

**HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**  
PUBLIC MEETING  
Judge Welsh Room, Town Hall  
Provincetown MA

**WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 6, 2017**

Members Present: Thomas Biggert (TB), Chairman; Lisa Pacheco Robb (LPR); Martin Risteen (MR); Marcene Marcoux (MM); Laurie Delmolino (LD)

Absent: Excused Absence Hersh Schwartz

Others Present: Annie Howard (AH), Building Commissioner; Jody O'Neil (JON), Recording Secretary

The meeting was called to order by TB at 3:34pm.

**1. WORK SESSION: VOTES MAY BE TAKEN**

**a) Update on potential violations reported to the Building Commissioner.**

- i. AH reported that she had gotten most of her letters out regarding potential violations.
- ii. Louis Rossignon (LR), owner of 17 Center St. spoke, apologizing for the installation of a fence that was not approved and for missing Nov. 1<sup>st</sup> meeting when the decision came down in favor but with modification. LR said he had given his contractor the wrong specifications for the fence and would paint the fence white.  
TB reported that the existing fence must come down to 4' and be an open picket; offered that some residents choose pickets plus hedgerow. LR said they would not have gone ahead with those limitations and asked if HDC would permit existing fence to be cut down to an acceptable size. TB told LR that the fence contractor should have been well aware of Town's acceptable parameters.  
LR said he would review some options and return to present at the Dec. 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. MM concurred with TB and suggested that cutting down the existing fence could be an option as long as it complied with the bylaw.  
LD apologized to LR for a costly mistake, and asked HDC what it might do going forward to prevent this happening again. MM responded that the decision clearly stated specified the modification of a four foot picket fence. LR said he was not present to accept the decision nor verbally informed of the change in plans and that he would have expected the original request to be denied before making his next move.  
TB remarked that LR's expectations would probably have been met at a Full Review, but as the decision was made as Administrative Review, the determination came down as voted.

**c) Determination as to whether the applications below involve any Exterior Architectural Features within the jurisdiction of the Commission; with Full Reviews to be placed on the public Hearing agenda on the December 20<sup>th</sup> Public Hearing agenda and Administrative Reviews to be acted on by a subcommittee appointed by the Commission.**

TB made a motion that the following be considered as Administrative Review for today: ii., 287 Bradford St.; iii., 15 Commercial St.; iv., 25 Tremont St.; v., 14 Center St., UF; vi., 162 Bradford St., U3; vii., 349 Commercial St., UA; viii., 577 Commercial St.; ix., 7 Center St.; x., 232 Bradford St., U2; xi., 309 Commercial St.; xii., 14 West Vine St., #2; xiii., 409A Commercial St.; xiv., 10 Masonic Place, #3

MM seconded the motion, and it passed, 5-0-0.

MM spoke out about the state of many applications of late that are coming to HDC lacking elevations and lacking proper sizing details, and Presenting poor photographs. This is a problem.

- ii. 287 Bradford St. – To modify and already approved plan (*waiting for new plan to sign*).  
No one presented. MM noted the size was unclear; LD & TB agreed.  
TB made a motion to approve for the same size and location only; MM seconded the motion, and it passed, 5-0-0.
- iii. 15 Commercial St. – To replace composite deck with azek decking. Laurie Ferrari (LF) from Property Management presented, concurred with TB that the footprint was the same and related to MM that the rails would be untouched.  
TB made a motion to accept as presented; LD seconded the motion, and it passed, 5-0-0.
- iv. 25 Tremont St. - To replace entrance doors in kind.  
LF presented; said replacement was fiber-glass, in kind. TB asked if wood would be an option; LF said it would not. MM took issue with the documentation lacking location and elevation.  
TB made a motion to accept as presented; MM seconded the motion, and it passed, 5-0-0.
- v. 14 Center St., UF – To re-shingle a roof.  
AH said this is a posthumous application in that the roof had already been done.  
TB noted the asphalt shingles in kind; made a motion to accept as presented. MM seconded the motion, and it passed, 5-0-0.
- vi. 162 Bradford St., U3 – To replace a fence in kind.  
MM said she was unclear per the height from documents presented.  
TB noted the copy referred to a replacement of the wood lattice, location adjacent to parking, same dimensions as existing stats.

TB made a motion to approve with the condition that all sections be the same height. MM seconded the motion, and it passed, 5-0-0.

- vii. 349 Commercial St. UA – To re-shingle front of structure.  
Peter Grasso (PG) presented; verified wood shingle replacement on lower section where vertical fence board is currently in place.  
TB remarked this is not replacement in kind. MR said he had been to the site and that as it is storefront commercial space, HDC should pay close attention to what passes as replacement features in those locations.  
PG said it matches the opposite building in look. LD asked if the replacement was tongue-in-groove, PG said it was not. LPR felt the look resembled painted plywood. PG said he thought the boarding was added in the 1950's.  
TB made a motion that HDC make a site visit and table the decision until the Dec. 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. MM seconded the motion, and it passed, 5-0-0.
- viii. 577 Commercial St. – To replace 6 skylights in kind.  
LF presented. MM said her only concerns was the azek trim, given its visibility.  
LF confirmed for LPR that the trim in question is for the strips between skylights. LPR said wood is not a good fit for that location as it's a high moisture spot.  
TB made a motion to accept as presented; LD seconded the motion, and it passed, 5-0-0.
- ix. 7 Center Street – To replace 8 windows in kind.  
Tom Sayers presented; said original windows are about 35 years old and rotting; seeking one-over-one replacements. TB noted vinyl cladding, which Tom Sayers said is within the courtyard space.  
TB made a motion to accept as presented; LD seconded the motion, and it passed, 5-0-0.
- x. 232 Bradford, U2 – To re-shingle structure.  
No one presented. MM noted that applicant asked why they must come before HDC if the house is not historic; MM remarked that the property lies within Town's Historic District and that is the reason. TB added that HDC wants to keep the property preserved and pristine.  
TB remarked the applicant had submitted a good picture and made a motion to accept as presented. MM seconded the motion, and it passed, 5-0-0.
- xi. 309 Commercial St. – To replace 4 windows and 1 door in kind.  
Ed Boxer, owner, presented, said his contractor was not present, confirmed the door was wood, windows were fixed. MR noted the trim was all wood, confirmed space was commercial.  
TB made a motion to accept as presented on the condition that all aspects of replacement are in wood. MM seconded the motion, and it passed, 5-0-0.

- xii. 14 West Vine St. #2 – To re-side.  
No one presented.  
TB noted wood shingles and made a motion to accept as presented;  
LPR seconded the motion, and it passed, 5-0-0.
- xiii. 409A Commercial St. – To replace existing deck with azek decking.  
No one presented.  
MM asked for clarification that only the decking not the railings were being replaced; LPR concurred, from diagrams.  
TB made a motion to accept as presented; MM seconded the motion, and it passed, 5-0-0.
- xiv. 10 Masonic Place, #3 – To replace decking in kind.  
No one presented.  
MM noted it was mahogany for mahogany.  
TB made a motion to accept as presented; MM seconded the motion, and it passed, 5-0-0.

The Administrative Reviews completed, HDC moved to Full Review applications.

- i. 4 Baker St., – 18- 061; to modify an already approved plan (*waiting for new plan to sign*).  
AH distributed diagrams. TB noted the door had been installed.  
HDC signed on plans; decision having already been made.
- xv. 6 Cottage St. – To amend a previously approved plan.  
AH called in Leif Hamnquist (LH) to present. Don DiRocco joined him.  
AH confirmed the location was Unit #2, the window wall; AH confirmed applicant is going through appeal process, but is willing to do west wall with no openings, and will put in openings following decision.  
LH said the plan was amended in terms of changed dormer and re-vamp options per fenestrations.  
TB made a motion to accept as Full Review to be heard at Dec. 20<sup>th</sup> meeting; MM seconded the motion, and it passed, 5-0-0.
- xvi. 212-214 Commercial St. – To replace skylights with a dormer on the north and south elevation of a structure.  
TB made a motion to accept as Full Review; MM seconded the motion, and it passed, 5-0-0.
- xvii. 18 Pleasant St., U3 – To install new and replace existing windows and doors.  
TB made a motion to accept as Full Review; MM seconded the motion and it passed, 5-0-0.
- xviii. 155 Bradford St. – To remove decks, replace remaining railings and decking and to replace windows and doors.

TB made a motion to accept as Full Review; MM seconded the motion, and it passed, 4-0-0. LPR sat out the vote.

**b) HDC 18-028, 18 W. Vine St. reconsideration.**

MM read a letter from attorney, Jonathan Silverstein, which indicated that the previous HDC ruling may stand; that there is a lack of clarity if and when there was a conflict of interest regarding LD's participation in the decision concerning 18 W. Vine St. based on the facts submitted; that any conflict of interest could be determined to be of her own choosing. In conclusion, the 3-2-0 decision in favor will stand and be filed today or tomorrow.

MM spoke of a forthcoming conflict of interest law seminar to be presented perhaps in February and with the participation of other Town boards. MM said she had already spoken to the State which is prepared to participate, adding that such seminars have been a re-occurring feature in Town operations in the past, presented every two or three years. The HDC will initiate holding the Conflict of Interest Law Seminar and will want to invite other Regulatory Boards and also Town Employees.

**2. PUBLIC COMMENTS:** On any matter not on the agenda below.

**a) 34A Pearl St.**

Jeffrey Mulliken presented with hand-out, photos.

JM reported that after it was determined the structure could not be raised, the walls were removed to reinforce the foundation whereupon a robust infestation of carpenter ants was found within the walls. JM said they tried to rescue as much of the structure as possible, preserving some beams and salvageable lumber for re-use in a decorative sense; mentioned receiving AH's e-mail per the use of unsafe materials in construction.

TB remarked that HDC is always pleased to learn that builders are operating with green initiatives, that dealing with old houses is never easy. MM said she, too, appreciates the challenges the applicant has faced and that safety overrides historic, thanked the applicant for keeping HDC informed.

No other public comments; Public Hearing began at 4:23pm.

**3. PUBLIC HEARING: VOTES MAY TAKEN**

**a) HDC 18-056 (continued from the meeting of Nov. 15<sup>th</sup>)**

Application by **Don DiRocco, of Hammer Architects**, on behalf of **Jay Anderson**, requesting to demolish an existing three-story structure and construct a new two-story structure on the south elevation of the property located at **53 Commercial Street, Rear**.

Lester J. Murphy (LJM), Don DiRocco (DD) and Leif Hamnquist (LF) presented with on-screen projections; PDFs to be sent to HDC tomorrow.

MR read a statement citing the Mullin Rule that he had reviewed the PTV recording of the Nov. 15<sup>th</sup> meeting, which he missed, and reviewed

article materials and so was prepared to participate in deliberations on the decision. .

DD addressed screened schematics, said entire length stands at 84'; height to be raised for FEMA regs. is 4.3', which is not favorable. As an alternative, one renovation plan would remove third floor and add a pitch roof which is compatible to other structures, but not suitable as it looms high over neighborhood.

Rejecting this alternative, DD said they then went back to the original concept and overlaid a re-vamp on the old design which now shows the whole building in the less restrictive FEMA AO zone, which has a much less stringent requirement; in an AO Zone a structure must be 2' above the adjacent grade, not an intense requirement. The whole point, DD said, was to take the building out of the FEMA V Zone; current proposal involved removing 6' on Harbor side and a piece of what is now the garage to re-work the remaining structure to comply with the FEMA AO Zone and give the rear a cluster look.

Views were presented from West End Parking lot; the beach; and Commercial St. DD said the tower roof was changed to a 3-and-12 pitch; changed shingles; reduced roof line; simplified trim details; windows brought down to comply with roof line.

DD observed that in studying the landscape of Town structures, gable ends facing water emerged as a defining feature and, as such, the applicant was aiming to achieve that same look.

LJM remarked that this revamp will be more expensive but that owner intends to use as much of the original structure as possible to avoid a demolition in favor of renovation. TB asked how that will be facilitated. DD explained that as a new foundation is needed to be compliant, by separating the walls and remounting them, the structure will be re-confirmed with a reduced footprint.

MM said she wouldn't make a decision without the actual plans in hand and with proof that the renovations would not serve as a demolition, appreciated a new sensitivity to the site. LH said that the next set of diagrams will have notes on construction procedures, specifying which walls are affected.

HDC assured LJM that the applicant was moving in the right direction.

LPR said she liked the original design, thought it was a great improvement to the district; liked the re-vamped tower.

MR remarked that the applicant has done a good job in re-design, asked for a review of FEMA AO zoning. DD said it signifies a flood elevation of 2; meaning 2' above the highest adjacent grade, not the sea level – which pertains all other FEMA zones; buildings would be uniform through step-ups, ridge height of rear building will be 27''.

LH commented on the intricacies of the application process that addresses two lots and four buildings but that is actually one structure.

LD spoke of the complex as a beautiful reproduction of a community of four simple cottages but with a Disneyland structure in the middle that throws the humble aspect off.

TB said he agreed with LD 100%; that even as applicant had made great progress, the tower doesn't seem to fit, needs to be re-thought.

HDC discussed tower, cupola options with applicant. TB recommended HDC spend time with forthcoming drawings and required actual plans in advance of the next meeting.

DD signed continuation waiver.

TB made a motion to accept a time extension; LPR seconded the motion, and it passed, 5-0-0.

TB made a motion to continue the case at the meeting of Dec. 20<sup>th</sup>; LPR seconded the motion, and it passed, 5-0-0.

**b) HDC 18-072 (continued from the meeting of November 15<sup>th</sup>)**

Application by **Joaquin Wheeler**, on behalf of **Barbara Reynolds**, requesting to remove and replace an existing roof and install a skylight on the structure located at **462 Commercial Street**.

Joaquin Wheeler presented, discussed drawings with HDC at dais. TB recorded changes.

TB made a motion to accept with skylight modification of 21x37+7/8. MM seconded the motion, and it passed, 5-0-0.

**c) HDC 18-078 (continued from the meeting of November 15<sup>th</sup>)**

Application by **Mark Kinnane, of Cape Associates, Inc.**, on behalf of **Barry Peskin**, to demolish and reconstruct on a new foundation at the property located at **11 Brewster Street**.

No one presented.

AH read an e-mail letter from Barry Peskin's lawyer requesting to hear decision at the HDC meeting of Dec. 20<sup>th</sup>; said she had to accept the e-mail as applicant's time-waiver.

TB mentioned that the structure was artists' buildings and that Cookie Mueller was a former tenant; that this was a cause to ponder decision. LPR remarked that there should be no public commentary made without applicant being present and the discussion was postponed.

TB made a motion to accept the applicant's e-mail as a time-waiver; MM seconded the motion, and it passed, 5-0-0.

TB made a motion to move the decision to the Dec. 20<sup>th</sup> meeting; LD seconded the motion, and it passed, 5-0-0.

**d) HDC 18-101**

Application by **Pavel Fiodarau**, on behalf of **Jacqueline LaLonde**, requesting to add and reconfigure windows on a dormer, add a window in the attic to match existing windows and to replace a kitchen window on the structure located at **5 Dyer Street**.

Pavel Fiodarau presented; remarked that both windows are not visible from Commercial or Dyer Streets.

TB read a letter from owner stating windows in question were not street-visible.

MM read a letter from Daniel Luther and Dan Judas from Benchmark Inn, abutter, in support of application, having determined the windows are not in public view; are pleased to see neighbors keeping old house in great condition with historical sensibility.

TB read a letter from Stephen Katsurinis and Brandon Quesnell, immediate abutters, who found the improvements appropriate, windows not visible.

LD felt that in a perfect world the attic window would be a bit smaller as is generally seen on the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor of structures.

TB felt the dormer window a vast improvement; received confirmation that new fenestration was 6-over-6, in kind; made a motion to accept as presented. LD seconded the motion, and it passed, 5-0-0.

e) **HDC 18-107**

Application by **KKA Bazarian**, on behalf of **509 Commercial Street, LLC** requesting to raise a structure 9' to meet FEMA regulation, to remove and replace a deck and enclose the area beneath it on the south elevation and to construct a stairway for egress on the west elevation on the property located at **509 Commercial Street**.

TB read a statement quoting the Mullin rule that he had reviewed the PTV video and read materials of the case on Dec. 4<sup>th</sup> and thus was able to participate in these deliberations.

Lester J, Murphy, attorney (LJM), Lyn Plummer (LP) and Kevin Bazarian (KB), presented.

LJM spoke of the need to raise the building 2' above the FEMA-required flood elevation level. Also, owner is now mandated to design a 2<sup>nd</sup> egress on the west elevation.

LP spoke of the original application with HDC and Zoning and based on advice from AH, removed the back porch element that would have triggered FEMA. However, as it is now determined that the foundation situation has forced FEMA requirements, they have added that addition back on; seeks HDC's advice on lattice-work and how to make effective.

KB said of TB's request for feed-back, that he had nothing to add.

Public comments:

Philip Cozzi (PC), owner of residence at 508 Commercial St., the Old Homestead across the street, said he initially had no problem with the design but had contention with BFEE 9' level and asked for explanation; remarked that new building has no resemblance to original structure; objected to the shadow profiles on adjacent profiles with newly proposed ridge-line; stated open stairwell on west elevation is a huge massing, monumental; asked if parking would be underneath the new house; and suggested that the project posed a negative impact on the neighborhood.

LD interjected, said that this segment of the meeting was a time for reading of letters.

PC continued, asked again per parking and huge massing on the east view from his upper deck, suspected it topped out at over 14'; felt plans were very vague and that scale to plans were not accurate per 3/16's of an inch. PC said he would offer a re-design of his own at no charge that would lower the ridge-line and make the property more appropriate; advised everyone to look at David Dunlap's book of historic Provincetown for reference. PC reiterated that he was in favor of initial design and asked how things got to this point.

No Letters.

TB closed Public Comments; said he agreed with PC and asked what had happened to bring new design so far over scale.

LJM replied that the FEMA regulations had forced the changes.

LD offered that FEMA kicked in because the foundation needed to be repaired. TB asked for Site Specific Elevation cert., which was presented. Applicant verified that property is in the FEMA V Zone, which has a 26% chance of flood, per guidelines read by MR.

LJM reported new elevation means the base elevation is 15' and the new structure must be 2' above that requirement. MR responded that there was still too much massing in the new design, asked how much had been added; what is the additional massing from the original?

LPR asked for spot elevations on the site plan.

LD asked if foundation repair had been done; KB said it had not. LD asked if new foundation would trigger FEMA; AH replied it would.

LPR suggested this case put the Town in uncharted waters nationally; remarked that 9' is a massive change for the east end of town; asked if there are loopholes to consider. LPR said she could not vote today without benchmark elevations and how they relate to site contours; was shocked at a 9' lift.

MM concurred with LPR for the need for verification; asked is there could be a creative attempt to not go above the 49% FEMA trigger; asked if it was the market value that produced the trigger.

AH reported the 49% is based on the linear footage of the foundation. LPR asked if a percentage of the foundation could be altered to avoid the trigger; LP said she was informed that 100% of the foundation sits in the zone and that they have done everything they can and didn't feel there was any more research available to avoid their predicament..

AH asked if structural engineers wrote up an evaluation. KB replied that there might be options but they would be up to AH; AH said, no, that acceptable proposals would come from a structural engineer. LPR recommended that endorsement as it might offer up a solution.

TB suggested HDC needed to do some research on foundations. LPR concurred, requested accurate contours. LP said they could try to return for the decision on Dec. 20<sup>th</sup> but could not say for certain; mentioned that \$10,000 was what was in question for the structural analysis to install steel, raise house.

AH informed that the assessed value is not the appraised value which is what starts the motion; then the appraisal number is weighed against construction costs which, in this case, came in below 50% by a little.

It was agreed that a time-constraint of January 30, 2018 would be put in place. LJM signed the constraint.

TB a motion for a time constraint in the case; MM seconded the motion, and it passed, 5-0-0.

TB made a motion to move the decision to the meeting of Jan. 3, 2018; MM seconded the motion, and it passed 5-0-0.

AH remarked on the foundation case with abutter St. Mary's Church, and how the parties then worked hard to avoid a FEMA impact.

TB remarked that owners and builders working in high velocity zones should come to understand the scope of what they are up against in re-design. LD suggested that HDC needs to be vigilant in making owners in historic district keep to the 25% level of preservation.

f) **HDC 18-108**

Application by **Robert A. Henrique**, on behalf of **Donald E. Butterfield**, requesting to replace a deck in-kind on the south elevation of the structure located at **43 Commercial Street, UB**.

Robert A Henrique presented. MM remarked that the change from wood to steel cable rendered the decision as a Full Review; said she preferred wood.

TB made a motion to accept as presented; LPR seconded the motion, and it passed, 5-0-0.

g) **HDC 18-109**

Application by **William N. Rogers , II**, on behalf of **Leonard Enos**, requesting to restore a fire-damaged building, including restoring a second floor dwelling unit, constructing a roof structure for a second floor seating area, adding a new means of egress deck and stairway and creating a new restaurant/bar area in the structure on the property located at **315A Commercial Street**.

Presenters were Lester J. Murphy (LJM), attorney; Gary Lockwood (GL), engineer, of William N. Rogers; Leonard Enos, Jr. (LE); Leonard Enos, III.

LJM referred to the 2006 application on behalf of Mr. Enos for renovation and modifications, until Chapter 91 had thwarted that project. Updating to the fire that occurred to the property this year over the Memorial Day holiday, the owner now wishes to address those original plans as they seek approval for a re-build.

GL said the three-bedroom apartment in the middle section is to be moved to the location where the pizza place stood; middle section will now house the bar/restaurant. In the rear of the building are the two means of egress to serve the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor.

No public comments or letters.

MM mentioned she sat on the approved decision of original plans 11 years ago; cautioned about going over 50% to trigger FEMA; said she liked the design and were fitting to the guidelines..

GL remarked that they are so on top of FEMA flood zone issue and are on target to keep from having to raise the structure at an estimated 5'; said they will work with AH and the contractors to shave every number.

LE said they've done their due diligence and referenced the property at 509 Commercial St. as to what they have already experienced in terms of fielding guidelines and limitations.

LD said she found the design charming, which she usually doesn't say.

LPR said that as it's already been approved she would agree, but one nit-picky item was the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor bracing, which seemed kind of country-western-like. GL replied that the angle-bracing helps keep the size down.

MR said he liked the design and would vote to approve as presented.

TB appreciated the design and feels people will really appreciate the look; asked if visible elements would be wood. GL said it would except for composite where features were not visible, and the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor decking, too; all remarked that a cedar porch would be wonderful, but GL mentioned they needed to be careful not to trigger the 50% over-limit of costs.

AH pointed out that two-over-one windows will not be installed; GL concurred as the space is too slim between buildings.

TB made a motion to accept as presented; MM seconded the motion, and it passed, 5-0-0.

#### 4. **DELIBERATIONS ON PENDING DECISIONS: VOTES MAY BE TAKEN**

HDC discussed assignation of pending decisions. MM said she had filed 11 decisions this week and would be filing another nine.

Decisions by TB, read by TB:

- cc) **HDC 18-073: 634 Commercial St.** Decision from 11-1-17  
TB made a motion to approve the decision; LD seconded the motion, and it passed, LD, 5-0-0.
- x) **HDC 18-051: 4 Mozart Ave., #3** Decision from 11-1-17  
TB made motion to approve the decision; LD seconded the motion, and it passed 5-0-0.
- t) **HDC 18-037: 6 Cottage St.** Decision from 11-1-17  
TB made a motion to approve the decision; MM seconded the motion, and it passed, 4-0-0; LD, recused.

Decisions by MR, read by MM:

- u) **HDC 18-038: 25 Tremont St., #A1.** Decision from 10-4-17  
MR changed "highly significant" to "significant."  
TB made a motion to approve the decision; MM seconded the motion, and it passed, 5-0-0.
- s) **HDC 18-026: 22 Bangs St..** Decision from 10-4-17  
TB made a motion to approve as presented; LPR seconded the motion, and it passed, 4-0-0; MM, recused as abutter.

#### 5. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT SHALL PROPERLY COME BEFORE THE COMMISSION**

- 1. **d) Review and approval of Minutes:**  
MM made a motion to approve minutes of Nov, 29, 2017; TB seconded the motion, and it passed, 5-0-0;

AH added that a decision would be filed tomorrow on 18 W. Vine.

MR reminded AH that she said she would give him a priority list, per decisions.

AH said she was approached on street per 17 Center St. and suggested a letter to be sent out on fencing rulings.

AH referenced the FEMA issue as a very huge struggle; has been speaking with Andy at Dept, of the Interior in Washington, D.C., and Linda from the State, seeking workable loopholes.

TB made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 6:47pm; LD seconded the motion, and it passed, 5-0-0.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jody O'Neil