

**Montpelier Development Review Board**  
**June 20, 2005**  
**City Council Chambers, City Hall**

*Subject to Review and Approval*

**Present:** Philip Zalinger, Chair (began participation with item I.c); Kevin O'Connell, Vice Chair; Alan Blakeman; Roger Cranse; Douglas Bresette; Jack Lindley; Guy Teschmacher (participated in I-IV); Ylian Snyder (participated in items I.a , I.b, and V)  
Staff: Stephanie Smith, Administrative Officer

**Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order by Mr. O'Connell who explained that he would serve as the Chair of the meeting until Mr. Zalinger arrived.

**Minutes of June 6, 2005, Meeting**

Mr. Blakeman made a motion to approve the minutes of the June 6, 2005 meeting. Mr. Bresette seconded the motion. The Board voted 7-0 to approve the minutes, Ms. Snyder abstained on items II-VI.

**I. Consent Agenda**

**a. Design Review**

Property Address: 22 State Street  
Applicant: Carlo Rovetto  
Property Owner: James Blouin  
Zone: CB-I/DCD

- Installation of exhaust ventilation, exterior painting and new awnings
- DRC recommended approval with adjustments

**b. Design Review**

Property Address: 28 Elm Street  
Applicant: Lucy Ferrada  
Property Owner: Lucy Ferrada  
Zone: CB-I/DCD

- Alteration to pathway and installation of a wrought iron or wood arbor at pathway entrance
- DRC recommends approval with options

Mr. Cranse made a motion that the Board approve the first two items on the consent agenda with the DRC options and adjustments. Mr. Lindley seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Mr. Zalinger arrived and Ms. Snyder stepped down.

**c. Design Review**

Property Address: 3 Corse Street  
Applicant: Paul Donovan and Johanna Petersen  
Property Owner: Paul Donovan and Johanna Petersen  
Zone: HDR/DCD

- Construction of a 14' x 20' addition on lower level including a 14' x 20' deck above
- DRC recommends approval with options.

Interested Parties: Paul Donovan, Johanna Petersen, Caroline Ells

Ms. Smith explained that this application was being considered separately from the other consent agenda items

because a member of the public had indicated that she wished to comment on the application.

Ms. Petersen explained that the application had been amended from the originally approved design because the geologic work had revealed that the foundation work would cost more than had been expected. She said that the application was modified so that only a bay for a breakfast nook would be added at the level of the proposed deck.

Caroline Ells said that she had no problem with the design. She said that she had questions about the stability of the ledge and what will be done if problems develop. She asked whether her yard would be used by the applicant to provide access for the construction work. Ms. Ells said that she would want to have specific information about the timing of the construction. Mr. Zalinger explained that the Board's review has to do with spacial considerations. He said that the Board does not have jurisdiction over property right issues. Ms. Petersen said that she hoped that she would not have to use Ms. Ells' yard. Ms. Petersen said she would make the information regarding the geology available to Ms. Ells.

Mr. O'Connell made a motion that the Board approve the application with the DRC options., Mr. Cranse seconded The application was approved 7/0.

## **II. Site Plan Amendment and Design Review**

Property Address: 493- 535 Stone Cutters way  
Applicant: River Station Properties II  
Property Owner: River Station Properties II  
Zone: RIV/DCD

- Exterior alterations on the east side enclosure of HVAC units
- Parking Lot Layout
- Landscaping

Interested Parties: Steve Ribolini, Rick DeWolfe

Mr. DeWolfe referred to Ms. Smith's letter of June 9, 2005 in which she said that she would ask the City Arborist to attend the meeting. Ms. Smith said that Mr. Wilcox had agreed to attend. Mr. Wilcox explained that he is the Interim City Tree Warden and not the City Arborist. He said that his jurisdiction is limited to trees in the right of ways, but he was asked to give some advice on the proposed tree plantings. He referred to a publication of the Vermont Urban Forestry Program entitled "Recommended Trees for Vermont Communities." Mr. Wilcox explained that the site provides small planting areas so he recommended smaller, salt tolerant trees like serviceberry and Japanese tree lilac. He said that the green ash trees that had been planted were surviving, but had suffered some damage from snow plowing. Mr. Zalinger asked whether it was fair to say that the decrease in the area available for planting is further limiting the number of species that can be planted and the health of the environment in which they have to grow. Mr. Wilcox said that was correct. He said that the planting area is fairly long, but is being made more narrow. He said that small trees will do better with the limited area for root growth. He noted that there are no overhead wires in the area, so it would have been nice if larger growing trees could have been planted. He added that there will always be trees growing up from the river bank.

Mr. Bresette said that the Board did not have a landscape plan showing the approved plan for the parking area and what was actually planted. Ms. Smith said that a site inspection had revealed that everything had not been planted according to the approved plan. She said to her knowledge that the only changes are reflected in the current proposal to add three trees and to request approval for an area that was proposed as lawn and deciduous trees on the north side of 535 Stone Cutters Way, but has been planted with evergreens and perennials and covered in washed river stone. Mr. O'Connell said that he thought that the Board was clear at the last meeting that it wanted a plan with some

specificity. He said that it appeared that the Board was still in a position where it was not sure of what it was reviewing. Mr. DeWolfe referred to sheet C1.04 and reviewed the locations of the trees on the plan. He said that he believed that the existing trees in the parking lot islands were green ash and crab apple. He said that granite curbing would be installed at the edge of the parking lot along the river and the applicant will be planting serviceberry or crab apple along that edge between the curb and fence.

Mr. Bresette said that it appeared that the landscaping will not differ from the as-built condition except for the relocation of one tree. Mr. DeWolfe said that screening will be planted along the proposed curb. Mr. Zalinger asked why the grass area was to be converted to stone on the north side of #535. Mr. DeWolfe said that the area is significantly shaded by the building.

Mr. O'Connell asked whether the applicant had provided a written response. Ms. Smith said that the presentation at the meeting was serving as the applicant's response. Mr. Zalinger said that the Board still did not have an understanding of what the approved plan was or what was proposed. Mr. DeWolfe said that the applicant would like to relocate one tree and, as a change to the plan, keep the stone that was installed on the north side of the #535. He said that the applicant has agreed to plant service berry and crab apple trees between the proposed granite curb and the fence along the river, but the number of trees has not been specified. Mr. DeWolfe added that the applicant said that he would plant three more trees at the western side of the lot. Mr. Zalinger said that the proposal would provide for three more trees over a length of over 100'. Mr. DeWolfe said that the trees would be in addition to the roses that had been planted at that location. Ms. Smith said that the roses were part of the originally approved plans.

Mr. O'Connell said that he did not feel that the Board had been presented with the information that it had requested. Mr. Zalinger said that Stone Cutters Way represents a significant investment of public resources and the building in question was to have been a flagship for the area. He said that the site was not built according to the approved plans and that he was not now comfortable with a landscaping plan that is not clear. Mr. DeWolfe proposed that he bring the application back to the Board with detailed landscaping plans, but requested that the Board discuss the other application issues.

Mr. DeWolfe said that he was asked to explain why the site was not built as approved. He said that the difference between the approved plan and the site as developed consists of a missing island that was supposed to break 12 parking spaces into two sections. He said that he did not see anything else that deviated from the approved plan. Mr. Teschmacher noted that the angled parking had been built as straight parking. Mr. DeWolfe agreed. Mr. Bresette said that a handicapped space had been removed. Mr. DeWolfe said that it appeared that there had originally been three handicapped parking spaces, but only one handicapped space is required for every 25 cars. Mr. Ribolini said that there are two handicapped spaces on the site with one at each end of the parking lot since the lot serves two buildings. Mr. DeWolfe said that the submitted as-built plan incorrectly omitted the symbol for one of the existing handicapped spaces.

Mr. Bresette said that he did not understand why the site was not built as approved. Mr. Ribolini said that the person doing the construction did not follow the plans. Mr. Bresette said that the owner is ultimately responsible. Mr. Ribolini said that the owners recognized that and the application had been submitted to the Board to try to get the site built in a way that will satisfy the Board and serve the owners and occupants of the building. Mr. Zalinger said that the application materials stated that there is not as much free parking available in the area as had been anticipated by the developer. Mr. Zalinger said that he understood that the developer wanted to achieve more parking on the site and, if that was the motivation for the changes, the Board might as well be told of that now. Mr. Ribolini said that the changes were needed because what exists today is not what was approved and the applicant must seek approval for the changes that were not previously approved. Mr. DeWolfe explained that his firm was asked to bring the site into compliance and develop a parking plan that would provide for more spaces. He said that the proposed plan provides

one additional space. He said that the plan also proposes granite curb to prevent snow plows and vehicles from running up and over the vegetation. He said that the edge of the pavement on the westerly end of the site on the river side would have to be extended by 18" in order to allow for the 90-degree parking spaces. Mr. DeWolfe said that the 90-degree parking allowed for the additional space and for the handicapped space to be van accessible. He said that the approved number of parking spaces was 32, the as-built number is 34 and the proposed number of spaces is 35. Mr. Lindley asked whether the proposed parking configuration resulted in the request that the green space be reduced by 18" along the length of the parking. Mr. DeWolfe said that was the case. Mr. Lindley said that he felt that the Board deserved a better explanation of the planting scheme if they are asked to give up the 18" of green space.

Mr. Bresette asked whether the drive aisles would be one-way and whether the proposed 90-degree parking might affect the traffic flow. Mr. DeWolfe said that the aisles are one-way. Ms. Smith said that Tom McArdle conveyed to her that he did not feel that the 90-degree parking was an issue with respect to one-way circulation. Mr. Cranse and Mr. Bresette said that they were satisfied with the presentation on parking.

Mr. Ribolini asked whether the Board wanted to discuss the screening on the air-conditioning unit. Mr. Lindley said that he would like to know what the noise levels from the units are. Ms. Smith said that a violation would be pursued if a complaint was received. Mr. Zalinger and Mr. Bresette said that the screening matches the other side of the building and did not raise an issue.

Mr. Blakeman made a motion to table the application until the final landscaping plans are available for review. Mr. Bresette seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

### **III. Site Plan Review**

Property Address: 325 Elm Street  
Applicant: City of Montpelier  
Owner: City of Montpelier  
Zone: MDR

- Change of use from undeveloped land to recreational use - park with a canoe launch

Interested Party: Geoff Beyer, Montpelier Parks Department

Ms. Smith noted that the agenda incorrectly indicated that the application was subject to design review.

Geoff Beyer described the project. He said that the small riverside property would be turned into a park with canoe access and an amphitheater. He said that a bridge connecting to the bike path might be proposed at some time in the future. Mr. Beyer said that wooden benches had been proposed in the amphitheater so that they could be moved to allow construction equipment access to the future bridge site, but stone benches may be substituted for some wooden benches in an area where access will not be needed. He said that the plan addresses some concerns raised by the neighbors including providing lighting and visibility of the site to the river. Mr. Zalinger asked about the crosswalk. Mr. Beyer said that he had agreed with the Chief of Police's recommendation that the crosswalk be deleted from the plan. Mr. Beyer said that the crosswalk at Pearl Street could be used and the road shoulder will be used to walk to the site.

Mr. Zalinger asked how the short term parking would be enforced. Mr. Beyer said that, initially, there would be signs designating the parking as short term and some enforcement measures would be undertaken if a problem developed. Mr. Zalinger asked whether the Parks Department would seek to have violators ticketed. Mr. Beyer said that he would do that only if the parking was abused. Mr. Zalinger said that it was an important issue because the park will attract people to the site, but only the short term parking will be provided. He said that it was important that the short term parking be enforced so that vehicles do not back up while waiting to access the site. Mr. Beyer said that he would

work with the Police Chief to have the parking limits enforced.

Mr. Lindley asked how much use is expected. Mr. Beyer said that he thought that the canoe use will be popular, but that he did not expect the vehicles to be backed up. Mr. Cranse asked how the parking traffic will flow. He said that there would be a pull-off where two vehicles could park at the same time. He said that the area has adequate length so that the vehicles would not need to perform a parallel parking maneuver. Mr. Bresette said that the ballfield up the road from this site goes to great lengths to keep people off of the road shoulder. He expressed concern that this application proposes to use the shoulder. Mr. Beyer said that this application will not involve anything near to the traffic volume that is generated by the ballfield. Mr. O'Connell asked whether the TRC had reviewed the application. Ms. Smith said that the TRC reviewed that application and only raised the concern with the crosswalk. Mr. Zalinger observed that the site is municipal land and can be used by people today. He said that the proposed improvements may result in more use, but the short term parking should address that. He said that he did not want for the Board to imply that this relatively passive use of the river front should be discouraged or compared to commercial enterprises.

Mr. Lindley asked whether permits will be required for persons playing bongo drums in the park. Mr. Beyer said that there would be no permit requirements but the noise ordinance would apply. Mr. Blakeman observed that the site looked like a place that teens might use for swimming like they do at the VINS Center. Mr. Beyer said that this location is not as attractive because it is less private. He said that he would not have a problem if families chose to swim there and that teens may or may not use the site appropriately, but that he would be surprised if there was a problem.

Mr. Blakeman made a motion that the Board grant site plan approval with the staff recommendations. Mr. O'Connell seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

#### **IV. Design Review and Site Plan Review**

Property Address: 22 Court Street  
Applicant: Vermont Mutual Insurance Co.  
Zone: CB-II/DCD

- Demolition of residence and parking lot expansion

Interested Parties: Brian Eagan, Vermont Mutual Insurance; Rick DeWolfe, DeWolfe Engineering Associates; Anthony Otis, Montpelier Historic Preservation Commission; Marcia Hill; Fred Bashara; Sue Kruthers, Central Vermont Medical Center; Charles Martin; Soren Pfeffer; Margot George; Les Blomberg, Montpelier Heritage Group; Daniel Hecht; Ward Joyce; George Maleck, CV Chamber; and Dona Bate, Lost Nation Theater.

Mr. Teschmacher recused himself from the application. Ms. Snyder joined the Board to participate in the review.

Mr. Zalinger advised the attendees of the meeting that the Board encourages public participation, but the role of the Board is limited. He read section 505.g of the ordinance regarding the requirements for demolition.

Mr. Eagan gave an overview of the history of Vermont Mutual in Montpelier. He said that 151 of the company's 197 employees presently work at 89 State Street. He stated that there is on-site parking for 131 spaces and the application would result in 11 additional spaces. Mr. Eagan said that only 11 of the 151 employees are residents of Montpelier. He described the company's goal of keeping its workforce together and noted that it had to move 35 employees out of the downtown location several years ago when an application for parking was withdrawn. He said that Vermont Mutual has invested heavily in the downtown building and the workforce is currently being expanded. Mr. Eagan said that the application materials include an economic feasibility study. He added that Vermont Mutual had contacted the Vermont Land Trust to see if they were interested in moving and renovating the building. He said that

the Trust was not interested due to the deterioration of the building.

Mr. DeWolfe expressed his belief that the information shows that it is not economically feasible to get a return on the renovation of this property as either a residence or as office space. He said that there has been significant structural damage to the center of the building which caused a four-inch displacement of the center bearing wall, the west wall is bulging about two inches, the east porch has a four-inch sag and the center of the east wall has a four-inch sag. He said that the roof leaks and water running into the center of the building have caused damage. Mr. Zalinger asked whether the building had unique historical or architectural value. Mr. DeWolfe said that he understood that there is a letter from Jack Anderson that states that the building has such value.

Mr. DeWolfe said that the paved parking lot extension will occupy a large portion of the site. He said that there will be a net gain of 11 spaces. He said that drainage will be directed to the existing drainage system. He described the proposed rediblock concrete wall with a guardrail at the top. Mr. DeWolfe said that the applicant has agreed to the DRC recommendation that a tubular steel guardrail be used instead of the standard "w" guardrail that was originally proposed.

Mr. Zalinger asked what evidence supported the conclusion that the property is incapable of earning an economic return. Mr. DeWolfe said that there was an analysis by E.F. Wall. Mr. Lindley said that he did not see anything in the analysis regarding the 20% tax credit. Mr. DeWolfe said that was not included. Mr. Eagan said that it was his understanding that the use of the tax credit would require that the building be kept in the same form and function. Ms. Smith said that she believed that the building could be changed to an office use within some limits. She said that she had a question about the soft costs in the analysis. She asked whether a survey was needed to rehabilitate a building. Mr. DeWolfe said that he would advise his clients to have a survey prepared if the property were to be sold, mortgaged or if a loan was to be obtained for the rehabilitation. He said that the bank would want to see a survey. Mr. Zalinger said that he was not sure whether he agreed.

Mr. O'Connell asked whether it was correct that vegetation, including the large maple tree would be removed. Mr. DeWolfe said that was correct. Mr. Cranse asked why Vermont Mutual left the building empty for ten years and did not take care of it. Mr. Eagan said that the building has a flat, inverted roof and Vermont Mutual maintained the roof drain. Mr. Cranse said that the engineer had testified that the building is badly deteriorated and that deterioration must have occurred over the last ten years. Mr. DeWolfe said that he could not state whether that deterioration occurred in the last ten years or prior to that. Mr. O'Connell said that it was unfortunate that the building was vacant and was allowed to deteriorate, but he noted that there is nothing in the ordinances to prohibit a land owner from allowing that to occur.

Mr. Zalinger said that the two E.F. Wall estimates and the economic analysis were the only information presented to demonstrate that the property is incapable of yielding and economic return. Mr. DeWolfe said that was correct. Mr. Zalinger asked if the Board was to extrapolate that there are no other available alternatives. Mr. DeWolfe said that there were none that the applicant is aware of.

Anthony Otis, Chairman of the Montpelier Historic Preservation Commission submitted a letter of comment objecting to the proposed demolition (a copy is available in the City Planning Department Office). He read from the letter, including the statement that "The Montpelier Historic Preservation Commission expresses to the City and private property owner that the building should be preserved and integrated into a larger solution to the parking issues, and should be demolished only if demolition were contingent upon a binding commitment to create a streetscape component of a size and character of buildings existing on Court Street."

Marcia Hill, a resident at 25 Court Street, said that Vermont Mutual purchased the property, allowed it to fall into

disrepair and then used that as a reason to tear it down. She said that does not seem right.

Fred Bashara, owner of the Capitol Theater, said that he has walked by the building for many years. He said that the building has looked the way it does for 20 to 30 years. He said that he had the opportunity to see the inside of the building and observed damage that has been there for a long time. He said that, if the building caught fire, it could threaten adjacent and nearby buildings. He said that the building could not support a rehabilitation.

Sue Kruthers, of the Central Vermont Medical Center, urged the Board to consider what Vermont Mutual means to the City. She said that the City should help the company to attain the parking spaces that it needs to remain viable at the downtown location.

Charles Martin, of 20 Court Street, said that he wanted to clarify some points related to the application. He said that a cedar hedge already exists, but the hedge does not extend the entire length of the property line. He said that the property had been surveyed when Vermont Mutual purchased the property and the iron survey markers are in the driveway between the two properties. He noted that the proposed retaining wall would be located on the property line and would raise setback issues. He added that the site in question is a beautiful property and he knows of people who would be interested in purchasing and rehabilitating it. Mr. Martin said that Vermont Mutual moved the tenants out of the building when it was purchased. He said that it was fit for habitation and, if it is not habitable now, Vermont Mutual would have to be blamed.

Soren Pfeffer, a member of the Design Review Committee, said that the DRC members did not get together to prepare a statement, so he would be providing his thoughts on the application. Mr. Pfeffer said that he has a Master's degree in architecture and twenty years of construction experience. He added that there is a broad scope of experience among the members of the DRC. He said that E.F. Wall is not the contractor that someone would hire to do a renovation of a single family home in Montpelier and their analysis should be considered in that context. Mr. Pfeffer said that he believed that the 20% tax credit could be applied to the entire sum. He said that the DRB should look at all available alternatives including the possibility of selling the property to someone who could and would renovate the property. He said that he was sure that there are a lot of people in Montpelier who would be interested in that alternative. He said that, based on his experience, he could make the costs work by using different numbers and deleting some of the items on the list. Mr. Pfeffer said that there are other solutions to the parking problem including company incentives for employee car pooling. He said that, during a walk through of the house, the DRC generally agreed that the house could be renovated to result in a very nice building. He said that there were old moldings and other nice features in the house. He said that the structural damage could be repaired, noting that it might be expensive, but is something done on houses in Montpelier on a regular basis.

Margot George, Chair of the Design Review Committee, said that she has gone through the tax credit process on her own property. She said that the property has to be a rental and the credit would be 20% of the project cost. She said that some changes to the floor plan could be permitted under that program. Ms. George said that the Land Trust may have said that it was not interested in the building because the Trust would have to restore the building to a higher government standard. She said that achieving that standard may not have been feasible for the Trust. She said that surveys are not required by banks and the survey should not be included in the renovation costs.

Les Blomberg, of the Vermont Heritage Group, said that the demolition ordinance sets a very high standard. He said that the ordinance requires that the property be found to be incapable of earning an economic return, all alternatives must be considered and the alternatives must be found to be non-feasible. He said that the building was occupied 10 years ago, and since then, the owners have lost about \$80,000 of rental revenue by leaving the building vacant. He said that Vermont Mutual proposed to tear the building down in 1999, but withdrew the proposal in the face of public opposition and a poor economic analysis. He said that a comparison of that analysis and the current one is

enlightening. Ms. Smith said that the prior analysis is in the application file. Mr. Blomberg said that the current economic analysis is padded with excess costs. He said that the building should be put on the market to test the alternatives theory. He said that he believed that the Board must reject the application because the submission is incomplete (the analysis does not address tax credits), alternatives have not been fully addressed and the poor economic analysis overstates costs and understates revenue.

Daniel Hecht, 10 Court Street, said he had lived in the area for 25 years. He said that he had been inside the building more than 10 years ago and it was quite livable. He submitted a letter in opposition to the application (a copy is available in the City's Planning Department Office) and summarized its contents. He said that there is also a 10% State tax credit available that would change the economic equation. He submitted copies of pictures of three buildings on Court Street that had already been torn down for parking. He said that neither the Board nor the applicant had examined all of the alternatives. Mr. Hecht stated that the proposed parking lot expansion would be an eyesore adjacent to the State Capitol building. He said that there are resources available to help companies with these issues.

Ward Joyce, builder and architect and resident of 27 Court Street said that the applicant is proposing to remove the house and also to remove the lot from the street by lowering by 6' to 8'. He said that the proposal would denigrate the street and destroy the fabric of the street.

George Maleck, of the Central Vermont Chamber of Commerce, said that feasibility is in the eye of the beholder. He said that there are innumerable bankruptcy cases where something that was believed to be feasible was proven to be infeasible. He urged the Board to err on the side of the company which has been a good neighbor since the time that Court Street existed. He said that Vermont Mutual has helped the community and Court Street and is a great corporate citizen. He urged the Board to recognize that there will always be shades of gray regarding feasibility.

Ms. Bate, a Montpelier resident, said that she knew Mr. Eagan through the Central Vermont Chamber and as a donor to the Lost Nation Theater. She said that Vermont Mutual has supported Montpelier in many ways. She urged the Board to pause for 24 hours to consider this and ways to coexist, partner and show mutual respect.

Mr. Zalinger asked if anyone else wished to speak on the matter. No one expressed an interest in speaking.

Mr. Zalinger suggested that the Board consider this application in two parts. He said that the Board should make the decision on the demolition first and then review the site plan and design. Mr. Bresette asked if the demolition of the building is proposed in order to get more parking and whether a parking garage had been considered. Mr. Eagan said that the demolition was intended to allow for the additional parking. He said that the analysis was done for adding parking without the significant cost of a garage.

Mr. Lindley made a motion that the Board consider the demolition in a deliberative session and continue the site plan review to a later date. Mr. Blakeman seconded the motion. Mr. Zalinger said that the record on the demolition would have to be closed in order to proceed in that manner. He asked whether the applicant had any more information to submit on the demolition. Mr. DeWolfe said that the applicant did not have more information to submit on that issue. The Board approved the motion by a vote of 6-0 with Mr. Zalinger abstaining.

#### **V. Public Hearing - Variance**

Property Address: 40 Wheelock Street  
Applicant: Bert Klavens and Barbara Asen  
Property Owner: Bert Klavens and Barbara Asen  
Zone: MDR

- Variance of 14' from the north side yard setback for a 36' x 24' second story addition

- Variance of 3' from the south side yard setback for the construction of a 15' x 10 covered porch accessible entryway

Ms. Smith said that the applicant has requested a continuance to the next meeting on July 5, 2005. She said that the applicant began the variance process, as the staff had advised, but the applicants found that they needed to change the proposal based on discussions with contractors.

**Adjournment**

Mr. O'Connell made a motion that the meeting be adjourned. Mr. Cranse seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephanie Smith  
Administrative Officer

*These minutes are subject to approval by the Development Review Board. Changes, if any, will be recorded in the minutes of the meeting at which they are acted upon.*

*Transcribed by Kathleen Swigon*