

## SEEKONK ZONING BOARD REGULAR MEETING

### MINUTES August 8, 2011

Present: Ch. Edward F. Grouke, Gary Sagar, Keith Rondeau, Mark Brisson (for Robert Read), and Jeffrey Creamer (for Ron Blum)

7:27 Chairman Edward F. Grouke called the meeting to order.

This is the meeting of the Town of Seekonk Zoning Board of Appeals, August 8, 2011. First I am going to read the Rules and Regulations. I am going to read each petition as it was advertised and call upon the petitioner or their representative to present their case. All testimony, including the testimony and statements of the petitioner and/or the representatives or witnesses will be taken under oath. We will hear from anyone in the audience to speak either in favor of or against the petition or with any questions. At the close of the evidence, we have a discussion and we also usually make a decision on the same night although we are not required to do that. We may take a petition under advisement and give a decision at a later date. It is our practice to decide it on the night of the hearing. It is reduced to writing and filed with the town clerk within 14 days. There is an appeal that is available to the Superior Court by the petitioner or other parties who have the proper legal standing and has to apply with the very strict time limitations. That appeal is governed by very strict time limitations. If anyone is considering an appeal, they have to be very careful to meet the time limitations that are set forth in the law.

**2011-13**     **Fall River Avenue Development Partners, LLC.**, 1539 Fall River Avenue, Seekonk, MA 02771 Owner, by Robert Davis Petitioner, requesting an appeal of the Zoning Enforcement Officer's Decision, and if necessary, a **Variance** under Section 6.4 and **Special Permit** under Section 5.3, to raze the existing house and reconstruct a house at the appropriate setback at 376 Warren Avenue, Plat 1, Lot 26 in an R-3 Zone containing 264,559 sq. ft.

**2011-14**     **Fall River Avenue Development Partners, LLC.**, 1539 Fall River Avenue, Seekonk, MA 02771 Owner, by Robert Davis Petitioner, requesting an appeal of the Zoning Enforcement Officer's Decision, and if necessary, a **Variance** under Section 6.4 and **Special Permit** under Section 5.3, to raze the existing house and reconstruct a house at the appropriate setback at 380 Warren Avenue, Plat 1, Lot 100 in an R-3 Zone containing 10,000 sq. ft.

Paul Carlson InSite Engineering 1539 Fall River Avenue, sworn in. I am here to request a variance for lot frontage and width setbacks under Seekonk Zoning Bylaws 6.4 and a special permit for the two legal nonconforming properties under Seekonk Zoning Bylaws Section 5.3. I would like to give you a background on the project and what is proposed under this petition. The property consists of 2 parcels shown as lots 26 and 100 on Seekonk Assessors Map lot 1. This total property is 6.5 acres of land. Two houses currently exist on the property with their lots 376 and 380 Warren Avenue. House number 376 which is about 130 years old is located up on the northwest quadrant of the site and 380 which is a ranch style house built in the 1950's. The surrounding land, on three sides is agricultural land actively farmed by 4-Town farms. Our reason for being before you this evening is to request variances to reconstruct these two houses further back on the property. As you can see from the plans, the existing setbacks are approximately 20' to Warren Avenue for both these properties. These two houses are considerably less than 50' setback that is allowed under zoning. Similarly, the existing side yards are only 15-20 feet where 35-40' is the zoning minimum. It is our proposal to raze and reconstruct these houses to meet the current zoning bylaws of 40,000 square foot lots as required by zoning under the R-3 district. The houses meet all dimensional setback requirements as shown. The only variances we will be requiring for this lot is the frontage and width at the front yard setback. Right now the one house is proposed here meeting the 50' front yard setback; the second house is proposed almost 200' off of Warren Avenue. Please note that these houses currently exist in similar substandard frontage allotments. One, the ranch house has 119' of frontage and this lot has 10,000 square feet with 100' of frontage. Again, those two lots will maintain the same frontage as shown. We respectfully request the variance to tear down these houses, these two eyesores and construct new houses more in compliance to the Town of Seekonk.

Ch. Grouke Are there any plans for the remaining land on lot 26?

P. Carlson There is the potential for a subdivision with that remaining portion of land.

Ch. Grouke So you are going for two variances, the frontage and the frontage at the front yard setback.

K Rondeau I was trying to figure out the existing lot lines, where are the existing lot lines?

P Carlson Right now, the ranch house, 376, is the yellow dash line that is a 10,000 sq foot lot. The farm house, currently runs down around here.

K. Rondeau That is only a 10,000 sq ft lot and you are going to increase it to how many sq ft?

P. Carlson We are going to comply with current zoning 40,000.

G Sagar Those houses could be rebuilt where they are.

- P. Carlson Potentially, yes. It would be right up against Warren Avenue, a potential hazard.
- Ch Groucke Is there anyone to speak in favor of the petition? No response. Is there anyone to speak in opposition of the petition? No response. Is there anyone with any questions?
- William Platt I have questions, not directly opposition. I live across this parcel at 352 Warren Avenue representing neighbors, sworn in. Our concern is not the razing of these houses and the rebuilding of new houses. Our concern is the future subdivision allows multiple buildings. I walked the land and it looked to me that there were possibly six perc tests done. If that is true, I don't know if they are proposing another 4 down the road. I am an architect so I know this could open up the possibility of a new subdivision and sometimes what gets approved one month, six months down opens up for more approvals. That is our concern. We don't have an issue with people putting up homes similar in scale. I don't know if there are provisions for the scale of houses. They have issues of nonconformance and that is why they are here today. If I was a developer, this area left may be a future right of way, subdivision. We are here tonight to see what are the future plans, if there are any and we would be dead against 6 homes in there.
- Ch Groucke Just looking at it, not having any other information, theoretically, regardless of what we do, there is 200' of frontage there between the lots which presumably would be enough room for a subdivision regardless of what we do. We would not be the ones to act on a subdivision anyway, that would be the Planning Board. It looks like this plan would take up some land too, it would dedicate some of this big lot to these two lots which would theoretically reduce what else could be done.
- W. Platt I appreciate some decent lot sizes. The concern is these go through and then another 3-4 get built in back. I have been told there are wetlands back there, that is our possible opposition down the road. Are the variances just for the re-delineation of the lots?
- Ch Groucke Yes, they have two nonconforming lots right now; because they don't have the frontage or the side yard where they are right now. So a special permit would be involved because they don't conform. The variances they are seeking now would be for insufficient frontage on the street and the setback line. Their argument for this proposal is that they are giving us less need for variances than what is needed now, it is less nonconforming.
- W Platt It would be nice to know what is proposed for these houses as far as scale.
- Scott Allen 400 Warren Avenue, sworn in. I reside here. If there is proposed subdivision, are there laws in place as far as how close the roads can be?

Ch Groucke That is Planning Board determination that we wouldn't act upon.

S. Allen I am not opposed to it but honestly, my house is here and the property line is here, if the road is here it is 6' away from my bedroom window.

P. Carlson The two houses shown are just for scale, there are no specific plans for those lots. By the size, this could be a ranch style and this one could be colonial, it could have multiple styles to it. I have nothing further.

K Rondeau The footprints you show, that is generally the location to measure setbacks?

P. Carlson Correct.

Ch. Groucke We would approve it exactly that way.

W Platt Having done developments there are usually square footage bedrooms bathrooms...the scale of the buildings on this street tend to be smaller, as you go towards Medeiros Farm Road, the houses become more grandiose but there is a nice feel to it in this area, there is a scale to the street, that is why we moved there. The agricultural is a plus. Ideally if the scale could be similar, the buildings now are small they could get repaired not torn down but the scale is important. It would be nice to see a similar scale as to what is on the street now instead of something big and turreted.

G Sagar made a motion to close the public hearing, seconded by J. Creamer, **and so voted unanimously by:** Ch. Edward F. Groucke, Gary Sagar, Keith Rondeau, Mark Brisson and J. Creamer.

**VOTE: (Approve 5-0)**

G Sagar made a motion to uphold the decision of the Building Inspector, seconded by K. Rondeau, **and so voted unanimously by:** Ch. Edward F. Groucke, Gary Sagar, Keith Rondeau, Mark Brisson and J. Creamer.

**VOTE: (Approve 5-0)**

G. Sagar I think what they are proposing, the end product is far superior to what is existing there now. I think if they had renovated the existing structures in terms of a future subdivision, they could get more lots out of it so I think they are sensitive to the neighborhood meeting most of the setbacks, I think the end product is far superior than what is there now and hopefully they keep in minds the concerns of neighbors when they build or reconstruct but I support it and would vote for it.

K Rondeau If we approve this, we are taking a nonconforming lot and making it more conforming, at least as far as square footage. It is an eyesore right now to the neighborhood. As to future development, even if we did nothing tonight it looks like they could put a road in there, we are not going to be able to do anything about that. The best case scenario is what we have been proposed.

G Sagar What we have done in the past on many petitions that included razing structures, would you mind making them available to the Fire Department for a limited amount of time for training purposes?

G Sagar made a motion to approve both petitions simultaneously as submitted and that the two existing structures be made available to the Fire Department for training for a period not to exceed 30 days after final approval, seconded by K. Rondeau, **and so voted unanimously by:** Ch. Edward F. Grouke, Gary Sagar, Keith Rondeau, Mark Brisson and J. Creamer.

**VOTE: (Approve 5-0)**

**2011-15**                    **George and Theresa French**, 1685 Fall River Avenue, Seekonk, MA 02771 Owner, by Theresa French Petitioner, requesting an appeal of the Zoning Enforcement Officer's Decision, and if necessary, a **Variance** under Sections 6.3, 6.5, 6.8 and 13.1 and a **Special Permit** under Section 5.3, to install an in ground pool at 1685 Fall River Avenue, Plat 1, Lot 63 in an R-3/Mixed Use Zone containing 19,937 square feet.

Theresa French            1685 Fall River Avenue sworn in.  
George French

T. French                    We are here to put in an in ground pool. We found out that our lot is a nonconforming lot and we are here to seek approval.

Ch. Grouke                Did you take care of the septic because it mentions here in the letter that you need to be 10' away.

T. French                    We did, we are now 10' away from the septic.

So the issue is that your lot is nonconforming because there is no frontage. But you were approved previously by the Zoning Board to construct a house there.

T. French                    There was a house already there, it was an existing house all we did was reconstruct the house.

Ch. Grouрке                So you want the pool to be 15' away from the property line where you show it on the plans.

T. French                    Yes.

K. Rondeau                Where is the pool going to be located? The plans we have show 10' from the septic and 15' from the property line.

T. French                    The pool is not gunite, it is a kit, it is not a permanent structure per say, just a steel frame with a liner.

Ch. Grouрке                Is it going all the way in the ground or just partial?

G. French                    All the way in the ground 20' x 40'.

G. Sagar                    I drove by there yesterday, is that the area where you already started excavating?

T French                    We didn't realize that a pool was considered a structure and we filled out an application, paid the fee and we started excavating thinking that we were all set that we were good to go. That was a Friday and we found out shortly thereafter we couldn't make it conforming.

G Sagar                    Back in 2007, there was a dispute with the neighbor regarding the property line. Has that been resolved?

T French                    Yes, in land court.

Ch. Grouрке                Where you want to put the pool, Fall River Avenue is up here correct?

T. French                    Yes, (inaudible) there is a leach field in the front yard.

Ch. Grouрке                Is there anyone to speak in favor of the petition? No response. Is there anyone to speak in opposition to the petition? No response. Is there anyone here with any questions? No response.

K. Rondeau                What is the setback for a pool?

G Sagar                    The same as a structure.

T French I spoke with Mr. Yaghjian and he did not have a problem and the Ferreiras did not have a problem. (inaudible)

K. Rondeau Did you give any thought to moving the pool in the back?

T. French The septic is in the back. The shape of the lot is a hardship, we purchased it in 1995 and it was nonconforming.

Ch. Grouke You are also stuck with an undersized lot in the zone that makes it difficult to comply with the setbacks.

G Sagar Mr. Chairman, is there any discussion to be had regarding Town Counsel's previous opinion that if it is not in the book, it is not allowed? You and I are both of the strong opinion that it is not applicable but is it worth mentioning?

Ch. Grouke No, I don't think so because it was directed to the question of the accessory use of a common driveway. Then we would be taking down all the pools.

K Rondeau Your right of way is here and the front yard is the leaching field?

T. French Yes.

G Sagar It is in an R-3 zone and less than half of what is allowed under current zoning bylaws. I am sure the lot was created before zoning.

G Sagar made a motion to close the public hearing, seconded by M. Brisson ,  
**and so voted unanimously by:** Ch. Edward F. Grouke, Gary Sagar, Keith Rondeau, Mark Brisson and J. Creamer.

**VOTE: (Approve 5-0)**

G Sagar made a motion to uphold the decision of the Building Inspector, seconded by K Rondeau , **and so voted unanimously by:** Ch. Edward F. Grouke, Gary Sagar, Keith Rondeau, Mark Brisson and J. Creamer.

**VOTE: (Approve 5-0)**

G Sagar This is probably the only place on the site where they could put a pool.

K Rondeau A pool is not a hardship, but the size and shape of the lot is a hardship, we could very well grant a Variance based upon the size and shape of the lot as a hardship.

J Creamer I think I would have an issue if a neighbor complained but they all got noticed and nobody was here, obviously nobody has a problem with it.

G. Sagar According to Mary's (McNeil) letter you need 4 Variances and a Special Permit. When you pull the permit the Building Inspector might require you to submit a certified plot plan showing exactly where this is, that is her call, especially with the septic system nearby.

G Sagar made a motion to approve the application and plans as submitted, seconded by J. Creamer, **and so voted unanimously by:** Ch. Edward F. Grouke, Gary Sagar, Keith Rondeau, Mark Brisson and J. Creamer.

**VOTE: (Approve 5-0)**

**2011-16** **Seekonk – 226 Limited Partnership**, 1051 Reservoir Avenue, Cranston, RI 02910 Owner, by Stephen Silverstein, “Not Your Average Joes” 151 Campanelli Drive, Suite C, Middleboro, MA 02346 Petitioner, requesting an appeal of the Zoning Enforcement Officer’s Decision, and if necessary, to nullify, amend or supersede decisions #93-07, #87-13 and request a **Variance** under Sections 7.5 and 7.7 a **Special Permit** under Section 5.3, to allow modifications to the exterior of an existing structure, an addition, new outdoor patio, and subdivide interior space for two tenants at 1125 Fall River Avenue, Plat 1, Lot 194 in a Highway Business Use Zone containing 92,445 square feet.

**2011-17** **Seekonk – 226 Limited Partnership**, 1051 Reservoir Ave., Cranston, RI 02910 Owner, by Stephen Silverstein, “Not Your Average Joes” 151 Campanelli Drive, Suite C, Middleboro, MA 02346 Petitioner, requesting an appeal of the Zoning Enforcement Officer’s Decision, and if necessary, a **Variance** under Sections 12.4.2.2, 12.4.2.3 and 12.4.3 to allow modification of the existing signage; new building and awning signs at 1125 Fall River Avenue, Plat 1, Lot 194 in a Highway Business Use Zone containing 92,445 square feet.

G Sagar Mr. Chairman, can we take them separately?



Ch. Grouke Okay we will take 2011-16 first.

Stephen Navega I am an attorney with an office address of 447 Taunton Avenue, Seekonk also a resident in Town at 175 Warren Avenue. Sworn in. I am here representing "Not Your Average Joe's" restaurant, they are taking over the Bugaboo Creek building. They already have a liquor license through the Board of Selectmen and the ABCC is working on it. We are here tonight under Section 5.3 to extend or alter a structure, in this case the restaurant building itself which is currently preexisting legal nonconforming. There are two previous Zoning Board decisions 93-07 and 87-13. We are requesting that they be nullified in whole or in part to accommodate the relief that we need for the interior renovations, the dining room kitchen and remodeling. We are also requesting a portion of the building be partitioned off to accommodate another tenant that is about 3,000 square feet. My client is investing two million dollars in this building and will meet or exceed bylaws. We are requesting to enclose the front awning or overhang. It is not for more dining rooms or anything of that nature, it is aesthetic in the sense that it will make a better looking building and more in line with the other buildings. This is a local establishment, there are 16 restaurants and they are pleased to come into Seekonk and plan on opening before Thanksgiving. We will not encroach any further and when I say that, I want to be up front and say that right now they are at 48.5 feet front setback, that is current, and we will not encroach any more than that. And the 160 square foot addition is just a proposed roof overhang that will be enclosed also. This will enclose the front door, there will be 59 x 5' (inaudible) They are also contemplating an outdoor patio, 704 square feet. This outdoor patio will be 48.1 feet off Mink Street and the current ramp that is there right now. It is 8" more than the ramp right now. Section 5.3 allows for modifications if it is not substantially more detrimental than the existing nonconformance. This is a Highway Business zone, use. It is a restaurant now and has been for many years. I would suggest to you that it is appropriate for a special permit to be issued by the Zoning Board of Appeals. (inaudible) I have the CEO here, Stephen Silverstein, the architect and the owners of the land.

Ch. Grouke So we are talking about the shaded areas here and you are going to enclose the overhang and enclose the front door and the other shaded area is going to be a patio.

S. Navega The front door is going to be located just a few feet over to the right of the building.

M. Brisson What is it made out of?

Steve Silverstein 24 High Street, Dartmouth, MA sworn in. We are relocating the front door to center it on the 6,500 square feet on the west. The patio is concrete, we have not decided if it will be stamped but it will be a concrete patio poured within the boundaries of the current bylaw.

Wayne Jacques Jefferson Group Architects, Inc. 700 School Street, Pawtucket, RI Sworn in.

The patio section goes to the parking lot to the current curb line on west and north side, there is a proposed pergola but would not be attached to the roof.

K. Rondeau Is this the handicapped ramp?

W. Jacques No. This area here is on grade, it is flush with the front door so it slopes down towards the back. The access is in the northwest corner of the lot.

G Sagar Mr. Navega in your application you talk about subdividing the interior, we have no jurisdiction over that so that is for informational purposes only?

S. Navega Yes.

K. Rondeau What about the use?

G. Sagar It doesn't matter, it is within the Highway Business district and you can do just about anything.

S. Navega It is just more square footage than my client needed.

G. Sagar It is interesting, in the decisions of '87 and '93, it talks about in '87 how the state took some land to widen the street, and if they hadn't taken the land you probably would not have to be here because you would have met the setback issues.

S. Navega That is the unique thing about this property, when talking about variances. With the government taking some of the property, it creates a situation that would not have required us to be here.

G. Sagar The other issue is, when we did our research, these two decisions have never been recorded so when you talk about nullify, when we did the legal ad, I had "amend or supersede" what is on file.

Ch. Grouke I think the choice of words is much better than "nullify". With nullify, you don't want to throw the whole thing out.

G. Sagar I think if we go forward with this approval and supersede and mention those two decisions then everyone's interest is protected provided you record it. I would like to say in this economy I think you are taking on quite a project, I wish you well and you have my full support.

Ch. Grouke Is there anyone to speak in favor of the petition? No response. Is there anyone to speak in opposition to the petition? No response. Is there anyone here with any questions? No response.

G Sagar made a motion to close the public hearing, seconded by J. Creamer , **and so voted unanimously by:** Ch. Edward F. Groucke, Gary Sagar, Keith Rondeau, Mark Brisson and J. Creamer.

**VOTE: (Approve 5-0)**

G Sagar made a motion to uphold the decision of the Building Inspector, seconded by K. Rondeau , **and so voted unanimously by:** Ch. Edward F. Groucke, Gary Sagar, Keith Rondeau, Mark Brisson and J. Creamer.

**VOTE: (Approve 5-0)**

G Sagar made a motion to approve the application with the stipulation that this decision amends or supersedes 87-13 and 93-04, seconded by J. Creamer, **and so voted unanimously by:** Ch. Edward F. Groucke, Gary Sagar, Keith Rondeau, Mark Brisson and J. Creamer.

**VOTE: (Approve 5-0)**

Ch. Groucke Okay, 2011-17; we already read the petition as advertised.

S. Navega This property fronts on Fall River Avenue and Mink Road. If you look at your bylaw under 12.4.3.1, you are allowed 2 pylons signs, each with 120 square feet space and illuminated. They are only requesting one such sign and actually, they are only going to change the insert from the current language of “Bugaboo Creek” to “Not Your Average Joes”. This is all part of a package to persuade you to give us the relief we are seeking. As far as the building signs themselves; we are looking for a building sign on Mink Road that is approximately 8.6’ x 4.6’ or 40 square feet, illuminated from within allowed under the bylaw. We are also on Mink Road, looking for a not illuminated “NYAJ” (Not Your Average Joes”) name only on the awning about 19 square feet. If you look at the front of Fall River Avenue, we are looking for a 13.5’ x 7.2’ or 96 square feet illuminated from within sign over the front door area. Also, on the Fall River Avenue side, we are looking for a 6.3’ x 3.4’ or 21 square feet facelet sign only with the name “NYAJ” only. Also, on the Fall River Avenue side, not illuminated “NYAJ” name only on two separate awnings about 19’ square foot each. Under 12.4.2.2 we are allowed two building signs for a total of 300’ sq ft. The front Fall River Avenue sign is only 96 square feet and the Mink Road sign is only 40 square feet. As far as the awnings are concerned, section 12.4.2.3 allows signage for the

simple purpose for displaying the occupying company name and is exempted from the square footage description although the awnings are not individually lettered I would respectfully suggest to you that they be considered in the same spirit as 12.4.2.3. Even if you include them, they are only a total of 57 square feet and added to the Mink Road and Fall River Avenue, the whole total is 193 square feet. I will suggest to you this, if you look at the front of Fall River Avenue as designed, the façade where the 96 square foot sign is proposed to be may change a bit, nothing that requires additional relief from the Board, maybe a Building Inspectors call, but the awnings might be eliminated if that is the case. If the awnings are eliminated, that would leave us with the two signs, one on Mink Road, one on the front of Fall River Avenue and the one for the building on the left. I am suggesting that in the spirit of compromise, my client is not seeking two pylon signs if we eliminate the awnings we should be able to proceed with construction with what we have proposed. I will mention to you that there is printing on the front of the building under the front sign, there is some printing “kitchen, bar”, that kind of thing. We are suggesting that if we agree not to have a second pylon sign, and remove the signage on the awnings, I think we could come into compliance with the bylaw. This is a unique parcel of land, and as you touched on it earlier, the state took some of the land when they expanded Fall River Avenue. It is a particularly fast traffic pattern here and if you look at the bylaw, due to the size shape and topography of the lot a substantial hardship exists. Highway Business as you know and a variance will not affect the zoning district. Any variance allowed because it is in the Highway Business Zone would not be contrary to the public interest or nullify or substantially derogate the intent. I think this is not unique as I have been before the Board before and “Bed, Bath and Beyond” was allowed a second sign and they don’t front on two streets. Recently, the CVS on Baker’s Corner was allowed a second sign. So I am suggesting tonight that we are looking for your approval on a Variance to allow reinsertion of the (inaudible) strip on the pylon sign, the 96 square foot sign on the front, the 40 square foot sign on the Mink Road side, and the facelet 21 square foot sign to the left of the front door, keeping in mind the façade might change in the front.

K. Rondeau For clarification, what you are saying is on the front, the sign on the awning will be eliminated and the one on the side and you would want to go with the larger sign, the sign next to the windows and the sign at the peak and keep the pylon sign.

S. Navega Yes. I would point out the tenant sign but that is for another day.

W. Jacques The other thing was the tag line lettering; “kitchen, bar, creative casual cuisine” above the front door but below the (inaudible).

M. Brisson There is only one pylon sign there now right?

S. Navega Yes, I hate to hammer it home but we are allowed two.

M. Brisson I am just looking at all these signs. I only need one sign to identify a place myself but...

G Sagar In the '87 decision, under "B. That the present free standing sign be removed and constructed to conform to the requirements of the zoning bylaw". I assume it has been corrected from the 1987 decision.

S Navega I assumed the same thing when I read it. It is refreshing to see my client coming in and wanting to invest with the economy the way it is. This relief is nothing excessive.

Ch. Grouke Is there anyone to speak in favor of the petition? No response. Is there anyone to speak in opposition to the petition? No response. Is there anyone here with any questions? No response.

G Sagar made a motion to close the public hearing, seconded by J. Creamer, **and so voted unanimously by:** Ch. Edward F. Grouke, Gary Sagar, Keith Rondeau, Mark Brisson and J. Creamer.

**VOTE: (Approve 5-0)**

G Sagar made a motion to uphold the decision of the Zoning Enforcement Officer, seconded by M. Brisson, **and so voted unanimously by:** Ch. Edward F. Grouke, Gary Sagar, Keith Rondeau, Mark Brisson and J. Creamer.

**VOTE: (Approve 5-0)**

G Sagar made a motion to approve the application for a facadelet sign, tag line sign, Mink Street and Fall River Avenue signs and the pylon sign on Fall River Avenue, seconded by K. Rondeau, **and so voted unanimously by:** Ch. Edward F. Grouke, Gary Sagar, Keith Rondeau, Mark Brisson and J. Creamer.

**VOTE: (Approve 5-0)**

**Executive Session:**

G Sagar Executive Session will not be held.

**Approval of Minutes:**

G Sagar made a motion to table the approval of minutes until September 19th, seconded by K. Rondeau, **and so voted unanimously by:** Ch. Edward F. Grouke, Gary Sagar, Keith Rondeau, Mark Brisson and J. Creamer.

**VOTE: (Approve 5-0)**

**Discussion:**

G Sagar I have met the new Town Administrator, she seems to be very nice and knowledgeable.

G. Sagar made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by M. Brisson, **and so voted unanimously by:** Ch. Edward F. Grouke, Gary Sagar, Keith Rondeau, Mark Brisson and J. Creamer.

**VOTE: (Approve 5-0)**

Meeting adjourned at 8:40 PM

Respectfully submitted by:

---

Christina Testa, Secretary