



BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT / APPEALS REGULAR MEETING

June 27, 2019 // 7:00 p.m. // Town Board Chambers
301 Walnut Street, Windsor, CO 80550

MINUTES

A. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Horner called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

1. Roll Call

The following members were present:

Chairman	Danny Horner
Vice-Chairman	Jose Valdes David White Jennifer Dionne
Alternate	Charles Schinner
Senior Planner	Millissa Berry
Deputy Town Clerk	Trisha Conway

2. Review of Agenda by the Board and Addition of items of New Business to the Agenda for Consideration by the Board of Adjustment / Appeals

There were no changes to the agenda.

3. Reading of the statement of the documents to be entered into the record:

I enter into the record the Town's Comprehensive Plan, the Town's Zoning Ordinance, the staff report regarding the action items of this hearing, and all of the testimony received at this hearing.

B. CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Approval of the minutes from May 23, 2019

Mr. Valdes moved to approve the consent calendar as presented; Ms. Dionne seconded the motion. Roll call on the vote resulted as follows; Yeas – Horner, Valdes, White, Dionne, Schinner; Nays – None; Motion carried.

C. BOARD ACTION

1. Public Hearing – Variance of Municipal Code Section 16-12-50 of the Municipal Code pertaining to open space and Section 16-12-40 pertaining to setback in the Single Family Residential (SF-1) Zone District – Bowman's Addition Lot 16 Block 3 – 317 9th Street; Everett and Beverly Darco, owners/applicants.

Mr. Horner moved to open the Public Hearing; Mr. Valdes seconded the motion. Roll call on the vote resulted as follows: Yeas – Horner, Valdes, White, Dionne, Schinner; Nays – None; Motion carried.

The applicants, Mr. Everett Darco, 829 Walnut Street stated he is requesting a variance from Municipal Code Section 16-12-40 and Section 16-12-50 to allow for a

new house with an attached garage to be built on their property addressed as 317 9th Street in the Single Family Residential (SF-1) Zone District.

Mr. Darco stated the house will be 5 feet from the property line on the south side alley access, 11 feet from the north side property line, and the east side will be 13 feet with a 10 foot sewer line easement. Mr. Darco's sewer line for 829 Walnut Street will be relocated in the 10 foot sewer line easement, due to conflicts with the line running underneath the projected new construction home site located at 317 9th Street.

Per Mr. Darco stated the total amount of open space is 3,579 sq. feet, and he believes the requirement is 3000 sq. feet. The new home is compliance, and compatible with other homes in the neighborhood. The overall dimensions of the home are 32 wide by 52 deep, and the foot print of this home is to accommodate our disabled daughter. The home will be built on 1 level allowing access to the garage, kitchen, bedroom, living area with the possibility of expanding to 2nd level with installing a wheelchair lift mechanism.

Mr. Horner asked if there are any comments from public regarding the variance request; None

Ms. Berry stated this variance request from Section 16-12-40 is to allow a front setback less than 20 feet from the west property line. The variance request from Section 16-12-50 would allow the lot itself to have less than 3,000 sf of open space.

Municipal Code Section 16-12-40 states:

"Minimum setback shall be twenty (20) feet. Minimum offset shall be five (5) feet."

Municipal Code Section 16-12-50 states:

"As a part of the minimum lot area of six thousand (6,000) square feet per dwelling unit, a minimum of three thousand (3,000) square feet thereof shall be livable open space."

The request for the setback relates to the creation of the lot prior to the zoning code that allowed the lot to be less than 6,000 square feet in area.

The current 624 square foot house, built in 1902, would be removed and replaced with a house of approximately 2400 square feet (includes attached garage and second floor). The proposed front setback along 9th Street is 5 feet and the proposed open space for the lot is approximately 2,272 square feet. The proposed site plan can be found in the presentation. The proposed attached garage would be accessed from the alley.

Municipal Code Section 16-6-60 (Variances) states the following:

Variances may be considered where, due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the provisions of this Chapter would result in unnecessary hardship. Variances will not be granted contrary to the public interest and will only be considered when the spirit of this Chapter can be observed and public safety and welfare secured.

Section 16-6-60 defines unnecessary hardship as follows:

For purposes of this Article, unnecessary hardship shall be defined as a situation where the property cannot be reasonably used under the conditions allowed by this Code. The situation shall result from circumstances unique to the property and shall not be created by the landowner. The variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the surrounding neighborhood. Economic considerations alone shall not constitute an unnecessary hardship if a reasonable use for the property exists under the provisions of the Code. It is the responsibility of the landowner to prove that an unnecessary hardship exists.

Municipal Code Section 16-1-10 (Declaration of Purpose) provides guidance on the purpose and spirit of the zoning code:

The regulations contained in this Chapter shall be held to be minimum requirements enacted to promote the health, safety and general welfare of the Town. To these ends such regulations have been prepared in accordance with the Comprehensive Development Plan for the Town and are designed to lessen congestion in the streets; to secure safety from fire, panic and other dangers; to provide adequate light and air; to prevent the overcrowding of land and undue concentration of population...

Staff has analyzed whether an unnecessary hardship exists:

- a. Whether the property can be reasonably used under the conditions of the Code.

The property can be reasonably used under the conditions of the Code.

- b. Whether circumstances unique to the property exist that were not created by the landowner.

The property is a legal lot within the Town. The property was subdivided to its current size prior to the adoption of the current municipal code. The property was originally platted in the early 1900s and then subdivided to its current state. Records were not found but based on information found on nearby properties with similar conditions, the subdivision likely happened prior to 1950. The lot is approximately 4,000 square feet in area.

Setback

The existing house, built in 1902, has a 5 foot setback from the western property line. No prior variances were found on the subject property but a setback variance was approved in 2010 for the property immediately to the north where a reduced setback of 9.5 feet and lesser minimum open space of 2,142 square feet was approved.

A portion of the right-of-way appears to be part of the subject property's yard. In this case, the west property line is inset from the sidewalk by approximately 15 feet. With this area and the requested 5 foot setback, the house would be 20 feet from the inside of the sidewalk. The house would also be setback at a distance from the sidewalk as the other houses on the east side of 9th Street in this neighborhood. The submitted materials show the access to the garage being off of the alley and is allowed as proposed. If garage access ever was proposed off of 9th Street, verification would need to be presented to ensure a driveway was at least 20 feet in length.

One reason for the reduced setback is to allow a 10 foot sewer easement along the rear of the property and to provide more of a buffer and yard between the new house and the house immediately to the east. The Engineering Department will need verification of the location of the sewer and water lines at the time of building permit.

Open Space

The requested 2,272 square feet of open space is similar to the open space found on other lots in the area that were subdivided similarly to this one. The open space area in the right-of-way between the western lot line and the sidewalk is approximately 1,300 square feet. Combining the right-of-way area and proposed open space on the lot, the result would be open space of approximately 3,572 square feet.

c. Whether the essential character of the surrounding neighborhood would be altered.

The essential character of the surrounding neighborhood would not be altered.

- The property is located in a residential zone and is adjacent to residential properties of similar proportions, including house size.
- There are several similar subdivisions at the end of blocks in the area. These some of the lots received variances to allow the reduced setback and lesser amount of open space; others there are no records found.
- The house will be designed with a pitched roof, asphalt shingles and exterior materials that meet code.

d. Public safety and welfare are ensured

It is not foreseen that public safety and welfare will be compromised with the granting the variance request.

- The house would be set back far enough from the sidewalk so it will not cast shadows onto the walk which is particularly important in the winter months when ice could become an issue.
- The house would be approximately 20' from the sidewalk.
- The house would meet minimum setbacks for the side and rear yards.
- Drainage issues are not foreseen.

Staff has not determined that an undue hardship exists because the property can be reasonably used under the conditions of the Code. However, the request and circumstances of the site are consistent with variances granted in the recent past in the older part of town. Therefore, staff is recommending approval of the variance request as proposed with the following conditions of approval:

1. The applicant obtains a building permit for the house.
2. A setback survey is conducted with the installation of the foundation of the house to confirm the setback.

Should the BOA be inclined to approve the variance request, findings of fact supporting the decision are required. Suggested findings for this case are as follows:

1. The lot was configured between 1903 and 1950 and is smaller than a typical single family lot due to the lot split.

2. The proposal is consistent with Town development decisions in the area.
3. The granting of this variance request will not alter the character of the surrounding neighborhood.
4. The granting this variance will not pose any public safety or welfare concerns.

Since all motions are to be made in the affirmative, staff recommends that the following motion, second and action on the petition be made as follows:

1. A motion to approve the request for a variance from Section 16-12-40 and 16-12-50 with the two conditions recommended by staff.
2. A second; and
3. The Chair calling for the vote as follows: All members in favor of the variance vote "yes"; all opposed to the variance request vote "no", with a minimum of four "yes" votes required to approve the variance request.

Should the Board be inclined to approve the variance request, findings of fact supporting the decision are required.

Mr. Horner asked the Board if they had any questions for the applicant.

Mr. Valdes asked Mr. Darco if the home would be new construction.
Per Mr. Darco; Yes

Mr. Valdes asked Mr. Darco for clarification that this home would be for his daughter because he lives next door.
Per Mr. Darco; Yes

Mr. Valdes asked Mr. Darco if he had any concerns regarding the conditions recommended by staff.
Mr. Darco stated staff worked with him extremely well explaining what he could, and could not do prior to the hearing. The biggest finding was the sewer that Mr. Darco would have to move over into the 10 foot variance.

Mr. Schinner asked Ms. Berry whether we were discussing a garage or a house.
Ms. Berry stated the garage is attached to the house, and it would be the whole structure as shown in this variance application.

Mr. Schinner asked Ms. Berry to display, and explain the rendering for the requested variance.
Per Ms. Berry she explained the outline of the rendering.

Mr. Schinner asked Ms. Berry whether the garage off the alley complied with the visibility triangle.
Ms. Berry; Yes, engineering signed off on the request.

Mr. Schinner asked Ms. Berry where would the easement go just somewhere in that 13 foot space.

Per Ms. Berry; Correct, she clarified on the rendering, and specified it's a 10 foot wide easement with a leeway of 3 feet.

Mr. Valdes moved to close the Public Hearing; Mr. White seconded the motion. Roll call on the vote resulted as follows: Yeas – Horner, Valdes, White, Dionne, Schinner; Nays – None; Motion carried.

Mr. Horner asked for a motion on the variance.

Mr. White moved to approve the request for a variance with the conditions recommended by staff; Mr. Valdes seconded the motion. Roll call on the vote resulted as follows: Yeas – Horner, Valdes, White, Dionne, Schinner; Nays – None; Motion carried.

2. Public Hearing – Variance of Municipal Code Section 16-12-40 of the Municipal Code pertaining to setback in the Single Family Residential (SF-1) Zone District – Park Addition 2nd Filing Lot 1 – 132 Ash Street; Bonnie Ham, owner/applicant.

Mr. Valdes moved to open the Public Hearing; Mr. White seconded the motion. Roll call on the vote resulted as follows: Yeas – Horner, Valdes, White, Dionne, Schinner; Nays – None; Motion carried.

The applicant, Ms. Bonnie Ham, 132 Ash Street is requesting a variance from Municipal Code Section 16-12-40 to allow for a porch to be constructed on the front of her house addressed as 132 Ash Street. The property is in the Park Addition Subdivision 2nd Filing and is zoned Single Family Residential (SF1).

Ms. Ham stated her house is fairly new construction, and no exterior landscaping has been completed, making the front porch the next step in the process. The house required a variance to be built, because the lot has a large easement across the backside for the lake trail. Ms. Ham is requesting this variance to shave the front entrance, block the rain, and create privacy.

Mr. Horner asked if there are any comments from public regarding the variance request; None

Ms. Berry stated this a variance request Park Addition 2nd Filing Lot 1, 132 Ash Street, pertaining to a front setback along Ash Street for the Single Family Residence. The site is located at the end of 2nd Street, south of the Windsor Lake.

Municipal Code Section 16-12-40 states:

“Minimum setback shall be twenty (20) feet. Minimum offset shall be five (5) feet.”

The variance request from Section 16-12-40 is to allow the porch to be within 20 feet of the front property line. The proposed setback is 6 feet to allow for a porch that is 5 feet in depth and approximately 30 feet wide.

According to the application, the house was built 11 feet from the front setback. In addition to the setback, there is approximately 4 feet between the property line and

the sidewalk creating 15 feet between the sidewalk and the house. Please see the packet for additional information on the project

Municipal Code Section 16-6-60 (Variances) states the following:

Variances may be considered where, due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the provisions of this Chapter would result in unnecessary hardship. Variances will not be granted contrary to the public interest and will only be considered when the spirit of this Chapter can be observed and public safety and welfare secured.

Section 16-6-60 defines unnecessary hardship as follows:

For purposes of this Article, unnecessary hardship shall be defined as a situation where the property cannot be reasonably used under the conditions allowed by this Code. The situation shall result from circumstances unique to the property and shall not be created by the landowner. The variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the Page 2 of 3 surrounding neighborhood. Economic considerations alone shall not constitute an unnecessary hardship if a reasonable use for the property exists under the provisions of the Code. It is the responsibility of the landowner to prove that an unnecessary hardship exists.

Municipal Code Section 16-1-10 (Declaration of Purpose) provides guidance on the purpose and spirit of the zoning code:

The regulations contained in this Chapter shall be held to be minimum requirements enacted to promote the health, safety and general welfare of the Town. To these ends such regulations have been prepared in accordance with the Comprehensive Development Plan for the Town and are designed to lessen congestion in the streets; to secure safety from fire, panic and other dangers; to provide adequate light and air; to prevent the overcrowding of land and undue concentration of population...

Staff has analyzed whether an unnecessary hardship exists:

- a. Whether the property can be reasonably used under the conditions of the Code.
The property can be reasonably used under the conditions of the Code.
- b. Whether circumstances unique to the property exist that were not created by the landowner.

The current house was built in 2017. The applicant received a variance in 2001 to allow the house to be built with up to a 10 foot setback. Support for the reduced setback was a trail easement that ran across the north portion of the lot on the Windsor Lake Levee. Having the house be closer to the southern property line would allow more room for the trail.

- c. Whether the essential character of the surrounding neighborhood would be altered.

In a number of ways, the essential character of the surrounding neighborhood would not be altered.

- The property is located in residential zone and is adjacent to residential properties of similar proportions, including house size.

- Many of the houses in the neighborhood have front setbacks less than 20 feet and closer to 10 feet.
- Houses with porches exist in the neighborhood.

d. Public safety and welfare are ensured

It is not foreseen that public safety and welfare will be compromised with the granting the variance request.

- The porch addition would not increase shadows onto the walk than the existing house does.
- The porch would be approximately 15' from the sidewalk.
- The porch would not encroach into utility easements.
- Drainage issues are not foreseen.

Staff has not determined that an undue hardship exists because the property can be reasonably used under the conditions of the Code. However, the request and circumstances of the site are consistent with variances granted in the recent past in the older part of town. Therefore, staff is recommending approval of the variance request as proposed with the following conditions of approval:

1. The applicant obtains a building permit for the porch.
2. A setback survey is conducted with the installation of the foundation of the porch to confirm the setback.

Should the BOA be inclined to approve the variance request, findings of fact supporting the decision are required. Suggested findings for this case are as follows:

1. The house was permitted a reduced setback in the past.
2. The proposal is consistent with Town development decisions in the area.
3. The granting of this variance request will not alter the character of the surrounding neighborhood.
4. The granting of this variance will not pose any public safety or welfare concerns.

Since all motions are to be made in the affirmative, staff recommends that the following motion, second and action on the petition be made as follows:

1. A motion to approve the request for a variance from Section 16-12-40 with the two conditions recommended by staff.
2. A second; and
3. The Chair calling for the vote as follows: All members in favor of the variance vote "yes"; all opposed to the variance request vote "no", with a minimum of four "yes" votes required to approve the variance request.

Should the Board be inclined to approve the variance request, findings of fact supporting the decision are required.

Mr. Horner asked the Board if they had any questions for the applicant.

Mr. Valdes asked Ms. Ham do you foresee any changes to the rendering that would infringe on any of the distances or items discussed.

Ms. Ham stated there will not be any changes to the porch, and will not be any larger than 5 feet deep.

Mr. Valdes asked Ms. Berry whether this is the 2nd variance in the same location.

Ms. Berry; Yes, it is a front setback variance, but back in 2001 when the original variance was granted to get the easement there wasn't a house proposal.

Mr. White asked Ms. Ham about replacing the concrete slab on the front of the home.

Per Ms. Ham the concrete slab is going to be incorporated into design.

Mr. Schinner asked Ms. Berry about the distance between the house, and sidewalk on the current rendering.

Ms. Berry stated about 11 feet to the property line, and 4 feet from the sidewalk.

Mr. Schinner asked Ms. Berry about where the utilities are located in the property.

Per Ms. Berry the electrical runs perpendicular for individual lines to the house, and parallel main services along the street.

Mr. White asked Ms. Berry about the measurement giving him the impression this would leave about a 10 foot setback from the sidewalk to the porch.

Ms. Berry stated yes from the sidewalk to the porch.

Mr. Schinner asked Ms. Ham whether this was going to be a single step porch or whether the steps would protrude out of the 5 foot porch.

Per Ms. Ham there will be no change to the current concrete steps like shown in the rendering.

Mr. Valdes stated his assumption based off of the description, and rendering provided would be the porch would extend to the 2nd step keeping the dimensions the way they are giving Ms. Ham 5-6 feet in porch depth.

Mr. Valdes asked Ms. Ham whether that was an acceptable result.

Per Ms. Ham; Yes

Mr. Valdes moved to close the Public Hearing; Ms. Dionne seconded the motion. Roll call on the vote resulted as follows: Yeas – Horner, Valdes, White, Dionne, Schinner; Nays – None; Motion carried.

Mr. Horner asked for a motion on the variance.

Mr. Valdes moved to approve the request for a variance with the conditions recommended by staff; Mr. White seconded the motion. Roll call on the vote resulted as follows: Yeas – Horner, Valdes, White, Dionne, Schinner; Nays – None; Motion carried.

3. Public Hearing – Variance of Municipal Code Section 16-9-50(e) pertaining to sign setbacks and offsets – Eagle Crossing Subdivision 6th Filing Lot 1 - 6435 Crossroads Blvd – Maura Rux, applicant.

Mr. Valdes moved to open the Public Hearing; Ms. Dionne seconded the motion. Roll call on the vote resulted as follows: Yeas – Horner, Valdes, White, Dionne, Schinner; Nays – None; Motion carried.

The applicant, Ms. Maura Rux was unable to attend the hearing, in attendance is Christopher Schmidt, Owner; Bright Sign Solutions located in Fort Collins. Mr. Schmidt is the contractor working with the sign for the Arby's restaurant location requesting a variance from Municipal Code Section 16-9-50(e) to allow for the separation between freestanding signs to be less than 100 feet.

Mr. Schmidt stated the neighboring business to the east is 7-Eleven, and they have monument sign current existing. To obtain the 100 feet separation Arby's monument sign would be sticking out in the drive-thru pass lane by about 2.5 feet. The applicant is requesting at least an 80 foot separation in a landscaped area allowing traffic to pass through that area.

Per Mr. Schmidt stated other options purposed to move the sign to the other end of the property, but that's where the drainage pond is located. The east side was also purposed as an option for the sign, but would potential cause problems with future infrastructure.

Mr. Horner asked if there are any comments from public regarding the variance request; None

Municipal Code Section 16-9-50(e) states the following:

Distance separation... Freestanding signs shall be separated by at least one hundred (100) feet.

Ms. Berry stated property is located at 6435 Crossroads Blvd and is the future site of an Arby's Restaurant that is forecasted to open to the public in July. The applicant is requesting to install a freestanding sign in the southwest corner of the property. However, that location would put the proposed sign within 100 feet of the existing 7-11 freestanding sign on the property immediately to the west. The applicant is asking to allow the freestanding Arby's sign to be 78' to the west of the 7-11 freestanding sign.

Municipal Code Section 16-6-60 (Variances) states the following:

Variances may be considered where, due to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the provisions of this Chapter would result in unnecessary hardship. Variances will not be granted contrary to the public interest and will only be considered when the spirit of this Chapter can be observed and public safety and welfare secured.

Section 16-6-60 defines unnecessary hardship as follows:

For purposes of this Article, unnecessary hardship shall be defined as a situation where the property cannot be reasonably used under the conditions allowed by

this Code. The situation shall result from circumstances unique to the property and shall not be created by the landowner. The variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the Page 2 of 3 surrounding neighborhood. Economic considerations alone shall not constitute an unnecessary hardship if a reasonable use for the property exists under the provisions of the Code. It is the responsibility of the landowner to prove that an unnecessary hardship exists.

Municipal Code Section 16-1-10 (Declaration of Purpose) provides guidance on the purpose and spirit of the zoning code:

The regulations contained in this Chapter shall be held to be minimum requirements enacted to promote the health, safety and general welfare of the Town. To these ends such regulations have been prepared in accordance with the Comprehensive Development Plan for the Town and are designed to lessen congestion in the streets; to secure safety from fire, panic and other dangers; to provide adequate light and air; to prevent the overcrowding of land and undue concentration of population...

Staff has analyzed:

- whether special site specific condition exist
- whether an unnecessary hardship exists
- the Impact on public interest, safety, and welfare
- the impacts to the neighborhood character

The property can be reasonable used and there are three building-mounted signs on the property. There are also other locations on the site where a freestanding sign can be located while meeting code standards.

There is a utility easement that runs along the front of the property in which a freestanding sign cannot be placed. This easement and the layout of the drive thru aisle does limit where along the Crossroads frontage a freestanding sign can be located.

The subject sign could be located east of the proposed location without interference with the drive-thru or utility easement (see presentation) but it would still be 90 feet east of the 7-11 freestanding sign. With this location the developer would need to relocate a street tree to the west to allow for the sign to be installed. Irrigation lines may also have to be relocated.

For the proposed location or one farther east, no negative impacts on public interest, safety and welfare are foreseen. The sign would be outside utility easements and outside the sight visibility triangle for the intersection to the west.

The proposed sign in the proposed location would not negatively impact the neighborhood. There are many freestanding signs in the area of similar design and scale.

Staff has not found that an unnecessary hardship exists since the property can be used reasonably and there are other signs on the property announcing the business. Therefore, staff is recommending denial of the variance request.

Should the Board of Adjustment move to approve the variance request - to allow the freestanding sign to be within 100 feet of another freestanding sign as proposed in the application materials, the following conditions are recommended by staff:

1. The applicant obtains a sign permit from the Planning Department prior to installation of the sign.

Should the BOA be inclined to approve the variance request, findings of fact supporting the decision are required. Suggested findings for this case are as follows:

1. The granting of this variance request will not alter the character of the surrounding neighborhood.
2. The granting this variance will not pose any public safety or welfare concerns.

Since all motions are to be made in the affirmative, staff recommends that the following motion, second and action on the petition be made as follows:

1. A motion to approve the request for a variance from Section 16-9-50(e) with the conditions recommended by staff.
2. A second; and
3. The Chair calling for the vote as follows: All members in favor of the variance vote "yes"; all opposed to the variance request vote "no", with a minimum of four "yes" votes required to approve the variance request.

Mr. Valdes asked Mr. Schmidt whether what the preferred location would be to place the sign.

Mr. Schmidt stated the purposed location would be the location for the variance, because they are trying to grab the attention from the intersection.

Mr. Valdes asked Mr. Schmidt what are the dimensions of the sign.

Mr. Schmidt stated the sign is 9'3" long by 6' foot tall, there is a 4'x4' section with the Arby's logo, and 5'x4' zip track to put up special for the week.

Mr. Valdes asked Mr. Schmidt if there will be any issues obtaining the sign permit.

Mr. Schmidt stated we at the final stages of the permit pending the variance.

Mr. Valdes moved to close the Public Hearing; Mr. Schinner seconded the motion. Roll call on the vote resulted as follows: Yeas – Horner, Valdes, White, Dionne, Schinner; Nays – None; Motion carried.

Mr. Horner asked for a motion on the variance.

Mr. Valdes moved to approve the request for a variance with the conditions recommended by staff for the 78 foot variance; Mr. White seconded the motion. Roll call on the vote resulted as follows: Yeas – Horner, Valdes, White, Dionne, Schinner; Nays – None; Motion carried.

D. COMMUNICATIONS

1. Communications from the Board Members

Mr. Valdes asked staff about the multitude of duplicated variances in the downtown area.

Ms. Berry stated we are working on updating the code, and working closely with site plan review.

2. Communications from staff

Ms. Berry asked the Board about postponing the July 25th due to meeting quorum requirements to August 1st.

E. ADJOURN

Upon a motion duly made, the meeting was adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Trisha Conway', written over a horizontal line.

Trisha Conway, Deputy Town Clerk