

TOWN OF KINGSTON, NEW HAMPSHIRE
HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
Tuesday, March 1, 2017
Public Meeting

Members Present:

Virginia Morse, Chair
Charlotte Boutin, V. Chair
Glenn Coppelman, Planning Board representative
Susan Prescott
Stanley Shalett
Stacy Smoyer

Other Attendees: Ing-Marie Bahr
 Richard Edmunds
 David Edmunds
 Jef Flanders-McDougall
 Buck Lovern
 Ernest McGowen
 Scott Ouellette
 Jeff and Julie Robie

Ms. Morse called the meeting to order at 7:05 PM.

Town Board Updates:

HDC: Ms. Morse requested corrections and omissions of the minutes from the February 14, 2017, meeting. The minutes incorrectly attributed comments made by Ms. Smoyer to Ms. Prescott and vice versa; Ms. Morse will request a correction from the Recording Secretary. Also, Ms. Prescott abstained from voting in the November minutes since she was not there but did vote in the December meeting. Also, "Lions Club" is spelled incorrectly. In addition, on page 7 of the minutes, Ms. Smoyer created the visuals for Mr. Landry, not Ms. Prescott. Ms. Morse will request that all of these issues be corrected in the minutes.

Motion to approve the minutes with above corrections made by Ms. Prescott, seconded by Mr. Shalett. All others in favor, none opposed, and Ms. Morse abstained.

Board of Selectmen: No representative present.

Planning Board and CIP: Mr. Coppelman provided an update for both the CIP and the Planning Board. He believes the CIP is on the agenda for the next Planning Board public hearing on March 21. At that meeting, the CIP will be presented and presumably adopted by the Planning Board. It will then go to the Selectmen and Budget Committees as an advisory document.

The Planning Board is getting ready for the vote at the town meeting, specifically for the warrant article adding inns as a permitted use within district in addition to bed and breakfasts but also removes criteria and provides conditions to follow when doing an inn or a bed and breakfast. The plan is to move this into Site Plan Regulations so it will be handled at the Planning Board level. Changing to regulations instead of ordinances allows flexibility for the reviewing board to adjust as needed to the application. Assuming the vote passes on March 14, inns will be added, and regulations will be moved. Then, the plan will be ready. The first working session of this began at the Planning Board meeting last week and the discussion continues to March 7. If this is not ready, it will be finished on March 21. There are no applications pending at this time for inns or bed and breakfasts, but the Planning Board is trying to get it done in time for the vote. The hope is to finish the discussion on March 7.

Ms. Smoyer's recollection was that the HDC would meet with the Planning Board and confer. Virginia clarified that she gathered the HDC notes/comment from their prior meetings and attended the Planning Board meeting to discuss them. Ms. Smoyer asked if discussions included bylaws for bed and breakfasts and if they would be applicable to inns. Mr. Coppelman said there is a section for each, and there is overlap in some instances but also differences; he stated the Planning Board is accommodating different type of businesses in their discussions. They are attempting to allow more flexibility with regard to different types of activity including acknowledgement that the scale is larger in an inn than a bed and breakfast. He confirmed that Ms. Morse has been representing the HDC but invited any member of the HDC to come to the next Planning Board meeting on March 7 at 6:45 PM. Mr. Greenwood has been documenting these discussions and has shared the minutes with Ms. Morse; she will be sending these minutes to the HDC.

**Public Hearing: Consideration of Application from Richard Edmunds
187 Main Street, Tax Map R34, Lot 71B, Pursuant to Kingston Town Ordinances
and Regulations Articles IV, L, and LI
Proposed Demolition and Construction**

Ms. Morse read the reason for the public hearing regarding this issue to all attendees. She invited Richard Edmunds and his son, David, to speak to attendees.

Mr. Edmunds introduced himself and David as well as a contractor, Ernest McGowen, who was also in attendance.

Ms. Morse clarified that she wants the discussion in two parts: Application for demolition and application for a new building. Demolition will be discussed first.

Discussion of Proposed Demolition:

Mr. Edmunds stated in his multiple walk-throughs of the home, there are problems with structure, foundation, frame, floor plan, windows, and problems from being vacant for a long time such as water damage and mildew. Also, the floor plan is not workable for what people would want. He is not eager to knock down a historic building, and this end

of Main Street has well-maintained houses, and he does not think this property is up to those standards.

David wrote up an extensive explanation of reasons for the demolition for the HDC. Ms. Morse distributed this paperwork to members of the HDC for their reference. She wanted the information shared publicly; David offered Ms. Morse to read this; she did so. In summary from this paperwork, the house is in a state of disrepair with the exterior reaching the end of its useful life. The paint is peeling, the siding is deteriorating, and the masonry is falling apart. There is a large hole in the foundation to the right of the front door, signalling a structural issue. On the interior, the floor is unstable in areas, bringing into question the status of the frame of the home. The layout is odd, and the house violations current codes. There is mold and mildew on the ceilings and walls, and the air quality is terrible. The building is not salvable as there are too many structural, health, and safety issues and code violations to justify remodeling the existing structure. Per David, the best course is to demolish and build a new house meeting the design guidelines of the HDC.

Ms. Morse also read a letter from Greg Buchanon, the construction supervisor and project manager of Edmunds Contracting and an employee of Mr. Edmunds. He will be working closely with his employer regarding the proposed new house. He provided his opinion on why the house needs to come down. Per his opinion, the existing structure is in bad shape. It has been unoccupied for a long time with no upkeep. There are structural problems, and the house is unsafe. The fieldstone foundation is falling in multiple areas, the floor is sagging, and the floor joists are cracked. There is mold visible on the 1st and 2nd floors on the plaster of the walls and ceilings. The exterior shows a lack of upkeep with rot into the sheathing, and the siding is falling off. There is flaking lead paint on the exterior. The windows and doors are extensively rotted. It would not be cost effective to repair this house. The materials in the house can be saved and documented for historical records if need be. In his opinion, the best decision is to demolish the existing house and design a new structure to match other structures of that timeframe and to match the neighborhood.

Ms. Morse also read a letter from Patrick Cane, the owner and manager of Rockport Construction Services. He inspected the property and believes the house is beyond repair and unsafe to renovate. The support beams are rotted and split. The foundation is not salvageable. There are odd room sizes, steep stairways, and low windows that are unsafe. There is mold and mildew apparent throughout the house. It would not be safe or cost effective to renovate as the property is too far gone due to lack of maintenance.

Mr. Coppelman requested that Mr. McGowen share his thoughts. Mr. McGowan has worked in finish carpentry for 30+ years and has been directly involved in renovating 3 Victorian homes. He loves working on old homes to bring them to their potential. He and Mr. Edwards went through the building. The foundation is crumbling with a basement crawl space. The main carrying beams are rotted and the floors warped. The staircase is steep without enough room to correct the problem even if walls are taken out. He believes after a detailed review, the house is not a candidate for restoration. He has seen

the design for new home, and it makes more sense. He opened the discussion up for questions. He added that he thinks some things can be removed from the house such as some wide pine boards, a corner cabinet in the dining room with a nice glass door. He intends to save whatever he can and reuse it if possible.

Ms. Morse opened the discussion up to HDC questions.

Mr. Shalett asked about the steep staircase. He asked if a spiral staircase could be used. Mr. McGowen said in his experience, inspectors usually do not like spiral staircases as they are tricky to negotiate, especially when moving furniture, and he felt it was not practical in this application. Mr. Edmunds shared these are not found often in residential homes and that it requires a hallway on both ends, which is not practical here. Mr. Shalett said he has a spiral staircase that does not take up much space and can be negotiated since it is not steep and that it may be a solution if the building is replicated to match the old structure.

Ms. Smoyer expressed concern about the basement. She noted that when she went into the basement of the house, it looks to be supported by metal jack posts in the center of the rooms. These were directly on the dirt floor, not on concrete, and did not look to be supporting the rooms. Mr. McGowen and Mr. Edmunds concurred. She noted they mentioned the roof was failing, and she noticed that as well when she was there. She also saw water leaking into rooms from the roof. Mr. McGowen noted there is rot to the carrying beams as well due to water. Mr. Coppelman asked if the decay in the beams could be from powder post beetles or something more serious, and Mr. McGowen could not tell. He said it is maybe from moisture and mildew and age but is not sure; powder post beetles may be a factor as well.

Ms. Boutin also saw the property and praised Mr. McGowen for being helpful. Due to the steep drop into the basement, he took pictures for her rather than have her climb down to the basement, and the pictures came out well. There are 2 staircases that are very narrow, and she had a difficult time navigating the stairs due to their width. The ceilings are coming down where they are waterlogged. In her opinion, the building has been left too long without care.

Ms. Prescott toured the house as well. She has just renovated an old home herself. She believes anything with unlimited money and time can be achieved, but that is not always the case. The house may not be worth what it would take to renovate it. She thinks it would need to be raised up with a new foundation installed. Then, all rotten posts and the skeleton of the house would need to be replaced. Mr. Edmunds added that if that was economical, he would do so and update the house, but it is still a house with a bad foundation with a bad layout. Installing a spiral staircase would require taking out the middle of the house. So much would need to be done that it would not be like the original, anyway. He had a test pit dug and had a septic system designed 2 weeks ago. This proposed septic plan has been looked at by the Health Officer, and he agreed. His engineer also agreed the best location for the septic system is in front of house near the

road and away from the wetlands on the property. Also, a house in this condition cannot be moved.

Ms. Morse expressed concern about being able to get rid of the mold. Black mold is dangerous, and she saw that in many places. She is a neighbor and has a house low to the ground as well, and water must be pumped frequently; it is tough to keep the moisture out. She battles mold as well. She is concerned about water running through house without attention.

Ms. Morse also shared that the Heritage Commission has begun to identify at-risk historical properties and document homes and buildings so history can be saved. This has been done for this property, and a copy of the report was given to Mr. Edmunds. Walter Roy and Bob Bean were invited into the house before it was sold and took pictures and completed a summary of the Saunders House. The report gives the historical background and condition of house, its features, and ownership transfers as far back as the early 1900s. There is a map showing it in place in 1856, and copies of this report are available in the library.

Ms. Morse also read a letter related to the proposed demolition from Mr. Bruce Reynolds in Meredith, NH. It is dated February 21. As he could not attend the hearing, he wanted to comment on the proposed demolition and rebuild. He grew up across the street at 182 Main Street and believes there is historical information available that the house may have been a carriage manufacturing site, and that history should be clarified before further action is taken. He acknowledged that he has not been inside the house in many decades and that he realizes much is to be done. He would not object to the demolition provided the new structure remains architecturally and aesthetically accurate with the appearance of the Historic District as specified in the town Ordinances and guidelines. Since receiving that, Ms. Morse went back to the Heritage Commission and the Museum Committee for research. Neither could find information on this property being a carriage manufacturing site. On a map from 1856, there is a small carriage shop not connected to the house itself. Ms. Smoyer did research as well, and the Prescott family was not in the carriage industry from her research. Ms. Prescott did not know either. Ms. Boutin shared that she interviewed Ms. Clark at the garage, and at one time there was a carriage place down near the garage but not connected to this property. Per Ms. Morse, there were many carriage shops and manufacturing locations in town but not on this property. She did not see anything that looked connected to the carriage industry and does not feel it is an issue here.

Ms. Smoyer asked what items could be salvaged from the house. Mr. McGowen mentioned the hutch in the dining room and has removed the doors off of it. He also looked at some pine boards to be saved and is open to salvaging what he can including old hinges on boards. David added he may try to salvage the interior doors. Ms. Morse mentioned saving the old glass with the bubbles and ripples, and Mr. McGowen agreed.

The public was then invited to comment.

The first members of the public to address the HDC were Jeff and Julie Robie, who live across the street at 184 Main Street. Mr. Robie stated that he agrees the house needs to be demolished and that it would be unmanageable to fix. Due to the health risks of mold, mildew, lead paint, and possibly asbestos, he expressed concern about how the demolition will occur. David stated he already met with an abatement contractor and the report is currently under review by Mr. Edmunds and himself. Once a permit is issued, a trained professionals will commence abatement with minimal disturbance. Ms. Robie shared that she appreciates the effort to protect wetland. She asked more specific questions about health concerns during the demolition, and David reiterated that the abatement will be done by trained professionals and that he has seen this done in the past. The abatement contractor will take measures to contain airborne particles in the area. Once abated materials have been cleared, the demolition of the house will proceed. Ms. Robie asked if only New Hampshire guidelines would be used in the abatement, and David confirmed that the abatement will include everything required by the state of New Hampshire but not guidelines outside of the state.

Next, the board heard from Scott Ouellette of 189 Main Street. He supported what others have said during this meeting. He stated that demolition would not have been his first choice, but in this case, it seemed necessary. He also stated that the proposed new construction looks like it would fit into the neighborhood.

--Gap in recording--

(Unknown speaker) asked what Mr. Edmunds envisioned when purchasing the home and if he planned to live there or sell it. Mr. Edmunds knew on the day of auction that the house was in a nice location with a nice lot of land and easily accessible to 125; he saw value in its location. He knew that a new house would need to go up and that he could not salvage the existing frame. He believed that rebuilding the house would be cost prohibitive and that the sale price most likely would not include a large profit. He is discussing with his wife whether or not they may sell their current house in Salem and move in, but this decision has not been made yet. (Unknown speaker) asked if some of the interior features could be saved, and Mr. Edmunds concurred that this is the case.

Ms. Morse brought the discussion back to the motion for the Application for Demolition. She again asked for any comments from the HDC members, and none were expressed.

Motion: Mr. Coppelman reluctantly moved to approve the Application for Demolition of the property at 187 Main Street. The motion was seconded by Ms. Boutin.

Members in favor: Six.

Members in opposition: None

No abstentions.

Ms. Morse notified Mr. Edmunds that a certificate will be mailed to him and to the Selectmen's office within 24 hours so that when the permit is pulled, the certificate will be there. Mr. Edmunds provided his mailing address to Ms. Morse but mentioned that he

is in the process of scheduling a meeting with the Building Inspector. Instead, Ms. Morse will put a copy of the certificate for Mr. Edmunds in the HDC mailbox at Town Hall.

Discussion of Proposed New Construction:

Ms. Morse read from a document written by David regarding the overall goal for the property. This document also included pictures of surrounding properties, including the homes of the Ouellette and Robie families, and noted different features of houses that his architect has tried to include in the new construction. Ms. Morse said she spoke with Mr. Edmunds one day when she went through the house; he has a hard copy of the design guidelines for the town, and he has reviewed them. Per David, a new single-family home will be built following town guidelines according to current codes using present-day building materials. The property will fit in with the look and feel of the neighborhood.

According to the information provided by David, there are 3 proposed key changes to the land:

1. Relocate and install a 3 bedroom septic system per New Hampshire guidelines.
2. Install a drilled well.
3. Set the new house back from Main Street as shown on the site plan provided to allow for the new septic design.

This documentation also stated there would be little to no impact to the current land.

The documentation noted the following design elements:

- Center chimney, 9 window colonial reproduction with 2 gables facing Main Street. Another option would include 2 chimneys, one at each end of a gable.
- Flat pigeon returns to match neighboring houses
- Sidelight element at front entry door
- Front entry steps consisting of 3 granite risers with a landing. Wood frame is also an option.
- Windows: Double hung 6/6 white vinyl windows with 3.5 inch flat casing and large early colonial sill. Shutters are not proposed to match existing neighborhood homes.
- Siding: Exterior high-quality CertainTeed Monogram double 4 inch clapboard siding. Color: Sea grass. This siding was chosen for its rough cedar true-texture finish, which is molded from real cedar boards. A sample was provided.
- Corner posts of 6 inch white CertainTeed traditional vinyl super corners.
- Soffit of white CertainTeed InvisiVent.
- Trim coverage: Alcoa aluminum coverage in white.
- Roof: Lifetime Owens Corning architectural shingle. Color: Slate stone gray. A sample was provided.

The members of the HDC and the public were then given time to look at samples and documents as well as the front, side, and rear elevation drawings of the proposed house provided by the Edmunds'. There were 2 plans provided: One of existing conditions and one including the proposed moving of the house, distances from the well, setbacks, etc.

Ms. Morse asked Mr. Edmunds to explain the plan. David offered to discuss the design elements, and Ms. Morse agreed.

- One element commonly noted in the neighborhood is the flat pigeon return located at gable ends and cornices, which will be recreated and used in the new home. He explained what the gable return looks like on the drawings and showed the HDC pictures of neighbors' homes with this design element.
- He also noticed sidelights at the front door of other homes, and he pointed these out on the drawings provided. He is not sure exactly what the sidelight design will be, but it will be included. Ms. Prescott asked if a sidelight is planned on 1 or both sides, and he said either is being considered.
- Another element noted are 6/6 double-hung windows with 3.5 inch flat casings and an early colonial sill. He brought a sample Harvey window for viewing that is smaller in size than what will be installed but is made of the same material.
- He stated there is no intention to install shutters as few neighboring homes in the front and side of the house have them.
- He explained the sample of CertainTeed Monogram siding that was brought. It is a high-quality vinyl with true texture technology, where the vinyl is formed from an impression of a true cedar board. This provides a very natural-looking cedar impression on a vinyl panel. The sample was passed around. Mr. Coppelman noted that the Commission approved house modifications in vinyl as it recognizes it is costly to maintain wood siding, but there are products in between wood and vinyl, such as a cement board product like HardieBoard, that is approved by many federal and state agencies for historic preservation. This would provide a traditional historic look. David offered to consider it and has used it in the past. He chose this vinyl as it is realistic-looking and did not feel that the difference between a vinyl and a cement board product would be visible. Ms. Prescott said that colonial reproductions usually have siding spaced smaller at the bottom near the foundation and then increases; this can be done if HardieBoard is used. However, David added that installation such as this would void the warranty of the product as it would not be installed per manufacturer's instructions.
- The last thing David discussed was the roofing single. He passed around the sample. He also passed a book around with samples and colors.

Ms. Prescott had a question about how much concrete would be visible on the new foundation. Mr. Edmunds explained that he wants a regular basement with a concrete floor with an 8 foot wall; six feet would be buried with 2 feet visible. He plans plantings and a slope to the road. Ms. Prescott wanted to confirm that 2 feet of concrete would not be visible when driving by; Mr. Edmunds said this would not be the case.

Regarding the planned plantings near the foundation, Ms. Boutin asked if this would cause problems with the proposed septic system due to the roots of the plantings. Mr. Edmunds said the septic would be 6-8 feet away and so will not interfere with septic.

Mr. Shalett asked about the 2 planned entrances and the proposed garage. Mr. Edmunds said there will be 2 entrances, one on Main Street and one on East Way. The front door will still face Main Street to maintain the same address. He stated he had a brief phone

conversation with the Chief of Police, and he will show the building plan to the Chief to review the location of the driveways. He clarified that the driveway off of Main Street will be narrow, maybe gravel. There will be a paved driveway from the garage door to East Way. Mr. Shalett asked about the elevation near the driveway. Mr. Edmunds said it would be contoured runoff.

Mr. Shalett asked about the shed on the property. Mr. Edmunds said he is open to donating it to the HDC but is not sure how it would be moved. Mr. Shalett thought a flat bed could be used if the shed is jacked up. Mr. Edmunds said if they can do it, he is fine with that. The shed is not usable to him, although the structure is better than the house and appears to be newer. Ms. Morse said the Museum Committee has some interest in making the shed supply storage, and Jane Christie has spoken to Ms. Morse about her intention to get Richard St. Hilaire's opinion on moving it. Mr. Edmunds said he just needs Mr. St. Hilaire to contact him so it is done before he needs to move earth and make changes to the property. Ms. Boutin mentioned that at the Heritage Committee meeting, it was mentioned that the shed may be going out behind the library or where the Grace Daly house will be taken down. Ms. Morse sent that to them in writing as well. Mr. Edmunds thought it would not be tough to move the shed but would require equipment, possibly even a crane.

Ms. Morse brought the conversation back to the design of the proposed new home itself.

Ms. Smoyer asked if the pictures provided were to scale. David said there was no scale on this plan. She proceeded to note that there were elements pulled from neighboring homes but not all were noted on drawings. David agreed, and Mr. Edmunds clarified that the sidelight would be glass, but the transom decoration would not be glass. Ms. Smoyer wondered if there were plans to add any other embellishments such as trim work to the building. David said they could but would need to discuss this. Mr. Edmunds said maybe embellishment could be installed on the windows of the 1st floor but not upstairs. David said in his research, which focused on colonial reproduction/revival, he did not see that detail above windows. As there were various details in the pictures provided, Ms. Smoyer asked David which style he was going to match. David replied that some of the elements discussed may be included but not all. Mr. Coppelman then expressed concern that the applicant took pieces from neighboring homes of different periods instead of picking 1 style of home. David thought the intent was to fit into the neighborhood, not build a new home in a particular style. Ms. Smoyer said she thought house should look historically accurate, i.e. not a blending of styles but one time period in one style. Mr. McGowen said he did not feel that is the case and that the design aspects look accurate. Ms. Smoyer stated the design is going in the right direction but is not quite there. Mr. Edmunds said he added the gables because the neighbors had them. Mr. Coppelman explained that the gable is representative of a Greek Revival, but the gable should not be a decoration stuck onto different style of home. Mr. Shalett said it looks artificial to him, involving a conglomeration of many styles; he recommends sticking with one style and asked if a 3D model could be made to help them visualize the new home. Mr. Edmunds said he could change the design in the front of the house to help, though the back and

ends of the house are not easily visualized and may not be changed. David asked the members of the HDC for suggestions. Ms. Prescott gave an example using a picture where the windows were 9/6 downstairs but 6/6 upstairs to give the house a colonial look.

--Gap in recording--

Ms. Smoyer said she wants final documents with more detail. David was not aware of that. Ms. Morse said providing trim detail; choosing 1 design, i.e. colonial as opposed to Greek Revival and colonial; and blueprints are needed for the exterior. She recommended that Mr. Edmunds reuse as many features as possible from the original house. She will continue the public hearing with more specific plans.

David asked if the HDC could provide guidance on materials that could be approved. Ms. Morse explained that vinyl is approved as is vinyl or HardieBoard trim. She was not sure if aluminum has been used in the past. If vinyl will be used, it should be an extrusion of the exact trim on the house. She was not sure if metal doors have been approved, usually wood doors. David looking for a clearer vision. Mr. Coppelman suggested to use as many natural materials as possible that would have been found when the house was originally built. Ms. Boutin added that pictures provided to the HDC should be identical to what will be used.

Ms. Morse asked for further comments. Mr. Edmunds asked when next meeting will be held. He was informed it will be on Tuesday April 11. Ms. Morse asked Mr. Coppelman if it is procedurally possible to continue the public hearing at a specific time and date if a motion is made to continue the hearing. Mr. Coppelman said this is accurate.

Motion: Mr. Coppelman moved to continue the public hearing on this matter to April 11 at 7:15 PM. The motion was seconded by Ms. Prescott.

Members in favor: Six.

Members in opposition: None

No abstentions.

Mr. Edmunds then asked if he could obtain a permit for the foundation prior to the design of the new home being finalized with the HDC. Mr. Coppelman said he did not think this was advisable in the event that the design was changed. Mr. Edmunds will check with the building inspector, Rob Steward.

Ms. Morse thanked Mr. Edmunds and Mr. McGowen for being responsive to feedback. Mr. McGowen shared that the Edmunds' are honest, decent, and flexible and will work with the HDC to come up with the plan. Mr. Coppelman concurred that they are forthcoming and explained that building in the Historic District is different. David shared that he recently replaced the roof on the oldest house in New Hampshire, Jackson House in Portsmouth.

Application: Ing-Marie Bahr, 119 Main Street
Modification of Previous Application

Ms. Morse invited Ms. Bahr and Mr. Buck Lovern to come up and thanked them for being patient. Ms. Morse explained there is a modification of an approved application to be discussed. Ms. Bahr had HDC approval to add a 3 bay garage, mudroom, master bath, and upstairs hobby room to the rear of the existing structure. Now they want to modify that plan. New plans have been provided and are to be reviewed for a modification to the prior approval.

Mr. Lovern said after looking at the cost, they have decided not to add a room over the top of the garage, though the garage will still be higher than the eave coming out toward the garage. The garage will have the same footprint, just a lowering of the roof line and keeping the garage at a 10 foot elevation inside.

Ms. Morse stated that the appearance from the front would be changed very little but wanted to meet with everyone to get it properly on record.

Mr. Coppelman said it is aesthetically better than before; the look from Main Street is the most important, and this new plan is an improvement on the street view. Ms. Smoyer noted that all features are maintained from before. Mr. Coppelman asked if all materials to be used on the outside would remain the same, and Mr. Lovern said yes. Mr. Coppelman asked if the roof pitch would change; Mr. Lovern said the pitch did change and will now match the existing house.

Ms. Morse looked through the paperwork to make sure it was complete. She thought it was and opened up to questions. There were none.

Motion: Ms. Prescott moved to approve the revised application. Ms. Boutin seconded this motion.

Members in favor: Six.

Members in opposition: None

No abstentions.

Mr. Lovern asked if a new approval would be issued, and Ms. Morse said she will get a copy out tomorrow and another copy to over to the Selectmen's office.

Discussion of Critical Correspondence

Mr. Coppelmen noted they may have passed over a discussion of critical correspondence. Ms. Morse stated she read a letter from the Reynolds fellow, but she read it during applications, and there was no other critical correspondence.

MM&S to adjourn at 9:20 PM. Mr. Coppelman moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Prescott. All members agreed.