

MEETING MINUTES
GEORGETOWN PLANNING BOARD
Wednesday, May 2, 2012
Memorial Town Hall – 3rd Floor
7:45 p.m.

Ms. Evangelista – {To the Public} The Planning Board scheduled a public hearing at 7:00 pm. It will be continued to 7:45 pm because we do not have a quorum. Two members of the Board are attending a very important Knights of Columbus meeting and promised to be here at 7:45 pm.

Present: Mrs. Matilda Evangelista; Mr. Tim Howard; Mr. Howard Snyder, Town Planner; (Mr. Harry LaCortiglia and Mr. Chris Rich arrive at 7:53 pm)

Absent: None.

Meeting Opens at 7:55 pm.

Mr. LaCortiglia – **Move** to agenda item of Public Hearing for the Senior Housing.

New Business:

1. Public Hearing – Planning Board Amendment to ISH Bylaw.

Mr. LaCortiglia - I presume most of you were present at the last meeting. If you could please sign in and list your addresses. Essentially, the Planning Board has proposed some changes to the independent senior housing bylaw. Throughout the years there have been two amendments. The year 2000 and subsequently in 2006 and with minor inconsistencies in the bylaw it's our hope that when we finish hearing your comments, this Board will close the public hearing and decide what the wishes of the Board will be. Reads Public Hearing Notice.

I've been informed by the Planning Board; the proponents should make the first suggestions. First anyone who is in favor, please come forward and speak your mind.

Mr. Gary Fowler - Selectman of the Town of Georgetown. Basically what you are proposing is to allow you to be the special permit granting authority. You're going to open up what you can grant. My question is, as that authority, would it go to the board of appeals?

Mr. LaCortiglia - This board would not be able to grant anything greater than one bedroom in the RA district. As with any special permit, applicants that are aggrieved have the right to the zoning board of appeals.

Mr. Fowler - If you refuse, you still have that option. As you being the special permit granting authority, how much in detail would you go into a subdivision before you would make your decision?

Mr. LaCortiglia - We would have a full public hearing.

Mr. Fowler - How detailed?

Mr. Rich - Gary, if this amendment were to pass, the Planning Board would have discretion to choose between 1 or 2 bedrooms if the applicant requests it in the RA district. There are also a series of prerequisites in order to pass in any project. This Board dissects this plan. If we don't find it is conducive to the parcel and giving considerable weight to the public opinion. It has to be consistent with the character of the neighborhood.

Mr. Fowler - If it went to the ZBA and they said yes, would you still have that same discretion?

Mr. Rich - To win an appeal with the ZBA there has to be a hardship of the property or there is something unique to that property. It is a very high threshold to meet. That's a Board and based on evidence given before them, they can make any decision they wish to make. They can say you met the threshold.

Mr. Fowler - This would give you a bit more discretion?

Mr. Rich - The way it is written now, this Board has no discretion, there is no waiver. This is not a new system to this Planning Board.

Mr. Fowler - Okay, thank you.

Mr. LaCortiglia - We did have a gentleman who raised his hand earlier who was opposed to this. Please come forward.

Mr. Jim Smith - 85 North Street. I probably misheard the question as to whether I was opposed to this particular situation. I guess my question is why does this Board want to make this change? Are we streamlining a process? I'm not sure why you're looking for this authority. I'm not sure I'm against it.

Mr. Rich - We had a meeting. We were sent a Citizen's Petition and a request to do an impact study and if the Planning Board decided to come up with a decision to discuss the concerns of the citizen's petition. The Chair decided over a weekend dissecting the present bylaw. The present bylaw had some flaws; first is the Board had no discretion and second there were some discrepancies to the minimal affordable housing required. If it was passed by the Board they would take cash payments to the town in lieu of the affordable housing payments. They would take it and spend it as they saw fit. That was not mentioned in the present bylaw.

Mr. LaCortiglia - That is §165-112. That is the reason for the proposed changes. It currently reads that 15% of the total number of units has to be affordable housing. There is another section that says 20%. This is an inconsistency that we need to try to correct as a 25 to a 25 and we can certainly discuss it.

Mr. Snyder – Please have a copy of Article 32 noted in the Record as Exhibit 1.

Mr. LaCortiglia - The way the bylaw is written now, the developer just has to build it.

Ms Evangelista - A special permit is not an automatic given. They still have to meet the guidelines and that could be many different things. The bylaw reads out what the guidelines are. We have a bylaw that anyone is to build an ISH they have to build 20% to the affordable housing.

Mr. LaCortiglia - The minimum amount of affordable housing component for any of the ISH developments has to be 20%. §165-112 the proposed change – offered an incentive to the developer. That incentive was a 10% requirement. If you go to 15, if you want more than 25 units and you gave at least 15% affordable housing then the Planning Board may approve more units. Everyone now, because the change was made, has to make 20% and there is no incentive to do more than what was required. The way it's written, everyone automatically gets the more than 25 units because they are already hitting the 20% mark.

Ms. Evangelista - I don't think you're reading it correctly. If you did 25 then it would be 2 ½. You're saying only 20%.

Mr. Rich - As of May 18th last year, this was changed.

Mr. LaCortiglia - If you want more than 25, and you are willing to make that an affordable unit, you get 26, maybe, if it's appropriate. The way it's written now, everyone has that already, they get it by right.

Ms. Evangelista - I think 20% is quite a lot for a developer to be given. I'm not for the 5% more. It's hindering the developer's incentive. We have a maximum of 12 in the RA but if they want to do 25 then you are saying 25% would be affordable?

Mr. Rich - In the RA the maximum amount of units that are allowed are 12.

Ms. Evangelista - With the exception of the RA but here you're saying you can go over more than 25 if you give 25% more affordable. You're saying yes and then you're saying no. I can't support it. It's too jumbled.

Mr. Snyder - If a developer comes in to do 25 units, 20% would be 5 units. If he wanted to do 28, the 25% would represent 7 units.

Mr. Rich - For anything in the RA only. Tillie, would you be happier if it said "with the exception of the RA zone, the special permit granting authority may approve more than 25 units" and the rest of that sentence. "Except for the RA"

Mr. LaCortiglia- We need to wait till the end of the hearing. When the hearing closes we will propose that as part of decision.

Mr. Smith - I'm not necessarily opposed. I'm more opposed to the 1 to 2 bedroom in the RA district. Maybe not perfectly understanding. I'm opposed to the density issue as it's already a very dense area.

Mr. Rich - No one is losing the forum. This just gives the applicant the right to request it and the Board the discretion to grant either one or two or any combination thereof.

Mr. LaCortiglia - If it's appropriate.

Mr. Howard – It is not giving the developer the right. Right now we can't grant a developer that because it's not within our control. This would allow us to do this. In some instances it may make more sense in some parts in the RA district.

Mr. LaCortiglia - Is there anyone else in favor or opposed?

Andrea DiGiovanni- 27 Pond Street – I was here, present at the last meeting.

Mr. LaCortiglia- Are you referring to the Citizen's Petition.

Ms. DiGiovanni - Yes. There was quite a crowd of people that wanted to speak up against this petition. I just wanted to reinforce their statement for the primary reasons of these bylaws being written in 2000. Since 2000, this town has experienced more traffic and more flooding and as could be easily seen from flood maps being re-mapped on a regular basis. These strict bylaws should stand. There should be no over-riding. These laws should be protected. The possibility of over crowding, the safety as far as traffic, especially in the school district. The RA has three schools. With more paving, there is going to be more flooding. There shouldn't be any more lenience or give when we know the situation is progressing and getting worse. The black water, the flooding, the safety of our children. These are all effects – reasons why not to loosen the standards that are in the bylaws as designed in 2000.

Mr. LaCortiglia - Anyone else?

Mr. Carl Gardner - I'm not a Georgetown resident or voter. I'm a private developer working with the owners of 76 and 78 North Street. My comments are strictly from a developer point of view. Section 105-108, for any amendment to 109 you would also need to amend 108. This is just per building unit. If this amendment is passed, making the amendment without amending 108 would make the changes you make moot. With regard to the percentages of affordability, I would note it's already designated 20% affordable, that's not clear by the language.

Mr. LaCortiglia - That doesn't change the RA.

Mr. Gardner - RA is already treated differently in the RB and RC. A higher percentage of affordability is already given as 20% and it's less in the RB and RC. I think it's important to cover all the subject matter. The parking requirements, project maintenance, there is more at issue than the number of bedrooms.

Mr. LaCortiglia - Essentially this was brought forward in response to the Citizen's Petition to address that and look at other sections of the bylaw and clean up other areas.

Mr. Gardner - Your goal is to leave 108 as is?

Mr. LaCortiglia - The Board may or may not allow.

Mr. Gardner - Please make that discretion dealing with both 108 and 109.

Ms. Evangelista - What are your concerns with parking and maintenance.

Mr. Gardner - I do think 112 needs to be amended along with 108 and 109. With regard to 112 – it should be clarified to what district it applies to and I would agree your disincentivising a developer. If they have an option to make payments in lieu of and you're not getting any more affordable units.

Mr. LaCortiglia- I was reminded by Mr. Snyder of a letter to the Board from David & Margaret Smith. I'm going to ask Tillie, the clerk, to read this. Letter received April 24th, marked as Exhibit 2, read out loud by Ms. Evangelista.

Ms. LilaBeth Weiss- I live in the RA zone. The bylaws are to keep the population from overcrowding and to protect the ground water. The idea that a senior citizen would like two bedrooms. You're saying you're not allowing two bedrooms per unit but still only three bedrooms per dwelling. Is that what this is or are you going back to 3 bedrooms? You've left 108 out of it.

Mr. LaCortiglia - That is not proposed tonight. It is now too late to do that.

Mr. Rich - It's just what you said.

Ms. Weiss - It's to protect overcrowding, our water. Lots of units, you start to deplete the town resources. The character of the town. What you've done here without changing 108 is still limiting the number of bedrooms, so you're now limiting the population.

Mr. Rich - There is no discretion to change 108. A bedroom is defined as square footage.

Ms. Weiss - How is that determined?

Mr. LaCortiglia - When someone comes in with a parcel drawn up, you have to determine yield, under regular subdivision. Yield is the number of how many single family house lots can be created from the parcel based on square footage, that's all part of zoning; building area, frontage, lot depth, width, parking, etc.

Ms. Weiss - I can understand two bedrooms, as long as we're not making it so we can increase population then change 108 then it doubles. If you're not changing the total number of people on a property.

Mr. LaCortiglia - The very nature of ISH is an automatic doubling. If I have a lot that has a single family residential building. That yield is one, now someone comes in with an ISH and says I don't want a single family, I want an ISH. It doubles automatically.

Ms. Evangelista - It's zoned for 15,000 sq. ft. that means one building can be built. The incentive to put in elderly housing, we hope is small units for people to downsize, to give the developer the incentive to use the land as much as they can; provided they give us affordable units. It's an incentive to still build and not raise our tax base so high we would have to suffice for new schools. That's the purpose to build an elderly so we wouldn't have the high expense to raise our tax base. Right now, the only building we have on that category is Country Manor, in this area. There really aren't any duplexes. That's some of this history. Your concerns are valid. It will increase traffic and cover your other issues. Groundwater, there is another permit.

Mr. LaCortiglia - Uniquely enough, I was sent a copy of the original bylaw when it was first presented. My understanding is the RA was excluded from ISH development. You could only do it in the RB or RC.

Ms. Evangelista - It was changed in the following year in the fall. You have to keep up, show up for the meetings. Zoning will change, it's a moving target. If there are issues we're going to review it. In the interest in property on North St, we looked at the bylaw. There is a lot that can be changed.

Ms. Weiss - What is improving the bylaw? To me, if you're going to develop, I'd rather see two houses. No more dwellings make this dwelling have more bedrooms, hold more people but limit the reduction of limited space. We shouldn't be increasing population.

Mr. Snyder - If I can interrupt, I think we're getting off track. I want to address Ms. Weiss. The whole purpose of zoning is to regulate growth pressures appropriately. In 2007 Master Plan there was some discussion on ISH. If it's located closer to the community core there would be less traffic, more of an ability of the population to walk without having to drive. You have smaller parcels, much more environmental constraints, by the nature of the sites. They are going to be smaller and smaller. For the protection of open space there needs to be a development with maintenance and care.

Mr. LaCortiglia - If folks are amenable to changing the ISH. We need a definition of open space. What is open space? Is it the opening between two buildings? That's how it was defined at Parker River Landing and Raymond's Creek.

Mr. Rich – The Planning Board had a meeting. The workshop was a public meeting. Mr. Comiskey came in and cited the prior issues with open space. We need an amendment that open space is not only designated on a plan. There needs to be some bounds in writing, recordable form. The restrictions need to be recorded with the registry of deeds.

Ms. Evangelista - With a special permit the Board is able to put special conditions. If we see things not in the bylaw, we can add to it.

Mr. Rich - Open space is a large contiguous piece of property where its' only purpose is to enjoy the natural beauty of that parcel - passive recreation, not active.

Mr. LaCortiglia - Bear in mind we do define it. You can't assume what stands in one stands in the other.

Ms. Weiss - The guts of the bylaw are to protect the overpopulation, natural resources. A little change here and there people forget. We've already doubled the amount of people coming in. I don't think it's a good idea.

Ms. Evangelista - When it first came around for an RA District, it wasn't allowed. You have to show up for the town meeting.

Mr. LaCortiglia - It used to be 4:1 density that got changed to 2:1. Don't ever forget as a citizen of this town, in the same way you have the right to a citizen's petition. You have that power; you are the citizen's – you and 9 friends, anytime you think something is wrong.

Mr. Howard - If the citizen's petition passed, that would allow two bedrooms per unit, which goes drastically beyond what we could do.

Ms. Evangelista - I think we're concentrating on the bedroom issue. To my mind, the real important issue is that when you go to town meeting, you vote and it's spelled out. You decide whether 1 or 2. However if you go with the bylaw as Harry wrote it, you depend on the planning board having the ability to say how many bedrooms.

Juliette Rec - I missed the meeting last week. Since this is already going to be at the meeting on the 7th. Hopefully people will stay and vote. Basically, the planning board wasn't in favor of increasing. Personally, I'm not in favor of increasing in the RA district. Maybe in the RB or RC. I don't want to see the increased traffic near the Perley School. The elderly aren't walking; I don't personally see a lot of elderly walking on North Street.

Mr. LaCortiglia - When there is a zoning amendment being proposed, the planning board must make a recommendation to Town meeting. For tonight, we will make our recommendation on these changes.

Ms. Rec - For the record, I am not in favor.

Mr. Sean McGee - I live on North St. I was not in complete understanding what we were going towards. I'm not one way or the other. My questions pertain to what's allowed on a special permit. If the citizen's petition goes down, is there a vehicle for a developer to come into the RA district to propose 2 bedrooms in any building. Is there a special permit? I thought there was a vehicle to get a 2 bedroom unit. If the citizen's petition is shot down (if it doesn't pass) there is still no vehicle for a developer to come in unless this one passes. There is a plan unit where you could design something all the neighbors would like.

Ms. Evangelista - Usually a developer who is promoting something will gather the neighbors, and then design something compatible. Then come back to the planning board.

Mr. McGee - I don't think the neighbors had an opportunity to see this.

Ms. Evangelista - Some developers already have an idea and we haven't seen an application since it started.

Mr. McGee - Clarify the 25% if a developer wants to increase the number of units. This is only in the RB and RC district. A 25 unit development or more and they want to build more units. Is there a dollar amount for that additional unit through affordable? The proposal is for 25% affordable.

Mr. LaCortiglia - Right now without a change every developer who comes in every developer must do 20%. In another section they are required to do 20% they automatically can have more than 25 units because the bylaw only says they are required to have 15. They are already over the 25.

Ms. Evangelista - It must be specified RA district and that will be decided later.

Mr. McGee - Who determines the in lieu payment? It's 4%, is there any way they could come in and we would increase that?

Ms. Evangelista - The planning board decides that.

Mr. LaCortiglia - I don't believe we have the option to change that number. I'm going to respectfully disagree with Tillie.

Mr. Snyder - The affordable housing trust exists to provide affordable housing whether new development or renovation. There are multiple ways to achieve that. The in-lieu payment is for other developments as well, it's deposited into a trust and those are all in public hearings how the money will be used.

Mr. Gardner - The only ISH is in the RA district. With the RA it's 20% - it's another exception where it makes it stricter. If your amendment passes – I just want to be sure it's understood without amending 108 which is the number of bedrooms, if town meeting awards you this discretion, the only type of development that can occur. If you want to maximize space, the more incentive you create or disincentive to create more building. A 3 unit building is a more efficient space. You're creating more of an opportunity that is of benefit to the area.

Ms. Evangelista – Reads the housing balance bylaw 165-71. There is no defining district.

Mr. Gardner - My apologies. Not by district, by type.

Ms. Weiss - Affordable housing. When you are requiring a builder to have a certain amount of affordable housing in the ISH, and then the person sells, is there any requirement for the dwelling to stay that way?

Mr. Snyder - When a dwelling is designated as affordable housing the deed is filed at the registry and right behind that is a deed rider and then the mortgage. Whatever happens with the mortgage in respect of the deed rider being in front of the mortgage it must be followed.

Ms. Weiss - If a parcel of land is ISH developed, the number of dwellings is doubled compared to single family housing in any district. If a parcel is subdivided there are a lot of restrictions in ISH. If the same parcel is a single family dwelling; are there restrictions?

Mr. LaCortiglia – No restrictions. One house per lot.

Mr. Snyder - All that is dependent on Title 5. It comes down to square footage, outflow. Allowing to double, what was eluded to before if you have a single family lot it's as of right this property could be divided. That subdivision wouldn't require any waivers. A proposal could come in where a developer could build 4 houses but not meet all the requirements, but can meet the requirements for 2 – he'll only be able to build 2.

Mr. LaCortiglia - Anybody who would like to speak? No more questions.

Gary Fowler - I'd like to go to the affordable part. Can affordable be by square footage? What defines affordable? Is it the size?

Mr. Rich - No. If you're building for example, Little Hills, if that came in today it would have to be 20% affordable.

Mr. Fowler - In this district and as we say the soils may well plan the sq. footage we're going to. We had an affordable study done and they talked about perhaps getting some planning for affordable. Size, we talked about luxury and what he considers not. IF one of these units is affordable, then you're taking the same unit and reducing the price and if for some reason it goes up, we have to come back to the Board.

Mr. Rich - We had units sold as affordable. The deed writers were not effective. IF they bought the house for \$130,000, there is a formula now a small percentage (the 130,000 goes up). Affordable housing is not to make those less fortunate rich; it's to allow the less fortunate a place to live.

Mr. LaCortiglia - Any more comments regarding this issue we have here. Are there any other comments from anyone?

Mr. Rich – **Motion** to close the public hearing.

Mr. Howard – **Second**.

Motion Carries: 4-0; Unan.

Mr. Rich - **Motion** to vote in favor of the changes presented with §165-112, second line beginning of the second sentence, insert “in the RB and RC zones the special permit granting authority may approve the”

Mr. Howard - **Second**.

Ms. Evangelista - I would like to discuss. I don't like the findings; I don't like the idea of being so liberal and casual about findings. You haven't given detailed explanation of fact requirements, of plans requirement, engineering requirements. I don't like the idea of leaving it to the Planning board's discretion. It's too loose.

Mr. LaCortiglia - Are you happy with the wording Mr. Rich proposed?

Ms. Evangelista - The whole basis we go through this is to be specific. Have the people decide. This is their chance to say yes or no. I'm not supportive of it.

Mr. Howard - I think we should just punt this and think about it.

Mr. Rich - I think the changes are necessary, I think it's a great start – I don't think it's an end all. At the fall town meeting, if necessary, we can make other changes, not necessarily these amendments, if you will, but we can then look at it a bit more in depth. I think it's a great educational process of what the citizen's petition would do.

Mr. LaCortiglia - It did raise awareness. I've never seen so many people at a public hearing.

Mr. Rich - It's in the best interest of everybody to be for or against all of it to come to town meeting and be heard and vote.

Mr. Howard - I think we tried to react and didn't have the time to think it through. My way of thinking, this is a small percentage of what needs to be changed. Things can be changed in the fall and next spring and give us time to make any substantive changes to clarify for ourselves and the public.

Mr. LaCortiglia - I'm going to call that question. The planning board would recommend to town meeting with these small changes.

Motion fails; 2-2.

Ms. Evangelista- **Motion** to pass over Article 32 at Town meeting, form a subcommittee to go over the entire ISH bylaw and that this committee also has members of the public.

Mr. LaCortiglia- Is there a second for that?

Mr. Howard - No.

Motion fails.

Mr. Howard- **Motion** to pass over Article 32 over at the Town Meeting.

Ms. Evangelista- **Second.**

Mr. Rich- I think you're taking a huge risk. What happens if the people who are in favor of the citizen's petition but find this meeting halfway decide to say okay, we don't have an alternative now, we're going to change all of the RA to 2 bedrooms? Do you want to take that chance?

Ms. Evangelista- At our workshop, it was mentioned but not confirmed the Citizen's Petition would be prior to ours. What happened that it got switch.

Mr. Rich - As I understand, past practices are Citizen's Petition's are always last.

Ms. Evangelista - About your concern about risk. Special permits, the Board can put conditions on. The Board of Health can turn down bedrooms. As a board, because of the conditions that the state allows in 40A, you can put conditions on it. If you feel it's encroaching what's already on our books, you can add those conditions.

Mr. Howard - You meaning the Board?

Mr. LaCortiglia - I don't think we're taking any kind of risk here. We've had a public hearing – everyone knows where this board stands. Again, tonight, more of an educational experience, I think if this Board were to pass over this planning board amendment to ISH the town meeting voters will do the right thing.

Mr. Rich - I like to err on the side of safety.

Mr. Howard - **Motion** to recommend amendment be passed over at Town meeting.
Ms. Evangelista – **Second**.
Motion Carries: 3 – 1.

Approval of Minutes:

1. April 18, 2012

Mr. Howard – **Motion** to approve minutes of April 18th.

Mr. Rich - **Second** subject to discussion.

Ms. Evangelista - I suggest you pass over them.

Mr. LaCortiglia- I would suggest Howard give us an abridged version. Requirements are who is present, what time, vote count.

Mr. Rich - We need to find the laws of what the definition of minutes are.

Mr. LaCortiglia- Motion to approve the minutes is withdrawn.

Mr. Rich - I'd like to propose the minute format as they were taken not change.

Mr. LaCortiglia - Is there a motion?

Mr. Rich - **Motion** the format of the minutes do not change.
Ms. Evangelista - **Second**.
Motion Carries: 4-0;Unan.

Correspondence:

1. Vouchers:

Mr. Rich - **Motion** to pay the invoices in the amount of \$504.00.

Ms. Evangelista – **Second**.

Motion Carries: 4-0;Unan.

Mr. Rich- **Motion** to put off until the next meeting approval of the April 18th minutes until the 5/16/12 meeting.

Mr. Howard – **Second**.

Motion Carries; 4-0;Unan.

2. **Legal Notices**

a) **May 16th: 161 West Main Street: Site Plan Application**

Ms. Evangelista- Make sure we discuss this at our next meeting.

Old Business:

1. **Administrative Assistant Job Description: To be sent to Personnel Board**

Mr. Rich - **Motion** to send the administrative assistant detailed job description to the Personnel Board.

No Second.

Motion fails.

New Business:

1. **161 West Main Street: Informal meeting with Applicant**

Mr. Snyder- I've invited 161 West Main Street. The applicant is proposing an additional use. The first floor is an office and it's moving to the basement. The applicant wants to bring in a daycare to the first floor. It requires site plan approval. I invited the applicant to informally discuss his application with the Board before a public meeting.

Mr. LaCortiglia- Is it exempt because it's educational?

Mr. John Sousa- 12 Tenney Street, Megan Susa. Consulting business on the 1st floor. No visitors, strictly office space. When the Pentucket Preschool was notified they were to vacate. We stepped forward and offered them our first floor and we would move our office to the basement. In terms of use of the building. The footprint is not increasing. We have approval from the building department, septic, the assessors. The problem is we need to have the site turned over by August 1. We've done this backwards.

Mr. Snyder – This is an opportunity to informally discuss this application with the Planning Board so we can agree about requiring site plan review. Would you have preferred them come to the Board for the first time in a public hearing and then request a site plan?

Mr. Sousa - Because we're up against a scheduling issue with every passing week.

Ms. Evangelista- Did you get a permit from the Zoning Board to have your office there?

Mr. Sousa – I received a letter from the building inspector and basically the ruling was to use as office space, the term medical office building really was more descriptive. It's still being used as an office building. It's consistent.

Ms. Evangelista - It was vacant for a very long time. There had to be proof for him to write that letter.

Mr. LaCortiglia- Site plan review at the next Planning Board meeting. We can debate at the public meeting. You've already submitted everything you need for the site plan review?

Mr. Snyder - The documents will be distributed.

Mr. Rich - To address your concern, this Board will act as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. Sousa - Our concern is giving them a place to be August 1st.

Ms Evangelista – What is your business?

Mr. Sousa - We design commercial kitchens.

Mr. Howard – **Motion** to adjourn.

Mr. Rich - **Second**.

Motion carries; 4-0; Unan.

Meeting adjourned at 10:23 pm.