

Law & Legislature Committee Meeting

August 29, 2023

Present: Nick Smith, Shaun Flatter, Ryan Paisley, William Carrow, Town Manager Robert Cote, and Sue Muncey were in attendance.

Mr. Paisley brought the meeting to order. It is Tuesday, August 29, 2023, at 6:00 p.m. and we are present and meeting at the Clayton Town Hall Council Chambers. Please let the record reflect that all members of the committee are present with the exception of Councilwoman DeBenedictis who is an excused absence from this meeting. As you all know, this is a second installment of our goal to revisit and re-envision different ordinances we have on the books and ones that we would consider to implement in the future tonight. These ordinances mainly focus on Title 2 which is a big part of our code with two (2) exceptions that come from other areas that we will get to.

Discuss and Vote to Recommend that Council Adopt Ordinance #2023-06 – An Act to Amend Article 2-2.5 of the Clayton Municipal Code Related to Keeping of Pets.

Mr. Paisley stated this ordinance very simply just does two (2) things. One it outlaws allowing a person in possession of an animal to permit that animal to attack or threaten another person or another animal in town. Secondly, it outlaws cruelty to animals and defines cruelty to animals in two (2) ways. One the torture, suffering cruel treatment. Second abandonment and/or infliction of pain or injury or to the deprivation of food, water, and/or shelter. Inspiration from this ordinance comes from the fact which might be surprising. Delaware, even though as small as we are, has the second highest level of animal cruelty rates in the entire country. It is just a few 100 cases away from beating Texas for the number one spot. Even with the staggering number of cases we do have, there are many and in fact most of them probably never are reported and counted. For that reason a poll on this issue came back and said 46% of people say that they want stricter animal cruelty laws and you might even think that this is not an issue in the Town of Clayton. I can say with 100% certainty that it is. An issue because my dog was attacked 10 years ago by a pitbull that was at large. We were walking down the street. His mother was walking the dog. A pitbull got loose, came out of nowhere, and attacked the Beagle that they had and she almost died. After thousands of dollars, thankfully she was saved. In addition to that I believe it was last year on Clayton Avenue so this is something that is going on in town and in both instances the town was not able to do much. I am hoping that we can make it enforceable in town. Mr. Paisley opened it up to questions, comments, or concerns. Mr. Smith had a question about 1.7. It talks about court but this is an ordinance. He understands with the State, but this is an ordinance. It states “upon conviction”. What is that process? Mr. Carrow stated we can fine for our ordinances, but it is not a criminal charge. The SPCA and the animal control people can charge. For town ordinances we write a town ordinance ticket. It basically goes no where. You just pay the fine and that is it. So if you have an incident that is fairly serious, you would need that. The animal control people can fine you and they then can actually charge you with a crime. Mr. Carrow stated he imagines our police officers could do that too. It is part of the title whether it is animal control or a police officer. Usually animal control does them. They deal with them all the time. If we write a ticket on our ordinance, it is a ticket that stays in town. It is like a parking ticket. It doesn’t go on your record. Mr. Smith stated he is reading upon conviction thereof before any court would be subject to a \$50 fine or the \$100 fine. If it is not going to court, where does that put us? Mr. Paisley

stated he cannot speak to that because it is an existing ordinance. Mr. Smith stated he is struggling with the language. He does not understand because it is the same language that came up in reference to the infrastructure damage and the penalty for it. Mr. Paisley stated it is widely used throughout the code book. In fact that same similar format is used very widely, but he assumes it was drafted by the solicitor at that time. Mr. Smith stated none of this is a change. He is just struggling with it. When he asks Mr. Chambers there might be a simple answer. Mr. Smith stated ultimately there is the backside of an appeal to the ordinance violation. Isn't there? If somebody gets a violation for an ordinance there is an appeal process. Mr. Cote stated he has been having these conversations in depth with the code enforcement officer which of course we know with his previous background and we have come across this as Vice Mayor Paisley just stated several more instances within our ordinance book of this type of language. A recommendation that he brought me and since we are discussing this can we talk about things that aren't in here. We can talk about additional things tonight right? Mr. Paisley stated correct. Mr. Cote stated he recommended on another ordinance that he and I have been working on that we are going to bring to you at a later time. Not for discussion tonight because that is not on the agenda. He had heartburn with the term conviction thereof in a court as well as you did Mayor and his recommendation he started using the word assessed. So spit balling for purposes of this conversation, this could potentially look like any person harboring a pet not in compliance with this article or any section or subsection of this article shall instead of upon conviction thereof, shall be assessed. A fine of \$50 for the first offense and \$100 for each subsequent offense and get rid of everything in between. Mr. Smith agrees with striking that section out. A lot of these situations are not going to get into the courts so you are not going to have a conviction but we still have a violation of an ordinance. Mr. Carrow stated if we went to court for an ordinance issue, it would be civil court not a criminal court. Mr. Smith stated the judge has no jurisdiction over that. Mr. Carrow stated anything ordinance would be civil not criminal. Mr. Paisley stated he thinks they are all right. The thing that he is questioning is an attorney drafted this so in his mind there has to be a reason. It could be that perhaps that is a state regulation there would have to be some conviction process before a fine could be levied. He doesn't know. He has no problem striking it now and sending it to Mr. Chambers for review. Mr. Smith stated he would put it in the review to be stricken. Mr. Carrow stated there are only two (2) ways of conviction. You can either be convicted by a judge or convicted on your own in a court, a voluntary assessment. A person knows they are wrong and pays the fine. That might be the way this is reading here. When they pay it they say that they are guilty. Mr. Flatter stated either way you have the same end result. If they say they will pay it, you are convicting yourself. If you just strike through it and it just says shall pay a fine if you don't have to convict yourself, you just take that completely out you just pay the \$50 fine. Mr. Carrow stated right. Mr. Cote stated and shall be assessed versus shall pay. Access doesn't mean your are going to pay it. Mr. Carrow stated he understands where Mr. Paisley is coming from. At one time somebody would think somebody had at one time looked at that thing. But he also agrees with Mr. Cote. The wording doesn't sound perfect. Mr. Paisley stated maybe we are tying ourselves. Mr. Smith agreed. Mr. Paisley stated he has no problem with striking. His only request is that we reach out to Mr. Chambers after this meeting and get his feeling on it. Mr. Paisley stated worse comes to worse we could go back and discuss this after the introduction. Mr. Flatter had a question about 2.2-5.6 private property. We are saying that it is unlawful for any person, a person in possession of an animal, to permit said animal to attack or threaten another person on private property. So if he has a dog in his house and somebody breaks into his house and he allows his dog to attack that person for breaking into his house he can be fined? Mr. Paisley stated penalized in his mind. In that case the dog is defending its territory. Mr. Flatter stated he allowed it. Mr. Paisley stated in his mind it is a defense, not an attack. The dog would be defending its territory, its family. Mr. Flatter stated so his

question is like threaten another person on public property in the Town of Clayton he could see that. But if you step onto my property and I perceive you as a treat and my dog attacks and I don't call him off. Then now I am at fault because I used my dog to defend my property. Mr. Smith stated it is a wording issue. Where Mr. Paisley is trying to get to is if you allow your dog to go onto your neighbor's property and attack their dog. If we left out private property it would be excluded. Mr. Carrow stated how about if you made it another person's private property. Mr. Smith stated another person's private property does distinguish your property away from everyone else's. Mr. Paisley stated you have to keep in mind we have a trailer park in our town where there is it is not subdivided into lots. It's all one property. Mr. Smith stated it is technically the land is all one property, but you are paying for a strip of it. Mrs. Muncey stated they are paying property tax on the dwelling. Mr. Carrow stated you have property that you are responsible for taking care of right? Don't you have a yard responsible for cutting and you have to take care of it. So that would be your property. That is what you pay for in your lot rent. Mr. Paisley stated you could very well be right. He can't say definitely. The reason he has heartburn is if you say another person's private property then in my case where my dog was attacked it wouldn't be under the provision of this article. Mr. Carrow stated when your dog was attacked, where were you at? Where were you walking on the street? That is public property. Mr. Paisley stated that is all the same. The town doesn't own it. Mr. Smith stated that doesn't mean it is not public. That means we just don't own it. Mr. Paisley stated well I was told. Mr. Smith stated we couldn't own it, it is a community. Mr. Paisley stated a public area. But when he asked about street repair, they said they couldn't do it. It was not theirs. Mr. Smith stated that is because we don't own it. But what he is saying is common use public areas aren't always owned by a municipality. The road is still a common use public area and in this ordinance that could easily be distinguished as public versus private property. Mr. Smith stated he agrees the way it is currently worded it applies to the homeowner. Mr. Flatter stated there he agrees. He understands exactly. He didn't see it that way. When he read it the first time it was the home defense. So he couldn't allow his dog to defend his private property. I completely understand if my dog goes to the next door neighbor's house which is private property and attacks I understand why the verbiage is in there. He thinks there needs to be distinction. Mr. Paisley stated you could always put another sentence in there. An animal defending itself from attack. Mr. Smith stated so the animal is the property. Mr. Paisley stated territory which is a defense not an attack in his eyes. He is not an attorney. Mr. Smith stated a dog is going to defend itself. It is defending its power. Mr. Flatter stated he agrees private should be on there for that fact of private property as a whole. The wording needs to be a distinguishing verbiage. Whatever that private property versus general private property and I don't know what that wording is. Mr. Smith stated make a note to get Mr. Chambers involved in that section as well. The concern of distinguishing the differences between ownership property versus private property. Mr. Paisley stated if there were no other questions, comments, or concerns he would accept a motion to recommend that Council adopt Ordinance #2023-06. Mr. Smith he recommends that this goes before Council for introduction. Mr. Paisley stated recommend that Council adopt. Mr. Carrow stated it has to be read and someone looks into those questions. Mr. Smith stated it can go. It could be after introduction. It is still coming back to be discussed and vote again.

Mr. Smith made a motion to recommend Ordinance 2023-06 goes before Council for introduction. Mr. Flatter seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Discuss and Vote to Recommend that Council Adopt Ordinance #2023-07 – An Act to Amend Article 8.3 of the Clayton Municipal Code Related to Procedure to Annex Unincorporated Territory Contiguous to the Town.

Mr. Paisley stated when we did the Charter change, the change to the annexation piece was quite significant. The Charter piece would change quite significantly. What the new ordinance says is if 2/3 of the people in the contiguous territory sign a petition requesting annexation into the town, the town would adopt a resolution which would contain a description of the territory proposed to be annexed. The proposed zoning classification, which would be consistent with the comp plan and the specific date, time, and place where we would hold a public hearing on proposed annexation and that we would do so that we would publish a resolution at least twice in the newspaper at least two (2) weeks but not more than four (4) weeks before the day. It then provides for a public hearing and we would obviously comply with the State Office of State Planning Coordination and submit a plan of services, the annexation vote, and then the formal notice. If the territory was annexed we would formally the people. A significant section here, just to clarify, was that there was a sentiment that was expressed by people in the town prior to this that under the old Charter, the town did not have the power to go out and initiate a conversation with potential annexes about wanting to come into the town. He put plainly in there for clarity that the town has the power to initiate and bargain meaning that we would have the power to go to people and talk about them potentially wanting to come into the town and that we would be able to bargain by means of an annexation agreement so that we could enter into this contract that basically if we were to request annexation, you would be willing to provide utilities, subdivision approval, whatever the case would be, and just put that in there so it is very clearly. Then finally there is a standard severability. I will open that one up for discussion. Mr. Smith stated that he read it and it makes sense to stay in line with the Charter. He doesn't have any issue with any terminology in it. His recommendation is to wait for introduction until after the Charter is signed. Mr. Paisley it was his intent to introduce this to the committee early because he wasn't sure if we had any potential people that wanted annexing in. His concern was if they were waiting for the Charter to be signed, a month for introduction, and then a month to discuss and vote but perhaps he is being a little overambitious. That is the reason it is on the agenda tonight. If committee feels that it should wait until the Charter is hopefully signed he has no issue with that. Mr. Smith asked in the changes end or stricken from here, does it violate the old? Mr. Paisley stated changing. His concern was he wanted to put an effective date in here. He was told that in all likelihood by the time it passed the Charter would already be signed. Mr. Smith stated he can make a motion to send in to introduction, but he would leave it off the agenda until the Charter it signed to discuss and vote. So you need to introduce it and then delay the discuss and vote. Mr. Smith stated we can introduce it and then just not bring it back for discuss and vote until the Charter is signed. Mr. Smith stated he doesn't want to muddy the water. We will stay the old way and then once it is signed we make the switch. Mr. Carrow stated that makes sense.

Mr. Smith made a motion to recommend Ordinance 2023-07 goes before Council for introduction. Mr. Flatter seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Discuss and Vote to Recommend that Council Adopt Ordinance #2023-09 – An Act to Amend Article 2.2-3 of the Clayton Municipal Code Related to Control of Vegetation.

Mr. Paisley stated this is very simple. This takes mention of Town Foreman and replaces it with Town Manager in addition to needed grammar changes in the existing language. Quite frankly, that is all that is in here.

Mr. Flatter made a motion to recommend Ordinance #2023-09 goes before Council for introduction. Mr. Smith seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Carrow asked if there was anyway that instead of having to do every one of these ordinances where we change Town Foreman to Town Manager that we could present something to just cover all of it? This way we wouldn't have to touch every single one of them. Mr. Flatter stated all inclusive. Mr. Carrow stated in all of our ordinances where it mentions Town Foreman change to Town Manager. Mr. Smith stated what you are speaking of is a command ordinance that commands a change throughout the ordinance and that is way beyond his knowledge. He thinks such a thing exists. His concern is looking down the road is for future council members when they are reading the ordinances. They are going to read through that and then they are going to hit a command ordinance that changes everything they have read through. It has to go through the process of touch and change.

Discuss and Vote to Recommend that Council Adopt Ordinance #2023-10 – An Act to Amend Article 2.3-3 of the Clayton Municipal Code Related to Dangerous Buildings.

Mr. Paisley stated again the same exact thing. This takes mention to the Town Manager or Town Foreman and changes them to the Town Manager. There isn't even grammar corrections in this one. That is all there is to it. Mr. Smith stated this is a recently adjusted ordinance to begin with. Mr. Paisley stated that is why there was no other change. Mr. Carrow stated with dealing with some of the issues we have had with some of the buildings is there anything else in the ordinance that needs to be changed or addressed? Mr. Smith stated he didn't think so. He is assuming Mr. Quackenbush went through the ordinance. Does he have any issues any adjustments? Mr. Cote stated not that he has brought to him. Mr. Smith stated we have two (2) months. It is going to go through introduction and come back for discussion and vote. Mr. Cote stated the only movement we have on this is we are probably going to start executing it. Mr. Carrow stated he wanted to make sure as the Town Manager there wasn't anything that he would like to see in the ordinance. Mr. Cote stated he hasn't tested the full weight of this ordinance yet, but he is about to.

Mr. Smith made a motion to advance Ordinance #2023-10 for introduction to the Council. Mr. Flatter seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Discuss and Vote to Recommend that Council Adopt Ordinance #2023-11 – An Act to Amend Article 2.4-4 of the Clayton Municipal Code Related to Depositing of Grass Clippings or Other Lawn and Garden; Material in the Streets, Alleys and Sidewalks.

Mr. Paisley stated this is very similar. Again we are swapping Town Foreman to Town Manager or their designee because this would most likely be something the Code Enforcement Officer would handle in conjunction with the manager. A grammar correction here in that there was a weird semicolon where there shouldn't be anything in the middle of the title so that is why you see the title corrected. But other than that there is no adjustment. Mr. Cote stated Section 2.2-4 talks about tobacco. Mr. Paisley stated good catch. Can you swap that. It is a carryover from a prior ordinance.

Mr. Smith made a motion to advance Ordinance #2023-11 to Council for introduction. Mr. Flatter seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Discuss and Vote to Recommend that Council Adopt Ordinance #2023-12 – An Act to Create Article 1.4 and Article 1.4-1 of the Clayton Municipal Code Related to Streets and the Handi-Park Program

Mr. Paisley stated this ordinance very simply creates a process to where if someone who has been issued a handicap parking placard or handicap license tag wants to designate a handicap parking spot in front of their home they can do so by submitting a letter to the town requesting that to be done. It would be submitted to the Streets Committee for recommendation before Council approval. The only thing that it requires is again that they have a handicap parking placard or a license plate that has been issued. If the Council would approve it, we can put a handicap parking spot in front of the house if they wish. If we don't want to keep it there forever, we could install it for a stated period of time. Mr. Carrow stated we have had problems in town a few times where we have issued a handicap spot in front of a house and the person has moved or died. Is there any type of time limit where they have to renew it or anything like that? It would have to be done at a Streets Committee level. Mr. Paisley stated well I would assume yes. It does say in here that the town council should have the ability to approve or deny the application and install a designated handicapped spot for a stated period of time. We could put you know 10 years. Mr. Carrow stated or we could say until the individual moves. Mr. Paisley stated to the lifetime of resident. Mr. Smith stated if they have a plate it would be until they move. If they have a placard, it has an expiration date. Mr. Paisley stated so you could just put the expiration date of the placard. Mr. Carrow stated that would be something we do at the Streets Committee level. Mr. Smith stated keep in mind that in doing so there is a cost to this – signage, paint. Mr. Smith stated he is letting them know that they need to keep in mind that a lot of people on Main Street – you can't have every other spot. Mr. Paisley stated that is why it says that the Council shall have the ability to approve. If Main Street got too far up, we could say we are very sorry it was first come first serve. Mr. Smith stated it could be left up to the discretion of the Streets Committee. Mr. Flatter stated what happens when so and so is in my parking spot? He sees this coming. Mr. Carrow stated that doesn't matter. If you have a handicapped spot, that is not strictly for you. If somebody else comes up there and has a handicapped tag or placard, then they can park in that spot. Mr. Flatter stated that needs to be known. If somebody is going to go through the application process to put this in front of their house. Mr. Cote stated he can see issues. Mr. Smith stated if a handicapped parking area is established through this process that doesn't reserve the right. Mr. Carrow stated just like if you go to the store. The handicap spots aren't there for a particular person. Mr.

Paisley stated if the town council elects to install a designated handicapped parking spot, said parking area shall not be construed to be exclusive to the applicant. Mr. Cote asked if this was inclusive to folks that don't have a driveway? Let us say I live in a neighborhood. I have a driveway and I have a handicapped placard. Can I also have a handicap spot in front of my house in addition to my driveway parking spots? Mr. Paisley stated he couldn't see a circumstance where the committee would approve that. I don't know if we should restrict ourselves. Mr. Smith stated here is the scenario on Longwood Lane. The driveways are real short. We have an ordinance that states they cannot block the sidewalk. Said person has a handicap van. They are going to be in violation if they leave it in their driveway. They could put in an application to park the van on the street in front of their house. Mr. Flatter stated that is where the committee determines that it will be situational dependent in certain circumstances. That is where you kind of leave it on the Streets Committee to make the best judgement for the town and to justify why. In his development Providence Crossing the driveways are plentiful. You have two (2) designated parking spots already. Other circumstances where you might be in violation because you needed a handicapped van with the ramp, etc. – lets take that into consideration. For the approval of this one, because of that reason, as long as it is justifiable and the Streets Committee agrees. Mr. Smith stated he doesn't think we are going to be tied down with what he sees.

Mr. Flatter made a motion to advance Ordinance #2023-12 as adjusted to Council for introduction. Mr. Smith seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Discuss and Vote to Recommend that Council Adopt Ordinance #2023-13 – An Act to Amend Article 2.2-2 of the Clayton Municipal Code Related to Handling and Disposition of Garbage, Trash, and Rubbish

Mr. Paisley stated again this is another one of these ordinances where Town Foreman was stricken. Because in the spirit of full transparency, this ordinance as it existed had some very interesting language that garbage, commercial garbage collection fees, were set by the Town Foreman. With approval of the Council, he didn't understand that. Elected officials set the fees. Mr. Carrow stated how that came about was because basically we charged what we are charged. We passed the increase along. Mr. Carrow stated the Town Manager would bring that to light to the Council when we did our budgets. That is how that got worded that way. He didn't actually make the decision. He was the mouthpiece. Council had to make the decision whether they wanted to eat that money or pass it onto the customer. Mr. Smith stated with it ultimately falling into the Town Manager's responsibility the same way the Town Foreman and Mrs. Muncey used to do. They calculate that right into next year's budget. By the time it even comes to the Budget Committee it is in there. We just approve the number. Mr. Smith read the line garbage shall not accumulate more than seven (7) days. We exceed that sometimes with holidays where the trash pickup day is pushed until Friday or the following Monday even. He suggests bumping that to 10 days. It doesn't look like there is any flexibility in that statement. That would be his recommendation especially when you have snow issues where the trash just doesn't get picked up for a couple of days unless you wanted to put a clause. Mr. Flatter stated exemptions of holidays or weather-related incidents. Mr. Smith stated the way he sees it, the ordinance is binding us. We are bound by the contract. Mr. Flatter stated do we need it? Do we need to highlight seven (7) days? Mr. Carrow stated that was a good point. Mr. Flatter stated who really abides by that. What if I am on vacation? Do we really need to put seven (7) days in writing in the ordinance? He can't think of a reason why we would. Mr. Smith stated he doesn't think so. We bear the responsibility to have scheduled service. The town bears that burden

already. Mr. Carrow stated the only thing he could think of would be it would give us the authority to fine them. Mr. Smith stated if they don't take their trash in the back of their house and drag it to the curb, we do have something within the ordinance saying but that is going to fall under other things. If someone has trash in their backyard, it is going to fall under a nuisance ordinance. Mr. Flatter stated if he goes on vacation and he misses trash day, his trash is going to sit for 14 days. Mr. Smith stated this isn't a change. This is something that has just been in there. Mr. Flatter stated honestly he doesn't see a reason why we would have to highlight that. Mr. Paisley stated everyone raised some pretty valid points. Mr. Smith stated the trash company is not bound by our ordinance because we have a contract with them. Their contract has all the loopholes they need to jump through. Mr. Smith stated letter H say for extra items such as appliances and/or rubbish the resident must contact the Town Office. Mr. Cote asked if that was true? Mrs. Muncey stated they call us and we tell them in turn that they have to call the trash company to schedule it. Mr. Smith asked if we wanted to change that. Mr. Paisley stated if we are going to refer them to the trash company. Mr. Carrow stated he would leave it in there just for that fact that we could change trash companies. Mr. Smith stated they are paying us so they should. Mrs. Muncey stated we can't schedule and set up a time for somebody's trash. They do it on their own schedule. Mr. Flatter stated it is almost more of an informational piece. I am sure you receive those calls. Mrs. Muncey stated all the time. We tell people when they do their utility deposit, but most of the time they don't pay attention to us so they call us anyway. Mr. Paisley stated the question still remains on seven (7) days. I think we should at least contemplate that for a second. You made a valid point where it can fall under other things like a nuisance. Do you have to jump through more hoops to declare something a public nuisance than you would if it was just to say here you shall not let your garbage accumulate for more than 30 days. Mr. Cote stated for a nuisance, he would rely on the code enforcement officer to give him a recommendation on that one. Mr. Smith stated strike seven (7) days and see where it gets us. Mr. Paisley said so strike the whole section. Mr. Cote stated he would make a recommendation for consideration. I see the seven (7) day option. I see the point of stretching through the time period. But what about a health and safety perspective, like something along the lines of no garbage shall be allowed to accumulate. Mr. Smith stated you can make it 15. I am fine with that. That gives them two (2) weeks. Mr. Cote stated 15 days to a point where it becomes a health and safety hazard. Mr. Smith stated he didn't want to leave a grey area. Mr. Cote stated the mindset, the reason he was going with the smell is if somebody has a garbage can and they allow it to go beyond whatever number we choose the wrong wind on a hot day. Mr. Smith said true statement, good recommendation. Change the 15 to 7.

Mr. Smith made a motion to advance Ordinance #2023-13 to Council for introduction. Mr. Flatter seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Discuss and Vote to Recommend that Council Adopt Ordinance #2023-14 – An Act to Amend Article 2.3-1 of the Clayton Municipal Code Related to Open Burning.

Mr. Paisley stated times have certainly changed and what he wants to do is to expand on the idea there and make it more clear and also establish a portion of the code that we could use if there needed to be more relevant areas later down the road things that would need to be fire-related ordinances a place where they could go. So instead of open burnings, this will now be known as fire prevention and mitigation. I have named it the fire prevention and mitigation act. Specifically what you will first see is more clarifications so you won't be able to burn things like waste, garbage, chemicals, sleeves, sumps, things that might blow up or something that is hazardous to the town because those are the things that we want

to avoid obviously. But the exemptions for clarity would of course be BBQ grills, campfires, patio fire pits, pits that are not operating for a very extensive period of time, and obviously an indoor fireplace. But as we all know there are state forces at play. So there is a supremacy clause in here that says if the State Fire Marshal or another authority that has jurisdiction issues a burning ban, that ban, and the prohibitions therein will supersede what we have on paper here. Finally, there is a provision for security. Key systems are also known by an acronym Knox boxes for the fire service. We do have an ordinance on the books for new construction of Knox boxes, but it is in just a general place. A place that is no where near this and being that he wanted to organize this for future ordinances could come in that were applicable to fire and Knox boxes are related to fire departments. I wanted to put that here so it would be in the same place, but also this has a mandate for existing commercial buildings and apartments beginning January 1st. Mr. Carrow stated for the exemptions you mentioned several times in here where they cannot operate continually for more than eight (8) hours. Who is going to decide how long they have been operating? Mr. Paisley stated that was a valid point. His thought was if somebody is complaining and saying hey my neighbor's house they are gone but the fire pit has been on. So the town verifies and comes back the next day. It is still running 24 hours later. At that point the town could step in. Mr. Carrow stated if there was some way of saying that we were there seeing it in operation. It has to be something fairly documented. Mr. Smith stated that is the last thing he wants to do is adopt an ordinance that can be thrown into his face at the Christmas Tree lot. Mr. Paisley stated the patio fire pits are designed to be much more safe than just putting some logs in your yard. Mr. Smith stated he has a couple of issues. The 3' diameter. My neighbor just bought a 4' one yesterday. Mr. Carrow stated that is a generic standard now. Mr. Carrow was speaking to Alex and Dover has a 5' diameter. The state supersedes. Mr. Paisley stated what would you have us do? Mr. Smith stated his preference would be to make it 4'. His preference would be to make it something to the effect that it has to be continually supervised. Mr. Paisley stated so you would have patio fire pits operated under adult supervision. Mr. Smith stated continually supervised. Mr. Carrow asked what the intent was on having eight (8) hours on it. Mr. Paisley stated that was the part of the enforcement piece of it in his mind. Mr. Smith stated to make it adult supervision. He has to have faith in our officers and/or code enforcement officer. Mr. Paisley stated does that fit in with the formatting you see where it says 2.3? It is like its is say the following act or activity shall be exempt to the prohibitions of this chapter. Mr. Smith stated he would just push actually supervised patio fire pits. Mr. Flatter stated patio fire pits operated under adult supervision. Mr. Flatter stated why don't we combine C and D. Patio fire pits/outdoor fireplaces operated under adult supervision. So you are pretty much saying if you have a fire outside, you must have adult supervision. Mr. Paisley stated probably more efficient. Mr. Smith asked how they felt about the 3' diameter. Mr. Carrow said change it. Mr. Smith said he thinks it changed to four. Mr. Flatter stated especially since they are readily available at Lowe's. Mr. Paisley stated the state supersedes us all day, every day. Mr. Flatter had a question about D – waste lumber, unsplit logs, or stumps. Mr. Carrow stated they are talking about burning a whole stump. That is a generic standard. Not limbs, we are talking about logs like a tree. Mr. Carrow stated he thinks what they are doing is anytime you burn something big like that without breaking it down and making it smaller its going to burn longer. So if you throw a stump in there or you burn a stump it would burn for a week. That is what they are trying to get at. Mr. Flatter stated he knows people who have bonfires. I mean waste lumber. Are you talking about pallets that are treated chemically versus standard pallets that are treated chemically because one you can burn one you can't because of a health hazard. Mr. Cote stated if someone makes an addition or an upgrade to their home and they have leftover pieces of untreated 2 x 4's they are not allowed to burn it? Mr. Smith stated technically under this ordinance that would be correct. Mr. Smith stated he was okay with it for now. Mr. Carrow had a couple of questions

under exemptions. There is nothing in here and I know we've had an issue before with the fire department. If they want to do training fires like they have an abandoned structure and they want to burn it. He used First State Military Academy as an example. They had a building out there that they wanted to burn. Is the fire company going to be able to come in, do training fires in it, and then burn it down for them. Nothing was around it. There was no hazard. They were not allowed to do it because of the ordinance that is in place. Downtown says you cannot do any type of prescribed burning or anything like that. Mr. Smith stated he has no problem with adding a section in there authorizing the fire department to do any necessary training. Mr. Flatter asked when that happens does the fire department typically let the town know? Mr. Carrow stated absolutely. Mr. Smith stated he would put something to the effect of upon notification to the town the fire department has discretion to do any necessary training. Mr. Paisley stated previously coordinated controlled burns by the Clayton Fire Company. Mr. Flatter stated being an exemption. Mr. Carrow stated his other question was about Knox boxes. Is there anything that says that they are responsible for annually updating the information that is carried in the Knox boxes? Here is the problem. A couple of weeks ago when the tree fell on Clayton Avenue they had to get inside Fingertip Fantasies. The fire company went to the Knox box to get the key and it did not fit. In that case they had to bust the door open to get inside. So there is no sense in saying we are going to make them put a Knox box here to put your key and stuff like that in it and then not make them update it. We should have something that says our code enforcement officer can make sure they update their information. Mr. Smith stated with it being our ordinances we can't mandate the fire department to do anything. Mr. Flatter said so annually the code enforcement officer goes arounds and checks. Mr. Smith stated this adds apartment buildings. Now what is the definition of an apartment build? Mr. Carrow stated maybe a dozen multi-family dwellings. Mr. Smith asked if Mr. Burnett's building had a Knox box. Mr. Carrow stated yes he has one on the front. Mr. Smith asked how many more. Mr. Carrow stated the ones on Coleman Street. There are two there. Mr. Smith asked how many of these houses are divided up into three or four different apartments over there on Main? Mr. Cote stated that was going to be his recommendation for consideration. What is the definition of an apartment? There are multi-family dwellings. There are single detached single family. Are we going to consider a home on Clayton Avenue that has two (2) units on it an apartment? Or are we just sticking to something that is called apartment? Mr. Smith stated the purpose of a Knox box is to gain access to the main entry point. Then there are individual doors beyond. Mr. Carrow stated all that does is gain them access through the main door. It gets you into the building basically. Mr. Smith stated but not the apartment doors. Mr. Cote stated the reason he said that is the word apartment isn't used in the zoning ordinance. Mr. Smith stated if it is a communitive access point to access another door there should be a Knox box. How we regulate that he doesn't know. Mr. Smith talked about the old homes. They don't have Knox boxes. They have their own doors. Mr. Carrow stated the places across the street. He believes they have four (4) apartments there. Mr. Smith stated each apartment has its own access from outside. It is more of when there is a communitive access point. Mr. Carrow stated he would say any structure that exceeds more than four (4) apartments. Mr. Flatter stated he looked up Knox boxes. A Knox box is required for multi-family residential structures. And under that it says all multi-family residential structures that have a restriction. Restricted access through locked doors and have a common corridor for access to the living units shall install a Knox box. Mr. Carrow stated that is a good one. Mr. Cote stated which is what we have right there. Mr. Cote stated he wanted us to say the exact language that we have in the zoning ordinance because a resident could say or someone in town that is not happy about us telling them they have to put a Knox box in by 1 January 2024. They are going to say define apartment. That question is going to come to me and I'm going to say well I don't know what an apartment is because we didn't define it. Like Councilman Flatter stated

multiple family dwelling or building contains three (3) or more dwelling units, including units that are located one over the other. Mr. Smith stated so what that eliminates is the house that has four (4) apartments, but you can gain access to each apartment individually. Then they don't need a Knox box. Access is what he was getting at that common access point. Mr. Carrow stated that gets you away from the ones on Coleman Street. There are four (4) apartments in each building. They all have individual access from the outside. Mr. Paisley stated so we could say for any new commercial multi-family dwelling with a common corridor for access. Mr. Flatter stated to the living units. Mr. Smith asked if that was not address in the new construction code. Mr. Cote stated he has the new construction code. Mr. Smith stated he is pretty sure Knox boxes are address in the new construction code under that same stipulation. Mr. Carrow stated you don't have to put a Knox box in if we were building an apartment building outside of Clayton. There is nothing that says you have to put a Knox box in. There the fire company can request it. Mr. Smith asked if there was something in our own standards that forces it? We have an ordinance that says you have to put a Knox box in any new commercial. What we are doing here is going to make it for any commercial right? Mr. Paisley stated for new and existing. He stated the intent is you know like he said there is one on the books now. It is just in a general place. Mr. Cote stated secured key system shall be required and inspected annually for any new commercial or multi-family dwelling with a common quarter for access to living units. And shall be installed in the satisfaction and the condition of obtaining our business license. Mr. Carrow asked about public assembly. How about a public assembly place? He used the VFW as an example. It would be considered commercial but its also a public assembly. Mr. Cote stated for any new commercial facility, public assembly. Mr. Smith stated we still need to adjust existing. Mr. Paisley stated a security system shall be required and inspected annually for any new commercial build, public assembly facility, or multi-family dwelling with a common corridor for access to the living units and shall be installed to the satisfaction of the Town of Clayton as a condition for obtaining a Certificate of Occupancy and/or business license. Mr. Flatter stated he would get rid of the period after living or put a period after living units and then create a second sentence. Mr. Cote stated either one of those will work. Mr. Carrow stated they have to buy the Knox box from the Town of Clayton. Mr. Flatter asked about the installation. Mr. Carrow stated they are responsible for the installation. Mr. Flatter asked who dictates where they are installed. Is there a fire code? Mr. Carrow stated there is no fire code, but it is usually at the front door of the premises. Mr. Flatter asked shall it be installed to the satisfaction of the Town of Clayton as a condition or would it be to the satisfaction to the fire company? Mr. Carrow stated the Town of Clayton. Mr. Smith stated it will be installed at the access point, the entry point. Mr. Carrow stated like most businesses, it would be the front by the front door. The apartments on S. Rodney Street the Knox box is located on the corner by the fire sprinkler where the sprinkler system hookup is. That gets them into that room where the fire alarm system is. At Clayton Intermediate School there is one at the front door and also one around back at the sprinkler system to get in the back of the building. Mr. Flatter asked when they come to town, how will they know where to put it. Mr. Carrow stated he will leave that up to the code enforcement officer. If he want to refer them to the fire company, we could set a policy with that. They could be referred to the Public Works Director. Mrs. Muncey stated she needs to order the Knox box. I order and pay for it and in turn they pay for it. Mr. Carrow stated the town is the only one that can order them. We carry a standard key on the fire apparatus which is like a master key. It gets into all the Knox boxes in Smyrna and Clayton. It is going to take a little bit of time to do for existing businesses that do not have them. They have to be ordered, installed, and people need to be educated on them. Mr. Paisley asked if January 1 was too soon. Mr. Carrow stated you could start doing them. There is no way it will be done by then. You need to look at something mid year like July 1st. Mr. Flatter stated the

ordinance he was reading actually gives them a six (6) month grace period and it says for multi-family residential and existing location specified by the fire official within six (6) months of the effective date of this ordinance. Mr. Carrow agrees with July 1st. That would give you eight (8) months. Mr. Paisley agreed that would be a good idea. Mr. Smith asked what the follow up to this is. Once it is finally approved, is the town going to contact all the applicable parties? Mr. Carrow stated yes as far as the ones that don't have them yet. You would have to reach out to them. Send some type of letter stating this ordinance was passed. This is what they are, the reason for it, and so forth. Mr. Cote asked how much a Knox box was. Mrs. Muncey stated it is between \$500 - \$600. Mr. Cote stated who is responsible for that. Mrs. Muncey stated the property owner. We have to pay for it and then we have to bill it out. Mr. Cote stated so all these business owners will be affected. Mr. Smith stated it is the cost of doing business. Mr. Paisley stated if it goes into effect in November do we want to give these businesses more time because a lot of businesses don't have, if it was \$100 that is one thing. Mrs. Muncey stated if they are renting, that would go to the landlord. Mr. Flatter stated we are giving them 8-9 months to come up with \$500 to be compliant. I know there is going to be pushback. Mr. Carrow stated it is definitely easier doing this for any new construction. Now you are talking about going back to people. Churches, even a church, \$500 - \$600 could be a little bit of a burden on them. Mr. Carrow stated he doesn't see any churches that have them. Mr. Flatter stated this is a safety issue right? Mr. Smith stated if a business argues hardship in regards to this the town is buying it anyway. We can put a levy on their taxes and put it into their property tax and make them pay it that way. There are ways to get it. We could work something out. Mr. Paisley stated in the synopsis we need to change the date until July of 2024. Mr. Carrow asked if they could pay in a couple of installments. We could figure something out.

Mr. Flatter made a motion to advance Ordinance #2023-14 with changes for introduction to Council. Mr. Smith seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Discuss and Vote to Recommend that Council Adopt Ordinance #2023-15 – An Act to Create Article 2.3-6 of the Clayton Municipal Code Related to Short-Term Rentals

Mr. Paisley stated short-term rentals are popping up wildly over the country. These are things like Air BnB's VRBO's and things of that nature. The National League of Cities looked at this issue and basically did a study and identified what cities and towns are doing across the country. They identified best practices in these scenarios because nobody wants to discourage or limit a resident's ability to have a little side hustle to make some extra cash. But with that said, there are some risks that are involved with short-term rentals so this ordinance attempts to address those and for purposes of clarity and transparency, I tried to put myself into the short-term renters shoes. So in order to dissuade them of any false sentiments, I did three (3) things in the beginning. (1) state the purpose which is as I just said not to limit or discourage the use of short-term rentals but to promote their safe operation. (2) He put a definition of what we mean when we say short-term rental and customer and property owner. (3) Finally very plainly put our goals, which are to safeguard the health and safety of residents and guests encourage tourism in a stable manner and sustain the quality of residential dwellings and their surroundings. The things that this study did that the National League of Cities that one of the best ways to enforce issues is due to creating a permitting system. When we would enact this ordinance what would happen is when they would have to put on the permit is a phone number where they could be reached 24 hours. If there is a problem at this dwelling the Town of Clayton can reach out and get in touch with the individual. This is not something the town should be making a lot of money off of. So here the permit fee is \$20 just to recoup our costs

and man hours of dedicating people to get his permit. The next is a limit on occupancy. There is a concern with short-term rentals that you don't want people to rent a house in your town for the purpose of throwing a party. What this says is that the property owner and the customer will not permit a gathering of more than 10 people present simultaneously at the request or at the invitation of the customer. The property owner and normal occupants are not counted. If someone has a house that they are renting a room and they have a wife, a spouse, and four (4) kids there are six (6) people right there so those individuals would not be counted. It also gives the Town Manager and/or their designee the right to inspect the property if there is reasonable suspicion of code violations. Another recommendation from the National League of Cities was a three (3) strike system. You don't want to end someone's permit for just one (1) bad tenant. It implements a system where if they attain three (3) strikes within one (1) year, the town would have the option to possibly vote to suspend that property's permit and then it lists what constitutes a strike. One would be an issue or situation where Clayton Police, State Police, or other on-duty law enforcement respond. A verified noise complaint. Excessive trash not stored properly. A verified incident that poses a threat to the health, welfare, and safety to the people and property of the town. Verified incident of discharge of peace or verified evidence of a gathering of more than 10 people. Because you are having people come into your home that are not from around here, they don't know this property or things like that. It requires them to have proper working safety equipment, smoke detectors, carbon monoxide, fire extinguisher, and safety information. There is a violation clause in here meaning that if someone is caught advertising a short-term rental that doesn't have a permit we are not going to move immediately toward a violation. We are going to reach out to them. The town will make a written attempt to get in contact with them and inform them of this permit requirement. If they after 30 days of confirmed notification make no attempt to ascertain a short-term rental permit and they continue to advertise or engage in short-term rental transactions, they may be applicable to a fine if the town chooses to do so of not more than \$50. Each month that they continue to do that would constitute a separate offense. I know this seems a little bit far removed from what we have going on, but two (2) years ago the short-term rental industry as a whole was a \$138 billion industry and in the United States there was two million listings alone. It is expected to grow annually by 11% each year. As interesting as it seems, short-term rentals are now constituting 20% of the home rental market. If you take a look on short-term rental sites like Air BnB and VRBO, we have several of these in town so this is going on and the intent of doing this is not to play a gotcha game with people that are trying to advertise short-term rental but it is meant to really protect people that live near these things and also other short-term renters because you know if you have one house that is constantly a problem and gains a reputation that is going to look bad on you and the town for short-term rentals. As a whole, I think this is sensible. I think it is a way to protect the residents. It is a way to protect the guests and it is a way to protect the short-term renters whether at each different location. Mr. Paisley opened it up for discussion. Mr. Smith stated it all makes sense, except now he is trying to read into the definition of short-term rental. Where he is struggling is where it says where such rentals are facilitated through online platforms applications for intermediaries. If I just post it on my Facebook anybody looking for a church home rental contact me – is that applicable? Do I have to use some sort of vendor for this to apply to me? Mr. Paisley stated it would not be limited to Air BnB and VRBO. If you were advertising on Facebook Marketplace and say hey I am renting a room out for \$100 a night, yes we would be applicable to that. Our Facebook is an online platform. Mr. Smith asked if Facebook, in definition, facilitating it? Mr. Paisley stated yes because that is the method of which you are advertising. You are not going to your friends and say hey somebody wants to stay in a room it is \$100. It is facilitated by you going to an online platform and advertising it. Mr. Smith stated and if I do word of mouth. Mr. Paisley stated it would not be. That would be pretty hard to... Mr. Smith

stated he is just asking to try and get clarification here. I think this is a good thing to start with and we'll have to see. It is one of those things that, you know, the wrinkles have to iron themselves out as we move along. I don't see anything that is really jumping out that is going to be of negative effect to the residents of the town. Mr. Flatter stated he doesn't see Clayton being a Dewey Beach. What he was specifically talking about was the 10 people. If someone was having a wedding and my Aunt and her family, my parents, and my cousins are all coming and they have two (2) kids each. That is 12 people right there. I don't want ten 20 year old bachelors coming into town and just raging for 29 days, but I don't know if 10 in his eyes is the right number or if there needs to be a specific number. They may loose business. If you have a five bedroom house and I am telling you only 10 people could come. Mr. Paisley stated if I have a house and I have a spouse with four (4) kids, that is six (6) people. Those are not counted in the ten people if you live there. Mr. Flatter stated if you live in that dwelling. Mr. Paisley stated all the time. You are not counted. Mr. Flatter stated if I own a house that I turn into a VRBO and it is rented out for weddings and events, stuff like that. Now I'm limited to 10 people that I can put in this house in the Town of Clayton when I use it for formal events and stuff like that. That would be my only issue is we are really handcuffing the individual as an owner. If you have a five (5) bedroom house hypothetically, it is beautiful, it is well maintained, never had an issue, you could only have 10 people in that house. Mr. Paisley stated you have five (5) bedrooms. Two people to a room. That is ten. Mr. Flatter stated or we could go with no more occupants than livable space. Does every town or does every house/dwelling have a fire code number? Mr. Carrow stated commercial buildings and he used an example. We track some of these places if we see them. We put them in for all our members that there is a house in Providence Crossing that we have flagged as a large occupancy load. A finished basement with five (5) bedrooms, large area for church service setups. We have seen this when we go there for an automatic alarm. You would be surprised at how many places there are in town. Mr. Smith stated he thinks 10 is an okay number but you have to exclude the people living there. If I want to rent my house out to 10 people I'm good right? They cannot have any more than 10 on top of that. They can't have a gathering. Mr. Flatter stated what if we put an exemption in there. To exceed 10 with town approval. There is an application. I know that is more work, and I understand that. Maybe there is a process to exceed 10. If you have three (3) families coming in and there are 12 people you have to notify the town. You are exceeding the limit occupancy. Mr. Smith stated that is more clerical. Mr. Flatter stated it is, he agrees. Mr. Smith stated he thinks property owner needs to go away altogether because at no time can we limit and I understand it ways in a short-term rental, engaged in a short-term rental, but the property owner we can't restrict how many people we have in this house. Mr. Paisley stated but he is not counted. Mr. Smith stated shouldn't be there. Mr. Carrow stated for this section the property owner and the normal occupants of the unit shall not be counted. Mr. Smith stated what do you consider normal occupants of the unit. Mr. Paisley stated people that live there full time. Mr. Cote stated that is not what this said. Mr. Smith stated he would consider that to be the renters. They are who is authorized to occupy the unit. Mr. Paisley stated you are exactly right. But they can also come back and say well hey this these 30 people, are part of my party that I am having and I am renting this from you. These are the people that I've invited. They are part of the transaction. It's like I think there needs to be a number set. If 10 is too low, it would be hard for me to say 15 in the house. That is a lot of people. Mr. Smith stated I have nine (9) people under my roof tonight. Mr. Cote stated he is going to give an example just for thought purposes, not to add any political opinion or anything like that. So myself, personally, my daughter plays travel volleyball and whenever we go to distant locations specifically Orlando, Florida, the team members will typically rent houses with pools down there in Florida. This past year one of the teams rented a VRBO right outside of the Orlando Convention Center and then chose to invite all of the other teammates to the house because they had a

nice pool, an outdoor barbecue, and it was a place to gather. There were well above 10 people in that location. Are we willing to prevent that same occurrence from happening here in Clayton? Let us use Providence Crossing as an example of that. Five bedrooms, 3-1/2 baths – the house we talked about in that location. Say a family member wants to come into the Town of Clayton and rent a location in Providence Crossing, a very nice house in a very nice neighborhood, to have a family reunion. With a lot of their family members that are in the Smyrna / Middletown area - that was their entire intent. This house had a beautiful layout. They had a pool that had an outdoor barbecue. But we are not going to allow them to have that family reunion at that location based on this ordinance. Is that the intent is my question for this. Mr. Paisley stated you raised a very important question. I think the real intent, if we are questioning intent, is that in your case you would never do anything to desecrate a dwelling. We have to be prepared for you know a 20 some individual invites a huge party and they screw everything up. It is a bad get together. Mr. Cote stated the role for the criminal. Mr. Smith stated his problem is that the owner of the property takes on that liability period. Once they start to make an issue. Let us say all the 21 year olds come. If they want to destroy that house from the inside and I don't hear a peep that is not my problem. Once they become a nuisance outside the home, now they are going to start crossing over legal boundaries where we can control that situation. Where would the penalty side of this fall? It is not like we as a town can come in and throw him out. Mr. Paisley stated no that is not in there. The penalty for this if we caught you with an excessive amount of people would be you get a strike. Mr. Smith stated it is too restrictive. Mr. Paisley stated well if that is too low... Mrs. Muncey stated the owner is taking the responsibility when they are collecting that money. They are making a profit. They are making a profit off of that. They are taking that risk. Mr. Smith stated we are not setting these ordinances to protect the property owner. We are setting it to protect the remainder of the town. Mr. Paisley stated look at the ramifications. So if we don't put this in place. A short-term family throws a party. You have 30 people at your house. You are taking up a lot of people's parking spots. Mr. Smtih said so be it as long as they are parked legally. Mr. Flatter stated maybe the issue isn't with the 10 people. Maybe the issue is with the gathering. As Mr. Cote said, I have a pool in my backyard. I rent my house out hypothetically and three (3) families come and they invite their friends, invite their volleyball friends, and the next thing you know there are 15 people in my backyard. They are having a barbecue. There is no loud music. They are just hanging out. Maybe it is not the gathering. Maybe it is more the allowable space inside that house. Mr. Smith stated it should be limited to the agreed upon contract. Therefore if something goes haywire, we can very well just call the property owner and say hey how many people agreed to be on this contract. Mr. Flatter stated that is just what you have to do when you go rent a house for a week. You have to say there is going to be eight (8) people here – four (4) adults and four (4) children. Mr. Paisley stated he did not know that. Mr. Flatter stated we rent houses down at the beach every year for a week and you have to specify who is staying there. Mr. Paisley stated he did not know that. Mr. Smith stated the agreed upon contracted amount of occupants. Mr. Paisley stated at no time shall a property owner and/or customer engage a short-term rental exceed agreed upon occupants. Verified evidence that a gathering of more than the agreed upon number of occupants in the rental contract.

Mr. Flatter made a motion to advance Ordinance #2023-15 with the changes for introduction to Council. Mr. Smith seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Discuss and Vote to Recommend that Council Adopt Ordinance #2023-16 – An Act to Amend Article 2.1-1 of the Clayton Municipal Code Related to Tobacco Use Within the Town’s Buildings and Automobiles

Mr. Paisley stated this code is related to tobacco use within the town’s buildings and automobiles. The changes reference to Town Foreman to Town Manager with grammar corrections.

Mr. Smith made a motion to advance Ordinance #2023-16 to Council for introduction. Mr. Flatter seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Discuss and Vote to Recommend that Council Adopt Ordinance #2023-17 – An Act to Amend Article 2.4 of the Clayton Municipal Code Related to Annual Registration of Vacant Buildings and Registration Fees

Mr. Paisley stated this changes Town Foreman to Town Manager and grammar corrections.

Mr. Flatter made a motion to advance Ordinance #2023-17 to Council for introduction. Mr. Smith seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Paisley asked for a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Carrow made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Smith seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 8:09 p.m.

Recording Secretary,

Sue Muncey