



City of Laconia
Zoning Board of Adjustment
Monday, September 20, 2021 - 6:30 PM
City Hall in the Armand A. Bolduc Council Chamber

9/20/2021 - Minutes

1. CALL TO ORDER

S. Bogert called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM

2. ROLL CALL

Present: S. Bogert; G. Ober; M. Dellavecchia; M. Foote ; R. Maheu; J. LaRoche; M. Hayward

3. RECORDING SECRETARY

K. Santoro, Zoning Technician

4. STAFF IN ATTENDANCE

D. Trefethen, Planning Director

5. ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

5.I. August 16 2021 Zoning Board Of Adjustment Meeting Minutes (PDF)

M. Foote made a motion to accept the minutes of August 16, 2021 as presented.

G. Ober seconded the motion.

All in favor.

6. EXTENSIONS

S. Bogert informed the Board that the applicant for the three extension requests is unable to attend the meeting for personal reasons and has requested that the extension requests be continued to the October meeting. The Board acknowledged the request and the three requests for extension will be placed on the October meeting agenda.

6.I. 664 Scenic Road Special Exception Extension Request (PDF)

Continued at the request of the applicant to the October 18, 2021 meeting.

6.II. 63-99 Fletcher Lane Special Exception Extension Request (PDF)

Continued at the request of the applicant to the October 18, 2021 meeting.

6.III. 63-99 Fletcher Lane Variance Extension Request (PDF)

Continued at the request of the applicant to the October 18, 2021 meeting.

7. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS, CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE VOTE Note: The Purpose Of This Agenda Section Is For The Board To Continue The Public Hearing For The Applicant And The Public To Provide Input. The Board May Also Deliberate The Application, Decide And Conduct A Final Vote At This Time.

7.I. ZO2021-0018SE 33 Clearwater Place Special Exception Application (PDF)

Chair S. Bogert informed the Board that in August he had received a letter from the attorney for the applicant, requesting that he recuse himself from the application. S. Bogert stated that he had discussed the request with the Planning Director and other counsel and he will not be recusing himself from the application.

Attorneys James Bianco and Brendan Wile, agents for the applicant, addressed the Board. They noted that they sent an update to the

information that was sent to the Board on July 20th. The Board members had the pages in front of them.

They noted that Mr. Melville, the owner of the property, had filed an application for Short Term Lodging (STL) at the same time he filed the request for a Special Exception for STL. J. Bianco noted that there had been issues that were not handled properly but that is why he has contracted their services. Attorney Bianco noted that there is now an on-site manager to deal with issues as they arise. He stated that the owner has indicated that he plans to spend more time at the house.

Attorney Brendan Wile outlined the requirements for the Special Exception and what the owner has done to abide by them or rectify any concerns of the neighbors. He informed the Board that the owner contracted "At the Lake Rentals" to facilitate the short term lodging and handle issues such as excess trash, parking complaints. They noted that they have provided documentation from the former owners showing that the house has been used for Short Term Lodging since 2014, five years and six summer seasons prior to the enactment of the Short Term Lodging Ordinance. The construction of a fence on the sidelines of the property has been discussed to help mitigate accidental trespass by guests and to reduce noise.

Dan Mardis of At the Lake Rentals noted that they are based in Moultonboro and that everyone who works there lives in the area, they are not an 800 number to call.

J. LaRoche asked what the normal trash pickup day is (Tuesday) and noted that parking is scattered, how do they keep them in the driveway. D. Mardis responded that the trash pickup he does on Saturday is on the turnover day and is supplemental to the regular pickup. He noted that the company calls guests a few days before check in to remind them of the rules, including parking in the driveway only. He noted that they have had the property a few years and that the problems have been few and far between.

R. Maheu noted that they do have the information they asked for regarding the number of years the property had been rented out prior to the ordinance.

S. Bogert commented that as part of the permitting process there could be conditions of approval. He also asked about a welcome packet for the guests that would explain all the rules, have numbers to call if there is an issue, etc.

D. Mardis reiterated that they have a two part welcome packet. First is by phone prior to check in, they go over rules and expectations. The second is a packet of information that reiterates the rules and has information on who to call if there is a problem.

At 7:04 PM S. Bogert opened the public hearing.

Jon Hildreth, 39 Clearwater Place, addressed the Board. He provided a count of the number of permanent residents on Clearwater Place (14 adults; 3 children); he stated that the number of guests at 33 Clearwater more than doubles the number of people and the amount of cars parking on the street. He stated that this is not someone who is renting to pay taxes, he is for profit. It is like a hotel.

Jon Hildreth commented that at the July meeting it was stated that there was no permit in place but it was still rented without a permit. He said rentals came through right until September, the house was bought for income.

Insha Haque, 40 Clearwater Place, addressed the Board. She commented that her primary concern is safety. She stated that there were three occasions where there was significant delay in leaving her driveway. She informed the Board that she and her husband are doctors and if there is an emergency at the hospital and there is a delay in them leaving that it is not safe for the community.

G. Ober asked if the police were contacted. I. Haque informed her that she had contacted the police the week of the 4th of July and was told it was not their authority and to call Zoning.

Tracy Hildreth, 39 Clearwater Place, addressed the Board. She noted that she wears hearing aids, and that even without them in she has had to close the windows because of the noise. She noted that they are paying premium taxes for waterfront property, and this is a nuisance.

James St Pierre, 114 Morningside Drive, noted he lives in the adjacent neighborhood. He asked why the burden of policing short term rentals falls on the neighbors. Why do they have to call the police, city, etc. There is technology, sound monitoring equipment, video cameras, etc. that could be required.

Allen Gauthier, 100 Morningside Drive, commented that they had a problem with another house on Old N Main Street and now they are looking at another problem house. He stated that they pay premium taxes and this is like a hotel, it would bring their property values down. A. Gauthier mentioned illegal treehouses built at another residence in the City and expressed that the City doesn't have the enforcement capability.

At 7:22 PM with no additional members of the public who wished to speak, S. Bogert closed the public hearing.

The Board then opened their discussion of the application. S. Bogert commented that an hour response time (to clear cars parked in the street) creates an unnecessary health hazard, he has grave concerns about the number of cars and people.

Attorney Bianco commented that it is not what they want either, that is why they have put measures in place to prevent it and eliminate the issue.

Dan Mardis responded to the question about complaints. He said that he had a complaint regarding a large number of people; upon investigation the situation was not as it was reported. He suggested they, as a condition, could put a cap on the number of cars permitted, it would be a reasonable accommodation.

The Board discussed the Ordinance, the allowed occupancy, it was noted that there is a revocation clause if conditions of approval are

violated.

D. Trefethen addressed the Board. He explained that the property is only part way through the process, not to the fault of the owner. He noted that if a permit is issued, the occupancy, based on the square footage of the house, would be 12 people. He also noted that parking is part of the permit review process. D. Trefethen also stated that enforcement is put on hold while permits are in process. He noted that it has been an unfortunate set of circumstances that have delayed this application from the time it was submitted in April.

D. Trefethen responded to the public comment on why it is on the neighbors to report infractions, he noted it is because they are there, staff is not at these locations all day every day. D. Trefethen noted that, according to the police logs, no parking complaints had been received. He also noted that there is language in the ordinance for revocation of a permit if there are documented violations. There is a one year moratorium to reapply once a permit has been revoked.

D. Trethen noted that there have been no complaints on properties that have a Short Term Lodging permit. He understands the issues that the North Main St property had. He reiterated that this property (33 Clearwater Pl) has not completed the process.

M. Dellavecchia commented that the Clearwater property has been a nuisance for a while. G. Ober noted that the members of the public have made good points and noted that they could go to Council and address the issues. She did note that the applicants have met the standards and she is going to support the application.

It was asked that if the application goes forward, can the ZBA condition the approval (e.g. require a fence). D. Trefethen informed them that yes they can impose reasonable conditions. He also reiterated that once an application has been made, it is an attempt to come in to compliance, enforcement is suspended.

M. Foote commented that he feels for the people in the community, people who park in the roadway can get in the way of emergency vehicles.

M. Dellavecchia commented that he supports short term lodging that is done responsibly but he does not buy what the attorney for the applicant is saying, and that it is a nuisance property.

M. Dellavechia made a motion to deny application ZO2021-0018SE for a Special Exception per Article VII Section 235-70(2) to allow Short Term Lodging.

Reason for denial: It would place an increased demand on municipal services and it is a hazard to the neighborhood.

R. Maheu seconded the motion.

Four in favor (S. Bogert; R. Maheu; M. Foote; M. Dellavecchia); one opposed (G. Ober)

8. PUBLIC HEARINGS, POSSIBLE CONSIDERATION AND VOTE Note: The Purpose Of This Agenda Section Is For The Board To Have A Presentation From The Applicant And Open A Public Hearing For The Public To Provide Input. The Board May Also Deliberate The Application, Decide And Conduct A Final Vote At This Time.

8.I. ZO2021-0041VAR 28-36 Endicott St East Variance Application (PDF)

R. Bertholet outlined his application. He explained that he has a subdivision application that has been submitted to the Planning Board. In order to subdivide the parcel with the parking lot remaining in its existing configuration, he needs relief for the small parking area outlined on the application, it is existing and therefore, would not meet the required setback of 10' for pavement. Additionally, there is a driveway that crosses to the residential portion of the lot as fire department access. He indicated that there are cross easements in place that would allow passage between the properties if they were under separate ownership.

At 7:57 PM S. Bogert opened the public hearing.

At 7:57 PM, with no one to speak for or against the application and no written comment submissions S. Bogert closed the public hearing.

M. Foote made a motion to approve Application ZO2021-0041VAR for a variance from Article VIII Section 235-48 E(2) Design Requirements to allow for an existing parking lot, that overlaps the proposed boundary line, to remain in place after the subdivision of the lot.

1. Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest because:

The asphalt is existing, it would have no impact on the general public.

2. If the variance were granted, the spirit of the ordinance would be observed because:

It will maintain the integrity of the existing parking lot; to remove it would cause more damage than leaving it in place.

3. Granting the variance would do substantial justice because:

There is no physical change to the property as it exists and leaving the parking provides needed overflow parking for the residential units.

4. If the variance were granted, the values of the surrounding properties would not be diminished because:

The parcel(s) will remain in the same configuration as they have been for many years. It will have no effect on the surrounding property values.

5. Unnecessary Hardship

b. If the criteria in subparagraph (a) are not established, an unnecessary hardship will be deemed to exist if, and only if, owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, the property cannot be reasonably use in strict conformance with the ordinance, and a variance is therefore, necessary to enable a reasonable use of it.

The property has been in the same configuration with the commercial buildings to the front of the property and the residential units to the rear with the appurtenant parking areas. This would not change. The use is reasonable as it would have no effect on the use of the property, it would just allow the subdivision into two parcels.

G. Ober seconded the motion.

All in favor (5-0)

8.II. ZO2021-0044 1164 Weirs Blvd Unit 4 Variance Application (PDF)

G. Ober recused herself from the application. J. LaRoche was seated as a voting member for the application.

David Ryan outlined his application to the Board. He started to install a 4'x12' deck on the end of his cottage. It was noted that he will need to contact DES to see if a Shoreland Permit will be required. The Board asked if there were going to be any stairs. The applicant stated there would not be any stairs, just the required safety railing.

At 8:05 PM S. Bogert opened the public hearing.

At 8:05 PM, with no one to speak for or against the application and no written comment submissions S. Bogert closed the public hearing.

M. Foote asked that the conditions regarding all state and local permits be attached to any approval.

J. LaRoche made a motion to approve application ZO2021-0044VAR for a variance from Article VI Section 235-35B Side and Rear Setbacks to permit the construction of a 4' x 12' deck on the rear of the cottage.

1. Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest because:

This variance will not be contrary to the public interest because it will have no effect on the public because it seeks to allow a private deck to be utilized to fully capacity.

2. If the variance were granted, the spirit of the ordinance would be observed because:

The spirit of the ordinance will still be observed because the deck will allow for rain, water and snow to flow through the gaps in the decking to the unaltered earth below. The deck has very minimal impact within the 50' shoreland buffer, as only 3 cement footings are in the earth to support the deck. There will be no impervious cover below the deck and the deck will not impede the view of the lake for any of the surrounding properties.

3. Granting the variance would do substantial justice because:

Granting this variance would do substantial justice because this would allow an improved second egress from my dwelling in case of a fire.

4. If the variance were granted, the values of the surrounding properties would not be diminished because:

This deck will greatly enhance the property owners use of the property, while increasing its value as well as having no negative impact on the value of the abutting cottages and properties.

5. Unnecessary Hardship

The existing structure is preexisting nonconforming as it sits in the side and rear setback areas. The proposed project is a reasonable one as it has minimal impact on the ground (3 support posts) and provides an improved means of emergency egress on the water side of the property.

Condition of Approval: All state and local permits are applied for and received. No stairs to be added unless required by the building code.

M. Foote seconded the motion.

All in favor (5-0)

G. Ober returned to the meeting.

J. LaRoche returned to alternate status.

8.III. ZO2021-0045VAR 55 Shore Drive Variance Application (PDF)

Applicant Al Rousseau outlined his application. He noted the house has an odd shape that that a corner of the proposed deck, approximately 20sf, would encroach into the front setback.

The Board briefly discussed the application.

At 8:15 PM S. Bogert opened the public hearing.

At 8:15 PM, with no one to speak for or against the application and no written comment submissions S. Bogert closed the public hearing.

G. Ober made a motion to approve application ZO2021-0045VAR. for a variance from Article VI Section 235-35A Front Setback to permit the construction of an 8x16 front deck a portion of which would encroach into the front setback.

1. Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest because:

The variance will have no impact on the general public.

2. If the variance were granted, the spirit of the ordinance would be observed because:

The spirit of the ordinance will still be observed, the deck will improve the overall appearance of the house and allow enhanced enjoyment of the property with a minimal encroachment into the setback.

3. Granting the variance would do substantial justice because:

Granting this variance would do substantial justice because this would allow the improvement of the property with minimal impact.

4. If the variance were granted, the values of the surrounding properties would not be diminished because:

This deck will enhance the property owners use of the property, while increasing its value as well as having no negative impact on the value of the neighboring properties.

5. Unnecessary Hardship

The existing structure sits at an angle on the lot, and the lot sits where the road curves. The project is a reasonable one as it allows enhancement of the property with minimal impact on the front setback.

Condition of Approval: All state and local permits are applied for and received.

R. Maheu seconded the motion.

All in favor (5-0)

8.IV. ZO2021-0046EW 74 Sterling Drive Equitable Waiver Application (PDF)

Builder Fred Deveau outline the application. He informed the board that the house at 74 Sterling Drive is about 95% complete, only interior work remains. When the bank had an as built survey done it was discovered that the corner of the house encroached on the greenspace buffer. This is a cluster subdivision so typical setbacks do not apply; this house is one of the lots that abuts the greenspace area. To add additional difficulty, the lot is oddly shaped. The encroachment was accidental in nature and was not discovered until near completion of the house.

At 8:29 PM S. Bogert opened the public hearing.

At 8:29 PM, with no one to speak for or against the application and no written comment submissions S. Bogert closed the public hearing.

G. Ober made a motion to approve Application ZO2021-0046VAR for an equitable waive of dimensional requirements from Article VII Section 235-40B(6)(h)[1] Cluster Development Setback requirements to permit the construction of a single family house; the corner of the house encroaches into the 10' setback from the greenspace buffer.

a. The violation was not noticed or discovered by the owner, former owner, owner's agent or representative or municipal official until after a structure in violation had been substantially completed or until after a lot or other division of land in violation had been subdivided by conveyance to a bona fide purchaser for value;

The violation was discovered when the house was substantially (95%) complete.

b. That the violation was not an outcome of ignorance of the law or ordinance, failure to inquire, obfuscation, misrepresentation or bad faith on the part of any owner, owner's agent or representative but was instead caused by either a good faith error in measurement or calculation made by an owner or owner's agent or by an error in ordinance interpretation or applicability by a municipal official in the process of issuing a permit over which that official had authority;

Plot plan was submitted to the City and we were unaware of set back from the buffer zone. The house was placed in error into the buffer area.

c. That the physical or dimensional violation does not constitute a public or private nuisance nor diminish the value of other property in the area nor interfere with or adversely affect any present or permissible future uses of any such property;

The encroachment into the buffer is very minor, approximately 2-3ft at the corner of the house. It does not affect any present or future use of the property.

d. That due to the degree of past construction or investment made in ignorance of the facts constituting the violation, the cost of correction so far outweighs any public benefit to be gained that it would be inequitable to require the violation to be corrected.

The cost to move the house would be very high and the cost would significantly outweigh any benefit to the public.

M. Foote seconded the motion.

All in favor. (5-0)

8.V. ZO2021-0047VAR 674 Main St Variance Application (PDF)

Applicant was not in attendance.

The Board agreed to move the application to the October 18, 2021 meeting.

8.VI. ZO2021-0048VAR 18 Endicott St N Variance Application (PDF)

Attorney for the applicants, Ari Pollack, outlined the application to the Board. The variance application is for the rear setback. It is part of an overall application that is in the Planning Board process. Attorney Pollack explained that the new owner, NWM (North Water Marine) are in the process of demolishing some buildings that are over 40 years old and in poor condition. They will be replaced with new buildings built to more modern standards. The current buildings can handle boat storage for boats 16'-25' long and 8' wide; the proposed new buildings will be turned, moved as far forward as possible and can handle the newer boats up to 30' long and 10' wide.

Architect Michael McGowan, presented the proposed layout and explained that overall there is a reduction in foundation area by approximately 37%; the turned buildings leave the center area open for use by the forklifts to move boats in and out of storage. This improves both safety for the forklift operators and the public as it keeps the forklift operators from having to back out into Channel Lane to place or remove a boat in storage.

The applicants noted that they have applied for the DES and other state permits as required.

At 8:55 PM S. Bogert opened the public hearing.

At 8:55 PM, with no one to speak for or against the application and no written comment submissions S. Bogert closed the public hearing.

The Board briefly discussed the project. It was clarified that Channel Lane is privately owned road, each property owns a portion of the road, as well as it having a railroad right of way.

M. Foote made a motion to approve application ZO2021-0048VAR for a variance from Article VI Section 235-35B Side and Rear Setbacks to permit the replacement of nonconforming structures in the rear setback.

1) Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest because: The New Structures will be less non-conforming than the current legal, non-conforming Existing Structures. In all cases, and even considering each structure independently, the existing nonconformity will remain the same or will be reduced. The four New Structures will have +/- 37% less total ground coverage area compared to the existing structures. The New Structures will also have +/- 2% less total volume than the Existing Structures (even with increased height). The New Structures will provide 120 lineal feet of clear viewing from land to water and vice-versa by removing the existing 210' monolithic structure that runs parallel to Weirs Channel and Channel Lane. The public interest would be served by this improvement through greater visibility of the lake and less overall non-conformance.

2) If the variance were granted, the spirit of the ordinance would be observed because:

In all cases the amount of new structure that falls within the setback will be equal to or less than the existing structure and the total square footage of the four new buildings within the setback will be reduced by 860 sq ft compared to the existing. Article VI, Section 35.B, Table 2, "Table of Dimensional Requirements: Nonresidential Uses", Foot Note 4 states that for properties not within the Shoreland Protection Overlay District the setback from public waters shall be the greater of 25' or one foot for every vertical foot of structure. In our case, however, the proposal rear setback is the same as or enlarged in comparison to the existing condition.

3) Granting the variance would do substantial justice because:

The reconfiguration of these buildings and granting of this variance would add value to the public, abutters and to the owner. The value to the public and abutters would be the removal of existing buildings that are obstructing views to and from the Weirs Channel, are aging and have no architectural significance and do not add value to the surrounding area. The new configuration would open up 120 ft of clear view to and from the Weirs channel and would replace the existing aging buildings with new current structures that will have architectural appeal as reviewed during site plan review. The new configuration will enable approximately 700 square feet of new pervious green space and will also facilitate the repair, maintenance and re-landscaping of the slope that is in failure and is the cause of the structural failure of Building 5B between the waterfront and the existing buildings. The entire slope and area between the existing buildings and the waterfront will be re-landscaped in accordance with NHDES guidance and conformity with the State's shoreland protection program. Overall, the aesthetic of the entire space will be improved and add value and services to the community as well as to the owner's ability to conduct safe and efficient marina operations.

4) If the variance were granted, the values of the surrounding properties would not be diminished because:

As previously noted, granting of the variance would allow for the replacement of existing structures that are aging, in a state of deterioration and are no longer fully functional for today's marine applications. In short, buildings in poor condition will be replaced with new functional buildings and will be orientated such that they are less intrusive to the surroundings and viewscape.

5) Unnecessary Hardship a. Owing to special conditions of the property that distinguish it from other properties in the area, denial of the variance would result in unnecessary hardship because:

i. No fair and substantial relationship exists between the general public purposes of the ordinance provision and the specific application of that provision to the property because: The property is heavily developed with nonconforming structures. Redevelopment provides an opportunity to bring the property, and its structures, more towards conformity, and with minimal zoning relief considering the placement of the current structures.

ii. The proposed use is a reasonable one because:

The hardships that exist are as follows:

1. Building 5B is in structural failure and must come down for safety reasons. Replacement of Building 5B on its current footprint is possible but will eliminate the possibility to correct the hardship issues with Existing Buildings 6A, B & C. Existing Buildings 6A, 6B & 6C are obsolete, failing and if replaced on each existing footprint, would have substantially diminished function in operation of modern boats due to limited turning radius and total length of fork truck and boat inside of the building envelope.

2. If the variance were to be denied, the option would be to rebuild on the existing footprint and have the fork trucks servicing the rack systems by backing into Channel Lane. This would be perpetuate a potential hazard to the users of Channel Lane, could obstruct emergency traffic and would increase vehicular and pedestrian congestion and interactions on Channel Lane during peak summer months. The proposal limits fork truck incursions onto Channels Lane solely to transit trips to the launch area and eliminates all retrieval and positioning movement into and out of the racks systems on Channel Lane. In addition, if the variance was to be denied, the new viewscape lanes would be lost.

Condition: All state and local permits to be applied for and received.

G. Ober seconded the motion.

All in favor.

8.VII. ZO2021-0049VAR 27 Centenary Ave Variance Application (PDF)

G. Ober recused herself from the application.

M. Hayward was seated as a voting member.

Applicant Richard Homs, with his partner Glen Robertson, outlined the application. He noted that they recently acquired the property through a tax sale by the City. They have been cleaning up the property and doing some renovations. The intent is to rent it to long term/year round tenants. The applicants are proposing to put a second story deck to allow for an extra means of egress and to allow for the enjoyment of the view towards the lake.

At 9:14 PM S. Bogert opened the public hearing.

At 9:14 PM, with no one to speak for or against the application and no written comment submissions S. Bogert closed the public hearing.

M. Foote made a motion to approve application ZO2021-0049VAR for a variance from Article VI Section 235-35A Front Setback to permit the construction of a second story deck.

1. Granting the variance would not be contrary to the public interest because:

The variance will have no impact on the general public.

2. If the variance were granted, the spirit of the ordinance would be observed because:

The spirit of the ordinance will still be observed, the deck will improve the overall appearance of the house and allow enhanced enjoyment of the property.

3. Granting the variance would do substantial justice because:

Granting this variance would do substantial justice because this would allow the improvement of the property with minimal impact. Additionally it provides a second means of egress in an emergency for the tenants.

4. If the variance were granted, the values of the surrounding properties would not be diminished because:

This deck will enhance the use of the property, while increasing its value as well as having no negative impact on the value of the neighboring properties.

5. Unnecessary Hardship

The lot is extremely small, the existing structure sits in both front setbacks, any improvements would require relief from the Board. The project is a reasonable one as it allows enhancement of the property with minimal impact on the front setback as the deck is on the second floor.

Condition of Approval: All state and local permits are applied for and received.

R. Maheu seconded the motion.

All in favor (5-0)

9. OTHER BUSINESS

G. Ober returned to the meeting.

G. Ober brought up performance zoning, there was a recent article in The Daily Sun about potential development in the Weirs at the drive in property, and there has been talk of development of the property next to the Cumberland Farms on Endicott St. North. She noted that properties in the Weirs are smaller and for a developer the only logical way to go is up. G. Ober expressed concern and stated that the ZBA is not irrelevant, that they are reasonable people. Performance zoning eliminates the need for developers to go in front of the ZBA for most things. S. Bogert commented that he is not in favor of performance zoning, that the more eyes that look at projects the better product the City will receive.

10. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:27 PM M. Foote made a motion to adjourn the meeting.

G. Ober seconded the motion.

All in favor. (5-0)