

ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT PUBLIC HEARING AND MEETING

October 25, 2005

A public hearing of the Zoning Board of Adjustment was held on Tuesday, October 25, 2005 at 6:30 p.m. in the Auditorium at City Hall.

Sean Duffy conducted the hearing.

Members present were: Sean Duffy, Vice Chair  
Susan Douglas, Clerk  
Jack Currier

Also present, Carter Falk, Deputy Manager/Zoning

Mr. Duffy announced that there were only three members on the Board tonight and with only three members present, all three votes would be needed in order for the vote to approve the application. The application is denied if all three do not agree. He said an applicant might postpone to a date in the future if they do not wish to go forward with three members.

Mr. Duffy said in hearing tonight's cases the Board would be looking for evidence on the following points of law as established under the City of Nashua Zoning Ordinance and empowered to it under the State of New Hampshire enabling legislation.

For variances in the ordinance the following conditions must be met:

- (1) A zoning restriction as applied to your property interferes with reasonable use of the property, considering the unique setting of the property in its environment;
- (2) no fair and substantial relationship exists between the general purposes of the zoning ordinance and the specific restriction on the property;
- and (3) the variance would not injure the

public or private rights of others.

(2) The spirit and intent of the ordinance must not be broken by granting the variance.

(3) Granting the variance will not adversely affect other property in the district.

(4) Granting the variance must be of benefit to the general public and not solely the individual.

(5) Not to grant the variance would result in an injustice.

For special exceptions designated by the ordinance, the following must be met:

(1) The use requested must be listed in the Table of Use Regulations as a special exception in the district for which the application is made or is an existing non-conforming use for which a request to expand is being in accordance with Subchapter 13 of the Nashua Revised Ordinances.

(2) The requested use will not create undue traffic congestion or unduly impair pedestrian safety.

(3) The requested use will not overload any public water, drainage or sewer system or any other municipal system to such an extent that the requested use or any developed use in the immediate area or in any other area of the City will be unduly subjected to hazards affecting health, safety, or the general welfare.

(4) Any special regulations for the use set forth in other sections of the zoning ordinance are fulfilled.

(5) The requested use will not impair the integrity or character of the district or adjoining zones nor be detrimental to the health, morals or welfare of the residents of Nashua.

He said the order of receiving testimony will be in the following manner: Testimony will be heard from the applicant seeking the adjustment. The applicant will have fifteen minutes to address the five points of law just described. The Board will not consider in their decision any information that does not address those points.

The timing light on display will shine green until there is one minute remaining at which time the amber light will come on. When the light turns red, the speaker must stop testifying. The Board may then ask questions of the applicant.

After the presentation the Board will then take testimony from those in favor of the application and then from those in opposition.

He said each speaker would be allowed five minutes to address the Board. The timing light will show a green light until one minute is remaining. The amber light will be on during the last minute and the speaker must stop when the light turns red.

He said speakers are asked to confine their comments only to the new points of information or may simply state that they agree with the previous speaker. Speakers will come forward to the microphone and state their name and address for the record. All testimony given this evening is understood to be given under oath as in a court of law.

At the end of all testimony in opposition, the applicant will have five minutes to address any points raised in opposition. After this testimony one (only one) person from those in opposition will be given five minutes to address the applicant's rebuttal. No new testimony may be given and only someone who spoke in opposition may provide rebuttal testimony.

He said should the applicant or any of the public in opposition feel an unjust or unlawful decision was made may request a rehearing of the Board within 30 days of the decision. Contact the Office of Zoning for further details about the process. If

any person or party is not granted a rehearing or still feels that an unjust or unlawful decision has been rendered by the Board you may appeal the case to the New Hampshire Superior Court.

Changes to Agenda announced by Mr. Falk:

Postponed to 11/9/05 Meeting:

1. Andreas Nikitas (Owner) 9 Simon Street (Sheet 87 Lot 307) requesting variance to encroach 7 feet into the 10 foot rear yard setback to construct a 7'x14' walk-in cooler addition. GB Zone.

11. Jeffrey M. Hirsch (Owner) Regency Centers (Applicant) 550 Amherst Street (Sheet H Lots 181, 184 & 646) requesting the following variances: 1) to exceed maximum height of luminaries, 6 feet allowed, 30 feet proposed, and 2) to exceed 0.2 foot-candles at external property boundary. GB Zone.

12. Mobil Oil Corporation (Owner) Armand Sancier (Applicant) 267 Main Street (Sheet 97 Lot 13) requesting the following special exceptions: 1) to allow a 2-bay automatic car wash with exterior car vacuums, and 2) to allow for a reduction of the 25-foot required buffer strip adjoining a residential district to not less than 10 feet. GB/MU Zone.

13. AS-VR Realty Trust LLC (Owner) Wal-Mart Real Estate Business Trust (Applicant) 420 Amherst Street (Sheet H Lot 485) requesting special exception to work within an "other" and critical wetland buffer to construct a 146,951 square foot retail store and associated site improvements. AI Zone.

Re-Advertised - Will also be on 11/9/05 Meeting Agenda:

7. One Parke Place, LLC (Owner) 120 Coliseum Avenue (Sheet E Lot 1548) requesting special exception to allow a 20 unit elderly housing building on a portion of existing lot. RC Zone.

-----

2. Anthony W. & Karen I. Terilli (Owners) 19 New Hampshire Avenue (Sheet 138 Lot 28) requesting the following variances: 1) to encroach 5 feet into the 25 foot front yard setback, and 2) to exceed maximum building area, 20% permitted, 23.9% requested - to construct a 10'x22' farmers porch and an 8'x10' shed. R9 Zone.

Karen Terilli, 19 New Hampshire Avenue. Mrs. Terilli said the area variances are needed for the lot as they do not have any other reasonable or feasible method other than to obtain the area variances.

She said this allows for a reasonable use of the land compatible with the neighborhood.

She said a farmer's porch addition to the house will be of the same or greater value and quality to the surrounding properties.

She said the proposed variances are not contrary to the public interest because they allow for residential use in a residential district.

She said substantial justice allows them reasonable use of their land.

She said currently at this location there is a small porch with stairs and a metal ramp, uncovered, with cement patio on ground connected to the existing house.

Mr. Currier asked if they are doing any work on the house.

Mrs. Terilli said they split their lot over the summer and the land has been sold to an individual who will be building a house on the vacant piece and she put a second floor addition on their house. She explained that she had handicapped children and how this would be beneficial for them.

Mr. Currier asked if Mrs. Terilli had talked with her neighbors

about this request.

Mrs. Terilli said she had. She said everybody knows her family and the reasoning for it.

She said they are asking for the shed because they had to get rid of their garage to sell the vacant piece because it was encroaching on that land. It's needed to put in the lawnmower, snow blower, etc.

**SPEAKING IN FAVOR**

No One.

**SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION**

No One.

Mr. Currier said this is the end of a dead end street. He said by putting in a farmer's porch its actually picking up the neighborhood.

**MOTION** by Mr. Duffy to grant the variances: 1) to encroach 5 feet into the 25 foot front yard setback, and 2) to exceed maximum building area, 20% permitted, 23.9% requested - to construct a 10'x22' farmers porch and an 8'x10' shed at 19 New Hampshire Avenue. He said the variance is needed to ensure the applicant's reasonable use of the property given there is no other reasonable/feasible method for the applicant to pursue. It is within the spirit and intent of the ordinance that reasonable development of the property is allowed. It should not adversely affect the property values of surrounding parcels. It is not contrary to the public interest. Substantial justice will be served as the applicant has reasonable development use of their property.

**SECONDED** by Mr. Currier.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

3. Patricia A. & Peter Brault (Owners) 20 Dora Street (Sheet 111 Lot 96) requesting variance to encroach a maximum of 17 feet into the 25 foot front yard setback to construct a 5'x40' farmers porch on a nonconforming structure. R9 Zone.

Peter Brault, 20 Dora Street. Mr. Brault said he didn't know what to expect so he is unprepared.

Mr. Duffy asked some questions of the applicant.

Mr. Duffy asked if Mr. Brault felt he had a reasonably sized piece of property compared to the other people on his side of Dora Street and the other side of the street.

Mr. Brault said "yes."

Mr. Duffy asked Mr. Brault if he had a unique layout on his property in that the cul-de-sac circle has cut into and eliminated a front yard buffer that most others enjoy on the street.

Mr. Brault agreed.

Mr. Currier asked what the construction is that's going on at the house.

Mr. Brault said it's a second story addition on the existing footprint.

Mr. Currier asked if there is a parking issue here.

Mrs. Brault said not at their end, but at the other end there is.

**SPEAKING IN FAVOR**

No One.

**SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION**

No One.

**MOTION** by Mr. Currier to grant the variance request to encroach a maximum of 17 feet into the 25 foot front yard setback to construct a 5'x40' farmers porch on a nonconforming structure. The variance is needed to enable the applicant's proposed use of the property given the special conditions of the property. It's at the end of a cul-de-sac street where the width of the cul-de-sac cuts into the front yard setback. It is within the spirit and intent of the ordinance. It will not adversely affect the property values of surrounding parcels. The addition could increase property values of surrounding parcels. It is not contrary to the public interest. Substantial justice will be served.

**SECONDED** by Mr. Duffy.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**4. Jeffrey & Karen Morse (Owners) 31 Gordon Street (Sheet 64 Lot 7) requesting variance to encroach 2 feet into the 10 foot right side yard setback to construct an attached two-story 15'x24' garage addition. RA Zone.**

Atty. Tom Clossonn. Atty. Closson said he is representing Jeffrey & Karen Morse in this matter. He said this request is for an encroachment of 2' into the 10' side yard setback in order to construct an attached one-car garage with living space on the second story.

He said Mr. & Mrs. Morse came to the Board initially for a variance to encroach 7' into the setback in order to construct a 20'X24' two-car garage. The Board denied that request on July 26<sup>th</sup> and expressed concerns about the extent of the encroachment and the proximity to the abutter on the right hand side. In an effort to address these concerns they have revised their plan and are asking for a one-car garage.

He said there was also some concern about runoff as related to the abutting property on the right hand side. He said this proposal does two things to address the runoff issue. It moves the new structure further away from the abutting neighbor on the right hand side. Also, the way the property is situated, there is a driveway that runs down the right hand side. The proposed addition will replace part of that driveway and move the driveway to the left, away from the abutting neighbor on the right hand side. They will end up with landscaping or a grassy area where there's currently pavement. He said this will assist in preventing or limiting the runoff that affects the right hand abutting neighbor.

He said the hardship that the Morse's raised the first time around remains the same. They have a small home and they have two small children, a boy and a girl and they only have two bedrooms. They need more space.

He said they also have a driveway that is very severely pitched and not a good situation for small children. Their building proposal would substantially reduce the pitch of the driveway as well as create additional space for them and their growing family.

Atty. Closson said the request is consistent with the spirit of the ordinance given the changes they have made to the proposal.

He said it does not diminish or change the value of the neighborhood. He said the house immediately on the left hand side has almost exactly the same kind of structure that the Morse's are proposing to build.

Mr. Currier said the first application showed the proposed driveway, which would mirror the house on the left so it will be lower and dug into the ground.

Atty. Closson said this is correct. He said it will substantially reduce the grade of the driveway. The structure they are going to build is going to have the same roofline as the existing house and the roof will be pitched from front to back.

He said there was concern about the abutting neighbor on the right side. He said they have obtained a letter from this neighbor stating that he approved of the request. He provided this letter to the Board.

**SPEAKING IN FAVOR**

Mr. Duffy said they have a letter dated October 23<sup>rd</sup> from Leopold Levesque presented by Atty. Closson.

**SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION**

No One.

Mr. Currier said the concerns that were expressed at the last meeting when they discussed this case have been addressed by the Attorney and in the application.

The other members agreed.

**MOTION** by Currier to grant the variance to encroach 2 feet into the 10 foot right side yard setback to construct an attached two-story 15'x24' garage addition at 31 Gordon Street. The variance is needed to enable the applicant's proposed use of the property given the special conditions of the property. The house is built towards the right side of the property where the driveway is. The driveway has a steep pitch. This addition will make the driveway more user friendly and will also create a grassy area toward the right side neighbor. It is within the spirit and intent of the ordinance. It will not adversely affect the property values of surrounding parcels. He said it will enhance it because it will enhance the value of this particular parcel. It is not contrary to the public interest. Substantial justice will be served.

**SECONDED** by Mrs. Douglas.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**5. Christopher D. & Alicia Ann Murray (Owners) 9 Grace Drive (Sheet C Lot 2238) requesting variance to exceed**

**maximum wall height, 6 feet permitted - 9 feet proposed for a portion of a retaining wall. R9 Zone.**

Christopher Murray, 9 Grace Drive. Mr. Murray said they currently have a retaining wall in the back yard. Their land starts to drop off as they go out their back door. The current wall goes back about eight feet. He said they are proposing to extend it out further. He said they need the variance because the northeast corner of the wall will exceed 6' in height.

He said their intent is to extend their driveway to allow for safer parking for their camper as well as provide space for their three children to play on.

He said there is still separation between their house and the properties behind them that is a wooded area.

He said they've talked with all their abutters on Grace Drive and none of them are opposed to the work.

Mr. Duffy asked if they had talked with anybody on Sagamore Road.

Mr. Murray said his wife talked to the neighbor directly behind their house on Sagamore Road. They were okay with the proposal.

Mr. Duffy asked the height of the existing wall.

Mr. Murray said it's about 4' high at the highest point.

Mr. Duffy asked the existing paved driveway would be expanded.

Mr. Murray said they aren't going to expand it. As part of the new area they will have rock area to park their camper.

Mr. Duffy asked the topography drop from the back of the house to the lot line in the rear or from the existing wall is to the back.

Mr. Murray said about 11' - 15'. It goes back another 15' that they aren't doing anything with.

Mr. Duffy asked if they are going to be staying away from the existing right side yard setback

Mr. Murray agreed.

Mr. Duffy asked if there would be gravel all the way back.

Mr. Murray said there will be grass on 2/3 of the area.

Mr. Currier said he noticed a bunch of bricks in the driveway. He asked what the construction of the wall would be.

Adam Dale, 37 Galling Road, Hudson. Mr. Dale said the wall is going to be properly installed geo-grid and backfilled with chipped granite gravel for the flow of water so it doesn't build up. He said the block that they are using is a segmented retaining wall block that flows water through it. It is designed to hold weight.

Mr. Duffy asked if the camper would be seen by any of the abutters behind them or to the right side of the property as you are looking at it from the street.

Mr. Murray said he can see their house through the brush. He's not extending the wall out more than he was before.

Mr. Duffy said the request is up to 9' high. He said it may go a little lower than that depending upon how it's graded.

Mr. Murray agreed.

Mr. Currier asked if Mr. Murray had wheel chocks to prevent the camper from inadvertently rolling back.

Mr. Murray said they do. He said they currently park their camper on the wall a little bit.

#### **SPEAKING IN FAVOR**

Mr. Duffy said there is a letter received October 24<sup>th</sup> from John

Crandall, 11 Grace Drive basically stating that he is in support of the petition. He has no concerns about the proposed wall and it's finished height.

### **SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION**

Ryan Dunn, 8 Sagamore Road. Mr. Dunn said he abuts the back of 9 Grace Drive. He said he did speak to Mrs. Murray about this project. He said he's not opposed to the wall itself. He said he is asking about an additional visual buffer between the wall and his property. He said his brother-in-law happens to be a landscaper and said that there's a specific type of pine that works well in terms of buffering it visually. It's going to be a big wall, at least from his perspective. It might help, mostly in terms of resale so no one would have a problem with this large wall being in the back yard.

Mr. Currier asked what type of pine tree and how many would be he asking for.

Mr. Dunn said his brother-in-law said the trees would be somewhere in the range of 6'-8' and would be eastern pine trees and would be in a quantity sufficient enough to cover the general area where the wall is.

Mr. Duffy asked Mr. Dunn if the distance from his house to the rear yard is significantly more than the 30'.

Mr. Dunn said there's probably 30' - 35' to the lot line. He said there is a decent amount of trees between the two properties. Where the wall is cut in some of the trees have been removed or will be removed. It's a little more apparent now that the wall is there.

Mr. Duffy said he's guessing that Mr. Dunn has more like 50' - 70' to the rear lot line. He said it's quite an expense for trees given the distance between the two properties. He said he didn't see any other properties with a lot of big trees trying to buffer each other.

Mr. Dunn said the wall is especially visible to them mainly because of the grade of the property. He said the property at 9 Grace Drive is probably a good 25' - 30' above theirs. The way the wall is graded the 9' is completely exposed to them.

Mr. Duffy asked Mr. Dunn if he is aware that the entire wall isn't going to be up to 9' in height. He said there's a section mostly aiming at Mr. Dunn's property that's probably going to be in the 2' - 6' range, which is allowed by ordinance. Then there may be a 9' section and then a 4' - 6' section.

Mr. Dunn said he estimates that they would need two or possibly three trees.

#### **SPEAKING IN FAVOR - REBUTTAL**

Mr. Murray said he would not have an issue if he would put two to three trees in to block the area as a buffer.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Murray said they are also going to be putting up a fence.

Mr. Duffy asked Mr. Murray where the fence is going to go.

Mr. Murray said it will be inside the wall on the grass area.

Mr. Currier asked how tall the proposed fence is going to be.

Could not hear reply, but Mrs. Douglas asked if it was going to be more than 6' in height and Mr. Murray said it is not.

#### **SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION - REBUTTAL**

No One.

Mr. Currier said he's okay with the request, but with the condition that there be approximately two or three pine trees approximately 6' - 8' in height. He said this allows the applicant to position them and plan so that they essentially

block out a significant portion of the wall.

Mrs. Douglas said she thinks a vegetative buffer would be better along the property line.

Mr. Currier said he's not sure whether as you get away from the wall to the property line it might drop down more and if the trees are on the property line they might be further down. He said he's a little hesitant to specify where. He said they could make a condition that the applicant provides an adequate visual buffer of evergreen trees and they can leave it to the abutter and the applicant to agree on the location.

**MOTION** by Mr. Currier to grant the variance to exceed maximum wall height, 6 feet permitted - 9 feet proposed for a portion of a retaining wall at 9 Grace Drive. The variance is needed to enable the applicant's proposed use of the property given the special conditions of the property. There is a steep drop off in the back yard. By constructing the wall it will create a larger level back yard for the applicant to use. Special Condition: The applicant will provide a vegetated buffer of evergreen trees to provide a visual barrier on the backside of the property. The quantity and location of the trees is to be worked out between the applicant and the abutter. With the visual buffer in place there is no adverse affect to property values of surrounding parcels. It is within the spirit and intent of the ordinance. It's not contrary to the public interest. Substantial justice is served.

Mr. Duffy asked Mr. Currier if he would consider changing the wording of the special condition.

Some discussion ensued.

**AMENDED MOTION** by Mr. Currier to amend the special condition to say "a vegetated buffer of evergreen or equivalent .."

**SECONDED** by Mr. Duffy.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

6. Yolande D. Marshall (Owner) 5 Arlington Avenue (Sheet 27 Lot 64) requesting the following variances: 1) to encroach 4.5 feet into the 6 foot left side yard setback, 2) to exceed maximum building area, 20% allowed, 30.4% existing - 39.9% requested, and 3) minimum open space, 40% minimum required, 38.3% requested - all requests to erect a 12'x20' accessory tent garage. RB Zone.

Jan Pelchat. Mrs. Pelchat introduced Yolande Marshall and said that she is her mother.

Mrs. Pelchat said her mother has a smaller lot than is permitted under the zoning ordinance. She has 3,000 square feet where 6,000 square feet is required.

She said this structure does not and will not join with the street. She referred the Board to the pictures that had been provided to them of the house and the lot to show how small it is. She presented some additional pictures to the Board that show #1 and #3 Arlington Avenue. These show similar type encroachments.

Mrs. Pelchat said the structure is removable and can be removed once her mother no longer resides in the house.

She said the structure is shielded by her house and by her fence in her own back yard. The neighbor directly to the left of her mother's driveway and the one where she is encroaching into the setback on has provided a letter stating that he has no problems with this request being granted.

She said in the wintertime her mother has to rely on her neighbors and her family to come to the property to clear her driveway and car so that she can access to it.

Mrs. Pelchat said there's no new impact on utilities or the existing infrastructure. It improves the benefit for her mother's use of the driveway.

Mr. Duffy commented that this isn't a high traffic area.

Mrs. Pelchat said there's no traffic directly behind her mother's house. Arlington Avenue is a right-angled street and she is at the corner of the right angle.

Mr. Duffy said there aren't many garages in the area. He said he didn't see any covered canvas shelters or garages in the area.

Mrs. Pelchat said there are three garages on her mother's street and they are all permanent structures, one of which is in one of the pictures she just presented to the Board.

Mr. Currier said that Mrs. Pelchat indicated that this structure can be removed when her mother no longer resides in the house. He asked if this can be a stipulation if the Board approves the request.

Mrs. Pelchat said "absolutely." She said she is the executrix of her mother's will and she can make that a condition that once they sell the house that it be removed.

Mrs. Marshall said when she stops driving she would have it taken down.

#### **SPEAKING IN FAVOR**

No One.

#### **SPEAKING IN OPPOSITION**

No One.

Mr. Duffy said there is a letter dated September 11<sup>th</sup> from Richard Dickey to indicate he had no objection to the request.

Mr. Currier said in general he's not a fan of these portable shelters. They are not very attractive.

He said in this particular situation the applicant has stated that it would be removed when Mrs. Marshall no longer lives at this house or drives. It protects the neighborhood in the future because it would just go back to what it was.

**MOTION** by Mr. Currier to grant the variances: 1) to encroach 4.5 feet into the 6 foot left side yard setback, 2) to exceed maximum building area, 20% allowed, 30.4% existing - 39.9% requested, and 3) minimum open space, 40% minimum required, 38.3% requested - all requests to erect a 12'x20' accessory tent garage. The variance is needed to enable the applicant's proposed use of the property given the special conditions of the property. The driveway is right near the left side yard setback. It's a pre-existing non-conforming home. Special Condition: Accessory tent will be removed when Yolande Marshall no longer lives at the residence or drives an automobile. There will be no long-term impact to the property values of surrounding parcels. It is within the spirit and intent of the ordinance. It is not contrary to public interest. Substantial justice will be served.

**SECONDED** by Mr. Duffy.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

8. Christopher W. Eckler (Owner) 5 Amory Street (Sheet 38 Lot 84) requesting the following: 1) special exception to maintain expansion of nonconforming use, two dwelling units approved, three existing, and 2) variance for minimum lot area, 10,500 square feet required, 5,300 square feet existing. GI Zone.

9. Christopher W. Eckler (Owner) 7 Amory Street (Sheet 38 Lot 71) requesting special exception to maintain expansion of nonconforming use, two dwelling units approved, three existing. GI Zone.

10. Christopher W. Eckler (Owner) 19 Amory Street (Sheet 38 Lot 81) requesting the following: 1) special exception to maintain expansion of nonconforming use, two dwelling units approved, three existing, and 2) variance for minimum lot area, 10,500 square feet required, 4,582 square feet existing. GI Zone.

Christopher Eckler, 17 Amory Street.

Mr. Duffy reminded Mr. Eckler that he would need all three votes to have his applications approved. Otherwise, the application(s) is (are) denied. He said the alternative was to postpone so that there would be a full Board to hear the cases.

Mr. Eckler said he would postpone to date certain - 11/22/05.

## **Minutes**

**9/13/05**

**MOTION** by Mr. Duffy to approve the minutes of 9/13/05, waive the reading, and place on file.

**SECONDED** by Mr. Carrier.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

## **Request for Rehearing**

**None**

## **Regional Impact**

The Board discussed the agenda for the next meeting. They did not see any regional impact.

Mr. Falk said the applicant for 120 Coliseum Avenue and for the Mobil Oil Station on Main Street has requested that they be heard

first and second at the Board's next meeting because it's an "off" night for them. That is a Wednesday and they normally have meetings in another City. They may not wish to go with four members anyway, which is the number of members who will be present at next week's meeting.

## **Other**

Mr. Falk presented the listing for next year's meetings. He asked them to look it over to see if there are any adjustments to be made. He said they might wish to wait until there are five members to review it. The Legislative Office and the City Clerk's Office need to have these dates to reserve the rooms for all the various meetings.

Mr. Currier said he'd like to compare this list with a 2006 calendar so he can see if there is any conflict.

Mr. Falk said that they could Email him with their response.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Duffy called the meeting closed at 7:42PM

Susan Douglas  
Clerk

lt  
Taped