

APPROVED

**TOWN OF PELHAM
PLANNING BOARD / ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
JOINT MEETING**

August 18, 2014

APPROVED (Planning Board portion) – September 4, 2014

APPROVED (Board of Adjustment) – September 8, 2014

The Planning Board Chairman Peter McNamara called the meeting to order at approximately 7:00pm.

The Planning Board Secretary Paul Dadak called roll:

PRESENT: Peter McNamara, Paul Dadak, Paddy Culbert, Tim Doherty, Jason Croteau, Selectmen Representative Robert Haverty, Alternate Mike Sherman, Planning Director Jeff Gowan

ABSENT: Roger Montbleau, Alternate Joseph Passamonte

Mr. McNamara appointed Mr. Sherman to vote in Mr. Montbleau's absence.

JOINT CASE:

Map 17 Lot 12-180 - EAH REALTY TRUST - 956 Bridge Street

Mr. McNamara called the joint hearing to order. (*The abutter's list and meeting notes would be cross-incorporated into one complete record*). He read the Planning Board and Zoning Board cases aloud as listed on the posted agenda.

Mr. McNamara explained how the joint hearing would be conducted.

PB Case #PL2014-00005

Proposed 8-Lot Conservation Subdivision and Seeking a Special Permit to construct a road through the Wetland Conservation District ('WCD')

Mr. Dadak 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. McNamara provided a brief introduction of the case. He said the plan had been in front of both the Planning Board and Zoning Board. He felt there had been some confusion as to what exactly was being presented and what the options were. The matter was last in front of the Zoning Board. The applicant was asked to attend a joint hearing of the Boards in an effort to clear up what exists and to receive direction for how to proceed.

Mr. Joseph Maynard of Benchmark Engineering, representing the applicant, came forward to discuss the Case. He explained when the project first came in his client was interested in developing and

maximizing the site to see what they could get out of the property. At that time they came up with a yield plan that produced seven lots; they were looking for density offsets to try and get to eight lots. However, a lot of that revolved around making some modifications to the existing structure on the property. Over some time, the applicant preferred to keep the three-family structure, since that's where they resided, and develop the rest of the property. At that point Mr. Maynard said he came back to the Board and explained the situation of maintaining the three-family and developing the remaining land, which subsequently meant a request to the Zoning Board was needed. He put two requests into the Zoning Board to allow the applicant to continue residing in the three-family and still have development potential. In his thinking, the three-family was like three lots and he would reduce the density by roughly that amount. In the end the density wouldn't be any more than they would be allowed if they had the full property. The first request to the Zoning Board was a three lot conservation subdivision (with an approximately 18ft. wide private driveway) plus the three-family house. The second option was to subdivide the property as a conservation subdivision; reduce the yield (to 4-5 lots), but subdivide the three-family off the front and maintain the State's minimum lot size of approximately 1.35 acres for that use.

Mr. McNamara asked for confirmation that the request was no longer for an eight lot subdivision. Mr. Maynard said that was correct; as part of the zoning relief to keep the three-family structure the overall density of the use of the property was being reduced.

MOTION: (Culbert/Dadak) To accept the proposed subdivision for consideration.

VOTE: (7-0-0) The motion carried.

Mr. Doherty stated he was pro-conservation subdivisions, but came to the conclusion that the property was not right for one. He felt the Board had been misled. He said the Board was told at the last meeting that there was a variance (in place) for the multi-family unit as part of the conservation subdivision, but he since learned they didn't. He said the variance was only for a 3-unit building in a residential district, not for a conservation subdivision. Mr. Doherty didn't think the conversation would have gone as far as it did had the Board known that fact.

Mr. McNamara noted that the Board had not made any decisions. He said a variance had been granted (Case #2431 – February 8, 2010) to allow a three-family on the lot (in the residential zone). Mr. Maynard understood the Board's question to be if the three-family was legal, which he found it was. He said when the project started, they were looking to do away with the use. However, when he came back in a few months later, the applicant was seeking to keep the three-family, which was valid based on the variance that had been granted. He noted lot size was discussed, but not stipulated as a condition of that variance.

Mr. Doherty felt Mr. Maynard was avoiding what a conservation subdivision was. He believed the variance was to Section 307-16, Districts Defined, for a regular residential district. He said multi-family was supposed to be in a business district and the variance was for the dwelling to be in a residential district. He said the lot didn't have a variance from Section 307-106, conservation subdivision, which clearly states that only single-family detached residential units shall be permitted. Because the section refers to units (and not lots) the required frontage needed along Route 38 to keep the unit would be 600ft of frontage (200ft. per unit). Mr. Doherty said variances would be needed from the stipulation of single families and the required frontage. He noted they would also lack the lot line delineation between units because they were attached units. He felt the multi-unit structure

couldn't be in the conservation subdivision. Mr. Maynard replied when he left the previous meeting he believed he needed a variance and subsequently submitted an application for such.

For clarity, Mr. McNamara reviewed the information submitted to the Board. He said the applicant currently had a valid variance for the three-family dwelling on the entire property. He believed Mr. Doherty's point was including the three-family building within the request, it was contrary to the conservation subdivision rule.

Mr. Gowan said the applicant was seeking Zoning relief Section 307-12 (Table of Dimensions), 307-14 and 307-106 to allow the existing three-family building to remain on a lot size of 1.35 acres in the context of a modified subdivision. The three new lots will be subdivided on a new driveway meeting the Town's regulations. He asked for a moment to review specific Zoning.

Mr. McNamara stated the decision of whether the variance can go forward was with the Zoning Board. Mr. Doherty felt the applicant was asking for the wrong variances and if those variances were granted, the proposed development still could not come in front of the Planning Board. He said the Board was previously told that the applicant just needed a variance for lot size, but that's not the request that had come forward. He noted that the applicant was seeking a 'carte blanche' variance from Section 307-106 under general requirements for a conservation subdivision. He didn't feel that the request worked in the manner it was written. In reviewing the request, Mr. McNamara didn't have the same interpretation. He knew there was an approved variance from the past and the meeting minutes for such were provided to the Board. He didn't feel any harm had been done and the applicant had put requests in front of the Boards.

Mr. Gowan reviewed Section 307-106 the general requirements of a conservation subdivision. He believed Mr. Maynard was seeking relief for lot sizing (of the three-family) and to allow it to be part of a modified conservation subdivision. He pointed out that anything within Zoning had the potential for relief. Mr. Doherty said the spirit and intent of the ordinances had to be considered when granting variances. Mr. Gowan replied the variance request had not yet been reviewed by the Zoning Board.

Mr. Culbert agreed with Mr. Doherty.

Mr. Sherman asked if the original variance (for the three-family) was granted because they had thirteen acres. Mr. McNamara wasn't present for that meeting, but believed through testimony the board's rationale was because there was so much acreage the land could support three units. Mr. Gowan said the meeting minutes of the original variance were provided to the Zoning Board. He said there was no specific reference to an acreage requirement. Mr. Sherman pointed out that the applicant used the thirteen acres as his reasoning why they should be granted a variance. Mr. McNamara noted the regulations require a multi-unit family to have a minimum of three acres.

Mr. Doherty said he didn't have a problem with the applicant having the variance or subdividing the lot off of the parent parcel. He had a problem with it being part of a conservation subdivision. He said the applicant had the right to subdivide the multi-family lot off and have the remaining parcel come in with a new conceptual for a conservation subdivision. In his opinion, he didn't feel the applicant had the right to have the multi-unit as part of the conservation subdivision or included in a new yield plan. Mr. Maynard said the Zoning Board could place a condition that the lot is not included as part of the conservation subdivision and therefore not included in the documents. Mr. Doherty said the way the variance was worded that lot would be part of the conservation subdivision.

Mr. McNamara said the Zoning Board could place appropriate conditions on a variance. Mr. Doherty said the applicant would then need to do a new yield plan without including the lot. He said he wouldn't have a problem with that occurring.

Mr. McNamara asked for feedback if the Board was comfortable with having three buildings off a private driveway, or if they preferred the road to be up to Town specification.

Mr. Gowan noted there wasn't enough detail for a peer review at this time, but Keach Nordstrom would be involved if the plan moves forward.

Mr. Doherty said if a common driveway was considered for safety reasons it would be fine, but if it was being suggested because of saving costs, he didn't feel it would be appropriate.

Mr. Gowan told the Board that the matter had been discussed by the Highway Safety Committee ('HSC') and they in turn drafted a letter for the Board. Mr. McNamara read the HSC letter (dated April 30, 2014) aloud. After reviewing the proposed subdivision it was the consensus of the HSC that there was very little value in having the proposed project provide a right-of-way to the abutting parcel that may eventually connect to Ledge Road. If the road ends in a cul-de-sac, it would need to be at least 20ft. wide and built to Town road specifications, whether private or public.

The Planning Board deferred further action to allow the Zoning Board to conduct their portion of the meeting.

ZBA Case #ZO2014-00014

Seeking a Variance concerning Article III, Sections 307-12, Table 1, 307-14 & 307-106 to permit the existing 3 family building to remain on a lot size of approximately 1.35 acres with approximately 175ft of frontage on NH Route 38 and three additional lots to be subdivided off on a private driveway with a private road easement as part of a modified conservation subdivision where the 3 new lots will be subdivided on a private driveway meeting the Town's driveway regulations and not constructing the road to a Town standard and therefore the 3 new lots will not have frontage on anything other than the private driveway. If this Variance fails applicant seeks Case #ZO2014-00015.

ZBA Case #ZO2014-00015

Seeking a Variance concerning Article III, Sections 307-12, Table I & 307-14 to permit the existing 3 family building to remain on a lot size of approximately 1.35 acres as part of a conservation subdivision with 175ft. of frontage on Bridge Street and the remainder of frontage on a road to be constructed as part of the development.

Chairman David Hennessey called the meeting of the Zoning Board of Adjustment to order.

The Secretary Bill Kearney called roll:

PRESENT: David Hennessey, Svetlana Paliy, Bill Kearney, Chris LaFrance, Peter McNamara, Alternate Pauline Guay, Alternate Darlene Culbert, Planning Director/Zoning Administrator Jeff Gowan

ABSENT: Alternate Lance Ouellette, Alternate Kevin O'Sullivan

Mr. Joseph Maynard of Benchmark Engineering, representing the applicant read aloud the variance criteria submitted with the application for variance.

Mr. Hennessey asked Mr. Maynard if he received a copy of the February 8, 2010 meeting minutes during which the Board granted the original variance. Mr. Maynard said he read the minutes and saw that the end motion didn't include a stipulation. Mr. Hennessey asked Mr. Maynard to read the answer provided by the applicant's representative as to why the zoning restriction applied with the land owner's reasonable use. Mr. Maynard read "*The property has 13.2 +/- acres which will allow 3 total residences.*" Mr. Hennessey read the following aloud "*Mr. Hennessey felt Mr. Augenstein was eloquent as to why the variance would be justice for him. He pointed out that the variance had to be granted on the basis of the uniqueness of the property. He was unclear what made the property special to be able to grant the variance. Attorney LaBonte said the property was different, given the fact that Mr. Augenstein had 13 acres, which was more than sufficient to handle the residences on the property. He said the owner wanted to keep the property the way it was and not have it subdivided.*" He said obviously someone could change their mind, but the reason the variance was granted was because of the 13.5 acres. Mr. Maynard said that was part of the reason, not the whole reason.

PUBLIC INPUT

Mr. Mark Godin, 5 Wellesley Drive told the Board he was present at the meeting for the original variance. At that time he was in favor of the variance if it allowed the owner to stay in his home for retirement or financial reasons. However, he was against development in his back yard.

Mr. Maynard couldn't say what changed the owner's mind. He said with the first request for the three additional lots and maintaining a good portion of the rear in a conservation area, the lot wouldn't have further development potential. He said the owner was seeking to develop the land and maintain the residence for himself. He felt it was a reasonable request and use of the property.

Mr. Kearney said when the Board granted the original variance there had been discussion regarding lot size and subdivision. In his mind that was a big portion of why the variance was granted. He understood everyone had the right to change their mind, but felt the three-family home would have to have the required property before the Board went forward with any additional subdivision. He was not in favor of having a three-family dwelling on a 1.35 acre lot. Part of the reason he voted in favor of the original variance was based on the having thirteen acres.

Mr. Hennessey noted since the original variance was granted there had been zoning changes. From his part he didn't make a stipulation because he could see there may be some work in the back land and didn't want to limit its use. However, it was in the testimony that one reason the variance was granted is because of the size of the parcel. Mr. Hennessey said he never contemplated that any subdivision would leave 1.35 acres for the three-family, especially given the limited frontage.

Mr. McNamara said if the Board granted a variance, with the stipulation that the parcel not be a part of the conservation subdivision, they would in effect vitiate the initial reason for the first variance. Mr. Hennessey said he wanted the joint meeting to hear the Planning Board's opinion. He believes

the Planning Board was as uneasy as the Zoning Board about having a conservation subdivision with a three-family and three lots.

Mr. Maynard said one request was to reduce the density. He said it was a sizable tract of land, but the difficulty was that the three-family was located in the front corner of the lot. The land was narrow with a wetland area in the rear. He said any real development of the property besides a conservation subdivision or doing away with the three-family use at the front would utilize the whole piece. He explained because the driveway would need to be up to standard and a cistern would need to be added, there had to be some infrastructure that would offset the cost, but at the same time made the three-family use work. He noted the proposal would preserve more than the 40% open space required. Mr. Maynard said it would be difficult to sustain the three-family use because it would be on a three acre parcel, 750ft. deep, which would push everything to the rear of the lot. With the conservation subdivision he viewed the space at the back of the parcel as sewer loading/density. If there is a requirement that the three-family doesn't become part of the conservation subdivision, he would be fine with that decision.

Mr. McNamara believed the applicant had the right to develop the land and felt a conservation subdivision was a great idea because of the wetlands and the structure. He said the sticking point was if either of the variance requests were granted, they would be leaving the 1.35 acres intact with a three-family dwelling. Mr. Maynard said that's why he reduced the density because there was some offset for having the multi-family structure. He understood it would sit on 1.35 acres, but for lot size standard was acceptable to the State. The benefit of the project was having five acres in the rear that would never be developed past the wetland.

Mr. Hennessey said he had considerable issues with the first variance request. With regard to the second request, he said it wasn't appropriate to do 'trading' in zoning. However, he felt the development in the back was an appropriate mechanism.

Mr. Tim Doherty, Planning Board member stated if the Zoning Board voted against the variance, there were plenty of options for the parcel of land. He said spirit & intent was located in two different sections that went along with the purpose of the ordinance and of conservation subdivisions. He reiterated that conservation subdivisions were clearly meant for single-family units, not multi-family units. Mr. Doherty said part of the purpose of conservation subdivision was to minimize confusion over property issues. He said the proposal violated the purpose and didn't cover the spirit & intent.

Mr. Hennessey was familiar with different versions of conservation subdivision ordinances containing mixed uses. He noted the Zoning Board's job is to weigh the advantages to the community under the five criteria versus the written word. He said Mr. Doherty had a point that multi-family was never intended to be in conservation subdivisions.

Mr. Hennessey said the Board would address the variances separately.

BALLOT VOTE
#ZO2014-00014:
Mr. Hennessey – 1) Yes, 2) No, 3) Yes, 4) Yes, 5) No
Ms. Paliy – No to all criteria
Mr. Kearney – 1) Yes, 2) No, 3) Yes, 4) Yes, 5) Yes
Mr. LaFrance – 1) Yes, 2) No, 3) No, 4) Yes, 5) No
Mr. McNamara – No to all criteria

VOTE: (0-5-0) The motion failed.

VARIANCE DENIED

The Board then addressed Case #ZO2014-00015

Mr. Maynard as discussed by the Planning Board, he would accept a condition for the three-family to not technically be within the rights of the conservation subdivision. Mr. Hennessey said the Zoning Board didn't have that power and was limited to what conditions they could impose.

Mr. McNamara felt the Zoning Board could attach reasonable conditions, but was concerned about doing so because it would initiate the original variance. Mr. Hennessey was also hesitant about issuing a variance with the condition because it would overstep the boundary of the Planning Board. Mr. Maynard viewed it as a separate request to primarily subdivide the lot off. He said in terms of density it was part of the project, but he could also see separating the lot out since it had its own septic, well and driveway. Mr. Hennessey believed Mr. Maynard's suggestion to be different from the variance request in front of the Board. He said the variance request wasn't just to separate out a lot from the rest of the land. He said it included the wording about being included as part of a conservation subdivision.

Mr. Gowan commented that the Zoning Board had allowed applicants to modify their request for variance as long as they don't increase their request. Mr. Hennessey replied that the Board had allowed applicants to make substantial changes in front of the Board where discussion had altered the perception of what was in front of the Board. He said they had also allowed applicants to withdraw applications without prejudice. Mr. Gowan told the Board for the three-family to remain on three acres, the frontage and use (within residential district) would need to be varied. He said the applicant may have the ability to modify their variance request.

Mr. Maynard understood that the lesser relief would be to subdivide the lot. Mr. Hennessey believed having it remain a conservation subdivision the Zoning Board was in effect telling the Planning Board how to proceed with the ultimate subdivision of the land. Mr. Maynard understood. He noted if they removed 1.35 acres from the parcel there would be just under nine acres remaining, where ten acres were needed to do a conservation subdivision. He said they would need to come back in front of the Board for having less than the required acreage. Mr. Hennessey said the present case mingled the Planning and Zoning Boards. He said if it was going to take another joint meeting to solve the situation he would like Mr. Maynard to pull the application and work out a solution that made the most sense for the applicant and the Planning Board. He was personally amenable to limit the size of where the three-family was. There was a brief discussion regarding the parcel and noted that there were five acres in front of the wetland area and five acres located behind the wetland. Ms. Paliy said it seemed that the applicant had less developable land than indicated. Mr. Maynard explained there was developable land in front and behind the wetland; to maintain three acres with the multi-family dwelling any future development would be pushed to the east or rear of the site. Ms. Paliy didn't feel the parcel was a good fit for a conservation subdivision. Mr. Maynard didn't agree. He said the intent of conservation subdivisions was to preserve back lands and develop where houses could be clustered to produce shorter roads.

Mr. Hennessey said he would entertain eliminating the word 'conservation' from the variance request which would open up more options. Mr. Maynard had no issue with doing so. He told the Board he had no intent to develop the parcel in any other manner. No one offered a motion.

**BALLOT VOTE
#ZO2014-00015:**

Mr. Hennessey – 1) Yes, 2) Yes, 3) Yes, 4) Yes, 5) No
Ms. Paliy – No to all criteria
Mr. Kearney – 1) No, 2) No, 3) Yes, 4) Yes, 5) No
Mr. LaFrance – 1) Yes, 2) No, 3) No, 4) Yes, 5) No

Mr. McNamara – Yes to all criteria

VOTE: (1-4-0) The motion failed.

VARIANCE DENIED

MOTION: (LaFrance/Kearney) To adjourn the Zoning Board meeting.

VOTE: (5-0-0) The motion carried.

The Zoning Board of Adjustment meeting Adjourned.

PB Case #PL2014-00005 - Continued

Mr. Maynard said would like the opportunity to discuss a new course of action with his client before coming back to the Board. He asked that the case continued for approximately two months to allow for going back in front of the Zoning Board.

The case was date specified to the November 3, 2014 meeting. Mr. McNamara stated abutters would not be receiving additional notification.

(JOINT HEARING ADJOURNED)

PLANNING BOARD HEARINGS

PB Case #PL2014-00018

Map 35 Lot 10-193 & Map 35 Lot 10-191-1

GREEN, Richard, Green & Company - 1-5 Garland Lane - Proposed Conservation Subdivision of the above referenced lots. THIS ITEM WILL NOT BE HEARD AT THIS MEETING, THE FULL APPLICATION HAS NOT YET BEEN RECEIVED.

Mr. Gowan indicated that the application had been received after the present meeting was posted. Abutters will be notified of the hearing, which was scheduled to be heard September 4, 2014.

PB Case #PL2014-00023

Map 10 Lot 13-75

DREME BUILDERS – Bridge Street - Seeking a Special Use Permit to convert existing duplex into condominium form of ownership

(list of abutters was read later in the review process – see below)

Mr. Joseph Maynard of Benchmark Engineering, representing the applicant, came forward to discuss the request.

Mr. Gowan said the property had come up for subdivision and the Board made a determination that it wasn't suitable. He said since it was a fairly large lot the owner had a right to put in a duplex and had submitted a proposal to make a condominium form of ownership.

Mr. Maynard said Dreme Builders had purchased the five parcel that sat between Young's Crossing and Bridge Street. He said in the past the parcel was brought in for subdivision, but was not practical for those purposes. He found that the parcel met the Town's duplex regulations. They applied to the State and were approved for two separate septic systems that met the Town's Ordinances. They also received subdivision approval for the condominium. Mr. Maynard said the bank financing the building asked that the owner apply for the Special Use Permit to ensure it would be granted prior to construction. The condominium documents have gone to the State as part of the subdivision application.

Mr. Culbert recalled the Board only allowing a single-family home on the lot. Mr. Maynard said the lot wouldn't support a subdivision, but the requirements in the Town's Ordinance for duplex lots showed that the lot met more than it needed to. Mr. Culbert asked if the lot had flooding. Mr. Maynard said the duplex would sit to the westerly side of the property where there was a 'shelf'. The driveways were being reviewed by the Department of Transportation for curb cuts. Mr. Culbert questioned where the curb cuts were supposed to be. Mr. Gowan said when the plan came to the Board for subdivision the curb cuts were supposed to be done on Young's Crossing. He noted that the subdivision was denied and the present hearing was in connection with the type of ownership. Mr. Culbert asked if there would be a 'landing' to be even with Bridge Street. Mr. Maynard said based on the topography it made sense to have the garages under the building. There would be landings and turn-arounds at the bottom the driveways (near the structure).

Mr. Dadak 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.

It was noted that there was no need to accept for consideration since the request was not a 'land use' issue.

Mr. Doherty asked if the applicant would be amenable to adding a note to the plan that there would be no further subdivision of the property. Mr. McNamara said the only thing in front of the Board was a change of ownership. Mr. Gowan said the Board's former denial was strongly worded and he couldn't imagine a scenario of someone seeking a further subdivision. Mr. Maynard couldn't foresee a subdivision to create a new lot. He could only envision possibly taking a piece off to help a neighboring lot.

MOTION: (Haverty/Croteau) To approve the Special Permit.

VOTE: (6-0-1) The motion carried. Mr. Culbert abstained.

PB Case #PL2014-00024

Map 8 Lot 9-100

DREME BUILDERS – 319 Windham Road – Seeking a Special Use Permit to convert existing duplex into a condominium form of ownership

Mr. Dadak 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. Joseph Maynard of Benchmark Engineering, representing the applicant, came forward to discuss the request. He said the lot was subdivided earlier in the year and created a duplex lot. The State has granted approval for septic and subdivision. The condominium document had been drafted in accordance with the Town's rules and regulations. They were seeking to change the type of ownership from duplex to condominium use.

MOTION: (Haverty/Croteau) To approve the Special Permit.

VOTE: (7-0-0) The motion carried.

PB Case #PL2014-00025

Map 16 Lots 8-41 & 8-41-1

ROBERT EDWARDS, SR. TRUSTEE – 703, 713 & 715 Bridge Street – Proposed Lot Line Adjustment

Mr. McNamara informed that the matter would not be heard. After reviewing the application for the lot line adjustment it was believed the applicant should seek a clarification of variance with the Zoning Board of Adjustment. The applicant's engineer Meisner Brem requested a continuance. The case was date specified to the September 15, 2014 meeting. Mr. Gowan announced if anyone in the public would like a further explanation of why the applicant needed a variance, they should contact the Planning Department.

DATE SPECIFIED PLAN(S)

September 15, 2014:

PB Case #PL2014-00025 - Map 16 Lots 8-41 & 8-41-1 - ROBERT EDWARDS, SR. TRUSTEE – 703, 713 & 715 Bridge Street

November 3, 2014:

PB Case #PL2014-00005 - Map 17 Lot 12-180 - EAH REALTY TRUST - 956 Bridge Street

MINUTES

June 23, 2014

MOTION: (Croteau/Dadak) To approve the June 23, 2014 meeting minutes as written.

VOTE: (5-0-2) The motion carried. Mr. Culbert and Mr. Sherman abstained; they were not present for the meeting.

July 7, 2014

MOTION: (Croteau/Dadak) To approve the July 7, 2014 meeting minutes as written.

VOTE: (6-0-1) The motion carried. Mr. Culbert abstained.

July 21, 2014

MOTION: (Haverty/Dadak) To approve the July 21, 2014 meeting minutes as amended.

VOTE: (4-0-3) The motion carried. Mr. Sherman, Mr. Croteau abstained; they were not present for the meeting. Mr. Culbert abstained; he left the meeting prior to adjournment.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: (Haverty/Croteau) To adjourn the meeting.

VOTE: (7-0-0) The motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:45pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Charity A. Landry
Recording Secretary