



Town of Barnstable

Zoning Board of Appeals



www.town.barnstable.ma.us/ZoningBoard

Board Members:

Brian Florence – Chair Alex Rodolakis – Vice Chair
 David A. Hirsch – Regular Member Herbert Bodensiek – Regular Member Robin Young – Associate Member Matthew
 Levesque – Associate Member
 Spencer Aaltonen – Associate Member Jacob Dewey – Associate Member
 James Tinsley – Town Council Liaison

Staff Support

Elizabeth Jenkins – Regulatory / Design Review Planner - elizabeth.jenkins@town.barnstable.ma.us
 Anna Brigham – Principal Planner – anna.brigham@town.barnstable.ma.us
 Carol Puckett – Administrative Assistant – carol.puckett@town.barnstable.ma.us

Brian Florence - Chair	Present
Alex Rodolakis - Vice Chair	Present
David Hirsch	Absent
Herbert Bodensiek	Absent
Robin Young	Present
Matthew Levesque	Present
Spencer Aaltonen,	Present
Jacob Dewey	Present

Also present were JoAnne Buntich – Director of Growth Management, Anna Brigham – Principal Planner and Carol Puckett – Administrative Assistant.

Minutes

Wednesday, June 22, 2016
 Hearing Room – 2nd Floor – 367 Main Street, Hyannis, MA

Call to Order

Introduction of Board Members

As a quorum has been met, Brian Florence calls the hearing to order at 7:05 PM. All members present introduce themselves.

Brian reads the following with no response.

Notice of Recording

Please note that this meeting is recorded and broadcast on Channel 18 in accordance with MGL Chapter 30A §20. I must inquire whether anyone is taping this meeting and to please make their presence known.

Old Business

Brian reads the following into the record:

7:00 PM Appeal No. 2016-021

Giarelis

Daniel J. Giarelis and Karen L. Giarelis have applied for a Special Permit pursuant to Section 240-91(H)(3) Developed Lot Protection and a modification of Special Permit No. 2013-032. Special Permit No. 2013-032 approved the demolition of an existing dwelling and reconstruction of a new dwelling with a “garage under”. The Applicant is seeking a modification of the Special Permit to construct the garage adjacent to the house, at grade, and attached by a breezeway. The lot coverage of the original

dwelling/structures was 25.3%; the dwelling approved with Special Permit No. 2013-002 had a lot coverage of 17.9%; and the new proposal has a lot coverage of 22.4%. The property is located at 112 Ocean Drive, Hyannis, MA as shown on Assessor's Map 266 as Parcel 008. It is zoned Residence B.

Members assigned May 25th: Alex Rodolakis, Robin Young, David A. Hirsch, Matthew Levesque and Spencer Aaltonen. Continued from May 25, 2016.

Representative: Attorney John Kenney. Attorney Kenney states that his client is in the process of consulting with his wife and builder about making modifications to the plan. He also discussed the matter with Attorney David Lawler who is representing concerned abutters and would be interested in viewing the modifications. He therefore asks for a continuance so that they have time to make the modifications and meet with Attorney Lawler and his clients.

Alex Rodolakis asks for a motion to continue to July 27, 2016 at 7:00 pm.

Motion by Matt Levesque and seconded by Spencer Aaltonen to continue to July 27, 2016 at 7:00 pm.

Vote:

All in favor

CONTINUED TO JULY 27, 2016 AT 7:00 PM

Brian reads the following into the record:

7:03 PM Appeal No. 2016-024

Parrella

Cynthia Parrella has applied for a Special Permit pursuant to Section 240-91 H(3) to demolish an existing 2,081 square foot 3-bedroom dwelling and to construct a new 2,080 square foot 4-bedroom dwelling with attached garage on a lot consisting of less than 10,000 square feet. The property is located at 85 Hollingsworth Road, Osterville, MA as shown on Assessor's Map 140 as Parcel 069. It is located in the Residence C Zoning District

Members assigned tonight: Brian Florence, Alex Rodolakis, Robin Young, Matt Levesque, Jacob Dewey

Attorney Philip Boudreau is representing the applicant and gives a summary of relief being sought. Attorney Boudreau refers to an email from Mr. Veitas regarding lot coverage and whether the sheds were included with that. Attorney Boudreau confirms that the sheds and chicken coop are to be removed. There is a porch on the back and is included in the lot coverage calculations and the decks will feed out to a non-grade patio.

Brian Florence asks if there is anyone here from the public who would like to speak either in favor or in opposition. No one speaks.

Robin Young make findings:

Special Permit Findings

For all Special Permits, the Board is required to make general findings pursuant to § 240-125(C). The Board should review the evidence presented by the Applicant, staff, and members of the public and, after weighing such evidence, is encouraged to articulate if and how the evidence contributes to each of the required findings.

- The application falls within a category specifically excepted in the ordinance for a grant of a special permit.

Section 240-91(H)(3) allows for the complete demolition and rebuilding of a residence on a nonconforming lot by Special Permit.

- Site Plan Review is not required for single-family residential dwellings.
- After an evaluation of all the evidence presented, the proposal fulfills the spirit and intent of the Zoning Ordinance and would not represent a substantial detriment to the public good or the neighborhood affected.

Further, Section 240-91(H)(3) requires the Board to find that if the proposed demolition and rebuilding cannot satisfy the criteria established is H (1) As-Of-Right, then the Board may allow the demolition and rebuilding by Special Permit provided the Board finds that:

- The proposed yard setbacks must be equal to or greater than the yard setbacks of the existing building;

- The proposed lot coverage shall not exceed 20% or the existing lot coverage, whichever is greater. The existing and proposed lot coverage remains unchanged at 21.5%.
- The floor area ratio shall not exceed 0.30 or the existing floor area ratio of the structure being demolished, whichever is greater. The proposed FAR is .29.
- The building height, in feet, shall not exceed 30 feet to the highest plate and shall contain no more than 2 ½ stories. The proposed height is 18'7" to top of plate (30 feet maximum); 25' 4" to top of ridge. The proposed dwelling is 2 stories.
- The proposed new dwelling would not be substantially more detrimental to the neighborhood than the existing dwelling.

Vote:

All in favor

Based on the findings, Robin Young makes a motion to grant the relief being sought with the following conditions:

Conditions

1. Special Permit No. 2016-024 is granted to Cynthia H. Parrella for the demolition of an existing dwelling and construction of a 2,080 square foot dwelling at 85 Hollingsworth Road.
2. The site development shall be constructed in substantial conformance with the plan entitled "Plot Plan-House Reconstruction for #85 Hollingsworth Road" dated May 11, 2015, drawn and stamped by Falmouth Engineering; and the floor plans and elevations dated April 27, 2016 by Barnstable Harbor Builders.
3. The total lot coverage of all structures on the lot shall not exceed 21.5% and the floor-area ratio shall not exceed 29.9%.
4. The proposed redevelopment shall represent full build-out of the lot. Further expansion of the dwelling or construction of additional accessory structures is prohibited without prior approval from the Board.
5. All mechanical equipment associated with the dwelling (air conditioners, electric generators, etc.) shall be screened from neighboring homes and the public right-of-way.
6. The decision shall be recorded at the Barnstable County Registry of Deeds and copies of the recorded decision shall be submitted to the Zoning Board of Appeals Office and the Building Division prior to issuance building permit. The rights authorized by this special permit must be exercised within two years, unless extended.

Seconded by Matt Levesque

Vote:

All in favor

GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS

Brian reads the following into the record:

7:04 PM Appeal No. 2016-025

Habitat for Humanity of Cape Cod, Inc.

Habitat for Humanity of Cape Cod, Inc. has applied for a Comprehensive Permit in accordance with MGL Chapter 40B, §§20-23 and 760 CMR 56. They are proposing to divide a 5.91 acre parcel into four buildable lots, each to be developed with an affordable, three-bedroom single-family dwelling. The remaining land would be unbuildable open space and area for an access road. Waivers are being sought from the area, frontage and setback requirements of the RF Zoning District; the two-acre minimum lot area requirement of the Resource Protection Overlay District; maximum lot shape factor requirements; and from the Subdivision Rules and Regulations as follows: street length; width, alignment and grades; drainage; storm drains; clearing, grubbing and excavation; roadway foundation and surface; monuments; inspections; fee schedule; and electronic filing requirements. The property is located at 536 River Road, Marstons Mills, MA as shown on Assessor's Map 061 as Parcel 002. It is located in the Residence F and Resource Protection Overlay Zoning Districts.

Attorney Warren Brodie is representing the applicant. Also with him tonight are John O'Reilly of JM O'Reilly Associates, Leedara Zola – Habitat for Humanity's (HFH) Land Use Consultant, John Terry –HFH board member, and Ralph Speck and Chris Stamos – Volunteers.

Attorney Brodie gives summary of relief (Exhibit A) being sought and describes the proposed site as vacant and a level wooded acre located in the RF zoning district. He notes that this project will adhere to all conservation and town health regulations.

Lots #1-4 will be house lots and Lots 5-7 will be unbuildable. Lot #8 is planned to be deeded to the abutting neighbor. All four homes will be 3 bedrooms, full basement with a ranch design. They are also hoping to install solar panels if the funds are available. He talks about consistency with local needs and the waivers being requested. He talks about the selection and purchasing process consistent with Habitat's established procedures and consistency with Local Initiative Plan (LIP) and affirmative fair marketing requirements. The homes will be energy star qualified and will be affordable in perpetuity. He lists the local projects which have been approved.

Robin Young asks how much the houses are being sold for. Attorney Brodie states that the 3 bedroom is \$140,000 and is adjustable by adjusting the length of the mortgage. If Habitat grants the mortgages, it is a 100% no interest mortgage and by adjusting the length of the mortgage they can get the housing costs adjusted to 30% of the buyer's income. Mr. Young asks if they have authority over how the houses are maintained. Attorney Brodie explains that if Habitat is the mortgagee they have a clause in the mortgage that, if a house falls into disrepair, they, as mortgagees, have the right to go in and repair it and add the cost to the mortgage. Jacob Dewey asks who will be maintaining the unbuildable lots as far as landscaping. Leedara Zola explains that there will be a homeowner's association with strong documents. They also work with a profession management firm. She explains that they would not strive to have the unbuildable lots landscaped. She explains that there will be rules in the homeowner's association but will be a light touch concept. Brian Florence asks some of the things that are regulated with their light touch approach. Leedara explains that there are no rules and regulations about lawn mowing, etc., and would not have rules about when to mow your lawn. Brian asks about accountability. Attorney Brodie states that HFH will be on the board of the association for the first year or so to get it going and that the collection of dues overall will be done by a professional manager. They discuss homeowner's association. Brodie says that the association has been successful and the failure to pay dues can result in a lien on the property and enforcement can be done. Leedara explains that the fees are affordable as well as the house payment. Alex Rodolakis asks about the open lots and if they are to be owned by Habitat or the association. Attorney Brodie explains that the association will be a trust and that the open lots will be owned thusly. Alex is concerned that the association might not get along and is concerned about enforcement. Attorney Brodie suggests having the board review the association documents when written. Brian notes that they will be asking for the homeowner's and maintenance documents. Alex Rodolakis would like to see an entity take over the open lots.

Robin Young asks if and how many neighbors they have approached about the project. Leedara Zola says they sent out a friendly neighbor letter announcing what is happening and a schedule.

Jacob Dewey asks what happens in reference to secondary sales down the line. Attorney Brodie explains that the rider allows for the resale of the property but only to those who qualify and cannot be sold to anyone making more than a percentage of the median area income. The price is looked at by looking at inflation so that there is no windfall. Brian Florence asks who has oversight of the resale. Attorney Brodie explains that there are 3 rights of refusal; typically the town, HFH and the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD). Jacob Dewey clarifies that the houses cannot be rented except for a provision for military personnel.

John O'Reilly talks about the waivers for the road dealing with road construction, drainage and property markers. He explains that this road will be classified as a minor B road. The Fire Department has requested two, nine foot travel ways with berms. The length of the road is 590' which exceeds a "B" road requirement which requires a waiver. As for drainage, Mr. O'Reilly states that they are proposing central drainage facility as well as a grass swale for best management practices. They are not utilizing catch basins and are proposing to allow for half the bounds that are required. They are proposing 8" of permanent depth of crushed gravel and feel it sufficient for the amount of traffic on the road. Brian Florence asks about storm mitigation.

Brian Florence asks what communication has taken place with the Town Engineer. Mr. O'Reilly states they have had a staff meeting. Brian Florence notes that the Town Engineer has some further concerns (Exhibit B)

Brian Florence would like to have the comments from the town engineer answered.

Brian Florence asks for public comment

Ellen Walsh from Whistleberry Drive speaks and asks about zoning for this area. JoAnne Buntich explains that the minimum acreage is 2 acres in this area, the lots surrounding this property are approximately about an acre. Ms. Walsh has concerns about the environmental impacts. Brian Florence explains that documents regarding this are available for her reading.

Manual Roderick III, is an abutter who was initially had concerned but has spoken with Leedara Zola to have his questions answered. He wants to make clear that nothing will be put on Lot #5.

Brian Florence asks if HFH would like to continue. Leedara states that they are on a tight timeline. They are looking to keep this moving as quick as possible. JoAnne Buntich understands the timeframe and explains that a continuance would not interfere with the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) timeframe.

Motion is made by Alex Rodolakis to continue this to July 27, 2016 at 7:00 pm.

Seconded by Matt Levesque

Vote:

All in favor

CONTINUED TO JULY 27, 2016 AT 7:00 PM

Brian Florence calls the Tripp appeal and reads it into the record:

7:01 PM Appeal No. 2016-022

Tripp

Steven A. and Denise W. Tripp have petitioned for a variance from Section 240-91-H(1)(b)[1] Lot Coverage. The petitioners seek relief from the maximum of 20 percent lot coverage to allow the demolition of the existing 1,361 square foot, three bedroom dwelling and construction of a new 3,321 square foot, three bedrooms dwelling with an attached two-car garage. The proposed lot coverage with attached garage is 22.4%. The property is located at 41 South Street, Osterville, MA and shown on Assessors Map 117 as Parcel 069. It is located in the Residence C Zoning District and the Resource Protection Overlay District. *Continued from May 25, 2016*

Members assigned tonight: Brian Florence, Alex Rodolakis, Matt Levesque, Robin Young, Spencer Aaltonen

Attorney John Kenny is representing the Tripp's and gives a summary of relief being requested. Their intent is to demo/rebuild their retirement home.

He states that the building was built in the 50's on a block foundation and that currently there are old pipes and mold in the basement. There was an addition a number of years ago on sona tubes. They looked at renovating the property; however, the builder's opinion was that the renovation would not be supported by the block foundation. Also here tonight are Mr. Tripp and Mr. Lagadinos, the builder. Attorney Kenney states that the cost is not feasible or economical and that the demo/rebuild would bring the dwelling up to building code standards. This will be total buildout without coming back before this board. The design fits with the neighborhood. He hands in photos (Exhibit A) and explains photos on the GIS map and easel. He states that this proposal fits with the neighborhood and the hardship would in renovating and adding to a dated existing home.

Brian Florence asks if they have looked at alternative designs in order to fit the ordinance. Attorney Kenney states that because of lifestyle they have cut it down but the proposal is the minimum.

Brian Florence asks for public comment. No one speaks.

Matt Levesque makes findings:

Variance Findings

The statutory requirement of MGL Chapter 40A, Section 10 for granting a variance is a three-prong test. The Board is required to find that each of the following three requirements has been met in order to consider granting the variance:

- owing to circumstances related to soil conditions, shape, or topography of such land or structures and especially affecting such land or structures but not affecting generally the zoning district in which it is located;
- a literal enforcement of the provisions of the zoning ordinance would involve substantial hardship, financial or otherwise to the petitioner; and
- desirable relief may be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and without nullifying or substantially derogating from the intent or purpose of the zoning ordinance.

An application for a variance that has met all three requirements “does not confer ... any legal right to a variance.” The Board still has the discretionary power to grant or not to grant the variance.

Vote:

AYE: Alex Rodolakis, Matt Levesque, Spencer Aaltonen, Robin Young

NAY: Brian Florence

A motion is made by Matt Levesque to grant the relief being sought with the following conditions:

Variance Conditions

1. Variance No. 2016-022 is granted to allow the construction of a new single-family dwelling and two car garage at 41 South Street, Osterville, MA.
2. The new dwelling shall not exceed 22.4% of lot coverage but shall meet all other requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.
3. The new dwelling shall be in substantial conformance with the site plan submitted to the file by MacDougall Surveying & Associates dated April 26, 2016, and the elevations and floor plans by Lagadinos Building and Design, Inc., dated April 20, 2016.
4. The above-described dwelling and attached garage shall represent full build-out of the lot. No further additions shall be permitted without approval from the Board.
5. This decision shall be recorded at the Barnstable County Registry of Deeds and copies of the recorded decision shall be submitted to the Zoning Board of Appeals Office and the Building Division prior to issuance of a building permit. The rights authorized by this variance must be exercised within one year, unless extended.

Seconded by Spencer Aaltonen

Alex would like Attorney Kenney to reiterate the specific findings to the three prong test.

Attorney Kenney states that because of the age of the structure, if renovated, the existing block foundation would not support the new structure and the dated wiring and plumbing would create a financial hardship if the applicants tried to renovate and add onto the existing structure.

Matt Levesque accepts the amendment to the findings.

Vote:

AYE: Alex Rodolakis, Matt Levesque, Spencer Aaltonen, Robin Young

NAY: Brian Florence

GRANTED WITH CONDITONS

Brian calls the Dillon appeal and reads it into the record:

New Business

7:02 PM Appeal No. 2016-019

Dillon

John J. Dillon, Jr., Trustee of the John J. Dillon Jr. Trust has appealed the decision of an administrative official pursuant to Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 40A, Sections 8 & 15 and Barnstable Zoning Code Section 240-7(A). The Appellant seeks the Board's review of the issuance of a building permit to Danute Quinn on April 1, 2016 for the construction of a single-family dwelling on property addressed as 2155 Main Street/Route 6A (formerly 59 Dillon Lane), Barnstable. The appellant is claiming that the property on which the dwelling is to be constructed does not have the required 150 feet of frontage on Dillon Lane required by the Residence F Zoning District because the applicant does not have rights to use Dillon Lane. The property address that is the subject of this appeal is 2155 Main Street, Barnstable, MA as shown on Assessor's Map 236 as Parcel 014. It is located in the Residence F Zoning District.

Members assigned: Alex Rodolakis, Robin Young, Matt Levesque, Jake Dewey, Brian Florence

Representative: Attorney Albert Schulz gives summary of his appeal and talks about the frontage and the length of the property line on which it borders. He gives the definition of public ways and frontage as defined in the ordinance. He suggests that the provisions of the town's bylaw support the argument that you have to have rights in the way in order to use that frontage. Attorney Schulz states that Attorney Bernard Kilroy has submitted an affidavit saying he has examined the title and that there are no rights on either side to use the entirety of Dillon Lane. He states that back in the 70's when this subdivision

was approved; there was no exchange of reciprocal easements. Attorney Schulz also refers to the statement of standing in his memo (Exhibit A). He then gives the background on standing. In March of 1974, John and Ann Dillon and Daniel and his wife Sharon filed a sketch plan with the Planning Board showing division of three (3) lots. Two weeks later an application for a subdivision plan was filed with only lot #1 and lot #2 but the street, Dillon Lane, stayed in the same position. He refers to his memo (Exhibit #1) and explains. There was a sketch plan done. He states that in the application, Daniel misrepresented to the Planning Board that he had an easement to use that way but for some reason it was approved. By today's standards, you have to submit proof to the Planning Board that you have rights in the way that you are claiming for frontage. He refers to Dolan vs Town of Chatham (Exhibit B) which he states also agrees with idea of rights in the way in order to have proper frontage. He refers to Exhibit #8 of his memo on standing which shows the property to give them an idea and would submit that Attorney Revere did not present the Dolan case in its correct standing. The frontage in Dolan was 29' frontage on a public way and 98' was on a private way on which there was no rights to use. He refers to the Superior Judicial Court decision. Also, he is not sure what the basis for the issuance of the building permit was for. It seems to be under Section 801-12.F of the Subdivision Rules and Regulations, which he has attached as Exhibit #6. He states that under MGL Chapter 41, Section 81 Q, the Planning Board is powerless to pass regulations governing the size, shape, width, use, frontage of lots and would suggest that Section 801.12 cannot be a basis for the issuance of a permit. He states that the Planning Board did not vote to authorize anything under 801.12 and the only motion before the board was an ANR preliminary plan with a right of way across it and not a subdivision. Three members voted in favor, one against and never got the vote and would suggest that it can't be a constructive approval because they acted on it. He states that the main thing was that there was never a motion before the Planning Board to approve or authorize the use of the easement to Lot #2.

Brian Florence asks for public comment.

Attorney Paul Revere is here representing Danute Quinn. Brian Florence asks Attorney Revere if he is okay with him (Brian) sitting on this case since his office has had dealings with Mr. Revere's office. Attorney Revere is okay with him sitting on this case.

Attorney Revere states that some of the questions suggest that perhaps the Planning Board and others was not paying attention back then but submits a copy of a post office certified receipt signed John Dillon dated 5/16/74 (Exhibit C). He states that John Dillon became deceased and in 1988, the Dillon brothers deeded the property to John Dillon Jr. The deed which states that the property is subject to an easement was filed. Daniel Dillon then dies and deeds his property to Danute & Tom Quinn. Because there are two lots, one purchase price is paid but one lot was given to Tom and one to Danute. Danute then proceeds and goes to the Planning Board, Mr. Schulz contacted Mr. Revere and suggested they use an easement, there was an objection to the roadway, discussions with the Planning Board were done and, as set forth, they went before the Planning Board and ran into the quorum issue. There was a 3 to 1 vote and because of the voting rules, 4 affirmative votes were needed in order to pass. He states that Mr. Dillon opposed the plan but did not appeal that action. They then went to Old King's Highway and then to the Building Department which issued the permit. He refers to his memo about quantitative and qualitative requirement in the ordinance. He goes on to state that there is an issue of standing and the concept of standing is having someone who has something as stake. He doesn't think that Mr. Dillon can prove that he's aggrieved. Mr. Dillon is an abutter and abutters are persons of interest and are presumed to be aggrieved. If his client rebuts the presumption of aggrievment then Mr. Dillon has to prove he is aggrieved. He refers to his memo, first page, last paragraph in bold and underlined (Exhibit D). He states that Attorney Schulz refers to the Denny vs Seekonk Board of Appeals case and the Picard cases both referred to in his memo (Exhibit D) except those cases, Attorney Revere states, have been overruled. Attorney Revere states that Attorney Schulz' clients reasons: integrity of the zoning ordinance = is not standing, and it messing up his easement doesn't work either. He refers to the Dolan case. He asks if there are any questions from the board.

Alex Rodolakis asks if it could just stand without the issue with the Planning Board. Attorney Revere states that if the Planning Board had voted 4-0 in favor, Mr. Schulz would have no argument.

Brian Florence asks Ruth Weil – Town Attorney for comment. Attorney Weil states that the definition of frontage under 240-60 deals with signs in the Hyannis Village Business zoning district (HVB) and the definition under subdivision was not passed through the zoning ordinance process. She does not believe there is a definition of frontage in the ordinance and under those circumstances to use the normal definition as to whether there is linear frontage on a way and adequate access. She states that ZBA's task is to decide if the Building Commissioner acted reasonably with the information before him. Barnstable does not require in its zoning ordinance that frontage and access be the same.

Attorney Schulz briefly goes over the Dolan case.

Board deliberates.

Alex Rodolakis asks what the recourse would be if they overturn the Building Commissioner's decision. Brian explains that either party has the right to appeal.

Motion is made by Brian Florence stating that the Building Commissioner acted reasonably, responsibly and judiciously in the execution of his duty in issuing the building permit and therefore he moves to UPHOLD the decision of the Building Commissioner to issue a building permit.

Seconded by Robin Young

Vote:

AYE: Robin Young, Matt Levesque, Jake Dewey, Brian Florence

NAY: Alex Rodolakis

Alex Rodolakis states that he struggled with the issue of access.

UPHELD THE BUILDING COMMISSIONER

Correspondence

Received 06-15-16 – Notice of License Application No. W16-4686 - Waterways License Application for 132 Fox Island Realty Trust to construct and maintain a boardwalk, pier, ramp and float at 132 Fox Island Road, Osterville, in and over flowed tidelands of Dam Pond.

Received 06-16-16 – Notice of License Application No. W16-4670 - Waterways License Application by the Town of Barnstable for dredging at Gateway Marina, in and over flowed tidelands of Hyannis Inner Harbor.

Matters Not Reasonably Anticipated by the Chair

Upcoming Meetings

July 27, 2016, August 10, 2016, August 24, 2016

Adjournment

Motion to adjourn is made by Alex Rodolakis and seconded by Matt Levesque.

Vote:

All in favor