

**MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE**

MUNICIPAL COMPLEX, 1 JUNKINS AVENUE

EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

7:00 p.m.

July 16, 2013

MEMBERS PRESENT: Vice-Chairman Arthur Parrott; Susan Chamberlin; Charles Lemay, Christopher Mulligan, David Rheame, Alternate: Patrick Moretti

EXCUSED: Chairman David Witham; Derek Durbin; Alternate, Robin Rousseau

ALSO PRESENT: Juliet Walker, Transportation Planner

Vice-Chair Arthur Parrott announced petitioner requests for two postponements until the next meeting were received.

Christopher Mulligan moved to postpone the hearing for 1 Ash Street. Charles Lemay seconded, and all were in favor.

Susan Chamberlin moved to postpone the hearing for 1390 & 1400 Lafayette Road, Christopher Mulligan seconded, and all were in favor.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A) May 21, 2013

David Rheame moved to approve the Minutes with one minor correction. Christopher Mulligan seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

II. PLANNING DEPARTMENT REPORTS

A) Electronic Packet Submittal

Planner, Juliet Walker presented recommended amendments to the Board of Adjustment Rules and Regulations. The first was a revision to Section 4 to change Item #3, adding that applications be signed by the property owner. The second would be an insertion at the end of that section to submit 11 copies of plans, exhibits, and other supporting documentation, as well as including digital PDF files of those documents that could be posted on-line and increase transparency. This

was already a requirement, but they wanted them to be consistent with other guidelines, including the Site Review Regulations.

Board Member, Susan Chamberlin asked if the requirements and form would be available on line, and Ms. Walker said it is in PDF form. Ms. Chamberlin asked if they could make it possible to fill it out online. Ms. Walker said they could probably provide a hyperlink in the document to that application, but they wouldn't want to write the URL into the document in case it ever changed. Ms. Chamberlin said it would be consistent with the other rules to have access to the form online.

Board Member, David Rheume said he was concerned with a requirement to provide PDF's of larger plans from a large format scanner which might not be reasonable for most residents. Ms. Walker said larger formats tend to be prepared by professionals who have access to large format scanners, but they could consider a policy that would say residential applicants who do not have access to a scanner could request a waiver from the requirements. Mr. Moretti asked if the library has the ability to scan, and Ms. Walker said she didn't know.

Vice-Chair Parrott said it should be stated in the rules and regulations that an applicant could provide hand prepared plans if they did not have that capability, and would not be prevented from filing. Ms. Walker said they would take that suggestion and modify the amendment to include an option for a waiver for next month's meeting.

Mr. Lemay said the wording needed to be clarified whether the 11 copies needed to be digital. It was agreed that Ms. Walker would amend the proposed change to the Rules & Regulations regarding electronic submittal of application materials for action at the August meeting.

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS – OLD BUSINESS

A) Case # 6-1

Petitioners: David P. and Nancy T. MacDonald

Property: 28 Ball Street

Assessor Plan 207, Lot 54

Zoning District: Single Residence B

Description: Construct attached 24' x 24' garage.

Requests: The Variances necessary to grant the required relief from the Zoning Ordinance, including the following:

1. A Variance from Section 10.521 to allow a rear yard setback of 18'± where 30' is the minimum required.

(This petition was revised from that receiving initial consideration at the June 18, 2013 meeting.)

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Property owner, Mr. David MacDonald said in the interim from the last meeting he learned there were different ways to establish lot size and coverage percentage. Using the Tax Assessor's Analysis of Lot Coverage data, it was determined they did not have to request relief from lot coverage.

Vice-Chair, Arthur Parrott asked the applicant to provide a brief description of the project and address each of the criteria.

Mr. MacDonald said the house was built around 1780 and the old field stone and mortar foundation is crumbling, and need of repair. So long as they were going to jack the house up to repair it, they thought it would be a good opportunity to add a garage. Sheet 5 showed an addition to the kitchen to connect to the garage to provide access in bad weather. The garage dimensions would be 24' x 24', which was still 20%. Sheet 6 showed the plot plan with the existing structures in black and the proposed changes in red. Sheet 7 showed what the property would look like when the project was complete.

In response to the criteria for approval, Mr. MacDonald said the justification to repair the foundation and add a garage was that they would benefit from a better use of the property without hurting anyone. He said the project would not increase City services, and would cause no environmental violations. He said denying the variance would be a hardship for them.

Mr. Rheume asked Mr. MacDonald to explain why the previous application listed the house as 897 s.f. and this month it was listed at 628 s.f. Mr. MacDonald said last month he measured with a tape measure and this month he took assessor's records.

Mr. Rheume asked if the hedge trees on back corner of property would remain, and Mr. MacDonald said they would.

Ms. Chamberlin asked if garage would cover part of the cobblestoned area, and Mr. MacDonald responded that right now the cobbles extend to the back wall of the house so some of the cobbles would be removed and the driveway would be a little shorter. Ms. Chamberlin clarified that they then would not actually be losing green space but would be covering some of the parking area. Mr. MacDonald said that was correct.

SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION TO THE PETITION, OR SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

With no one rising, the public hearing was closed.

DECISION OF THE BOARD

*Mr. Rheume moved to **grant** the petition as presented and advertised. Mr. Lemay seconded, and the motion carried unanimously for the following reasons:*

Review Criteria:

- Granting the variance will not be contrary to the public interest, as the existing row of trees along the rear of the property, which the applicant represented, would remain, will mitigate the intrusion into the rear yard setback.
- The spirit of the Ordinance will be observed, as the essential character of the neighborhood, which includes properties with a number of small garages, will not be changed.

- The lot size is adequate for a two-car garage and the placement is reasonable so that allowing the homeowners greater enjoyment of their property will cause no harm to the general public.
- The improvements to the property, including the addition of a garage and stabilization of the home, will not diminish the value of the surrounding properties.
- A special distinguishing characteristic of the property is that the lot is smaller than the required minimum lot size for this district. This creates a hardship for the property owner in attempting to comply with the dimensional requirements.

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS – NEW BUSINESS

1) Case # 7-1

Petitioners: Matthew & Katherine Hatem

Property: 1 Ash Street

Assessor Plan 149, Lot 34

Zoning District: General Residence A

Description: Install 39'±L x 27'±W x 18'±H condenser unit at rear of existing home.

Requests: The Variances necessary to grant the required relief from the Zoning Ordinance, including the following:

1. A Variance from Section 10.521 to allow a rear yard setback of 7'± where 20' is required.
2. A Variance from Section 10.521 to allow building coverage of 28.3%± where 28.2% exists and 25% is the maximum allowed.

DECISION OF THE BOARD

*As previously noted, the Board voted to **postpone** the petition to the August 20, 2013 meeting at the request of the attorney for the applicants.*

2) Case # 7-2

Petitioners: 4 Amigos, LLC

Property: 1390 & 1400 Lafayette Road

Assessor Plan 252, Lots 9 & 7

Zoning District: Gateway

Description: Install free-standing signs

Requests: The Variances necessary to grant the required relief from the Zoning Ordinance, including the following:

1. A Variance from Section 10.1243 to allow multiple freestanding signs on a lot where only one freestanding sign per lot is allowed.
2. A Variance from Section 10.1251.20 to allow a freestanding sign to exceed 100 s.f. in area.

DECISION OF THE BOARD

*As previously noted, the Board voted to **postpone** the petition to the August 20, 2013 meeting at the request of the attorney for the applicants.*

=====

3) Case # 7-3

Petitioners: Julie L. Cyr

Property: 91 Spring Street

Assessor Plan 133, Lot 10

Zoning District: General Residence A

Description: Replace a nonconforming deck and stairs.

Requests: 1. An Equitable Waiver as allowed in RSA 674:33-a for a deck resulting in 27%± building coverage where 25% is the maximum allowed.

If the Equitable Waiver is not granted, the Variances necessary to grant the required relief from the Zoning Ordinance, including the following;

2. A Variance from Section 10.521 to allow 27%± building coverage where 25% is the maximum allowed.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Mr. James Bruner, a contractor representing owner Julie Cyr said the owner applied for a variance in 1987 for an addition in the back. A deck was overlooked on that application, but the contractor built it anyhow. The deck was poorly built and has since rotted and was removed a year or two ago. A set of French doors were at the back of the addition and with deck gone they cannot use the doors so the owner hired Mr. Bruner to build a new deck with a platform and a step. He said Ms. Walker from the Planning Department recommended an equitable waiver, but they were not sure if that would be necessary because the new deck is 8’ from the back of the building - less than what was, and the rear setback is 23’ where only 20’ is required.

Mr. Rheume noted that the deck was listed at 64 s.f. or 8’ x 8’ and asked if the additional 16 s.f. would be for the stairs. Mr. Bruner said the additional square feet were for the 18” steps. Mr. Rheume said he was estimating a 2’ distance for those steps, and Mr. Bruner said he was.

Mr. Rheume asked if the former deck was completely gone, and Mr. Bruner said it was except for the concrete piers in the ground.

Mr. Lemay said he wanted to have a brief discussion on which standards they would use so the applicant could argue which facts were relevant.

He referenced one of the important criteria to grant an Equitable Waiver which was that “due to the degree of past construction or investment made in ignorance of the facts constituting the violation, the cost of correction so far outweighs any public benefit to be gained, that it would be inequitable to require the violation to be corrected.” In this case, what they would be considering was not there now so, in his opinion, it was not like a house that was three feet closer to the property line than it should have been and saying they didn’t have to take the house down. This was a deck that had been removed. If they had come when the deck was still up and said a dimensional infraction had been found and the Board had granted an Equitable Waiver, it would

not make the deck a pre-existing nonconforming use according to the law so there would be no rights to rebuild it without a variance. He concluded that a variance was necessary in this case. Ms. Chamberlin agreed that they could not make a finding under an Equitable Waiver because the deck was gone and it did not fit under these circumstances. Mr. Rheume said he thought it should be a straightforward variance request. Vice-Chair Parrott also agreed that it was not a good candidate for an Equitable Waiver.

Mr. Bruner went through the five points for a variance that was outlined in his letter, stating that:

- The 80 s.f. decking would have no impact to public interest, and would improve values of existing property
- The spirit of the ordinance would be observed by the owner and builder by maintaining the legally allotted setback mandated by City
- The owner deserves the right to walk out of his addition as previously approved and certified by the City to the backyard
- Granting a variance would represent substantial justice to the homeowner
- Building the deck and stairs would have no negative impact on value of surrounding properties
- The literal enforcement of provisions would cause hardship to the owner by limiting access to the backyard through the preexisting back door

SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION TO THE PETITION, OR SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

With no one rising, the public hearing was closed.

DECISION OF THE BOARD

The Board determined that the circumstances of the request did not allow them to make a finding under item (d) of RSA 674:33-a so that an **Equitable Waiver could not be granted**.

*Mr. Mulligan moved to **grant the variance** as presented and advertised. Mr. Morietti seconded, and the motion carried unanimously for the following reasons:*

Review Criteria:

- The relatively small increase requested in building coverage would not alter the essential character of the neighborhood nor threaten the health, safety or welfare of the general public.
- Decks are common in this neighborhood and the addition would be in keeping with the general intent of the requirements in the General Residence A District.
- In the substantial justice test, there would be no gain to the general public that would counterbalance the loss to the applicant if the replacement of the previous deck were not allowed.
- A replacement deck that is smaller in size would not diminish the value of surrounding properties.
- The previous addition, approved in 1987, included features that would allow the living space to open onto a deck so that there would be no fair and substantial relationship

between the general purposes of the Ordinance provision for lot coverage and its specific application to this property. The use is a reasonable one in this residential neighborhood and depriving the applicant of the use and requiring reconfiguration of the egress would result in a hardship.

=====

4) Case # 7-4

Petitioners: St. Gelais Revocable Trust, Gerard J. & Barbara J. St. Gelais, Trustees

Property: 13 Van Buren Avenue

Assessor Plan 250, Lot 51

Zoning District: Single Residence B

Description: Construct an 8'±L x 8'±W x 8'±H shed in the right rear corner of the lot

Requests: The Variances necessary to grant the required relief from the Zoning Ordinance, including the following:

1. A Variance from Section 10.521 and 10.572 to allow a right side yard setback of 5'± where 10' is required for an accessory structure.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Gerard St. Gelais, one of the trustees of the property said the prefabricated shed would be delivered to the site. Mr. St. Gelais said the proposed placement would meet the rear setback, and he was trying to place it so it would be as unobtrusive as possible to neighbors. He said he spoke with the neighbors to the rear and the side and they had no problems with the placement, and agreed that the new shed would look better from their point of view. He also stood on Van Buren Avenue, and it seemed to fit in the corner of the lot, and moving it out an additional 5' would take space from the small lot.

Vice-Chair Parrott asked the applicant to address the Board on the five criteria. Mr. St. Gelais said granting the variance would not diminish the value of the surrounding properties, and granting it would help them enjoy their property and yard. He said he tried a mockup with an 8'x8' tarp in another place and it jutted out and looked strange. Vice-Chair Parrott noted that they had copies of Mr. St. Gelais' letter.

Mr. Rheume said it looked like the house was centered on the property. Mr. St. Gelais said it was closer to the neighbor's lot line, and there was quite a bit more space between his house and the lot line than theirs. Mr. Rheume said he was referring to the front and back yard being halfway between van Buren and McKinley Streets, and Mr. St. Gelais said it was.

SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION TO THE PETITION, OR SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

With no one rising, the public hearing was closed.

DECISION OF THE BOARD

*Mr. Rheume moved to **grant the variance** as presented and advertised. Mr. Mulligan seconded, and the motion carried unanimously for the following reasons:*

Review Criteria:

- With small sheds common in many areas of Portsmouth, the proposed shed will not be contrary to the public interest.
- While the proposed setback is half that required, angling the shed so that the measurement is from the corner will lessen the impact and observe the spirit of the Ordinance.
- The shed will improve the owners’ enjoyment of their property without infringing on the general public.
- A small shed placed in a logical location will not diminish the value of surrounding properties.
- The special conditions of the property are the relatively small size of the lot and the way the house is centered front to back so that moving the shed away from the property line would impede the small amount of yard available. A shed is a reasonable use of a property in this residential neighborhood.

=====

5) Case # 7-5

Petitioner: Douglas F. Fabbriatore

Property: 536 Marcy Street

Assessor Plan 101, Lot 56

Zoning District: General Residence B

Description: Construct an 11’ x 16’ rear addition over existing kitchen, lift the main roof over existing front section of home and add shed dormers.

Requests: The Variances necessary to grant the required relief from the Zoning Ordinance, including the following:

1. A Variance from Section 10.324 to allow a nonconforming building or structure to be added to or enlarged with the addition or enlargement not in conformance with the Zoning Ordinance.
2. A Variance from Section 10.521 to allow a front yard setback of 2’ 10”± where 5’ is the minimum required.
3. A Variance from Section 10.521 to allow a left side yard setback of 0’± for an addition where 10’ is the minimum required.
4. A Variance from Section 10.521 to allow building coverage of 32%± where 27.4%± exists and 30% is the maximum allowed.

SPEAKING IN FAVOR OF THE PETITION

Mr. Rick Jones, the applicants architect said they advised the owner to get a licensed survey done, and passed out copies. Mr. Jones said the initial rough calculation and application showed 32% lot coverage, but the survey showed it was actually only 27%, so the fourth variance would not be needed.

Mr. Jones said the attic space was insufficient with 6.5 feet ceiling space only in the middle so the owner would like to raise the ridge beam by 2’ and introduce dormers on the left and right side. Mr. Jones said the apron of the roof will continue, and referred to Ex.02, the existing north elevation facing Humphrey’s Court. Ex.a.2.01 showed the apron of the main roof continuing in front of the dormer with a larger window in the attic at the east, front elevation facing Marcy

Street. Ex.a.2.02 showed the zero lot line, and house on the lot line adjacent to neighbor's driveway with the addition of a bedroom on top of the kitchen.

Mr. Lemay asked if the wall on the zero dimension side would go straight up from where it was. Mr. Jones said it was set back 16" from this face and the roof continued. Mr. Lemay asked about the wall where the kitchen was, and Mr. Jones said that one would go straight up. Mr. Lemay asked if the eave would be the same size, and Mr. Jones said it would be.

Vice-Chair Parrott asked what the net increase from the present ridgeline of the main house to the proposed ridgeline. Mr. Jones said the existing height is 28.8' and they were proposing to go up 2' to 30.8', with 35' being the maximum allowed. Vice-Chair Parrott said it wouldn't be as if they were adding a third story. Vice-Chair Parrott asked if the addition on the one story kitchen would be a full story. Mr. Jones said they would be going from a 12' 10" ridgeline to a 24' ridgeline.

Mr. Rheume asked if the survey confirmed that the property line runs along the side of the home at the back end where the addition would be, and Mr. Jones said it is on the lot line. Ms. Walker said it helped to have a survey done but the dimensions of the existing house and addition didn't agree with the site plan. Mr. Jones said the confusion was that the initial submission showed the roof dimension and the overhang, but not the footprint which was an error, so the corrections and an accurate survey led them to the difference in coverage. Ms. Walker said the projecting roof lines didn't need to be incorporated in the calculation, and the burden of proof would be on them for accuracy.

Vice-Chair Parrott asked if the walls were flush with the foundation, and what kind of foundation is it? Mr. Jones said the walls were flush, and he believed the foundation was stone, which they would get into at their HDC presentation. Vice-Chair Parrott said their concern is the footprint, and asked if there was any expectation that they would have to do any more foundation work. Mr. Jones said he had been in the basement and was satisfied that it was heavy duty construction.

Ms. Chamberlin said she appreciated that there was a zero setback at present, but was concerned about the zero setback raising up another floor. She asked if they had approached the neighboring family that would be most affected by the increase. Mr. Jones said he was notified, and believed there was a letter in the application from another neighbor in support of the project. He said he had not personally approached them, but the neighbor was there when he stopped in and Doug Fabbriatore's father was talking to them about it, and the indication was that he was supportive. Ms. Chamberlin said there was a driveway shown in between the neighbors. Mr. Jones said it was on north side which would not cast a shadow on the neighbor's property, only his own.

SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION TO THE PETITION, OR SPEAKING TO, FOR, OR AGAINST THE PETITION

Mr. Bob Gunning of 43 Humphreys Court, three houses away from the property, said he was in strong opposition to the application. He said he was concerned with the changes to the main roof, and felt it was a bid for more square footage with no regard for aesthetics, history, or the negative affects on neighboring property values. Mr. Gunning said the house is prominently featured in the southern seaside gateway to the City, and he thought this proposal would change it from a two-story gable ended house to a three-story house with a semi-flat roof that would appear inconsistent and out of proportion because the footprint would not allow for the visual weight of the added roof

height with a double full shed dormers. Mr. Gunning said shed dormers may exist in the area, but they are limited to one-story houses. He said he lives in a house similar in age, size and shape. The houses have a 12/12 pitch, and the purpose is to wick moisture, create a barrier between bedrooms and shed snow. He said it sometimes works when people renovate their attics into living space, but the roofs never work as well as the original design. Aside from the pitch of the dormers, the attic rooms are 28' high, only a few inches away from the sun, always hot in summer, and require air conditioning from May through September.

Mr. Gunning said he wasn't there to talk about the kitchen addition, and had no problem with it; but when he heard there were no foundation problems, he wanted to note an inconsistency because he heard there was no foundation below the kitchen where second floor was to be added. Mr. Gunning submitted his letter to the Board.

Mr. Jones said although the dormers were at a shallower pitch, they would be increasing the pitch of the main roof from 10' and 12' to 12' and 12'. The dormers would be 4' and 12' which would be consistent with the other dormers in the neighborhood. He said it was common to have shed dormers on the flanking sides when there is a gable facing the street. He went on to say it was not about adding square footage, but currently the attic is being used as a TV room and is non-compliant so they are increasing the space by 2'. However, the bedroom addition over the kitchen would add square footage for the owner's daughter.

Mr. Gunning said it appeared that the dormers would be around 90% of the roof with dormers on both sides. In looking around the neighborhood he said shed dormers on gable-ended homes were generally at the rear of the house, parallel to the street, though occasionally they're perpendicular at the side of the house. However, those were usually limited to one or one and a half-story homes, and he said he has never seen a double shed dormer on a two story home that would turn it into a three story home. He said there were no other homes in area with same dormer arrangement except for Pickering Marine shop which is one and a half stories.

Mr. Jones reiterated that the main roof proposed would have a 12' and 12' gable expression on the façade, appearing as a two story home from the street; and the dormers would be 4' and 12' which is consistent with other gable end housings facing the street with dormers flanking the sides.

Mr. Gunning said the impression he got from looking at the plans is that the roof would be 90% dormer which would be visible from all sides. He said he felt the proposal is ill advised because the house will be permanently altered. The neighboring Prices went out of their way to build a new historic home, and he thinks their property value will be diminished.

Mr. Jones said the setback is 5' on front and back, not 2' as suggested.

DECISION OF THE BOARD

Vice-Chair Parrott asked where the proposal is in respect to the HDC. Ms. Walker said it would go before the HDC next month. Vice-Chair Parrott said they were getting out of their jurisdiction discussing architectural details.

Ms. Chamberlin said she would not comment on styling because that would better be addressed by the HDC. It did appear to be a significant addition, and with Variance Request #4 removed, they

would not be asking for any coverage that was not already allowed. She said she appreciated the concern over a big change, but the lot coverage fits within the ordinance, and the footprint would remain the same. The home would be used by the owners and would not be a rental property. It did not appear to be significantly out of character for the neighborhood.

Mr. Lemay said they should look at the context of the variances requested, and the impact on neighbors. The applicant said the front and side yard setbacks would remain the same. They were asking for a blanket variance to allow a non-conforming structure to be added to or enlarged. These situations would still exist if they denied the variance and it would be inappropriate to deny for reasons unrelated to the variance they were asked to approve. The aesthetic considerations are legitimate but that is the HDC's responsibility.

Mr. Rheume said shed dormers are fairly common in Portsmouth. If the home were not in the Historic District, the applicant could move forward and place one dormer on the side closest to the property line, though they couldn't build a second one which would be awkward, and the Board wouldn't have any control over that. The HDC has the opportunity to look at design. He said he was more concerned with the rear addition. The house is curved and runs along that property line. He said it was rare to see that from an architectural standpoint which creates some unique building challenges, but in the spirit of the ordinance the applicant made a point that the addition would improve the air and light, and the positioning would only cast shadows on the applicant's property rather than their neighbors'. Mr. Rheume said it was interesting that none of the directly abutting neighbors came forward to indicate opposition, including the one most affected which left him a bit torn.

Vice-Chair Parrott said he would support the request for variance. Although the concerns expressed were valid, they were more about design which were not the factors the Board looks at and they do not apply aesthetics to their criteria. Other homes in the area have renovated and changed in similar fashions, and at the end of day nothing on the land will change. There are little to no changes with respect to neighbors who did not make an appearance anyhow.

Mr. Mulligan said he thought it significant that the abutter most affected by the proposal did not attend to express any concerns for diminished property values. He also said they needed to be mindful that the south end was developed generations before zoning was in anyone's consideration and slavish devotion to setback requirements appear no where in this neighborhood. Under different circumstances a zero setback going up would cause problems, but he said he felt it would be reasonable in this case.

Mr. Rheume said he had some reservations and did not feel they should pass the request unanimously and would not support it.

The Board determined that the variance for building coverage would not be needed.

*Mr. Lemay moved to **grant the remaining three variances** as presented and advertised. Mr. Mulligan seconded, and the motion carried 5-1 with Mr. Rheume voting against the motion. The petition was granted for the following reasons:*

Review Criteria:

- Granting the variances will not change the essential character of the neighborhood nor threaten the health, safety or welfare of the general public.
 - No public good would result from restricting an expansion to an existing nonconforming building that has been in place for many years.
 - There was no specific testimony to support a conclusion that the value of surrounding properties would be diminished and it was presented that the existing setbacks would remain unchanged.
 - One of the special conditions of the property is the existing nonconformance in a neighborhood developed well before zoning. To impose a restriction resulting from changes in the Ordinance over time would not be reasonable.
-

V. OTHER BUSINESS

No other business was presented.

III. ADJOURNMENT

It was moved, seconded and passed to adjourn the meeting at 8:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jane K. Kendall
Acting Secretary