

TOWN OF DERRY
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MINUTES
July 15, 2010

Members Present

Allan Virr, Chairman
David Thompson, Vice Chairman
James Webb, Secretary
Ernest Osborn
Cecile Cormier

Members Absent

Alternates Present

Michael Fairbanks
John DeBonis

Betsy Burtis
Jason Gesing

Alternates Absent

Stephen Popp

Staff Present

Mr. Virr called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m. with the salute to the flag, and notice of fire and handicap exits.

It was noted for the record that Mr. Thompson would recuse himself from this meeting and Ms. Burtis would sit for the following case.

10-116 James Vittum, Jr.
(Owner: Ryan's Hill Properties, LLC)

Requests a variance to the terms of Article VI, Section 165-32.A.1.c to allow the operation of a cordwood business with on-site stockpiling of firewood. 152 Rockingham Road, Parcel ID 03093.

James Vittum, 72 Kilrea Road, said that the property owner Dan Warren was also present. Mr. Vittum said that he was seeking a variance for his firewood business at 152 Rockingham Road. He read his application for the Board. Mr. Vittum said that he had approached Mr. Mackey a year ago and asked him where he could sell cordwood and was told to look in the General Commercial zones which he had and located this property and thought everything was all set and had met all the requirements so he relocated his business to 152 Rockingham Road.

Mr. Virr said that the ordinance says that you can sell fire wood just storage is not allowed. Mr. Vittum said that he now knows that due to the incident with Roy's Tree Service being relocated to Rockingham Road.

Mr. Virr asked if the inventory was just cut wood or logs. Mr. Vittum said that he purchases grapple loads which come in log lengths and cuts them into cut & split.

Mr. Fairbanks asked how is the noise limited to less than 85 decibels. Mr. Vittum said that he has a John Deere diesel motor with an exhaust system processor which produces less noise and that Roy's Tree Service had a chain saw test done and it was less than 80 decibels.

Mr. Osborn asked how many cords of processed wood was being stored. Mr. Vittum said that he currently has 200 cords.

Ms. Cormier asked if the logs are delivered how many times a week does he receive deliveries. Mr. Vittum said possibly 1 to 2 loads a week.

There was some discussion with where on the property the wood was stored.

Mr. Fairbanks asked what hours would be utilized for cutting the logs. Mr. Vittum said that generally 9-5 Monday – Saturday and if there are no customers that he is not there operating.

Mr. Osborn asked how the wood was loaded for deliveries if it was by loader or forklift. Mr. Vittum said that he utilizes a conveyor and cuts the wood with a hydraulic chain saw which is quieter than a regular chain saw.

Mr. Virr asked if the work was performed in the rear of the property if the houses were in view. Mr. Vittum said yes but there was an extensive tree line and that the stockpiles are located the farthest away from the houses.

Ms. Cormier asked what type of vegetation was in the area. Mr. Vittum said mostly ash which lose their leaves in the fall and minimal pine fairly thick area.

Mr. Webb asked if the area was shared with other businesses as it appears in the pictures. Mr. Vittum said yes that he rents space to the rear of the property and that he believed that there was a repair shop, taylor business, etc. located on the property.

Mr. Virr asked if there were also oil trucks there. Mr. Vittum said yes that Rockingham Oil also rents space on the property.

Ms. Cormier asked what equipment was shown in the pictures. Mr. Vittum said that it was a wood processor that cuts wood in half and processes it into stove lengths.

Code Enforcement

Mr. Webb read the following staff report provided by Mr. Mackey for the record.

The applicant's request is for a variance to allow the stockpiling of cordwood in conjunction with a firewood business in the rear of the above referenced property. The Board has dealt with a similar case a few months ago, further down Rockingham Road. Article VI, Section 165-32A describes the permitted uses in the General Commercial Zoning District. Subsection 1b lists "heating supplies and appliances" as a permitted use, however, subsection 1c states "coal, wood or heating materials not stored on the premises." It would appear that the purpose of the regulation is to eliminate large visible stockpiles of these materials. The sale of the material is permitted in the zone, not the stockpiling. The applicant currently stores logs & cordwood in the rear of the property, behind the building in an area which is substantially screened from abutters. To date, no complaints have been received from abutters regarding this operation. Due to the provisions of the zoning ordinance when it was discovered that he was operating this business, the owner was notified that the material must be removed or a use variance must be obtained. If approved, appropriate forms must be filled out at the Planning Department. There are pictures in the file for the Boards review.

Favor

No abutters present.

Opposed

Pamela Anderson, 1A Lawrence Road, said that she owns a 2.1 acre lot which directly abuts the property in the rear. She said that she had filled out a complaint form with the Code Enforcement Office and had requested that it was submitted to the Board for tonight's meeting. Ms. Anderson said that she also had a letter from neighbor at 1B Lawrence Road that had not been notified as they had recently purchased the property and presented the Board with the complaint form for the record. She said that the property line is not evergreen trees so it does become barren in the winter months so she would be hearing more noise from the property and is fully aware of the noise as she also lives across the street from Roy's Tree Service and is continually being woke up at 5:30 am from the noise of the trucks banging and beeping and noise from chain saws as they are still operating from the property. She said that she is concerned with the hours of operation as the applicant stated that he would be operating on Saturday and was also concerned with how many employees and equipment noise would be generated as she had purchased her home in a residential zone and is being continually subject to the beeping, banging noise from trucks and chain saw. She said when the noise started up again that she had wondered where it was coming from and realized when she received the abutter notification. Ms. Anderson said that the American Standards for an average chain saw was 110 decibels and that the town ordinance states not to exceed 80 decibels. She said that her property runs 300 feet to the rear but her home sits back and also has a pool and pond that they sit at frequently which is really only about 200 feet so it is really

not that far away so they will be directly affected by the noise generated from the property.

Mr. Fairbanks asked if she was not concerned with the storage but just the noise. Ms. Anderson said yes as the grapple loader produces banging and beeping noises and saws etc. as 2 Lawrence Road is still operating from the property.

Mr. DeBonis asked if they have heard noise from this applicant. Ms. Anderson said yes.

There was some discussion with regard to noise, hours of operation and location of where product would be stored.

Rick McNeil, 7 Blunt Drive, said that his home was relatively close to the property location and that the applicant may state only operate from 9 to 5 that they hear the noise constantly. He said that he noticed the stacks of logs and when the leaves fall that they will be very visible to his property.

Ms. Cormier asked why he had not called the Code Enforcement Office before to make note of the noise. Mr. McNeil said that he did not know of the process that is associated with this use until now.

Connie Lynch, 5 Blunt Drive, said that she was concerned with noise levels especially on Saturday.

Mr. Vittum said that he is aware of the noise that is involved with the process of firewood that is why he purchased the machine to process the wood as it creates less noise. He said that operating on Saturday was important to establish new accounts but have not operated on a Saturday in a while as sales are down at the moment. Mr. Vittum said that he was at the site today with the machine operating and could still hear the buffer noise being generated from the other business on the property. He said that he has operated equipment for many years and do not bang and clang his equipment as that generates costly repairs with wear and tear on the equipment.

Ms. Cormier asked if the stockpile of logs along Blunt Drive could be reversed to the cordwood pile to create more of a sound barrier. Mr. Vittum said that he believed that the logs were better for a sound barrier.

Mr. Virr asked if a restriction of delivery of logs be limited to the hours of 9:00 am to 5:00 pm and no deliveries on Saturday. Mr. Vittum said that his earliest deliveries have been at 7:30 but will speak with the driver.

Mr. Virr motioned to go into deliberative session.

Seconded by Mr. Webb.

Mr. Webb motioned to come out of deliberative session in order to read the second letter into the record.

Seconded by Ms. Cormier.

Mr. Webb read letter from 1B Lawrence Road for the record.

Mr. Virr motioned to go into deliberative session.

Seconded by Mr. Osborn.

Deliberative Session

Mr. Virr said that the Board has dealt with this issue in the past as the ordinance is vague as there are numerous areas that sell bundles of wood in the area.

Ms. Cormier said that the stockpiling as it was not in the front of the property and not an eyesore so she did not find a problem with the request. She felt that the Board needed to make a condition that requires a noise meter reading be conducted while equipment is operating and if over 80 decibels then the applicant would need to come back before the Board.

There was some discussion with regard to noise decibel testing.

Mr. Virr said that there needed to be some sort of set hours of operation.

Mr. Osborn said that he would like to see 9:00 am to 5:00 pm Monday – Friday but possibly limit 9:00 am – 1:00 pm on Saturday for processing and no grapple load deliveries on Saturday.

Ms. Burtis said that she was unfamiliar with the previous case and what transpired at that meeting if the Board could clarify some of what had occurred.

Mr. Virr stated that during a previous case hearing that the applicant also was relocating to a property on Rockingham Road and requested to also stockpile cordwood and was told that they required a variance due to the fact that the zoning ordinance restricted the stockpiling of firewood on the property.

Ms. Burtis said that she was also concerned with the fact that a Town Employee had told the applicant that they could move there that a Town Official should be aware of what is going on before stating that they could operate there.

Ms. Cormier said that the applicant stated in their letter of intent that they had spoken to Mr. Mackey and Mr. Sioras before renting the property.

There was some discussion with regard to the zoning ordinance and it's allowed usage.

Mr. Virr reviewed the conditions for the Board.

Mr. Webb said that the request should only be granted to the applicant and if abandoned for more than 1 year that the variance is void.

Mr. Virr also said that the decibel test to be conducted at the property line and cost to be paid by the applicant with Code Enforcement present.

Mr. Virr motioned to go into public session for motion.

Seconded by Ms. Burtis.

Mr. Webb motioned on case #10-116, James Vittum, Jr., Owner: Ryan's Hill Properties, LLC, to Grant a variance to the terms of Article VI, Section 165-32.A.1.c to allow the operation of a cordwood business with on-site stockpiling of firewood. 152 Rockingham Road, Parcel ID 03093, as presented with the following conditions:

- 1. Hours 9:00 AM – 5:00 PM Monday – Friday, 9:00 AM – 1:00 PM Saturday.**
- 2. Grapple load deliveries limited to hours of 9:00 AM – 5:00 PM Monday – Friday only.**
- 3. Subject to noise level test at property line conducted with Code Enforcement Officer present. Noise not to exceed 80 decibels. Cost for test shall be paid by applicant.**
- 4. If the use is abandoned for more than 12 months, the variance shall be null and void.**
- 5. Variance is granted to applicant and does not run with the land.**
- 6. Subject to filling out change of use forms with Planning Department.**

Seconded by Mr. Osborn.

Vote:

Mr. Webb: Yes. Believe noise level is not as loud and with stated conditions that have been stipulated will not be as loud.

Mr. Osborn: Yes. Believe criteria has been met and Town previously told location was approved and that set conditions will take care of any problems.

Ms. Cormier: Yes. Believe has met variance criteria. Town Official stated could locate at site and therefore is there. Do not feel cordwood is against the spirit and intent of the ordinance.

Ms. Burtis: Yes. Agree with Ms. Cormier.

Mr. Virr: Yes. Property is located in general commercial zone and there could be other things there other than cordwood.

The application was Granted by a vote of 5-0-0. Anyone aggrieved by a decision of the Board has 30 days to file a request for a rehearing. After that the recourse would be to appeal to Superior Court.

**10-117 T-Mobile Northeast, LLC
(Owner – Blount Communications, Inc.)**

Requests a variance to the terms of Article III, Section 165-28.B.1.a, to construct a 140 foot monopole telecommunications tower and supporting facilities. Parcel ID 03116, 8 Lawrence Road, Zoned LMDR

Attorney Steven Grill, Devine Millimet & Branch Professional Association representing the applicant, said that he was also here with Dinesh Dasani, Radio Frequency Engineer with T-Mobile and William Blount, owner. Attorney Grill said that he had additional materials sent to the office via Fed-ex for the Board's review prior to the meeting. Attorney Grill read the application for the Board. He said that he has been involved with telecommunications for a number of years and that it is no longer a novelty today as everyone has a cell phone and many people have eliminated their landlines. Attorney Grill said that the services that are provided by tiny little devices has created a large demand for additional antennas. He said that the applicant has a growing demand for services and that included in the application shows existing towers within 2 miles of the tower. Other towers in neighboring communities have increased demand which has required more facilities and that T-Mobile does not plan on future expansion at this time in Derry but do have one proposed in Londonderry and Atkinson due to demand and capacity in the area.

Mr. Thompson asked if they were the same applicant that applied for the variance at Dollar Bills. Attorney Grill said that he was not aware of an application at that location.

Mr. Thompson asked what happened with that variance. Attorney Grill said that he was not aware of another site that he would have to look into that one and if the Board knew when that was.

There was some discussion with other properties and co-locations.

Mr. Fairbanks asked if other properties were looked at within the telecommunications overlay. Attorney Grill said that they had reviewed other properties along Route 28 and that the parcels and spoke with a few landlords that were not willing to lease the land also were smaller parcels looked at and felt that they would be a problem with the Planning Board. He said that there is an affidavit in the file indicating the properties that were suitable for the proposed project.

Mr. Thompson said that he felt that the Board should continue the case so additional information could be obtained.

There was some discussion with regard to coverage filled by other tower locations within the area.

Attorney Grill requested a continuance to the August 19, 2010 meeting so he could research the area further for additional information that was being requested by the Board.

Mr. Thompson motioned to continue case #10-11, T-Mobile Northeast, LLC, Owner, Blount Communications, Inc. to the meeting of August 19, 2010.

**Continued to August 19, 2010 – Meeting
To be placed 1st on the agenda.**

Seconded by Mr. Webb.

Vote: Unanimous.

Mr. Osborn, Ms. Cormier, Mr. Webb, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Virr.

It was noted for the record that Mr. Osborn would step down from the following case and Mr. Gesing would sit.

**10-118 Garrett DeBlois
(Owner: Raymond G. & Patricia Carle)**

Request for a variance to the terms of Article VI, Section 165-45.B.1.d, to construct a 2 car garage less than 15 feet from the side lot line at 8 Moody Street, Parcel ID 32011. MHDR District.

Garrett DeBlois, said that he was the contractor for the proposed project and would be representing the owner, he read the application for the Board.

Ms. Cormier asked if they knew exactly where the lot lines were located. Mr. Garrett said that the deed and tax map were a bit confusing but that they did locate two stakes on the property that were within one foot of each other and that is how they came to the set back of 8 feet.

Ms. Cormier asked if there was an actual pin there. Mr. DeBlois said yes but thinks that it may have been moved at one time.

Mr. Fairbanks asked if the request would be for the 2' setback and not just the 8' setback. Mr. DeBlois said that both measurements are not from a certified plan.

Mr. Virr said that if the applicant was not sure where the actual boundary lines are how would it be possible to know that the proposed garage would not be on someone else's land and that rough estimates are good but if slightly off could be detrimental. Mr. DeBlois said that the map shows the true frontage and believe that what he has presented is accurate and presented the Board with pictures of other properties within 1' of the lot lines and that the proposed garage would be more than that.

There was some discussion with other alternative locations and properties lines.

Code Enforcement

Mr. Webb read the following staff report provided by Mr. Mackey for the record.

The applicant's request is to install a detached two stall garage less than 15 feet from the right side property line. The property is located off Crystal Ave. in an area of small lots and non-conforming structures. There is an old slab located on the property that appears to be from a structure that existed in the past. If approved, building and electrical permits will be required. There are pictures in the file for the Boards review.

Favor

Keith Taylor, 6 Moody Street, said that he was in favor of the proposed garage and that the property owner is an elderly couple who could really benefit from having a garage but requiring them attach it would be more costly as would require structural changes to the existing structure.

Richard Trembley, 5 Laurel Street, said that there is an existing concrete slab there where he feels that used to have a garage and is in favor of the proposal. He said that Mr. DeBlois recently purchased a property on Crystal Ave. that he has cleaned up nicely and feel that he would build a decent looking garage for Mr. & Mrs. Carle.

Opposed

No abutters were present.

Ms. Burtis asked why the property owners were not present. Mr. DeBlois said that they had a prior engagement which made them unable to attend.

Mr. Virr motioned to go into deliberative session.

Seconded by Mr. Thompson.

Deliberative Session

Mr. Webb said that he did not see a problem with the request.

Mr. Gesing said that all parties were noticed and no one in objection so feel there was not an issue.

Ms. Cormier said that if the proposed garage is in the same area as the existing slab than she also did not see a problem.

Mr. Thompson said that there was an existing slab and appears that there was no problem when it had a structure on it at one time so do not feel there would be an issue of having another garage built there.

Mr. Virr said that the request should be subject to obtaining all permits and inspections and as presented.

Mr. Thompson motioned on case #10-118, Garrett DeBlois, Owner: Raymond G. & Patricia Carle, to Grant Request for a variance to the terms of Article VI, Section 165-45.B.1.d, to construct a 2 car garage less than 15 feet from the side lot line at 8 Moody Street, Parcel ID 32011, MHDR District as presented with the following conditions:

- 1. Subject to obtaining all required permits and inspections.**
- 2. Completed within 1 year or variance shall be void.**

Seconded by Mr. Webb.

Vote:

Mr. Thompson:	Yes. Do not see a problem as stated previously.
Mr. Webb:	Yes. Feel meets the criteria for a variance.
Ms. Cormier:	Yes. Believe meets the criteria for a variance.
Mr. Virr:	Yes. Have some issues with actual property line location but feel criteria has been met.
Mr. Gesing:	Yes. For the same reasons as stated.

The application was Granted by a vote of 5-0-0. Anyone aggrieved by a decision of the Board has 30 days to file a request for a rehearing. After that the recourse would be to appeal to Superior Court.

Request for Rehearing

Property Portfolio Group Request for Rehearing of case #10-111, Requests Appeal of An Administrative Decision of the Planning Board (May 5, 2010), with regard to the Site Plan Determination application of MTM Realty, LLC, located at 32 West Broadway. Planning Board waiver of site plan review violated Article III, Section 165-15 & 16, and Article VI, Section 165-33, C, D, E, F & G of the Town of Derry Zoning Ordinance. In addition, applicant also alleges that the decision violates Article VI, Section 165-49, G, 1, b of the Town of Derry Zoning Ordinance. Parcel ID 29194, 7 Central Street, Zoned CBD

The Board reviewed the information provided to them for the applicant's request for a rehearing.

Mr. Virr said that Attorney Griffith states in his request that the Zoning Board was unlawful and unreasonable in their decision. Mr. Virr reviewed RSA 676:3 for the Board and said that he did not know if an error in law was made on the Board's part and believed that the Board made it abundantly clear the reasons of denial and poled each section separately.

Mr. Fairbanks said that according to paragraph 2 does not say that it has to be written on the notice of decision only that the reasons have to be on file in the Board's office and on file for public inspection within 5 business days and that had been done.

Ms. Cormier said that the minutes of the meeting and the intent of the decision was clear and that the applicant was also present. She said that she did not believe that in the past that the reasons were listed on the notices.

Mr. Virr said that the Board needed to examine the evidence presented to see if a rehearing should be granted.

Mr. Webb said that he believed that the Board addressed each issue and did not feel that an error was made and that the Board covered each issue individually.

Mr. Virr said that Attorney Griffith states that the tavern was proposing a major expansion and that the Planning Board did not see it as a major expansion and waived site review which is in their purview to do.

Ms. Burtis said that she heard from the applicant that the Planning Board should have required a full site review of the property but did not. She said that if the Board grants the request for the rehearing and refer it back to the Planning Board for a full site review that maybe it would avoid a Superior Court matter.

Mr. Osborn said that it would not matter

Mr. Virr said that the Board grants a rehearing would they come up with the same determination.

Ms. Cormier said that the Board was right on their decision and that the applicant was aware of reasons for denial as the Planning Board has the right to determine how to proceed with their cases and that the Zoning Board has nothing to do with that.

Mr. Fairbanks read the Land Use Regulation section for the Board.

Mr. Thompson said that he felt that the Board failed according to RSA 676:3 as the official notice does not indicate reasons for denial and feel that alone should grant the request for rehearing.

Mr. Virr reminded the Board that a no vote would be to not grant a rehearing and a yes vote would be to grant a rehearing.

Mr. Thompson motioned to Grant the Rehearing Request of case #10-111, Property Portfolio Group, to Grant Appeal of Requests Appeal of An Administrative Decision of the Planning Board (May 5, 2010), with regard to the Site Plan Determination application of MTM Realty, LLC, located at 32 West Broadway. Planning Board waiver of site plan review violated Article III, Section 165-15 & 16, and Article VI, Section 165-33, C, D, E, F & G of the Town of Derry Zoning Ordinance. In addition, applicant also alleges that the decision violates Article VI, Section 165-49, G, 1, b of the Town of Derry Zoning Ordinance. Parcel ID 29194, 7 Central Street, Zoned CBD, as presented.

Seconded by Mr. Osborn.

Vote:

Mr. Osborn: No. Believe it was covered the first time.

Mr. Webb: No. Believe that it was documented clearly as to why denied.

Ms. Cormier: No. Believe the Board gave full attention and scrutiny to case and sections. Believe that the applicant is aware of reasons for denial even though not on notice of decision.

Mr. Thompson: Abstain.

Mr. Virr: No. Believe Board discussed case and documented each section and that the Board did set forth its reasons for denial. Not aware of personal opinions of Board members and as far as the closed session the applicant was informed that the merits of the case were not discussed.

The application was Denied by a vote of 0-4-1. Recourse would be to appeal to Superior Court.

Dom Vincent, LLC, Request for Rehearing of case #10-112, Requests Appeal of an Administrative Decision of the Planning Board (May 5, 2010), with regard to the Site Plan Determination application of MTM Realty, LLC, located at 32 West Broadway. Planning Board waiver of site plan review violated Article III, Section 165-15 & 16, and Article VI, Section 165-33, C, D, E, F & G of the Town of Derry Zoning Ordinance. Parcel ID 29197, 40 West Broadway, Zoned CBD

The Board reviewed the information provided to them for the applicant's request for a rehearing.

Mr. Virr said that he felt that the case mirrored the previous case in the reasons for the request and felt that the Board reviewed the request in detail. He said that the same applies that the Board needs to determine if they got it right the first time around as the Board did discuss each section and voted unanimously on the decision.

Mr. Osborn said that he felt that the Board reviewed each section carefully and got it right the first time around.

Mr. Webb said that the applicant was not an actual abutter to the property.

Mr. Virr reminded the Board that a no vote would be to not grant a rehearing and a yes vote would be to grant a rehearing.

Ms. Cormier motioned to Grant the Rehearing Request of case #10-112, Dom Vincent, Appeal of An Administrative Decision of the Planning Board (May 5, 2010), with regard to the Site Plan Determination application of MTM Realty, LLC, located at 32 West Broadway. Planning Board waiver of site plan review violated Article III, Section 165-15 & 16, and Article VI, Section 165-33, C, D, E, F & G of the Town of Derry Zoning Ordinance. Parcel ID 29197, 40 West Broadway, Zoned CBD as presented.

Seconded by Mr. Osborn.

Vote:

Mr. Webb: No. Believe that the Board reviewed in detail and is a mirror of previous case.

Mr. Thompson: No. Reasons being that the request did not state notice of decision error.

Mr. Osborn: No. Believe that there was no change and that the Board got it right the first time.

Ms. Cormier: No. Believe that the Board reviewed all evidence and came to the proper decision and no new evidence was provided.

Mr. Virr: No. Believe that the Board treated the request with equal due diligence and that the Board made correct decisions on each section and did not feel that the Board made a mistake in law.

The application was Denied by a vote of 0-5-0. Recourse would be to appeal to Superior Court.

Other Business

Local Government Center 69th Annual Conference – November 17-19, 2010

Local Government Center 23rd Annual Municipal Volunteer of the Year Awards – November 17, 2010.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Osborn motioned to approve the June 3, 2010 minutes as amended.
Seconded by Mr. Thompson.

Vote: Unanimous

Mr. Gesing, Mrs. Burtis, Mr. Fairbanks, Mr. Osborn, Ms. Cormier, Mr. Webb, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Virr

Mr. Osborn motioned to approve the June 17, 2010 minutes as amended.
Seconded by Mr. Thompson.

Vote: Unanimous

Mr. Gesing, Mrs. Burtis, Mr. Fairbanks, Mr. Osborn, Ms. Cormier, Mr. Webb, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Virr

Adjourn

Motion to adjourn by Mr. Fairbanks.

Seconded by Mr. Osborn.

Vote: Unanimous.

Mr. Gesing, Mrs. Burtis, Mr. Fairbanks, Ms. Cormier, Mr. Osborn, Mr. Webb, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Virr.

Adjourn at 10:27 pm

Minutes transcribed by:

Ginny Rioux

Recording Clerk

Approval of Minutes September 2, 2010

**Ms. Cormier motioned to approve the July 15, 2010 minutes as amended.
Seconded by Mr. Osborn.**

Vote: Unanimous

Mrs. Burtis, Mr. DeBonis, Mr. Fairbanks, Mr. Osborn, Ms. Cormier, Mr. Webb, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Virr