



Zoning Board of Appeals

May 22, 2014 - **Minutes**

New Bedford Main Public Library, 613 Pleasant Street

PRESENT:

Allen Decker (Acting Chairman)

James Mathes (Acting Clerk)

Bob Schilling

Deborah Trahan

Dan Romanowicz, Building and Inspectional Services Commissioner

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER by Allen Decker @ 6:03 pm.

Mr. Decker started by explaining to the applicants that because only four members of the board were present, a unanimous decision would be needed. If the applicants decide they would prefer to have a continuance until all five members of the board are present, they may do so by signing a form. All petitioners agreed to proceed with their petitions.

Mr. Decker then explained procedures.

Case #4134

Communication dated 4/25/14 from the Commissioner of Buildings and Inspectional Services was read into the record.

A motion was made (JM) and seconded (DT) that the communication be received and placed on file.
Motion passed unopposed.

A motion was made (JM) and seconded (DT) that the appeal be received and placed on file.
Motion passed unopposed.

A motion was made (JM) and seconded (DT) that the plan be received and placed on file.
Motion passed unopposed.

A motion was made (JM) and seconded (DT) that the owner of the lots as indicated are the ones deemed by the board to be affected.
Motion passed unopposed.

A motion was made (JM) and seconded (DT) that that the action of the clerk in giving notice of this hearing is hereby ratified.
Motion passed unopposed.

A motion was made (JM) and seconded (DT) that the communication from the Office of the City Planner be received and placed on file.
Motion passed unopposed.

Mr. Decker declared hearing opened and called upon the petitioner.

Petitioner Kynsey Rogers explained that she would like to open her own dog grooming business. She stated that she had been grooming since the age of 16. She stated that she has been working at Monique's Grooming in Rhode Island and would like to start slow, operating 3 days a week to build a clientele. She mentioned that she would be working alone and was considering servicing about 4 - 5 dogs per day.

Mr. Decker questioned whether the applicant had intentions to have animals overnight.

Ms. Rogers stated she did not. She plans to work the dogs one on one and have them in and out in about an hour and a half.

Mr. Decker questioned if the dogs would be kept inside the facility to which Ms. Rogers stated that they will remain inside.

In response to an inquiry by Mr. Decker on how parking would be handled, Ms. Rogers indicated that the residence has a driveway that can be used. She confirmed to Mr. Decker that she only plans to serve one client at a time.

In response to an inquiry by Mr. Decker on intended hours of operation, Ms. Rogers explained that she planned to be operating from 9am-3pm, which would be contingent on when clients would be able to pick up their pets. She stated she was planning to take clients three or four days a week. She explained that she will initially retain her Rhode Island job.

In response to Mr. Mathes, Ms. Rogers reiterated her planned hours of operation were from 9am-3pm, three or four days per week.

Upon invitation to Mr. Decker's invitation to be recorded in favor of this petition, Joseph Lopes, New Bedford City Councilor, 75 Dudley Street, New Bedford, voiced that he wished to be recorded in favor of the petitioner.

Upon further invitation to speak in favor, Kathleen Botelho-Rogers, the petitioner's mother and the property owner, asked to say a few words about the petitioner. She started by praising her daughters' love for animals and exceptional grooming abilities. She reiterated Ms. Rogers' desire to start off the business slowly, and stated that she would be there to assist her if needed. Ms. Botelho-Rogers mentioned that the petitioner already has some local clientele who are currently traveling to Tiverton for her services. She also stated that the property has four gates already in place as a safety precaution to prevent animals from leaving the facility accidentally. Ms. Botelho-Rogers further mentioned that the petitioner has also taken some classes with the Humane Coalition and plans to go into rescue. Ms. Botelho-Rogers concluded by apologizing for not being aware that people could come here and speak in favor of Ms. Rogers petition and that had she known they would have had a lot of support present at the meeting.

There was no response to Mr. Decker's further invitation to be heard in favor.

There was no response to Mr. Decker's invitation to be heard in opposition to the petition.

Mr. Decker closed the public hearing.

Ms. Trahan asked if there should be any time restrictions that the Board may want to put in place as far as the earliest to the petitioner could open for business. She offered that Ms. Rogers had said she had planned to start at 9am, and that that could be noted in the petition. Ms. Trahan also brought attention to the City Code 25.25, which states that the petitioner can have up to one employee, not a member of the household, employed on the premises in the home occupation. She suggested this be put in the motion in the event Ms. Rogers needs to have an employee.

Mr. Decker explained to the petitioner that this would provide the flexibility to have a non-household member help her as an employee.

In response to an inquiry by Mr. Decker, Ms. Rogers indicated that she did plan to have advertising on the premises.

Ms. Trahan informed the petitioner that the allowed signage must be unlit and no larger than 3 square feet.

Mr. Schilling questioned if Ms. Rogers planned to take clients before 9am. Ms. Rogers stated that she could.

Ms. Trahan explained that they would like to put in the motion that hours would be no earlier than 8:00 am so neighbors aren't disturbed. She also added the motion would contain the condition of no overnight stays for the dogs.

A motion was made (DT) and seconded (JM) to grant a special permit under provisions of the city code of New Bedford to Kynsey, Robert and Kathleen Rogers of 90 Brock Avenue New Bedford 02744, relative to the property located at 90 Brock Avenue, Assessor's Map Plot 4 Lot 68 in a Mixed Use District. To allow the petitioner to operate a dog grooming business from 90 Brock Avenue which would require a special permit under Chapter 9 Comprehensive Zoning Sections 2500, 2520-2528 and 5300-5303 and 5360-5390, with the following conditions: that the business not be operated before 8:00 am and that there be no overnight stays of any of the pets; that this project be set forth according to your application and that you record this at the Registry of Deeds.

Motion passed unopposed.

Ms. Trahan apprized the petitioner that it takes approximately 2-3 weeks to get the paperwork for the process. She stated there is also an appeal period where anyone could come in and appeal the petition, and that the paperwork will explain that. She advised Ms. Rogers to not do anything until that process is complete. Then she will need to take the paperwork and record it at the registry so that you are doing it in legal fashion.

A brief recess was called, then hearings resumed.

Case #4132

Communication dated 4/17/14 from the Commissioner of Buildings and Inspectional Services was read into the record.

A motion was made (JM) and seconded (DT) that the communication be received and placed on file.

Motion passed unopposed.

A motion was made (JM) and seconded (DT) that the appeal be received and placed on file.

Motion passed unopposed.

A motion was made (JM) and seconded (DT) that the plan be received and placed on file.

Motion passed unopposed.

A motion was made (JM) and seconded (DT) that the owner of the lots as indicated are the ones deemed by the board to be affected.

Motion passed unopposed.

A motion was made (JM) and seconded (DT) that that the action of the clerk in giving notice of this hearing is hereby ratified.

Motion passed unopposed.

A motion was made (JM) and seconded (DT) that the communication from the Office of the City Planner be received and placed on file.

Motion passed unopposed.

Mr. Decker declared the hearing open.

Bill Lockward from Lockward Architects addressed the Board on behalf of Aramis Arias who is the purchaser of the building at 501/509 Kempton Street. He stated that Mr. Arias would like to renovate the structure to put it back as an active building in the City, as the building has been vacant for several years. Mr. Lockwood explained the purpose of the project is to renovate the ground floor commercial space and subsequently renovate the structure above as a single unit structure. The property has previously been used as offices and apartments, as well as other things.

Mr. Lockward drew the Board's attention to the site plan and aerial photo. He stated that the site plan shows there are seven spaces paved on the site. It's a through block site, so there is available parking on the street on three sides in addition to that which can be fit on the back of the lot. Regarding the structure itself, the ground floor was formerly divided into three separate commercial spaces. The proposal is to divide it into two separate commercial spaces, combining two of those spaces into one and the third one to stay as a separate commercial space. The owner will retain a small storage area on the same level. He stated there is also a basement which is similarly divided, so those basement spaces will go with the commercial spaces on the first floor. The ground floor is about 4000 sq/ft. in area, with about 2000 sq/ft of residential area up above. He directed the Board to photos of the existing structure, formerly the Denmark Pharmacy.

Ms. Trahan asked what the petitioner planned on putting in those spaces. She explained that the intended use for the site would help determine needed parking spaces that the Board is being asked for alleviation from.

Mr. Lockward explained that the petitioner has a tentative interested renter of a barber shop for the smaller of the two spaces. The other space is being developed as a speculative commercial space for either office or retail space.

Mr. Decker expressed interest in the proposed business hours of operation for the commercial spaces.

Mr. Lockward responded that it would depend on the future tenants, but he assumed that normal business hours would apply. He stated that a retail operation may have hours that extend into the early evening.

Mr. Decker asked him to reiterate that the living space above is intended for a single occupant, to which Mr. Lockward concurred.

Ms. Trahan addressed Mr. Romanowicz with regard to what the policy is when a business license is requested regarding parking, as far as what the building will be used for.

Mr. Romanowicz explained that they would take a conservative approach and put in office and retail, which gives a total requirement of 18 spaces. But the petitioner has 7 spaces.

Ms. Trahan asked what happens if the Board approves the petition but there are not enough spaces for what they want to put in the location.

Mr. Romanowicz asked if the petitioner had received a special permit from site plan review.

Mr. Lockward explained they had not received the special permit as of yet, and that they would be petitioning the Planning Board on June 11th.

Ms. Trahan remarked that the Zoning Board would have to set a condition; that as a general practice the matter would be proposed to the Planning Board first and then come before the Zoning Board. She questioned if the Board should continue this matter until after the Site Plan Review.

Mr. Lockward respectfully submitted the applicant was not going to be able to create any more parking spaces, but may be able to condition the use such that we wouldn't lease to any high parking loaded use, like a restaurant.

Ms. Trahan explained that her issue is that since they don't know the type of business, how many employees, or the customer traffic of any future tenant, she is concerned with possible parking issues for the neighbors. She again suggested that this is the reason why a site plan review is generally done first.

Mr. Mathes said the continuation makes sense to him but asked Mr. Lockward if that created any issues for the petitioner.

Mr. Lockward replied that they would be going before the Planning Board June 11th. Mr. Decker confirmed that the next Zoning Board meeting was scheduled for June 26th.

Ms. Trahan explained to Mr. Lockwood that he would need to sign a continuance to be put on the agenda for the June 26th Zoning Board meeting. Then, assuming the Planning Board review was done, this Board could make an informed decision, to which Mr. Lockwood agreed to this suggestion.

A motion was made (DT) and seconded (JM) to continue Case #4132 to the June 26th meeting so that the petitioner has time to be heard by the Planning Board first.
Motion passed unopposed.

Case #4133

Communication dated 4/30/14 from the Commissioner of Buildings and Inspectional Services was read into the record.

A motion was made (JM) and seconded (DT) that the communication be received and placed on file.
Motion passed unopposed.

A motion was made (JM) and seconded (DT) that the appeal be received and placed on file.
Motion passed unopposed.

A motion was made (JM) and seconded (DT) that the plan be received and placed on file
Motion passed unopposed.

A motion was made (JM) and seconded (DT) that the owner of the lots as indicated are the ones deemed by the board to be affected.
Motion passed unopposed.

A motion was made (JM) and seconded (DT) that that the action of the clerk in giving notice of this hearing is hereby ratified.
Motion passed unopposed.

A motion was made (JM) and seconded (DT) that the communication from the Office of the City Planner be received and placed on file.

Motion passed unopposed.

Mr. Decker declared the hearing opened and called upon the petitioner.

Attorney John Janiak of 700 Pleasant Street New Bedford addressed the Board, representing the petitioners Roger and Loraine LaCoste. Att. Janiak explained that Ms. LaCoste purchased 240 Adelaide Street in 2010 from Irma Spiliopoulos. Just prior to that time, Ms. Spiliopoulos owned a larger piece of land that this piece was carved out of into the two lots which appear on the ANR plan, with a notation that the purpose of the subdivision was to create two buildable lots. The 240 Adelaide Street, on which there was the existing structure, and a vacant lot which would then become buildable. So both the buyer and the seller relied in good faith on the subdivision plan. What occurred, when they split the lot in half, 8000 sq/ft plus and more than 100 ft of frontage on both, they at the time were apparently in compliance with zoning.

Att. Janiak related that in 2013, Commissioner Romanowicz wrote an enforcement letter informing Ms. LaCoste that she was in violation of certain side line and set back requirements. On the endorsed plan, the northerly side yard only, consisting of 8 feet at the time, should have been 10 feet. Att. Janiak stated he is unaware of what the thought process of the engineer who prepared that plan was, but Ms. LaCoste regardless was in technical violation of the side line requirement. He stated he can see no other way, except by variance, to correct this.

Atty. Janiak stated that when the land was in common ownership it would have been a simple procedure to fix. However now, with the ownership split, there's no way to correct the problem except by variance. He explained this is clearly a hardship on Ms. LaCoste, who has lived there as a tenant since 1981. He stated the hardship has to do with the configuration of the lot, and that neither she nor the seller of the property was aware of the violation and it certainly wasn't an attempt to avoid zoning. Understanding the importance of an ANR plan, and that it is not a guarantee of zoning, Att. Janiak expressed that it would have been convenient if someone in that office at that time had said the line needed to be moved.

Att. Janiak said he believed the issue came to the attention of Mr. Romanowicz's department in connection with inquiry of whether or not the side yard of the property was buildable. He stated Ms. LaCoste now finds that four years after the property was purchased, it's an apparent zoning violation.

He explained that the southerly side yard and the rear yard are grandfathered in, as those were existing sidelines. The petition provides for relief for sidelines, rear yards, as per the plan. The southerly yard is 4 feet, but again that is a preexisting non-conforming; which as the Board knows, the bylaw in New Bedford doesn't provide for equal side yards. Att. Janiak said he assumed that the engineer misinterpreted the bylaw and deliberately created an 8 foot side yard when he should have created a 10 ft side yard. He concluded by adding that this petition has nothing to do with any intended improvements or changes to the footprint, but is simply to make this lot legal for a house that's been there since 1954.

Mr. Decker expressed that he understands the hardship that's been presented, but what concerns him is that Ms. LaCoste made the purchase with this survey in place, presumably having read the writing on the survey.

Mr. Janiak explained that it was a standard endorsement and she relied that purpose of this subdivision was to create two buildable lots. Typically in residential transactions, zoning is not done by lawyers. Att. Janiak reiterated that Ms. LaCoste has lived there for 33 years and has owned the property now for 4 years.

Ms. Trahan inquired if the property was bought directly through the owner.

Mr. Janiak confirmed it was bought directly from the owner. Ms. Spilipoulos created the subdivision plan and sold the lot to Ms. LaCoste on the basis of that plan, and now there is no other way to correct this. He offered that Ms. LaCoste in a sense is a victim here, as is Ms. Spilipoulos, lacking zoning degrees and backgrounds.

There was no response to Mr. Decker's invitation to be heard in favor.

There was no response to Mr. Decker's invitation to be heard in opposition.

Mr. Decker closed the public hearing.

There being no further discussion, a motion was made (JM) and seconded (BS) to grant a variance under provisions of the City Code of New Bedford to Roger and Lorraine A. LaCoste of 240 Adelaide Street New Bedford MA relative to property located at 240 Adelaide Street, Assessors Map Plot 130 Lot 371 in Residential "A" zone district, and to allow the petitioner to rectify numerous zoning violations due to an (ANR Plan) Approval Not Required Plan created in 2009, which will require a variance under Chapter 9 Comprehensive Zoning Sections 2700 (Dimensional Regulations), 2710 (General), 2720 (Table of Dimensional Requirements (See Appendix B), 2750 (Yard in a Residential District), 2753 (Rear Yards), 2755 (Side Yards), and that the project be set forth according to plans submitted with the application and that it be recorded at the Registry of Deeds and a Building Permit be issued by the Department of the Inspectional Services and acted upon within one year.

During the roll call vote Ms. Trahan, after saying yes, wanted to add for the record that there is a hardship that wasn't caused by the owner herself. However, because of the shape and topography of the land and the structure that already exists, as well as the fact that it wouldn't be a detriment to the neighborhood, she was voting yes.

Motion passes unopposed.

Ms. Trahan explained that it takes approximately two weeks to receive the paperwork. Then there is a 21 day right of appeal after which the petitioner must take the paperwork to the Registry of Deeds to record it.

Case #4135

Communication dated 4/25/14 from the Commissioner of Buildings and Inspectional Services was read into the record.

A motion was made (JM) and seconded (DT) that the communication be received and placed on file.

Motion passed unopposed.

A motion was made (JM) and seconded (DT) that the appeal be received and placed on file.

Motion passed unopposed.

A motion was made (JM) and seconded (DT) that the plan be received and placed on file.

Motion passed unopposed.

A motion was made (JM) and seconded (DT) that the owner of the lots as indicated are the ones deemed by the board to be affected.

Motion passed unopposed.

A motion was made (JM) and seconded (DT) that that the action of the clerk in giving notice of this hearing is hereby ratified.

Motion passed unopposed.

A motion was made (JM) and seconded (DT) that the communication from the Office of the City Planner be received and placed on file.

Motion passed unopposed.

Mr. Decker declared hearing opened and called upon the petitioner.

Kenneth Ferreira, a registered land surveyor and professional civil engineer with offices at 46 Foster Street New Bedford MA, addressed the Board on behalf of petitioner Mr. Gacek who is also present. Mr. Ferreira asked to submit two documents to the Board to assist with his presentation.

A motion was made (DT) and seconded (JM) to receive and place on file the plans and an exhibit submitted. Motion passed unopposed

Mr. Ferreira continued that he originally was contacted by a potential buyer for this lot, and at the time, after researching the Assessors records, found that all of the lots surrounding this lot were owned by someone else and this lot was created by Land Court in 1974. As such, it had proper frontage and proper area to constitute a buildable lot. The exhibit submitted to the Board shows, on the first page, that written prior to December 18th, 2003 states that 'When the lot is more than 100 feet deep, you need to add additional rear yard depth.' 'Where a lot is less than 100 feet deep you may subtract ½ of the diminution in depth below the 100 feet but no less than 12 feet'. Mr. Ferreira explained that in this particular case the lot is about 70 feet deep, which is 30 feet less than the 100 feet, so 15 feet can be subtracted from the 30 feet for the rear yard.

Mr. Ferreira stated that when the new zoning took effect, supposedly there were no major changes. However, after December 18th 2003 they kept Section 2754, which states that when a lot is more than 100 feet deep you need to add rear yard. But strangely enough they dropped the other sentence which said you could reduce the rear yard. Mr. Ferreira explained that that this lot and the whole subdivision of Wilson Street was created many years ago, and at the time none of the lots were 100 feet deep and most of them are now built upon. If the law had been truly grandfathered, then the regulations prior to 2003, since the lot was created in 1974, would have taken affect. Petitioner subsequently found out that in fact the lot directly to the rear, which is Lot 47 owned by Timothy Upham, had been previously owned by Mr. Gacek's father. Then Mr. Gacek purchased this vacant lot from his father a long time ago. Since then, his father has passed away and he has inherited the back lot which has been sold. However, for a moment in time there was a merger of title.

Mr. Ferreira said he believes that the uniqueness is that the shape of the lot certainly doesn't conform to any of the standards today in terms of depth and there is no way to make the lot deeper. He stated there is a minimum set back of 20 feet in the front yard. The house is modest at only 25 feet in width and there's no way to get 30 feet in the rear. Mr. Ferreira expounded that if you looked at 20 feet and 30 feet out of 70, you would have a 20 foot wide house which doesn't make any sense.

Mr. Ferreira repeated that the shape of the lot creates some of this problem and that the hardship was not created by his client but by the fact that the zoning has never been challenged or reinterpreted. Mr. Ferreira mentioned he had spoken to the City Solicitor, and the law is no longer there and he doesn't know why. It was a good law prior to 2003 where there were two scenarios, more than 100 feet deep, less than 100 feet deep, and suddenly it just disappeared. He stated he doesn't think there is a detriment to the public good. Mr. Ferreira explained that this is an over 8000 sq foot lot, well over the 75 foot minimum. It's in conformity with the general lots in the neighborhood, and now a builder has come along to purchase the lot and put up a modest size home 25'x31'. Mr. Ferreira invited questions from the Board.

There being no board questions, Mr. Decker's invited those who wished to speak in favor of the petition. Richard Gacek, 29 Darling Street, Acushnet addressed the Board. He stated as the owner of the property on Wilson Street he has owned the property for almost 40 years with the intent of building a home on it at some point, either in retirement or to sell the land and have a house built on it. About four years ago Mr. Gacek said

he put the land up for sale but the construction market stalled and no one was building houses at that time. About four months ago a builder approached him with an offer to purchase the land with the intent to build a nice single family house on it. Mr. Ferreira drew the plans and submitted them to the Building Department for a permit. It was declined because it didn't have enough footage in the back yard. As a result, we had to go for a variance to have the house built on the lot.

There was no further response to Mr. Decker's invitation to be heard in favor.

In response to Mr. Decker's invitation to speak in opposition, Rosemary Ledoux of 200 Wilson Street addressed the board. She owns the lot across the street from the petitioner. She stated that she is not sure if she is in favor or opposed to the project as she feels she needs more information on some issues. Ms. Ledoux was unclear where the lot's boundaries are, but felt it didn't look deep enough. She related that she was concerned about off street parking because it is a small street with no sidewalks and some foot traffic.

Ms. Trahan and Mr. Decker explained that there does need to be off street parking, as reflected in the proposed plans.

Ms. Ledoux expressed her other concern is how close the house would be to the street.

Mr. Decker tried to help Ms. Ledoux understand that what is being proposed by the construction as submitted complies with the zoning and is within the required set back from the street, which in this case is 20 feet. It also complies with side yard requirements. The issue is that, as proposed, the structure would be 6 feet and some odd inches too close to the rear lot line. And that that is because of the deck that would be on the back of the structure.

Ms. Trahan tried to summarize the explanation further by saying the lot meets all of the requirements except for the depth, which because of the proposed deck will be short of the requirement by 6 or 7 feet.

Mr. Ferreira indicated the foundation is 23' from the rear line. He showed Ms. Ledoux the plans and explained that the house would be 44 feet from the right side line and 45 feet from the left on this large lot. He stated parking will be on the left side of the house. And all roof run off will be directed into infiltrators in the ground so the gutters don't spill out into the street. That it is a relatively small house within a big lot. Mr. Ferreira confirmed that it is one single lot.

Ms. Ledoux explained that originally she had not been sure if it was going to be a single lot and not divided. She was assured by the Board and Mr. Ferreira that it was in fact a single lot.

Also seeking to be heard in opposition, Eileen Dunleavy, who abuts the property directly to the left, signed in and consulted with Mr. Ferreira.

Also seeking to be heard in opposition, Janet Costa, who lives directly across from the petitioner at 194 Wilson Street addressed the Board. Her concern is related to the parking. Ms. Costa stated she has two driveways, one on each side of her house. Currently, to get out of the driveway by backing up, she is almost hitting the petitioners' property line. Ms. Costa explained that she has had two accidents on the street. The first when her daughter's car was parked on the street in front of her house, and the second while her car was in the driveway it was hit by a person driving down the street. Ms. Costa is concerned that additional street parking will make the area very congested.

The Board explained to Ms. Costa that there are no parking restrictions on Wilson Street, but that the plan being proposed will have its own off street parking with two parking spaces.

Mr. Ferreira explained that the potential for four off-street cars existed in the plans.

Ms. Costa said she was also concerned about any problems during construction with ease of her getting into her property.

Mr. Ferreira assured her that all construction and work would take place on the property itself. That obviously in the beginning of construction, large vehicles such as backhoes would be there to dig foundations and such, but that would be temporary.

Mrs. Dunleavy questioned if the variance was just for the back of the house, and Mr. Ferreira confirmed it was.

Mr. Decker asked if after having their questions addressed, they wanted to speak in opposition. All agreed that their questions had been answered and they were not in opposition to the petition.

There was no response to Mr. Decker's invitation for further questions or to be heard or recorded in opposition.

There was no response to Mr. Decker invitation to the board for any further questions regarding the project.

Mr. Decker closed the public hearing.

Mr. Romanowicz did offer the board plans for the house on the intended property.

A motion was made (JM) and seconded (DT) to grant variances under provisions of the City Code of New Bedford to Richard M. Gacek of 29 Darling Street, Acushnet MA, relative to property located at NS Wilson Street Assessors' Map Plot 95 Lot 63 in a Residential "A" zoned district, and to allow the petitioner to construct a single family dwelling with a rear yard deck which will require a variance under Chapter 9 Comprehensive Zoning Sections 2700 (Dimensional Regulations), 2710 (General), 2720 (Table of Dimensional Requirements, Appendix B), 2750 (Yards in Residential Districts) and 2753 (Rear Yards), and that the project be set forth according to plans submitted with the application and that it be recorded with the Registry of Deeds and that the building permit be issued by the Department of Inspection services and that be acted upon within one year.

Motion passed 4-0.

Mr. Decker stated that meeting from last meeting will be carried forward.

A motion was made (DT) and seconded (JM) to table the election of officers until next meeting.

Motion passed unopposed.

Whereupon the meeting was adjourned.