

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING OF DECEMBER 4, 2006
SUBJECT TO APPROVAL AT THE NEXT REGULAR MEETING**

I. CALL TO ORDER:

Meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m., Jeffrey Partington, Chairman, presiding.

Members Present: Jeffrey Partington, Rick Lemek, Leo Felice, Michael Lupis, Jim Libby, Christopher Desjardins and Jeff Presbrey

Members Absent: Bruce Ferreira

Others Present: Ron Faford, Town Council Liaison, Ray Cloutier, Zoning Board Chairman, Thomas Kravitz, Town Planner, and Christine Langlois, Recording Secretary

II. ATTENDANCE REVIEW:

The Chairman acknowledged that one member was excused from the meeting.

III. ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES:

The **minutes of the Planning Board meeting of November 6, 2006** were read. *A motion to accept the minutes as presented was made by Mr. Lupis, seconded by Mr. Felice and carried unanimously by the Board.*

IV. CORRESPONDENCE:

- Common Ground Newsletter
- Two Notices of Insignificant Alterations to Wetlands from RIDEM
- Water Uses for Rhode Island – Today and Tomorrow Booklet

V. OLD BUSINESS:

Land Development:

Pine Ridge Village Planned Development (Age-Restricted), Steere Farm Road & Mowry Street, Harrisville; Map 176, Lots 3 & 5; Map 177, Lot 30: Preliminary Major Plan Review/Public Hearing (continued from last month's meeting): Attorney Brian LaPlante Dr. Lucien Benoit were in attendance to represent the request. Attorney LaPlante told the Board that the project has still not yet received its DEM permit and asked that the Board grant an extension of the review to the January 2007 Planning Board meeting. He added that the engineers are currently working to address the concerns expressed by the Board at the last meeting, and would be submitting updated materials shortly. *A motion to continue the Preliminary Plan Review and Public Hearing to the January 8, 2007 Planning Board agenda, as requested by the applicant, was then made by Mr. Felice, seconded by Mr. Libby, and carried with unanimously by the Board.*

Subdivision:

Hill Farm Estates, West Road, Pascoag; Map 72, Lots 11 & 12; Map 73, Lots 1 & 2: Preliminary-Final Minor Rural Residential Compound Review/Public Hearing: Ms. Betsy McKenzie, of EMAC Engineers, and Mr. William McIntosh were in attendance to

represent the request. Ms. McKenzie stated that the Board had received the updated information at the last meeting, which she had outlined at that meeting, and asked if they had any additional questions based upon their review. Mr. Partington noted that the information they had provided to the various departments had been satisfactory. Mr. Felice questioned whether a security instrument had been provided as well as inspection fees. Ms. McKenzie stated that it could be provided to the Administrative Officer within the necessary timeframe, as well as the inspection fees.

A motion was made by Mr. Felice to set a bond amount of \$145,000 for the project with inspection fees at 2% of the bond amount, or \$2,900. The motion was seconded by Mr. Presbrey and carried unanimously by the Board.

A motion to approve the Hill Farm Estates Preliminary Minor Rural Residential Compound Land Development was made by Mr. Felice because the subdivision is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan; the application is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance – particularly Section 30-208 Rural Residential Compounds; as indicated by RIDEM and DPW site inspection(s) and plan reviews, there will be no negative environmental impacts; the subdivision will not result in the creation of unbuildable lots, because all proposed lots conform to the Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision Regulation Requirements and the lots are physically accessible; the subdivision has adequate and permanent physical access to West Road, which is a public street. The motion received a second from Mr. Presbrey and carried unanimously by the Board.

VI. NEW BUSINESS:

Major Land Development:

Nason Mill Landings, LDD Enterprises, LLC, Douglas Pike, Nasonville; Map 114, Lot 6: Master Plan/Informational Meeting Review: Doug Leighton, of Gates, Leighton Associates, Jeff Lambert, Dennis Darveau, and Rick Dearing, principals, John O’Hearne, of O’Hearne Associates, Joseph Delsesto, of Fuss & O’Neill, Inc., and Christopher Manchester, of Gates, Leighton, were in attendance to represent the request. Mr. Leighton began the discussion by stating that since the Preapplication Plan review for the mill site at the corner of Route 102 and Victory Highway, the development team has been working on the Board’s comments from that evening. He noted that on July 26, 2006 the applicants’ were successful in obtaining a zone change (from Light Industrial (LI) to Village Commercial (VC)). He then outlined the changes made since the Preapplication review:

- Blue silos have been removed from the site
- the flood plain issue resolved by creating garage space on the first floor and raising the roof of the southern-end of the building to create living space on the second and third floor; the garage space being able to house approximately 52 vehicles – reducing the number of parking spaces on the site and being able to create more green space

- the four duplex units were relocated closer to Douglas Pike in order to historically create a streetscape that harkens back to previous ridge line orientation as shown by the historical evidence located for the site
- addressed the concern for the walking distances from the parking areas to the units by using the first floor area of the southern-end of the building for under unit parking and constructing a pedestrian path that travels through the lower portion of the building providing easier access to the units
- more commercial space – proposed restaurant space of approximately 3,100 sq/ft; three additional commercial spaces of approximately 6,000 sq/ft on the north-end of the site
- common space of approximately 5,000 sq/ft for a pool and exercise rooms
- water tower will be removed as it did not have any viable use and the extra square footage was needed for additional parking; the edge condition of fencing and landscaping as illustrated on the southern-end would be extended to screen the additional parking in the northern-end.

He then turned the meeting over to John O’Hearne, of O’Hearne Associates.

Mr. O’Hearne addressed the architecture of the building. He noted that they have attempted to keep the proposed addition lower than the existing metal structures that exist currently on the building. The duplexes were changed to be parallel to the street – much similar to the actual cottages that had existed years ago, and the structures are smaller, although the square footage is the same. The previously proposed 8-car garage underneath has been removed, and cart ports have been provided in the rear of each unit, which also serves to address the flood plain issue. He noted that a small cupola tower has been provided on the main building, which would house an elevator shaft, for an elevator to service the 22 units - making them handicapped accessible, on the second and third levels. The units are to be approximately 1,400 sq/ft each; the other units in the main building being townhouses and will range from 1,250 to 1,400 sq/ft. All the units will have two bedrooms. All new construction will have a brick veneer in order to blend in with the existing buildings. He then turned the meeting over to Joseph Delsesto, of Fuss & O’Neill.

Mr. Delsesto offered an overview of the proposed utilities. He stated that they had petitioned the Sewer Commission for a tie-in to be established for this site, which they have provided with two tie-ins. The existing septic system for the building will be abandoned and/or removed and disposed. He noted that the project would have well water, having conducted well water testing and found to have sufficient capacity for the development. Mr. Partington asked if it would be a community well. Mr. Delsesto said yes it would. He noted the developers are still investigating natural gas service and what it would involve to bring a line to Town. He pointed out that the project would require zoning relief from several areas, including multi-use zoning requirements and possibly parking relief. He then turned the meeting over to one of the developers, Dennis Darveau, who has conducted some demographic research for the project.

Mr. Darveau told the Board that he had conducted market research for a 1-, 3- and 5-mile radius to see what could suit the demographic needs of the project. His conclusion was the target audience for the property should be the 45-64 age range, hitting two age brackets (45-54; 55-64) according to the Census Bureau and meeting the demographics needed for household income/net income for houses being purchased by that age group. He noted that two-bedroom units are adequate for that age group, usually being empty-nesters and snowbirds. In regards to the gas line, he noted that they are still unclear as to whether they would use propane or natural gas and are currently in communications with National Grid. The nearest pipeline is approximately 1.9 miles away, which would be pretty costly. National Grid is doing research (number of households, etc.) to see if they could defer some of the cost. He added that they are also trying to reach out to area businesses to see if there is interest for connection and perhaps share the cost for the line to be brought into Town. He also noted that he has been in contact with the Tax Assessor to predict any impacts, any benefits and determine comparable units. He then asked if there were any questions from the Board.

Mr. Presbrey had an issue with the six parking spaces at the north end of the property, noting that it seemed a little bit tight and suggested pushing the berm over a bit to make the spaces more accessible. Mr. Leighton noted that the parking lot has been designed to provide adequate access for the fire department. Mr. Presbrey also voiced concern with the retail restaurant parking – that the requirements call for 101 spaces but the applicants are requesting a variance to 91 spaces. He noted that although the residential space will be gated, there are approximately 17 spaces that could be included for the commercial end and suggested they review utilizing those spaces for commercial use. Mr. Leighton stated that there are control issues to be addressed especially with the concept this evening that allows for a pedestrian activity portal to the north and south areas of the building. He added that they are working on the design of this project with an eye on what would happen on the other side of Douglas Pike, but view this project as a beginning to the re-creation of the village character to this whole corner and other opportunities for parking outside of this immediate property. Noting the extra area of residential parking, Mr. Presbrey suggested that this extra parking be used for perhaps employee parking of the restaurant and commercial space.

Mr. Presbrey questioned the location of a water quality unit in the south end stormwater detention area. Mr. Delsesto said the water quality unit is located before the detention area. Mr. Presbrey responded that the plan showed the unit after the detention area on the drainage plan. Mr. Delsesto said that they had not decided whether to use infiltration or detention. If the plan goes with detention, the water quality unit would be place before. Mr. Presbrey also pointed out that the existing flared end is slated to be replaced at the discharge point and asked if there was an easement present to allow for drainage onto the abutting property. Mr. Delsesto said it would be replaced and also stated that it was the developers' belief that there is an existing easement to accommodate the existing storm flow. Mr. Darveau added that the easement dates back to 1800 when one of the previous mill owners, Mr. Nason, purchased the property, and began selling off piece of adjacent property. Each one of those parcels has easement language that allows the right for the

runoff – they cannot ever backfill it and must keep it open. Mr. Presbrey suggested relocating the runoff to the southwest back of the building that flows down toward the river. Mr. Delsesto said that the plan would be reviewed by RIDEM and that it depends on the watershed. Finally, Mr. Presbrey suggested they investigate infiltration units for the roof drains of the new residential buildings in order to direct the roof water back into the ground.

Mr. Libby noted that the letter the Board received from the RI Historic Preservation Society discouraged the second floor additions to the existing building, although, as an architect, he stated that he was in favor of it. He also noted that the Historic Preservation stated that they liked the proposed duplex units in the front. He encouraged the developers to contact Historic Preservation because they may be entitled to tax credits as high as 30% at the State level and Federal at 20%. Any money that can be returned to the developer could be placed back into the project, further improving the quality of the project for the Town. Mr. Dearing said that they had approached the Historic Preservation, but felt some of the limitations they could place would be costly. Mr. Libby told him that usually the money that comes from the tax credits, helps defer the cost of the additional requests from Historic Preservation. He added that tax credits may not be available for the new construction and may be available for the existing portion of the building.

Mr. Libby suggested that the developers consider providing one of the garage parking spaces as an area for trash storage, with a compactor, instead of the usual dumpster outside the building, making it easy for residents to empty their trash. He further questioned the need for two sidewalks near the residential buildings. Mr. Leighton stated that the concept was to provide a sidewalk along Douglas Pike and another sidewalk within the fenced-in area – the interior sidewalk was creating a “walking loop” for all the residents. This loop would also include pedestrian access along the river. The outside sidewalk was to re-establish the residential-commercial feel to the street. Early discussions with RIDOT show that they would be in favor of this concept, utilizing the extra-wide breakdown lane (previously used for tractor-trailer parking with the previous industrial use) for the sidewalk areas. Mr. Libby stated that he preferred the elimination of the roadway sidewalk and allow curbing with landscaping. He questioned whether the walking paths would be public or private. Mr. Leighton said that it was intended to be private as it runs very close to the residential units facing the river, but there will be signage along the path and if someone wandered onto the path, it shouldn't be an issue. Mr. Libby then questioned why the duplexes would now have carports instead of garages. Mr. Leighton said that it was because of the flood plain zone. Mr. Libby suggested a breakaway panel garage door, as having a garage door gives a more complete look.

Mr. Felice questioned how the development would handle the storage capacity for the well for these units. Mr. Darveau stated that the capacity is calculated by the residences, what the usages are and the State's formula for x-number of gallons for reserve at all times (approximately one day and a half). He noted that the capacity would be stored in pressurized storage tanks that provide equal pressure throughout the complex. The

pumps would be working at night to refill for morning, constantly recycling so that the water is drawn from all the tanks and not just one. Mr. Felice asked if there was sufficient refill capacity based upon the calculations. Mr. Darveau stated that the well is approximately 275 feet deep; the amount of hours test running was approximately 5 hours and did not drain the well more than 60 feet down – a continuous 23 gallons per minute for the total 5 hours. Noting that this is the only source for water, Mr. Felice then asked what they proposed to do if something went wrong with this well. Mr. Darveau said they would drill another well.

In regards to the public sewer, Mr. Felice asked if they had received any written approval from the Sewer Commission. Mr. Delsesto said that a letter was received from the Sewer Commission, subject to further design, but are allowing the tie-in for the development, at this point. At full design, additional data will be submitted to the Commission for their review. Finally, Mr. Felice questioned the status of the Physical Alteration Permit (PAP) from the State. Mr. Delsesto said that they would not seek a PAP until they were ready to submit the Preliminary design.

Mr. Lemek asked if the duplexes had been moved away from the street with the Master Plan. Mr. Leighton stated that the duplexes had been moved slightly away from the street, changing the orientation and running the ridge lines as they had historically been. Mr. Lemek then asked how many of the units would be considerable affordable. Mr. Dearing said that they have made a conscious effort to provide 10% of the units as affordable housing. Mr. Kravitz stated that the Comprehensive Plan requires 20% of the units as affordable, but suggested approaching the moderate-level or 120% of the median family income. Mr. Delsesto stated that the developers were willing to fore-go the tax credits and provide historical features, even though it costs a little more; however, they have a certain number of units they must get and that is why the developers have tossed around 10% of the units as affordable by giving up on the tax credits. Mr. Kravitz pointed out that there are a number of programs available that would help provide financing for the affordable units.

Mr. Partington noted, for the record, that the zoning variances, specifically from parking requirements, the development would require are only necessary because of the existing structure and the previous use of the site, so that he believes a precedent would not be set by granting the approvals. He suggested the possibility of placing some parking in the rear of the building – even if it was parallel. He further questioned why the walking pathway did not continue into the far northern corner of the property. Mr. Leighton stated that the developers were unclear as to any further developments and pedestrian links in this area in order to provide a walkway access towards the intersection.

As there were no further questions from the Board, Mr. Partington, noting that this is a public information review, asked if there were any questions from the audience.

Suzanne Gartland, of Nasonville, stated that she believed the water was polluted. Mr. Partington told her that the developers must go through extensive testing when preparing

to utilize a well for public use. It becomes a community well and is tested on almost a daily basis. Mr. Darveau added that they were fortunate enough to obtain a history of the well testing during the time that the mill was operating when they purchased the property. Mrs. Gartland also asked the hours of operation of the proposed restaurant. Mr. Leighton stated that it would be based on the restaurant's interests. The developers are building the space for a restaurant – with no particular entity in mind at this time. Mr. Partington pointed out that the restaurant would be located behind the residential units, tucked into the north side of the building, so it would be off the street.

Kevin Blais, of Tarklin Road, complimented the developers on their vision for the property. Noting a previous presentation to the Town Council in which the developers stated that the walking paths would be public, he questioned why the paths are now being considered private for the residents of the development. Mr. Leighton stated that the residential component, which is the southern-most part, which will be a gated community, will have a pathway designated for the residents; the northern part, which is the retail entrance and the restaurant, will be open to the public with water access all along the back of the building. Mr. Blais said that it was his understanding that there would be a complete loop of the property. Mr. Leighton noted that bedrooms of the units are located on the back side of the building which they considered was not a good idea to allow for public access. Mr. Blais then asked what the target price for each unit would be. Mr. Leighton stated that they have not established a set price for the units as of yet.

Frances Lambert, of Nasonville, noted that her husband was part owner of the property, and that they have been residents of Burrillville for almost 20 years. She stated that they are pretty excited about the project because they live in the neighborhood and would never do anything to compromise the area.

Mr. Kravitz asked to summarize a few points, so that these items are not overlooked:

- Recreation fee in lieu of land donation, based upon a number from the Assessing Department
- 20% of units for affordable housing
- Copies of the State's correspondence regarding their review of the property to be provided to the developers.

He noted that the Board has approximately 120 days to arrive at a decision from this evening, although it may not take that long. He felt it was important that the developers know what they're up against in dealing with the State agencies requirements before going into the detailed engineering. He asked if the developers could provide a brief letter stating that they have received all of the State comments and that they still wished to continue with the project. He then would feel more comfortable with the Board offering a Master Plan approval and Findings of Fact for the project.

The Board noted that the plan would require zoning variances prior to the developers submitting the Preliminary plan. *A motion to forward a favorable recommendation to the Zoning Board for relief from the zoning items as outlined in the applicants submission*

was made by Mr. Libby. The motion received a second from Mr. Felice and carried unanimously by the Board.

A motion to continue the Master Plan review of the Nason Mill Landings Land Development project to the January 8, 2007 Planning Board meeting so that the Board has ample time to generate proper legal findings of fact to enter into the record was made by Mr. Libby. The motion received a second from Mr. Desjardins and carried unanimously by the Board.

Minor Land Development:

Phil-Anna Estates, Benedict Road, Nasonville; Map 46, Lot 11; Map 64, Lot 5: Conceptual Plan Review for Rural Residential Compound: Norbert Therien, of National Surveyors-Developers, Inc., Joseph Casale, of Casale Engineers, and Mr. and Mrs. Lee Lapierre were in attendance to represent the request. Mr. Therien explained that the plan represents two properties that total approximately 45 acres and are located on Benedict Road. He noted that this conceptual plan had appeared before the Planning Board in 1999. At that time the Board had reviewed three different configurations: Plan A showing a horseshoe-shaped roadway entering onto one property and exiting on the other, with the proposal for 6 conventional lots; Plan B being similar to Plan A due to the physical constraints of the properties-horseshoe-shaped roadway with 6 proposed lots; and Plan C representing a rural residential compound, relatively new at that time, with a proposal for 4 lots with a single access roadway from Benedict Road, crossing a stream and providing frontage for the proposed lots on a cul-de-sac. He described the terrain as follows: Benedict Road as relatively level, entering the property over a rise, then down a steep embankment, then crossing a stream with the majority of wetlands in this portion of the property, then an additional steep slope rising to a plateau where the cul-de-sac is proposing – creating a roadway with a length of about 930 feet. He noted several test holes dug in 2001 and that the site has been deemed suitable for on-site septic systems as well as private wells for water. He pointed out that this would truly be a family compound, as it is proposed that Mr. & Mrs. Lapierre will build here as well as their three daughters. He explained that there were a number of issues that have delayed the project but the main reason for the delay was in regards to the access from Benedict Road and the wetlands crossings. Initially two submissions were made to RIDEM and both were denied. After several consultations with RIDEM, the applicants pursued a York Bridge system (a wooden pole bridge system spanning approximately 75 feet with 15-feet from abutments to piers and piers to abutments) in order to cross the stream. RIDEM reviewed the proposal and have formerly signed a consent agreement and a permit to allow the York Bridge system. The total height of the bridge is approximately 14 feet designed with an H2O weight load capacity. He added that the roadway would remain private, with no obligations to the Town. School buses and trash pickup would occur at the end of the roadway on Benedict Road. He further added that the plan is awaiting subdivision site suitability.

Mr. Partington then asked if there were any questions from the Board members. Mr. Felice asked if their engineer could outline how he arrived at the proposed drainage.

Joseph Casale, of Casale Engineering, offered a brief overview of the drainage – proposed closed drainage system with a series of catch basins (designed to capture and clean the water), with the use of sumps in the catch basins and water quality orifices, discharging into different types of swales as well as riprap and check dams that will flow back into the stream. He added there will be no increase in runoff from the development. Because of RIDEM's very tight limit of disturbance, he stated that the development will not have any detention ponds or any infiltration system.

Mr. Lupis questioned the weight capacity of the bridge. Mr. Casale stated that when it is referred to H20, it means that each axle has a weight capacity of 20,000 lbs, typical of one of the bridges in Town.

Mr. Libby asked if the plan provided for any open space areas. Mr. Therien said there were none. Referring to the previous review in 1999, it was discussed that the applicants could designate certain areas as “no build” but still leave the areas as part of the individual lots, but that it was open for discussion this evening. It is a preference of the Lapierres that the individual lot owners have control over the four different lots, placing protective covenants over certain portions of the property. Being a private association they can do as they wish by creating the protective covenants. A vast majority of the property is wetlands, with a stream that cuts diagonally across the property from the southwest to the northeast, limiting what can actually take place there. Mr. Libby added that he had thought there could be open space provided on either side of the proposed roadway, citing that in about 50 years, the same owners may not be there. Mr. Felice pointed out that if for some reason an accident were to occur on the land adjacent to the roadway, there may be some liability to an individual owner.

Mr. Presbrey questioned the cost of the bridge and its life expectancy. Mr. Lapierre said that it would cost \$192,000 and has a minimum life expectancy of 65 years. He explained that the timbers that are used for this bridge are treated to be environmentally safe, no contaminants can leach from the timbers. They have been approved and used by RIDEM. He also added that it would have been much easier and cheaper to go with a steel bridge; but that was not what his family wanted for the property, as the parcels were owned by his grandparents years ago. Mr. Presbrey asked if there was a recommended maintenance plan for the bridge. Mr. Lapierre said yes there was a plan. Mr. Presbrey then questioned the width of the bridge and the proposed roadway. Mr. Lapierre replied that the bridge was 22 feet wide, 20 feet to the curb and the roadway was 20 feet wide. Mr. Presbrey voiced extreme concern with the roadway having a grade greater than 8%. Mr. Casale told the Board that by the time he became involved with this project, RIDEM had granted their approval based on this roadway and profile of 8.93% as a means of not widening the roadway through the wetlands. Mr. Therien added that when the plan was reviewed back in 1999, 10% was the allowable grade. Mr. Kravitz questioned whether the gravel surface would erode on an 8% grade. Mr. Casale explained that from Benedict Road to the bridge is approximately 20 feet wide and graveled; then a 75-foot span across the stream and then to a 20-foot wide paved roadway. In the area that has exceeded the 8%, after you enter the property and climb up, there is a small portion of pavement to address

the grade. The pavement, gravel and the limits was part of the adjudicatory process with RIDEM.

Mr. Partington voiced concerns regarding the total amount of drainage, structures and the upkeep of a bridge structure being maintained by four houses. Over time he felt that if regular maintenance does not occur, a great deal of work and money would be required to upgrade it in the future. He suggested the applicants meet with the DPW Director to see if a financial arrangement could be made whereby the Town could be compensated by a fee from the applicant to conduct regular maintenance support services to the drainage system. Mr. Partington stated that because the complexity of the bridge and the drainage system, he feels that they cannot be well maintained by someone who is not trained in this work. Mr. Therien attempted to explain that the drainage system is just a series of little walls that water runs against to slow down the flow, as well as little check dams to allow sediment to take place and to diminish the overall velocity of the water coming down the roadway. Mr. Partington pointed out that the road is approximately 900 feet in length with a good portion of it being gravel and the different height changes to the roadway could cause erosion that requires much more than just filling in. Mr. Therien then agreed to meet with the DPW to see if something could be developed. He further suggested a yearly inspection report, conducted by the DPW or some other entity, as to regular maintenance having been conducted on both the bridge and the drainage system. Mr. Felice suggested drafting a preventive maintenance schedule, with DPW assistance, to be conducted by a private entity. Mr. Kravitz, noting that the proposal is different from other rural residential compounds the Board has approved, stated that it was fine for the Board to ask for a maintenance program and annual reporting with photographs. He pointed out that there is no open space area proposed - that the rural residential compound ordinance refers to open space, and suggested that they investigate providing open space with the next submission.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS:

Report from Administrative Officer:

Mr. Kravitz noted that during the month of November, Certificates of Completeness were issued for: **David & Donna Leduc and Barry & Jamie Hopkins, Chum Boulevard, Harrisville** (Administrative – two lots), **Phil-Anna Estates, Benedict Road, Nasonville** (Conceptual Minor Land Development – four lots); and **Nason Mill Landings, Douglas Pike, Nasonville** (Master Major Land Development – 42 units). The following plans were rejected as incomplete: **Ronald Caponigro & Rene Gagne, Pulaski Road, Nasonville** (Administrative – two lots); and **Gregory Demetrakas, South Main Street, Pascoag** (Conceptual Minor – four lots). The following plan for **Harrisville Village LLC, Steere Farm Road & Mowry Street, Harrisville** (Final Major Land Development – 67 units).

Planning Board Discussions:

In regards to motions that are amended, Mr. Partington told the Board that they must follow through on completing the vote of the amendment, and then complete the original motion vote.

As there was no more business to address, a motion to adjourn was then made at 9:27 p.m. by Mr. Lupis, seconded by Mr. Felice and carried unanimously by the Board.