



OLD VALUES - NEW HORIZONS

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

3 No. Lowell Road, Windham, New Hampshire 03087

(603) 432-3806 / Fax (603) 432-7362

www.WindhamNH.gov

1
2 **Approved Minutes Zoning Board of Adjustment**
3 **September 27, 2016**
4 **7:30pm @ Community Development Department**
5
6

7 **Mark Samsel, Chairman** - present **Mike Mazalewski, Alternate** - excused
8 **Heath Partington, Vice Chair** - present **Kevin Hughes, Alternate** - present
9 **Pam Skinner, Secretary** - present **Jim Tierney, Alternate** - excused
10 **Mike Scholz, Member** - present **Jay Yennaco, Alternate** - excused
11 **Bruce Breton, Member** - present

12
13 **Staff:**

14 Dick Gregory, ZBA Code Enforcement Administrator
15 Andrea Cairns, Minute Taker
16

17 Meeting called to order at 7:30p.m. by Chairman Samsel.
18

19 Chairman Samsel reviewed the process for the public.
20

21 **Lot 21-A-30 Case # 24-2016**

22 **Applicant/Owner-John & Lois Freeston**

23 **Location-11 Woodland Road**

24 **Zoning District-Residence A District and Wetland & Watershed Protection District (WWPD).**

25 Variance relief is requested from **Section 601.3** to allow the construction of a 12'x16' garage in the
26 WWPD, **Section 702, App. A-1** to allow the garage to be 44 ft. from the front lot line where 50 ft.
27 is required, **Section 703** to allow the garage in the front yard, which is not allowed.
28

29 Ms. Skinner read the case into the record. The abutters list had been read at the previous meeting.
30

31 John Freeston presented the application. Mr. Freeston noted the board heard part of the case at the
32 previous meeting, but they omitted an additional section from the legal notices so they needed to
33 continue the hearing.
34

35 Mr. Freeston noted they are hoping to construct a 12'x16' garage to hold a vehicle and provide
36 storage.
37

38 Mr. Freeston reviewed the five criteria
39

40 Mr. Scholz questioned if pushing it back further would require more fill and a larger impact to the
41 WWPD. Mr. Freeston noted that was accurate, they were trying to make it level with the front of the
42 existing garage. There are no other locations for the garage. All other locations would bring it closer
43 to the water or their leach field.

44 Chairman Samsel questioned which direction the doors would face. Mr. Freeston noted they would
45 be facing away from the street and the side facing the street would only have windows with window
46 boxes.

47
48 **MOTION: Mr. Partington made a motion to go into deliberative.**

49 **Mr. Scholz seconded the motion.**

50 **No discussion**

51 **Vote 5-0**

52 **Motion carries**

53
54 Chairman Samsel saw no issues with the request given the condition of the land. It is a reasonable
55 request.

56
57 Ms. Skinner noted they had a letter from the Conservation Commission who requested they use
58 gravel around the shed for infiltration.

59
60 Mr. Partington reviewed the five criteria. In his opinion:
61 1. (contrary to public interest): met the criteria
62 2. (spirit of the ordinance): met the criteria
63 3. (substantial justice): met the criteria
64 4. (value of surrounding properties): met the criteria
65 5. (hardship): met the criteria

66
67 Mr. Scholz, Ms. Skinner and Mr. Breton agreed.

68
69 **MOTION: Mr. Scholz made a motion to grant variance relief from Section 601.3 to allow the**
70 **construction of a 12'x16' garage in the WWPD, Section 702, App. A-1 to allow the garage to**
71 **be 44 ft. from the front lot line where 50 ft. is required, Section 703 to allow the garage in the**
72 **front yard, which is not allowed, with the condition they have a perimeter of gravel around**
73 **the structure, where possible, to mitigate stormwater runoff.**

74 **Mr. Breton seconded the motion**

75 **No discussion**

76 **Vote 5-0**

77 **Motion carries**

78
79 Chairman Samsel noted there is a 30-day appeal period.

80
81 **Lot 22-L-71 Case # 30-2016**

82 **Applicant**-Edward N. Herbert Assoc. Inc.

83 **Owner**-Homai Khanna

84 **Zoning District**-Residence A and Cobbett's Pond & Canobie Lake Watershed Protection.

85 **Location**-39 W. Shore Road

86 Variance relief is requested from **Section 702, App. A-1** of the Windham Zoning Ordinance to
87 allow 29 ft. setback from Canobie Lake, where 50 ft. is required, **Section 406.2** to allow an increase
88 in footprint from 1,460 sq. ft. to 1,840 sq. ft. and an increase in volume from 19,074 cu. ft. to 22,274
89 sq. ft.

90
91 Ms. Skinner read the case and abutters list into the record.

92 Shayne Gendron from Edward N. Herbert Assoc. Inc. presented the application.

93

94 Mr. Gendron presented the board with updated plans and photographs of the site. (Exhibit A)

95

96 Mr. Gendron noted the owner purchased the home two years ago. Approximately 6-8 months after
97 she purchased the home she had double knee replacement and is having trouble getting up the stairs.
98 All the bedrooms are on the second floor. The son came up with a proposal to do an addition. It is
99 an existing non-conforming lot of 0.3 acres and sits on Canobie Lake. Half of the lot is within the
100 50' water buffer. The addition needs to fit with the existing home and work with the current floor
101 plan. There will be no land clearing; they will use existing lawn. They are proposing a single-story
102 addition; the rear is a full walkout so it will match the appearance of the existing home. The existing
103 state approved septic system in good working order. They do not want to get close to the septic with
104 the addition. They contacted shoreland protection and they need to do something in return to make
105 it more conforming. They are willing to get rid of the driveway and sidewalk and replace both with
106 porous pavement, which will bring the impervious coverage down from 24.8% to 19.23%. Those
107 numbers may even come down a bit more; he is looking at getting the numbers down below 19%.
108 The 12.4% building coverage will go to 15%. It will be 29' from Canobie Lake. The existing
109 structure is closer to Canobie Lake and West Shore Road so it is not becoming more non-
110 confirming.

111

112 Mr. Partington questioned what the current setback from the lake is. Mr. Gendron noted the stairs
113 are 19' and the existing foundation is about 28'.

114

115 Mr. Gendron reviewed the five criteria.

116

117 Mr. Scholz questioned if the porous pavement needed to be vacuumed. Mr. Gendron noted it would
118 need to be maintained and vacuumed. Cobbett's Pond will require they have a cleaning schedule
119 and maintenance plan.

120

121 Mr. Gendron noted the home would be guttered and all runoff will be deviated into drywells.

122

123 Ms. Skinner noted that the Conservation Commission had no issues with the plans given there is no
124 further encroachment to the lake, they are installing porous pavement and will utilize drywells.
125 They have no issue with plan.

126

127 **MOTION: Mr. Breton made a motion to go into deliberative.**

128 **Mr. Scholz seconded the motion.**

129 **No discussion**

130 **Vote 5-0**

131 **Motion carries**

132

133 Chairman Samsel believed the plan met the five criteria. The use is very valid and given the
134 proposed improvements he believes the plan is reasonable and there is good attention to detail.

135

136 Mr. Breton agreed. The building area is increasing by 2% but the impervious coverage is decreasing
137 by 5%.

138

139 Mr. Scholz also believed it met the five criteria and there was no other placement for the home.

140 Mr. Partington reviewed the five criteria. In his opinion:
141 1. (contrary to public interest): met the criteria
142 2. (spirit of the ordinance): met the criteria
143 3. (substantial justice): met the criteria
144 4. (value of surrounding properties): met the criteria
145 5. (hardship): met the criteria

146
147 Mr. Scholz questioned if the board was comfortable having a condition that they have proper
148 maintenance of the porous pavement. The board felt that was reasonable. Chairman Samsel had
149 concerns with enforcement.

150
151 **MOTION: Mr. Scholz made a motion to grant variance relief from Section 702, App. A-1 of**
152 **the Windham Zoning Ordinance to allow 29 ft. setback from Canobie Lake, where 50 ft. is**
153 **required, Section 406.2 to allow an increase in footprint from 1,460 sq. ft. to 1,840 sq. ft. and**
154 **an increase in volume from 19,074 cu. ft. to 22,274 sq. ft. per plans submitted with the**
155 **condition that the porous pavement be properly maintained.**

156 **Mr. Breton seconded the motion**

157 **No discussion**

158 **Vote 5-0**

159 **Motion carries**

160

161 Chairman Samsel noted there is a 30-day appeal period.

162

163 **Lot 21-H-13C Case # 31-2016**

164 **Applicant** Edward N. Herbert Assoc., Inc.

165 **Owner**-Lake Shore Road Realty Trust, Peter Kashulines-Trustee

166 **Location**-14 Lake Shore Road

167 **Zoning District**-Residence A & Cobbett's Pond and Canobie Lake Watershed Protection

168 Variance relief is requested from **Section 702 App. A-1** to allow frontage of 50 ft. where 175 ft. is
169 required, a front setback of 15 ft. where 50 ft. is required and side setbacks of 12 ft. on both sides
170 where 30 ft. is required & a lot of 7,750 sq. ft. where 50,000 sq. ft. is the minimum required.

171 Pam read case and abutters into the record

172

173 Ms. Skinner read the case and abutters list into the record.

174

175 Mr. Gendron presented the board with updated plans and photographs of the site (Exhibit A). The
176 plans included more detail, the state approved septic system and architectural plans of the proposed
177 home.

178

179 The lot is an existing non-conforming lot of record and is 0.17 acres. The lot is within shoreland
180 protection, Cobbett's Pond and Canobie Lake watershed protection. It is a street back from
181 waterfront, but the front corner is 175' from Cobbett's Pond so only a portion falls within the
182 protection area. No shoreland permit is needed for the septic system. They will need Cobbett's Pond
183 approval.

184

185 Currently there is an 8' side setback on one side and a 12' setback on other side, but they are
186 proposing 12' setbacks on both sides. They would like to make it a little larger to accommodate a
187 garage underneath which will alleviate parking issues along the road.

188
189 The home will be two-bedroom, with the garage on the ground level. The impervious coverage on
190 the lot is 13.2% and they are proposing 19.4%. The existing home is 11.2% with the proposed home
191 being 12.6%. They are adding gutters and drywells to the home. They are working on the shoreland
192 protection permitting, only a small portion of the lot needs to be permitted. They did submit permits
193 to the National Heritage Bureau and received clearance for the property.
194
195 They pushed the home back by 8' but still need frontage relief. The 50' setback they are asking for
196 is for the deck. The home will be an additional 8' back.
197
198 Mr. Gendron reviewed the five criteria.
199
200 Ms. Skinner read a letter dated 9/10/16 from Michael and Julianne Carrozzella, abutters to the
201 property. They had concern that a 15' setback would not allow enough room for parking without
202 blocking the roadway. They had concerns about drainage as well. They are happy to see the
203 property renovated.
204
205 Ms. Skinner read a letter from the Conservation Commission questioning if they will use porous
206 pavement. They had no issues with the setback.
207
208 Mr. Gendron noted they did not propose porous pavement because the impervious percentages are
209 low enough and he did not believe it was necessary. Rainwater and runoff will also be handled
210 through Cobbett's Pond and shoreland protection.
211
212 Mr. Gendron also noted they are going to have enough parking. There will be 15' of driveway, plus
213 8' below the deck, plus a two-car garage.
214
215 **MOTION: Mr. Scholz made a motion to go into deliberative.**
216 **Mr. Breton seconded the motion.**
217 **No discussion**
218 **Vote 5-0**
219 **Motion carries**
220
221 Mr. Breton had no issues with the application. The impervious coverage is increasing minimally
222 and there is better placement for cars.
223
224 Chairman Samsel agreed. He also had no issues with there being no porous pavement.
225
226 Mr. Scholz agreed it met the five criteria. Overall he understands the topography restraints and does
227 not believe the proposal is unreasonable.
228
229 Mr. Partington reviewed the five criteria. In his opinion:
230 1. (contrary to public interest): met the criteria
231 2. (spirit of the ordinance): met the criteria
232 3. (substantial justice): met the criteria
233 4. (value of surrounding properties): met the criteria
234 5. (hardship): met the criteria
235

236 **MOTION: Mr. Scholz made a motion to grant variance relieve from Section 702 App. A-1 to**
237 **allow frontage of 50 ft. where 175 ft. is required, a front setback of 15 ft. where 50 ft. is**
238 **required and side setbacks of 12 ft. on both sides where 30 ft. is required & a lot of 7,750 sq.**
239 **ft. where 50,000 sq. ft. is the minimum required per plans submitted.**

240 **Mr. Breton seconded the motion**

241 **No discussion**

242 **Vote 5-0**

243 **Motion carries**

244

245 **Lot 21-Z-268, Case # 32-2016**

246 **Applicant**-Edward N. Herbert Assoc., Inc.

247 **Owner**- The Carr Hill Family Trust

248 **Location**- 25A Cobbett's Pond Road

249 **Zoning District**-Residence A & Cobbett's Pond and Canobie Lake Watershed Protection

250 Variance relief is requested from **Section 702 App. A-1** to allow the attached garage to have a 40 ft.
251 front setback.

252

253 Ms. Skinner read the case and abutters list into the record.

254

255 Joe Maynard was representing the applicant.

256

257 Mr. Maynard noted the project was granted relief in February for setbacks, but because of shoreland
258 permitting they needed to move the house outside of the 50' shoreland area so the setbacks changed.
259 The property has some outbuildings and an existing driveway. The driveway needed to be
260 reconfigured to get a good approach into the garage. By moving the house out of the 50' shoreland
261 area, they now need relief for the new location of the proposed garage.

262

263 Mr. Maynard reviewed the five criteria.

264

265 *James Harvey – abutter*

266 It is a betterment to the neighborhood. Having lived next door he believes the owner has done the
267 best to their ability to meet the setbacks. He is in favor of the application.

268

269 **MOTION: Mr. Breton made a motion to go into deliberative.**

270 **Ms. Skinner seconded the motion.**

271 **No discussion**

272 **Vote 5-0**

273 **Motion carries**

274

275 Chairman Samsel, Mr. Breton, Ms. Skinner and Mr. Scholz were comfortable with the plans and
276 believe it is a reasonable request and met all five criteria.

277

278 Mr. Partington reviewed the five criteria. In his opinion:

279 1. (contrary to public interest): met the criteria

280 2. (spirit of the ordinance): met the criteria

281 3. (substantial justice): met the criteria

282 4. (value of surrounding properties): met the criteria

283 5. (hardship): met the criteria

284
285 **MOTION: Mr. Scholz made a motion to grant variance relief from Section 702 App. A-1 to**
286 **allow the attached garage to have a 40 ft. front setback per plans submitted.**

287 **Mr. Breton seconded the motion**

288 **No discussion**

289 **Vote 5-0**

290 **Motion carries**

291

292 **Lot 16-Q-172, Case # 33-2016**

293 **Applicant/Owner** –Paul J. Adams/Peter Costa

294 **Location**-30 First Street

295 **Zoning District**-Residence A & Cobbett’s Pond and Canobie Lake Watershed Protection

296 Variance relief is requested from **Section 702, App. A-1** to allow an 8 ft.x10 ft. shed to have a 5 ft.
297 side setback where 30 ft. is required.

298

299 Ms. Skinner read the case and abutters list into the record.

300

301 Paul McAdams presented the application. They need more storage for the home. They were hoping
302 to put in an 8x12 shed. Mr. McAdams noted that the legal notice stated they were looking to put in
303 an 8x10 shed.

304

305 The board agreed it should be re-noticed with the correct dimensions.

306

307 Ms. Skinner noted that the Conservation Commission had no issue with the plan.

308

309 **MOTION: Mr Scholz made a motion to continue the hearing for Case #33-2016 to the**
310 **October 25, 2016 meeting to allow for reposting to include the correct dimensions of 8’x12’.**

311 **Mr. Breton seconded the motion**

312 **No discussion**

313 **Vote 5-0**

314 **Motion carries**

315

316 **Lots 13-A-90 & 13-A-196A, Case # 34-2016**

317 **Applicant/Owner**-Medicus Healthcare Solutions, LLC

318 **Location**-22 Roulston Rd. & 12 Industrial Drive

319 **Zoning District**-Residence A and Wetland & Watershed Protection (WWPD)

320 Variance relief is requested from **Section 601.3** to allow to allow parking in the WWPD which is
321 not an allowed use, **Section 702.5** to allow parking without a 50 ft. buffer from a residential zoning
322 district, **Section 702, App. A-1 note 9** to allow parking without a 50 ft. buffer from a residential
323 zoning district.

324

325 Ms. Skinner read the case and abutters list into the record.

326

327 Mr. Karl Dubay and Matt Morrissey from Medicus presented the application.

328

329 Mr. Morrissey gave a history of Medicus. He noted they are outgrowing their current buildings
330 sooner than expected. They need to add additional parking. They had the opportunity to purchase
331 some land from the Windham Coop School to create additional parking adjacent to their buildings.

332 They will eventually look to put in a third building. The request for additional parking is a result of
333 the large density of employees in the second building.

334
335 Mr. Dubay submitted *Exhibit A* –a chart indicating the valuation of the property provided by the
336 assessor. The parcel is the second highest assessed parcel in town.

337
338 *Exhibit B – Color copy of the plans*

339 Mr. Dubay noted the residential zone buffer is for a parcel that is across the street and is abandoned.
340 He noted they will reconfigure the existing parking lot. They will expand the wet pond and add a
341 small ditch that will tie into the culvert system. They will install pervious pavement. They are not
342 proposing an additional driveway cut onto Roulston Road.

343
344 They met with the Conservation Commission and Economic Development and both went well and
345 resulted in some design improvements to the parking lot to maximize the buffers as much as
346 possible.

347
348 *Exhibit C – more detailed plan of the right side parking.*

349 The new plan refines the buffer and provides a 30’ buffer all the way down to a 2’ buffer where 50’
350 are required. This exhibit shows the grading and dimensional criteria.

351
352 *Exhibit D – summary of the tax map and zoning overlay plans*

353 Summarizes where the zone lines are in the area. The majority of the site is in limited industrial
354 district but there is one small area in residential. There is a road in-between the residential area and
355 the proposed parking area.

356
357 *Exhibit E – Aerial view with GIS mapping overlaid*

358 Mr. Scholz noted the zoning district is limited industrial and not residential A which is how it was
359 posted so it was posted incorrectly.

360
361 Chairman Samsel and Mr. Breton did not have any concerns about the way it was posted.

362
363 Mr. Dubay noted there is a substantial buffer in the form of vegetation and roads between the
364 abandoned home and the parking area.

365
366 A small portion of the lot is in the lake overlay district. They are conforming to that.

367
368 Mr. Dubay reviewed the five criteria for both variance requests.

369
370 Chairman Samsel asked for clarification on the waterflow for the new section of parking that abuts
371 the rail trail. Mr. Dubay noted the drainage does go towards the rail trail but is intercepted by a
372 drainage ditch. They are expanding the wet pond for more capacity and adding in porous pavement.
373 With those two systems working together, they would make sure their drainage volumes were
374 reduced. They do not want to put more impact on the rail trail ditches. Chairman Samsel raised
375 concerns over drainage noting it would be their responsibility to mitigate any additional stormwater
376 that may jeopardize the integrity of the rail trail.

377

378 Mr. Partington questioned how the transition worked from impervious to porous pavement. Mr.
379 Dubay noted they like to see the sheet flow go from impervious to porous and that is developed in
380 the engineering details.

381
382 Mr. Partington questioned how they salt porous pavement in the winter. Mr. Dubay noted they use a
383 vendor with certification and training to maintain it during the winter. With porous pavement you
384 do not have to use a lot of salt. The pavement has good qualities so that sun will melt it quickly. It
385 will be addressed in the operation and maintenance plan.

386
387 Mr. Partington asked what the business hours are. Mr. Dubay noted they will be doing night sky
388 friendly lights throughout the entire lot. Mr. Morrissey noted they work all hours.

389
390 Ms. Skinner noted the Conservation Commission sent a letter stating they had no issues with the
391 setbacks.

392
393 *James Harvey – Member of the Executive Board for the Windham Coop School*

394 They are in favor of the project and believe it would fit with the current characteristics of the area.

395
396 **MOTION: Mr. Breton made a motion to go into deliberative.**

397 **Ms. Skinner seconded the motion.**

398 **No discussion**

399 **Vote 5-0**

400 **Motion carries**

401
402 Mr. Partington reviewed the five criteria. In his opinion:

- 403 1. (contrary to public interest): met the criteria
- 404 2. (spirit of the ordinance): met the criteria
- 405 3. (substantial justice): met the criteria
- 406 4. (value of surrounding properties): met the criteria
- 407 5. (hardship): met the criteria

408
409 Mr. Scholz agreed it met the five criteria. He noted for the record that the applicant did specify
410 limited industrial in their application, which is the correct zone.

411
412 Chairman Samsel agreed it met the five criteria. He added that he has concern over any drainage
413 that may go onto state property (rail trail).

414
415 Mr. Breton and Ms. Skinner agree it met the five criteria.

416
417 **MOTION: Mr. Scholz made a motion to grant variance relief from Section 601.3 to allow to**
418 **allow parking in the WWPD which is not an allowed use, Section 702.5 to allow parking**
419 **without a 50 ft. buffer from a residential zoning district, Section 702, App. A-1 note 9 to allow**
420 **parking without a 50 ft. buffer from a residential zoning district conditioned on proper**
421 **maintenance of porous pavement per plans submitted.**

422 **Mr. Breton seconded the motion**

423 **No discussion**

424 **Vote 5-0**

425 **Motion carries**

426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472

The board took a five-minute recess and returned at 10:03 p.m.

Appeal of an Administrative decision- Lot 18-L-400, 49 Range Road

Applicant-49 Range Road Leasing, LLC

The applicant is appealing a decision of the Code Enforcement Administrator that site plan review not required as exempt under Site Plan Regulation Sec 302.7

Robert Murphy explained why they were appealing the decision.

Chairman Samsel noted they received correspondence from Attorney Campbell who noted the board needed to determine if they believe they have jurisdiction to hear the appeal.

Mr. Gregory released the letters from Attorney Campbell to the public. Chairman Samsel read the letter into the record.

Chairman Samsel also read the letter received from Attorney Bisson, representing the property owner, which was addressed to the Chairman of the Board.

The letters noted that the board has limited subject matter jurisdiction. If Mr. Gregory relied on the definition of expansion from the zoning ordinance then they have jurisdiction. If he relied on the definition from the site plan regulations then they do not have jurisdiction.

Mr. Murphy noted that they have applied for an appeal to the court and to the board. If the board determines they do not have jurisdiction, then they will go to the court. If the board determines that Mr. Gregory based his decision on the zoning ordinance, then they have a right to appeal. The appeal to the zoning board is the first step in the process.

Mr. Scholz questioned the time limit of appeals and asked Mr. Murphy how he determined the timeframe. Mr. Murphy noted they knew because of the timing of the site plan review. They determined Mr. Gregory could not have responded prior to July 27, 2016 and they filed their appeal on August 26, 2016.

Chairman Samsel questioned Mr. Gregory on what he used to interpret the definition. Mr. Gregory noted he used the site plan regulations.

The board agreed they did not have jurisdiction to hear the appeal.

MOTION: Mr. Breton made a motion to deny the appeal of a decision made by the Code Enforcement Administrator because they determined they do not have jurisdiction over the request. Mr. Scholz seconded the motion

No discussion

Vote 5-0

Motion carries

Other Business

473 Mr. Scholz noted they used to receive a variance history for all cases and no longer receive that.
474 Chairman Samsel noted it is good information to know, but not relevant to the cases before them.
475 Mr. Gregory noted he could include information if a variance has been denied. Mr. Scholz noted he
476 wanted to know that a review of the history is being done. The board agreed only denials should be
477 included.

478
479 **Review of the 8/23/16 Minutes**
480 **MOTION: Mr. Scholz made a motion to approve as amended the minutes from 8/23/16.**
481 **Mr. Partington seconded the motion**
482 **No discussion**
483 **Vote 4-0-1. Mr. Breton abstained.**
484 **Motion carries**

485
486 Mr. Partington requested that if board members were not available to attend meetings on Election
487 Day, they submit their request ahead of time and not the day of, since they likely know in advance
488 whether they can attend the meeting. The board discussed whether they should always cancel on
489 election days since many board members are involved in the elections.

490
491 **MOTION: Mr. Breton made a motion to cancel the November 8, 2016 meeting due to**
492 **Election Day.**
493 **Mr. Scholz seconded the motion**

494
495 **Discussion: The board did not have a problem meeting on that day and noted they have many**
496 **alternates.**

497
498 **Mr. Breton retracted his motion. Mr. Scholz retracted is second.**

499
500 **MOTION: Mr. Breton made a motion to adjourn at 10:51p.m.**

501 **Mr. Scholz seconded the motion.**

502 **Vote 5-0-0.**

503 **Motion passes.**

504
505 **Submitted by Andrea Cairns**