

**D-R-A-F-T**

**DURHAM PLANNING BOARD  
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 29, 2008  
TOWN COUNCIL CHAMBERS, DURHAM TOWN HALL  
MINUTES  
7:00 P.M.**

**REGULAR MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chair Bill McGowan; Vice Chair Lorne Parnell; Secretary Susan Fuller; Steve Roberts; Richard Ozenich; Richard Kelley; Councilor Julian Smith

**ALTERNATES PRESENT:** Councilor Jerry Needell; Kevin Gardner

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** None

**I. Call to Order**

**II. Approval of Agenda**

*Richard Kelley MOVED to approve the Agenda. Steve Roberts SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 7-0.*

**III. Report of the Planner**

- Mr. Campbell said there was a letter for Board members from the Conservation Commission that dealt with the Park Court application, and also said the minutes from the site walk had been provided. He said there was also an email from Councilor Julian Smith regarding a site walk of the Sawyer property.
- He said there was an email for Board members from Attorney Laura Specter regarding the issue of whether the multi-unit housing proposed by Park Court Properties should be considered a commercial or residential use. He said he would like this email to be made available to the public at the meeting that evening.
- Mr. Campbell noted that the Town Council had recently adopted the Zoning amendment to extend the ORLI district into the RB district off of Mill Road. He noted that there had been discussion on a possible conservation easement that would occur as part of the Zoning change, but said this had not been moved forward.
- He said there would be a conceptual consultation concerning a proposed 4-unit housing development on Rosemary Lane. He also said there was a request for Technical Review from St. George's Episcopal Church.
- Mr. Campbell briefly reviewed the issues currently before the Economic Development Committee.
- He said he would like to move forward with the amendments to the Shoreland Protection Overlay that addressed the recent changes to the State Shoreland Protection Act. He said the Conservation Commission was fine with the most recent draft amendments.
- Mr. Campbell said there would also be some minor amendments to the Aquifer Protection District, which had come out of the recent ORLI Zoning change discussions.

**IV. Public Hearing on an Application for Subdivision** submitted by David T. Sawyer, Durham, New Hampshire on behalf of Albert Sawyer, Durham, New Hampshire to subdivide one lot into two lots. The property involved is shown on Tax Map 9, Lot 18-0, is located at 6 Spinney Lane, and is in the Multi-Unit Dwelling/Office Research Zoning District.

David Sawyer said his father wanted to subdivide his 3-acre plus parcel and will 1.2 acres of it to him. He said the test pits had been done, and there was sufficient area for a septic system. He noted the plan that showed the residence that was proposed. He said there wasn't a lot of room to work with on the site, but said he was happy with the plan that had been developed.

He said the ZBA had approved some variances for the property, with a couple of conditions. He said one was that the house would be limited to a 5-bedroom structure, and he noted that he only planned to have 4 bedrooms. He said he had also been granted a special exception regarding the frontage requirement.

Mr. Sawyer said approval of this application would mean that he would be able to use the back lot, which otherwise would be a tax burden. He also noted that this area hadn't been in the MUDOR district until recently.

***Steve Robert MOVED to open the public hearing an Application for Subdivision submitted by David T. Sawyer, Durham, New Hampshire on behalf of Albert Sawyer, Durham, New Hampshire to subdivide one lot into two lots, for the property located at 6 Spinney Lane, in the Multi-Unit Dwelling/Office Research Zoning District. Councilor Smith SECONDED and PASSED unanimously 7-0.***

Mr. Sawyer read a letter from neighbor Dick Gsottschneider that expressed his support for the subdivision that was proposed. He also said that at the previous Planning Board meeting, he had asked neighbor Ursula Hoene if she approved of the subdivision he was proposing, and she said yes.

Chair McGowan asked if there were any members of the public who wished to speak for or against the application. There was no response.

***Steve Roberts MOVED to close the public hearing. Councilor Smith SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 7-0.***

Chair McGowan said the waivers the applicant had requested had been granted at the previous meeting, and also noted that copies of the ZBA's decision granting several variances had been provided to the Board.

Mr. Kelley said it should be noted in the Findings of Fact that the Board had approved the waivers at the previous meeting. He also asked if the Public Works Department had weighed in on the application.

Mr. Campbell said yes, and said there were no issues identified. He said obtaining a driveway permit should not be an issue.

Mr. Kelley asked Mr. Sawyer if he had reviewed the conditions of approval.

Mr. Sawyer said he had, and was fine with them.

## **FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. The applicant submitted an Application for Subdivision of Land with supporting documents on September 23, 2008.
2. The applicant submitted an Existing Conditions Plan on September 23, 2008.
3. The applicant submitted a Subdivision Plan on September 23, 2008, entitled “Conceptual Subdivision Plan, Land of Albert K. Sawyer, Tax map 9, Lot 18-0, Spinney Lane, Durham” prepared by Eckman Engineering, LLC, Portsmouth, NH, dated September 8, 2008.
4. The applicant submitted a letter of intent on September 23, 2008.
5. The applicant submitted a copy of the deed for the property on September 23, 2008.
6. The applicant submitted a Boundary Plan on September 29, 2008.
7. James B. Campbell, Director of Planning and Community Development, granted exemption of this application from Conservation Subdivision Regulations on October 1, 2008.
8. The applicant submitted a request for waivers on October 6, 2008.
9. The applicant submitted an updated Subdivision Plan on October 8, 2008.
10. The application was accepted at the October 15, 2008, meeting of the Planning Board.
11. The Planning Board approved the waivers requested at the October 15, 2008 meeting.
12. Eckman Engineering LLC submitted a letter on October 15, 2008 regarding the NHDES Subdivision Approval application package.
13. The applicant submitted on October 17, 2008, a copy of the October 14, 2008, Zoning Board decision to approve a variance application and a special exception application for this property.
14. A site walk was held on October 24, 2008.
15. A public hearing was held on October 29, 2008, and no members of the public were in attendance to speak in favor or against the application.
16. Richard Gsottschneider submitted a letter of support on October 29, 2008.

## **WAIVERS**

The Planning Board has considered this request and hereby grants waivers from the Subdivision Regulations Sections 5.02 Pre-application Review Phase, 7.01 Phase I Conceptual, 7.02 Phase II Design Review, 7.05 Construction Plan, and 9.06 Storm Water Drainage.

## **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL**

The following conditions shall be met prior to the Signature of Approval on the Subdivision Plan. These conditions shall be met within six months of the signing of these Findings of Fact and Conditions of Approval by the Chair of the Planning Board. If these conditions are not met within six months, the applicant must come before the Planning Board for review of the conditions:

1. The applicant shall supply two Mylar plats and one paper copy for signature by the Planning Board Chair. The plat shall be prepared by a licensed surveyor and shall meet

all requirements of Section 7.03D of the Durham Subdivision Regulations. The final plat shall meet the conditions set forth in the variance and special exception approval from the Zoning Board of Adjustment dated October 14, 2008.

2. A certificate of monumentation shall be provided to the Planning and Community Development Department.
3. The applicant shall submit the required NHDES subdivision application package to the State for approval.

Conditions to be Met Subsequent to the Signature of Approval on the Subdivision Plan:

1. The referenced Subdivision Plan and these Findings of Fact and Conditions of Approval shall be recorded with the Strafford County Registry of Deeds, at the applicant's expense, within seven (7) days of the Chair's signature on the Plan.
2. The applicant/owner shall obtain a driveway permit from the Department of Public Works.
3. The applicant/owner shall ensure that there is prominent marking advising public safety personnel of the location of the house.
4. The applicant is required to adhere to the approval and conditions of the Zoning Board of Adjustment approval of October 14, 2008.

***Richard. Kelley MOVED to approve the Findings of Fact and Conditions of Approval for the Application for Subdivision submitted by David T. Sawyer, Durham, New Hampshire on behalf of Albert Sawyer, Durham, New Hampshire to subdivide one lot into two lots, for the property located at 6 Spinney Lane, in the Multi-Unit Dwelling/Office Research Zoning District. Susan Fuller SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 7-0.***

- V. Public Hearing on a Site Plan Review Application** submitted by Park Court Properties Inc., Durham, New Hampshire for the construction of a mixed-use, multi-unit building which would create 32 units with 124 beds. The property involved is shown on Tax Map 13, Lot 5-0, is located at 262 Mast Road and is in the Multi-Unit Dwelling/Office Research Zoning District.
- VI. Public Hearing on a Conditional Use Permit Application** submitted by Park Court Properties Inc., Durham, New Hampshire for the construction of a mixed-use, multi-unit building which would create 32 units with 124 beds. The property involved is shown on Tax Map 13, Lot 5-0, is located at 262 Mast Road and is in the Multi-Unit Dwelling/Office Research Zoning District.

Mr. Campbell recommended that the Planning Board make the email from Attorney Laura Spector public, and read it into the public record.

***Susan Fuller MOVED to make public the Oct 2, 2008 email message from Attorney Laura Spector regarding the opinion as to whether this a commercial or residential use. Richard Ozenich SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 7-0.***

Ms. Fuller read the email out loud.

Bill Doucette, representing the applicant, Perry Bryant, briefly reviewed the process the design team had been going through for the past year, to get to this point of having complete applications before the Board. He noted that there had been meetings with the Conservation Commission during this time, and said its findings were reflected in the materials the Board had been provided with.

He said the team was not disappointed in any way with the process so far. He said they were trying to provide a sustainable facility, one which was sensitive to the site and the area's natural resources, and would contribute to the quality of life for the Durham community. He said it was also hoped it would be a living lab of sustainability for the University to utilize.

Mr. Doucette said there were two conditional use permits being requested, one to allow a multi-unit residence facility in the MUDOR district, and the other to allow construction within the Wetland Conservation Overlay District. Mr. Doucette then read out loud how each of the criteria for approval of the Condition Use Permit application for the multi-unit facility were met.

Councilor Needell said the Board's attorney's advice could be interpreted as saying that what was proposed was a residential use, which was not permitted in the Wetland Conservation Overlay District. He asked if the Board needed to make clear what its opinion was regarding this issue, and whether perhaps a variance was needed.

Mr. Campbell said the Board could either accept or not accept the Attorney's opinion, as well as the Code Administrator's opinion. He noted that they shared the same view. He said if the Board accepted the views, the applicant would need to get either a variance or a Zoning change.

Councilor Needell said he was inclined to ignore the advice of the Attorney, and said he didn't think the application could go forward without a variance or a Zoning change.

Mr. Kelley said he agreed with Councilor Needell, and said a variance was required.

Chair McGowan asked how this impacted the process that evening.

Mr. Campbell said if the public was there that evening to speak at the public hearing, it would be good to hear from them. He said the Board should also make it clear that evening whether a variance was required.

There was discussion as to whether the Board should open the public hearing before addressing what the applicant needed to do regarding this issue.

Mr. Roberts said he thought there was some confusion in the Ordinance regarding this issue, and said he would like to see a change to it. But he said he didn't know if the applicant would like to wait for this change to be made.

Mr. Doucette said the applicant wanted to do what was most expedient. He also said he didn't see the downside to getting conditional use approval, conditional upon ZBA approval. There was further discussion on this, and Mr. Doucette said the applicant would rather not stop the process right now.

Councilor Smith asked if the Board could provide a supportive letter to the ZBA concerning this issue, and was told that this could be done.

Mr. Campbell said a letter from the Planning Board could help the ZBA in its decision-making

Chair McGowan asked whether if a variance was granted, this might impose additional conditions on the applicant. There was discussion that such a thing could in fact happen.

After checking further with Board members, Chair McGowan said there was consensus that the Board agreed with Attorney Specter's opinion.

Mr. Kelley said he could support opening the public hearing, and continuing it for a short time. He said this would move the process forward, and the applicant could do what he needed to do.

***Richard Kelley MOVED to open the public hearing on a Site Plan Review Application and a Conditional Use Application submitted by Park Court Properties Inc., Durham, New Hampshire for the construction of a mixed-use, multi-unit building which would create 32 units with 124 beds, for the property located at 262 Mast Road in the Multi-Unit Dwelling/Office Research Zoning District. Susan Fuller SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 7-0.***

**Robin Mower, Faculty Road**, said she was speaking first as a private citizen, and asked if the development would not be requiring Town trash removal.

Mr. Doucette said it was correct that the development would not require Town trash removal.

Ms. Mower next spoke as a member of the Conservation Commission. She read out loud the letter from the Conservation Commission, dated October 23, 2008.

“At the October 9, 2008 meeting of the Durham Conservation Commission (DCC), representatives of Park Court Properties, Inc. (the applicant) presented plans for a mixed-use, multi-unit development located at 262 Mast Road. A Conditional Use Permit Application has been submitted due to, among other things, impact to the wetland buffer on the property. Pursuant to SECTION 175-61. B. in Durham's Wetland Conservation Overlay District ordinance, the Planning Board must seek the advice of the Durham Conservation Commission under these circumstances.

After the presentation and discussion, the DCC decided to make the following comments:

- 1) **Overall concept**—The DCC is impressed with the thought and effort being put forth to create a cutting-edge green-building project. The plans to incorporate green roof systems and pervious drives and walkways will greatly enhance the project's ability to control the hydrologic impact on the site.
- 2) **Wetlands impact**—The plan, as presented to the Commission, does a good job at avoiding direct wetland impacts and minimizing the impact on the wetland buffer. While our preference would be for a smaller building footprint, we recognize that the applicant is proposing a plan that will restore a wetland area that currently is not functioning as such. This effort should improve the hydrologic functions and add to

diversity of habitat on the property. It is important to note that these benefits *are tied to plans for considerably fewer parking spaces and an entry drive that is narrower than the regulation requires*. The DCC fully supports this approach. With the close proximity to the University and West Edge parking, as well as mass transit availability, it makes sense to minimize the area needed to support vehicular entrance and parking on this property. *Any change to this plan would likely have much more impact on the wetland buffer and wetland restoration efforts.*

- 3) **Wetlands mitigation and restoration**—The DCC met with the applicant on May 5, 2008 for a preliminary consultation regarding the wetland restoration efforts. We were pleased to see that this latest plan responds to most of our comments and recommendations. Largely, we have recommended minimal disturbance and an effort to “let nature take its course.” The applicant is debating between active management by mowing this wet-meadow once a year and letting it grow for a few years to see what will happen. We encouraged the applicant to take the later approach. The DCC stressed that an aggressive monitoring program, in any case, would be important to ensure that invasive species would not become predominant.
- 4) **Construction impact on wetlands**—The DCC expressed concerns about the wetland impacts during construction. In some areas improvements in the buffer zone are very close to the wetland area. The applicant agreed that it will be a challenge and stated that they have been planning to use the most current Best Management Practices, including a choice of Silt Soxx instead of the traditional silt fence to control erosion and runoff from construction activities.

In summary, the DCC would like (1) to express our support for the overall approach to this project, (2) make recommendations that the applicant allow the wetlands to return to their natural vegetation and that Best Management Practices (plus Silt Soxx) be employed during all phases of construction, and (3) to express our hope that the Planning Board will see the importance of allowing for less-than-required parking and road width. Flexibility in this latter area of regulation will be paramount to minimizing the impacts to the wetland resources on the property, thereby contributing to the project’s status as a model of cutting-edge green-building.”

Chair McGowan asked if there were any other members of the public who wished to speak for or against the application that evening. There was no response.

***Councilor Smith MOVED to continue the public hearing until November 12<sup>th</sup>, 2008. Susan Fuller SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 7-0.***

Mr. Doucette briefly reviewed the Conditional Use permit that was required because the facility would be located within the Wetland Protection Overlay District. He reviewed the detailed letter from NHSC Inc. concerning why the project met the criteria for issuance of such a permit, under Section 175-61 of the Zoning Ordinance. He said the onsite wetland was presently of low quality, and said there was the opportunity to enhance its quality as part of this development. He said ceasing mowing activities, allowing the wetland to grow in naturally, and providing buffer plantings around its perimeter would create an excellent wetland/upland habitat.

He noted that the Conservation Commission agreed that the wetland should be in its natural state, which among other things would provide a defense against invasive species. He said that was what the applicant intended to do. He also noted that the letter from the Commission mentioned the parking issue, and he said that under the conditional use permit, the Board had some discretion on the number of parking spaces that were required. He said the applicant proposed 34 spaces outside plus an additional 16 parking spaces under the building, which were intended for the shared cars. He said the Zoning Ordinance required 96 spaces.

Mr. Kelley spoke briefly concerning the warranty deed and wording in it concerning the sewer right of way.

Councilor Needell asked if there was a particular aspect of the plan that would be addressed at the next meeting, and Mr. Doucette said he wanted to hear what the Board would like to see addressed.

There was discussion on letters provided to the Board concerning the applications from Town department heads.

Mr. Kelley noted that the plan called for installing a 12 inch sewer line, and that the development only needed a 6 inch width. He said the Town would need assurances that the line going over the land was adequate for the flow from the facility as well as the Channel 11 facility.

Mr. Doucette said that was why Mr. Lynch was doing a video inspection of the sewer lines in that area. Mr. Kelley said he would be looking for some answers concerning this. He said he thought Mr. Cedarholm should speak with the Planning Board about his review of the project relative to sewer capacity.

Mr. Doucette said he would get some answers for Mr. Kelley.

There was brief discussion on the roadway width proposed, 18 ft of pavement and gravel shoulders, and the Fire Department's opinion concerning this.

Councilor Needell noted that in the MUDOR zone, a recreational space needed to be provided for a multi-use residential facility.

Mr. Doucette said a passive recreational area had been included in their most recent plans.

Mr. Parnell asked if there would be on site property management for the facility, and if information concerning this could be provided to the Board.

Mr. Doucette said there would be facilities and residence management for the site, and said the goal was to write a set of rules that had teeth and was part of the approval. He said they understood that they needed to make the Police Chief comfortable about management of the property if Mr. Bryant didn't own the development in the future. He said they would try to have a draft ready by November 12<sup>th</sup>.

Councilor Needell said he didn't believe the Board had seen a request for a waiver from the impact fee requirement. There was discussion.

Mr. Doucette asked the Board if it wanted to decide on the Conditional Use permit regarding the Wetland Protection Overlay District that evening.



Chair McGowan said the Board at a future meeting would need to go through the checklist of the various criteria that needed to be met.

Mr. Doucette said the applicant would apply to the ZBA for a variance as soon as possible. It was noted that the ZBA would be meeting on November 18<sup>th</sup>, which was after the next Planning Board meeting.

## **VII. Discussion of Zoning Ordinance Issues Regarding Article XXII, Landscaping, and Article XXIV, Septic Systems.**

### **Article XXIV, Septic Systems**

Septic system as structure. There was discussion that consultant Steve Whitman, who had provided the Planning Board with recommendations regarding Article XXIV, had recommended that septic systems not be called a structure. After detailed discussion, the Board agreed not to make this change to the Ordinance because septic systems should be subject to setback requirements, etc.

Square footage for the Leachfield. There was discussion about the current requirement that there should not be less than 5,000 sf for the leachfield, and whether this was justified. Mr. Roberts said the idea with this amount of square footage was to be able to provide enough area for 2-3 leachfield locations over time if needed. But he said he couldn't really find anything to support requiring 5,000 sf.

Ms. Fuller said a leachfield of this size used up a lot of space on a lot, and she recommended that the Ordinance say there should not be less than 4,000 sf for a leachfield.

Mr. Kelley said he could support this. It was noted that this was what the State did, and the consensus of the Board was to make this change.

### **Minimum width of rectangular area for the leachfield shall be 40 ft.**

Councilor Smith asked why something like this would have been established, and there was discussion.

Chair McGowan asked whether if this was taken out, it impacted anything, as long as the leachfield was approved by Mr. Johnson. There was discussion.

There was discussion by the Board. Mr. Campbell said Mr. Whitman was inferring from his recommendation that there was presently no standard leachfield dimensions required by the State.

Mr. Gardner suggested that if the rectangle was too narrow, it might not be possible to have an evenly distributed flow over the leachfield.

Mr. Roberts said with a narrow system, if a line plugged up one was out of luck.

Mr. Campbell said the consultant was suggesting that by requiring a minimum of 40 ft, such narrow systems would not be allowed.

After further discussions, the consensus of the Board was to recommend that this requirement out.

Mr. Roberts said he was opposed to making this change, stating that a consultant at the time from UNH had provided the Board with guidance on why having this minimum width was a good idea.

Minimum number of test pits. Board members spoke about the fact that currently, a minimum of 4 satisfactory test pits were required within the suitable area. After discussion, the consensus of the Board was to change this to a minimum of 2 satisfactory test pits.

No portion of the required suitable area shall be located within 125 ft of very poorly drained or poorly drained soils. There was discussion that it had been recommended that this be changed to “..within 75 ft for poorly drained soils.”

Mr. Campbell noted that making this change would create a conflict because the buffer strip requirement in the Rural and RC districts was 100 ft.

Mr. Kelley said this would just mean allowing something in the buffer. After discussion, he said he would be ok with changing this to 100 ft for poorly drained soils, and that this would eliminate the conflict.

Mr. Gardner asked what the motivation had been for making this change, and also asked what understanding the Board needed to have in order to say that 75 ft, 100 ft or 125 ft was ok. He said he didn't really know the answer to this.

After detailed discussion on this, the consensus of the Board was to leave the requirement at 125 ft for both soil categories.

Minimum depth to ledge shall be 5 ft. Mr. Campbell said the consultant's comment concerning this was a question as to whether this was even possible in Durham. He noted that most other towns in NH required 4 ft.

Ms. Fuller recommended changing this to 4 ft, stating that 5 ft meant a lot of fill had to be brought in.

Mr. Campbell noted that there had been a 20 acre lot in the Rural District that had become a house lot because they couldn't find 5 ft to ledge, or 4 test pits.

After detailed discussion, the consensus of the Board was to go with what the State required (4 ft.). Mr. Gardner summarized that it didn't make sense for the Town would do something other than the State for something like this.

Innovative systems approved by NHDES that provide a higher level of treatment may be installed on sites that cannot meet all of the above standards if the Planning Board grants a Special Use Permit. Mr. Roberts said he strenuously objected to this change, asking what happened if someone constructed the system improperly, and it failed. He noted that Massachusetts required yearly inspections of septic systems, and said if they were going to make this change, inspections should also be required, as well as design standards.

Chair McGowan asked if a requirement that there be a yearly inspection could be included as part of the special use permit. .

Mr. Roberts asked how it could be guaranteed that one of these innovative systems would be built right, and that it would be checked every year.

Mr. Campbell noted that Durham didn't have special use permits, and suggested that if the Ordinance included a provision on innovative septic systems, this should be handled through a special exception, which the ZBA would address.

Mr. Kelley asked if the ZBA could require a yearly inspection as a condition of the approval of the special exception.

Mr. Campbell summarized that the wording of the provision in the draft Ordinance had been changed to say that the ZBA would handle this through a special exception, and that a report would need to be provided every two years by a certified septic system inspector.

Mr. Kelley noted that this would tie in well with septic system maintenance.

Mr. Gardner said he agreed with Mr. Roberts' comments, but said he thought there should be the same kind of requirement for regular septic systems, or else, this would unfairly penalize people who had newer, better systems.

There was discussion on this by the Board.

Councilor Needell asked if in order to grant approval of an innovative septic system, NHDES required that there be inspection.

***Richard Kelley MOVED to the proposed changes to the Article XXIV, Septic Systems, to public hearing on November 10, 2008. Richard Ozenich SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 7-0.***

### **Article XXII, Landscaping**

After brief discussion on the proposed changes to Article XXII, Chair McGowan summarized that Mr. Campbell would sit down the landscape architect Robbi Woodburn to make some improvements to the recommendations.

## **VIII. Other Business**

- A. Old Business:
- B. New Business: **Request for Extension on Conditions of Approval for Site Plan Approval at 1 Madbury Road, Map 4, Lot 1-0.**

***Richard Kelley MOVED to extend for 6 months the Conditions of Approval for the Site Plan Approval at 1 Madbury Road, Map 4, Lot 1-0, at the applicant's request. Steve Roberts SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 7-0.***

C. Next meeting of the Board: **November 12, 2008 (Only meeting in November)**

**IX. Approval of Minutes – September 24, 2008**

*Susan Fuller MOVED to approve the September 24, 2008 Minutes. Steve Roberts SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED 6-0-1, with Richard Ozenich abstaining because of his absence from that meeting.*

**X. Adjournment**

*Richard Ozenich MOVED to adjourn the meeting. Richard Kelley SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 7-0.*

Adjournment at 9:06 pm.

Victoria Parmele, Minutes taker