

**ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MARCH 6, 2019 MEETING
DRAFT MINUTES**

Attendees: Acting Chairman Nicholas Wallner, Andrew Winters, Jim Monahan, and Scott Sakowski. Laura Scott arrived at 7:35 pm

Absent: Christopher Carley, Rob Harrison

Staff: Craig Walker, Zoning Administrator
Rose Fife, Clerk of the Board

Meeting commenced at 7:01 pm.

08-19 Jon & Jennifer Lamoureux: Applicants wish to expand an existing single-family dwelling lacking frontage on an accepted City street and requests the following:

- 1) Relief from RSA 674:41, Erection of Buildings on Streets: Appeals, to permit the issuance of Building Permits for a lot that does not have frontage on a Class V or better highway,
 - 2) Variance to Article 28-8-3(c)(2), Conditions for Development of Non-conforming Lots, Section (a), to permit the issuance of Building Permits and construction on a lot that does not have frontage on an accepted City street where a minimum of 22 feet of frontage is required,
- for property located at 31 Temi Road in an RM Residential Medium Density (w/o sewer) District.

Testified: Jennifer Lamoureux. She has lived at this location for 19 years. They have 3 children. They would like to add family room on off the rear of the home. They would also like to gain 1 bedroom, and combine 2 bedrooms into one. Winters: Where is the entry way to their property? Mr. Walker showed the entry on the GIS maps (driveway from Guay Street). They have a paved easement to gravel drive. Sakowski: How wide is the right of way? Ms. Lamoureux was not sure. Walker: According to the map approximately 10 to 12 feet. Monahan: Did you build the house? Ms. Lamoureux: The house was built in 1968 and they are the 3rd owners. They purchased the home in June 2000. Walker: Lack of frontage is the issue in front of the Board. Winters: When it was originally built without frontage, was that allowed? Walker: It may have been allowed in 1969 or an approved paper streets back then. Winters: Possibly the paper street was to be tied in. Walker: Possibly. Ms. Lamoureux: Eversource power lines come into the side of the property and they own an easement. Sakowski: Are they keeping it a single family residence. Ms. Lamoureux: Yes they are keeping it a single family residence.

In favor: Daniel Prescott, River Road, Epsom NH. He is a trustee of the abutting property. He grew up there. He is the primary abutter at 149 Pembroke Road. The Lamoureux's are good neighbors. Both he and his mother and sister are all in favor of this expansion. The property is off the main line of travel so there is no visual impact to neighborhood. This is an oversized lot compared to others in the neighborhood. This will increase the value of the property and tax revenue for the City of Concord.

In opposition: none.

Code: none.

DECISION: Winters: Does RSA 674:41 give the Board the power to allow development when there is no frontage. Walker explained. It enables the Zoning Board to grant relief from a State RSA. Winters: Are there a lot of land locked property in Concord. Walker: There are several homes on private streets (Walker explained private streets and an ordinance that allows issuance of BPs.)

A motion to approve for both requests was made by Monahan and seconded by Sakowski. Monahan: It's a reasonable request. The frontage issues are something they inherited and the addition is fine within the context of setbacks, it does not appear to create an unreasonable safety issue, etc. Motion passed by a 4-0 vote.

09-19 Daval Realty: Applicant wishes to construct a new warehouse/wholesale storage/distribution facility (Principal Use K-7) with an accessory retail outlet (Accessory Use B-9) and requests a Variance to the Supplemental Standards, Article 28-5-39, Retail Sales Accessory to a Principal Manufacturing or Wholesale Use, to allow an accessory retail area occupying 2,990 SF of floor area where the Ordinance permits a maximum of 2,500 SF of floor area for property located on a portion of the vacant property currently known as 108 Old Turnpike Road in a IN Industrial District.

Testified: Attorney Laura Hartz of Orr and Reno. She represents Daval Realty and Banks Auto. They want to build a new distribution center for Sanel Auto Parts on Banks' Chevrolet property. She gave an overview of the property via power point. It is a 17 acre parcel. The municipal airport is on the right. They want to develop a 5 acre portion of the 17 acre lot. They will be subdividing off the 5 acres they'd like to build on. The building is 36,000 s.f. with 22,292 s.f. devoted to the warehouse and 2,977 s.f. devoted to the retail part of

the property. The office space, which will hold Human Resources and payroll, etc. will be 10,932 s.f. This will be their corporate offices. They will have two separate driveway entrances, one on Old Turnpike Road and one on Ripley Street. There are loading docks on the rear of the building. The power point presentation showed the layout of the interior building. There will be a portion of the building used for retail. They are allowed 2,500 s.f. They would like 490 s.f. more. That would allow them to display inventory.

The variance is not contrary to the public interest as it won't threaten public safety or welfare. Granting the variance will not change the character of the neighborhood as the area has a fair amount of distribution and wholesale use. In 2002 this Board granted Company C 10,000 s.f. of retail space. They are asking for 1/3 of that space. Monahan: How did they come up with the 2,500 s.f. amount? Attorney Hartz: It is in the Ordinance. As far as the spirit of the ordinance: The purpose of the ordinance is to make sure the retail space maintains their secondary position. Most of the building's design is dedicated to wholesale storage. Substantial justice: They are only asking for a slight increase of retail space. This will not cause a diminution in property value. Hardship: There are several special conditions on the property. The lot is undeveloped. A big portion of the property is in the IN district. Sakowski: The hardship is tied to the customer expectations. Why wouldn't 2,500 s.f. meet their customer's expectations.

Erin Lambert of Wilcox/Barton testified. The original design was larger. If they would go any smaller they would have to eliminate an entire row of product. They have a 2 story racking system right behind the retail space. This is the smallest amount of space that would allow this set up to work.

Matt Damori, of Sanel's testified. This is the right amount of space due to the expansion of car manufacturers, etc. The breadth and depth of vehicles has grown. Customer's want selections. The calculation is based on vehicles in operation, i.e. what kind of cars are people driving. Product needs to be in front of the customers, not stored where they can't see it. It also allows them to display some bulk material. They do auto parts, paint body and equipment and heavy duty truck parts. Ease of access will enhance customer experience. They are on Manchester Street now and don't have that size space for display.

Winters: They have retail stores all over NH. Would this wholesale building support those stores? Mr. Damori: It would support approximately 8 stores. Winters: Why are retail stores connected to distribution center? Mr. Damori: They run about 3,500 s.f. of retail space.

** (7:35 pm Laura Scott, alternate Board member arrived.) **

Monahan: What is on the property now? Attorney Hartz: It's undeveloped. Monahan: Will the retail store on Manchester Street be replaced by this one? Mr. Damori: It will be replaced by this one. Monahan: What about signage. Ms. Lambert: There will be a freestanding sign as well as an affixed sign. They intend to comply with the Ordinance. Monahan: What about parking. Ms. Lambert: Parking conforms. Monahan: Lot coverage? Ms. Lambert: Approximately 47% lot coverage. They comply with setbacks and parking. Monahan: One story? Ms. Lambert: The office is 2 stories and the rest of the building is one story but the racking system will be the whole height.

In favor: Tracy Banks. Represents Daval and Banks Chevrolet. Sanel's has been a neighbor for over 62 years. She's in favor.

In opposition: Jim Cholette, 8 Ripley Street. He likes the plan but has concerns. He has concern with having two entrances, one of which is on Ripley Street. Ripley Street has signage at both ends saying no thru trucks and is a narrow road. Mr. Cholette is concerned with the narrowness of Ripley Street.

Code: Walker: The existing facility on Manchester Street is a nonconforming use at that location. The layout isn't particularly good for truck traffic, etc. It is, in his opinion, a functionally obsolete location.

Letter in support from Company C in favor.

Rebuttal: Attorney Laura Hartz. They have reached out to the City's Traffic Engineer. The purpose of two entrances is for smooth truck/traffic flow. They will work with the abutters to alleviate their concerns. Monahan: What about the volume of truck traffic. Attorney Hartz: They do not know what that would be at this time. It's not all 18 wheelers. Some are boxed trucks. Mr. Damori: They aren't quite sure but right now they run substantial trucks out of Manchester Street and they are expecting it to be 50% less due to the reduction in space. They expect shipments to come sporadically throughout the week. Monahan: Is the driveway on Old Turnpike Road anticipated to be two way traffic. Mr. Damori: Yes it is.

DECISION: Monahan: The hardship is that the retail experience is different today. Winters: Their business is not the average retail experience. He doesn't believe it will create traffic issues. A motion to approve the request was made by Winters, seconded by Sakowski and passed by a 4-0 vote.

10-19 [125 NSS, LLC. \(Fred Potter, Managing Member\)](#): Applicant wishes to expand an existing professional office (Principal Use F-1), established by Variance, by adding 12,836 of new office, conference room and storage and a carriage house with a 5 vehicle capacity (accessory parking structure, Accessory Use B-3), and requests the following:

- 1) A Variance to Article 28-2-4(j), The Table of Principal Uses, and in accordance with Article 28-8-2(d), Status of Uses Established by Variance, to allow the addition of 6,874 SF +/- of office space, a 997 SF +/- conference room, 4,965 SF +/- of basement and storage areas (total new gross floor area = 12,836 SF +/-), and a 5 vehicle accessory parking structure.
- 2) A Variance to Article 28-2-4(k), (Uses) Accessory to a Non-residential Use, to permit an accessory parking structure (carriage house) where parking structures are not permitted as accessory to a principal non-residential use,
- 3) A Variance to Article 28-4-1(h), The Table of Dimensional Regulations, and Article 28-4-1(f), Maximum Height of Structures, to allow a maximum building height of 43 feet where a maximum height of 35 feet is allowed,
- 4) A Variance to Article 28-7-2(e), Table of Off-Street Parking, to allow the provision of 28 parking spaces when 69 are required, (Total gross floor area = 20,663, Parking 1 space/300 SF of gross floor area = 68.87 (69) parking spaces) for property located at 125 North State Street in an RN Residential Neighborhood District.

Laura was part of the Board from here forward.

Attorney Kelly Ovitt Puc of Sulloway and Hollis testified. Also Fred Potter and Engineer Chin Chang.

Attorney Ovitt Puc had a power point presentation. They were before the Board last June. This property is on the corner of N. State Street and Franklin Street. In June 2018 they were coordinating with Jon Chorlian with the St. Peter's project. That project had been approved. The collaboration never moved forward. They have returned looking for relief for 125 N. State Street needing to expand his building. This is independent of the St. Peter's project. Monahan: Would June's approval affect shared parking, etc. Attorney Ovitt Puc: The sharing parking will no longer happen.

Fred Potter spoke regarding the businesses he owns and operates. Two primary businesses. Kidz Vac's which supplies vaccine funding for 6 states. Legacy Wise is another business. It is an estate document preparation program. They have 3 years of software development and will be prototyping at this facility. They serve elderly and low income individuals. This also allows them to deal with handicapped accessibility. They have a professional accounting firm in the building. In the next 3-5 years they will have other businesses there.

Attorney Ovitt Puc: Fred Potter acquired this building in 2014. The property is in the RN district which is mainly residential. There are other commercially used buildings. This property has been used as an office for approximately 40 years. This Board granted a variance for office use in 1980. Low intensity uses. The eyesore is the exterior stair off the back of the building. It is a 1 acre lot which is large for this area. It has 29 parking spaces that exist now. She showed the plan that was approved in June 2018. Originally Mr. Potter was going to acquire the Manse on the St. Peter's campus but will no longer be doing that. The conference room on front is identical to what it was. Legacy Wise program will hold seminars mainly on the weekends. Off the back they showed a connector from the original building to add 8 offices; two in the basement, two on the first, second and third floors. They will have an elevator. Accessibility is a huge component of this design. They will have ground level entrance to the building. The building has existing office space. She showed photos of the property. The elevator shaft is the part that exceeds the height limitation. They will not be removing any of the green space out front. She also showed site line projections.

They are requesting variances to expand nonconforming offices uses. Also to allow a parking structure as an accessory use even though it is attached. If this were residential use, a garage would be allowed. It will be a modest parking structure. The size is consistent with the carriage house on St. Peter's campus lot. They are also looking to permit maximum building height up to 43 feet. They tried to minimize it as much as possible but it is only because of the elevator shaft. They are requesting a variance for parking. Calculations would require them to have 69 spaces but they only have 28 spaces. They conducted a parking study in February 2018. The average number of vehicles parked there was 8 and the maximum number was 11 parking spaces used. At most they think they would use 25 spaces. Winters: How many total offices would be there? Attorney Ovitt Puc: A total of 25, which includes the reception desk. Winters: Are people not in the office a lot. Mr. Potter: His business has 4 people there typically. Three of his offices are primarily vacant. Wallner: If they subtracted out the unused space, what would the parking need to be. Ms. Chang: Approximately 41 parking spaces. Attorney Ovitt Puc: There will also be 2 handicapped spaces provided. Wallner: What about on street parking. Mr. Potter: There is some on street parking on Franklin Street. They did a count and no one utilized on street parking. Monahan: Will there be expansion of the leased office space. Mr. Potter: The newly constructed space would be leased while they are growing Legacy Wise. That would be a 3-5 year build out. Monahan: Would this be a work/live situation in this building? Attorney Ovitt Puc said no. Winters: There is a lot of space in the building that is not functionally being used. Attorney Ovitt Puc agreed. They are trying to preserve the value of the building and the neighborhood. Monahan: The variance goes with the property. The concern is not what they are doing, but what they may be doing 12 years from now.

Attorney Ovitt Puc went through the criteria of a variance. Denial would result in unnecessary hardship. Due to the unique condition of this property what they are requesting is reasonable. This is a large lot for this neighborhood. It's a historic property. The existing use is going to be enhanced. They are not changing the use. They are not increasing the volume of the use. They are not putting in a parking garage. Required parking is excessive for what they need based on their parking counts. Requiring 69 spaces on that lot would require unreasonable hardship and more paving of the property. The request is not contrary to the spirit and intent of the Ordinance as it would allow them to continue to preserve this building in an established mix used neighborhood. The request is consistent with the character of the neighborhood. All additions are designed to fit in with character of neighborhood. The request is not contrary to the public interest as the proposed use is consistent with the current use. Substantial justice is met as it is a low
ZBA DM 3.6.19

intensity commercial use. The variance for the parking would do substantial justice as required parking doesn't match up with their actual needs. Granting these requests will not diminish property values as the existing building is one of the highest valued property in the area. The elevator tower is specifically designed to be hidden and tucked away.

Walker: Stated there had been several previous variances granted for this property. The most recent Variances granted in 2006 were similar to the current proposal.

In favor: none.

In opposition: Jennifer Roff, 6 Bradley Street. If in the future those 41 parking spaces are needed, there isn't a lot of parking on Franklin Street to be utilized. There are so many driveways on Franklin Street, so people would probably end up going to Bradley Street, which is the block behind this property. She is concerned with the traffic and with parking on Bradley Street. Her concern isn't with this project, but with what might come along in the future.

Code: none.

DECISION: Monahan questioned Walker for guidance with the concern for variances going with the property. Walker: It is true that variances will run with the land. In this case, it would be difficult to differentiate from one office use to another. There have been conditions placed on buildings in the past that if there was an expansion of office use, etc. that they would have to provide offsite parking.

Rebuttal by Attorney Ovitt Puc. They don't expect to generate much additional traffic. They believe it is unlikely their additional traffic would spill over onto Bradley Street.

Walker: What is Mr. Potter's maximum expectation for employees? Mr. Potter: 1 per seat and they are building 25 seats. That would be the maximum that would be in that building. That would count everyone in the building. Wallner: What would he would think of a restriction on the number of employees? Mr. Potter: It doesn't affect him in a negative way.

DECISION: Scott was not here for last year's requested variance. She passes by this property often and it has been beautifully maintained. She doesn't have any issue with the height variance as it provides accessibility. She has no concern with the use or parking structure. The variance for the number of parking spaces causes her concern. She can envision the property being sold and putting in as many desks as possible. Most do not rent office space without parking. She's concerned with restricting the number of employees because some of those would not be at the office. Winters: Variance request #1 and #4 are essentially linked. His personal view is that he understands it wouldn't possibly be residential. He has concern with the fact that they currently have no more than 10,000 s.f. of useable space and they are looking to more than double their useable space. They are looking to add over 13,000 s.f. , which is enormous in a residential district. He thinks they have a hardship for a nonresidential use, but adding on 13,000 s.f. is an unreasonable addition in a residential zone. He has no problem with request #2 and #3 but cannot support #1 and #4. Sakowski: Adding more parking spaces to the front of that property would be a detriment to the lot. He shares the same pause on the parking. #4 is giving him pause but thinks it can be workable. Monahan: Has concern with parking. Winters: There are multiple businesses in that building. Scott: The building could sell and there could be one business in there. There is on street parking that is allowed in that area that can be utilized.

Variance #3: A motion to grant the request was made by Scott and seconded by Monahan. The representation was it was just for the elevator. Motion passed by a unanimous vote.

Variance #2: A motion to grant the request was made by Scott. She feels it is a good solution to have covered parking. It fits with the current use of the property and the character of the neighborhood. Motion was seconded by Monahan. A condition that the second floor of the covered parking would always be vacant. Motion passed by a unanimous vote.

Variance #1: A motion to grant the request was made by Sakowski and seconded by Monahan. Monahan understands the challenge of a historic property and the addition gives the property owner a chance to make it work. Motion passed by a 4-1 vote with Winters in the minority.

Variance #4: A motion to grant the request was made by Sakowski and seconded by Scott. Wallner concurs that there is enough space for their need and there is off street parking. If parking becomes an issue then the desirability of the property would become an issue. Motion passed by a 3-2 vote with Winters and Monahan in minority.

11-19 [The Barn at Bull Meadow for Harold Lassonde:](#) Applicant wishes to develop a Commercial Indoor Recreational Facility¹ (Use C-3) and requests the following:

- 1) A Variance to Article 28-7-7(f), Driveway Widths, to allow a driveway width of 20 feet when a minimum driveway width of 24 feet is required for two-way traffic,
- 2) A Variance to Article 28-7-7(h), Surfacing and Drainage, to allow the driveway to be constructed of gravel, without a durable paved surface, when the driveway is required to be paved with a durable, dustless surface,

3) A Variance to Article 28-7-2(e), Table of Off-Street Parking, to provide 60 parking spaces² when the parking requirements for Commercial Indoor Recreation Facilities, would require 125 parking spaces, for property located at 63 Bog Road on property located in both an RO Residential Open-space District and an RM Residential Medium Density District.

(¹ A Variance was granted on August 1, 2018, Case #46-18, to allow the Use in a Residential District.)

(² – Sixty (60) parking spaces is based on proposed 180 non-fixed seat capacity and, Article 28-7-2(d), Parking Requirements for Public Assembly Uses, which requires 1 parking space for every 3 fixed seats.)

Testified: Nick Golon, Engineer from TF Moran, Justin, Jennifer and Erik Stevens also available to testify.

Erik Stevens testified. They now have an engineered developed plan. This is a wet piece of land. They are trying to mitigate the impact to the property and to the neighbors.

Nick Golon testified. He gave an overview of the property. The venue is under 6,300 s.f. for a 180 seat maximum facility. The building is over 6,000 s.f. but the main room is 3,500 s.f. The parcel is 33.73 acres. They are trying to develop just over 3 acres. The rest of the property is basically all wetlands. The driveway is between 12 and 15 feet right now. It was an old woods road. A rail trail bisects the property. There isn't much of another place to locate parking and the building due to wetlands. It's a residential neighborhood and they are trying to site it away from the neighbors. They've been able to site the venue outside the buffer area. The parking lot has been designed to keep impervious surface outside of the boundary. They have wetlands along the length of their roadway. They have worked with City staff. They worked with the Conservation Commission who also was in favor of their request. The Fire department was consulted. The parking will have 24' aisle widths. The areas where pedestrians will be getting out of their cars will be paved. They have also sought out the applicable State applications.

Criteria: The requests are not contrary to the intent of the Ordinance for a 20' driveway width. This is a baseline standard for driveway construction for safe travel. The Fire Marshall concurred with 24 to 20. Granting the requests will not alter the essential character of the locality. There will be no negative effects. It is not contrary to the public interest. It is consistent with good engineering practices. It will not diminish surrounding property values. The gravel driveway has similar justifications. It would be about 3,500 s.f. of wetlands that would need to be impacted to have a 24' wide driveway.

Sakowski: They are providing 69 parking spaces for 180 seats. Mr. Golon: Correct. Walker: For fixed seating situations they would calculate by fixed seats but when it's a public assembly area where there are no fixed seats its 1 per 40 s.f. Mr. Golon: With the hall being 3,500 s.f. the parking calculation would be a different number. It is not contrary with the spirit and intent as the intent of the Ordinance is to ensure that they have a useful number of parking spaces on site. A total of 125 parking spaces are needed. They are asking for 69 parking spaces for a 180 seat function hall. It is not contrary to the public interest. The parking arrangement conflicts with the terms of the Ordinance. The number of parking spaces provided is consistent with good public practice. If granted it will not diminish property values.

Winters: Is there a design for the structure itself. Mr. Owen showed a drawing of the structure.

Scott: 69 parking spaces are being provided. Per the septic approval, they have 180 seats. Mr. Owen: They connected to public water and sewer. Scott: If they were fixed seats they would only need 60 parking spaces. They are never going to book an event with more than 180 people because that's what they are sized for? They all said yes. They can only fit 180 people. Scott: To reiterate no event will have more than 180 people? They said correct. Sakowski: Would you entertain a condition that it be for only 180 people? Mr. Owen: If the Board deemed it appropriate.

In favor: none.

In opposition: Maggie Knowle – Secretary for Board of directors of Freedom Village Cooperative mobile home park. Her only concern is the water issues that they are having that come from that property. Depending on where they place the parking lot, the beaver meadow brook that runs through may affect their property in terms of water. Walker: He showed on the GIS map where the property was located in respect to where their property is located. Sakowski: Are you in favor of gravel surface, but not a tar surface? Ms. Knowles: That is correct. Walker: That will be part of the site plan review. That is the point in time where they should be providing drainage calculations. Those are part of the Engineering standards. Sakowski: DES also has involvement.

Rebuttal: Mr. Golon: A drainage study has been done for this property. There is no increase in volume of runoff as they need to mitigate their run off on site. The areas of pavement that they do propose is being treated in accordance with the regulations.

Code: Walker: The conversation that they reference with Fire Prevention, he would suggest that the Board may want to ask for something from the Fire Prevention office in writing in their own words. An emergency vehicle needs at least 12 feet for passage. For two way traffic, 20 foot wide drive could be problematic. He is concerned with safety. Emergency vehicles on gravel road may or may not be an issue.

Rebuttal: Mr. Golon spoke with regard to the width of the drive and the concern with it being unsafe. The typical allowable standard is 20 feet. This is event driven, not a strip mall. It's not a highway. As far as the durability of the road, the existing road is ZBA DM 3.6.19

substandard and it is a considerable cost to upgrade this road. They are filling 2-2.5 feet on this road. They are raising the elevation of the road. Scott: It was testified to that they met with the Fire Marshall. Mr. Golon said they discussed it several times and he was okay with it.

DECISION: Scott: She has no problem with any of these requests. She is okay with the 20 foot wide driveway but would like it in writing confirming that the City Fire Chief doesn't have a problem with this. Allowing the driveway to be gravel instead of paved is appropriate for the length and it is a less environmental impact with wetlands. She finds it interesting that if this venue were fixed seats they would be in compliance. Walker: It is common, even with the Fire department, that they have different standards to calculate with.

Winters: He is more persuaded by the self-regulation argument with regard to parking. Is it viable to ask for further evidence from the Fire Marshall. Wallner: The site plan should take care of it. Walker: The Board has the ability to request the Fire emergency personnel appear before them to answer any questions they have. Winters: He is comfortable with voting tonight.

Variance #1: A motion to approve the request was made by Winters and seconded by Scott. The Board set the requirement that the Assistant Fire Marshall provide written documentation that they are in support of this request. Motion passed by a unanimous vote.

Variance #2: A motion to approve the request was made by Scott due to the fact that it will have a lesser environmental impact on wetland. Motion was seconded by Monahan, and passed by a unanimous vote.

Variance #3: A motion to approve the request was made by Scott due to the fact that if it was fixed seating they would be in compliance but because it was not, they need the variance with a restriction that other events would be for 180 people or less. Sakowski seconded the motion and it passed by a 4-1 vote with Monahan in the minority. Monahan doesn't agree with the restriction.

MINUTES: A motion to approve the Minutes from February 6, 2019 was made by Winters, seconded by Monahan and passed by a 4-0 vote with Scott abstaining.

NON-AGENDA ITEMS:

Walker discussed Aroma Joe's/Domino's Pizza request, Case #05-19 - 212 Fisherville Road, that was before the Board last month. The applicants were asked to relocate the dumpster and add a parking space where the dumpster was originally to be placed. Is it a significant change or is it consistent with the Board's original approve? A motion that it was consistent with the Board's original approve was made by Winters, seconded by Monahan and passed by a 3-0 vote with Scott and Sakowski abstaining as they were not present for the original meeting.

Meeting concluded at 9:48 pm.

*Respectfully submitted by
Rose Fife, Clerk of the Board*