

**Kingston Planning Board
Public Hearing
September 20, 2011**

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM. There were no challenges to the legality of the meeting.

Members in attendance:

Richard Wilson, Chairman	Mark Heitz, BOS rep.
Glenn Coppelman, Vice Chair	Ernie Landry
Jay Alberts	
Adam Pope (Arrived with the meeting in progress)	

Also in Attendance: Glenn Greenwood, Circuit Rider Planner; Ellen Faulconer, Administrative Assistant; Police Chief Don Briggs, Jr.; Larry Middlemiss, Health Officer.

Absent: Rich St. Hilaire, alternate

Board Business

Correspondence:

- Notification of Groundwater Withdrawal Permit for Granite Fields Golf Course; Mr. Wilson noted that a public hearing had been requested in the past; Mr. Greenwood explained that it allowed the Town to ask questions, establishes baseline for project. The Board unanimously agreed to request the public hearing.

ACTION ITEM: Mr. Greenwood will notify agency that the Town is requesting the public hearing.

- Danna Truslow has received the Groundwater report and was waiting for the Board to authorize the review. Ms. Faulconer notified the Board of the current bond balance. Mr. Greenwood stated that it is the Board's practice to request the bond be replenished to \$5000 when it drops below \$1000.

MM&S to ask Diamond Oaks to refurbish the bond amount to \$5000. (Motion by Mr. Coppelman, second by Mr. Landry) PUNA

- Letter received requesting the Board grant a 90 day extension from the deadline for the original approval of Diamond Oaks from October 26, 2011 to January 25, 2012. Mr. Wilson suggested that, due to the bankruptcy procedures, the Board probably didn't have much choice so as to not impact the value of the property at the time the Town was notified.

MM&S to extend the deadline of the conditional approval of Diamond Oaks to January 25, 2012; a 90 day extension. (Motion by Mr. Alberts, second by Mr. Coppelman) PUNA

- The Board confirmed that Ms. Truslow is authorized to review the Groundwater Withdrawal report once the Town has received the bond replenishment.
- Law Lecture Series announced.
- Letter received from Building Inspector re: expansion of use at Kuzirian site. Mr. Coppelman suggested checking if the Inspectors had received a reply and then a letter can be written inviting them to come in to speak with the Board.

ACTION ITEM: Ms. Faulconer will follow-up with the Building Inspector on Kuzirian.

- The Early pit was reviewed in regards to the required Bond; Mr. Greenwood had been told that it was being sent to the Town; Ms. Faulconer stated that the Town had not received anything. He added that they might be sending it to him directly

ACTION ITEM: Ms. Faulconer will confirm with the Financial Officer that nothing had been received regarding the Early bond.

- Town and City magazine received; an article on Land Use changes was distributed.
- A compliance issue for the property on the corner of Hunt Rd. and Rte. 125 was reviewed.

ACTION ITEM: Ms. Faulconer will invite the property owner to come in to speak with the Board prior to asking for enforcement from the BOS; a response will be required within a two week deadline.

- Legal notification of challenge from Galloway of the Planning Board's decision of the Brox Industries plan.
- Budget request had been received; the submission is due by next Thursday; Ms. Faulconer had a question about the amount needed for contracted services for Impact Fees. Mr. Landry explained that the proposal was separated into three parts with approximately \$6500 for each part with a maximum cost of \$16,500.

ACTION ITEM: Ms. Faulconer to send proposed budget to the Board members for their review.

Mr. Landry stated that the proposal seems to include the schools and wondered if they were expected to contribute to funding the proposal.

ACTION ITEM: Mr. Greenwood to contact Mr. Mayberry regarding the timing for the Impact Fees in regards to the contract.

- Correspondence from Mr. Maher; based on discussions Mr. Greenwood has had with Mr. Michaud and a proposal on that site, the letter will be added to next week's correspondence and reviewed then.

John's Truck and Auto and Salvage of Kingston, NH
71 New Boston Road
Tax Map R18-22, 23

Mr. Wilson explained that this was a continuation from last month's public hearing. He read comments adding that both Mr. Steward and Mr. Greenwood were suggesting that the Board do a site walk on this location. Mr. Wilson read Mr. Nichols response letter and a waiver request for section 904.5F re: septic systems.

<Board note: Mr. Pope joined the meeting at this time.>

Mr. Greenwood explained that whether doing the review of the site as a minor modification or a larger review, there were a lot of items on the lot that were not part of the original approval. He commended the applicant for showing what is currently on site by updated the plan and re-iterated that there were items on the proposed plan that weren't there before.

Mr. Wilson announced that the Board would do a site walk on Saturday, Sept. 24 at 7:00 AM.

Richard Beauchesne and Steve Grace, the owners, stated that the concrete has been added to protect the water quality on the site.

MM&S to continue to September 27 @6:30 PM. (Motion by Mr. Pope, second by Mr. Landry). **PUNA**

Stepping Stone Music Opportunities, Inc.
Sad Café
3 New Boston Road
Tax Map R19-10

Mr. Wilson started this hearing by reading from the ZBA minutes and the last paragraph; the motion was to allow the Sad Café to locate in the SFR zone; the specifics had not been addressed, just allowing a business to exist on the site. He explained that he read this as Board members had asked about the ZBA approval at a previous meeting.

Mr. Wilson read the waiver requests:

904.6. D and E: avoid buffers and screening

904.6. I: eliminate need for controlled substances

904.7: avoid complying with erosion and sedimentation treatments

904.8: avoid completing a lighting plan for the sight.

908.16.6: Avoid water quality maintenance and Inspections.

Ross LaBlais, representing Sad Café, stated that they would be willing to do a lighting plan and they are no longer requesting a waiver. Buffering requirements were reviewed; Mr. Wilson explained that even though they were willing to build a fence, they still needed a waiver.

Mr. Wilson said that several Board members and abutters did a site walk on the property; noise levels were recorded; he added that before the music started, the site was not in compliance with

the noise ordinance. He explained that a yard sale was going on. Mr. Pope noted that the site was in compliance for day time. Mr. Wilson stated that he had called a sound engineer after the test who reminded him that there was ambient noise that may have affected the tests; he suggested going back at night to get an accurate representation.

Mr. Mailhot, Chairman of the Board of Directors for the Sad Café, commented that the site walk and sound check was a good activity as it let them know where they needed to be; they have no interest in moving into a building and spending time and money only to be shut down. He added that they will put up the fence and change the lighting. Mr. Wilson reminded the applicant that the sound level is only one piece of the issue. Mr. Alberts asked Mr. Wilson to review some of the sound level numbers done at the site. Mr. Wilson said that without the music, the levels were 54 to 57; 55 is ok during the day; most of the levels were between 61 to 65; when it was tried with the door open, it went from 56 to 68. Mr. Alberts asked if the music inside was set at 100 decibels; Mr. Mailhot said that they tried to run most with 90 decibels. Mr. Wilson stated that one fear he had was that nothing was done with a lot of bass and he wondered what the levels might have been then. He continued that there was still an issue with the septic system. Mr. Mailhot stated that he felt that was a civil issue; they hadn't heard from the abutter but they do have a new plan ready; he added that he was not sure if it was the Church that had to proceed with that.

Mr. Wilson reviewed the list of waivers. Police Chief Briggs discussed some of his requirements for the entrance including a separate entrance and egress with cars entering in one location and exiting in a separate location. Fencing was reviewed and discussed in conjunction with noise abatement; Mr. Wilson commented that outside noise would not be easily controlled and the higher the fence the better for this. Mr. Mailhot stated that they were not intending to change the existing two entrances. Chief Briggs recommended a right turn only to Route 125 with the exception of local traffic; the Sad Café personnel would need to police this. Mr. Wilson asked if the Sad Café would have personnel in the parking lot all night; Mr. Mailhot said that there would be personnel in the parking lot all night. Mr. Wilson confirmed for Mr. Heitz that the entrance to the site was currently "wide open"; Mr. Heitz questioned whether this should be addressed. Chief Briggs added that the applicant was intending to use the site for different uses such as renting it for weddings and birthday parties. Mr. Mailhot stated that he hadn't addressed that yet but would be writing a letter to the Board about it. Chief Briggs stated that if the applicant intended to have large events on site then their people would have to manage the traffic on the site. Mr. Heitz noted that the Board had not allowed open entrances for over 5 years and questioned if the Chief was suggesting it be allowed. Chief Briggs stated that the applicant would be using traffic cones to manage the traffic on the site which would make the site easier to maintain in the winter; he added that he would want painted lines, arrows and possibly physical barriers for the site. Mr. Mailhot stated that there are approximately 70 people on a Friday or Saturday night; a community meeting might have 20 people. Chief Briggs suggested clarifying the hours of operation regarding one or two staff in the building versus the rest of the operation. Mr. Mailhot explained that the bands come in to set-up around 5:00 PM and being playing around 7:00 PM. Mr. Wilson asked if the bands were only there on Friday and Saturday evenings; Ruth Kay, the Executive Director stated that a good week has 4 nights; she continued that they would like to open 4 nights for bands as it is healthier financially. Mr. Alberts said that he agreed with the applicant that it would be crazy to have sound levels above the Ordinance. He referred to Mr.

Greenwood's comments and asked Mr. Greenwood if he still had concerns if they fit into the Ordinance requirements. Mr. Greenwood answered that the Ordinances rule; he thinks that the applicant is challenged to put in adequate sound buffering; he did not feel comfortable with the noise levels heard on the site walk until he had walked onto an abutter's property, very far away from the lot line. Mr. Coppelman stated that he would like the Board not to get hung up on only the sound issue, there were more global issues regarding the use in this zone and whether it was appropriate; there were significantly more critical items for the Board to discuss regarding a decision by the Board. Mr. Coppelman said there was an issue with Lighting which needed to be Dark Sky compliant; it might not be enough for Chief Briggs security issues and the Board needed to find out what was appropriate. He continued that the Board would need to be authorizing a fairly high fencing around the property in a relatively open and treed residential area adding that visually it could be problematic for the neighborhood. Mr. Coppelman explained that controlled access is an issue as the Board does not approve wide open access to a development; he said that without getting into specifics, this is a residential neighborhood, the site was a church that has a variance for a commercial use and the question is whether this use is appropriate for this neighborhood.

The variance was discussed; Mr. Wilson read excerpts from the ZBA minutes and the interpretation of their approval. Mr. Heitz stated that he didn't think that anyone on the Board thought that the proposal is close to the prior use of the site adding that he didn't think that anyone would think it was a similar use. Mr. Mailhot referred to the previously discussed police report; Mr. Wilson stated that at the time he noted how many of the calls were vehicle stops. Mr. Wilson clarified that the amount of police calls were not his issue, if a church was before him he would have an issue with them going to 11 PM. Mr. Mailhot asked to know what criteria are needed by the Board so they can decide to do the project or not. Mr. Coppelman referred them to Article 904, the site plan review process that encompasses the requirements when an application is reviewed. Mr. Alberts suggested that Sound and Lighting should be done first for the Board to make their conclusions. Mr. Heitz suggested that a good place to start might be the waiver requests. Mr. Wilson noted that they are requesting fencing instead of a 50 foot vegetated buffer and if they couldn't get this they might not go any further. The septic was discussed; Mr. Wilson stated that the Board doesn't currently have an approved septic plan. Mr. Greenwood stated that if the Board required the 50 foot vegetated buffer, a lot of the parking would be eliminated. Mr. Coppelman suggested that a 20 foot lot line setback for activity needed to be considered. Chief Briggs stated that he had suggested the fence to keep everyone on this parcel of land, try to alleviate the noise issues; Mr. Wilson stated that the noise levels dropped from 62 to 60 when a truck was used to simulate fencing during the site walk. Wetlands and parking were discussed. Mr. Pope said that additional buffering with vegetation would help with the sound; there was only one area exposed without a tree line. Existing vegetative conditions, fencing, setbacks and possible plantings were discussed. Mr. Wilson asked if the Board could get past the buffer and setback issues; the fence is proposed to be 8 ft. high on both sides of the property right up to the property line; Chief Briggs stated that there would be no fencing in the back to allow for snow storage; he added that cars and kids in the parking lot would still cause noise. Mr. Heitz stated that he would like to hear from abutters regarding the setback issues, fencing and plantings before making his decision. Mr. LaBlais said that 32 parking spaces would be lost if the Board required compliance with the 20 foot setback.

Mr. Pope commented that several issues had come up that he thinks the applicant should comply with the ordinances; he thinks the main issues are traffic and buffering; he would like to hear from the public about these issues. Mr. Coppelman confirmed that the applicant will bring in a plan showing lighting fixtures and cut sheets for the Board to review.

Mr. Wilson asked for public comment. Mr. Edwards, 80 Main Street, explained to the Board that he felt there were three significant issues: noise, traffic patterns, appearance. He said that all three issues directly impact the market value of his home; he hoped that this did not directly impact the enjoyment and property value of his property. Mr. Edwards asked about the noise ordinance limits; Mr. Wilson answered 30 decibels at the property line at 9:00 PM; the tests showed the highest number at 69, most in the 63-64 range. Mr. Edwards noted that these numbers are 30 to 39 levels above that allowed in the ordinance. Mr. Wilson stated that the applicant assured the Board they would be addressing the noise levels so there was no need to discuss it further and asked Mr. Edwards to move on. Mr. Edwards said that traffic patterns should be changed; the Board should not offer waivers on curb cuts; he said that fencing had to be aesthetically pleasing. There were no further public comments.

Mr. Wilson returned to the waivers. Fencing, aesthetics, sound mitigation were continued to be discussed. Mr. Heitz stated that Mr. Quintal had comments pertinent to the Erosion and Sediment waiver; a concern about the existing stormwater run-off entering the wetlands without treatment; he said that there is more traffic than a church; there's a greater potential for contaminants and there is no management between the parking lot and the wetlands. Mr. Coppelman suggested that some site activity may require sedimentation controls during the development process. Mr. Wilson explained that the State and Federal Government require the Towns to monitor all sites for water quality. Mr. Coppelman confirmed that the Lighting Ordinance waiver had been withdrawn. Mr. LaBlais commented that the site had been this way for 30 years. Mr. Wilson stated that it didn't matter; Mr. Heitz added that the church only used it one day a week. Mr. Wilson explained that this was a change of use and the applicant needed to comply with the rules. Mr. LaBlais repeated that this site has been like this for years and cars had been parking on the site for 30 years. Mr. Wilson strongly re-iterated that it didn't matter. Mr. LaBlais argued that compliance with rules only applies to new projects; he's never seen the need for compliance for this type of proposed use. Mr. Heitz explained that the Town Engineer raised the concerns of the untreated water going into the wetlands. Mr. Wilson noted that the area where snow storage is showing is borderline to approve since it appears to be too close to the wetlands. Mr. Heitz asked if there was a stream on a specific area of the plan; Mr. LaBlais said that there was an area of poorly drained soils. Mr. Wilson asked the Board for direction regarding the fencing and buffering; he added that the plan didn't show the fence at this point; the plan is incomplete. Mr. Pope said he is okay with the fence being closer than 20 feet; Mr. Alberts agreed. Mr. Heitz questioned putting the fence right on the property line. Mr. Coppelman said that he was willing to concede the requirement for 50 feet but not on the 20 foot setback. Mr. Landry said that he would require the 20 ft. setback.

The septic system was discussed. Mr. Mailhot explained their interpretation of the easement requirements and allowances. Mr. Middlemiss stated that the easement was granted for the existing septic system, not for brand new systems; a new system has to be on the applicant's own property; it's a brand new system, not an expansion; clarifying that no one has the right to put a

septic on someone else's property and he would only approve the system designed that way with a court order.

The Board continued to review the number of parking spaces, vegetation. Mr. Heitz noted that most of the vegetation being discussed is on the abutter's property; Mr. Pope added that the opposite side has almost no vegetation. Mr. Heitz agreed that the right side is pretty open; a fence should be added with additional vegetation. Discussions continued on fencing, vegetation, setbacks, septic, parking configurations.

Mr. Wilson explained that at this point, the Board could not accept the plan as there are many things wrong or missing; they needed to be corrected needing to include hours of operation, number and location of parking spaces, handicap parking and accessibility.

Mr. Heitz explained that he would like the applicant to get input from the abutters regarding the vegetative buffer, location of the planting, fencing setback and the request to place directly on the property line instead of a 20 foot setback with vegetated plantings in front of the fence. Mr. LaBlais agreed that if he were starting with a vacant site, complying with regulations would be different. Mr. Heitz stated that some lots just won't support certain uses; it doesn't mean that you get rid of all the rules. Mr. Wilson said that Board looks at this like a new application. Mr. Heitz explained that if the building was on the property line, he'd have no problem but it's not a problem for the applicant to cut back on some of the asphalt to comply with some type of buffer; if the abutters don't have an issue with buffer, he might embrace waiving the whole buffer; the abutter may agree to this with some plantings in front on their property instead of on the proposed site; he added that the applicant cannot convince him that it is the same use as a church.

Mr. Wilson asked if the applicant wanted to do some work on the plan and come back to the Board or did they want a vote? Mr. Pope suggested the applicant follow Mr. Heitz's suggestions. Mr. Wilson added that the septic is still an issue which might really affect the plan; there is still an issue with the traffic pattern. Mr. Pope added that the entrance is another issue and he'd like the Town Engineer's opinion on Erosion and Sediment management; wants to talk about the entrance. Mr. Heitz included traffic flow with one way in and one way out, signage to take a right out of the parking lot in an attempt to try to eliminate noise affecting abutters on Main Street. Mr. Mailhot stated that they would like to keep the entrance open and direct traffic using traffic cones; when no one is there, he would like the cones to come down; he would also like to keep traffic away from the building. Possible parking, traffic impacts and possible solutions were discussed. Mr. Wilson stated that during the site walk, there was discussion about possibly requiring police details. Mr. Heitz suggested that the applicant supply a traffic control plan that can be followed. Mr. Wilson stated that the Board could review the waiver requests after hearing additional input from abutters. Mr. Alberts said the discussion told the applicant how the Board feels.

MM&S to continue the Sad Café hearing to October 18th at 7:00 PM. (Motion by Mr. Alberts, second by Mr. Pope) PUNA

Solar Hills Estates Subdivision
76 and 78 Hunt Road
Tax Maps R6 Lots 10-4, 14

Mr. Lavalley introduced himself as the registered land surveyor for the revised plan; two lots have been deleted from the proposed subdivision. He noted that he had received Mr. Quintal's comments and his office had addressed them although they don't have the answers to all of them yet. He stated that he received Mr. Greenwood's comments this evening; it explained that the subdivision proposal is for 6 lots adding that it would require a waiver from the 8 lot minimum required by the Town; the intention is to eventually continue and it would then be 8 lots at that time. Mr. Greenwood had an issue with the numbering that Mr. Lavalley said he could change. Mr. Wilson said that both Mr. Quintal's and Mr. Greenwood's comments suggested a site walk. Mr. Lavalley read Mr. Quintal's comments and his comments addressing them.

Mr. Lavalley expressed his disappointment that neither Mr. Quintal nor Mr. St. Hilaire were present at the meeting. He stated that he will be submitting a waiver for the 100 foot cul-de-sac. He would like the waivers for the cul-de-sac and dead end length this evening; 905.9.F: asking for a waiver for the radius of 150 ft. cul-de-sac to build a 100 foot temporary cul-de-sac and waive the 1,000 foot restriction. Ms. Faulconer suggested that since the Board was going to do a site walk there was really no reason to rush to the waiver until after that time. Mr. Lavalley stated he had no objection to waiting until after the site walk. Mr. Lavalley again commented about Mr. Quintal and Mr. St. Hilaire's absence and commented that, although he did receive Mr. Quintal's comments, he would like to receive them further in advance. Ms. Faulconer explained that the procedure is for the Planning Board office to receive them the day before the meeting; allowing for sufficient time for Department Heads and the Town Engineer to review and make comments as they have other duties and responsibilities besides reviewing plans. Mr. Wilson reminded Mr. LaValley that he had made significant changes since the last meeting and they needed to be reviewed. The waiver requests were reviewed; Mr. Pope reminded the Board that the applicant came in with a dead-end road and the Board asked for a cul-de-sac. Mr. Coppelman explained that the Town doesn't want to create a lot of dead end roads. Mr. Lavalley said that the main reason for the 1,000 foot limit regarding fire protection had gone away since these buildings were going to have sprinkler systems. Ms. Faulconer understood the request to waive the 1,000 foot limit agreeing that the requirement had to do with fire suppression; she asked why the Board would waive the requirement of 8 lots in favor of 6 as it did not appear to have anything to do in way of the Town's interest; Mr. Lavalley had previously stated that this was simply to avoid needing an Alteration of Terrain permit which was definitely in the applicant's interest but did not appear to benefit the Town in anyway. She also stated that the applicant was asking for a temporary cul-de-sac but asked how long temporary was. Mr. Wilson said there was no guarantee that Mr. Conant would be extending the road and developing his property. Mr. Lavalley noted that the Board had received a letter from Mr. Conant about his intentions for his property. Mr. Lavalley agreed that the major reason to have 6 lots was to avoid an Alteration of Terrain permit; the intention is to eventually have 8 lots. Mr. Pope asked if the waivers were granted for the 1,000 feet and the 100 foot cul-de-sac, could he get 8 lots. Mr. Lavalley said that the road is guaranteed to continue on; there would still need a ROW on the next property. He said that the applicant would continue the road whether Mr. Conant did or not; the road will be continued and the 8 lots done eventually. He re-iterated that Ms. Faulconer is correct that this is

being proposed this way to avoid an Alteration of Terrain permit. Mr. Heitz asked what the issue was with getting the permit. Mr. Lavalley said it was the expense and time which could take 3-4 months and a considerable fee, possibly \$1200. He added that he understood that a financial hardship shouldn't be the Town's issue re-iterating the intention to continue on to the eight lots.

Mr. Wilson read comments from the Conservation Commission; they have asked to see the Certified Wetland Scientist's report on how the Wetlands were determined and asked that the ROW easement be 50 feet. A letter received from abutter Paul Husson was read into the record.

Public comment: James Shuffleton, 31 Mayflower Drive, E. Hampstead, asked about the proposed locations of the homes and driveways. Mr. Wilson explained that they are not required to be built where shown; they do have to comply with the Ordinances and regulations; siting can change with the property owner.

Dan Bartley, 72 Hunt Road said that the test pit on Lot 5 had been moved about 25 feet and would fall out of the area; no 4,000 square foot area is shown on the lot. He asked how surface water was depicted on the plan or is it just shown as wetlands. He asked how the Board could tell whether the well is within 100 feet of surface water due to requirement that well placement not being within 100 ft. of surface waters. Mr. Middlemiss and Mr. Greenwood confirmed that requirement. Mr. Middlemiss stated that it should be changed; Mr. Greenwood said that it is currently a requirement and therefore it stands at this point. Mr. Lavalley said he would check it and comply with the setback. He added that some of the soils are very poorly drained. Mr. Bartley repeated his comment that the test pit on Lot 5 had been moved and was now outside the 4,000 sq. ft. area.

ACTION ITEM: Run Mr. Bartley's comment about Lot 5 past the Town Engineer.

Mr. Lavalley stated that lot 10-4 is no longer part of the subdivision. Ms. Faulconer said that the Board had not received that mylar; there was nothing recorded; no deed had been received which is a requirement. The Board agreed to leave the posting as it was originally received.

The Board decided to schedule a site walk on Saturday, October 1st at 9:00 AM; Mr. Wilson announced that the public is invited.

MM&S to continue to October 18th at 8:00 PM. (Motion by Mr. Coppelman, second by Mr. Alberts) **PUNA**

Mr. Wilson announced that this was the public's notification of the site walk and the public hearing.

Board Business, continued

ACTION ITEM: Ms. Faulconer to send copy of R03-6 Letter to the Board for review.

Dunkin' Donuts
53 Church Street

Mr. Heitz addressed the Board about a proposal to add a walk-in cooler and enclose the walkway. Mr. Greenwood confirmed that this proposal qualifies for an expedited site review; 12 copies of the proposal have been received; there is an existing plan on file. Mr. Heitz confirmed that, as the property owner, he was in favor of the proposal. Mr. Greenwood said that this is less than 1500 sq. ft of additional, new area; Mr. Heitz clarified that it increases about 300 square feet. The Board agreed with Mr. Greenwood's assessment; no further review is required by the Planning Board.

ACTION ITEM: Ms. Faulconer will contact the Inspectors about the Board's decision regarding Dunkin' Donuts.

- The Brox plan was reviewed; the Board decided to have 4 pages: 2,3,5,6 recorded. The conditions of approval were reviewed; they agreed that they were met.
- Northland Lot Line Adjustment mylar was signed by the Chairman.
- Mr. Alberts spoke about the "recreation" zoning project; he had met with Mr. St. Hilaire and Mr. Gleason of the YMCA; he stated that some of the language for innovative zoning might be appropriate.

MM&S to adjourn at 10:30 PM. (Motion by Mr. Coppelman, second by Mr. Alberts) **PUNA**