

**APPROVED**  
**TOWN OF PELHAM**  
**ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING**  
**August 10, 2015**

The Chairman David Hennessey called the meeting to order at approximately 7:00 pm.

The Secretary Bill Kearney called roll:

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

**ABSENT:** Chris LaFrance, Alternate Lance Ouellette, Alternate Darlene Culbert,  
Alternate Kevin O'Sullivan

Ms. Guay was appointed to vote.

**CONTINUED HEARING(S)**

**Case #ZO2015-00013**

**BROOKWOOD REALTY GROUP, LLC - Off Tina Avenue, 10 Tina Avenue & 15 Tina Avenue – Seeking a Variance concerning Article IV & V, Sections 307-16 & 307-18 to permit the temporary use of a property to store non-hazardous materials such as steel and other construction materials and to re-grade an area less than 2 acres. The closest of the stored materials is 500ft+ from the end of Tina Avenue**

Mr. Hennessey informed that the applicant requested extension for sixty days and read aloud their written request.

**MOTION:** (McNamara/Kearney) To date specify the case for sixty days.

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

Mr. Gowan noted due to Town Counsel's opinion that the use qualified as a junk yard, it triggered additional variance relief required given the area was directly over the aquifer and aquifer conservation district it was appropriate to provide the applicant additional time.

The case was date specified to Thursday, October 15, 2015.

**HEARINGS**

**Case #ZO2015-00014**

**Map 30 Lot 11-140**

**RODRIGUES, Joseph - 130 West Shore Drive - Seeking a Variance concerning Article III, Section 307-12 to permit a 12ftx18ft shed.**

Mr. Kearney 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.

The applicant Joseph Rodrigues came forward to discuss the variance request. He told the Board he and his wife were year round residents at 130 West Shore Drive and seeking to erect a 12ft.x18ft. shed and a variance to the 15ft. side setback. He noted that the direct abutter at Map 30 Lot 11-139 supported the request and included their written statement to such.

Mr. Rodrigues read aloud the variance criteria as submitted with the application.

Mr. Hennessey noted Mr. Gowan made a point (in his comment memo) about the request being an expansion of a non-conforming use. He said the Board can either ask the applicant to amend the application, or they could consider an approval the grant for an expanded use, which he felt was appropriate. The Board agreed that the variance would imply the approval for an expansion of a non-conforming use.

Mr. Kearney wanted to know the height of the shed. Mr. Rodrigues was unsure; the shed would be a Reeds Ferry shed. He informed the Board that he received a Shore Line permit. Mr. Hennessey noted he had been by the property; a shed wouldn't block anyone's view. Mr. Kearney asked how far off the lot line the shed would sit. Mr. Rodrigues replied the shed would be right on the lot line. He noted that the abutter was his daughter and son-in-law. Mr. Hennessey informed that a variance ran with the land. Mr. Rodrigues replied when passed away his daughter and son-in-law would own his property.

On the site plan, Mr. McNamara saw there was an existing shed to be relocated. He asked if it would be torn down or moved. Mr. Rodrigues stated the existing shed was not his.

Mr. Hennessey opened the hearing for public input. No one came forward.

Mr. Hennessey stated he had been by the property. It was a very narrow lot and nothing would be blocked with the proposed shed.

Mr. Gowan read aloud the letter from the abutter at 136 West Shore Drive in support of the variance.

**BALLOT VOTE**                      Mr. Hennessey – Yes to all criteria  
**#ZO2015-00014:**                      Ms. Paliy – Yes to all criteria  
   Mr. Kearney – Yes to all criteria  
   Mr. McNamara – Yes to all criteria  
   Ms. Guay – Yes to all criteria

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

#### **VARIANCE GRANTED**

#### **Case #ZO2015-00015**

#### **Map 30 Lot 11-188**

#### **LAWSON, William - 19 Grace Road - Seeking a Variance concerning Article VII, Section 307-39 to permit a deck within the Wetland Conservation District**

Mr. Kearney 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.

The applicant, William Lawson came forward to discuss his variance request. He would like to construct an open deck (11ft in length by 12ft. 6inches) using a composite deck system. The stairway will have a landing at the top and lead down to the ground surface. The deck will be used for personal enjoyment

and an additional egress. He told the Board that there were a number of homes with similar decks (some larger and closer to the water) around the water; desired he stated he would produce photographs of such.

Mr. Lawson read aloud the variance criteria as submitted with his application.

Mr. Hennessey asked for an explanation of the exits from the property. Mr. Lawson said they had exits, but was concerned with the front exits possibly being blocked if a tree fell. He noted the tree can't be reviewed because it was too close to the shore line. He said having an additional exit to the rear of the home would be beneficial.

Mr. McNamara reviewed the depiction of the house and deck. He confirmed that the proposed deck would be constructed on the pond side of the home. Mr. Lawson answered yes; the deck would allow for an additional emergency exist. The pond side had a sliding glass door that lead nowhere. It was noted the house was currently 34ft. from the water; with the deck they would be approximately 23ft. from water.

Mr. Kearney wanted to know if any clearing was required. Mr. Lawson replied there was nothing in the location. They would use sono tubes in compliance with codes when constructing the deck.

Mr. Gowan stated that the applicant had received a Shore Land permit by notification. A copy of which was included in the Board's informational packets.

Mr. Hennessey opened the hearing to public input. No one came forward.

Mr. McNamara noted in parts of the neighborhood it was the exception, rather than the rule, that there were decks and other structures within the Wetland Conservation District ('WCD'). He felt it was getting to the point that the part of the variance responsive to that type of situation was becoming unenforceable. He said the Board would be hard pressed to deny an applicant given there were so many properties that had decks going into the WCD. Mr. Hennessey replied the application in front of the Board differed due to the safety aspect and because they were proposing an open deck allowing water to flow through. Impermeable surface wouldn't be expanded.

**BALLOT VOTE**                      Mr. Hennessey – Yes to all criteria  
**#ZO2015-00015:**                  Ms. Paliy – Yes to all criteria  
    Mr. Kearney – Yes to all criteria  
    Mr. McNamara – Yes to all criteria  
    Ms. Guay – Yes to all criteria

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

## **VARIANCE GRANTED**

### **Case #ZO2015-16** **Map 30 Lot 11-226**

**CALDWELL, Richard & DOUCETTE, Karla - 43 South Shore Drive - Seeking a Variance concerning Article III, Section 307-8 (C) to permit the addition of a second floor to a home on a non-conforming lot. The footprint/foundation of the home will not change, the second floor will be added to the structure currently in place and will consist of the same dimensions.**

*It was noted that the abutter list would be read once for Case #ZO2015-00016 and #ZO2015-00017; however, the Board would consider the cases separately.*

Mr. Kearney 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.

The applicant, Richard Caldwell came forward to discuss his request for Variance. He told the Board he and his wife had resided in Pelham for approximately five years and were in the process of selling their home. They recently purchased a home at 43 South Shore Drive and were seeking the first variance to add a second floor to the home. He provided the Board with the architectural plans and noted the septic design was approved earlier in the day. He also indicated receiving e-mail confirmation from Shore Land Protection that his proposal wouldn't go against their program.

Mr. Caldwell read aloud his response to the Variance criteria as submitted with the application.

Mr. Hennessey said when facing across the street (with one's back to the existing home), he questioned who owned the land. Mr. Caldwell replied with his back to the pond, the neighbor to his right also owned property across the street. Mr. Hennessey confirmed the total height was roughly 27ft. from grade. Mr. Caldwell believed that to be true.

Mr. McNamara wanted to know if there would be a property behind the applicant's property that would have their view impacted. Mr. Hennessey commented that the Board was always concerned with blocking someone's view to the pond and had been known to impose height restrictions. Mr. Caldwell explained his house was located toward the property line so the septic area across the street lined up directly. Mr. McNamara noted with a majority of the homes in the area having second floors, it was becoming the character of the neighborhood which would make it hard pressed for the Board to deny the variance. Mr. Hennessey didn't feel the area houses were true 2-story homes, they were more of a 1.5 story structures such as a cottage and/or cape. Mr. Caldwell displayed photographs of neighboring homes to provide a comparison to what he proposed.

Mr. Kearney reviewed the plan and saw there were five properties across from the applicant (on the land side) and questioned if any of them were currently developed. Mr. Caldwell replied to the left of his lot there wasn't much development; however to the right of his lot and further down the road was developed. Mr. Kearney questioned if increasing the height of the existing home would block anyone's view to the pond. Mr. Caldwell replied no one currently had a view through his lot, so raising the existing structure wouldn't block anyone.

Mr. Hennessey opened the hearing to public input. No one came forward.

Mr. Hennessey indicated he went to the neighborhood earlier in the day and saw that the applicant's property was small and the house sat in the corner of the lot. He felt the request was reasonable and noted there was a slight grade toward the pond making the height less than what the Board had approved elsewhere.

For the public, Mr. Gowan clarified the comment about the septic being across the road. He explained on conforming lots where there is a Town/State owned road in between it wouldn't be allowed to have a septic across the street. In this instance with a section of private road the homeowner owns the portion across the private drive. Mr. Caldwell told the Board there was already a septic system in the proposed location. When reviewing a new system they reviewed a 'clean solutions' system and were told it would be best to have a new system in the same location as the existing system. The proposed system would be an upgrade to a bigger system.

**BALLOT VOTE**  
**#ZO2015-00016:**

Mr. Hennessey – Yes to all criteria  
Ms. Paliy – Yes to all criteria  
Mr. Kearney – Yes to all criteria

Mr. McNamara – Yes to all criteria  
Ms. Guay – Yes to all criteria

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

**VARIANCE GRANTED**

**Case #ZO2015-00017**

**Map 30 Lot 11-226**

**CALDWELL, Richard & DOUCETTE, Karla - 43 South Shore Drive - Seeking a Variance concerning Article VII, Section 307-41 (B) to permit the addition of a deck to a home within a wetland conservation area. The proposed deck will run the length of the back of the home (24 feet) and will extend an extra 3.5 feet to accommodate a staircase along the side of the house and will be 10 feet deep.**

*It was noted that the abutter list would be read once for Case #ZO2015-00016 and #ZO2015-00017; however, the Board would consider the cases separately.*

The applicant, Richard Caldwell, told the Board they were seeking a Variance to be allowed to construct a deck on the side of the house closest to the water. Currently there is nothing on that side of the home and were looking to have a second means of egress. He spoke to Shore Land about the deck and was told as long as it was shorter than 12feet deep they would be able to receive approval by notification. The proposed deck will run the length of the home and extend out enough to run a staircase.

Mr. Caldwell read aloud the Variance criteria as submitted with his application.

Mr. Hennessey questioned if the flooring of the deck would be permeable. Mr. Caldwell replied it would be permeable.

Mr. Kearney wanted to know how far the deck would be from the water. Mr. Caldwell said he used a tape measure. The home was currently 35feet away from the water. The proposed deck would extend 10feet from the home. Mr. Kearney questioned if the lot would be cleared of any shrubs and/or trees. Mr. Caldwell replied the home hadn't been lived in for many years. There were some overgrown areas that would be taken out; nothing substantial.

Mr. McNamara noticed on the schematics there were two windows and a door that would remain on the lower level. He questioned if they went into the home proper. Mr. Caldwell stated they went into the basement and would remain as such.

Mr. Hennessey opened the hearing to public input. No one came forward.

Mr. McNamara questioned if the majority of homes in the neighborhood had decks. Mr. Caldwell replied he didn't do a count , but felt it would be in the range of 50% or more.

**BALLOT VOTE**  
**#ZO2015-00017:**

Mr. Hennessey – Yes to all criteria  
Ms. Paliy – Yes to all criteria  
Mr. Kearney – Yes to all criteria  
Mr. McNamara – Yes to all criteria  
Ms. Guay – Yes to all criteria

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

**VARIANCE GRANTED****Case #ZO2015-00018****Map 30 Lot 11-335**

**CONSTANT, Daniel & Debra - 2 Springdale Lane - Seeking a Variance concerning Article III, Section 307-12 & Table 1 to permit construction of a single family home 10 feet from the side property lines and 12 feet from a private right-of-way that was never constructed.**

Mr. Kearney 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 Variance request. He explained that the property had come in front of the Board last year to allow construction on a lot with no frontage. Subsequently the variance was granted contingent upon the lot being a minimum of one acre in size. He stated they were working to make the adjustment to lot to make it one acre. During the past year the applicant had been deciding what they wanted to do with the property and where they would like to build their house on the lot. They would like to keep the new house in the same area as the existing camp. This location provided a good view of the water and was somewhat even with the year-round home on the southeast of the applicant's existing home. Mr. Maynard noted if they were to push the home back it would put it into the set of power lines that fed the area. Therefore moving the house back would require them to push it a considerable distance behind the power lines to allow for the construction of the dwelling. Ultimately, the applicant would like to keep the home down on the water side of the lot and were seeking a 10ft side setback. They were also seeking a 12ft. setback (of the deck on the front of the house) to a paper road that was never constructed.

Mr. Maynard read aloud the Variance criteria as submitted with the application.

Mr. McNamara asked for the approximate square footage of the existing dwelling and the size of the proposed dwelling. Mr. Maynard replied his client stated 26ftx26ft. The new dwelling was proposed to be 36ft.x 60ft with a 12ft. porch on the front. Mr. McNamara questioned the distance between the existing dwelling and the side setback. Mr. Maynard replied it met the existing side setback. Mr. McNamara understood that the proposed home would be substantially larger than the existing home. Mr. Maynard answered yes; the existing home is a camp constructed in the 1920's. In reference to the meeting minutes when the applicant last came in front of the Board, Mr. McNamara confirmed nothing had been done on the two acre lot and questioned if there were any plans to do anything. Mr. Maynard stated nothing had been done and there were no plans at this time. Mr. McNamara saw that the plot plan indicated lot 11-335 contained 1.00 acres. He understood the engineering had been done, but paperwork hadn't yet been submitted. Mr. Maynard stated that was correct; the paperwork hadn't yet been filed. Mr. McNamara asked why the applicant was back in front of the Board. Mr. Maynard replied the location where the applicant wanted to build the house was the most reasonable location to keep a home on the property due to the slope of the land to keep views of the pond and not interfere with the power lines that crossed through. Mr. McNamara questioned if the expansion of the proposed home would block any abutter views of lake. Mr. Maynard replied there was no one located behind the lot.

Mr. Kearney wanted to know how far back from the lake the house would have to be moved to meet the 15ft setback. Mr. Maynard told the Board they would have to move the house approximately 80ft. back to avoid the existing power lines.

Mr. Hennessey opened the hearing to public input.

Marjorie and Charles Haggerty of 120 High Plain Road, Andover, MA (owners of Map 30 Lots 336 & 351) came forward. Ms. Haggerty told the Board they were dual abutters and had purchased Lot 336 in December, 2014. She noted one intention of doing so was to prevent further development of the area and retain the tranquility of the area enjoyed for approximately 85 years. During the last hearing in front of the Board, the applicant was only allowed to build one property on their existing land. She noted with the reconfiguration the applicant would be enabled to have three properties. She further noted the waterfront lot was not assigned a lot number. Ms. Haggerty told the Board they considered the proposal a significant hardship on them. She stated they had no need to purchase additional property, but had spent a considerable amount of money doing so to prevent further development of the area. She noted the abutting property was in trust to her brother. Ms. Haggerty was concerned that granting the variance would allow the applicant to build a duplex and have their current dwelling. She spoke of the time when the previous owners (Kimball family) sold the property to the applicant everyone was made well aware that the Kimball family intentionally kept part of the back lot so it could never be developed. Ms. Haggerty stated they had engaged an engineer and surveyed their back lot. Mr. Haggerty added they wanted to use the back area for a leach field and received notification from Dig Safe regarding such. Ms. Haggerty explained they had limited area in which to place their septic, given they would also need a well. They considered requesting a variance for encroachment on their very limited lot. In addition, she didn't understand the stated difficulty with the power lines and thought it may be possible to have them moved without significant financial burden. Ms. Haggerty stated the applicant's proposal imposed on the closest abutters and put the applicant in close proximity.

Mr. Charles Body told the Board he had an interest in a property located two properties from the applicant. He pointed out there was a buildable envelope on the applicant's lot. He stated if the existing structure were torn down a new structure could be built without the necessity of a variance. He felt perhaps the existing power lines (toward the rear) could be relocated but at the same time understood there was a delicate balance between water views and Zoning compliance. Mr. Body commented that the hardship was on building the structure as contemplated and perhaps it couldn't be built within the same envelope. He reiterated an adequate structure could be built without a variance. Mr. Body stated his issue was the substantial development of the lot area and of the use, given the proposed home would get close to tripling the size of the structure. He felt it wouldn't be a bad idea to remove the existing structure and build something to modern taste that would still comply with Zoning such as it exists. He commented that the setback distance wasn't substantial; however, the more noteworthy fact was part of the enjoyment of the properties was the isolation. The purpose of the setbacks was to provide a certain degree of privacy. Mr. Body felt allowing someone to build closer, particularly when they could otherwise build reasonably and not encroach on the setbacks, seemed to be improper and an abuse of discretion. He spoke of alternatives that wouldn't impose on the side setback. He didn't feel there was a hardship that related to the topography or buildable envelope of the applicant's lot that didn't otherwise affect other lots in the area.

Mr. Hennessey brought the discussion back to the Board, but left the public input portion open.

Mr. Maynard understood Springdale enjoyed being an isolated area for a large number of years but didn't see that it was different from any other side of the pond. He believed it was a matter of time before people wanted to upgrade their properties. He spoke the design of the proposed home, noting that a deck was typical of a lake house. The house was faced in a way to get the most view of the lake as possible. He noted people typically want to build 'up' because of constraints; the applicant was trying to build a one-story house that would be suitable for the neighborhood.

Ms. Paliy wanted to know why the power lines couldn't be moved. Mr. Maynard replied there is typically an easement associated with power lines; that research hasn't been done. He told the Board the last power line he had done was in Windham, NH where it cost his client \$30,000 just to move the pole. Ms. Paliy was familiar with the property, but wanted a site walk. She noted she moved a power line at no

cost because they didn't have an easement and it was in the wrong location. Mr. Maynard replied his client had been researching the easement, but had some difficulties dealing with Fair Point.

Mr. McNamara asked Mr. Maynard about other properties in the area that encroached within the side setbacks. Mr. Maynard replied an extensive amount of work was done for the prior owner; a lot of the homes were close to the lot line and two houses down from the applicant's property there was a home over the lot line. Given the size of the proposed home, Mr. McNamara felt it would be a minor adjustment to make up the five feet. Mr. Maynard replied there was five feet each side for a total of ten feet. He noted taking ten feet from a ranch-style home was a considerable chunk.

Ms. Haggerty commented about the notation of a right-of-way between properties impacted her family's two cottages. She stated they were already encroached upon by the right-of-way. She explained that the previous owner (Kimball) bought the right-of-way (slice off the back lot) so that area couldn't be developed. She reiterated they were already encroached upon and the applicant's proposed encroachment would be a further injustice.

Mr. Hennessey closed the public hearing. He commented that the other cases dealt with situations that were already in place; the case in front of them was a new property in the area. He felt difference was that the applicant's hardship was self-imposed. He said there was no reason for having a 60ft. structure other than it being the applicant's preference.

Mr. Kearney added that the applicant had options for the location and size of the house without requiring any variances. Ms. Paliy reiterated her request for a site walk so she could better understand why the request was in front of the Board. She noted it was a large lot and wanted to see the reason for the variance.

Mr. Hennessey reviewed the criteria. He didn't see how the variance was not contrary to the public interest given the issues brought up by the abutters. He didn't feel that the spirit had been observed with the location or substantial justice had been done. Based on the proposed home, agreed with the applicant that the values of homes wouldn't be affected. He felt the special conditions of the property were being created by the size of the structure.

Mr. McNamara understood the abutter's concerns and noted if anyone wanted to limit development next to them, they buy the lot. He noted that the applicant was asking for a one third reduction in an area that had existing dwellings that were close to lot lines. He agreed that a smaller home would be more appropriate on the parcel and it could be placed in such a way so the Board wouldn't be discussing a lot line adjustment. The Board had to take the application as presented. Given what was in front of the Board, Mr. Hennessey saw no hardship.

In looking at the criteria, Ms. Guay agreed. She said the only one not affected was in regard to diminishing the value of surrounding property. She felt the proposed was self-imposed and would be a very intense use of the lot. She believed there was sufficient room on the property to build within the confines of the setback requirements.

In Mr. Kearney's opinion there was an opportunity for the applicant to conform to the Town's rules and regulations. There were other locations the applicant could construct a home. Mr. McNamara replied the Board wasn't reviewing 'a house' they were being asked to consider the proposal. Mr. Hennessey stated the Board had to review what was in front of them and discuss hardship. Mr. McNamara pointed out other cases had come in front of the Board with hardship because of the lot size. Mr. Kearney replied that the difference with other cases was the size of the lot. In this case the property was an acre, which provided the applicant with other options to conform; in other cases the applicant didn't have the opportunity to move locations.



Ms. Paliy felt the proposal would cause diminution to other properties because it would cause overcrowding. She reiterated her desire to conduct a site walk to determine if the proposed made sense. She felt there was too much information not presented, such as who owned the power lines. Mr. Hennessey entertained a motion for site walk. Ms. Paliy made a motion to conduct a site walk. Mr. McNamara seconded the motion. He didn't feel a site walk would clarify the issue of the power lines. He believed the applicant had explained the reasons for the size and location of the house. He was unsure if a site walk would provide the Board with any new information. Ms. Paliy wanted to see the proposed location of the house with other houses and why it wouldn't make sense elsewhere.

**MOTION:** (Paliy/McNamara) To conduct a site walk.

**VOTE:** (2-3-0) The motion failed. Ms. Paliy and Mr. McNamara voted in the affirmative. The remainder of the Board voted in opposition.

Mr. Hennessey reopened public input to give the applicant and public an opportunity to respond.

Mr. Maynard felt it would be prudent to see the site because there was a rising slope behind the property. He noted a small portion of the area behind home had been excavated; if they push the home back it would be raised up. He noted the cottage had been built in the location for the best views of the water and the area was the best spot for a dwelling.

Mr. Haggerty wanted to know if they could have input for when the site walk occurred. Mr. Hennessey replied the Board voted down a site walk but would reconsider. Mr. McNamara heard Ms. Paliy say she didn't have enough information before her to make an informed decision and her additional questions might be addressed at a site walk. Mr. Hennessey asked if Ms. Guay or Mr. Kearney would reconsider a site walk. Mr. Kearney was comfortable with what the Board saw the last time they walked the site (12-16 months ago). There was nothing brought to his attention that may need additional consideration. Ms. Guay agreed. The Board did not reconsider their vote regarding a site walk.

**BALLOT VOTE** Mr. Hennessey – 1) No, 2) No, 3) No, 4) Yes, 5) No  
**#ZO2015-00018:** Ms. Paliy – No to all criteria  
 Mr. Kearney – 1) No, 2) No, 3) No, 4) Yes, 5) No  
 Mr. McNamara – Yes to all criteria  
 Ms. Guay - 1) No, 2) No, 3) No, 4) Yes, 5) No

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

## **VARIANCE DENIED**

### **DATE SPECIFIED CASE(S) - Thursday, October 15, 2015**

Case #ZO2015-00013 - BROOKWOOD REALTY GROUP, LLC - Off Tina Avenue, 10 Tina Avenue & 15 Tina Avenue

### **MINUTES REVIEW**

**July 13, 2015:**

**MOTION:** (McNamara/Kearney) To approve the July 13, 2015 meeting minutes as written.

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

**July 20, 2015:**

**MOTION:** (Kearney/McNamara) To approve the Zoning Board's portion of the July 20, 2015 joint meeting minutes as written.

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

**July 25, 2015:**

**MOTION:** (McNamara/Kearney) To approve the July 26, 2015 site walk meeting minutes as written.

**VOTE:** (4-0-1) The motion carried. Mr. Hennessey abstained.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION:** (McNamara/Paliy) To adjourn the meeting.

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

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:55pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Charity A. Landry  
Recording Secretary