

**Zoning Board of Appeals
Lakeville, Massachusetts
Minutes of Meeting
February 15, 2007**

Members present:

Donald Foster, Chair; Derek Maksy, C.R. Canessa, Member; David Curtis, Member; Joseph Beneski, Associate Member; Eric Levitt, Associate Member

Atty. Laura Pawle, David Varga from BSC Engineering, and Richard Heaton from H & H Associates were also present

Regular Meeting:

Mr. Foster opened the regular meeting at 7:05 p.m.

Roll called. Mr. Foster read aloud the agenda and the order of hearings. Mr. Foster asked members to consider a new associate member to replace Steve Flood. The Selectmen will probably ask for a recommendation.

The Minutes of January 18, 2007 were reviewed. Mr. Beneski moved to accept as presented, Mr. Curtis seconded. No discussion. The **vote** was **unanimous for**.

Station Street Development LLC hearing – continued:

Mr. Foster reopened the Station Street hearing at 7:15. Mr. Baptiste updated the Board on the situation and indicated that he wanted to continue until April 19, 2007 at 7:15 p.m. Mr. Curtis moved to grant the continuance. Mr. Canessa seconded the motion. No discussion. The **vote** was **unanimous for**.

The hearing closed at 7:16.

Markson hearing:

Mr. Foster opened the Markson hearing at 7:17 and read aloud the legal notice. Mr. Foster first read a letter written on February 5, 2007 by Mr. Markson thanking the Board for it's willingness to continue and then a letter dated January 30, 2007 from Mr. Markson requesting that his hearing be continued.

Mr. Foster asked Mr. Beneski to be a voting member because Mr. Veary was absent. Mr. Maksy made a motion to continue to the March 15, 2007 meeting. Mr. Canessa seconded

the motion. Mr. Beneski noted that no other Boards have submitted comments regarding this petition except for the Building Commissioner. Mr. Foster appointed Mr. Beneski to chase down comments from other Boards. Mr. Foster reminded members that the ZBA would conduct no business on this petition until the petitioner was present. All voted in favor.

The hearing closed at 7:19.

Zion hearing:

Mr. Foster opened the Zion hearing at 7:19 and read aloud the legal notice. Mr. Foster asked Mr. Beneski to be a voting member because Mr. Veary was absent. Mr. Foster next read a letter from Mr. Marot of the Planning Board, dated February 1, 2007 recommending approval providing that both lots remain under the same ownership. Mr. Foster explained that the ZBA had granted permission to build the garage several months before but had not realized that the lot was not contiguous with the other lot, which has the dwelling, and therefore, this garage would be an accessory building without a principal structure on the same lot. This petition asks for a Variance for the accessory building without the principal building.

Mr. Maksy asked about the deed. Mr. Zion explained that both lots are held on one deed. Mr. Beneski suggested that the ZBA receive a copy of the deed for the files. ZBA members discussed property boundaries to the edge of the road versus to the center of the (private) road.

Mr. Maksy noted that this configuration, of the garage on a separate lot across the road, is common in that and other neighborhoods near the pond.

Mr. Foster asked if anybody present wished to speak on this petition. Nobody present spoke.

Mr. Maksy then made the motion to approve the Variance with the following restrictions:

1. This would be the only building on the lot
2. The petitioner would provide a copy of the deed to the ZBA for the files.

Mr. Curtis seconded the motion. The **vote** was **unanimous for**.

Mr. Foster then explained to Mr. Zion the timing of the filings, the appeal period, etc.

The hearing closed at 7:33.

Stagecoach Village LLC hearing – continued:

Mr. Foster reopened the Stagecoach Village LLC hearing at 7:35. Atty. Marguerite Mitchell reviewed engineering issues and responses to points raised by BSC Engineering. Mr. Beneski pointed out that the ZBA has not yet seen the new plans even though BSC and other Boards have. Mr. Foster said that the missing plans were a failure of the ZBA and not the petitioner.

Atty. Mitchell discussed the restrictions imposed by Natural Heritage on the plans, including moving the tennis courts and the bocce courts. They also asked to eliminate the islands in the road and to change the boundaries. Atty. Mitchell presented a letter from Natural Heritage approving the plan.

The amount of fill required was also discussed. Mr. Maksy voiced his concern that the project, through all the changes and redesigns, has become unattractive and boring. Mr. Foster reiterated to Mr. Gay his opinion that what was once a plan with unique characteristics has become ordinary.

Mr. Beneski voiced concern that the slope of the land means that many or most of the dwellings will have either an unsafe drop off or a basement walkout on the backside. Mr. Varga asked what had been filed with MEPA. Atty. Mitchell responded that an ENR had been filed. Mr. Maksy reiterated his concern that the project is no longer attractive, and asked what could be done to make it better. Mr. Maksy asked about the area that once held the tennis and bocce courts. Atty. Mitchell responded that Natural Heritage objected. Mr. Beneski also expressed concern at the road width and cul-de-sac diameter.

When Cathy arrived she stated that she did not have the plans and as far as she knew they were not in the Town Clerk's office.

Architect Jerome Dixon then presented the plans for the three styles of dwellings and the layout. He stated that they realize on some of the units that might back into a hill, they will have to do retaining walls and carve out spaces below grade so they might have a stone wall or a stone hill. On the opposite side where they have a downhill slope they will wind up with an elevated deck, in some instances, six or eight feet. A walk out unit is also possible with some units. It will be very important to deal with each unit individually and they will all look slightly different. The developer did not want to build a typical boxy type of Town House development which tends to block light and air but as these units are seen together they should have a nice modulation to them and they will get a lot of shadow to them and air. They will even adjust the positions of windows where neighbors are close so that they are not looking directly into another unit.

Mr. Foster asked how the affordable units would differ from the market rate units. Mr. Dixon said that they would not. There would be an opportunity to up grade for the market units. Mr. Beneski noted that the interior of the units should also have the same basic quality. Atty. Mitchell said that building specifications have been submitted during this process and every unit would have those as a minimum with upgrades still possible.

Atty. Gay noted that they are trying to design buildings individually but they are going to have individual adjustments depending where they are located on the site. Although MEPA does have total control over this site, they have control over how they build these buildings and how they landscape.

Mr. Dixon added that every unit will have a front porch that should be able to accommodate furniture to allow people to sit out front. Atty. Gay noted that the units would also have a two-car garage with room for two cars in the driveway.

Mr. Varga asked how far back development would be on the rear of the houses on the northerly side of Kingman Street. Mr. Dixon said on those north easterly units they will wind up carving out landscaped space. They will have stone walls shaped into the hillside. These retaining walls will be two and a half to three feet high. They have identified an area that will be a formal deck and where they are right at grade they are going to do this with an appropriate material such as stone or brick as opposed to wood. On the opposite side where this is turned around and sticking out over a drop in grade, they will provide an elevated deck or possibly a walk out.

Mr. Varga was concerned that there were some critical grading issues particularly in the back of these North East units and that having specific ground water testing to know what they are dealing with was crucial in terms of achieving the design situation they were talking about. The site grading and the overall relationship on how they sit on the site is an important feature but the Board needs to be conscious of having a good handle on what needs to be done because if all of a sudden you grade something two or three feet to the groundwater that is going to have major grade impacts to accessing the garages from the roadway.

Mr. Dixon said they do anticipate having to get into a lot of detail in regards to this issue. There are two basic methods to do this. They can drill a lot of holes which is exorbitant and tremendously expensive or during the construction processes they will start to cut away and they can visually see the mottling in the soil. They then have their Geotech guy advise them on what to do and they can make some of these determinations. He agreed that every one of these conditions needs to be checked and must have a design detailed for it. Mr. Dixon felt that the methodology should be addressed in some fashion and that he would defer to the client and the attorney to what is appropriate. He believed that the 40B process is one where conceptually they want to move ahead without spending tens of thousands of dollars and then be denied. He reminded them that the Building Inspector would still have to administrate this in some fashion. When permits are pulled, they will have to demonstrate that they do know where the water is what they are going to do. There are methods to doing this without them going back and spending hundreds of hours and money and then guessing at it without a lot more testing.

Mr. Varga said that in terms of how the total site fits together they need to develop what they expect to be doing for grading and development for each of the proposed dwellings because there was going to be significantly more impact than what is shown on the plans. Atty. Mitchell responded that for the purposes of tonight, 40B requires them only to

submit preliminary plans to the Board. If, however, they find that they can't do what has been proposed they would be bound by what is on those plans. She suggested that be a condition of the Decision. Atty. Mitchell didn't feel that at this stage this was something that should be holding up the issuance of the Comprehensive Permit. Mr. Foster replied that the question of the Comprehensive Permit is in question and that it was not a given.

Atty. Gay said that he understood but they were here for a 40B Comprehensive Permit. They were not here for the final design of the subdivision which comes well after the preliminary subdivisions are approved. It is not reasonable for them to spend thousands of dollars on testing water levels for something that they can't build. What they can say is if they are going to build this project, we'll give you the Permit but it has to be built in accordance to these specifications and if something changes you have to come back to the Board and they will have to approve it. Mr. Foster said that maybe the fundamental question is should they build on this parcel or not. The Board wants to be assured about certain things about this property such as the issues of water and drainage. Once the Permit is issued they cannot un-issue it. Mr. Maksy agreed with the point about the condition. He stated that there needs to be some sort of catch to it so if it does happen there is a condition in there to protect the residents that are going to live there. Things have happened that now make this project difficult and it has changed the scope of the project.

Mr. Beneski spoke about his concern with the proposed retaining walls and some of the other issues. At the last meeting, it was talked about going below 40 units. He felt that number did need to be cut because this plan was just too tight. He would like to see the comments from the other Boards.

Mr. Varga then distributed some materials to the Board. Atty. Mitchell stated that the Board also had the response from their engineer, Kevin Walker, which had been distributed earlier. Mr. Varga also wanted to confirm that the plans that he reviewed were the ones that the Board had. Mr. Varga then addressed the following points:

760CMR 31.02

1. There are individual landscaping plans in the packet. An overall landscaping plan needs to be provided.
3. Architectural plans showing general finish were included but the Board needs to decide if they want additional information.

Section 1 Narrative Summary

1. BSC would like to see the flow figures that are approved from the City of Taunton.
2. Please remove the impervious area from above the soil absorption systems.

Section 8

7. 7b & 7c are technical matters that still need to be addressed.

Section 10

- 2c. The ZBA needs confirmation from the Fire Chief that emergency vehicles can maneuver in this reduced cul-de-sac.
- 2d. The ZBA needs confirmation from the Fire Chief that a 20' wide roadway is acceptable.
- 2f. The grading for the side slopes around the units must be shown on the plans.
- 2j. A waiver has been requested from street light requirements. Atty. Mitchell advised they are requesting photosensitive driveway lanterns. There was a discussion about the lighting due to the proximity of the houses. Mr. Foster stated that the Board would insist on lighting that met the dark sky standard. Mr. Curtis asked if they would be putting a street light on Route 79. Mr. Abbanato said that there would be signage. Mr. Curtis thought a light would be required. Atty. Mitchell said a lighting plan could be provided as part of the final plans.
- 2k. A waiver has been requested to waive street tree requirements. Atty. Mitchell stated that although some features had been provided, further detail would be provided in the final plan. Mr. Varga asked for clarification of the term Final Plan. He felt that some of these items were necessary for the Board's evaluation. Mr. Abbanato said that they based this on following the rules and regulations of the Town for subdivisions. Mr. Foster clarified that what Mr. Varga is asking is what level of detail can they expect to see before they are asked to issue a Comprehensive Permit. Atty. Mitchell has argued that you don't need final plans, you only need preliminary plans in order to grant a Permit. Mr. Varga is saying that some details are needed. Mr. Varga added that under the regulations a landscaping plan is clearly required. Atty. Mitchell responded that these are not issues that they have a problem with if the Board is looking for something specific to put on a plan they would be agreeable to that as a condition of what the final plans will show. There was a discussion regarding what detail they could provide because they did not know what style of house would be on each lot.
- 4a. Mr. Varga advised that this had been discussed. Given the depth of cut from many of the proposed dwellings the groundwater at the dwellings need to be determined before construction as this may have a major site grading.
- 4b. Final grading and septic system details are still needed.

Section 14

1. No Development Site Plan is included.

Section 15

Mr. Varga is still waiting for the sight distance to be added to the report.

Review of Plans

8. Abutting lot development is not shown. Where are the sensitive receptors or the nearest person affected by the development.

Sheet 3 of 9 (Now sheet 4 of 15) Topographic Sheet

1. The grading to rear of units still needs to be provided.

Sheet 4 of 9 (Now sheet 4 of 15) Topographic Sheet

3. A common driveway extends about 350 feet beyond the cul-de-sac. This needs to be covered with the Police Chief and the Fire Chief.

Sheet 9 of 9 Detail Sheet

2. Add erosion and sedimentation control details.
 3. Add construction stone entrance detail.
 4. Add a note to require street sweeping to prevent mud and dirt from being tracked on the public ways.
 5. Add sanitary details.
- All these items are still outstanding.

Trash disposal was also discussed. It is to be individual pick up. Mr. Varga continued with his review that had been done for the Conservation Commission. These are items that he would like the Board to be aware of:

Construction Operation and Maintenance Schedule

1. A Storm water Pollution Prevention Plan should be submitted to the Conservation Commission.
2. A copy of the EPA's NPDES NOI form needs to be submitted to the Conservation Commission.

3. BCS recommends a requirement for inspection of the construction erosion controls be observed on a weekly basis and after every 0.5-inch 24-hour rainfall.

Mr. Varga advised that some of the items in this report are ongoing and he would like the Board to be aware of them. Mr. Foster asked if they should be required as part of the Permit. Mr. Varga responded that yes either through the ZBA in conditions or then through the Conservation Commission in a Notice of Intent and that the Boards would need to coordinate that. Mr. Abbanato responded that all of the items should be addressed through the conditions of Natural Heritage. Atty. Pawle stated that they could build all of these items into the conditions.

Infiltration Calculations

- b. BSC is asking for the calculations to be revised using a rate of 1.02 inches per hour. Mr. Varga noted that this was another technical matter that he wanted the Board to be aware of.

Supplemental Data Report with Drainage Calculations

- j. The submitted calculations are acceptable but Subdivision Rules and Regulations require that the system be designed for the 25-year frequency storm. BSC recommends that a grate inlet analysis be calculated for the 25-year storm event. Mr. Varga stated that a waiver might be asked for the analysis to be calculated for a 10-year storm. He recommends that an updated list of the waiver requirements also be submitted.
- k iv. Please confirm that the bottom of the basin is at least two-feet above the seasonal high ground water level. BSC recommends that the bottoms of the basin be raised to the elevation of 95.5.
- l 1. A waiver to allow storm drains to be sized for the 10-year storm has been requested as part of the Comprehensive Permit process. BSC recommends that the Conservation Commission not issue the Order of Conditions until this has been ruled on by the Zoning Board.
- l 2. Regulations require that all storm water shall pass through an oil separator manhole prior to outfall. A waiver will be requested. BSC recommends again that the Conservation Commission not issue the Order of Conditions until this has been ruled on by the Zoning Board.

Plan Review

- a ii. The Site Development Contractor is responsible for approving all plantings for the purpose of ensuring long term viability of the proposed planting. This item needs to be confirmed by the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Topographic Sheets

- b ii. The berm to the southwest of units 30 and 31 is only about three feet wide. BSC notes that K & J Engineering's response is acceptable but wants them to revise the design and calculations.
- v. The grade of the walkway between units 35 and 36 is greater than 5%. This grading needs to be revised.
- vi. Seven of the buildings on the west side of the proposed access drive have depth cuts that range from seven feet to ten feet deep. Groundwater concerns for all of these proposed dwellings need to be addressed.
- x-xv. These are several new items that need to be addressed.

Utility Sheets

- 17 e i. The proposed access drive is about 13+63 feet. The Zoning Board needs to confirm acceptance.
- 17 e ii. The proposed cul-de-sac outer diameter is 100 feet. The Zoning Board needs to confirm with the Fire Chief that those dimensions are acceptable.

Mr. Varga advised that completed his review. Mr. Foster asked if there were any further questions. No one spoke.

Mr. Richard Heaton, of H & H Associates, then began with his review of the pro forma. He stated that a pro forma is a projection of future events based on a set of assumptions that are defined. In 40B, they look at a snapshot of the business at a point in time. The conclusions that he has reached in his report are based on his understanding of the facts.

Mr. Heaton said that he did meet with the applicant who provided additional information for him. The cost and revenues of the project are based as of December 2006. As this project is not expected to be built out within the next two years, these costs and revenues will change. In his opinion, the project, if built in 2006 as presented, is economic at 40 units with 11 affordable units and also at 38 units with 10 affordable units. He felt that there was a good chance that if the project was built over three years it would generate excess profit to the Town. Mr. Foster replied that they were less concerned with the excess profit that might be returned to the community but more concerned with maintaining the profit level at a reasonable level for the developer but minimizing the scope of the project as much as possible so that the community benefits in a different way.

Mr. Heaton advised that he had four areas he wanted to discuss. In regards to the price of the affordable units, this price should be no more that 30% of the AMI. The price of these units suggests the amount will be \$144,100. This price is too high and will produce

a cost that is 32% of the AMI for Lakeville. This price should be reduced to \$135,000. This information has been presented to the applicant.

The next item Mr. Heaton discussed was the Market Rate Selling Price. The selling price of the market rate units is \$260 per square foot of living area. He felt that was reasonable for 2006 but that amount would increase to \$292 by 2009. The third area discussed was construction costs. The applicant was putting in a road and needed a lot of fill. The applicant has indicated the cost of putting in the road at \$350 per linear foot with fill being \$13 per cubic yard. He felt those prices were conservative and estimated a road could be put in for \$300 per linear foot with fill at \$12 per cubic yard.

The fourth item was the Site Acquisition Costs. Mr. Heaton advised that the Site Eligibility letter issued by Mass Housing stated that the land value should be the last arms length transaction if it occurred within the last three years. The applicant executed a Purchase and Sales for \$1.5 million with additional costs of \$60,000 bringing the actual cost of the land up to \$1.56 million. This land was appraised at \$1.9 million. He looked at the appraisal to see why there was such a difference. He found that the appraiser evaluated 22 sites in the area and concluded the average cost per acre was \$70,000. This cost multiplied by 22 acres gives you a total of \$1.54 million but for some reason, which was not apparent to him, the average was changed to \$85,000. There is also an anomaly site with a value of \$160,000 that was included in the averaging which he felt should not have been included.

Mr. Maksy asked what number was used in the pro forma. Mr. Heaton replied that Mass Housing and DHCD came up with a philosophy that land value should be based on appraised value and Mass Housing should be the one to determine what is used. He noted that has not yet been tested in Court. These are guidelines only. Atty. Pawle noted that Mr. Heaton was correct. There is nothing in the regulations on how to determine the value in terms of vested equity. Their interpretation has always been the actual cost. It is true that the State Agencies have adopted the standard of appraised value based on current zoning. Mr. Heaton asked members to refer to Addendum A which shows that the project is profitable at 40 units and at 38 units.

Mr. Abbanato noted that he did have a discussion with Mr. Heaton about profit sharing with the Town if the profit did rise above a certain percentage. Mr. Foster felt that the Board of Selectmen should be involved in any conversation regarding that.

Mr. Maksy asked if the Board set the percentage of profit allowed. Atty. Pawle replied that Mass Housing allows up to 20% but it has taken the position in the past if the Board and applicant negotiate something different such as different in terms of 20% or different in terms of what is used for costs that would be acceptable. About half a year ago Mass Housing changed its policy and now decided that it has complete control over determining what that percentage is, and how its going to be calculated, and whether or not the developer has met it or exceeded it. She did not know what Mass Housing's reaction would be to profit sharing.

Mr. Foster then stated that the Zoning Board has maintained a good posture on this project even when told by the Selectmen that they did have the right to turn it down. There was then a discussion on the site acquisition costs. Atty. Gay stated that although there were a lot of things they did agree on, they did not agree with the acquisition cost. They did not do the appraisal. They hired someone to do it. Atty. Gay also distributed a supplement to the appraisal which he said should answer some of the questions that had been raised. He noted that they did not create the rules. The State Agency creates the rules and they are asking to live by them. They are willing to look at a partnership with the Town and they are looking to do this project right. Discussion continued on the issue. The applicant noted that if the appraisal had come in lower than the purchase price, Mass Housing would still require them to use the appraisal amount. Mr. Foster suggested that they table the disagreement for now and see where they come to on other aspects of the project, such as the partnership that was discussed.

Mr. Foster asked if there were any comments from the public. No one spoke.

Mr. Foster advised that they would need to find the updated plans as well as get comments from the other Boards. He had also asked Mr. Heaton to run another set of calculations but he did not feel that it would be necessary for him to attend the next meeting.

Mr. Maksy made the motion, seconded by Mr. Curtis, to continue the Stagecoach Development LLC hearing until March 15, 2007. The time would be at 7:15. The vote was **unanimous for**.

The hearing closed at 10:15.

Six Bridge St. Realty Trust hearing – continued:

Mr. Foster reopened the Six Bridge Street Realty Trust hearing at 10:16. Mr. McCarron had submitted some updated plans to the Board. A revised pro forma was included in the package.

Mr. Foster said that they would be deliberating on the change from a single story bedroom downstairs to a two-story bedroom upstairs and the second half of that question is the change from an age restricted development to a non-restricted development.

Mr. McCarron advised that none of the infrastructure will change only the footprint of the building. It does provide additional open space. Mr. Foster said that they could deliberate on the greater height, although it is within the bylaws, and the potential for children. Mr. Curtis liked how the downstairs was completely open.

Mr. Beneski asked if there had been input from other Boards in regards to the proposed changes. Mr. Foster said that he did write the letter but had not sent it. Mr. McCarron also provided a copy of a report from Citizens' Housing and Planning Associates. The

report looked at the implications of multi-family housing development for municipal and school expenditures. It indicates that these types of developments bring in approximately .1 to .3-.4 children per unit. Mr. Foster felt that because of the location of these units they were more apt to be purchased by people who wanted to walk to the train rather than by people with families.

An abutter, Mr. Vickery, spoke of his concern that the property was less than three acres and there was the possibility of twelve or more children, you just didn't know. They would be in one area with nothing to do. This could be a problem. It was then discussed how many children were currently living on Bridge Street and if they were causing any problems.

Ms. Higgins made the point that there could be additional cars if these children are older. Mr. Foster said that this was a good point to consider. Mr. Canessa discussed trying to keep some of the units 55 and older. Atty. Pawle said that there could be problems with that and they would probably want to go with either one or the other.

Mr. Foster asked what members thought. Mr. Beneski said that this was a concern for the neighbors. It would now be mixed ages and he was undecided right now. Mr. Curtis did not have a problem with changing it from age restricted. He suggested that a fence could be put up to alleviate the neighbor's concern. Mr. Maksy noted that although he would be abstaining from the vote, he also thought a fence could be put up. He felt that 55+ units would not sell in the Town.

Mr. Beneski suggested some give and take. If there are three or four children there should be play area set aside. An extra parking area is another option as well as some fencing for a buffer zone.

The type of fence to be put up was then discussed. Board members also discussed fencing the entire property. Mr. Maksy suggested that Mr. McCarron could work out the details with the neighbors. The type of fence put up should also be agreed to by the neighbors. Mr. Foster suggested the condition should be an appropriate fence and shrubbery if requested by abutters. Members agreed with that. The width of the driveway was also discussed.

Mr. Curtis then made the motion to approve the request to remove the age restriction and to allow the modified dwelling layout plan for the second floor with the following conditions:

1. A fence and/or appropriate shrubbery along the property line if requested by abutting neighbors.
2. The driveway will be doublewidth.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Beneski.

VOTE – Mr. Curtis, Mr. Beneski, Mr. Canessa, Mr. Levitt, Mr. Foster - **AYE**
Mr. Maksy – **ABSTAIN**

The next requested change had been regarding extending the water line. Mr. Foster said that where that had been left at was, with the support of the Board, he would communicate to the Board of Selectmen that this project should be placed on the waiting list for water as of the date of the letter requesting the change, which was October 3, 2006. Mr. Foster advised that he had verbally done that but would confirm that with a letter. He advised the applicant's attorney that this Board had no authority regarding water.

Atty. Pawle suggested that a vote on that be taken.

Mr. Beneski made the motion, seconded by Mr. Curtis, to deny the request to modify Section 17 on the original Comprehensive Permit as stated in the October 3, 2006 letter from the applicant.

VOTE – Mr. Curtis, Mr. Beneski, Mr. Canessa, Mr. Levitt, Mr. Foster - **AYE**
Mr. Maksy – **ABSTAIN**

Mr. Curtis made the motion, seconded by Mr. Beneski, to authorize Mr. Foster to sign the modified Comprehensive Permit on behalf of the Board. The **vote** was **unanimous for**.

Mr. Curtis made the motion, seconded by Mr. Canessa, to adjourn the meeting. The **vote** was **unanimous for**.

Meeting adjourned at 11:15.