasing a kit from Menard's. He planned to have someone do the cement work and then he would attempt to put the shed up himself.

There were no public comments.

Mr. Leonard asked the petitioner if he planned to match shingles, siding and the same colors as on the home.

Petitioner stated that the shingles would match his home and the structure would be vinyl sided. He explained that his home is brick and he is not going to brick the shed, but the trim, overhang, shingles and color would match his home. He stated that when he removes the shed, he would like to keep the foundation and use it as a patio with a table, chairs and an umbrella.

Mr. Leonard asked Mr. Shortt if that would be a problem?

Mr. Shortt replied that would be fine.

Mr. Leonard asked if the petitioner planned to remove the shed before the new shed is completed?

Petitioner replied that he planned to final out the new structure first because he does not want all of his things just sitting out in the back yard and creating a mess for his neighbors to look at.

Mr. Leonard stated so the bond is something the board would need to look at?

Petitioner answered yes, if a bond is required that would be fine.

Mr. Shortt asked the board if they wanted to put a time frame in as to the removal of the old shed possibly 60 day after the final inspection of the second accessory structure, the old shed would have to be removed?

Mr. Leonard assumed the petitioner would like to get everything cleaned up and back in order as soon as possible.

Chairman Stepnak asked the petitioner if the 60 day was something he could live with?

Petitioner replied yes 60 days after completion of the new shed would be fine.

Chairman Stepnak asked the petitioner if he would agree with the \$500 bond?

Petitioner stated that would be fine.

Motion by Mr. Yaschen to approve Petition # 2013-10 for a second accessory building. He stated that the variance would not confer any special privileges that are denied to other properties in the same zoning district and would not be contrary to the spirit or intent of the ordinance with the condition that the petitioner would put up a \$500 performance bond upon completion of the new shed the petitioner would have 60 days to remove items to the new shed and the old shed must be torn down in that 60 day period.

Supported by Mr. Leonard

Chairman Stepnak added that the cement foundation from the old shed could be left as a patio, but the structure must be removed.

Mr. Yaschen agreed with the addition to his motion.

Mr. Leonard continued support.

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Granted

6. **ZBA PETITION # 2013-11:** Nicole Gatto, 29208 Rachid, Chesterfield, MI 48047. Requesting a variance to place a 12' x 10' shed on her side lot at the address above.

Nicole Gatto, 29208 Rachid, Chesterfield, MI 48047 addressed the board.

Petitioner stated that they were requesting to place a 12' x 10' shed at the side of their home. She explained that they live on a corner lot and there are easements which prevent them from putting the shed in another place on their property. She stated that they could put it at one end at the rear of the yard but it would have to go on a sump lead. She explained that upon applying for the variance they received a letter from their Homeowners' Association stating they would like the shed to be placed behind their home. She claimed that unfortunately, if the board would look at the diagram, there is no other place to put the shed. She mentioned that Mr. Shortt was out to their property that day and she also told the board she had pictures of her yard for the board to look at.

Chairman Stepnak directed the petitioner to bring the photos up to the board.

Petitioner stated that the proposed shed would be placed on the side by their fence. She mentioned that they actually had a shed at that location for about a year and a half with no complaints. She stated that they just received an email from the Association yesterday and she contacted an attorney who told her that any decision by the Township should supersede the by-laws of the Association.

Chairman Stepnak stated that the Homeowners' Association can make recommendations, however, the Township has the authority over that and the ZBA would make the final decision on the matter.

Petitioner mentioned that they did consider putting the shed in the location suggested by the Association which would move it closer to the swing set. However, for the safety of the children and for aesthetic purposes it would not make any sense to do that and would create an eyesore in the middle of their yard.

Tony Gatto, 29208 Rachid, Chesterfield, MI 48047 addressed the board.

Mr. Gatto stated that they would put the shed anywhere, they just needed some direction. They just want to keep their things in a structure and keep their yard looking nice.

Petitioner mentioned that they have a two-car garage and have considered putting in a third bay, however, with the corner location that would be impossible. She stated that their other option would be to move the swing set up and put the shed in that location. However, the shed would be technically be behind their home, but it would still be in the side lot and then unfortunately then her neighbor would have to go out and look at the shed and even though it will be a nice shed that will compliment their home is it something people want to look at.

Chairman Stepnak stated that they could take a look at it and possibly direct the petitioners with some options but they are not in the position to solve the problem, they can just move on what is presented to them.

Mr. Militello stated that looking at the site plan and the sump lead, he asked if there was no where north of that for the location of the shed?

Petitioner replied that of they would look at the photographs, they would notice a large patio with a retaining wall around it. Unfortunately, with that and the easements, there is really no other location for the shed on that particular side of the house.

Mr. Gatto stated on the other side of the house there is the sump pump line and the sewer that goes through there. He also mentioned that it also floods back in that area and when it rains they got a water that drains on their property from the surrounding properties in that area. Therefore, he mentioned that it would be very difficult to build something in that area.

Mr. Militello explained that he just had a concern with the placement of the shed in that area because of the location of the driveway and the sightlines for the sidewalk and for cars coming by. He commented that he did not know how well a child walking or riding a bike would be seen right there if they were trying to back a car up. He stated that main problem with the location as far as he was concerned would be the safety issue.

Mr. Yaschen asked if the open spot in the pictures is where they would like to put the shed?

Petitioner answered yes.

Mr. Yaschen asked where the little shed shown in the photographs would be going?

Petitioner replied that they have already removed that small shed. They had received a letter from the Township stating the shed had to be removed, so they complied with that order. At that time, they were told to apply for a variance for a shed which they did.

Mr. Anderson stated that the other board members have addressed his concerns.

Mr. Klonowski stated that looking at the site and doing a few measurements, it seems like there would be enough room to put the shed in the back yard.

Mr. Gatto asked if he meant where the play set is located?

Mr. Klonowski replied no on the northwest side of the yard because there seems to be room for the shed and room to get into that area. He commented that the board has to look at the practical difficulty and that would not exist if the shed can be located in the back yard.

Petitioner stated that they could not put the cement slab on the sump lead and also they have a drainage issue in that back area. She thought it would cause a problem for the neighbors with flooding because every time it rains it gets very wet back there.

Mr. Klonowski asked Mr. Shortt if there were drainage issues on that area of the property?

Mr. Shortt stated that he did not look in that area, he just discussed possibly putting the shed in back 10' from the house. They would go out of their patio and the shed would be in that location.

Petitioner stated that she was not 100% opposed to that location, but they thought it would look funny being there.

Ms. Jones had no comments.

Mr. Leonard stated looking at the site plan and looking at the pictures; there are things in the pictures that are not on the site plan. He asked if the gazebo and the patio were both things the petitioner's just put in?

Mr. Gatto stated that the patio existed when they purchased the home.

Petitioner stated that they put in the gazebo and the retaining wall last summer.

Mr. Leonard asked if the petitioner's put in the garden?

Petitioner replied yes.

Mr. Leonard stated that he served on the ZBA for nine years and he does not recall ever entertaining a shed on the side of a home. He stated that there are sightlines and safety issues in this case as Mr. Militello has pointed out. He explained that this would be a big safety issue for him to have the shed in that area. He stated that what was built back there was caused by the petitioners and maybe at the time they did not consider where a shed could be place on the property. He commented that it would be a lot of work, but the garden could be moved and the shed be placed in that area.

He reiterated that placing the shed in the proposed area would be a big safety concern for him.

Chairman Stepnak stated that from sitting on the ZBA for many years and before that on the Planning Commission he was aware that corner lots are allowed more space between the street and the house so there is clear vision. He explained that purchasing a corner lot has its disadvantages.

Mr. Gatto stated that they are finding this out.

Chairman Stepnak stated that unfortunately even though they are allowed more space a lot of that space may not be utilized. He mentioned that when he was on the Planning Commission they actually created these lots larger and if the petitioners go look at some of the older subdivisions, they would see that those corner homes do not even have the extra space. He mentioned that they have put fences and pools on the side of a home, but not a shed and actually most of the property on the side was never intended as buildable space.

Mr. Gatto stated that he understood those facts, but he mentioned that the fence is six feet from the sidewalk and the shed would be four feet away from that, so the shed would be ten feet from the sidewalk.

Chairman Stepnak stated that the reason corner lots are given more space is because they want to make sure there is clear vision so when driving down the street it doesn't look like a tunnel.

Petitioner stated that they do not want to compromise safety; they have a three year old son. However, they had the shed up for a year and a half and there were no complaints or problems that arose because of the location. She reiterated that they do not want to compromise safety and they do not want to flood out their neighbors with a shed at the back of the property.

Chairman Stepnak stated that if it is suggested that the shed go at the back of the property the petitioners would still be responsible for the drainage back there and not be allowed to flood out their neighbors' property. He explained that there would be things that could be done to build up the property so that the water could drain properly and the Building Department would come out and let them know what has to be done.

Mr. Yaschen read a letter from Dominic Orlando, 29136 Baypointe Drive, Chesterfield, MI which stated that the petitioners have made many improvements to their home and he was in favor of the petitioner putting the shed in the proposed location. The letter was retained for the ZBA records.

Mr. Yaschen read a very lengthy letter from Laurie Gaborik, 29201 Rachid Lane, Chesterfield, MI which in essence requested that the board deny the petitioner's variance. The letter was retained for the ZBA records.

Petitioner brought in a document signed by their neighbors stating they had no objection to the request to put a shed in the proposed location. The document was signed by: Chris Tiede at 29102 Baypointe, Rich Chipman at 29241 Rachid Lane, Susanne Rettell at 29245 Rachid Lane, Mary Mestor at 29213 Rachid Lane, Jamu Labaz at 29212 Rachid Lane, Danielle Muir at 29168 Rachid Lane, LaShenda Vennamer at 29205 Rachid Lane, Sandy Gendreau at 29217 Rachid Lane, Tom and Shelly Hodges at 29184 Rachid Lane, Dave Thomas at 29141 Baypointe, Chuck Beck at 29144 Baypointe, Florentina Marconi at 29221 Rachid Lane, Tony Antoszewski at 29197 Rachid Lane and Michael Williams.

Barbara Johnson, President of the Baycourt Estates Homeowners' Association, 47628 Clairmont, Chesterfield, MI addressed the board.

Ms. Johnson stated that according to the by-laws sheds are to be placed at the rear of the dwelling and asked to board to deny the petitioner's request.

Stephen & Deborah Angst, 29193. Rachid Lane, Chesterfield, MI sent a letter to the board which was brought in by Barbara Johnson which requested that the board deny the variance. The letter was retained for the ZBA records.

Patrick and Sherrie Antoszewski, 29197 Rachid Lane, Chesterfield, MI sent a letter to the board which was brought in by Barbara Johnson which requested that the board deny the variance. The letter was retained for the ZBA records.

Frank Rossi, Vice-President of the Baycourt Estates Homeowners' Association, 29034 Bay Pointe, Chesterfield, MI addressed the board.

Mr. Rossi made some additional comments and requested that the board deny the variance.

Sandy Gendreau, 29217 Rachid Lane, Chesterfield, MI addressed the board.

Ms. Gendreau read a letter that she had written expressing that Mr. & Mrs. Gatto were great neighbors and have done many improvements to their home. She stated that the shed would not be a sightline issue. She requested that the board approve the variance for the petitioners. The letter was retained for the ZBA records.

Chairman Stepnak stated that the petitioners seem like great people, but the problem is that they have rules that have been set forth. He mentioned that by looking at the petitioner's back yard, the board members just seem to think that the shed may possibly fit in their back yard. He stated for instance it there was a stream running

through the back yard and there was no other place to put the shed, it would be very possible the board would look differently at the variance. The purpose of the board is to address those issues. He explained that the board members look at the plans and also go out to look at the property so they have a visual idea of what is out there and what they move on could have other implications on what happens in another neighborhood down the road.

Ms. Gendreau stated that she understood that, however, the petitioners do not have room in their back yard.

Florentina Marconi, 29221 Rachid Lane, Chesterfield, MI addressed the board.

Ms. Marconi made some comments in support of the granting of the variance.

There were no further public comments.

Chairman Stepnak stated that the problem in this case would be that the petitioner must prove a practical difficulty and he mentioned if there were no other possible place to put the shed, that could be considered a practical difficulty. He mentioned that is not just our rule that is a State law.

Mr. Gatto asked suppose they put the shed where the play set is currently located and put the play set in that location, would that be legal?

Chairman Stepnak asked Mr. Shortt where would be a place the shed could be located so the petitioners would not have to come back in front of the ZBA for approval?

Mr. Shortt explained that the shed would have to be in line with the house, there would have to be a 30' setback off of Rachid, 10' from the house and 1' off the easement. He stated that if the shed was moved back behind the house 10' from the house and close up to the patio there would still be about 22' from the sidewalk. He mentioned that the board members stated that they would like the shed to be placed in back of the house.

Chairman Stepnak mentioned that Mr. Shortt is the Head of the Building Department and he is in his office at the Township most days and the petitioner could come into the office to discuss any type of drainage issues or any other questions they may have on the matter.

Petitioner stated that she just did not feel that location would complement the look of the home and the aesthetics of the property. She stated based on what she has read they cannot place the ratwall over the sump lead.

Mr. Shortt stated that it could be done at their own risk. He mentioned that he had to replace his last year. He explained that those pipes get loaded with calcium and plug up so they need to be replaced.

Mr. Leonard asked Mr. Shortt if the sump line could be rerouted; it would not have to be a straight line?

Mr. Shortt replied yes the sump line could be rerouted. He stated that it is probably deep enough so they could go right over it. He instructed the petitioners to look down into that catch basin and told them they would see the pipe coming right in there. He stated that the petitioners would be responsible to replace the sump line if it plugs up.

Petitioner asked if the board would consider them moving the shed closer to the fence?

Mr. Shortt explained that just because the sump discharge shows it is right here on the plans does not mean that is, in actuality, the exact location.

Petitioner stated that because they do have the retaining wall there, would the board allow them to put the shed closer to the fence so it is not in the center of the yard. She asked Mr. Shortt how far the shed would have to be from the fence?

Mr. Shortt answered that the shed would have to be three feet from that side, ten feet from the house, and 1 foot off the easement. He stated if the shed would be put in that area, they would not even need a variance.

Petitioner stated that when they went in to get a permit for the shed the girl at the desk stated that they would have to come in for a variance and they discussed the matter with John St. Germaine.

Chairman Stepnak stated that any time the petitioner had any questions to come in and discuss the matter with Mr. Shortt. He explained that there was adequate space as to where the shed could be located behind the house. He asked the petitioner if she planned to go in that direction.

Petitioner stated that she would have to look at their options and see and that she would probably just ask the board to Table the issue to make sure that it would work, instead of them coming back in front of the ZBA for another variance.

Chairman Stepnak stated that looking at the plans it does not look as though the petitioner could prove a practical difficulty for putting the shed in the side yard. A practical difficulty would mean that the petitioners would have no other physical place to put the shed in the back of the yard. He stated after discussions with Mr. Shortt it looks as though it is possible to put the shed in the back yard within specs. He explained that it is up to the petitioner to prove a practical difficulty.

Mr. Klonowski thought it was important to point out that if the variance is denied the petitioner would still be able to put the shed in the back yard.

Mr. Gatto stated that he understood that and they just wanted to put the shed in a place that made sense. He commented that he was almost to the point of bulldozing the stuff back there and starting over or just sell the house.

Motion by Mr. Klonowski to deny Petition # 2013-11. The petitioners did not prove a practical difficulty in this matter. The variance would be contrary to the spirit and intent of the ordinance. The shed in the proposed location would cause sightline issues which could pose a safety hazard.

Supported by Mr. Yaschen

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Granted

Chairman Stepnak polled the board for any additional comments:

Mr. Klonowski verified that he voted to deny and had no additional comments.

Mr. Yaschen verified that he voted to deny and had no comments.

Mr. Militello stated he voted to deny and had no additional comments.

Mr. Leonard stated he voted to deny. He commented that if the back corner would be tight back there, the garden could be moved and there would be tons of room in that garden location. The petitioners could relocate the garden in the area where they proposed to put the shed.

Ms. Jones verified that she voted to deny and had no comments.

Mr. Anderson stated that he voted to deny based on the safety and sightline issue not on the what ifs and whether toys would be piled up near the shed as was brought up in one of the letters. He voted to deny strictly based on the sustainable issue of safety.

Chairman Stepnak verified that he voted to deny the petition because the petitioner did not prove a practical difficulty. The petitioners did state that they would be willing to work with the Building Department to find a suitable location within the ordinance.

7. OLD BUSINESS:

There was no old business.

8. **NEW BUSINESS:**

There was no new business.

9. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM PRIOR MEETING:**

Motion by Mr. Yaschen to approve the minutes from the June 12, 2013 ZBA meeting.

Supported by Mr. Anderson

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Granted

10. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR:**

There were no additional comments from the floor.

11. **ADJOURNMENT:**

Motion by Chairman Stepnak to adjourn at 8:13 PM.

Supported by Mr. Yaschen

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Granted

Thomas Yaschen, Secretary

Grace Mastronardi, Recording Secretary