

TOWN OF BEDFORD
September 18, 2018
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES

A regular meeting of the Bedford Zoning Board of Adjustment was held on Tuesday, September 18, 2018 at 7:00 p.m. in the Bedford Meeting Room, 10 Meetinghouse Road, Bedford, NH. Present were: John Morin (Chairman), Gigi Georges (Vice Chairman), Kevin Duhaime, Melissa Stevens, Neal Casale (Alternate), Dave Gilbert (Alternate), and Karin Elmer (Planner 1)

Chairman Morin called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and introduced members of the Board. Regular member Sharon Stirling and Alternate Len Green were absent. Mr. Gilbert was appointed to vote.

Approval of Minutes:

Amendments: Page 18, Line 13, 'day doggie clients' should read 'daycare clients,' and Page 35, third full paragraph, 'Ms. McGinley' should read 'Ms. Elmer.'

MOTION by Mr. Gilbert to approve the minutes of the August 21, 2018 meeting of the Bedford Zoning Board of Adjustment as amended. Mr. Casale duly seconded the motion. Vote taken; motion carried on the minutes as amended, with Ms. Georges abstaining.

Chairman Morin reviewed the rules of procedure and swore in members of the public.

Applications:

- 1. Thomas & Emily Harrington (Owners) – Request for a variance from Article IV, Section 275-28 in order to construct a family room addition 28 feet from the edge of a wetland where 50 feet is required at 177 County Rd., Lot 22-84. Zoned R&A.**

Thomas and Emily Harrington were present to address their request for a variance. A photograph of their residence was posted on the screen.

Mr. Harrington stated as the Board can see, we are respectfully requesting that you grant this variance so that we can build a single family room addition to our home. We have three children and we would like to expand, it will be on the right-hand side of our residence as it is shown on the screen in the plan. We are requesting to enter the buffer zone of the pond that is on the far right corner of our residence. We have been

told that it is a manmade pond, I do not know, but it is a perfect circular shape that has now grown the vegetation around it. We have called upon a wetland scientist to come out to map it and look it over and it is in fact considered by everybody's definition a wetland. The way that our plans are drawn up, and we have gone over this for the past three years with multiple contractors; this is the only viable area that we can put into our home without making it a financial hardship on us. If you notice to the southeast corner, that is our septic line that goes into our septic, our well is on the south side of our house, we have a patio that I put in myself, and then just beyond the patio to the far edge of our yard we have looked at the options of maybe one day even putting in a pool or putting a bigger children's play area, which we do have a children's play area there with a swing set and house. We went before the Conservation Commission several weeks ago and they asked us to look at different options. We have gone back to our contractor, we have talked about a few variations that we can do just so the Board is aware that we have explored all of our options. We will not be able to build up on the existing foundation without having to replace and redo all of the foundation, so we would essentially have to take the whole house down and start from scratch and redo the foundation. If we were to go on the south side of the house, we would be interrupting the well and our septic line, and then in the back with the patio and the abandoned well that we had there prior to us and the abandoned septic, we can't guarantee how the ground would be. This is the only spot that we have that makes the most sense and would be the most financially responsible for us to do to add value to our home and expand the square footage of our house without major cost occurrences for us. We are completely understanding and respectful of the wetlands and the importance of trying to maintain not just the spirit of the buffer zone but also we are looking to make this a water feature for our home. It will add value, it will add resale value if we were to ever come and sell it, it is not in our plans right now or in the immediate future, but we do have to expand, and we would like to make this part of our property to really enhance our backyard living area. We have put a lot of sweat equity into this by replanting a lot of bushes and different types of ferns on each side of our house, we have added some featured lighting, and with the patio, and, again, we intend to make the pond just that much of an added feature to us but we need to expand the home. With five of us living in there it is tight quarters and the one single family room, a full basement foundation, we think would just be the perfect addition for us with as little problems that could come as possible.

Mr. Harrington proceeded to review the criteria of his variance application. **1. Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest: (1) Whether granting the variance would alter the essential character of the locality: (2) Whether granting the variance would threaten public health, safety and welfare:** By granting this variance we would add value to our existing home as well as value to the residents on the road. We live directly across from the Peter Woodbury School so it is a heavily traveled area morning, noon and night and we are making the footprint that much better in the area. With the visual aesthetics, as well as the home aesthetics, we are taking a lot of time and effort into having this look very well done and adding it like it is naturally supposed to be there. **2. The spirit of the ordinance is observed:** We are requesting to enter the buffer zone as minimally as we possibly can. We are still

planning on maintaining the existing wetlands surrounding our property and we will explore some of the suggestions that we had from the Conservation Commission. We cannot commit to what we would want to do right now at this moment but if the Board does so see fit, we can and will continue to look at some other types of drainage runoff so that it is minimally affecting that pond area. **3. Granting the variance would do substantial justice:** This would do substantial justice to us because we are just requesting this relief due to some of the limitations we already have on this property. By completing this project it will allow us to stay in our first home. We moved into the Town of Bedford because of, like most people I am sure that go before the Board, the school system. Our middle child has special needs so we specifically picked out Bedford because of the school system and because of the programs they offer for our son, and we fully intend to stay here for the duration of their schooling. With that being said, it would add value and increase the square footage that we would have so we would not be on top of one another. **4. The values of the surrounding properties will not be diminished for the following reasons:** We have a time table from contractors as to when this will start and end; it will overall increase the square footage of the residence, which will increase the property value. By maintaining this hopeful timeline, we hope that this will have little to no impact on any of the traffic that goes up and down County Road and the school that is directly across the street. We are going to be adding visual aesthetics to the front of the addition and hopefully with all of this it will increase values to the properties that abut us. **5. Literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance would result in an unnecessary hardship. Special conditions of the property distinguish it from other properties in the area:** We have limitations on our property. The remainder of our property, such as the septic line, the leach field and on our southeastern side of the property the back and side of the residence with the water and well, as well the abandoned septic system from the previous owners, and as I had previously told the Board and told the Conservation Commission, we talked about and had people come out and look at our foundation as it exists right now, and for us to build on top of what we have right now, it would be too much of a financial hardship. We would essentially be tearing the place down and redoing the foundation as a whole and then building. **A. Denial of the variance would result in unnecessary hardship:** **i. No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property:** A single family residence located on a private lot there is no public access to these wetlands and to this area. **ii. The proposed use is a reasonable one:** We feel respectfully that this is a reasonable proposed plan because we have looked at expanding all other options. As I said, this has been a project that we started three years ago, we have talked to countless contractors, as well as scientists and family and everybody else that has added their input into this and we feel that this is the best way to get the most bang for our buck, but to expand with minimal impact as we possibly can to the wetlands area.

Chairman Morin asked for comments or questions from the Board.

Mr. Casale stated I am a little confused by the report from the wetland expert. It states forested wetland and the edge of a manmade pond. You are referring to the manmade

pond; in reference to the setback you said from the manmade pond. It sounds like there is a wetland area and a manmade pond but I don't see it any of the delineations. Ms. Elmer stated I can answer that. The pond is actually within the wetlands, it is not a separate thing, so the pond is right here, but the wetlands are the whole back portion of the property. Mr. Casale responded alright. Mr. Harrington stated I did try to form a giant red box on our last page of this and tried to put the footage areas there. It is really the pond that is within that buffer zone of the addition. Where the cursor is on the screen, the A-12 flag is the start of the forested wetlands and the remaining part as well will be in that buffer zone area. Mr. Casale stated just to reiterate, the 28 feet is primarily at the edge of what looks to be a manmade pond. Mr. Harrington responded yes. Mr. Casale stated thank you.

Ms. Stevens stated we don't have the Conservation Commission's report in front of us because it wasn't ready in time, so basically the only request was that you look at building a second story or did they have any other requests. Mr. Harrington responded they just wanted to know what options we have explored. I received an email from Ms. Elmer in regards to putting in a rain garden for plant life around those edges so the runoff from our roof and any toxins that would be going in would be filtered out through the plants and vegetation. We have looked into it, we have talked to our builder about it, we have also talked to our builder about the gutters going into maybe some rain barrels and using it for other things, it is just for the financial cost of it. I don't want to lie to the Board and say that we are going to commit to something when we haven't factored it into any of the costs or anything like that. It is something that if the Board sees fit and this is the direction we have to go, then we will explore it. I don't want to commit to the Board that we can do something that financially we just can't do right now.

Mr. Harrington continued the other request that they had is we talked about moving the project up to coincide with the back edge of our existing foundation, which is essentially 4 feet but we would actually have to move it up 6 feet, but I took it from the 4 foot measurement of the back edge of our home. It is not shown on this picture but I believe it is on the overhead picture you will see that there is a tree on the north side of the house. If we were to move the project up, there are two things that would occur. We would have to take the first two to three limbs down from the tree at which time we would also have to counterbalance it, so they would be essentially cutting more limbs on the far north side of that tree based on where the roofline would coincide with the most extensive tree limbs. Also, we have three vehicles that are in that driveway. If we were to measure out the vehicles and then put them out, we would be extending beyond that fenceline where that telephone pole is, and for anybody who has come past our house during the morning commute and drop-off for the schools, we just try not to prohibit that visual on County Road. For us to move the project forward, though we would still remain within our driveway, it would cause somewhat of a block of the visual going down County Road from east to west.

Chairman Morin asked the public for those wishing to speak in favor, in opposition, or for those having comments neither for nor against this application. There were none.

Chairman Morin asked for a summation from the applicant.

Ms. Harrington stated this is something that we have worked really hard for. I went back to nursing school so that we could do this addition on our house. I really feel it is important for us to build on. Like my husband said, our son has Autism so he needs to be in the backyard, so our options of keeping him in the backyard with this addition will help with the fence that we have to put around the whole house to keep him in. That was why the option of putting the addition forward towards the road wouldn't work because we have the white picket fence in the front that has a retractable fence to keep him in when he is playing outside. We put a lot of heart and sweat into this house, we really like where we live, so we just hope you will take that into consideration. Chairman Morin stated thank you.

MOTION by Mr. Gilbert to move into deliberations on this variance application. Mr. Casale duly seconded the motion. Vote taken – all in favor. Motion carried.

1. Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest: (1) Whether granting the variance would alter the essential character of the locality: Chairman Morin stated adding this room is definitely not going to change the essential character. **(2) Whether granting the variance would threaten public health, safety and welfare:** Ms. Georges stated no. Chairman Morin stated I am not seeing anything in this that would do that. **2. The spirit of the ordinance is observed:** Chairman Morin stated the spirit of the ordinance is to make sure that there is a buffer between a structure and a wetland. Looking at the prints of where everything is and how it works out, it is awfully hard to put it somewhere else. They have given us a pretty clear explanation of reasons about moving it up, moving it to the side, moving it to the back, and it is a hard area to deal with. The only part that I might look at down the road for when we get to a motion is possibly looking at some type of buffer as in a planting or something. Ms. Elmer stated I think a berm would be pretty easy because if the backhoe is digging out for the foundation for the new addition, he can just take that dirt and create a little berm. It would be very simple. Ms. Georges stated I think that I would feel comfortable with saying that the spirit is observed if something like that were to be done. It would just bring it that much closer to reaching this particular piece. Ms. Elmer stated they could take their time doing all of the plantings, but if we got the little berm, it doesn't have to be real tall. Ms. Georges stated just have that buffer a little bit more clearly delineated, I think I would be comfortable. Mr. Gilbert stated I agree. **3. Granting the variance would do substantial justice:** Chairman Morin stated this is that scale looking at the applicant's and then the public interest. I think we have enough things to mediate some of the issues with the water. Mr. Casale stated the bottom line is there is very little they can do with the property as it is. **4. The values of the surrounding properties will not be diminished for the following reasons:** Chairman Morin stated we have heard no evidence to see that, and an addition is only going to help out the neighborhood. **5. Literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance would result in an unnecessary hardship. Special conditions of the**

property distinguish it from other properties in the area: Mr. Duhaime stated it doesn't seem to make sense to make them redo foundations, especially if that is not what they really want. **A. Denial of the variance would result in unnecessary hardship:** **i. No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property:** Chairman Morin stated again, the same thing as above. We have to look at the whole thing as a whole, and looking to where the wetland is and how we can mitigate some of the issues, I think it is very reasonable. **ii. The proposed use is a reasonable one:** Chairman Morin stated it is reasonable to put an addition onto your house, as long as we can meet certain criteria.

Chairman Morin asked Ms. Elmer, would the best way to add to the motion be for them to work with staff to mitigate the runoff? Ms. Elmer replied yes.

MOTION by Mr. Duhaime that the Zoning Board of Adjustment approve the request for a variance from Thomas and Emily Harrington (Owners) from Article IV, Section 275-28 in order to construct a family room addition 28 feet from the edge of a wetland where 50 feet is required at 177 County Road, Lot 22-84, Zoned R&A for the reason that it has met all the criteria for a variance, with the following condition:

- 1. The applicants shall work with staff on the Conservation Commission's request for a buffer from the wetland.**

Ms. Stevens duly seconded the motion. Vote taken - all in favor. Motion carried.

MOTION by Mr. Gilbert to move out of deliberations on this variance application. Ms. Georges duly seconded the motion. Vote taken – all in favor. Motion carried.

- 2. Dean Gagne (Owner) - Request for a variance from Article IV, Section 275-28 in order to construct a pool 40.5 feet from the edge of a wetland where 50 feet is required at 11 Blackbird Dr., Lot 7-14-12. Zoned R&A.**

Dean Gagne was present to address his request for a variance.

Mr. Gagne stated we are asking for a variance to put a swimming pool in. We are currently at 40.5 feet from the wetlands. My second time through the Conservation Commission they were favorable, I think that is the right word, not approval but favorable, for what I have done. My first proposal was around 28 feet and they asked if I could work with them to make the pool a little smaller, shift it closer to the house, so that is what I have done. I think we pulled it 13 feet closer to the driveway; I can't come closer to the backyard because my leach field is there. I think I need to be 10 feet away from the leach field and this proposal is 12 feet away, so it is just giving me a couple of

extra feet of buffer. Bringing it closer to the driveway I still have 12 feet there just for snow removal and a pathway to the backyard. The pool is designed now at 18 x 36. I have two daughters and they like to swim, they like to dive, and I have researched the smallest recommended size to be safe for diving, which is an 18 x 36 pool, so that is why we made it as small as possible.

Mr. Gagne proceeded to review the criteria for his variance application. **1. Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest:** **(1) Whether granting the variance would alter the essential character of the locality:** **(2) Whether granting the variance would threaten public health, safety and welfare:** The pool would be located in the backyard, it is not a front yard pool or anything strange, there are other properties in the neighborhood that have pools, there would be a fence around the pool to keep it safe for public interest, and with public safety I don't see any issues there. **2. The spirit of the ordinance is observed:** There are other homes in the neighborhood that have pools and we are just adding another pool to the neighborhood. I can count two within probably a ¼ mile of my house. **3. Granting the variance would do substantial justice:** It would just allow us to have a more usable backyard to have more fun in our yard. We love our neighborhood, we love the town, and like the previous applicants, our girls are in school, they are in the 5th and 6th grades, and it is just a great place to be. We love our house, so we are trying to make it more fun for them. **4. The values of the surrounding properties will not be diminished for the following reasons:** Again, it is just the pool; it is nothing out of the standard for the Town of Bedford and our neighborhood. We are not adding anything commercial looking; it is just a pool with a fence. **5. Literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance would result in an unnecessary hardship. Special conditions of the property distinguish it from other properties in the area:** **A. Denial of the variance would result in unnecessary hardship:** **i. No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property:** The location of the pool would have easy access to the house. The south side of our house, which you can see from the posted photo, off from the posted plan, is my well, the leach field is here, and there are wetlands all around the well. Back in 1984 when the house was built, I bought it in 2001, but I guess where the well is there was a pond, so that is certainly wet over there. I can't even get to my well without wading, so there is nothing to the south on my property that I could put it. Shown on the screen this area has grown; I talked to the Conservation Commission about that but nobody can prove it, but the property across the street, which is on the picture here, put in this, I will call a ditch that is actually more of a stream, it actually used to be all wet in here, without any permits, without any okay from the Town or from the State, so the State is going after to them to put it back. There is a new owner now of this property and the property next it and they recently have made all of this over here wet, so the wetlands that shows 40.5 feet probably prior to this, I am going to guess was probably an extra 5 or 6 feet, so it would be close to 46 – 47 feet. My property is as shown on the posted photo. **ii. The proposed use is a reasonable one:** We have worked with the Conservation Commission, they are favorable, and they like what I did with at the second meeting.

Chairman Morin asked for comments or questions from the Board.

Mr. Casale asked can you tell me what changes you made the second time around? It was a little confusing as it didn't line up with what I saw. Mr. Gagne responded the pool started 25 feet off the driveway from this location here and now it is 12 feet, so we have pulled it essentially east by 12 feet. I also asked the architect that I was working with to make it 18 x 36 and I think he made it 40.5 x 18 or something, so we actually shortened it by 6 feet. So the pool used to come out to around this area here, which made this distance here 28 feet. Like I said, I shifted it to the right and made it back to the original size that I asked the architect to do in the first place. I also had like a cabana/garage in this area, which was okay for the back wetlands, but I forget the distance to the side wetlands, and just completely removed that from the plans.

Mr. Casale asked other than reducing the size of the pool, there is absolutely no other way you can orient the pool? Mr. Gagne replied if we oriented it north/south, we are going to hit the wetlands on this side, which I think was even closer. This is 18 wide, so we are going to double it and bring it here, and I think it is actually closer to this side. We had the garage in this area and it made the garage like 20 feet. The garage/cabana wasn't a huge building. We tried playing with it. I think I have seven designs from the architect and this was by far the best option getting this 40.5 feet. What they did is they measured to the edge of the coping, the outside edge, where after talking to Ms. Elmer, it is the inside edge, and I don't what their coping is here, I think they generally do a foot, so it is actually even a foot more than that, so it is probably 41 feet. But like I said, you can see the dimensions here go to the outside edge, not the inside edge.

Mr. Gagne stated the Conservation Commission also asked for a garden or a planting bed, which is exactly what I plan to do. That would be making a planting bed basically around the whole side. This area right now is the kids swing set area, there are no trees in this area, so there is no mass clearing of trees to put this in, we are repurposing it, and right now on the outside edge of their play area I think is a 10 foot garden. I don't know if it will stay that big with a pool, but I like to garden, the girls like to garden, so we will definitely have something on the outside edge protecting the wetlands on that side. Chairman Morin stated the other thing too is you don't get a lot of runoff from a pool. Not like a building where it comes down and runs. Ms. Elmer stated what doesn't show here is there is a retaining wall, so the pool is higher than the wetland, but it is not really shown on this plan.

Chairman Morin asked the public for those wishing to speak in favor, in opposition, or for those having comments neither for nor against this application.

Maryellen Kraus, 7 Canary Lane, stated our property is to the back of the Gagne's property. My only question or concern would be that if there were some sort of a failure, a crack in the pool or something like that, that there is drainage that would sort of guide the water so that it would not come into our property and be a concern to us. Chairman Morin stated thank you.

Chairman Morin asked the applicant if they would like a summation. There was none.

MOTION by Mr. Gilbert to move into deliberations on this variance application. Ms. Georges duly seconded the motion. Vote taken – all in favor. Motion carried.

1. Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest: (1) Whether granting the variance would alter the essential character of the locality: Ms. Georges stated definitely not given the number of pools there are in this area. **(2) Whether granting the variance would threaten public health, safety and welfare:** Chairman Morin stated I don't see anything that is going to change anything there. **2. The spirit of the ordinance is observed:** Chairman Morin stated again, the spirit is to have a buffer. He worked with the Conservation Commission and their recommendation was a positive one in this project. He has mitigated and basically has 9.5 feet, and I think he has done a pretty good job to get to their recommendation and worked with them as hard as he could. Mr. Duhaime stated he agreed to maintain the rain garden that they are requesting. **3. Granting the variance would do substantial justice:** Ms. Georges stated justice would be to provide the pool for his daughters, and it seems he has made every effort to ensure that the concerns of the Conservation Commission were met. In terms of weighing the justice and the hardship to others, there doesn't seem to be a question on this. **4. The values of the surrounding properties will not be diminished for the following reasons:** Chairman Morin stated we didn't hear any evidence either way on this.

Ms. Stevens asked how do we address the water coming from the pool? I am just thinking that some people tend to drain their pool part of the way to end the season and if there is that slope, it seems like the elevation is higher there, is that anything we can address. What happens in those circumstances where water for some reason gets dumped onto somebody else's property? Ms. Elmer replied I have no idea. We have never been asked that question with all the pools that have ever gone in. I have no idea. I don't know where the drain from a build-in pool goes; I have no idea if it even has a drain. They pump everything and it is recirculating. Chairman Morin stated you might have to backwash every so often but it is not normally a lot. It is just the backwash of the filter. Ms. Georges stated I was hoping that we would come to that question at some point. Is it something that is not in our purview as the Zoning Board or is it something that is in our purview but we just haven't ever address it? Ms. Elmer replied it is in your purview but no one has ever brought that question up before so I don't know. You could say that any pumping go to the other direction. You want to make sure they are not pumping in that direction, that everything they pumped would go in this direction. Ms. Georges asked if we approve, we could make some sort of a stipulation? Ms. Elmer replied yes, barring any unforeseen accidents, if Mother Nature decides it is going to crack the pool and it is going to leak. Ms. Georges asked so we would say that we want it to be pumped in the northerly direction? Ms. Elmer replied yes. Ms. Stevens stated I guess if something like that were to happen, their homeowners insurance would just probably go after their homeowners insurance. Ms. Elmer responded just like if the gas tank on their car ruptures; you can't prevent

accidents from happening in those kinds of instances. You try to the best you can with what you have and try to think of contingencies. Chairman Morin stated and, again, depending on the types of vegetation or garden that they put in, it will mitigate a lot of that stuff getting into the wetland also. Again, that could be working with staff. Ms. Elmer stated you could do the staff again. There is a book that DES puts out and it is called *A Homeowners Guide to Stormwater Drainage*, and it talks about all different kinds of ways to do that, different plants to put in, berms, rain gardens, all different kinds of options for homeowners to use. I gave each Mr. Gagne and Mr. Harrington copies of that manual from DES, so we can work with him to see what will work best. Again, they are going to have extra soil because they are digging a hole for the pool, so it is easy to build a small berm. It is not like you have to truck extra soil in.

5. Literal enforcement of the provisions of the ordinance would result in an unnecessary hardship. Special conditions of the property distinguish it from other properties in the area: Chairman Morin stated looking at the property it is pretty tied up as in what is where. Again, they worked very hard with the Conservation Commission to try to find a location to be able to put in something. He has definitely changed his plan a lot from what originally was a garage and a much bigger pool, just down to a pool and mitigate that area as much as he could. **A. Denial of the variance would result in unnecessary hardship:** **i. No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property:** Chairman Morin stated we get into location, location, location. It is pretty tight up where it is. Again, he was working as hard as he could with the Conservation Commission to come up with a reasonable place to put this. **ii. The proposed use is a reasonable one:** Chairman Morin stated I think a pool is reasonable as long as you can fit it within the guidelines.

MOTION by Ms. Georges that the Zoning Board of Adjustment approve the request for a variance from Dean Gagne (Owner) from Article IV, Section 275-28 in order to construct a pool 40.5 feet from the edge of a wetland where 50 feet is required at 11 Blackbird Drive, Lot 7-14-12, Zoned R&A for the reason that it has met all the criteria for a variance, with the following condition:

- 1. The applicant shall work with staff to ensure that any water pumped from the pool will be pumped in the northerly direction.**

Mr. Gilbert duly seconded the motion. Vote taken - all in favor. Motion carried.

MOTION by Mr. Gilbert to move out of deliberations on this variance application. Ms. Stevens duly seconded the motion. Vote taken – all in favor. Motion carried.

Other Business:

Chairman Morin asked will we be getting some changes to our rules? Ms. Elmer replied I don't know if they will be ready for the October meeting. I think that is going to be a full agenda so I am not sure. I may hand them out at the October meeting without any discussion. You can take it home, digest it and then be ready to discuss it for the November meeting.

New Business: None

Adjournment:

Motion by Ms. Stevens to adjourn the meeting at 7:45 p.m. Mr. Gilbert duly seconded the motion. Vote taken – all in favor. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted by
Valerie J. Emmons