

APPROVED

**TOWN OF PELHAM PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES**

May 17, 2021

Chairman Tim Doherty called the meeting to order at approximately 7:00 pm.

The following notice was read aloud “A Checklist to Ensure Meetings are Compliant with the Right-to-Know Law During the State of Emergency” (*regarding access to the meeting*)

Secretary Danielle Masse-Quinn called roll:

PRESENT ROLL CALL: Tim Doherty – present
James Bergeron – present
Danielle Masse-Quinn – present
Cindy Kirkpatrick – present
Alternate Bruce Bilapka – present
Alternate Samuel Thomas – present
Alternate Paddy Culbert – present
Alternate Richard Olson – present
Selectmen Representative Kevin Cote – present
Planning Director Jeff Gowan – present

Via Telecommunication:

Roger Montbleau – present via Zoom; no one in the room
Paul Dadak – present via Zoom; no one in the room

ABSENT/

NOT PARTICIPATING: Alternate Selectmen Representative Hal Lynde
Alternate Mike Sherman

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

MINUTES

May 3, 2021

MOTION: (Montbleau/Dadak) To accept the May 3, 2021 meeting minutes as amended.

ROLL CALL VOTE: Mr. Dadak – yes
Ms. Kirkpatrick – yes
Mr. Cote – yes
Mr. Bergeron – yes
Ms. Masse-Quinn – yes
Mr. Montbleau – yes
Mr. Doherty – yes

(7-0-0) The motion carried.

OLD BUSINESS**Case #PL2021-00006****Map 22 Lot 8-117****SBJ Land Holdings – 13 Main Street – Site Plan Review for a Conditional Use Permit to construct proposed 4800 SF Mixed-Use Building and retail office and 6 Residential Housing Units**

Mr. Bergeron recused himself from the case. Mr. Doherty appointed Mr. Thomas to vote in place of Mr. Bergeron.

Mr. Joe Maynard from Benchmark Engineering came forward to represent SBJ Land Holdings. He noted that he went before the Board about four weeks prior. He informed that the property falls in the center of Town at 13 Main Street. It is a mixed-use development with a proposed office retail/commercial building on Main Street. The residential component would consist of six two-bedroom units directly behind the commercial unit. It was noted that during the last discussion, there were a couple of comments from the Board regarding the type of tree the landscape architect proposed. She came back substituting many maple trees previously proposed with green spire little leaf linden type trees. This type of tree takes a lot longer to grow, and it does not have the root structure that maple or oak would have.

Mr. Maynard noted that the Board accepted jurisdiction on the waivers for site-specific soil mapping and the parking island requirements. He added that Mr. Keach reviewed the plan and made some comments, which can be addressed once the plan is approved. He explained that the comments primarily had to do with putting the permit numbers for the septic approvals on the plan. Mr. Maynard stated that the septic plans were finished and submitted to DES and they were now just waiting on the approvals for them. He informed that he spoke with Pennichuck Water and will obtain a letter from them stating that they would provide water for the property. He added that Pennichuck did review the plan and is satisfied with it as it sits at this time, which he will get in writing for the Board. Mr. Maynard informed that Mr. Keach noted a surety bond in his letter for a limited performance guarantee. He added that it was also noted in the letter that he wanted the final footprint of the building on the plans before it is signed.

Mr. Steve Keach, the Town Engineer, came forward to address the Board. He stated that he wrote a letter to the Board on May 12, which Mr. Maynard's summary and remarks of were on-point. He noted that his remaining remarks were to set up potential conditions of approval, such as a receipt of the requisite State permits, receipt of correspondence of the water utility confirming the ability and intent to supply water, and a remark regarding the limited surety mentioned by Mr. Maynard. He reminded that in addition to the site plan, there is also a conditional use permit aspect to this plan that would have to be addressed. He reiterated that he would like the recordable site plan to mimic the footprint shown on the architectural drawings so that there would be no issues during construction, as the current footprint only shows an envelope rectangle. He noted that a remark made in his letter regarding garages could be stricken, as that came from an earlier drawing of the plan. Mr. Keach noted that this was the second letter that he wrote relative to this application and the brevity of the letter is reflective of the applicant's consultant did a good job addressing all the remarks that he could address after receipt of the first letter.

Mr. Doherty opened the discussion up to the Public. As no one came forward, Mr. Doherty closed the discussion to the Public.

Ms. Masse-Quinn reminded that the three waivers requested by the applicant were approved at the May 3 meeting, and one was withdrawn.

Mr. Maynard was given a list of conditions that were put together by Mr. Gowan. Mr. Maynard stated that it looked standard for what they had been talking about for this project. Mr. Gowan read the conditions into the record, stating that this is currently just a draft.

- 1) To provide adequate time for state permitting, the Planning Board has waived land development regulation 202-7B and has extended the length of this project to one year from the date of approval. (Mr. Gowan noted that this was not requested by the applicant, but one year has been the standard)
- 2) NH DES construction approval numbers for each planned on-site sub-surface sewage-disposal septic system to be shown on the recordable plans.
- 3) A letter from Pennichuck Water Company to be provided to the Planning Department confirming their intent to provide water to serve both the residential and commercial units.
- 4) Fire Department review of the proposed plan.
- 5) Approval of all required waivers to be noted on the recordable plans.
- 6) All easements to be recorded on the recordable plans.
- 7) Any approved project phasing to be clearly depicted on the recordable plans (Mr. Gowan noted that he did not believe this condition applied to this case).
- 8) A written memorandum by Mr. Steve Keach stating his satisfaction of all the items stated in his May 12, 2021, have been resolved and captured in the final recordable plan set.
- 9) Surety and Plan Compliance escrow to be provided as estimated by Keach-Nordstrom prior to plan recording.
- 10) If the residential units or the commercial units are to be conveyed as condominiums, the applicant shall provide draft HOA documents for legal review and approval by Town Counsel, including any easements.
- 11) An executed and recorded agreement regarding the access to and maintenance of the shared private driveway must be provided to the Planning Department prior to plan recording.
- 12) All applicable impact fees to be paid at the time of building permit issuance.
- 13) Utility plans, once designed by Pennichuck Water Company and Liberty Utilities, must be submitted to the Planning Director for transmittal to Keach-Nordstrom and the Highway Department for review and approval prior to scheduling the required pre-construction meeting to which representatives of the utility companies will be invited to attend.

Mr. Maynard stated that he did not have any issues with the proposed conditions. He noted that his client was currently working on the private drive now. Mr. Gowan noted that he was not implying that the Board should be a party to approving the private driveway agreement; he just wanted to make sure that an agreement existed and is recorded. Mr. Keach agreed that the conditions meet what he wrote in his letter.

Mr. Culbert asked why there were only five piles for snow storage. Mr. Maynard replied that there were seven proposed areas for snow storage. Mr. Culbert noted that there was no location for snow storage along the 43-foot driveway. Mr. Maynard replied that he could add another one at that location. Mr. Culbert agreed that he should. Mr. Doherty clarified that the designated area that they were adding for snow storage should be closer to Main Street.

Ms. Kirkpatrick asked if there was a sidewalk in front of the building. Mr. Maynard replied that there was a sidewalk down the private side of the drive on the left-hand side; on the commercial building, it is on the parking lot side and extends out to the private driveway. He noted that the sidewalk does not extend across the frontage on Main Street, but it is down the side road. He added that they made connectivity of the office building out to that sidewalk.

Mr. Gowan stated the Town of Pelham has in its capital improvement plans to extend the sidewalk on the other side of Main Street from approximately the VFW down to what will be the new Main Street bridge and then from that bridge out to Route 38. The DOT required that we have that in there in order for them to include a sidewalk on the Main Street Gionet Bridge. He stated that working with the Selectman; they

put it in the CIP; it will probably be in the 2023-2024 timeframe. He also noted that they convinced the DOT to leave the crosswalk that goes from Main Street right across the street at this driveway for pedestrians. He commended the question, but he felt that this one is pretty much covered.

Mr. Doherty noted that he added a condition 14 for one more area for snow storage.

Mr. Gowan asked a question relative to snow storage not really pertinent to this case since there are many designated storage areas, but moving forward, snow storage should be handled in the designated snow storage areas and not elsewhere. There are a few current projects where they think that the best area is the detention pond, and Mr. Gowan vehemently disagrees with that action. He doesn't feel that in this case, it is required to call this condition out mainly because there aren't any detention ponds, and they have adequate snow storage.

MOTION: (Cote/Montbleau) To approve the plan with the 14 conditions noted and issue a Conditional Use Permit.

ROLL CALL VOTE: Mr. Montbleau – yes
 Ms. Masse-Quinn – yes
 Mr. Cote – yes
 Ms. Kirkpatrick – yes
 Mr. Dadak – yes
 Mr. Thomas – yes
 Mr. Doherty – yes

(7-0-0) The motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS

Case #PL2021-00009
Map 24 Lot 12-191-14

COLLOCA, Robert & Lisa – 38 Wellesley Drive – Modification to a Site Plan to allow the applicant to construct an above ground pool and deck within a drainage easement

Mr. Robert Colloca came forward to address the Board. He informed the Board that when he went to pull a permit for an above-ground pool, he found out that there was an easement about six feet from the back of the house, which would prevent them from doing anything in their backyard. He stated he was before the Board to allow them to construct the above-ground pool over the easement. Ms. Colloca came forward. He noted that he believed they were in accordance with the other requirements.

Mr. Doherty asked for clarification on the lot being on common land. Mr. Colloca replied that they pay for an acre of land, but each parcel is only about 0.67 acres in size, with a common area on both sides of the street to make up for the one acre of land. Mr. Doherty asked if the common area was on their lot. Mr. Colloca replied it was not. Mr. Gowan explained that their lot is part of a conservation subdivision. He encouraged caution that if this modification were allowed that it not impact any drainage on the lot. He noted that the proposed drawing showed the pool area not being over the existing pipe or existing catch basin. He asked the Colloca's if they were proposing to regrade or add fill to the edge of the existing drainage. Mr. Colloca replied no, just enough to put the above-ground pool in. Mr. Gowan asked if they were planning to add a retention wall. Mr. Colloca replied that if they needed to, they would.

Ms. Masse-Quinn read the list of abutters aloud. There were no persons present who asserted standing in the case, who did not have their name read, or who had difficulty with notification.

Mr. Cote asked if the pool was going to be in the WCD. Mr. Colloca replied that it would be closer to the house, not near the buffer. Mr. Gowan clarified how it is depicted on the plan.

Ms. Kirkpatrick asked how far the pool edge was from the pipe. Mr. Colloca replied that it is about 6-8 feet away.

Mr. Doherty noted that they could potentially impact their foundation drain when digging to add the retaining wall and grading for the pool. He was just noting that they could impact the foundation drain; it is something to be aware of. He stated that if they inadvertently blocked it, they would experience water in the house/foundation. He explained that the original plan for the foundation drain was directly under the pool.

Mr. Gowan made a recommendation that if the Board were to consider allowing this that there should be no cutting or reducing of the grade within the drainage easement. Any digging should be on their side of the easement. He recommended they should do a little exploring with a shovel where they plan to put their deck to see if the foundation drain is there; if they don't find it, it is probably someplace else. He would suggest that if the Board approves this going forward, that it should require significant erosion controls around the edge of where the pool goes. He stated that if they do find the foundation drain, they could just reroute it.

Mr. Dadak asked about where the plans came from because they showed a proposed foundation drain. Mr. Gowan replied that their department provided the plan as a starting point for the applicants. Mr. Dadak also mentioned that they could potentially run across the foundation pipe when putting in the deck foundation and that they should be able to reroute it easily if needed.

MOTION: (Cote/Masse-Quinn) To accept modification to the Site Plan.

ROLL CALL VOTE: Mr. Cote – yes
 Ms. Kirkpatrick – yes
 Mr. Dadak – yes
 Ms. Masse-Quinn – yes
 Mr. Bergeron – yes
 Mr. Montbleau – yes
 Mr. Doherty – yes

(7-0-0) The motion carried.

Mr. Doherty opened the discussion up to the Public. As no one came forward, Mr. Doherty closed the discussion to the Public. It was noted how important maintaining the drainage structures on the property is.

MOTION: (Cote/Masse-Quinn) To approve a modification to the Site Plan with the condition that they dig on the house side of the easement and any damage to the drain, the applicant is responsible for.

ROLL CALL VOTE: Mr. Dadak – yes
 Ms. Kirkpatrick – yes
 Mr. Cote – yes
 Mr. Bergeron – yes

Ms. Masse-Quinn – yes
 Mr. Montbleau – yes
 Mr. Doherty – yes

(7-0-0) The motion carried.

Case #PL2021-00010

Map 22 Lot 8-130

BEAVER BROOK VILLAGE, LLC – 52 Windham Road - Modification of an approved mixed-use project regarding the commercial building to include professional/medical uses, as well as already approved retail use. Also, to increase the footprint of that building by using the rear farmer's porch for interior space and extending the width of the building by 5'.

Ms. Kirkpatrick recused herself from the case. Mr. Doherty appointed Mr. Culbert to vote in place of Ms. Kirkpatrick.

Ms. Masse-Quinn read the list of abutters aloud. There were no persons present who asserted standing in the case, who did not have their name read, or who had difficulty with notification.

Mr. Bill Reno from Beaver Brook Village, 52 Windham Road, came forward to address the Board. He informed that they were coming before the Board to request a slight modification to the commercial building. He explained that they wanted to increase the width of the building on the north side by five feet, giving them an extra 150 square feet. He noted that he also wanted to capture the rear porch footprint and turn it into interior rentable space, giving them roughly 300 square feet. He explained that the main goal for this was to put another successful business into Pelham. He informed that Mr. Dave Jordan did a quick review of the plan when they extended the footprint, noting that they are still well above the required parking. He informed that they were not encroaching on any setbacks and that the existing and approved site plan should remain 100% with the slight increase in square footage.

MOTION: (Culbert/Dadak) To accept this plan for consideration of the modification

ROLL CALL VOTE: Mr. Montbleau – yes
 Ms. Masse-Quinn – yes
 Mr. Cote – yes
 Mr. Culbert – yes
 Mr. Dadak – yes
 Mr. Bergeron – yes
 Mr. Doherty – yes

(7-0-0) The motion carried.

Mr. Gowan explained that he was initially concerned when the applicant first approached him because it was one of the nicest designs he had seen yet for a commercial structure but was far less concerned once it was explained that the applicant was only anticipating changing the rear of the structure. He noted that the applicant is not proposing to change the streetscape or the front elevation. Mr. Gowan did not recall if the plan reflected only retail spaces but thought it should have been retail, professional office, or restaurant. He stated that they would all like to see a restaurant.

Mr. Dadak stated that the architectural plan did not specify any toilet facilities on the second floor and asked if that was correct. Mr. Reno informed that the plan he was looking at was only a conceptual plan and that

once they get an actual tenant, the interior would be filled out. Mr. Gowan commented that whatever gets drawn up for the interior of the building will get reviewed by the building and electrical inspectors; it will have to be built to code, including bathroom and ADA code.

Mr. Culbert asked if the stockade fence would go down all the way to the American Legion land. Mr. Reno replied that was correct.

Ms. Masse-Quinn questioned the height since it is 40 feet and the current zoning is 30 feet. Mr. Gowan replied that this plan pre-dated the zoning change.

Mr. Doherty opened the discussion up to the Public.

Ms. Cindy Kirkpatrick, of 7 Mossy Lane, a direct abutter, came forward to address the Board. She had a question for Mr. Reno about the type of tenants that would go into the building. Mr. Reno replied that they are trying to go for not just retail to also allow professional office or medical. He thought, if anything, the amount of traffic based on this change would potentially be less intrusive to the area. Ms. Kirkpatrick talked about the stockade fence stopping just past her property where there is an existing fence which was put there by a previous owner who did not own the land that they put the fence on. She informed that this fence is currently falling apart and that the current owners are planning on taking it down. Mr. Reno felt that if the fence were taken down, they would rather the fencing match anyways and would most likely extend the stockade fence. Her other concern was about operation hours. Mr. Reno stated that since there are not yet tenants, that is not known, but it would follow Town guidelines and would not be all hours of the night.

As no one else came forward, Mr. Doherty closed the discussion to the Public.

Mr. Bergeron wanted to clarify a couple of questions that he heard Ms. Kirkpatrick ask the applicant about the stockade fence. Mr. Reno clarified the responses. Mr. Bergeron also asked about the change in footprint was in anticipation that the additional space would be for a single professional use. Mr. Reno replied that was the intention. Mr. Bergeron stated that he would support the change.

Mr. Gowan suggested that with approval, there should be a condition that the proposed stockade fence run the entire length of the property boundary. He stressed, and Mr. Reno concurred that he is leasing these units, not selling them, so he will be more diligent about the type of tenants.

Mr. Cote stated that this plan was proposed for a specific purpose and look. He did not agree about extending the footage and converting the farmer's porch. He is okay with altering the use of the property, as options are always good. Mr. Reno responded that they did not intend on changing the look. Mr. Cote said that he was changing the farmer's porch, and Mr. Reno said it was only the rear farmer's porch that they were proposing to change. Mr. Reno mentioned that it would be eliminating only the rear farmer's porch, not touching any in the front. Mr. Cote still felt that the design was done this way and approved for a reason and could not agree about the farmer's porch.

Mr. Montbleau didn't feel that what Mr. Reno was asking was unreasonable. The front side of the building is what the townspeople see. He noted that he was on the approval of the original building. He did not feel that removing the farmer's porch that is in the back changes the aesthetics that they were originally trying to achieve when they approved the plans. Mr. Dadak agreed with Mr. Montbleau's comments. He stated that what the Public would see from the front meets the original intentions.

Mr. Doherty agreed with Mr. Montbleau and Mr. Dadak that the Public would only see the front, and the only time that anyone would see the back would be in the parking lot. The tenants would see the back, but

it would be that way when they either rent or buy. Mr. Doherty informed that this was the first mixed-use development in the district and that mixed-use is not a requirement; it is an allowed use.

MOTION: (Culbert/Montbleau) To approve the modification to the Site Plan.

ROLL CALL VOTE: Mr. Cote – yes
 Mr. Culbert – yes
 Mr. Dadak – yes
 Ms. Masse-Quinn – yes
 Mr. Bergeron – yes
 Mr. Montbleau – yes
 Mr. Doherty – yes

(7-0-0) The motion carried.

DISCUSSIONS

Mike Sherman Letter of Resignation.

With reluctance, Mr. Doherty stated that the Board would accept Mr. Mike Sherman’s letter of resignation. He asked the Board if they wanted to start to find a replacement or wait a while. Mr. Culbert stated that he would like to mourn for a while. Mr. Doherty replied that he would hope that he would reconsider, even though that did not seem likely. Mr. Dadak agreed and added that Mr. Sherman always had good input about the plans and knew the history of many plans.

Mr. Montbleau gave a whole-hearted thank you to what Mr. Sherman had given them. He noted that his service to the Board was a great experience for the Board. He suggested not replacing him at this time, and if he decided to come back to the Board, there would be an opening for him.

Mr. Bergeron stated that out of the respect he has for Mr. Sherman, his opinions, and his service over the years to the Board, he would also agree that there not be a big hurry to try to replace Mr. Sherman. He will be missed greatly.

Mr. Gowan mentioned that the Board has four good, reliable alternates and, while entitled to have a fifth by statute, his opinion is that there is no rush to fill that position. When the Board is inclined to look, they can just notify the Planning Department, and they will post it. He agreed that Mr. Sherman was a good asset, and maybe with all the praise, he will come back.

Mr. Gowan’s last day with the Town of Pelham

Mr. Doherty asked him when his last day would be. Mr. Gowan replied that it would be on his birthday, May 31, and since it is a holiday, the actual last day will be May 28. This will be his last Planning Board meeting as Planning Director.

Mr. Doherty thanked Mr. Gowan for the service he has done for the Town and mentioned that the NRPC allows the Planning Board to nominate three alternates to the NRPC Commissioner. He asked Mr. Gowan if he would consider taking one of those alternate positions. Mr. Gowan agreed that he would consider it, as it is a wonderful organization. Mr. Culbert mentioned that it had been a pleasure serving with Mr. Gowan as Chairman, a member, and as Planning Director. Mr. Gowan thanked Mr. Culbert and echoed that he

also enjoyed his time working with him. Mr. Dadak thanked Mr. Gowan for everything he did for the Planning Board and felt that they benefitted from him as they oftentimes didn't see everything that he did.

Mr. Montbleau also congratulated Jeff. He remembers every phase of his participation and where he devoted his time to the Board, to the Town, to service, and that he made a professional position evolve to the Planning Director. Mr. Montbleau stated that Mr. Gowan did a great job representing this Town on many issues and brought a lot of perspective to Board members. He thanked him for being a good friend, a good Board member, and a good Planning Director. He wished him well in all his endeavors that he goes from here. Mr. Gowan thanked Mr. Montbleau and Mr. Culbert for the direction and helped that they gave him during the early days when he was first starting out.

Mr. Doherty asked Mr. Gowan for one last thing-to add the Board's current By-Laws to the Public Hearing.

Mr. Gowan told the Board that Ms. Jenn Beauregard would be his successor as Interim Planning Director for a period of one year. She will be reviewed, and Mr. Gowan has every confidence in her. He would say he trained her, but there was some of her training him in the process. She was in the Planning Department when he came on and still to this day is very much his right-hand person. She has some great ideas; he will let her share them at the appropriate time. She is looking forward to supporting this Board and the many other duties that the Planning Director has.

Discussion regarding changes to Land Use Regulations.

Mr. Gowan says that from the changes he previously gave in the earlier draft, in the current draft, he found one more reference to density in the language that they are striking that relates to the old zoning. He stated that he would find it in the document and mark it in a third color for the Public Hearing. He noted that the other change is under the environmental section, under the recommendation for surety, Page 27-F. He struck out the mechanism and added, "*The applicant shall provide a performance bond as estimated by the Planning Board's Consulting Engineer to guarantee the drainage structures function as designed for a period of ten years after construction. The stormwater bond shall be separate from project surety for roads, drainage, bounds, and other items requiring surety as described in Section 305 of these regulations.*" Mr. Gowan stated he had not yet sent them to the attorney to review.

Ms. Kirkpatrick wanted to confirm that change on page 53 regarding discussions. Mr. Gowan stated that he felt that it was covered in the prior section but wanted to check with Attorney Ratigan if it was appropriate to strike from page 53. Mr. Gowan noted that it could also potentially be struck from page 78. He stated that a copy of the changes would be sent to the Board with his comments prior to the meeting.

Ms. Kirkpatrick also asked about the reference standards on pages 91 and 93 – noting that there were references to the seacoast watershed alliance on both of those pages and wondered if it should be removed. Mr. Gowan agreed that the reference should be removed.

Mr. Thomas referenced page 74 under B-1; he questioned the section relative to tree removal, referring to over twelve inches in diameter. Mr. Cote clarified that the intent was to keep mature trees on a site to try to minimize the impact on the land. Mr. Gowan said that this is so that when the plan is developed, they have to specifically specify what trees over a certain size are coming out. Mr. Gowan is open to the Board coming up with a lower number than twelve inches, whatever they feel is the proper size. Mr. Thomas was also concerned with where they protect things such as stone walls from being removed. Mr. Gowan suggested that a change be made so it would read: "*The limits of land clearing and tree removal over twelve inches in diameter proposed as well as the identification of stone walls and other existing natural and man-made features.*" Mr. Cote thought that twelve inches were the correct size to specify.

Mr. Bilapka suggested that they have a forester come in and tag the trees to be removed. Mr. Cote felt that the forester would look at it differently than the Board would look at the reasons for preserving certain trees.

Mr. Thomas had a question about item J on page 67 regarding erosion control and how the Board and Town could implement this recommendation. Mr. Dadak noted that this was already a requirement for a developer based on State and Federal Law. Mr. Gowan agreed and noted that having the language in the regulations and knowing that someone is in violation of putting in the proper erosion controls gives the ability to act immediately to cease work until the controls are put in place. If it is necessary to put in a cease-and-desist order, a reference can be made to the specific ordinance. Mr. Gowan noted that The Design Engineer would understand proper erosion control, and it would be reviewed by the Town’s Engineering Consultant.

DATE SPECIFIED PLANS

June 7, 2021

Case #PL2021-00005 - Map 30 Lots 11-157, 11-158, 11-162, & 11-163 – CROOKER, Kevin & Constance & TERRY, Angela – 2 & 4 Andover Street and 3 & 5 Methuen Street

First Public Hearing on the Land Use Regulations

ADJOURN

MOTION: (Cote/Dadak) To adjourn the meeting.

ROLL CALL VOTE: Mr. Dadak – yes
 Ms. Kirkpatrick – yes
 Mr. Cote – yes
 Mr. Bergeron – yes
 Ms. Masse-Quinn – yes
 Mr. Montbleau – yes
 Mr. Doherty – yes

(7-0-0) The motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:21 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
 Jordyn M. Isabelle
 Recording Secretary