NEEDHAM PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

March 19, 2013

The regular meeting of the Planning Board held in the Charles River Room of the Public Services Administration Building was called to order by Bruce Eisenhut, Chairman, on Tuesday, March 19, 2013 at 7:00 p.m. with Messrs. Warner and Jacobs as well as Planning Director, Ms. Newman and Recording Secretary, Ms. Kalinowski. Ms. McKnight arrived at 7:35 p.m. Mr. Ruth arrived at 9:07 p.m.

Correspondence

Mr. Eisenhut noted the precinct meeting assignments. Precincts were assigned after discussion.

Board of Appeals – March 21, 2013

Gerry Pelissier, 2 Musket Road, Plymouth, MA 02360 – 1185 Highland Avenue.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Warner, and seconded by Mr. Jacobs, it was by the three members present unanimously:
VOTED: "No comment."

Request to authorize Building Permit: Major Project Site Plan Special Permit No. 2013-01: Urgent Care Centers of New England, Inc., 2 Adams Place, Suite 305, Quincy, MA 02169, Petitioner (Property located at 922-958 Highland Avenue, Needham, MA 02492).

Ms. Newman noted the Urgent Care Center is ready to occupy. She has the final plans and they meet the terms of the decision.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Warner, and seconded by Mr. Jacobs, it was by the three members present unanimously:
VOTED: to authorize the Planning Director to authorize the issuance of a building permit.

Appointments

7:00 p.m. – De Minimus Change: Major Project Site Plan Review No. 2011-01: Wingate Senior Living, 63 Kendrick Street, Needham, Massachusetts, Petitioner (Property located at 235 Gould Street, on the westerly side of Gould Street between the Wingate at Needham Nursing Home at 589 Highland Avenue and the MBTA Right of Way).

Mr. Eisenhut noted 3 members were present. One absent member listened to the tape of the hearing. David Kelly, of Kelly Engineering Group, stated it is under construction. The landscaping is still to go in. It will take shape in the next couple of months. He noted there were a few minor changes to take place. They are not obvious changes. The building was slightly changed during the process. The rear element was intended to be exterior and connect. They feel it would be better to enclose it for a direct interior connection. It is also further away from the abutters.

Mr. Kelly noted the main change is to the footprint. A lot of landscape changes have been made. They have changed the drop off area in front to provide more space. They have some parking spaces there now. The walkway entrance has been realigned and the dumpster location has been refined a bit.

Mr. Kelly noted Ms. Newman felt there was one modification that was important to discuss -- the modification to the drainage system. The site is at the bottom of the hill. The system was designed to mitigate all flow off the site as well as all changes. It has been installed and they are pleased with it. They found the gravel area extended further into the site. They want to take advantage and, at a cost, want to add extra stone under the slab. There will be a net increase with the new system of about 12,000 cubic feet of storage. There is a slight loss of storage with the new change at the rear. They had to fill in part of the pipe. He noted they will fill in the slight depression in the rear. There is a 4,900 cubic foot loss but almost a 7,000 cubic foot net gain of storage. The DPW has asked for detail of the catch basin in the depression. He added there are some small architectural changes.

Andrew Stebbins, architect, stated he met with the Design Review Board and they approved the modifications proposed. The new piece in the rear does not extend beyond. They are able to loop the plan with the new connector. There are some doorway revisions and a few additional airways for exhaust. They also had some revisions to color. They have alternated the colors to break down the building mass.

Mr. Jacobs asked if they had independent verification of the net gain. Mr. Kelly stated they did. It has been surveyed and calculated and verified by the DPW. Ms. Newman stated the DPW was happy with all. Mr. Jacobs stated the plan revisions are from October and November. He asked why it took so long to get here today. Roy Cramer, representative for the applicant, stated they had a meeting in November. Mr. Cramer noted it was partially on MBTA property and it was held up by negotiations.

Ms. McKnight arrived at 7:35 p.m.

Mr. Eisenhut noted the following correspondence for the record: a 2003 DPW letter; a memo from Fire Chief Paul Buckley and an email from Lt. John Kraemer of the Needham Police.

Terence Ryan, of 79 Evelyn Road, stated several borings were done at the site. There is ledge rock there. He asked if they found differing conditions and if it will all be graded down. Mr. Kelly stated there were not a lot of surprises due to so many borings that were done. The depression will be filled in and will be graded a little lower. Mr. Ryan noted the dumpster area and asked if there would be any accommodations for noise barriers. Mr. Kelly stated he believes it is fenced. He added it is 7 feet lower than the elevation of the rail bed.

Carolyn Uyenoyana, of 73 Evelyn Road, asked if when they are doing the drainage they would be allowing for future development or will they keep it as open park. Mr. Kelly stated the system designed does not accommodate any development of Parcel A. Ms. Uyenoyana stated the rail trail will impact the area. They need to think about that. She noted the landscaping are the final touches. She asked who you talk to if issues come up such as a light issue. David Feldman, of Wingate Development, stated she should feel free to call him.

Ms. Uyenoyana noted they took down town trees and talked about putting in mature trees. She asked if they were still doing that. Mr. Kelly stated they were. He clarified they have an extensive landscape plan that goes all the way to the railway bed.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Jacobs, and seconded by Mr. Warner, it was by the four members present unanimously:
VOTED: to close the hearing.

Ms. Newman noted Ms. McKnight will listen to the tape. They will vote the relief at the next meeting. Mr. Cramer submitted the approved plans.

Public Hearing:

7:30 p.m. – Major Project Site Plan Special Permit No. 2013-02: Town of Needham by its agent the Needham Permanent Public Building Committee, 500 Dedham Avenue, Needham, MA, Petitioner (Property located at 1407 Central Avenue, Needham, MA).

Upon a motion made by Mr. Jacobs, and seconded by Ms. McKnight, it was by the four members present unanimously:
VOTED: to waive the reading of the public hearing notice.

Hank Haff, Project Manager, noted a salt shed is proposed. It is over 10,000 square feet. They are asking for 2 waivers. The project complies with the Zoning By-Law. It is under 50 feet in height and over 200 feet back from the property lines. It is outside the 100 foot buffer and does not interfere with the Recycling & Transfer Station operations. They received approval from the Design Review Board, who had one minor comment. They went to the Conservation Commission. They had one minor request of additional hay bales. He noted the location is in the middle of the RTS site.

James Fair, of Weston & Sampson, noted the shed was located in the center after a lot of thought. It does not interfere with operations. Mr. Jacobs asked if it would follow the same exit path as cars. Mr. Fair stated they would or they could take the other exit. He noted there will be minimal traffic during a snow event. They went through the RDA process. He noted they will relocate the existing water line. Hay bales were proposed. They were asked to extend the hay bales all the way down and they will. There will be a drive through covered loading area and a covered equipment storage area at the side. The drive through section will be 4 feet lower.

Mr. Fair noted there will be a 35 foot clearance to the inside lowest point. The overhead door is 32 feet high and he showed the Board the elevations. He noted there will be skylights for natural day lighting and they have minimized the lighting on the outside. There will be a couple of wall mounted exterior lights. There is a zero foot candle impact and a minimal increase in lighting.

Mr. Fair stated the salt loading process is totally within the building. Ms. McKnight asked how they would come in. Mr. Fair noted they enter on the east side at the same entrance but take a hard right to follow the truck route to the building. Then they exit out the normal exit path. Mr. Jacobs asked what would be stored in the equipment storage shed. Mr. Fair stated there would be no gas or combustible equipment. It could be sander bodies. Mr. Jacobs noted there were no employee rooms or bathrooms. Mr. Fair stated that was correct. They can use the existing facilities.

Mr. Jacobs noted the footprint was 13,035 square feet but is now 14,296. Mr. Fair stated they did not account for the canopy. The 14,296 number is correct. Mr. Haff noted 3 sides of the structure are concrete.

Mr. Eisenhut noted the following correspondence for the record: an email from Janice Berns of the Board of Health with no comments; a letter from Town Engineer Anthony DelGaizo with no comments or objections; a memo from Police Chief Phil Droney with no safety concerns; a memo from Fire Chief Paul Buckley with no safety concerns and a memo from the Conservation Commission with a determination of the applicability.

Michael Leabman, of 1490 Central Avenue, noted he was at the Conservation Commission meeting. He raised some concerns operationally. He hoped some would be incorporated tonight. He stated a number of the issues raised were not addressed tonight. He had requested the route the trucks take be rerouted to the middle of the site. He noted the route they selected is closest to where he lives. DPW Director Richard Merson stated there were a number of routes around the site. This is the best with no backup noises. There are a couple of routes to Central Avenue.

Mr. Leabman stated during the day is fine but at night, or when the RTS is closed, he would like a shorter route down the middle of the site. Mr. Merson stated the routes would not be there once the salt shed is built. Mr. Eisenhut asked Mr. Merson if he would meet with Mr. Leabman to discuss routes.

Mr. Leabman asked if there was a way to contain the salt on site. A possible path of the water from that area is to his driveway. He would like to minimize salt pollution to the site. Mr. Fair stated all salt is stored in the building. Surface water runoff will be captured within the catch basin. Mr. Leabman asked what are best practices and stated he would like to see them.

John McCarthy, of 1509 Central Avenue, stated he is strongly opposed to the construction of a salt shed. He stated other capped landfills have become playgrounds. Our capped landfill is becoming a dumping ground for everything. He stated it is ugly and undesirable. He stated it decreases the value of their property and diminishes the quality of their life. He feels they will see and hear trucks all the time. He is concerned with the contamination of wetlands. He noted nothing guarantees the elimination of all these issues. He would like to meet and address these issues. He presented a letter to the Board. He stated they have done a great job but have not addressed his issues. He feels there would be a lot of compromise on his end.

Eric Weinstock, of 1501 Central Avenue, stated he agreed with the previous speakers. Ms. McKnight asked if a condition in the permit that the route would be used only for municipal vehicles or contractors contracted by the town would be acceptable. Mr. Merson stated they never sold salt to others. Mr. Jacobs asked what the clause was for wetland contamination. Ms. Newman stated the Conservation Commission made a finding. Mr. McCarthy stated he went to the Conservation meeting and was told it was not the forum. He went on the record.

For purposes of discussion Ms. McKnight made a motion to continue the hearing for further information to the next meeting. Mr. Jacobs asked what Ms. McKnight would like to hear. Ms. McKnight stated she would like alternate routes discussed and brought back to us. Also one plan had anti-tracking pads during construction. She does not see the pads after the construction is done.

Mr. Warner stated the proposed route has been used for years. Mr. Eisenhut stated they could have a condition that the proponents have discussed this in good faith and leave it at that. Katherine McCarthy, of 1509 Central Avenue, stated she wants a little containment for consideration. Stephen Popper, Project Manager, stated a route change would interfere with operations at the RTS. He stated there are a limited amount of times during the year they would use this. He commented they may not have a meeting of the minds.

Upon a motion made by Ms. McKnight, and seconded by Mr. Jacobs, it was by the four members present unanimously:
VOTED: to continue the hearing to April 2, 2013 at 8:30 p.m. for further information.

8:00 p.m. – Amendment to Major Project Site Plan Special Permit No. 2010-03: F & A Farms, Inc. d/b/a Volante Farms, 226 Brookside Road, Needham, MA, Petitioner (Property located at 292 Forest Street, Needham, MA).

Dave Volante, the applicant, stated they would like to enclose a small porch in front of the farm stand. The purpose is for display of wine and craft beer in the future. It does not alter the footprint.

Mr. Eisenhut noted the following correspondence for the record: a letter from Town Engineer Anthony DelGaizo dated 3/6/13; an email from Janice Berns of the Board of Health, dated 3/1/13, with no comment and an email from Police Lt. John Kraemer, dated 2/28/13, with no safety concerns.

Ms. Newman stated this requires a parking waiver. She stated they actually added 2 spaces. The numbers are fine but they did not meet the design standards. Ms. McKnight noted there was an issue with the handicap parking spaces and asked how it was resolved. Mr. Volante stated the spaces are on the plan now and have been approved by Engineering. He stated the 4 spaces are the fix. Ms. Newman noted they relocated the spaces and fixed the grading. Engineering did an inspection. She wants a sign off letter from them. She thinks the town and the Commission on Disabilities are satisfied.

Mr. Jacobs stated he does not want a 320 square foot addition that can only be used for wine and beer. Ms. Newman stated they will only put retail there.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Warner, and seconded by Mr. Jacobs, it was by the four members present unanimously:
VOTED: to close the hearing.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Warner, and seconded by Mr. Jacobs, it was by the four members present unanimously:
VOTED: to grant the relief requested for an amendment to a Major Project Site Plan Special Permit to allow an addition and grant a parking waiver.

De Minimus Change: Major Project Site Plan Review Special Permit No. 1995-09, Vinodivino (Raphael Keller-Go), 899 Walnut Street, Newton, MA 02461, Petitioner (Property located at 922-958 Highland Avenue, Needham, MA).

Roy Cramer, representative for the applicant, noted this has been licensed by the Board of Selectmen. He noted Hollywood Video is being divided into 2 units. Carewell has half the space and the rest is being leased by Mr. Keller-Go. He noted the window system on the Highland Avenue side will be reworked into a door and window system. On the parking lot side they will use the existing door. They will move it over a couple of feet.

John Scanlon reviewed the history and the proposed conditions. He noted they will fill in a small piece with glazing and wrap around with brick. Mr. Cramer stated there is no change in use. It is retail to retail. They went to the Design Review Board who approved the plan and approved the signage. He noted there will be 4 lights above the windows. The Design Review Board feels they should be replaced with 3 lights.

Ms. McKnight asked about security. There are 2 exit/entrances. She asked where the cashiers are. Mr. Keller-Go stated there would be 2 cashier stations near the door.

Mr. Ruth arrived at 9:07 p.m.

Ms. McKnight stated she would have liked existing controls on deliveries in this mall. Mr. Cramer stated the hours of operation will be Monday through Saturday 10:00 a.m. to 8:30 p.m. and Sunday noon to 5:00 p.m.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Jacobs, and seconded by Ms. McKnight, it was by the five members present unanimously:
VOTED: to approve the requested relief.

Decision: Amendment to Major Project Site Plan Special Permit No. 91-3: North Hill Needham, Inc., Petitioner (Property located at 865 Central Avenue, Needham, MA).

Ms. Newman noted they had reviewed the draft decision 3/19/13. They had the red lined version tonight. She noted the 3/12/13 letter regarding LEED Certification has been recognized in the decision on page 6. She added Exhibit 12 and in paragraph 1.26 they have acknowledged the commitments made. Ms. McKnight asked if there is a provision that refers back to the prior conditions. Mr. Cramer stated 3.1 listed all prior conditions. Ms. Newman clarified all previous conditions have been included.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Ruth, and seconded by Mr. Jacobs, it was by the five members present unanimously:
VOTED: to grant the requested relief in the form of the decision tonight.

ANR Plan – 78 & 90 Green Street (Morton and Lynn Hyams and 90 Green Street LLC, Petitioners).

Michael Zafiropoulos, representative for the applicant, stated he got involved at the last hours. He stated he was there for his wife and brother-in-law. He has submitted a plan for endorsement subdivision approval not required (ANR)and is not aware of any amendment being presented. He stated he spoke with Field Resources. They were going to get a piece of land from the abutters, the Hyams. He was told to go forth with a 3 parcel plan. He went forward with the plan before them. He was informed today that the Planning Director will put on a plan note that it does not conform. He stated this is a proposed amendment. There was no hearing or vote taken. Ms. Newman clarified it was published and they had a hearing.

Mr. Zafiropoulos stated as of now the lots conform to 81P. Mr. Ruth stated he does not feel they have anything in front of them. It is not validly signed. Mr. Zafiropoulos noted he does not feel the Board has the authority to put a notation on that Lots 1 and 2 are in violation of the proposed amendment. He suggested they amend the wording endorsed after a certain date. He would like to preserve the timing.

Mr. Jacobs asked what is wrong with "the lot width for Lots 1 and 2 as shown may violate." Mr. Zafiropoulos suggested, from a zoning perspective, they attach a letter to the plan held by the zoning enforcement office. Mr. Eisenhut stated it does not protect innocent purchasers. Mr. Jacobs stated he feels the language there is enough. He is not sure they have an obligation to call out the issues. He clarified the Planning Director is trying to avoid criticism and call it out.

Mr. Zafiropoulos suggested "the owners are aware of the published notice dated 2/7/13 with the proposed amendment to amend Article 2 subsection 4.1.1.5." Ms. McKnight commented she feels that is perfect. Mr. Eisenhut agreed.

Upon a motion made by Ms. McKnight, and seconded by Mr. Jacobs, it was by four of the five members present (Mr. Ruth voted in the negative):
VOTED: to endorse plan subdivision ANR with the added note as discussed.

ANR Plan – 171 Warren Street (J. Derenzo Properties LLC, Petitioners).

Ms. Newman noted there is an issue of the application. It came in with the LLC signed by an individual. Mr. Warner commented they cut down trees but there is no tree ordinance. He wants to call attention to this. This is a historic house. He would like to discuss town preservation rights. This is not a valid application at this time.

Jay Derenzo, of J. Derenzo Properties LLC, stated he would be willing to talk to anyone about buying the house. Mr. Warner stated he does not want to buy it. He wants to preserve the building. He would like the Historic Commission to call Mr. Derenzo tomorrow.

Ms. Newman stated the ANR plan has been reviewed and is fine. Mr. Eisenhut stated he agreed with Mr. Ruth this has not been properly executed. Ms. Newman stated she received the application and it was not signed by the manager. It needed to be re-signed and resubmitted. Mr. Jacobs stated it is a technical violation. They should submit the identical thing, get it date stamped and it is all set.

Ms. McKnight noted she sees a line with the name of the applicant. The records of the Secretary of State say a certain person is the manager of the LLC. The application has the signature of the applicant and the name is given above. The person who signed it is the manager. She feels that is good enough for her.

Mr. Ruth stated it is a substantive issue. The plan needs to show no portion of the structure can be built on the north side of the parcel after the break in line because of the lot width issue. A motion was made to deny the application under ANR as an insufficient application. Mr. Jacobs stated they do not recognize the application as being appropriate or correctly filed.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Ruth, and seconded by Mr. Warner, it was by the five members present unanimously:

VOTED: to withdraw the Warren Street application without prejudice.

ANR Plan – 78 & 90 Green Street (Morton and Lynn Hyams & 90 Green Street, LLC, Petitioners).

Upon a motion made by Mr. Ruth, and seconded by Mr. Warner, it was by the five members present unanimously:
VOTED: to accept the withdrawal of the Green Street application without prejudice.

9:30 pm. -- Article 2:PB Amend Zoning By-Law – Dimensional Regulations
Article 3:PB Amend Zoning By-Law – Lot Width Definition/Measurement
Article 6:PB Amend Zoning By-Law – Dimensional Regulations for Mixed-Use 128 Zoning District

Ms. Newman noted on Article 2 six lots had a taking. She put language in the zoning to exempt all lots with less than 5,000 square feet and 50 feet of frontage. Town Counsel David Tobin still needs to finish his investigation.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Ruth, and seconded by Ms. McKnight, it was by the five members present unanimously:
VOTED: to recommend adoption at Town Meeting.

Ms. Newman noted on Article 3 there is a concern it is too complicated. Mr. Jacobs stated Attorney Robert Smart's language works. Ms. McKnight noted they do not always have a straight line for the side line. She asked how they can draw a parallel line from the side line. Mr. Jacobs stated it should start at the front corner.

Gary Kaufman, of Eaton Road, stated he has a concern that in the future an elderly couple with a 30,000 square foot lot may need to sell their house and the house is quite dilapidated. Only a developer would buy it. It is 30,000 square feet but it is not a perfectly square lot. It could be divided into 2 15,000 square foot lots that are non-conforming. He feels the Board is starting to take away people's property rights. He stated care and caution needs to be taken with the value of people's property.

Ms. McKnight stated they should measure the lot width with a series of parallel lines perpendicular to a front line. Ms. Newman stated they should establish the first line in front and all lines are parallel to that. They should start at a front corner and go perpendicular to a side line. Ms. Newman stated Building Inspector David Roche suggested Mr. Smart's language was ok up to "for corner lot", then he suggested his own language. He feels it should say "shall be measured." Mr. Kaufman stated it was technical. He feels they should ask a surveyor to help. Mr. Ruth noted it should go to Town Meeting. Mr. Jacobs stated they have the basics. It is just tinkering now.

Upon a motion made by Ms. McKnight, and seconded by Mr. Warner, it was by the five members present unanimously:
VOTED: to send the Selectmen a request that a place be held for this Article in the Special Town Meeting.

Ms. Newman noted the Council of Economic Advisors is supportive of the changes to Article 6. Matt Talcoff, of the CEA, stated they are in support. Mr. Ruth stated there was no reason to do upzoning if it was not going to be successful. He is glad to know the business community thought it would be successful. Mr. Talcoff stated the CEA held the second set of symposiums last year. The business owners were supportive and in favor of rezoning. Mr. Ruth asked if the businesses feel this will prompt some activity. Mr. Talcoff stated they do.

Mr. Jacobs stated he is on the CEA. He noted Mr. Ruth's assumption is not quite right. The existing group of owners is small. He thinks it will be a bigger group that will do this.

Simon Boyd, of the Winhall Company, stated he feels increasing the Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR) requirement is over restricting. They cannot get to the maximum height. There is no way to do the maximum development if the

FAR is increased. It does not entice development. Mr. Ruth stated he hears Mr. Boyd is speaking against it. He feels there is no reason to bring it to Town Meeting if it is not going to work. Mr. Jacobs clarified Mr. Boyd wants to go ahead without FAR. Mr. Boyd stated he agrees with 4 out of 5 points but feels FAR should be out.

Mr. Jacobs commented he thinks the CEA feels FAR in that zone is a mistake and other regulations are enough. With FAR development cannot build out. Mr. Warner noted they have a proposal with the controversial issue of FAR. He asked if they should bring it up in the fall. Mr. Talcoff noted the CEA is in favor of this first step. It will allow assembly of sites. This might happen with 4 out of 5.

Mr. Ruth stated he is concerned an analysis from a different part of the Industrial District where there are bigger lots is being used here. They should do the hard homework and study this area. Mr. Talcoff stated there are some similarities. They could do a study but he is not sure it will give any different information.

Upon a motion made by Ms. McKnight, and seconded by Mr. Warner, it was by the five members present unanimously:

VOTED: to recommend this Mixed-Use 128 Article and request it be put on the warrant for the Annual Town Meeting.

Ms. Newman noted Article 4 is a half story definition clarification.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Ruth, and seconded by Mr. Warner, it was by the five members present unanimously:

VOTED: to recommend adoption of Article 4.

Ms. Newman noted re: Article 2 that dimensional controls get rid of inconsistencies.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Jacobs, and seconded by Mr. Warner, it was by the five members present unanimously:

VOTED: to recommend adoption of Article 2.

Ms. Newman noted re: the Selectmen's Article 1, they are proposing a moratorium on medical marijuana. The Attorney General has disapproved by-laws prohibiting Medical Marijuana dispensaries but supported moratorium by-laws..

A motion was made to recommend adoption of Article 1. Mr. Eisenhut stated he is opposed. He feels it sends the wrong message – a terrible message -- they were trying to bar them. He feels as a town they need to take a compassionate approach. They should have a convenient location, not out of sight. He feels it is morally wrong. He believes they have the zoning tools right now to deal with this. They call it a medical clinic. He stated it is called a medical clinic no matter where it is located and it needs a Special Permit. It should not be treated different from any other lawful use. He reiterated they do not need a moratorium. They can do it right now. It is similar in kind and similar in impact. This is a zoning moratorium and not a police power issue.

Ms. McKnight stated maybe the Board will find out their current zoning works well but they need to look at it. Mr. Jacobs stated they could oppose the moratorium or be fully in support of a moratorium although they have no request yet. They could study it. He does not feel there are zoning issues here. They are not going to support or oppose as there is no zoning issue. Ms. Newman stated the change is a zoning change. Mr. Eisenhut noted they are using the zoning as an excuse. Mr. Warner suggested saying they do not see a planning issue.

Mr. Ruth noted there is a lot to what Mr. Eisenhut was saying but the food aspect made him think it was more complicated. He does not feel it should be shunted to a corner. Mr. Jacobs stated other Boards in town have expressed they have some issues. Ms. McKnight noted they do not need to study it as they would characterize it as a medical clinic. Mr. Jacobs agreed and noted the Planning Board zoning covers the locations for those. Ms. McKnight withdrew the motion to recommend adoption of Article 1..

Minutes

Upon a motion made by Ms. McKnight, and seconded by Mr. Jacobs, it was by the five members present unanimously:
VOTED: to accept the minutes of 12/4/12.

Upon a motion made by Ms. McKnight, and seconded by Mr. Jacobs, it was by the five members present unanimously:
VOTED: to adjourn the meeting at 11:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Donna J. Kalinowski, Notetaker

Sam Bass Warner

Sam Bass Warner, Vice-Chairman and Clerk