

**SEEKONK ZONING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
MINUTES**

March 6, 2017

Present: Ch. Roger Ross, Frank Braga, Keith Rondeau, Shane Halajko, Gary Sagar

7:00pm Chairman Roger Ross called the meeting to order.
:: pledge of allegiance::

Ch. Ross: Ok, it is 7 o'clock the Zoning Board of Appeals for the Town of Seekonk for the meeting of March 6, 2017 is convened. I will ask everyone, if you would please to join me and the board in the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag ::all say pledge:: Thank you. Ok, I'm going to vary our usual procedure, because we have one matter that we need to address initially, and that is the fourth matter on the agenda its case number 2017-04, the petitioner is the Firefly CCRC Condominium trust. What we have done on this, and I apologize in advance for any inconvenience it may cause, but we anticipated in advance that we may have a significant turn out here, and I assume, most of the people who are here standing in the hall and seated are here on that particular matter. We are not going to proceed unless everyone is in the room and can hear the proceeding that are ongoing and if everyone gets into this room we have fire code violations. Consequently, what we have done is we are continuing this evenings meeting to April 10, we will reconvene at that time at the high school. We have reserved the auditorium, we want everyone who wants an opportunity to speak and address the issue before the board to have that opportunity, and logistically and by law, we couldn't do that this evening. We weren't sure how many people were going to turn up and turn out rather, but we anticipated what has happened. There are people standing in the back who probably can't even hear me, so if there were petitioners or witnesses testifying you certainly couldn't hear them, so what we will do, in the next day or two, certainly by the end of the week, we will re-notice everyone who is within the 300' of the subject property notifying each abutter that the matter was continued to April 10 again at 7'oclock at the High School at 261 Arcade Avenue in the Town of Seekonk. At that point we will proceed and anyone who wants to speak either in favor or in opposition to the petition will be given that opportunity. Again, I apologize for any inconvenience, but we had no other way to do it, until we actually convene the hearing, convene the board meeting for tonight, and to see what would happen. So anyone who is here on that matter, you certainly free to stay, but there's no need to, because we will not get to the merits this evening. So I will proceed with the agenda and follow our usual practice? So I will read the agenda for the matters that are down this evening, I will read the entire agenda, and take the cases in the order in which they appear on the agenda, with the exclusion of the matter we just addressed. After a particular case is heard, we will listen to the petitioner and any witnesses that the petitioner has and at that point I will ask if there is anyone in the audience who wishes to speak either in favor or in opposition to the petition we will hear all the evidence any members of the board may ask any questions of any witness who is testifying and we would expect that the questions will be answered truthfully and as comprehensively as possible. It is the typical practice of this board, although we are not required by law to do

so, to take a vote and decide the matter tonight. If any party whether it's the petitioner or any objector, wishes to file an appeal from our decision, those appeals are filed with the appropriate court of jurisdiction in the commonwealth of Massachusetts which would be the superior court or the land court and if you chose to avail yourself of the appellate rights that anyone has, there is strict time lines that constrain the time within to take an appeal. So I would simply caution anyone that to either review the statute, consult with counsel if you chose to file such an appeal, and one last thing, if there is anyone testifying I urge you, anyone that has any question on the matter, to direct those questions to the board, we shouldn't have conversations between witnesses and anyone in the audience. Having said that, the agenda for this evening is first case #

2017-01 Jeremy Thurber, 56 Roosevelt Street, Seekonk MA 02771, Owner/Petitioner, requesting a **Variance**, under Section 5.1.4 of the Town of Seekonk Zoning Bylaws for relief from the minimum required lot size of 14,400 sq ft to 10,000 sq ft at 56 Roosevelt Street, Plat 30, Lot 52 in an R-1 Zone containing 20,038 sq ft.

2017-02 Jeremy Thurber, 56 Roosevelt Street, Seekonk MA 02771, Owner/Petitioner, requesting a **Variance**, under Section 5.1.4 of the Town of Seekonk Zoning Bylaws for relief from the minimum required lot size of 14,400 sq ft to 10,000 sq ft at 56 Roosevelt Street, Plat 30, Lot 52 in an R-1 Zone containing 20,038 sq ft.

2017-03 Seekonk Square Realty, LLC, 1330 Boylston St. c/o United Property Group, Chestnut Hill, MA 02467 Owner, Attorney Stephen E. Navega, 447 Taunton Avenue, Seekonk, MA 02771 Petitioner, requesting a **Variance**, under Section 8.8.4.2 of the Town of Seekonk Zoning Bylaws for additional signage at 39 Commerce Way, Plat 7, Lot 23 in a Highway Business Zone, lot frontage 186', depth 935.4', containing 9.07 acres.

2017-04 The Firefly CCRC Condominium Trust, u/d/t December 29, 2014, 44 Davis Street, Seekonk MA 02771, Owner, 320 Fall River LLC, 320 Fall River Avenue, Seekonk, MA 02771, Petitioners, by Attorney Eric S. Brainsky, Esq. of Brainsky Levinson, LLC, 1543 Fall River Avenue, Suite 1, Seekonk MA 02771, requesting a **Special Permit** under Section 6.11.5(6) of the Town of Seekonk Zoning Bylaws for a Substance Abuse Rehabilitation Facility at 320 Fall River Avenue, Plat 14, Lot 78 in a Highway Business Zone/Mixed Use Zone/Residential 3 Zone in the Continuing Care Residency Campus Overlay District, with lot frontage of 1050', depth 1600', containing 54.5 acres+/- **Continued to 4/10/17**

2017-05 Keri Lynne Sousa, 76 Hawthorne Drive, Seekonk MA 02771, Owner / Petitioner, requesting a ~~Variance~~, SPECIAL PERMIT under Section 5.1.4 of the Town of Seekonk Zoning Bylaws for relief from the minimum required lot size of 14,400 sq ft to 11,550 sq ft at 76 Hawthorne Drive, Plat 6, Lot 85 in an R-1 Zone containing 11,550 sq ft.

2017-06 Jeffery H. Fisk, 72 Pond Street, Seekonk MA 02771, Owner, Borrego Solar Systems, Inc attn: Dean Smith, 55 Technology Drive, Suite 102, Lowell, MA 01851 Petitioner, requesting a **Variance**, under Section 5.1.4 of the Town of Seekonk Zoning

Bylaws for relief from the minimum side yard setback of 50' to 20' for a proposed large scale, ground mounted solar photovoltaic facility at 68 Woodland Avenue, Plat 35, Lots 23 & 24 in an Industrial Zone within the Solar Photovoltaic Overlay district containing 14.5 acres.

2017-07 Jeffery H. Fisk, Trustee of Fisk Family Realty Trust, 8 Jameson Drive, Rehoboth, MA 02769 Owner, Borrego Solar Systems, Inc attn: Dean Smith, 55 Technology Drive, Suite 102, Lowell, MA 01851 Petitioner, requesting a **Special Permit** under Section 4.2.2.g “Institutional, Utility and Recreational Uses” of the Town of Seekonk Zoning Bylaws for Public or Private utilities in an industrial district for a proposed large scale, ground mounted solar photovoltaic facility at 0 Woodland Avenue Rear, Plat 35, Lot 22 in an Industrial Zone within the Solar Photovoltaic Overlay district containing 12.5 acres.

2017-08 Jeffery H. Fisk, 72 Pond Street, Seekonk MA 02771, Owner, Borrego Solar Systems, Inc attn: Dean Smith, 55 Technology Drive, Suite 102, Lowell, MA 01851 Petitioner, requesting a **Special Permit** under Section 4.2.2.g “Institutional, Utility and Recreational Uses” of the Town of Seekonk Zoning Bylaws for Public or Private utilities in an industrial district for a proposed large scale, ground mounted solar photovoltaic facility at 0 Woodland Avenue Rear, Plat 35, Lot 21 in an Industrial Zone within the Solar Photovoltaic Overlay district containing 12.32 acres.

2017-09 Jeffery H. Fisk, 72 Pond Street, Seekonk MA 02771, Owner, Borrego Solar Systems, Inc attn: Dean Smith, 55 Technology Drive, Suite 102, Lowell, MA 01851 Petitioner, requesting a **Special Permit** under Section 4.2.2.g “Institutional, Utility and Recreational Uses” of the Town of Seekonk Zoning Bylaws for Public or Private utilities in an industrial district for a proposed large scale, ground mounted solar photovoltaic facility at 0 Woodland Avenue Rear, Plat 35, Lots 23 & 24 in an Industrial Zone within the Solar Photovoltaic Overlay district containing 12.32 acres.

2017-10 Stephen & Maureen Fisher 8 Olin Avenue, Seekonk MA 02771, Owner / Petitioner, requesting a **Variance**, under Section 5.1.4 of the Town of Seekonk Zoning Bylaws for relief from the minimum side yard setback of 15' to 13' for a proposed 17' x 24.5' addition at 8 Olin Avenue, Plat 9, Lots 40 & 41 in an R-1 Zone containing 10,000. sq ft.

2017-11 Stephen & Maureen Fisher 8 Olin Avenue, Seekonk MA 02771, Owner / Petitioner, requesting a **Variance**, under Section 5.1.4 of the Town of Seekonk Zoning Bylaws for relief from the minimum side yard setback of 15' to 10' for a proposed 6' x 15.5' addition at 8 Olin Avenue, Plat 9, Lots 40 & 41 in an R-1 Zone containing 10,000. sq ft.

2017-12 Stephen & Maureen Fisher 8 Olin Avenue, Seekonk MA 02771, Owner / Petitioner, requesting a **Variance**, under Section 5.1.4 of the Town of Seekonk Zoning Bylaws for relief from the minimum rear yard setback of 25' to 24' for a proposed 6' x

15.5' addition at 8 Olin Avenue, Plat 9, Lots 40 & 41 in an R-1 Zone containing 10,000. sq ft.

2017-13 Stephen & Maureen Fisher 8 Olin Avenue, Seekonk MA 02771, Owner / Petitioner, requesting a **Variance, Special Permit** under Section 5.1.4 of the Town of Seekonk Zoning Bylaws for relief from the minimum lot size requirements of 14,400 sq ft to 10,000 sq ft at 8 Olin Avenue, Plat 9, Lots 40 & 41 in an R-1 Zone containing 10,000. sq ft

Ch. Ross: That concludes the scheduled public hearings, we also have a regular session afterwards with new business which is the approval of prior meetings minutes. Having said that, first matter is the Thurber app, the Jeremy Thurber applications. That's 2017-01 and 2017-02. Mr. Thurber if you would approach to the podium please, raise your right hand, do you swear or affirm that the testimony that you are about it give will be the whole truth?

J. Thurber: I swear.

CH. Ross: Ok, fine, ok you, well, I recited what your application is for, would you please address the board and let us know what you are doing in your own words? To the extent that you choose.

J. Thurber: Essentially I would like to, I'm applying for a variance that would subdivide the lot to again, sell a separate lot. And also consider my property where my house is and septic system is as another lot, so.

Ch. Ross: Ok, do you have anything further that you want to say?

J. Thurber: Well, the only other thing further is, again, that over 60% of the properties in the neighborhood are actually 10,000 square feet or less, so we do actually would confine what the existing properties in the map have.

Ch. Ross: Do you have any witnesses other than yourself? Do you have anyone else who wants to testify?

J. Thurber: No

Ch. Ross: Ok, If you have nothing further I will ask from, the board will have questions no question, but why don't you take a seat, if you don't mind sir, I will ask if there is anyone in the audience who wants to speak to this petition and then I'll ask you to come back up and we'll deal with the issues that we may have. Is there anyone in the audience who wishes to speak in favor of the Thurber petition on Roosevelt Avenue? Hearing none, is there anyone in the audience who wishes to speak in opposition to this petition? Sir, would you step up to the podium please? Let me ask you if you swear or affirm that the testimony you are about to give will be truth?

D. Moline: Yes it is David Moline, 11 Wilson St, which is just on an angle from Mr. Thurber, I'm not sure I'm against the young fellow, I don't have enough information to make my decision, did he say, through the board, what he wants to do with the properties, the two of them?

Ch. Ross: What he proposes based on this survey plan that I have, he has an existing 20,038 square feet of land, he proposes to subdivide into two (2) lots of approximately 10,000 square feet each. One of them has his current home, and he's looking to build on the second lot if the property is subdivided, and either build and sell, or sell it as a lot for someone else to build, I'm not sure which he wants to do. But basically he wants to have sub-divide and have two (2) residences what is now his current property.

D. Moline: My only question is, if he could answer for me through the board, the house he's living in is a new septic when he purchased it. Does that come into the other 100 by 100 that he wants to divide? That leach field, does that come over that 100, in other words, my concern would be I don't know, if he can answer that for me? What I'm getting at is a water thing, it's all about water

Ch. Ross: Are you asking, make sure I'm clear, are you asking if the existing septic will service two properties?

D. Moline: No, no

Ch. Ross: Oh, ok

D. Moline: I'm just saying, when it's built, is it going to get into what he wants to divide with, does, in other words they're not equal is that, field, you know, cause it's raised and it looks like it comes over the hundred, you know what I'm saying? So my concern would be with the second lot, is that going to be enough? You know, for that?

Ch. Ross: meaning, is there enough room for the second septic?

D. Moline: Right and my reason for saying it is, the new aquifer in the North End of town and since Jacoby Way, and they made the new stipulations you know for the footage that they have to have. I'm just, when I'm, let me just go to my driveway, my house is on Wilson, my garage is on Ricard, there is house in foreclosure across from my driveway, you know, it's going to be a question there of one or two houses, that's going to go in there. Ok, it hasn't been done yet. If this gets ok'd are they going to ask for a variance and they're going to say "well you gave him a variance, I should get, you know I should get a variance", then on the other side of me the INAUDIBLE, towards Newman Avenue on the INAUDIBLE side, that lot I don't believe is a full lot, I'm looking a little bit to the future and I just wanted, through the board, I'm not saying I'm right or wrong,

Ch. Ross: Ok

D. Moline: I'd just let you people discuss it, ok and that's what I'm here for, right now I'm neither for nor against, I would just like to get those questions answered.

Ch. Ross: Can you answer that question, Mr. Thurber? If you'd come back to the podium please

J. Thurber: Ok, with the regards to the septic system and how everything, there's not going to be you know, any septic system moved essentially, so what the engineer assessed and proposed is potentially, basically taking the leach field that is existing, that's the raised portion of the yard, and I guess creating that for, making that the actual leach field for whatever new house was potentially built,

D. Moline: That's going to be changed then, there's going to be a change.

J. Thurber: Yes,

D. Moline: Ok, I had no idea

J. Thurber: The leach field, so there would be no change in the septic system to my house, but you know the property as it is, it would be essentially a leach field, put on the, I guess you would call it the front right, but the grades you would be done appropriately as the

D. Moline: However the INAUDIBLE passed

J. Thurber: Essentially, what you see in terms of the existing leach field that would necessarily stay the board of health has approved that

D. Moline: They've approved for you to move it

J. Thurber: Yeah and leave the existing leach field where it is. So with that

D. Moline: Ok, I'll leave it to the board, that's my question. Thank you,

Ch. Ross: Does anyone else want to speak on the Thurber petition either in favor or in opposition, yes sir. Would you raise your right hand please, and do you swear or affirm that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth?

T. Thurber: Trevor Thurber, 203 Homestead Ave, Rehoboth,

Ch. Ross: And you own property

J. Thurber: I own property in the area, and I'm also working on redoing the landscaping after everything is over, if, it's just basically in regards to his plan, and basically the neighbors house that is on the adjacent street has a raised front yard, and by putting a house in this area, you've got to max that grade and you've got to get rid of this big hump that he has now, that the other man is speaking about as far as the leach field. By putting a house in there it's not going to look like a hump in the middle of the lot anymore, it's kind of an eye sore. Um, and everything will blend in better between the two houses so that, and there's going to be no water issues, there's no other variance he would have to apply for at this point, that's all I basically wanted to say, there's no further variance needed it's just for the two lots, from there everything else would (INAUDIBLE)

Ch. Ross: Ok, thank you, is there anyone else who wishes to speak on the Thurber application, either in favor of, or in opposition to, hearing none, do any of the board members have any questions from Mr. Thurber? No questions at all,

K. Rondeau: It's pretty straight forward, as to what he is requesting.

Ch. Ross: Do I have a motion to close the public hearing?

G. Sagar: So moved

Ch. Ross: Is there a second?

S. Halajko: Second it

Ch. Ross: Ok, I have a motion and a second, all those in favor of closing the public hearing signify by saying "aye", Opposed no, the ayes have it, the public hearing is closed. Do any members of the board have any questions or comments? Not questions, comments, on this application.

G. Sagar: Someone's got to be the bad guy, and it may as well be me. This plat was laid out many many years ago. Back then the R-1 zone was 10,000 sf. Subsequent to that the planning board with the approval of town meeting increased the lot area in an R-1 zone from 10,000 to 14,400. Now to split this in half and create two lots, I think if we ever approved this there'd be a line out the door for similar lots in the town. One of the most famous cases goes back to the 1980's in an area that's called Holiday Hill, it involves Hiller Drive and Sunset drive, when that was laid out it was R-1 it was 14,400 a lot of people bought two lots, thinking they'd build one and have the second for future reference, the town rezoned it to an R-2, which made the second lot, non buildable now you needed 22,500 square feet. And this case, it's our zoning case 86-18, April 20, 1986, is right on point, if you'd like Mr. Thurber, you can certainly have a copy of it, here. While I recognize, we just recently we were just recently able to secure the services of a building inspector, who also doubles as a zoning enforcement officer, had there been a formal zoning decision, on this I think it could have spared the applicant a lot of money, and what he went through. To approve this, which I'd love to approve it, but, it just violates zoning 101, and I see no way how, we could even contemplate approving this.

K. Rondeau: they, over the years have turned down many, many applicants on a similar situation, looking to create, basically two lots that are sub,

Ch. Ross: Non-conforming

K. Rondeau: non conforming lots, and as recently, one of the last ones we did last year. It was a similar request, and like what Gary said, that decision back in '86 has almost been like the gold standard, for decisions that we've had to abide by all these years.

G. Sagar: And the other issue is that even if the existing house that is there now, that is on 20,000 square feet, that's not conforming also, because under our zoning by laws, when you're on a corner, you have to have two front yards. It's "Grandfathered" because it's existing, but it's unfortunate, but I see now way how we could ever approve this.

Ch. Ross: I agree, it just violates the whole concept of zoning. We've got a legal non conforming lot now because of the corner, as you said, and what the applicant is asking us to do is to create two non-conforming lots, and that just violates the whole concept of zoning. So, not to mention the precedent, but we don't even have to get to the precedent issue. I just think that the violation of all zoning concepts is sufficient that I couldn't violate to approve this, as you say, we've denied similar applications, in other residential zoning districts in the past. So for me I will certainly vote to deny this application. Anyone else want to speak on this? Well if no one else has any comments or wants to speak on this, I suggest the chair will entertain a motion on the application on the merits,

G. Sagar: to deny?

Ch. Ross: to deny, if that is what you want to.

G. Sagar: So moved.

Ch. Ross: Do I have second on the motion to deny the application as presented, filed and presented?

K. Rondeau: Second

Ch. Ross: Do I have any discussion on the motion, hearing none, I'll ask for a, I'll ask for a vote, all those in favor of the motion to deny the application on case number 2017-01 & 02 signify by saying aye, opposed no. The ayes have it the application as submitted by, both applications are denied. Sorry sir, good luck.

Ch. Ross: Next application is Seekonk Square Realty LLC, Mr. Navega. If you would approach please.

Atty. Navega: Good evening

Ch. Ross: Would you state your business address for the record please,

Atty. Navega: My name is Stephen Navega, I'm an attorney with an office at 447 Taunton Ave in Seekonk, I am also a resident of the Town, residing at 175 Warren Avenue.

Ch. Ross: You may proceed, Mr. Navega,

Atty. Navega: Good Evening I'm here tonight representing the South Coast Urgent Care facility they are proposing to revamp the Tweeter Building at 39 Commerce Way. With me tonight is Richard Poyant of Poyant signs, the signage contractor. We are requesting additional signage for that facility. They are proposing to staff an emergency care facility in the old Tweeter Building; this is akin to an emergency in the sense that they are going to be open seven days a week, 8-6, staffed with an MD. They will handle fractures, and sutures and sprains and colds and coughs, and all those kinds of things that an emergency room would handle. They have the ability to do lab work and x-rays, and they have four facilities, this Seekonk one is the fourth one, if you went by there you'll notice they're doing some work in the Tweeter building. There is no directional sign, and nothing on the pylon sign to indicate that South Coast is going to be there so. This, they are new to town and they are please to establish their presence, unfortunately no one from South Coast could be here tonight, but they have committed much time and effort and finances for this project and they plan on being a permanent presences in the town. Now historically, this

whole area is comprised of about 16 acres, and located in the highway business zone, and it is boarded by Rt. 6 to the south, Rt. 195 to the north, Commerce Way splits the property with frontage on the east and west side. This area is solely commercial and varies from multinational big name retail stores, such as Target, Best Buy, Kohl's, Marshalls, Home Goods and the like and including a multi-screen national amusement cinemas to small mom and pop type stores, there are some eateries mixed in. They are next to, and adjoining this area is Wal-Mart. Arguably it's the heart of the town's largest retail shopping center. Doing their due diligence they came acutely aware of the lack of public visibility to this facility due to the proximity to Rt. 6. All due to the overall topography of the land and structures, you may remember from your own memory or from the ZBA history of that general area, that due to the topographical layout of Rt. 6 and specific to that area, the general lack of product identity, or store identity and visibility is poor, and this board has granted relief in a form of signage variances, including the Target store after they inherited the building from Lechmere. More importantly and to the point, that the former Tweeter building was granted sign relief back in 2004, your case number 2004-07, and that case and all the others I've mentioned your board has determined that a hardship exists, mainly due to the location. They are not a retail sales business for this kind of retail area, they really don't advertise, their only physical way to let the public know who and where they are is through their building sign. To some people, this is a destination establish, like an ER they need the additional signage as the situation usually requires immediate medical attention. Their only seeking to identify the names, so they don't fit neatly into sign and advertising, but rather they just want to identify the business. So on under 8.8.4, the sign bylaw in general, and 8.8.4.2a in particular, they are allowed signage, not to exceed 200 sq affixed to the exterior of the building, in this case they are requesting signage on their main entrance area, which is on the north side of the building, just under 60 square feet, comprising a sign only to identify the facility. Again similar signs on commerce way front and toward, and only to identify the occupant, keep in mind this whole parcel fronts or abuts Commerce Way, Rt INAUDIBLE, Fall River avenue, and of course under 8.8.4.2c the by law permits and exemption, exception to allow for sign letters to simply display the company name. On the west side of the building, there are requesting a letter set channel sign, with letters that total, again, just under 60 square feet for the purpose of identifying the business, each letter only measure 1 foot 3 inches high, and extending 17'.6" long. This sign will only identify the occupant and spell out the name. Just to back up a little bit, this project entails a major renovations to the existing building and a complete rehab of the old Tweeter store, inside and out, during planning their marketing people identifying the problem and became aware that visibility and product identity were problematic. So due to the configuration of the building on the lots, there exists a significant visibility issue coming east and west on Rt. 6 as you pass Commerce Way, mostly due to the existing layout and angle of the building on the site and it is set back from Fall River Avenue. Without additional signs on the building, motorists while looking for the urgent care facility due to a medical immediacy can't identify the company or the product. Unfortunately, South Coast has inherited this issue but I would suggest to you that the request falls into the specific situation that our variance by law anticipates. That is to say, that all this is owing and circumstances relating to the size, shape or typography of the land or structure all the while, not affecting, generally the

zoning district in which it is located. A little enforcement of the by law would create a substantial hardship, financial or otherwise. The definitive word here is otherwise, that should not define, but it is up to your sound discretion, remember it doesn't have to be extraordinary, just a hardship. South Coast expects it to be a great deal of time effort and financial recourses to improve this property and we believe the property, project will be a great improvement of the area, and modernize, update and upgrade the building. Again, this request is not contrary to public interest, nor will it nullify or substantially derogate from the intent of the by law, but because this condition procures this property also peculiar to the area in generally, literal enforcement of the by law would create a substantial hardship. All this owing to the INAUDIBLE to the size, shape and topography, as I said. Due to a lack set backs from Fall River, and lack of visibility from the road, your approval can be granted without substantial determent to the public good. South Coast wants to be a good neighbor and a permanent facility but needs some assistance from the board. You remember it's a highway zone, we're not asking for any change in use, or activity, not otherwise allowed, just signage, keeping in mind, I don't want to repeat myself, that it's an emergency, type of facility they expect to receive to the kind of emergency situations that an emergency room would cover. Clearly they will refer out more serious things, via ambulance to local hospitals, but they will handle all the necessary fall from a tree, broken bones, sutures, that kind of stuff, lab work, seven (7) days a week, and this will be the forth facility. I urge you, members of the board to consider that and allow the signage as presented. Richard Poyant from Poyant sign is here to answer any specific questions as to the sign dimensions and that kind of thing with that said Thank you.

Ch. Ross: Does anyone have any questions of Mr. Navega, at this time?

S. Halajko: Comment?

Ch. Ross: I'm sorry?

S. Halajko: Comment, I just think it's the greatest establishment to have there, and obviously if it's an emergency type of set up where, for people to get treated, signage is very important, for people to find it so, that's about it.

Ch. Ross: Do you want to call your witness forward? Welcome again, would you raise your right hand please, and do you swear or affirm that the testimony you are about it give will be the truth?

R. Poyant: I do,

Ch. Ross: And would you state your name for the record, along with your business affiliation and your address?

R. Poyant: Richard Poyant of Poyant Signs, 125 Samuel Barnett Boulevard, New Bedford MA.

Ch. Ross: Ok, thank you, you may proceed.

R. Poyant: Well, as Atty Navega described, we are looking to get identification on four (4) sides of the building. These are individually illuminated letters simply to identify this is an urgent care facility affiliated with South Coast Health. We do not have any identification out on the Rt. 6 shopping center pylon sign. We're quite a ways back from Rt. 6, and our line of sight visibility is interrupted by other buildings in the plaza. It's really important for us to be able to have that identification so that patients who are in an emergency need, can locate the building as quickly as possible, as safely as possible to avail themselves of the services that are there at the urgent care facility.

Ch. Ross: Ok,

G. Sagar: Do you not have the availability of signage on Rt. 6, or you chose not too?

R. Poyant: We do not have availability.

Ch. Ross: That was my question, so the Rt.6 pylon is not available?

R. Poyant: Correct

S. Navega: It's already committed by the contracted place holders

Ch. Ross: Mr. Navega, what are the hours going to be again?

S. Navega: 8-6

Ch. Ross: 8-6, seven (7) days a week?

S. Navega: Yes

Ch. Ross: So my understanding is, the relief you're looking for has nothing to do with sign size, but it is the number? Correct?

S. Navega: Right

Ch. Ross: And all your signs will comply with the size limitations? Taken individually

S. Navega: taken individually they will yes, in total they'll

Ch. Ross: They'll exceed?

S. Navega: Yes

Ch. Ross: Questions? Keith

K. Rondeau: The illumination of the sign, did I read this right, they're going to be white lettering? And white illumination

R. Poyant: At night, South Coast Health will illuminate as white, and urgent care will be illuminated as a turquoise color.

K. Rondeau: I hate to ask the question, but is that going to be enough? From that distance from the road?

R. Poyant: Well we are limited by how big we can make them, on all four (4) sides

K. Rondeau: Ok, so you think the white signs will be seen?

R. Poyant: And during the day, the South Coast Health is almost black, it changes color,

K. Rondeau: Ok, it did say that they were black

R. Poyant: it is black in the day time and changes to white at night.

K. Rondeau: Ok, that was part of my

R. Poyant: question of some concern

Ch. Ross: Gary, you had a question?

G. Sagar: I just pointed to Keith

Ch. Ross: Oh, ok you don't have any questions?

G. Sagar: I have one,

Ch. Ross: Oh, ok

G. Sagar: Just a comment, I mean, this is an old building, and I'm sure they're going to invest a significant amount of money; I think it's going to really serve a great need for the people of the town, and I fully support 100%.

Ch. Ross: Any other questions from any members of the board?

K. Rondeau: It's one of the really classic examples of, like you said, meeting expectations of size, shape and typography based on the building where it is, how it's located, unless they raze the building and build something totally different and which nobody wants to see anyways, it's a good use of the current building. Just to put signs on it to make it more identifiable, this is the perfect example of why we need to do that

Ch. Ross: I agree, Particularly in light of the fact that there's no Rt. 6 exposure in terms of signage.

G. Sagar: We gave relief to Target and the Paper Store

Ch. Ross: The Paper Store
K. Rondeau: We even gave relief to Tweeter too
Ch. Ross: Tweeter in 2004. Ok Mr. Navega, Mr. Poyant why don't you take a seat for a moment and let me query the audience. Is there anyone in the audience who wishes to speak in favor of this petition? Hearing none, is there anyone in the audience who wishes to speak in opposition to this petition? Again, hearing none, at this point, I'll ask if anyone has a motion
G. Sagar: Move to close the public hearing
Ch. Ross: So moved, do I hear a second?
K. Rondeau: Second
Ch. Ross: Second, any discussion on the motion? Hearing none, I'll call for a voice vote, all this in favor of closing the public hearing signify by saying aye, Aye, opposed No, Ayes have it 5-0. I'll ask one more time, any questions or comments from the board? Anyone on the board?
G. Sagar: Mr. Chairman, I move we approve it as submitted
Ch. Ross: I'll ask for a second on that motion
S. Halajko: Second it,
Ch. Ross: Hearing a second, any discussion on the motion? Hearing none, by voice vote, all those in favor of approving the petition of Seekonk Square Realty LLC, as submitted, signify by saying Aye, aye, opposed no, Ayes have it 5-0. Mr. Navega, Mr. Poyant, good luck.
S. Navega: Thank you very much, good night gentlemen
Ch. Ross: Next matter I have is Keri Lynne Sousa, if you would approach please. Would you raise your right hand, do you swear or affirm that the testimony you are about to give will be the whole truth, would you state your name and address for the record, please
K. Sousa: Yes, Keri Lynne Sousa, 76 Hawthorne Drive, Seekonk, MA 02771.
Ch. Ross: Ok, this is one of the petitions Gary, you had an administrative question with, do you want to address that?
G. Sagar: The applicant has requested a variance; I don't believe is the proper venue to request. Extension of a pre-existing non-conforming so it should be a special permit. Part of our by-law mirrors section 40a section 6 of the state law, what we've done in the past is, the variance being a higher or tougher standard to get, seeing it was advertised as a variance we've allowed the applicant to amend the petition on the floor, to a special permit, which is actually in their benefit, because it is a lesser threshold that they have to meet.
Ch. Ross: Did you understand the comment, Ms. Sousa?
K. Sousa: Not really,
Ch. Ross: You applied for a variance; you should have applied for a special permit. The burden you have seeking a variance is much higher than it is seeking a special permit. Having said that, we will consider amending your petition, changing the petition from a variance to a special permit, assuming you so move, or request that of the board.
K. Sousa: Ok, I do,
Ch. Ross: You do? Ok
G. Sagar: Mr. Chairman, in accordance with the petitioners request, I move we amend this petition from a variance to a special permit
Ch. Ross: Do I have a second on that motion?
K. Rondeau: Second

Ch. Ross: Any discussion, hearing none, those in favor of allowing the petition to be amended as stated in the motion, signify by saying aye, opposed no, ayes have it 5-0. Now you can proceed, and tell us what you want to do, and why you want to do it.

K. Sousa: Ok, our current lot is 11,550 feet we'd like to add a second floor, to add more bedrooms to the home, as well as turn the existing three season porch we have into a dining room. I own the house; my parents live in the house with me. I have just recently become engaged I'll be married in January. I'd like to stay in the house, but it's not large enough to start a family of my own with my parents there as well, so we wanted to add more bedrooms on the second floor, so we would need three more bedrooms a bathroom and a living room area, and then a dining room area.

S. Halajko: What's the total amount of bedrooms you have?

K. Sousa: It will be five (5) we just put in a new septic system and the new septic system was built with this in mind, so the new septic system is large enough to support five (5) bedrooms.

Ch. Ross: And you're going up? Correct?

K. Sousa: Yes

Ch. Ross: So you are not expanding the footprint at all.

K. Sousa: No, because we have an existing porch right now that will become the dining room, and then everything else is up.

Ch. Ross: And you are going to keep the configuration of the porch for the same for the dining room, you're simply going to knock down a non weight bearing wall, right?

K. Sousa: right

Ch. Ross: So all your setback issues currently exist, the side yard and? Any questions of this petitioner by any members of the board?

G. Sagar: I think it's pretty straight forward

Ch. Ross: Do you have anything further; do you have any other witnesses? Why don't you take a seat, we'll poll the audience and we'll ask you to come back. Is there anyone in the audience who wishes to speak in favor of the Sousa application? Sir, if you would come forward please.

R. Perry: My name is Richard Perry; I own property on Hawthorne since 1963

Ch. Ross: Do you swear that the testimony you are about to give will be truth?

R. Perry: Yes

Ch. Ross: Go ahead sir,

R. Perry: When we moved to Seekonk in 1963, we bought a house at 84 Hawthorne Drive, we bought a house with four rooms and an expansion attic, since that time we have finished three rooms and a bath upstairs, we had put on a porch on the back and a two car garage. The same size lot that she is asking for now. And I strongly approve of what she is doing, and I hope you guys do the same.

Ch. Ross: Thank you sir. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak in favor of this application, hearing none, is there anyone in the audience who wishes to speak in opposition to this application? Hearing and seeing none, does anyone, anyone on the board have any further questions of Miss Sousa? Hearing none, I'll ask for a motion on the public hearing.

G. Sagar: I move we close it,

Ch. Ross: Do I have a second?

K. Rondeau: Second

Ch. Ross: Any discussion on the motion to close the public hearing? Hearing none, those in favor signify by saying aye, opposed no, Ayes have it 5-0. On the merits of the application, as amended for a special permit. Do I have a motion?

G. Sagar: I move we approve as submitted

Ch. Ross: Second?

K. Rondeau: Second

Ch. Ross: Any discussion on the motion? Hearing none, all those in favor of granting the relief requested on the petition, as amended? Signify by saying aye, aye, opposed no, ayes have it 5-0. Miss Sousa, Good Luck

K. Sousa: Thank you very much.

Ch. Ross: Before we get into the next matter, which is the Fisk matter, I'd ask if we could take a two minute break. We will adjourn for a couple of minutes.

G. Sagar: Mr. Chairman, before you proceed, I have to recuse myself from the next 4 petition.

Ch. Ross: Ok

G. Sagar: I am an abutter to this property

Ch. Ross: Ok, understood. So before we get to the merits of this, is someone here on the Fisk petition? I'll swear you in later, are you Mr. Fisk?

D. Smith: No, I'm Dean Smith from Borrego Solar Systems

Ch. Ross: Ok and Mr. Fisk is not here?

D. Smith: I don't believe he is here

Ch. Ross: Let me tell you the issue that we have, and the option is yours, Mr. Sagar had to recuse himself, he's an abutter, he's within 300' radius area. Consequently we have 4 members, that's a sufficient quorum. We can hear the matter, under Mass law; you need 4 votes for approval, so consequently there is no wiggle room. You need a unanimous vote of this board. So we're prepared to hear it tonight if you so chose. If you want to defer until the next scheduled meeting, and we will have a full board, Mr. Sagar is still going to recuse himself but we've got a member who is out of state, he will be back, so he'll be able to sit, and we have an alternate who is sitting this evening. So you'll have a full board. It's up to you, and whatever your decision is, I'd like it on the record.

D. Smith: Would that be the decision for both the special permit applications that we have as well as the variance?

Ch. Ross: That's correct.

D. Smith: Ok, and with 5 present would you need four out of the five

Ch. Ross: you need four, you need four, correct.

D. Smith: So we'd need four

Ch. Ross: So it's four out of five, or every member who would vote tonight.

D. Smith: I would probably feel more comfortable deferring until there is a full board.

Ch. Ross: That is fine, we have no objection. Just so you know, I don't know if you were here at the beginning of the meeting, but we have continued one matter until April 10, we will notify you by mail, by regular mail, Mr. Fisk and yourself, that the matter tonight, at your request was continued to April 10, this will not be the forum, it will be at the High School on Arcade Avenue, in the Auditorium.

D. Smith: Ok

Ch. Ross: I would expect, without knowing, but I'm fairly confident that we would hear your case before we heard the one of which we continued to April 10.

D. Smith: That would be very much appreciated

Ch. Ross: Ok, so we'll make sure on the agenda that you are heard in advance of the Firefly matter.

D. Smith: Thank you for the heads up,

Ch. Ross: Thank you very much. Ok. So we have three petitions, actually four petitions, one applicant, Stephen N. and Maureen E Fisher is there someone here on that matter? Ok, are you Mr. Fisher?

J. Tallman: No, my name is Jeff Tallman from Sitec Engineering; I have a place of business at 449 Faunce Corner Road, in Dartmouth Massachusetts.

Ch. Ross: You've appeared before the board before haven't you?

J. Tallman: That's correct.

Ch. Ross: You say Dartmouth?

J. Tallman: Yes,

Ch. Ross: ok would you raise your right hand, do you swear or affirm that the testimony you are about to give is the whole truth, on this matter?

J. Tallman: I do,

Ch. Ross: Ok, you may proceed

J. Tallman: Ok, the petitioners have filed a variances for the property located at 8 Olin Avenue,

Ch. Ross: May I interrupt you for a moment, please? Gary, this is another one of your issues, I believe? Administrative, are either Mr. or Mrs. Fisher here?

J. Tallman: Yes

Ch. Ross: Ok, so as long as they are here to understand, Gary, do you want to put on the record the same issue that you had before?

G. Sagar: One of these variances should be a special permit, because it is an extension of a legal non-conforming, pre-existing use. Again, as we did previously, all these four petitions were advertised as variances, which is a higher standard. So we would, what we have done this evening and in the past, is to allow the petitioners to amend here one of the variances to a special permit, and that would be

Ch. Ross: The one on the lot size

G. Sagar: 2017-13, so if they would, if your their representative, if you would ask us to do that?

J. Tallman: By all means

G. Sagar: Ok I would

Ch. Ross: and do I have your consent Mr. & Mrs. Fisher to so amend? Let the record reflect that the owners consented to the amendment of the petition.

G. Sagar: So I would move that 2017-13 be amended from a variance to a special permit.

Ch. Ross: Do I have a second on that motion?

F. Braga: Second

Ch. Ross: Any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor of allowing the amendment of petition 2017-13 signify by saying aye, aye, opposed no, ayes have it 5-0, go right ahead sir.

J. Tallman: It's funny if you ask if I have been before the board before. Last time I was here, was for this particular site back in 2012. At that time, it was the previous owners, the Giffords who were asking for a variance to put an addition on the rear of the property. Which was granted at that time. They never went forward, they never acted on it, they never built the addition. They decided to sell the house rather than put it on. The reason we are here tonight, because the Fishers would also like to put an addition on the home, actually two additions. The additions are slightly different than what was proposed previously. They are looking to go, put the main addition on the right side of the dwelling, which will be 17 x 24.5 feet which would give them an additional 417 square feet of living space. The

purpose for that addition would be to reconfigure the existing two bedrooms in the dwelling and add a master bathroom. Currently the house itself, if you take away the garage area, is, the living space in the dwelling is just under 1000 sq ft. So basically the reason we are here tonight, they are looking to add that one main addition that would allow them to reconfigure the bedroom situation and add a bathroom. And then the other addition they are looking for is at the left rear dwelling corner. What they are looking to do is provide some additional storage for the facility, by adding a 6' by 15.5' addition, just kind of squaring off that back corner. That area now is presently used for storage, I should note, the house that you see is on slab, there is no basement in the dwelling. There is a two, in that footprint that I show on the plan, there is a 2 stall garage included in that, which I didn't take out of the footprint. So what you see there is a house, again, with less than 1000 sq ft of living space, consisting basically of four rooms a kitchen a living and two bedrooms and one bathroom at the moment. So they been working on plans on how they could make the situation a little better there, we've come up with this scenario, the addition on the back left of the dwelling requires the two variances, the side setback of 10' and also a rear setback of, I believe we're asking from 25' to 24'. Which the 10' side setback and the 24' rear setback is where the existing dwelling currently is. So even though we are expanding, we are still keeping the existing setbacks.

Ch. Ross: Right, so you are not looking for any additional setback relief?

J. Tallman: Not with that particular addition, no.

Ch. Ross: On that side?

J. Tallman: correct. On the right side on the main addition, again with working and developing plans, the footprint that fits their needs, does require relief from side setback, 13' from 15', so that is an additional setback that we would be looking for. Again, if you look at the configuration of the dwelling, location of the dwelling on the property, the fact that the front, side and rear yard, I should say, the left side currently don't meet setbacks. We have very limited space where we can go. We looked at possibly going up, but they don't need an entire second floor, on the dwelling, like the previous application did. It's just the 417 sq ft addition that they are looking for, which does require 2' relief on the right side.

Ch. Ross: As I understand it, that is the only new relief, correct?

J. Tallman: Correct

Ch. Ross: You need four reliefs, but that's the new one

J. Tallman: That's correct

Ch. Ross: Ok, I'm sure you said it, but I missed it. The 17 x 24.5 addition the right is going to be used as what?

J. Tallman: It's to reconfigure the existing two bedrooms, they are relatively small, they want to put in one master bedroom and then a second bedroom.

Ch. Ross: Ok, thank you,

G. Sagar: So there would be no increase in the septic?

J. Tallman: That's correct. We are doing a septic repair as part of this project. We filed that with the Board of Health. There are two existing cesspools on the property now, a main cesspool and then an overflow cesspool, we'll be eliminating those and putting in a new Title 5 septic system as far

G. Sagar: It's amazing; when they built this that they put it on slab, because there is absolutely no water table

Ch. Ross: I was just going to say, no water table

J. Tallman: Fabulous soils for septic.

G. Sagar: I would like to comment to your comment earlier about asking if this gentleman, this company had been before us before, Sitec did a big job for the town a few years ago. They did a big survey for the Lagerquist property when it was deeded into conservation and they did a wonderful job.

J. Tallman: Thank you

Ch. Ross: That was before my time. Do any members of the board have any questions of the witness? This is pretty

K. Rondeau: Just one question, did you look at the, it's a 17' width requiring 2' setback relief, did you look at possibly doing the 15'?

J. Tallman: Yes, again it's the I know the applicant have looked into that and the configuration they'd like on the inside of the house, the 2 additional feet does make quite a bit of difference, for the configuration of the bedrooms, that they'd like.

K. Rondeau: The other question is, that rear corner portion, is that accessible outside, or inside?

J. Tallman: I believe just on the inside.

S. Fisher: Just from the garage, just for extra storage, we don't have much closet space just had a grandson, we got a dog. And my lot too, it's on a dead end street, it's all fenced in, there's only 5 houses on the street it's not like it's wide open, where you're going see...

Ch. Ross: So there is no exterior access?

J. Tallman: No

M. Fisher: The actual abutting neighbors have all contacted me that they are all excited about it, they're happy.

Ch. Ross: Ok, I'm set; does anyone else have any questions?

G. Sagar: No, I can certainly understand Keith's point about the setback. But at 13' the other side is only 10, so it's...

Ch. Ross: and 17 by 24.5 and you're getting two bedrooms out of that

J. Tallman: Well when you reconfigure the existing two that are already in the house, when you take in that space

Ch. Ross: Yeah

K. Rondeau: It is all fenced in anyways, so

G. Sagar: No basement, these people are really scrambling for storage.

J. Tallman: The Giffords who lived there previously had three children,

Ch. Ross: when that house was built on a slab that had to be a financial

S. Fisher: It was an older couple

M. Fisher: someone in the neighborhood owned part of the land, and that particular lot was for the parents, because they were older and they wanted them to have just a ranch, so they didn't have to do the two floors and they didn't want them to have to have a basement, to go up and down. I just recently found this out.

Ch. Ross: Ok, Are the petitioners going to testify?

J. Tallman: No, I don't think so,

Ch. Ross: There's no need to, if there is no questions for the board at this time, I'll ask you take a seat and let me poll the few members of the audience. And is there anyone in the audience who wishes to speak in favor of the Fisher petition? Is there anyone in the audience who wishes to speak in opposition to this petition? Seeing and hearing none, One more time, anyone wish to speak on this petition at all? Any of the board members have any further questions of, on this petition?

G. Sagar: Move to close the public hearing,
Ch. Ross: Do I hear a second?
K. Rondeau: Second.
Ch. Ross: All those in favor of closing the public hearing signify by saying aye, aye opposed no, ayes have it 5-0. I'll entertain a motion on, under these circumstances; I'm inclined to take them all once.

K. Rondeau: You want to take them all at once?
Ch. Ross: You want to take them, ok, let's do them separately, let me do it off here, on petition 2017-10 for a variance do I have a motion?

K. Rondeau: Motion to grant as submitted?
Ch. Ross: Do I have a second?
G. Sagar: Second
Ch. Ross: Any discussion on the motion, hearing none, all those in favor of granting the petition on 2017-10 as submitted, signify by saying aye, aye, opposed no, ayes have it 5-0. On 2017-11 also a petition for a variance, do I have a motion?

K. Rondeau: Motion to approve as submitted
Ch. Ross: Do I have a second?
F. Braga: Second
Ch. Ross: Having a motion and a second, any discussion on the motion, hearing none, all those in favor of granting the petition for a variance for 2017-11, signify by saying aye, aye, opposed no, ayes have 5-0. On 2017-12 third petition for a variance for minimum side yard from 15' to 13' do I have a motion?

S. Halajko: Motion to approve as submitted
Ch. Ross: Do I have a second?
G. Sagar: Second
Ch. Ross: Any discussion on the motion? Hearing none, all those in favor of granting the variance for minimum side yard from the required 15'to 13' signify by saying aye, aye, opposed no, ayes have it 5-0. And finally the petition 2017-13 on the lot area, on the petition as amended from a variance to a special permit, do I have a motion?

K. Rondeau: So moved
Ch. Ross: Second?
G. Sagar: Second
Ch. Ross: Any discussion on the motion? All those in favor of granting the petition 2017-13 as amended signify by saying aye, aye, opposed no, ayes have it 5-0. Good Luck Mr. & Mrs. Fisher. So that closes the public hearing, the only matter we have left is new business, approval of the minutes of the January 23, 2107 meeting. Any changes, revisions or deletions as submitted?

G. Sagar: Yes, Mr. Chairman
Ch. Ross: Mr. Sagar:
G. Sagar: First I would just like to request, going forward, Bridget if you could number the pages,
B. Garrity: Oh, absolutely
G. Sagar: turning to page 4, second instance when I spoke, on the fourth line down,
Ch. Ross: "So your house is really designed"?
G. Sagar: "Six of you, ok"
Ch. Ross: "Six of you, ok", yup

G. Sagar: And then where it is says it was designed by Mr. and it says inaudible, the name is Monsees.

B. Garrity: M-O-N-S-E-S

G. Sagar: S-E-E-S.

Ch. Ross: two EE

B. Garrity: I tried, I listened I tried, I can't

Ch. Ross: Any other changes or revisions?

G. Sagar: Other than that, I would move we approve with the amendment

Ch. Ross: Motion to approve the January 23, 2017 minutes as amended. Do I have a second?

K. Rondeau: Second

Ch. Ross: All those in favor, signify by saying aye, aye, opposed no, ayes have it 5-0.

G. Sagar: One item going forward Mr. Chairman, we will be convening at the High School in April, Bridget, did you contact the cable TV.

B. Garrity: Yes, I did

G. Sagar: I think that venue and with a large crowd, I think you should request, through the town administrator that we may want a police detail there. I think that would be wise

Ch. Ross: That's wise, I will send an email tomorrow, to Mr. Administrator, I think that is a good idea, the other thing is, if I could have a consensus on this, on the renotification, on the Firefly, thing it is at our request so if you get any pushback from the applicant and or his attorney I think we should eat the mailing.

G. Sagar: Think we should eat the mailing?

Ch. Ross: They didn't request it, we did

G. Sagar: Yeah, ok,

Ch. Ross: if that's not the sentiment and the consensus of the board, so be it, I just raised the issue.

G. Sagar: So is 106?

Ch. Ross: 106 times 46 whatever that is

Ch. Ross: 46 bucks, you can bill him, and if he balks

G. Sagar: Are we going to re-advertise in the newspaper?

B. Garrity: We don't technically have to, because we haven't opened the public hearing, at the request of the applicant, we are continuing it within the 65 days, if it was outside the 65, I would think we may have to, but I don't, we can, we are within the timeframe

G. Sagar: There is a new law that went into effect, for legal ads the newspapers are now also required to also publish it online, I believe that people in this town, there's only a handful of people that read the Sun Chronicle, would have a better opportunity to read it online than you would in print. So because of the sensitivity, if you will, of this petition, I would move that we also re-advertise it through the normal course of business.

Ch. Ross: What's the advertising cost? I know it's by line, assuming, what, actually, you're going to be placing an ad anyway right?

B. Garrity: Yes

Ch. Ross: For the 10th

B. Garrity: we don't pay for, that is

G. Sagar: we do it because it's a month away basically, and it's a change venue from what people are used to.

Ch. Ross: So you're going to be placing an ad for the other matters, so you're basically adding another.

B. Garrity: It's adding another, it's no big deal. I can tell you the exact price, it was...

S. Halajko: you're adding the Fisk and the adding the Firefly
B. Garrity: That particular one, because it was wordy, was \$213.86 to advertise it.
Ch. Ross: The thing is, I have no idea what's going to happen, I just have visions, one way or another, this might go up to Taunton, either side, dot our I's and cross our T's we don't want to get blown away on jurisdictions.
G. Sagar: Mr. Chairman, bring your "A" game, ok
Ch. Ross: Ok, are we closed? If there is nothing further, do I have a motion to adjourn?
G. Sagar: So moved,
Ch. Ross: Second?
S. Halajko: Second
Ch. Ross: All those in favor, signify by saying aye, aye, opposed no, ayes have it 5-0. We are done for this evening.