

These minutes were approved at the October 13, 2009 meeting.

**Durham Zoning Board of Adjustment
Tuesday August 11, 2009
Durham Town Hall - Council Chambers
MINUTES**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jerry Gottsacker; Ruth Davis; Carden Welsh; Edmund Harvey;
Sean Starkey

MEMBERS ABSENT: Chair Jay Gooze; Robbi Woodburn

OTHERS PRESENT Victoria Parmele, Minutes taker

I. Approval of Agenda

Mr. Gottsacker said he would be serving as Chair because of the absence of Chair Gooze. He said Ms. Davis would serve as ZBA secretary for the meeting, and also said Mr. Harvey and Mr. Starkey would be voting members.

He noted that the ZBA had received a Request for Rehearing on the decision made at the last meeting regarding the 50 Newmarket Road property.

Mr. Welsh said he had received this request for rehearing the previous evening. He said he would have no issue with waiting until the September 8th meeting in order to consider the request.

Chair Gottsacker said with a request for rehearing, the ZBA had to decide on it within 30 days of the decision on an application. He said if the Board decided to rehear the application that evening, there would be another public hearing, at a future meeting.

There was discussion that it was the Board's obligation to address this request within the 30 day time period. It was agreed that the Board would put the Request for Rehearing on the Agenda.

Sean Starkey MOVED to approve the Agenda as amended. Carden Welsh SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 5-0.

After discussion, it was determined that this Item would be heard under Other Business.

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- A. PUBLIC HEARING** on a petition submitted by Stan Pasay, Pasay Properties LLC, Newfields, New Hampshire for an **APPLICATION FOR VARIANCES** from Article IX, Section 175-28(D), Article XII, Section 175-53 and Section 175-54 of the Zoning Ordinance to build two additional 3-unit apartment buildings on a non-conforming lot where there is currently a 5-unit building. The property involved is shown on Tax Map

18, Lot 3-2, is located at 257 Newmarket Road, and is in the Rural Zoning District.

Mr. Pasay spoke before the Board. He explained that his objective was to build 2 three-unit, two bedroom apartments on his existing property. He said he had operated a student housing facility there for 5 years, and said it had been a very controlled and quiet environment. He explained that the lease was structured so that it only attracted juniors, seniors and graduate students, and said partying was not allowed.

He said his objective with the student housing he managed was to provide a nice, quiet environment for the residents as well as surrounding properties, and he noted that the police had never had to come to the property in over 5 ½ years. He also said the expansion he was planning would help meet the student housing needs of the University.

He said he intended to build units that were fairly substantial in size, with about 1400 sf per building, and two full bathrooms per unit. He said there would be a solar installation to supplement the heating system. He also noted that he had improved the property over the years with landscaping, and would carry this approach into the new project.

Mr. Pasay said that in terms of impacts to surround neighbors, the abutting properties on two sides of the property were in conservation land with the NH Fish and Game Department. He also said his property was not visible from another adjacent property where there was a single family home.

He said the access he was proposing would be the same as what was presently there, a horseshoe driveway around the existing 5-unit building. He also said that with the two buildings that were proposed, there would be 24-25 parking spaces. HE said there would be handicap parking.

Mr. Pasay said the septic system was very comprehensive, and would not interfere with the quality of life of other properties nearby. He also said noise issues would be minimal, noting that the neighbors lived far away and that he would be seeking students who were quiet.

There was discussion on the setbacks. Mr. Pasay said they were substantial, and said one couldn't see the neighbors home in summer or winter.

Chair Gottsacker said he had driven to the property that day, and agreed that one couldn't see it. He noted that what used to be a farm house was out front and obstructed the view further back on the property. He said it might be possible to see the buildings in the winter from some angles.

Mr. Pasay said in 5 ½ years, there had been no disturbance of the peace on the property. He explained that his lease was very explicit about this.

Ms. Davis asked if the parking lot would be potentially visible, because of lighting, etc. Mr. Pasay said the parking lot lighting was a nice lamp post of low voltage, and would

provide soft lighting to give some visibility in the dead of night.

Chair Gottsacker noted that there was a fair amount of parking behind the existing building, which the applicant planned to expand. There was discussion.

Mr. Pasay said he proposed to have a property management office on the site, so the presence there would be substantially more than in the past. He said there was plenty of space in the walkout basement to put the office.

Mr. Welsh asked how many people would be able to live on the property, if all the units were rented.

Mr. Pasay said the existing building had one student per bedroom, which was a selling feature, and said there were 11 people there now. He said with the new buildings, there would be two-bedroom units, and two students per bedroom because of the septic requirements. He said that would add 24 new students.

He said each student would have the option of having a parking space. He said there would not be any handicap accessible apartments, but said visitors would have handicap parking, and he also said there would be oversize doors. He said if any lighting on the property was found to be offensive, it would be addressed.

Ms. Davis asked if there was currently any outdoor lighting, and Mr. Pasay said there was some lighting directly on the building, as well as some lamp posts.

Mr. Starkey asked Mr. Pasay why he had decided to do two units, instead of adding to the existing building.

Mr. Pasay noted the HUD requirements and elevators requirements for a larger building. In response to a question from Mr. Starkey about the garage, Mr. Pasay said it was used purely for storage and to do repairs. He said there were tools, a pickup truck, and landscape equipment stored there, and said there was no plumbing there and no office. He said one side of the garage was heated.

Chair Gottsacker asked Mr. Pasay to speak about how the variance criteria were met with the application.

Mr. Pasay said there would be no decrease in the value of surrounding properties because the new buildings would be almost invisible from the road and surrounding properties. He said the same driveway would be used for the new units, so from the road, there would be no visible change whatsoever. He said he intended to put up quality buildings, and noted that the square footage would exceed the requirements. He said he was looking to create some solid revenue, which would meet his needs as well as the needs of Durham in terms of improving its tax base. He also said students living at his apartments would be close to Town, and would spend money in Durham instead of spending it some place else.

Mr. Welsh asked if the neighbors had complained in the 5 ½ years Mr. Pasay had owned the property.

Mr. Pasay said there had been no complaints.

Regarding the public interest criterion, Mr. Pasay said that in light of increasing UNH enrollment, and development in surrounding towns, the housing he was providing with these two new units would benefit Durham by improving the tax base. He provided details on this.

He said that regarding the hardship criterion, he was approaching retirement, and noted that the economy was such that a lot of people had been affected. He said developing the additional units was the right thing for him to do economically speaking, and was also the right thing for Durham.

Mr. Welsh asked Mr. Pasay what he considered the unique setting of the property.

Mr. Pasay said the property had a variance on it for the existing structure, and said he was asking for an extension of the existing variance. He also said in light of the fact that Durham was looking to increase the tax base, he was asking to expand on the existing variance.

Mr. Welsh said this didn't indicate what was unique about the property.

Mr. Pasay said he was trying to do a project that would be as green as possible, and he provided details on this. He said he would be providing quality apartments in Town, and said he thought that was something that was unique.

Ms. Davis asked if there was anything about the property itself and surrounding area that made it unique.

Mr. Pasay said there was nothing there that would interfere with anyone's quality of life.

Chair Gottsacker said he had noticed that behind the existing house, there was what had probably been a field. He said he assumed that the buildings could be put in a number of places on the property, but that putting them other than where the applicant proposed to put them would mean that some trees would have to be taken down, and the landscape would have to be disturbed more.

Mr. Pasay said not one tree would be removed in doing this project. He also said what he saw as unique was that he would be giving the kids a great place to live, and he provided details on this.

Ms. Davis noted that one of the hardship criteria for a use variance was that "no fair and substantial relationship existed between the general purposes of the zoning ordinance and the specific restriction on the property". She noted that Durham's Zoning Ordinance prohibited multi-unit residences in the Rural District, and that the property had previously

been granted a variance to allow a conversion of the structure there to a multi-unit residence.

She said the restriction in this instance was that multi-unit residences were not allowed. She said a question was why the Ordinance prohibited them in the Rural District, and said another question was what it was about what the applicant was proposing that should make the ZBA allow it on his property.

Mr. Pasay said the project would not alter the landscape, other than the two buildings that would be built. He also said there would be no interference with abutters' enjoyment of their properties, and said the housing would accommodate the needs of the University. He said he couldn't see how this project would interfere with anybody, or with the land.

Chair Gottsacker said he thought Mr. Pasay had addressed the hardship criterion regarding injury of the public or private rights of others already.

Concerning the substantial justice criterion, Mr. Pasay said he believed he had a project that met his needs and the needs of the Town, while not interfering with the surrounding area.

Regarding the spirit and intent of the Ordinance criterion, Mr. Pasay said the property already had received a variance to allow multi-family development, and said he was asking for an extension of this, in a way that was not offensive.

Ms. Davis asked why the Town prohibited multi-family housing in the Rural District. There was discussion.

Mr. Pasay said he was in favor of conserving fields, and didn't like overdevelopment. He said he had a project which when in place, one would hardly notice.

Ms. Davis asked Mr. Pasay if he felt the residences would not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the Ordinance.

Mr. Pasay said discouraging multi-family housing in the Rural District made sense. But he said he had an innocuous project on a property that already had a variance before he had bought the property. He said he wouldn't harm anyone with what he was proposing.

Mr. Welsh said the ZBA had had difficulty in the past with student oriented housing applications where no one was living on site. He said he realized that there hadn't been any problems at Mr. Pasay's property, with 11 residents, but said now there would be 24 additional residents.

Mr. Pasay said he had a lengthy lease that had been used for several years, and said among other things, it spelled out how many people could be in the apartment.

Chair Gottsacker said the ZBA sometimes put conditions on a variance approval to address concerns the Board had. He asked Mr. Pasay if it would be acceptable to him if

the ZBA or the Planning Board said a condition of approval was that there would be live-in property management on the property.

Mr. Pasay asked what constituted management of the property, and Chair Gottsacker said it was having a responsible person living on the property. He provided details on this.

Mr. Pasay asked if it would be acceptable if he reduced the rent for a student living there who would keep an eye on things.

Chair Gottsacker said that was in principle what he was talking about. He said there could be more detailed discussion with the Planning Board on what would need to be involved, if the ZBA granted the variance with that condition.

Ms. Davis noted that without someone there at night, the responsibility fell on a neighbor to call the police or call Mr. Pasay.

Mr. Harvey said what the applicant was proposing would triple the number of students living there. He also said there was no guarantee where things would be at with the property in 5 years.

Chair Gottsacker noted that a variance traveled with the land, which meant Mr. Pasay could get the variance, construct the buildings, and then sell the property, at which time the property management could go away.

Mr. Pasay stated again that the neighbor's house was very remote relative to his house, and also said he was a firm landlord in terms of enforcing the lease.

Chair Gottsacker noted that the ZBA had received a letter from the Todds, who were abutters and had concerns about the variance being requested .

Ms. Davis read the letter out loud, which indicated among other things that the Todds had concerns about how the variance would impact their property values.

Mr. Pasay stressed again the remoteness of the property, his intent with the lease, and the absence of problems at his property in the past. He said these things argued that the improvements he wished to make to his property would not interfere with the quality of life of his neighbors or diminish the value of their property.

There were no members of the public who spoke for or against the application at the public hearing.

Sean Starkey MOVED to close the Public Hearing. Ed Harvey SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 5-0.

Mr. Harvey said he thought the key with this application was conditions. He said his concern was that the property could change hands. He said he thought the uniqueness in this instance was that there was already a multi-unit building on the property, so it was

what it was.

He said a question was whether the Board wanted to allow two more buildings, which would have minimal lighting and would be surrounded by conservation land. He said this was a big increase that was proposed in the Rural District, but he said a variance already existed. He also said this seemed like a rural version of accommodating student housing, and said there weren't a lot of these kinds of situations in Durham.

Concerning the criterion regarding whether there would be a decrease in the value of surrounding properties, Mr. Welsh said he didn't have good evidence either way, but said the letter from the abutter at least gave him some pause about a perceived loss of value of surrounding properties.

Mr. Harvey said if this was the first variance for this property, he would agree that what was proposed was a major change. But he said this was already a multi-unit dwelling, and said going from 11 residents to 36 residents was not nearly as significant as turning the property into another use would be.

Mr. Welsh noted that this was a use variance being requested, because there would be more than a 50% increase with what was proposed.

Mr. Harvey said from a property value standpoint, it wasn't provable that there would be a significant change in the value of surrounding properties by doing more of what was already there.

Mr. Welsh said the Board didn't have any professional facts concerning this, but said he thought it was up to the applicant to show this.

Ms. Davis said it was up to the Board to decide on this based on what was presented by both sides. She said they could use their own judgment on this.

Chair Gottsacker read from the ZBA handbook on this issue, and said it indicated that it was really up to the ZBA to make a judgment on this.

Mr. Starkey agreed, but said he thought the burden of proof was still on the applicant. He said in this case, there was a lot of surrounding property that was not to be developed in the future. He also said that although there was an accepted use there now, what the applicant proposed would triple the number of people living there.

He said this represented much more than a 50% increase, and gave him pause. He said there was just one abutter, and said he wasn't sure that the additional buildings would decrease the value of that property. But he said he wasn't sure he had heard enough evidence that it would not.

Mr. Harvey noted that there would be a lot of cars coming and going on the property.

Mr. Starkey pointed out that this was a rural area, and stated again that although the

multi-unit use was already there, it would be tripling in size.

Ms. Davis said Route 108 was already a busy road, so she didn't see how one would notice a difference, in terms of cars coming and going.

Mr. Starkey said the neighbor might notice a difference in terms of the cars, and there was discussion on this by the Board.

Ms. Davis said the parking area wouldn't be visible from the neighbor's house.

Mr. Starkey said he was thinking more about noise coming from the cars.

Ms. Davis said the applicant had shown that with a strict lease, there had been no phone calls from the neighbors to him or to the police over several years. She said this meant the property had been managed well, and represented evidence from the applicant that what was proposed would not decrease the value of surrounding properties. She also said there was a visual and noise buffer.

Mr. Starkey noted that Mr. Pasay could sell the property. He said while he had done an exemplary job managing it, he wouldn't own it forever. He said the use variance would carry over to subsequent owners of the property.

Chair Gottsacker said the property was isolated, but said he had some concerns about traffic, which would be visible to everyone. He suggested that they could deal with this issue with a condition that said the Planning Board should pay special attention to traffic issues.

He also noted that elder care facilities and elderly housing multi-unit buildings were permitted uses in the Rural District, but multi-unit student housing was not. He said the real issue in terms of possible impacts on property values was whether students would create a ruckus.

He said that regarding the issue of the variance traveling with the land and not the owner, the Board might want to word a condition concerning property management for subsequent owners of the property. He said they could require a live-in manager.

Concerning the public interest criterion, Mr. Harvey noted the objection from the abutter, but said the letter had said nothing about noise or other interference, and instead had discussed property values. He also said he wasn't sure granting the variance would go against the public interest because the variance already existed.

Mr. Welsh agreed, and said it was hard to prove this one way or the other. He also noted that the fact that the property was on Route 108 made the traffic issue easier to accept than if it was on another road.

Mr. Starkey said he agreed with Mr. Welsh.

Ms. Davis said she wanted to know if in the winter, there was a view through to the neighbor's property.

Chair Gottsacker said the area was heavily forested. He said he agreed with what other Board members had said on the public interest criterion, and said he felt it was met. He also noted that the public interest in a larger sense was also the Town, the University and the students. In addition, he said the ZBA Handbook indicated that the interests of the abutters didn't rule.

Regarding the hardship criteria for a use variance, Mr. Starkey said in a way, the zoning restriction as applied to the applicant's property did interfere with his reasonable use of it. He said there was already a multi-unit building in place, and said he could understand the applicant wanting to increase his cash flow, and that the zoning restriction could interfere with this.

Mr. Starkey said that regarding the hardship criterion on whether there was a fair and substantial relationship between the general purposes of the Zoning Ordinance and the specific restrictions on the property, the property was in fact in the Rural District. He said he was concerned about this criterion being met because there was an abutter with concerns. But he said he didn't think granting the variance would injure the public or private rights of others.

Ms. Davis said she felt there was a unique setting in this instance, and said what made putting these two buildings on it ok was that it was heavily forested on the southern property boundary, and that there was a large distance between the proposed building on the south side and the abutting residence.

She also said the property was on Route 108, which was a fairly busy road. In addition, she said what made the property unique was that it was surrounded by conservation properties. She said she thought student housing there would have a minimal impact if it was properly managed.

Mr. Welsh read that the purpose of the Rural District was to preserve rural character.

Ms. Davis said it was a use variance being requested, and said the purpose of the Ordinance was to prohibit this kind of multi-unit housing in the Rural District. But she questioned why the Zoning Ordinance allowed multi-unit elderly housing but not non-elderly multi-unit residences in this district.

She said she thought adding these two buildings would not visibly change the character of the area because they would not be visible. She also said if the property was managed properly, the rural character of the area wouldn't be changed.

Mr. Harvey noted the wording Mr. Welsh had read from the Zoning Ordinance on the purpose of the Rural District, and said the use the applicant proposed didn't fit with that. He said he realized the applicant was trying to make things work with his property, but said going from 11 to 36 residents was a huge amount of growth. He said if he was

simply expanding the existing building rather than building two new buildings, this would be a much easier project to accept.

Mr. Welsh said he thought the first hardship criterion was met because the property was surrounded by conservation land and was on Route 108, and would not be seen given its location on the landscape.

But he said he was having trouble with the second hardship criterion, and said he thought it was dangerous to say that because the Zoning Ordinance allowed multi-unit elderly housing, multi-unit housing should be allowed in any district. He said he thought there was a specific restriction on this in the Rural District for a reason.

Mr. Welsh said it also opened up Pandora's box if one said it was all about whether the property would be visible. He said the wording in the Zoning Ordinance said the issue was not just what could be seen, but was also the importance of preserving rural land uses and the environment. He said he thought it was important for the Board to be careful about this.

He said when there were cows on Route 108, Durham felt more rural, and said this rural character was steadily being eroded. He noted that there were big corporations buying up a lot of rental property in Durham, and said a future owner of Mr. Pasay's property could be a corporation that just didn't care, and that would treat this property very differently.

Chair Gottsacker said the cows were gone from Route 108 because of the economics of farming, and not because they were zoned out. He said he thought the second hardship criterion was in fact satisfied, because there was less and less need for multi-unit elderly housing, which was allowed in the Rural District, and there was more of a need for student housing. He said there was not a substantial relationship between the general purposes of the Zoning Ordinance and the specific restrictions on the property in this case.

Chair Gottsacker asked which Board members felt that either the substantial justice criterion or the spirit and intent of the Ordinance criterion were not met.

Mr. Welsh said he questioned whether a purpose of the Rural District was to turn it into student housing.

Mr. Starkey said he didn't think the variance application met the spirit and intent of the Ordinance.

Chair Gottsacker noted that multi-unit elderly housing could be put in that would be much larger than what the applicant proposed.

Mr. Harvey said that was a planning issue.

Mr. Starkey agreed, and said he didn't think those who had approved the last variance for the property thought the number of residents would be tripling in size in the future.

Chair Gottsacker asked which Board members would not vote to approve the variance, even with conditions.

Mr. Starkey, Mr. Harvey and Mr. Welsh said they couldn't vote for it, and Ms. Davis and Chair Gottsacker said they could vote for it with conditions.

Ms. Davis asked if they should go through the variance criteria before the vote, and Mr. Gottsacker said it was in the minutes.

Sean Starkey MOVED to deny the APPLICATION FOR VARIANCES from Article IX, Section 175-28(D), Article XII, Section 175-53 and Section 175-54 of the Zoning Ordinance to build two additional 3-unit apartment buildings on a non-conforming lot where there is currently a 5-unit building. The property involved is shown on Tax Map 18, Lot 3-2, is located at 257 Newmarket Road, and is in the Rural Zoning District. Carden Welsh SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED 3-2, with Chair Gottsacker and Ruth Davis voting against it.

Break from 8:25-8:30 pm

III. Minutes

July 14, 2009 Minutes

Page 2, 4th full paragraph, should read "Ms. Shaheen said she realized that they might need to withdraw..."

Also, 5th full paragraph should read "...the accessory apartment were for a barn."

Page 4, bottom paragraph, should read, "...the property had been used as a..."

Page 6, 1st full paragraph, should read "...a place in Durham for things like poetry..."

Also, 4th full paragraph, should read "Chrissy Henderson..."

Page 10, 3rd paragraph, should read "...were twelve different variances they would..."

Page 12, 4th full paragraph, should read "...that Agenda Item II B and E would be....."

Also, 6th full paragraph, should read "...when the new Zoning Ordinance came..."

Page 13, 3rd paragraph, should read "...thought this criterion was met."

Page 14, 2nd paragraph from bottom, should read "...would alter the essential..."

Ruth Davis MOVED to approve the July 14, 2009 Minutes as amended. Ed Harvey SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 5-0.

IV. Other Business

Request for Rehearing on the APPLICATION FOR VARIANCE from Article XII, Section 175-53 of the Zoning Ordinance to change the use of a property from single family land use with accessory buildings to commercial land use of art center/theater/dormitory/ community center. The property involved is shown on Tax Map 6, Lot 9-8, is located at 50 Newmarket Road, and is in the Residence B Zoning District.

Chair Gottsacker noted that the variance was approved at the July 14, 2009 ZBA meeting,

and said there was a request for rehearing from Jeffrey Hiller, an abutter. He noted that right now, the Board only needed to decide whether it had made a technical error in its decision to approve the variance, or if there was some new information available now that was not known then.

Mr. Harvey said he read the same argument in Mr. Hiller's letter that he had heard at the July 14th meeting, and said he didn't see anything new.

Mr. Welsh said he had gotten the letter on Monday, and hadn't been able to read all of it. He said he did think Mr. Hiller had made a good point regarding the criterion on whether granting the variance would decrease property values. He said the minutes reflected what happened, and said the Board didn't really lay out that property values wouldn't be hurt. He provided details on this.

Mr. Starkey noted that Mr. Hiller had pointed out some court cases, but said he thought Mr. Hiller was expanding on the same arguments as before. He said he felt the Board had discussed the issues at length, and had addressed the majority of concerns. He said there was no new information.

Ms. Davis said she didn't see any new information. She said much of Mr. Hiller's letter suggested that the Board had made an error in its interpretation of property value diminishment, and noted that he had suggested that the Mill Pond Center property was not previously used to house transient residents, and was an arts facility.

She said she was questioning now whether the Board had properly considered the change in use when it decided whether or not property values would be affected. She said the question was whether the Board erred in its decision, and said she was still considering this.

Chair Gottsacker said he agreed that no new information had been provided, and that they had just gotten more detail in Mr. Hiller's letter. He said Mr. Hiller also claimed that the Board didn't adequately address the variance criteria, but he said the Minutes indicated that there was a lot of discussion on them. He noted that he had also watched the discussion on the DVD of the meeting.

He said the ZBA Handbook indicated that the ZBA didn't have to accept the conclusions of an abutter on property values, and he provided details on this. He said he also remembered that the Board had discussed how there would be significantly less traffic from the site with the change in use because there would be fewer events there than in the past, so there would be less of an impact from these events on property values.

Chair Gottsacker stated again that he didn't see any new information, and also said he didn't think the Board had made technical errors.

Mr. Harvey said something that could have been lost in the Board's deliberations was that there was a lot of discussion around the fact that this was an arts center. But he said the property would be going from being a place where there were events to a property

that was housing a lot more people. He said the Board danced around the fact that the property was becoming a very different place, but was being called the same thing.

Mr. Starkey said there were people already living there, and said the Board had allowed an expansion of this.

Ms. Davis said Mr. Hiller had said the Board's error was that it didn't properly interpret information on property values. She said she didn't recall getting examples of where property values would diminish, but noted that there was someone who spoke at the public hearing who said there had been a similar situation in her town, and that this had been a positive experience for the town, and there had not been a negative impact.

She said that was the only piece of empirical information the Board had to work with, and said its decision was made taking that information and their own opinion into account. She said they had decided that granting the variance would not impact property values.

Chair Gottsacker noted that the Board had also tried to protect property values with several conditions that were imposed, and he read through them. He said the Board had heard the abutters' concerns, and wrote them into the conditions for the variance that was granted.

Ruth Davis MOVED to deny the Request for Rehearing on the APPLICATION FOR VARIANCE from Article XII, Section 175-53 of the Zoning Ordinance to change the use of a property from single family land use with accessory buildings to commercial land use of art center/theater/dormitory/ community center, for the property shown on Tax Map 6, Lot 9-8, and located at 50 Newmarket Road in the Residence B Zoning District. Sean Starkey SECONDED the motion, and PASSED unanimously 5-0.

Mr. Starkey noted the upcoming Office of Energy and Planning's Fall Planning conference, and said registration began soon. He said he planned to go to the conference.

V. Adjournment

Sean Starkey MOVED to adjourn the meeting. Carden Welsh SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED unanimously 5-0.

Adjournment at 8:55 pm

Victoria Parmele, Minutes taker

Jerry Gottsacker, Secretary