

**City of Newburyport  
Planning Board  
January 4, 2023**

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 PM.

**1. Roll Call**

Planning Board Attendance: Alden Clark, Bob Koup, Jamie Pennington, Rick Taintor and Don Walters

Planning Board Attendance – Remote: Beth DeLisle and Richard Yeager

Absent: Heather Rogers

Planning Director Andy Port and note taker Caitlyn Marshall were also present.

**2. Annual Election**

Rick Taintor summarized the roles of the officers. Rick Taintor stated that he would like to move from Vice Chair to Chair. He also shared that Bob Koup would like to be Vice Chair and Alden Clark would like to be Secretary.

Don Walters made a motion to approve the slate of officers recommended by Rick Taintor. Jamie Pennington seconded the motion. All members voted in favor.

**3. Public Hearings**

- a) *Walt Thompson*  
*100 State Street*  
*Special Permit (PBSP-22-10)*  
*Continued from 12/7/22*

Walt Thompson stated the property is a three-story brick building built in about 1800 across from the Dalton Club and next to the municipal parking lot. His condominium unit in the building has a private entrance and a dedicated driveway. The problem he has been having is that a lot of rain comes down from the roof. They get soaked going in and out. He stated he has gone through a series of designs with brackets. The front of the building has a portico roof and columns. It is pitched with a downspout to the right. He is proposing to address the side entrance with a roof and columns to mirror the front entrance. It would have 8-inch diameter wooden columns and a flat roof, as well as maintain the iron railing. He stated the plans said wooden railings, but iron railings are what are in the front of the building. Mr. Thompson stated they basically looked at the front of the building and said let's make it look the same. He stated there are no gutters on the roof. They would maintain the granite steps that are there.

Don Walters asked Walt Thompson to help him understand if he considered using a gutter if his primary concern is water when it rains when he enters into his residence. Walt Thompson answered yes. He said the major concern is water coming down on their heads as they entered and exited the building. Carol Thompson, who also lives at the property, stated that the reason they cannot have a gutter on that roof is because it is not historically correct.

Don Walters asked how is this addition is any more or less intrusive than having a gutter on at least on that one side. Walt Thompson stated the entrance faces the North side and they get a lot of wind, rain and precipitation. They were looking for something that gave them protection. Carol Thompson said they couldn't get out the door in the wintertime without the protection of the roof. She stated it gets icy. This is their only exit because that is where their car is. She shared they got a diverter this year; the rain doesn't come straight down now it goes to the side. She shared the roof would help a lot.

Walt Thompson stated the entrance goes right into the living room. They are trying to get some protection.

Robert Koup stated he noticed the two columns sit at different elevation in terms of the tops of the steps.

Walt Thompson stated they are asymmetrical. He said extending the roof to the top step gives a little more protection of rain and more space. He stated if they were to move that column off the step and onto the landing it would give them less space.

Bob Koup suggested Walt Thompson find a way to sit the base of the right hand column to be at the same elevation as the left.

Bob Koup asked if the columns are intended to be the same as the columns in the front? Walt Thompson said the columns are 8-inch diameter and the ones in the front of the house are 12-inch diameter. He stated they are identical, just a smaller size for smaller footprint.

Richard Yeager applauded the elegant design solution. He noted that there is a downspout in the drawings and asked if that needs to be done. Would a scupper be sufficient?

Walt Thompson stated the downspout is there because there is one on the existing front entry on the building. They made the roofs identical.

Carol Thompson asked what a scupper is. Richard Yeager said that a scupper is a gutter that extends beyond and allows the water to freefall down. It acts like a downspout without a downspout physically being there.

Carol Thompson asked if they needed to have the scupper. Richard Yeager stated he was just raising the question. He was not sure what the Historical Commission would say.

Bob Koup said that the drawing shows a gutter that wraps around that roof that connects to the downspout. He asked if it is wooden or aluminum. Walt Thompson stated the roof will be slightly tilted towards State Street and it is a metal gutter that goes towards the driveway away from the building.

Richard Yeager asked to clarify if the gutter is on one side, the slope side or all three sides. Walt Thompson said it is on the side that faces State Street, and not on all three sides.

Rick Taintor stated that the drawing shows a gutter going around the roof. He said the two drawings don't match.

Director Port said there is an inconsistency in the drawings and there is need to clarify the gutter. He stated he want to make sure there is clarity in what Walt Thompson is proposing.

Carol Thompson said when they did the plans with the architect they had several choices. She is wondering if they put the wrong drawing in. The gutter is on one side, the side that faces State Street.

Bob Koup said the point the Board is trying to make is that the applicant went through great lengths to preserve the historical character of the building. The gutter detracts from it, it is not appropriate. He would suggest the applicant look for a solution that eliminates the gutter and the downspout. Then the applicant would be left with the historical detail they already have.

Walt Thompson stated they could tip the water towards the driveway and have it spill over. He stated they do not know what to do with the water.

Rick Taintor stated that the last image shows the portico roof pitched and drains away from the steps. The detail plan confuses things. The plan before does not show the gutter and downspout, which is the plan they are looking for. In addition, adding a block to the right hand column to bring it up to the same level as the left hand column.

Richard Yeager stated that looking at the plans there is a slight pitch to the roof and it can be concealed. It is pitched away from the building. The scupper can catch all that water and at that one corner drop it to the ground away from the staircase. He said that this type of solution has been done on this type of building many times over.

Public comment opened  
No comments.  
Public comment closed

Rick Taintor asked for a motion to eliminate the gutter and downspout, add the block to raise the base of the right column level to the left column, and allow a scupper and detail

of pitch of roof to be left up to final review of Office of Planning and Development.

Director Port clarified if the board would be approving plan without gutter and downspout. A scupper would be allowed if the applicant desired.

Richard Yeager made a motion to approve the special permit. Jamie Pennington seconded the motion.

Don Walters wanted to clarify the motion and the inclusion of a scupper is strictly optional for the applicant and to be reviewed by the Office of Planning and Development.

Director Port stated the written description would describe what was approved.

Beth DeLisle wanted to note that the last plan shows the pitch of the roof would need to change as well. The pitch would need to be away from building. She said right now it is pitching towards State Street.

Richard Yeager suggests it pitch away from building.

Beth DeLisle clarified the Office of Planning and Development would approve a change to the pitch.

Rick Taintor stated he would incorporate those thoughts.

All members voted in favor.

**Motion Approved.**

***b) Steven J. Lewis***

***2-6 Market Street***

***Special Permit Amendment (PBSP-22-12)***

Attorney Lisa Mead introduced herself, as well as Scott Brown and Matt Langis. She stated that in 2019 the Board granted an ITIF special permit to allow a payment in lieu of providing six required parking spaces at 2-6 Market Street. The mixed-use building consists of five residential units and originally it had 1800 square feet of commercial space. The parking requirement under the ordinance is nine parking spaces for the residential units and six parking spaces for the commercial use. The applicant at the time proposed using a lift to accommodate ten of the spaces on site.

The applicant has revised the plan to increase the commercial space to 2100 square feet by adding a 400 square foot mezzanine for the new tenant. There would be one tenant in the entire commercial space. They want the mezzanine to be used by their employees only, not to be used by the clients of the new tenant. As a result of the 2100 square feet the actual commercial space parking requirements will go to seven.

Attorney Lisa Mead stated that additionally the owners and consultants were informed

that the lift system that was originally proposed for the ten spaces in the rear cannot be used on the site given the east-west slope on the site that is needed to accommodate the storm water system. If there are no lifts on site there will be six and not eleven parking spaces on site. A total of sixteen parking spaces are now required, of which six will be provided on site. There are already six accounted for under the ITIF special permit. The applicant is requesting that the ITIF special permit be amended to allow payment for four more spaces, for a total of 10 spaces.

Attorney Lisa Mead addressed the approved plan, which shows the proposed lifts at the rear of the building. The building is structured to accommodate the lifts and the goal was to accommodate the lifts. However, the lift vendor informed the applicant that because the slope is more than three degrees across the back, the lift system won't work. She stated what they are now proposing instead is five spaces in the back against the building. The sixth space is tucked in the right hand corner, which was approved in the original plan. Under second 7A in the ordinance, the applicant is requesting approval to make a payment in lieu of four additional spaces through the ITIF special permit. The owner was looking forward to installing the lift system, however, it is not possible to install the lift system physically. This was not known at the time of permitting.

Attorney Mead stated that there is one other complicating factor, which would have necessitated the applicant to come back for a modification anyway. The Assistant Building Inspector determined a handicap space is required on site where one of the lifts was to be. Attorney Mead stated she disagrees with the Assistant Building Inspector, because the code states you do not have to provide handicap parking space if you have between zero and fifteen parking spaces. However, a handicap space must be provided before the applicant can obtain a certificate of occupancy. One of the residential units is occupied right now. Instead of going through a six to nine month appeal, the applicant has added the handicap space to the site plan.

The applicant is asking for an ITIF Special Permit for an additional 4 spaces. The applicant will not install a lift system that will be unsafe. The residential units will continue to use the on-site parking spaces, of which there will be six and there are only five units. That would be at least one space per residential unit. The remaining spaces will be accommodated through an ITIF payment.

Alden Clark asked a question about the handicap space. Is that required due to the commercial square footage? It is there because of the commercial space not the residential space?

Attorney Mead stated that the handicap space is not for the commercial space, but for all the spaces in total. We are not seeking an occupancy permit for the commercial space. The Assistant Building Director required the handicap space when the applicant was seeking an occupancy permit for the residential space.

Alden Clark stated the ordinance seemed the handicap space was required because of commercial space. He wanted to confirm the space at the site is for residential not

commercial. Attorney Lisa Mead stated that was correct.

Public comment opened

Jim McCauley of 27 Storeybook Drive came forward. He is a Newburyport City Counselor and member of the Public Safety Committee, which oversees parking. He stated that the ordinance says the parking requirement can be accommodated for properties near a municipal facility by paying into the fund. However, none of the municipal lots allow for overnight parking, the only exception being a small section of the intermodal garage, which is currently full. He asked how the Board is going to address this. He does think the ordinance needs some updating and clarification going forward. He talked about the intermodal garage and long term planning and stated that the garage could be sold at another time. This is part of the discussion they have when trying to accommodate growth within the city itself. He stated that granting additional access to the special permit should be under further review.

Beatrice Kelsey-Watts, a resident on Market Street came forward as well. She asked if the extra permit parking spaces were for on Market Street or the parking lot/garage.

Rick Taintor stated the parking spaces would be for a parking lot or garage.

Public comment closed.

Rick Taintor said that previously this wouldn't have been an issue because all the ITIF spaces were commercial spaces, but these are residential ones.

Attorney Lisa Mead wanted to address that comment. She stated the ordinance says it does not guarantee parking. The applicant has a right to rely on the ordinance. The ordinance prior to the ITIF said if you are within 300 feet of a public parking facility that counts as your parking. The idea was with the construction of the parking garage and the creation of a pay parking system the ITIF system was adopted. If you are going to park in the downtown or build property downtown that requires parking you should help pay for the provision of parking. If the City wants to change how it addresses downtown parking, the City Council needs to change the zoning. Otherwise we are allowed to rely on the zoning that has a standard and specifically says it doesn't guarantee parking.

Don Walters commented was that without having intense discussion with the supplier he can't accept that the lift system is impossible to do. He understands if they don't follow a standard design a warranty may not be in effect. He does not think the lift system should be ruled out. He is the only person currently on the Board who was present when the special permit was approved in December 2019, and he voted to approve it because he knew the residents that would park there would have a permanent place to park. He then stated the ordinance simply says you pay into the fund. It does not say what you can do with it. He hopes the neighbors understand that when an applicant pays into the fund the occupants can still park on the street. It does not mean they have to use the garage. Don said the special permit is at the Board's option, it is not at the applicant's option. His vote

is no.

Bob Koup agreed with Don Walters. He would like to see more discussion about the stackers. He said maybe it is not for the entire width of the site, maybe for just some of the spaces. He stated the applicant would need to show the board it is not possible to do that.

Rick Taintor said that looking at the minutes of the November 2<sup>nd</sup> he asked for an engineer to look at the parking to state that it was impossible with the grades. He said the Board did not get that information. The applicant submitted an email from the vendor saying this particular system would not work. He stated going back to when the board first approved this, residents came out and were concerned about people parking on the streets. He believed specifically about overnight parking. He stated there is a difference between commercial parking and residential parking in his point of view. That said, the Board is backed into a corner with the applicant coming in last minute looking for a certificate of occupancy and the Board is holding it up because of things that were not carefully assessed in the design of the project.

Bob Koup asked for clarification from Attorney Mead. He asked if she had stated there were nine residential spaces that were required. Attorney Mead agreed. Bob Koup stated if there are six surface spaces the applicant needs to make the stackers work on three spaces. Attorney Mead stated that was correct. Bob Koup then stated this is more about residential parking than commercial parking. He said if the way of getting to nine spaces is to make the stackers work within grading parameters in three of those spots, he has to believe the applicant could make that work.

Attorney Lisa Mead said she would let Mr. Langis address that comment. She stated she was not apart of the original hearing process, but she did go back and review all the minutes and there was not a lot of discussion, if any, from the residents about the parking.

Matt Langis stated they had researched into numerous systems. The manufacturers and installers not only won't warranty it, but they will not install it as well. He said the lifts are a life safety issue. There are four different slopes in each parking space. There is an east to west slope and a north to south slope. He said from a financial perspective, the lifts are \$4,000 to \$5,000 dollars, which is much less than paying into the ITIF fund. Matt Langis stated that they found out well into construction the lifts wouldn't work. The applicant believed that paying into the ITIF fund for parking was already under the special permit. When they found out the slopes were an issue, the back door had already been set. The accessible door is required by code. Potentially they could put lifts in the first or second parking spots. With those grades a car would bottom out. The applicant went through extensive research with single, two, and four post lifts. There are many different slopes they are working with so it won't work. If it was a left to right issue they could have made it work with shimming one side. It is not possible to install these in a safe way. Even if they could have raised the door in the back to a different elevation, he is not sure they would have been able to get the lifts to work.

Bob Koup asked Matt Langis to explain to the Board the requirement of the four different slopes.

Matt Langis said the cross slope is what they are concerned with. Each parking space has its own slope because of a sixty degree angle and drainage on site. He said this is the grading the applicant was left with. Even if they were able to match the slopes, the entire lift would be installed at an angle and you couldn't drive on it. Each spot is more complicated or worse the more you go along.

Bob Koup said that the applicant only has to make the lifts work in three spaces. He found it hard to believe the applicant could not work with the pavement to make the lifts work in three spaces.

Steve Lewis, president of Newburyport Properties LLC and resident at 11 Windward Drive, stated that he came to the Board two and a half years ago to improve the city and create a nice development. He came to the Board with intention to have the first lift system in the city. He still wants the lifts to work. He has had subject matter experts visit the site. His intention was to provide the building with parking. He stated he asked his team to do a vigorous inspection. He said that what they are presenting to the Board is the reality. He needs to come to the Board and ask for an extension or more significant allowance to the ITIF fund. He said this is not financial and he wants the lifts in his building. He said he regrettably wouldn't be able to install the lifts.

Alden Clark asked if there is a presentation that drainage can't be reengineered to provide the spaces to be level for the lifts.

Matt Langis said even if the applicant were able to re-grade this back lot, the approach which is the dashed line and the line between the handicap space has to stay the same. The applicant would need to come down a significant amount in order to get those three spaces to be level. They can't raise the middle space up and down which locks us in to what we can do to the left or right of it.

Attorney Lisa Mead asked the board to get a sense of the board before they take a motion. Rick Taintor asked if Attorney Lisa Mead was looking for that to avoid a negative vote. Attorney Lisa Mead stated that is what she was looking for. She said that they met on site. She stated she asked all the questions and it doesn't seem possible. She said the applicant needs to have parking or relief. She would like to hear where the board is on it. She wants her client to hear before a negative vote happens. They do not want to go through a six to nine month appeal and lose a commercial tenant. She stated the applicant has one residential tenant right now. The applicant would have an unoccupied building during the appeal. She respectfully requests to get a sense from the Board.

Rick Taintor asked how the Board felt. He stated there were two options, to look for continuance or get a sense of the Board before taking a vote.

Beth DeLisle stated she was on the Board when the Board approved this special permit



and the fact that the parking was all on site was significant to their analysis of the project. There is some contention if the handicap needs to be there. If it the handicap spot did not need to be there, is there potential to re-grade and make the lifts work? She said she would like to see more documentation indicating it is really impossible to put the lifts in. She also stated Attorney Mead said there would need to be four additional spaces, but the summary she received said there was six additional spaces needed.

Attorney Lisa Mead said the request is to have four additional ITIF spaces. The board already granted six ITIF spaces. The applicant is only looking for one brand new space, which is due to the increase of the commercial space.

Matt Langis stated that even if there were five spaces on site, an ADA space would still be required. Appealing this decision would take significantly longer than to go along with the assessment.

Attorney Lisa Mead then clarified Beth DeLisle's question.

Matt Langis said that regardless of the handicap space, the door needs to be accessible. The line needs to stay as is. The applicant can't figure out a solution that makes sense and will work. He does not see an available option. Even if the applicant were to slope the first two spaces differently, there would be a building code issue. If that door were pushed up a foot there would have been a possibility.

Rick Taintor stated he would like to keep comments within the board at this point. He then asked for a sense of the Board before making a motion. He asked if any Board members would be opposed to granting this request. He asked Board members to raise their hands if they were opposed.

Don Walters stated he was opposed and that he made that abundantly clear earlier.

Attorney Lisa Mead asked for a continuance.

Bob Koup made a motion to continue the special permit request to the next meeting on January 18, 2023. Alden Clark seconded the motion. All members voted in favor.

**Motion Approved.**

- c) *Douglas Deschenes*  
*22-24 Market Street*  
*Special Permit Amendment (PBSP-22-14)*

Attorney Douglas Deschenes represented the owners of 22-24 Market Street. He stated he was in front of the board earlier in the year seeking approval for an ITIF special permit to allow payment for one parking space with the re-development of the Market Street Inn. The developers are currently converting the property from a lodging house to an inn. He stated 22-24 and 26 Market Street were connected and were used as an inn or lodging

home since the early 1980s. There have been 43 years of ongoing use of this building. The clients have detached 26 Market Street to create a two family residence. The planned conversion of 22-24 Market Street would require a special permit from this Board to allow payment into the ITIF fund for one parking space, and this Board granted that one space. It has now been determined that while the applicant does have six units in the building, they have ten bedrooms. The applicant should have been required to have ten parking spaces, not six as they originally thought. Douglas Deschenes took responsibility for this error.

He reviewed the images of the building and the history of the building. Under the zoning ordinance the previous use of the building required five parking spaces but there were no spaces on the property, so the legal nonconforming parking status was five spaces. With the new configuration of ten bedrooms, the applicant needs ten spaces, of which five have been grandfathered. The applicant already received an ITIF special permit for one parking space and is seeking approval for payment into the ITIF fund for four additional spaces.

Rick Taintor asked the board if anyone had any questions. He then asked a question about the history of this special permit. He asked for clarification on the condition from April 20, 2022.

Douglas Deschenes stated the applicant is in demolition and has not received a building permit.

Director Port stated the bedroom count was not accurately covered in the prior presentation.

Rick Taintor clarified that the applicant would not be getting parking spaces in the parking garage, but would be getting parking relief by payment into a fund because they are near a parking garage.

Public comment opened.

Eric Showberg of 28 Market Street asked if the payment into the fund allowed people staying at the inn to park on the street and not in the garage.

Rick Taintor stated that was correct.

Public comment closed.

Don Walters said he understands the applicant's benefit explanation, but what is missing is how is this neighborhood is exacerbated by parking. He knows it benefits the city, but it would have a negative impact on the neighborhood.

Bob Koup did not disagree with Don Walters. Adding five cars to crowded residential streets is something they have talked about extensively. It is difficult to approve putting

five additional cars on a crowded residential street.

Rick Taintor said that there is something different about this request. When this was approved there was an understanding there would be no parking provided by the project. For whatever reason the distinction between bedrooms and units was missed. He stated he had less of a concern about this.

Douglas Deschenes stated there is no off street parking at this facility. There are a couple spaces to the left of 26 Market Street. In regards to the inn it has always been on street parking. He said that he did not think that the inn would have an impact on the neighborhood or would generate more cars needing parking. He believes the redevelopment of this property has a beneficial impact on the neighborhood. It will bring in a different clientele. He does not think it is detrimental.

Bob Koup asked if overnight parking is allowed in the garage down the street.

Director Port stated he believed the garage allowed overnight parking.

Councillor Jim McCauley stated that an ordinance was passed for inn guests to purchase from the Clerk's Office a \$15 pass that will allow them to park overnight. In general there is no overnight parking in any municipal lots except for the basement of the municipal lot by permit. The \$15 pass is only for the garage, anywhere in the garage.

Jamie Pennington found the last fact compelling. He supports the application.

Beth DeLisle agreed that the fact that overnight guests can park in the garage makes her more likely to approve the request. She was curious about a boarding house with ten bedrooms only requiring five parking spaces versus inn use requiring ten parking spaces.

Director Port stated what was presented earlier was there was credit given for five parking spaces based on the non-conforming use. When giving credit to any previous spaces it is tied to the ordinance at the time.

Douglas Deschenes stated there is clear evidence this has been utilized with 26 Market Street for an eight-unit ten-bedroom inn. The applicant couldn't rely on the eight units including 26 Market Street. Historically the main structure's legal use was a boarding house, which granted the five grandfathered parking spots.

Jamie Pennington made a motion to approve the special permit. Alden Clark seconded the motion.

Rick Taintor clarified the board would be changing the previous special permit from one ITIF parking space to five ITIF parking spaces. The same dollar amount would be used from the previous calculation.

Director Port stated language would be used due to the CPI index increase.

Rick Taintor stated the payment wouldn't be below \$7,693.00

Six members voted in favor. One member voted against.

**Motion Approved.**

*During the course of discussion and consideration of this application, plan(s), supporting material(s), department head comments, peer review report(s), planning department comments and other related documents, all as filed with the planning department as part of this application and all of which are available in the planning department, were considered.*

**4. General Business**

***a) Request for minor modification – 3 Doyle Drive (MM-22-31)***

Rick Taintor stated that the applicant for 3 Doyle Drive had a request to continue to the first meeting in February.

Alden Clark made a motion to continue the request. Bob Koup seconded the motion.

Don Walters asked if the board voted if this was a minor modification. Rick Taintor stated no they had not.

All members voted in favor.

**Motion Approved.**

***b) Approval of minutes***

- 12/7/22

Rick Taintor stated the approval of minutes would be deferred to the next meeting.

***c) Other updates from the Chair or Planning Director***

Ordinances: Director Port discussed zoning amendments. He asked if people wanted to be involved to let him know. He then discussed the proposed ordinance modifying the membership of the Board will be taken up by the City Council at the end of the month. The proposal is to change the Board's membership from nine members to seven members and two associate members.

Economic Development Forum: Rick Taintor stated there is a public forum for the economic development strategy next week. Director Port stated if members were to attend that it would be great. He is interested in hearing their thoughts.

West End Fire Station: Don Walters asked if the Cutter Fire station would be referred back to a committee on the City Council because it is over budget. Director Port stated yes, there is a higher number now. They are expediting that discussion. They will be revisiting the dollar amount on the construction side of this project.

Waterfront West: Don Walters asked about Waterfront West. He asked if Director Port was able to confirm there have been discussions between the developer and the Mayor's office on this. Is there a preliminary timeline that would be brought to the Board or the public? Director Port stated he hoped they would circle back with the development team.

Rick Taintor stated that the Board's subcommittee met last summer and fall and he is working on a draft zoning ordinance, including design standards. He hopes to talk about it at a future meeting.

Housing Production Plan: Director Port stated the housing production plan is to try to produce affordable housing. They made progress with the 40R District and 1 Boston Way. He stated they do need to look at the plan and update it again. They plan to work with the regional planning agency. He said getting input from Planning Board will be important.

Rick Taintor stated he met with MVPC and they weren't really clear at that point. MVPC's regional project has to be done by June 2024 but Newburyport has an earlier deadline in order to keep its Safe Harbor status.

Director Port said the trajectory of producing the units doesn't look like it is on plan to be there. They are not continuing to create more units. The percentage will be reduced a little bit from census numbers. It does not affect the Safe Harbor status.

Rick Taintor stated Safe Harbor keeps us in control of our own zoning. When they lose that comprehensive projects can come in and override zoning.

Don Walters asked if they had ever been out of Safe Harbor. Director Port stated this is the first time they have been in Safe Harbor since he had been there.

Don Walters asked if Director Port was aware of anyone doing something to increase affordable housing. He stated the old Kmart property facing Lowe Street would make sense.

Director Port stated he was asking about MBTA guidelines. Storey Ave is something they would want to look at.

## **5. Adjournment**

Alden Clark made a motion to adjourn. Bob Koup seconded the motion, and all members voted in favor.

**Motion Approved.**

Meeting adjourned at 8:54 PM

Respectfully submitted – Caitlyn Marshall