

**Danville Zoning Board of Adjustment**  
**Feb. 21, 2017**  
**7:30 pm**

**Members present:** Chris Stafford-chairman, Curt Springer, Tara Burkhart, Joe Luna, Roger Denison, Michelle Cooper, John Russo, Roger Whitehouse

**Excused members:** Jason Holder

**Others present:** Kevin Hatch, Atty.. Matt Serge, Cynthia Boisvert-Arago Land Consultants, Walter Baird, Ed Lang, David Knight; Judith Mathieu; **Heritage Commission:** Carol Baird, Jim Castine, Stacie O'Connor, Linda Roth, Marguerite Guilmette, Brenda Whitehouse; **Selectmen:** Shawn O'Neil, Judi Cogswell, Sheila Johannesen (left at 7:45pm)

Chris Stafford stated the business tonight included a continued discussion of a variance request for Peter Gorton and a rehearing discussion regarding the Meetinghouse Subdivision. The December 13, 2016 and January 24, 2017 minutes will be reviewed. (Note: The date on the draft minutes was erroneously noted as January 12<sup>th</sup>. This was the date referenced throughout this evening's discussion.) He suggested waiting to review the January minutes until after the variance discussion.

Curt made and Joe seconded a **motion to accept the December 13, 2016 minutes as amended.** John, Roger D., and Michelle abstained. The motion **passed.**

The annual meeting date was set for May 2, 2017 at 7:30pm.

**Peter Gorton, 78 Walker Road, Tax Map and Lot 3-21-15, variance of article VL.A, regarding lots with less than 200' of frontage for a proposed subdivision**

Curt excused himself from the table and sat with the audience.

It was noted that this particular application has been continued two times. Public testimony has been taken but the Board has not deliberated. Questions were raised previously about the density due to the multi-family subdivision on 11.9 acres. The possibility of reconfiguring the plans was discussed with the engineer and this was to be investigated and discussed with the property owner. The Fire Chief had stated the driveway as proposed is too long and the width will not support emergency apparatus. The engineer was aware of the continuation date and an abutter to the property is present for tonight's discussion. The Board discussed continuing the discussion or voting on it as submitted.

Roger W. said he believes the applicant should be aware of the discussion before a determination is given. Joe said that this application was brought to the Board four months ago and that should have been enough time to resolve any issues. The property owner has not appeared at the prior two hearings.

Chris said this raises some procedural issues that could be addressed in the Rules of Procedure. He said this Board also has another open application for a property off of Kingston Road, in which the applicant simply stopped attending the meetings and has not communicated with the Board. He said this represents a gap in our process. Something could be added to the Rules of Procedure regarding unexcused absences from meetings being grounds for denial of applications and/or requests. Chris said he is reluctant to vote due to this other application.

Tara said it seems unlikely the other applicants will be returning. Roger W. said a policy should be put in place before a vote is taken. Roger D. suggested offering continuation dates for the Gorton hearing and concluding at that future date. Chris pointed out that if we don't choose a date certain at this time then the abutters would have to be re-notified, the cost of which could be borne by the applicant.

Joe said that we've had hearings in which abutters have shown up and the applicant has failed to present anything. He said this is disrespectful to the process. He does not wish to penalize the applicant for failing to complete or present the application but to date they have not shown much interest in continuing. He said that even if we continued to a new date, the plan may be reconfigured such that it would create a new application.

Roger W. said he'd like to continue to a new date. Joe, Tara, and Roger D. said they'd like to deliberate and decide on the application tonight.

Chris reiterated that two issues were raised that would prevent the applicant from meeting the five criteria: the density and the driveway configuration. These are contrary to the public interest and a plan with six dwellings on less than 12 acres does not meet density. The plan as presented does not meet the criteria for granting a variance. Joe made and Tara seconded a **motion to deny the variance request**. The motion **passed** unanimously.

**Appeal from an administrative decision made by the Danville Board of Selectmen regarding a subdivision approval made by the Danville Planning Board on September 8, 2016 for Tax map 2 Lot 75, owned by Delridge Realty, which is adjacent to the Meeting House land (Map 2, lot 73) and cemetery (Map 2, Lot 74), which are lots in the Historic District.**

Chris excused himself from the table and Curt returned to the table.

Joe made and Roger D. seconded a **motion to approve the January 24, 2017 minutes as amended**. Curt abstained. The motion **passed**.

There was a question about who will be the voting members for this part of the discussion. Curt designated the voting members as himself, Joe, Tara, John and Roger D. Michelle sat with the audience.

Curt said this is a de novo case. Three hearings were held in October, November and December. A vote was taken in December saying the ZBA did not accept jurisdiction over the case. The Board of Selectmen appealed for a rehearing because under the law, only the Selectmen can appeal even though it was originally the Heritage Commission that first filed the Administrative

Appeal. On January 24th the ZBA voted to rehear the case based on advice given that the Selectmen become the appellant. The first time this Board considered this, the issues of standing and jurisdiction were considered. Now those are moot and this is a standard hearing. This Board voted for a public hearing and we will first recognize the Selectmen as the formal appellants. Then the Planning Board (PB), the property owner, and then abutters will have the opportunity to speak. Any of the aforementioned parties may have their agent or designee speak on their behalf.

Kevin Hatch, engineer for the property owner, said that the property owner's attorney, Sumner Kalman, had asked for a document to be hand-delivered at tonight's meeting. Copies of the "Objection to the Motion for Rehearing" document dated February 17, 2017 were given to the Board members. Matt Serge, attorney representing the Board of Selectmen, asked for a copy and was given one. Curt said that we could take testimony tonight or reschedule the meeting until legal advice is obtained regarding how to proceed. Joe questioned whether or not that was actionable by this Board because the request for a rehearing was already granted. He said the document from Atty. Kalman would have been timelier if it had been delivered earlier.

Kevin Hatch said that no certified letters were sent out for the meeting on January 24<sup>th</sup>. Curt said that apparently Attorney Kalman knew about the January meeting and that Kevin Hatch was in attendance at the meeting. Attorney Serge asked if the Board opened the public hearing yet. It was agreed that the motion to grant the rehearing couldn't be taken back. Curt said he would accept any points of order regarding taking public testimony at this meeting. Joe made and John seconded a **motion to open the public hearing**. The motion **passed** unanimously.

Shawn O'Neil, on behalf of the Selectmen, said he deferred to Attorney Serge to present the case. Attorney Serge said the letter from Attorney Kalman was untimely and the substance regarding the rehearing is incorrect since the Selectmen were invited to file a rehearing which was subsequently granted. He said this is a de novo review.

Atty. Serge said he will introduce two witnesses tonight: Cynthia Boisvert, the surveyor hired by the Selectmen, and Carol Baird, the chairman of the Heritage Commission.

Atty. Serge gave the Board members copies of a Request for Findings of Fact and Rulings of Law. He explained that by law the Board does not have to make any factual findings unless a specific request is made to do so. He said this goes through a chronology of events and procedures and asked the Board to either admit or deny them for the record.

He said that we are not here to decide who owns what and he is aware that the ZBA does not decide title issues, but that it decides zoning issues. He said the Selectmen are not here to say the land should not be developed, but that the Planning Board erred procedurally in approving the subdivision.

He said that Ms. Boisvert did extensive research and outlined the Historic District (HD), indicating the stone wall that is closest to the well location of the northern most lot is the edge of the HD. He handed out a colored plan showing Ms. Boisvert's delineation of the HD superimposed over the subdivision plan.

Atty. Serge also indicated that he has reviewed town maps from 2000 and 2008 which indicate the HD is what Ms. Boisvert indicates on the boundary survey and not what is on the subdivision plan. He said that he agrees with Atty. Pelech that if a survey shows different lot lines, it does not change the boundary of the district. He noted the Hearse House foundation is located within the area on the map that is indicated to be the HD. This is consistent with what the HD is, in that it is there to preserve historic structures.

Atty. Serge indicated that the HD logically follows the line of the stone wall, as generally stone walls were the parcel boundaries. He indicated that this puts part of lot 75-1 in the HD, making the lot a split lot, or one that has two district boundaries within it. He paraphrased section X.A of the Zoning Ordinance (ZO) which states that when there is a conflict of zones, the more restrictive one controls. This means the HD ordinance should have been considered when reviewing this lot. The Hearse House was not shown on the subdivision plan and the PB did not follow the proper procedure as outlined in the ZO when reviewing the subdivision, which calls for coordination between the PB and HC. Since the HD regulations are more restrictive, these should be the controlling regulations for the whole lot.

It was noted that in the original subdivision plan, the septic box was over the stone wall and the well radii was in the HD. Septic approvals have been sought and obtained from the state although it appears the septic has been relocated. The well is still within the HD. Atty. Serge said that it should be recognized that excavation, drainage, and other activities subsidiary to construction will occur in the HD, and this brings up the second zoning violation which is that anyone doing anything in the HD must first receive a certificate of approval from the HC. The PB granted final approval for the subdivision without any condition for seeking this certificate.

Cynthia Boisvert introduced herself as the surveyor hired by the Selectmen to conduct the survey for the meetinghouse and cemetery lots. She handed out 11"x17" recorded boundary plan (D-39980) and copies of a topo plan which she created from the subdivision plan. She said the purpose of the topo was to show the location of the Hearse House as between the cemetery and old stone wall, off of Main Street. She said this is in the HD. The topo also shows the 4000 square foot septic box. This box is required by the state to show where a septic system can be placed as well as a replacement system should the first fail. This septic box extends past the old stone wall into the HD and where the Hearse House foundation is.

Surveyors are required to address zoning and setbacks yet these were not in the subdivision plan. The Hearse House foundation is shown on the boundary plan. Ms. Boisvert stated the well radius has to be solely within the lot that it serves. It was explained that a septic system cannot be put within a well radius.

Curt asked what harm would be done with having a well radius within the HD. Atty. Serge explained that it is a title issue and puts an encumbrance on abutting land if the well radius extends over the property line. This is also a liability issue if the well becomes contaminated. It was explained that the HC should be involved when there is anything proposed within the HD.

Curt said he does not understand what the issue is for this lot, if the well radius can be put within the confines of the lot lines. Ms. Boisvert read from the ZO, Article XIII.B.6, "Any activity which may come before the Board of Selectmen, Conservation Commission or Planning Board

related to Tuckertown Road and its branches on town land or land within the Historic District under the closed, scenic and trail designations or for any other purpose shall be discussed with the Heritage Commission as part of the decision-making process.”

Ms. Boisvert explained that the septic system is much smaller than the 4000 square feet required to be shown on the plans. The size is a state requirement to ensure that if the first system fails, a new one can be built in a different location. She said that lot 75-1 is so tight, there is no room for anything to be moved. She said the septic box is an activity that was not discussed with the HC.

Curt asked if the first system fails and then the new owners go to the HC to get the certificate of approval to build the new system within the HD, if the certificate is denied, is there any reason the new owners can't put the replacement system in the same location as the failed system. Ms. Boisvert said the state will tell the owners to use the area within the septic box, not the same area as the failed system. She reiterated that the time to deal with that was during the original subdivision approval process with the PB.

Atty. Serge said this is a unique situation with a split lot. He reiterated that whatever happens in that lot, all of the activity should have been discussed with the HC. Curt said that he does not understand the concept of a split lot. Atty. Serge said the HD is an overlay, and just like a wetland overlay, the HD overlay applies and cannot be ignored.

Curt said that suppose the ZO does not specify a particular outcome that should result from the PB and the HC discussing a subdivision. He asked how that would translate to the PB requirements in the subdivision process. Ms. Boisvert said the ZO requires that the HC be involved in the process when the HD is being discussed. She read from ZO Article XIII.B.7 which reads, “It is unlawful for the municipality or any person to excavate, construct, alter, repair, move or demolish any buildings, structure, site or improvement which lies within an historic district, area or place, without first obtaining a Certificate of Approval from the Heritage Commission.”

She emphasized that the intent of the septic box is that at some point, a septic system will be placed within the HD. Atty. Serge stated that the PB could have involved the HC during the process and approved the subdivision without the Certificate of Approval having been issued, but the point is that the HC was not involved in the process as the ZO states it should have been. Given the uniqueness of the lot the HC should have been given a say regarding the subdivision.

Curt said the PB minutes will show the HC was involved in the process. Atty. Serge strongly disagreed with that. He said the HC came to the PB meetings as an interested party, not as a part of the approval process. The HC had the ability to attend public meetings and offer testimony just like anyone else, but they were not involved to the extent the ZO specifies.

Curt said that suppose the PB had made the point of involving the HC, and the HC had required Certificates of Approval, but the PB disagreed and approved the plan exactly as it has been approved. Curt asked if that would be acceptable. Atty. Serge said that he is unsure what his client would have said if the HC had been involved in the approval process. He said the reason for having a ZO is so a process is followed and respected. He said Curt's hypothetical situation may be what would have happened, and the aggrieved party could seek relief, but that particular

situation was not what happened. Curt said that this could be sent back to the PB but then it will still have come before this Board for a different reason.

Curt asked if there are any other issues that need to be considered, other than the septic box and Hearse House foundation. Atty. Serge said he is unaware of any other physical aspects that need to be considered. Ms. Boisvert said the process of involving the HC should have happened from the very beginning per the ZO.

Carol Baird briefly explained the history behind the HD and why it is important to the town. The town voted in favor of the Historic District zoning article in March 1999. Mrs. Baird showed the map that was used to form the HD with highlighted parcels indicating the lots to be included. She said this is what was presented to the voters. Included in this zone are the Meeting House, adjacent cemetery, and the remains of the Hearse House which was built in 1829. She showed a photograph taken in 1959 of the Hearse House as it stood on the property near the road. She summarized the purposes of the HD ordinance: safeguard the heritage of Danville; enhance the visual character, foster public appreciation, strengthen the economy, enhance property values, and promote the use of the historic district for the general welfare of the community.

Mrs. Baird read RSA 674:45 which explains the purposes of historic districts. She said that a list of activities requiring a Certificate of Approval from the HC is in the ZO. This includes anything that would have an impact on existing foundations as stated in Article XIII.8.k

Curt asked about the items requiring a Certificate of Approval, specifically if a foundation is to be disturbed. Atty. Serge said the HC has the authority to grant approval for any work to be done in that zone, but he cannot speak about what they would or would not approve. He said he'd be surprised if they allow a historical foundation to be disturbed. Atty. Serge said this gets back to the original point, in that the HC should have been involved. Curt asked about the statutory authority behind that. Atty. Serge said that it is a zoning requirement and the statutory underpinning is the town's ability to enact a zoning ordinance, and that the requirement to obtain a Certificate of Approval is perfectly legal.

Curt asked if anyone from the PB would like to speak. Jim Castine said that Mrs. Baird attended the PB meetings as a member of the public and to say the HC was involved is like saying the Police Department was involved in this hearing because a police officer is sitting in the audience.

Curt asked if the property owner would like to speak. Kevin Hatch introduced himself as the surveyor working for Delridge Realty, the property owner. He said the PB has no power to make boundary decisions. He said that only 75-1 is under discussion and there are others in town who would like to start working on the other lots in the subdivision. .

Mr. Hatch spoke about the HD and said it was created by map and lot number, specifically lots 2-73 and 2-74. He cited ZO Article XIII.7 and 8, saying these sections outline the activities requiring review by HC and that each of them involve physical changes to the property. He explained the well radius is for protection of the well and does not involve physical change. He disagreed with the interpretation of where the HD is and said that even if it were correct, there is nothing on his plan that proposes physical changes.

Mr. Hatch said the PB did not err in its interpretation and to say the HC was not involved in the process is incorrect. He explained that five letters were sent from the HC to the PB during the plan review. Carol Baird was also present during a meeting with Mr. Hatch and Peter Loughlin, counsel for the town. Mr. Hatch said that Mrs. Baird was present at every meeting and that some meetings included other members of the HC, and that there was never a request by the HC to have the application brought to them.

Mr. Hatch said that he does not believe a portion of the property is in the HD. He mentioned the book *Reminiscences* from which Mrs. Baird produced the photo of the Hearse House. He said a hearse in 1829 was a horse-drawn carriage and did not require a two-story structure to house it. He said page 7-4 of the Master Plan states a hearse house was relocated to the Center Cemetery in 1890s. He said page 7-18 of the Master Plan lists historic structures and it also notes the hearse house was moved in the 1890s to Center Cemetery.

Mr. Hatch said the structure in the photograph must have had a different use. He suggested the other use was that of an ice house and said there are records of leases for ice-houses near Peaselee Pond, which is on his client's property. In 1929 a lease for an ice-house was recorded which grants permission for the construction of the house and spells out the rules for cutting the ice, stating a right-of-way was granted near the cemetery, keeping up gates and bars. Mr. Hatch explained the path had to be kept, possibly between the stone walls, with gates possibly to keep out cattle. This is leading from the road to the pond with a structure near the road from which the ice was sold. He said there is little evidence of stones left and the stones are more of a ramp leading toward the pond. He said there is little reason for a ramp to lead to the pond if it were for a hearse.

Mr. Hatch said there are other articles that mention the hearse house, including something on the HC website which talks about the history of the Page/Peaselee family. The family flooded the land and leased the rights to build ice houses to others. When Henrietta Peaselee took up residence, she continued leasing the property for the ice business. He said this history was never mentioned during the PB hearings and said this Board should not continue delaying the project because of a boundary issue. He said this should be decided in court and arbitrary methods of slowing down the development should not be used. He said that if it goes to court and the court finds the lot line changes, then the zoning district boundary will change.

Curt asked Mr. Hatch about the zoning district boundary. He said that Atty. Pelech stated the boundary was based on what was laid out as the official map in 2008, or that the zone boundaries were essentially locked in to whatever was voted on in 2008. Mr. Hatch said he disagreed with that and that the PB does not have power to move the boundaries. He said the zoning districts stay where they were in 2008 and a survey will not move the boundary. He gave an example of someone buying a parcel in one zone, and then buying an abutting parcel which is in a different zone, then combining the two lots. Mr. Hatch said the zones will remain where they were even if the lots were combined into one. He said a survey precisely defines the lots and the zone boundaries will follow the parcel lines as defined in a survey.

Mr. Hatch further stated the PB was not required to have a joint hearing with the HC. Even if the PB thought part of the HD was in the subject property, no physical activity was proposed that

would trigger a review by the HC. Roger D. asked if Mr. Hatch thought any of the subject parcel is in the HD. Mr. Hatch said he did not.

Curt asked if any abutters would like to comment. There were no comments.

Atty. Serge commented that while the discussion is regarding lot 75-1, RSA 676:6 states that the appeal with the ZBA affects the entire subdivision approval and no activity should occur until the matter is resolved. Curt said that two lots have been conveyed. Atty. Serge said he is aware of this and a letter had been sent to the property owner informing him of the appeal and RSA 676:6 and that the subdivision approval is under appeal and the lots cannot be taken out piecemeal.

Atty. Serge said the ZO describes the district lines and specific lot numbers, and that they are documented in the town map and also defined by the official zoning map and all amendments. He said he agrees with Atty. Pelech in that the district lines do not change just because a lot line changes.

He mentioned that members of the HC attended the PB meetings as interested parties to the application which is not the same as attending as part of the decision making process. He read from the 23 June 2016 PB minutes which say that Carol Baird asked if the meeting with Peter Loughlin will be open to the public. (Note: Atty. Serge said the date was 28 July 2016) He read a portion of the ZO, Article XIII.a.3, "The areas and boundaries of the historic district are documented in Article III, Paragraph F., 'Zoning District and Boundaries' of the Danville Zoning Ordinance *and* on maps which are hereby designated as the Historic District Map of the Town of Danville *and* made a part of this Ordinance *and* the Official Zoning Map of the Town of Danville, together with all future amendments." (emphasis added) He said this answers the question about the 2008 zoning map defining the district.

Mrs. Baird showed the Board members a picture of the ice house from the Ruth Rich compilation titled The History of Danville, New Hampshire, published in 1976. She also showed the Board members a picture of the Hearse House from Reminiscences. Mrs. Baird discussed the Hearse House, saying she has spoken with several people who were living in Danville when the ice house was in operation. Clint Arnold told her he remembers walking down the cemetery road to the end and then turning right and that the ice house was near the water's edge. Butch Sanborn and Evelyn Arnold said the ice house was at the end of the cemetery road and to the right. Mr. Sanborn and Ms. Arnold both said the Hearse House was about 50' from Route 111A. Deb Meigs said the photograph of the Hearse House was taken around 1959 and it was the building used to house the hearse. Joe DeMarco, who lived in the cabin on the Delridge property, said to get to the ice house, you'd have to walk all the way down the cemetery road, turn right, and the ice house was near the water's edge.

Mrs. Baird said she wanted to clarify information regarding the Hearse House. She said the research done by the HC showed that a town vote was made in 1829 that a Hearse House be built on or near the burying ground near the Great Meadow Mill. She shared a map showing the Great Meadow Mill was south of Tuckertown Road and opposite Peaselee Pond. Town records and town reports indicate there was also a hearse house at Center Cemetery. There was a lot of work done at Center Cemetery including moving that hearse house from one location to another at



Center Cemetery. She said there is an assumption that the hearse house mentioned by Mr. Hatch is the one that was at the Old Meeting House cemetery but there is no documentation to support this. There is documentation that the Hearse House next to the Old Meeting House was there until 1959.

Mrs. Baird said the letters from the HC were done voluntarily and they were not invited to participate. She noted the PB has sent applicants to the HC and to the Conservation Commission in the past whenever there's a question regarding an application. She stated that no one from the PB was present during the discussion with Peter Loughlin and Kevin Hatch. She said the issue of the HD was brought up in July and from that point the HC continued to bring that concern to the PB's attention.

Curt asked if it is possible that there were two ice-houses and that one nearer the road was a retail location. Mrs. Baird said that people who grew up here said the Hearse House was 50' from the road and the ice-house was further away and near the water's edge. She said the town voted to build the Hearse House near the Great Meadow Mill near the burying ground. She said there are statements from residents, photographs, and other documents supporting the locations as she stated previously.

Atty. Serge said the Hearse House is not the lynch pin but is just another piece of the puzzle indicating where the correct line is.

Joe said that a letter was delivered to the PB from the HC on 25 August 2016, the same day that conditional approval was granted. This letter (dated 24 August 2016) identified conditions with which the HC disagreed. Final approval was granted on 8 September 2016. Atty. Serge said the letter should be part of the PB record. Joe asked for copies of the meeting minutes in which conditional and final approval were granted and a copy of the aforementioned letter. Mrs. Baird pointed out that the letter generated at that time was based on the assumption that the Meeting House lots were triangular.

Chris Stafford asked about certified letters being sent to all of the abutters. The receipts showed that all of the abutters were sent notices regarding the meeting. Curt said the Betsy Sanders received hers; Chris Stafford said he received his but there were some abutters who did not receive their letters.

John made and Roger D. seconded a **motion to close the public hearing**. The motion **passed** unanimously.

Joe said that this Board should address the request for findings of fact. He said a number of things were discussed that he's not sure the Board has seen. He made the following statements and posed the following questions:

1. Was the 24 August 2016 letter read into the minutes
2. What are the conditions given for conditional approval
3. Would like to read the minutes from the meetings in which conditional approval and final approval were given
4. Were the conditions met
5. Was there any correspondence from the PB to the HC whatsoever

6. Are there minutes for the meeting with Peter Loughlin and Kevin Hatch
7. Can this Board see a larger copy of the zoning map
8. A copy of the final approval for the Delridge Plan should be reviewed by this Board
9. Delridge contends their application was submitted in May 2016 and the possible issues with the HD were made in July 2016
10. Mr. Hatch intimated there were delays as a result of the HD issue. We don't know that but there was no testimony given by the town to refute that
11. The Board members should familiarize themselves with the ZO and the HD ordinance
12. The importance or lack thereof by Atty. Serge's assertion that the issue is only with lot 75-1—it is not known if that's important in this Board's decision making process
13. Will our decision have any implications on the other lots
14. The issue regarding a split lot is not fully understood
15. There are a number of issues that this Board could deliberate on, including should the PB have formally involved the HC in their decision making process
16. There is some uncertainty regarding the encroachment of the plan and there may be more concerns regarding the impact to zoning

Curt mentioned the request for findings. Atty. Serge said that under the Supreme Court law, this request has been made to the ZBA so it should be acted upon.

There was a short discussion about contacting Atty. Pelech with some questions. The request was made to involve the entire Board in compiling questions to an attorney. Joe said this Board may answer its own questions as it deliberates. Curt mentioned that Atty. Pelech is unavailable for a few weeks. Dave Knight asked that the Board members not discuss the issues among themselves. Joe asked and the Board concurred, that if each member looks for some answers, those can be brought to the other members at the next meeting and not discussed among themselves beforehand. Walter Baird asked if the questions posed to Atty. Pelech can be made public. Joe said that perhaps the questions can be inserted into the answers.

Curt made and Joe seconded a **motion to continue the public meeting on 28 February 2017 at 7:30pm**. The motion **passed** unanimously.

At 10:00pm Tara made and John seconded a **motion to adjourn**. The motion **passed** unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Janet S. Denison