

D R A F T

**ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
TUESDAY, MAY 13, 2008
TOWN COUNCIL CHAMBERS - DURHAM TOWN HALL
7:00 P.M.**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jay Gooze; Jerry Gottsacker; Ruth Davis; Carden Welsh

MEMBERS ABSENT: Robbi Woodburn

OTHERS PRESENT: Tom Johnson, Code Administrator/Enforcement Officer; Victoria Parmele, Minutes taker

I. Approval of Agenda

Chair Gooze noted that the ZBA currently had three regular members, and said a new alternate member of the Board would be appointed that month. He explained to applicants that three votes were needed in order to approve an application. He said 4 ZBA members were present, and said it was the Board's procedure to ask applicants if they wanted to continue the hearings on their applications until a meeting where there were 5 members present.

He said there had already been a discussion on not hearing the Sidmore application that evening, because there were 4 members. He noted that all ZBA members could be present for a meeting on May 27th, but said the Attorney for the abutter could not be present. He said both of the Sidmore applications should therefore be continued to the June ZBA meeting.

He reviewed the items the Board would be hearing concerning the Sidmore application at that time: The issue of installation of retaining walls, and the excavation issue. He noted that the walkout on the lower level related to this.

Chair Gooze then asked applicants who were scheduled to be heard that evening if they wished to continue their hearings to the June meeting. All three applicants said they were fine with hearing the applications at the present meeting.

Carden Welsh MOVED to approve the Agenda as amended, Jerry Gottsacker SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 4-0.

II. Election of Officers

Jerry Gottsacker MOVED to reappoint Jay Gooze as Chair of the ZBA, and Robbi Woodburn as Vice Chair. Carden Welsh SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 4-0.

Ruth Davis MOVED to appoint Jerry Gottsacker as Secretary of the ZBA. Carden Welsh SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 4-0.

III. Public Hearings:

- A. **PUBLIC HEARING** on a petition submitted by Core States Engineering, Newburyport, Massachusetts, on behalf of Courthouse Ventures, Gilford, New Hampshire for an **APPLICATION FOR VARIANCE** from Article XXIII, Section 175-133(F&G) of the Zoning Ordinance to modify the approved site signage plan to add a panel to the pylon sign and to add an internal window sign. The property involved is shown on Tax Map 5, Lot 4-2, is located at 4 Dover Road, and is in the Courthouse Zoning District.

Chair Gooze opened the public hearing.

Robert Schuller spoke before the Board on behalf of the applicants. He said a variance was being requested in order to allow changes to the signage for the site. He said a modification to the existing signage was needed in order to allow Subway, an existing business at the site, to have sign recognition outside of the building.

He said the plan was to modify the existing pylon sign by adding an additional panel to it, which would be the same size as the Dunkin Donuts panel. He said this would make the signage 14 inches closer to the ground, but he said there would still be sufficient clearance, and said the sign would not create a visual obstruction. He said the amount of total square footage for the sign seemed reasonable in that area, and said he didn't think the additional 6 sq ft of signage would take away from what was originally approved for the site. He said overall, he didn't think the increase would be noticeable.

Mr. Schuller said given the number of people coming through that area, having the ability to advertise on the outside of the building was important. He noted that there were a lot of out of town people passing by, and said this would help them see that Subway was located on the site.

He said a variance was also being requested for an interior illuminated sign so that someone pumping gas could see that Subway was located in the building. He said putting the lighting inside was better than putting it outside, which would take away from the visual appeal of the building.

Chair Gooze said his main concern was whether the additional signage would obstruct views for cars coming in and out of the site. He noted that currently, one could see underneath the sign.

There was discussion by the Board about the fact that the current 8 ft clearance under the sign would be reduced by 14 inches as a result of this additional sign.

Chair Gooze also said he didn't want to get into dueling signs, with the sign across the street. He noted previous deliberations on the sign for the Irving site, which got into this issue. He said perhaps the size of the Irving sign on the pylon could be made a bit smaller, so the bottom clearance didn't have to be reduced. He said he was simply bringing this up for discussion.

There was discussion about the purpose of the sign ordinance, and that sign clutter was an issue. Mr. Welsh said the Town didn't want this area to look like sprawl development, and said he thought it had looked more like this since he had come to live in Durham.

He asked if there was any relationship between Courthouse Ventures and the tenants of the property, and Mr. Schuller said he believed they were separate interests. Mr. Schuller also provided clarification that there could not be any additional tenants on the site, in part because the space requirements would not allow this.

Ms. Davis asked what the original design idea for the sign was, which Mr. Schuller had referred to.

Mr. Schuller said there had been discussion about the idea of splitting the Dunkin Donuts panel in half. But he said this didn't work out.

Ms. Davis noted that Dunkin Donuts appeared to be a big part of the building, and received clarification that Subway was integrated into the convenience store on the site, and was smaller than Dunkin Donuts. Ms. Davis asked whether, if Subway moved out, it would be replaced by another business, and also asked if Subway and Blue Canoe went together.

Mr. Schuller said if Subway wasn't there, there would be some kind of deli type business, which would either be a separate business or a Blue Canoe offering.

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

Carden Welsh MOVED to close the public hearing. Ruth Davis SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 4-0.

Chair Gooze said his concern was the visibility issue. He said there had been a long discussion by the ZBA in the past about the signs for this property. He said he didn't think the proposed additional signage outside would make much difference, and also said he wasn't concerned about the interior sign.

It was determined, after Chair Gooze re-opened the public hearing, that the interior sign would operate only when the business was open. He then closed the hearing.

Chair Gooze noted that allowing this signage meant that the business that went in across the street could put this kind of signage in too.

Mr. Johnson provided details on the signage at Gibbs. He also provided details on the regulation of interior signage. He said if it was facing outward to the street, to passing traffic, it was regulated.

Chair Gooze noted that there was a visual clutter issue with interior signs, just as there

was with exterior signs.

Mr. Welsh asked if a lot of variances had been approved for this site, and Mr. Johnson said the ZBA had approved some variance requests concerning signage, but had also denied some.

Chair Gooze noted that the ZBA had tried to keep signage to a minimum, for that part of Town.

Mr. Gottsacker said he thought the developer had done a good job with this site, and said there were not a lot of signs there. He also said this signage was self-limiting, and said he didn't see there was a problem. He said he felt the application met the variance criteria.

Chair Gooze said he felt the application met the variance criteria.

Mr. Welsh asked Mr. Johnson if there was a safety issue, and Mr. Johnson provided details that there was enough visibility.

Mr. Welsh said there was a possible argument to be made concerning the public interest, and said the codes were set for a reason, to avoid sprawl and keep signage to a minimum. He said that area of town had become more sprawl-ish than it used to be, and he noted the literature on the commercial impacts of this. But he said the sign would only be 6 ft, and he said the place looked pretty good.

Ms. Davis noted the purpose of the signage ordinance. She said aesthetically, the site looked nice, and also said she didn't realize there was a Subway there. She said the variance request was therefore in keeping with the Ordinance, in terms of the convenience issue.

Ruth Davis MOVED to approve the APPLICATION FOR VARIANCE from Article XXIII, Section 175-133(F&G) of the Zoning Ordinance to modify the approved site signage plan to add a panel to the pylon sign and to add an internal window sign, as presented in the plan submitted with the application, for the property located at 4 Dover Road, in the Courthouse Zoning District. Jerry Gottsacker SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 4-0.

- B. **PUBLIC HEARING** on a petition submitted by Alexander & Alexandra Bakman, Durham, New Hampshire, for an **APPLICATION FOR VARIANCES** from Article XII, Section 175-54 and Article XIV, Section 175-74(A)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance to build an addition resulting in a 44 foot sideyard setback and a 120 foot shoreland setback. The property involved is shown on Tax Map 11, Lot 24-4, is located at 118 Piscataqua Road, and is in the Residence C Zoning District.

Chair Gooze opened the public hearing.

Mr. Bakman said he wanted to put an addition on his home that would allow him to provide an indoor pool for his wife. He said there was only one side of the house that lent

itself to this, and he said the addition would only put them a few feet short of the 50 ft setback, and a few feet short of the 125 ft shoreland setback. He said on the side where the addition was proposed, there was nothing other than woods on the abutting property. He said the addition would not inconvenience anyone, and would not block any views. He provided the Board with pictures of where on the house the addition would go.

Chair Gooze noted that if the building was extended in another direction with the addition, the variances for encroaching on the setback wouldn't be needed. He said this would create more a U shaped building.

Mr. Bakman said he and his wife didn't like that approach.

Mr. Welsh received clarification that the abutters, the Hills, had no complaints concerning the variance being requested. He then asked why the addition couldn't be moved 5 ft forward, toward the front of the house.

Mr. Bakman said the house had an L shape, and said he and his wife didn't want a U shaped building. Mrs. Bakman said they had looked at the U shaped option, but realized it would break up the home. She also said they didn't want the addition to look like an add-on, and said the proposed location for this small addition was the natural spot for it to be on this building.

Mr. Welsh noted that the land down to the river looked steep, and Mr. Bakman said the house was located on a somewhat of a peninsula, overlooking the river.

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

Jerry Gottsacker MOVED to close the public hearing. Carden Welsh SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 4-0.

Chair Gooze said the Board could force the applicants to move the addition 6 ft, but he said nothing would really be gained by this, noting the woods next door. He also said he found the 5 ft shoreland setback to be acceptable, and said he believed that the variance request met the variance criteria.

Mr. Welsh said the addition would cause additional runoff, and noted that the addition would be located in a steep area. He said perhaps the Board could request something to prevent the additional runoff because of the roof.

Mr. Gottsacker noted that he had attended a recent DES seminar on the updated Shoreland Protection Act at the recent NH Office of Energy and Planning conference. He said the State was most concerned about disturbance of soil in the shoreland area, and provided details on this.

Chair Gooze pointed out that runoff from the roof of the addition would run to the side, and not toward the shoreland.

Mr. Welsh said Mr. Gottsacker's point was a good one, and he said there would still be 120 ft of setback from the shoreland.

Code Administrator/Enforcement Officer Tom Johnson said in order to meet the building code, there would have to be gutters at the roofline, or stone placed at the drip line in order to restrict soil erosion.

Ms. Davis said perhaps the Board could ask for stone around the base, as an extra level of protection from heavy rains.

There was discussion on this, with Mr. Bakman stating that there was stone there now.

Chair Gooze said this was a small request for an area variance, and said the question was whether it would hurt the shoreland.

There was further discussion with Mr. Gottsacker about what DES had said about impacts on the shoreland.

Mr. Johnson noted that if this was a detached structure being proposed, it would be allowed to impact the setbacks more than the addition that was proposed.

Chair Gooze said he believed the application met all five variance criteria, based on the discussion for this particular piece of property.

Ms. Davis agreed that it looked like the runoff would run more to the side, given the roof direction and slope.

Jerry Gottsacker MOVED to grant the APPLICATION FOR VARIANCES from Article XII, Section 175-54 and Article XIV, Section 175-74(A)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance to build an addition resulting in a 44 foot sideyard setback and a 120 foot shoreland setback., for the property located at 118 Piscataqua Road, in the Residence C Zoning District, with the proposed shed roof. Ruth Davis SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED 4-0.

- C. **PUBLIC HEARING** on a petition submitted by William N. Matson Jr., Durham, New Hampshire, for an **APPLICATION FOR VARIANCES** from Article XII, Section 175-53 and Article IX, Section 175-28(F) of the Zoning Ordinance to change the use of a single family home with two accessory apartments to a duplex with two 3-bedroom units. The property involved is shown on Tax Map 5, Lot 5-4, is located at 14 Schoolhouse Lane, and is in the Residence A Zoning District.

Chair Gooze opened the public hearing.

Mr. Matson described the building in question, explaining that it had 20 rooms, with 8 bedrooms and 6 bathrooms. He said it had a long history of being high-density housing, had been used primarily by students over time. He said no one had ever gotten it zoned for that, and also said no one had ever complained about this.

He said Schoolhouse Lane had only one single family home, so going to a duplex with 2 three-bedroom apartments would be in keeping with that area. He said his vision was for it to be high-end student housing, and to capture the former glory of the property. He also noted that if the variance were granted, there would be fewer people living there than would otherwise be the case.

He said he interpreted the 3 unrelated rule to mean that he could have one occupant in each accessory apartment, leaving 6 bedrooms and 4 bathrooms for himself. He said this was not a situation he could maintain, and said the best thing he could do with this would be to find a family that wanted this kind of living situation. But he said he didn't want a large family tearing the place up. He said if he were able to rent the building as 2 three-bedroom apartments, it would be economically feasible to make improvements to the property that currently didn't make sense.

Mr. Welsh asked for more history on the property, and Mr. Matson provided this information, among other things noting that he bought the property in 2003, that the house had had more tenants in it than was legally allowed, before and after he purchased it, and that there were only two tenants there now, which was legal. He said he currently lived at the property.

Ms. Davis asked what Mr. Matson had seen as the future use of the house when he bought it.

Mr. Matson said he thought he could derive a good income from it, and said he had the same vision then as he did now. But he said some other things had gotten in the way, which had kept him from devoting his full attention to the house.

Chair Gooze questioned whether a family of six people would be more disruptive than six renters.

There was discussion about this with Mr. Matson, and he said renting to a family was not something he wanted to do, but would do if there was no other option.

Alisa _____, an associate of Mr. Matson, said he was feeling that at this point, he would be forced to sell if his only option was to rent to a family, because he wouldn't be able to maintain the property. She said he would be selling at a seriously under-market price, which would invite in a family that might not be able to maintain the property either.

Mr. Matson said he would hate to see this happen, if he sold the property.

Ms. _____ said when Mr. Matson bought the house, he did not know about the 3 unrelated rule, and said this was a reason why there was now a hardship.

Mr. Welsh said it was hard to visualize the floor plan for the house. He asked Mr. Matson if he planned to live at the house, and Mr. Matson said he wasn't sure. He provided details on this.

Ms. Davis asked if there was enough parking on the site for six people, and Mr. Matson said there was a large lawn. He said five cars could be accommodated now with little trouble, and he described how more room could be made on the site for cars.

Chair Gooze asked if any members of the public wished to speak for or against the application.

Sally Hochgraf, Old Landing Road, said there was a section of the applicant's property that abutted her property, and said she looked right at it from her house. She said it was an undeveloped area, and asked if there were any plans to develop it.

Mr. Matson said if the property was ever going to be developed, it probably wouldn't be developed by him. He provided details on this.

Chair Gooze said as long as there wasn't a setback issue, the issue of what might happen on the site in the future wasn't relevant for this application.

Carden Welsh MOVED to close the public hearing. Ruth Davis SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED 4-0.

Chair Gooze said this was a use variance, and he noted that economic considerations didn't come into play. He said in terms of the hardship criterion, this was one of the larger houses in the area, but said size didn't make a property unique for Zoning purposes. He also said the ZBA had been consistent that the fact that there was room for more people in a building had no bearing on the Board's decision.

Mr. Gottsacker said he was in the middle on this application. He said the Table of Uses said residential duplexes weren't allowed in that zone, but elderly duplexes and elderly multi-unit buildings were allowed. He said the Town clearly didn't want duplexes for students.

Chair Gooze said he personally had been involved with an issue exactly like this one, and he spoke in detail about the rationale for the Zoning change concerning it. He said the rental issue in Durham had to do with the fact that there were students, and he spoke about some of the problems because of this. He said the more that students congregated without supervision, the more problems there were. He said the spirit and intent of the Ordinance was the criterion at issue here, and he said to him, there had to be something very special about a property in order to allow a duplex to be put in.

Mr. Gottsacker said a variance traveled with the property, and said while it was great that the owner was there now, a question was what would happen when there was no supervision. He noted his own experience as a landlord, and said he thought this was problematic.

Ms. Davis asked if the rental properties in that area were occupied by the property owners, and Mr. Matson said they were not.

Mr. Johnson provided details on this, and said most of them were not occupied by the

owner. He also said the properties in the area were all rentals, except for one.

Mr. Matson noted the noise issues with some of these properties, and said this tended to make the area unsuitable for family occupancy.

Chair Gooze said a key issue to consider was whether because there were student rentals here, the ZBA should allow more student rentals, which would create more noise, etc. He asked whether they should be giving up on having families there. He said it was still a nice area, and noted that having a family there could be a benefit to this area. He said he was very uncomfortable with this issue.

There was discussion about the issue of using surrounding properties as justification for how to treat this particular property.

Mr. Welsh asked what the rental situations were with these other properties, and Mr. Johnson provided details on this.

Chair Gooze noted that the Zoning Rewrite committee had the chance to re-zone this area, and didn't do so.

Ms. Davis noted wording in the Zoning Ordinance concerning the purpose of the Residence A district, in terms of maintaining the established character of a neighborhood, and she said the character of this neighborhood, interpreted narrowly, was student rentals.

Chair Gooze suggested that the Board go through the variance criteria. He said there was no proof one way or the other in terms of whether there would be a decrease in the value of surrounding properties as a result of granting the variance.

He said with the public interest criterion, the issue was whether there was no harm as a result of granting the variance, and he said it didn't have to be shown that there was a benefit.

Mr. Gottsacker said the fact that duplexes were removed from the Zoning Ordinance as an allowable use related to the public interest criterion. He said based on what Chair Gooze had said, this had been clearly identified, because otherwise the Zoning Ordinance would allow duplexes.

There was discussion on the hardship criterion, and the question of whether the Zoning restriction as applied to this property interfered with the applicant's reasonable use of the property, considering its unique setting in its environment.

Ms. Davis said something that she thought made the setting somewhat unique was the fact that the property was surrounded on many sides by student rentals.

Mr. Welsh said he didn't think this criterion was met. He said he did feel there was a fair and substantial relationship between the general purpose of the Zoning Ordinance and the specific restriction on this property.

Mr. Johnson provided details on the fact that the property was currently essentially a three-plex, and had not been inspected in terms of the fire code and other codes. He said if it were made into a duplex, it would have to be brought up to the 2008 building and fire codes.

There was discussion on this, with Chair Gooze noting among other things that there would be no supervision by a family if there were a duplex. He said that was why duplexes weren't permitted in the Residence A district.

Ms. Davis asked if this area of Town was a trouble spot, and Mr. Johnson said according to the police log, it was not. There was discussion on the number of cars on Schoolhouse Lane.

Mr. Gottsacker said the Ordinance was what it was, and said the property financials needed to be worked out based on the Ordinance, not based on ignorance of the Ordinance.

Chair Gooze noted that hardship had to be considered specific to a particular property, not to the area in general.

There was further discussion.

Chair Gooze said the substantial justice criterion related to the purpose of the Ordinance, and he said in this instance, the purpose was to not allow a large group of unrelated people in the building.

Ms. Davis noted the point made by the applicant in his application concerning what kinds of buyers were likely to be interested in the property.

Chair Gooze said he hated to see these kinds of areas change from residential.

Mr. Johnson noted Section 175-28 F of the Ordinance, regarding a change of a nonconforming use. He said if the Board approved the duplex, it would require a conditional use permit, which mean the Planning Board would look at the use.

Ms. Davis said in other words, there could be upgrades made to the property.

Chair Gooze said the Planning Board could put conditions on an approval to make sure that the property was well maintained, etc.

There was discussion about this.

Chair Gooze said he would like to see the area maintained, and said with a duplex, there would be six unrelated people with no supervision.

Mr. Johnson said he looked at this as a three family house situation right now, with no controls, no limitations, and no improvements.

Chair Gooze said he didn't look at it that way.

Ms. Davis said that given the setting, she didn't see why a family with the resources to make improvements to the property would choose this property.

Mr. Gottsacker said that was a decision the market made. He said the issue was clearer, concerning the spirit and intent of the Ordinance criterion. He said duplexes used to be allowed here but were no longer allowed. He said the rationale was that student duplexes didn't work well. He said given that, he didn't see that this application met the spirit and intent of the Ordinance criterion. He also said the public interest criterion was tied to this. He said there was substantial evidence that there were problems with duplexes in Town that were rented to students.

Mr. Welsh noted problems with duplexes in Burlington, Vermont, and said when there were no owners in a house, a town tended to go down hill because of creeping student rentals. He said at some point, the line needed to be drawn. He asked if the applicant could go to the Planning Board, with a change of use, and there was discussion. He said he did not feel the variance request met the spirit and intent of the Ordinance.

Ms. Davis said given the established character of the neighborhood, with a lot of apartments in it, she wondered if this beautiful family home, which needed maintenance, would work here.

Mr. Welsh said that typically, duplexes didn't look better, they looked worse, because the owner had no long- term interest in the property, and the only concern was cash flow.

Chair Gooze said he was caught between wanting badly to protect the Ordinance, and the fact that so many properties in this area had already changed.

There was discussion about recent applications before the Board that related to this application, which were denied.

Chair Gooze said the application didn't meet the spirit and intent of the Ordinance, public interest, and hardship criteria, given the discussion.

Mr. Gottsacker said he felt the application failed to meet the public interest and the spirit and intent of the Ordinance criteria. He also said it did not meet the hardship criterion because the Zoning restriction didn't interfere with the reasonable use of the property.

Mr. Welsh said he agreed that the application didn't meet these same three criteria.

Jerry Gottsacker MOVED to deny the APPLICATION FOR VARIANCES from Article XII, Section 175-53 and Article IX, Section 175-28(F) of the Zoning Ordinance to change the use of a single family home with two accessory apartments to a duplex with two 3-bedroom units, for the property located at 14 Schoolhouse Lane, in the Residence A Zoning District, because it is contrary to the public interest, wouldn't

result in unnecessary hardship, and would be contrary to the spirit and intent of the Ordinance. Carden Welsh SECONDED the motion.

Ms. Davis said she felt the uniqueness of the property in this setting should be considered, and said if this were a variance request for a property on Old Landing, she wouldn't support granting the variance. She also said she wished there was some opposition to the variance application, but said no one was present to speak against it.

There was discussion on Ms. Davis' comments.

Chair Gooze said he wished the Town would decide what should happen in this area of Durham.

The motion PASSED 3-1, with Ruth Davis voting against it.

Recess from 8:50-9:00 pm

D. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING on a petition submitted by Evelyn Sidmore, Durham, New Hampshire, for an **APPLICATION FOR EQUITABLE WAIVER** from dimensional requirements of the side yard setback and the shoreland setback for the new construction of a home. The property involved is shown on Tax Map 12, Lot 2-12, is located at 8 Cedar Point Road, and is in the Residence C Zoning District.

E. PUBLIC REHEARING on a February 12, 2008 denial of a petition submitted by Evelyn Sidmore, Durham, New Hampshire, for an **APPLICATION FOR VARIANCE** from Article XII, Section 175-54 of the Zoning Ordinance to install cement retaining walls for soil removal and erosion control on south end of the basement and north end, 8 feet east from original house stairs within the sideyard and shoreland setbacks. The property involved is shown on Tax Map 12, Lot 2-12, is located at 8 Cedar Point Road, and is in the Residence C Zoning District.

IV. Approval of Minutes – April 8, 2008

Page 11, bottom paragraph, should read "...an additional foot."

Jerry Gottsacker MOVED to approve the April 8, 2008 Minutes, as amended. Ruth Davis SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 4-0.

V. Other Business

A.

Chair Gooze said he had gone to court concerning the Palmer Case. He also said the Town hadn't heard back yet concerning the Stonemark case.

He said he and other Board members had recently attended the NH Office of Energy and Planning conference, and said there were good presentations, especially the one by

NHDES on the updated Shoreland Protection Act.

Mr. Gottsacker said he would send Board members a link on this presentation. He noted that it had provided a lot of good information about why setbacks were needed from the shoreland.

There was discussion on this. Chair Gooze said it was important that Minutes of ZBA meetings showed that the ZBA thought about these things, and provided a reasonable basis for making its decisions.

Mr. Johnson said the State Senate and House had passed a bill that postponed the updated Shoreland Protection Act from going into effect until July.

He also noted that the Planning Board would be getting proposed Zoning Ordinance changes that had been recommended by the Town Council. He said ZBA members should stay informed on this.

Chair Gooze noted one proposed Zoning change concerning getting rid of the “most restrictive provision” in the Ordinance.

B. Next Regular Meeting of the Board: **June 10, 2008

VI. Adjournment

Jerry Gottsacker MOVED to adjourn the meeting. Carden Welsh SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 4-0.

Adjournment at 9:15 pm

Victoria Parmele, Minutes taker