

Town of Norfolk  
Zoning Board of Appeals  
One Liberty Lane  
Norfolk, MA 02056

March 29, 2018

Zoning Board Members	Others
Chris Wider – Chair ----- Present	Devin Howe - Associate Member --- Present
Michael Kulesza –Vice Chair ----- Present	Medora Champagne – Assoc. Member --- Present
Donald Hanssen – Co-Clerk ----- Present	Amy Brady – Administrative Asst. - Present
Joseph Sebastiano – Co-Clerk ----- Present	Robert Bullock – Zoning Enforcement Officer
Robert Luciano –Full Member ----- Present	David DeLuca – Town Counsel

The duly posted meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals convened at 7:09 P.M. in Room 124 of the Norfolk Town Hall. Mr. Wider announced that the meeting was being audio and video recorded.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

**123 Seekonk Street, Appeal**

Present was Michael Brogan, appellant; Brian Almeida, attorney for appellant.

Mr. Kulesza read the public notice into the record. Mr. Wider recognized Atty. DeLuca, asking him to give an overview of the town’s position.

Atty. DeLuca stated that he was present at the Board of Selectmen meetings regarding the entertainment licenses that were issued, and which became a subject at Superior Court when there was an abutter appeal of the issuance of those licenses. The appeal was heard at Norfolk Superior Court in (“the vicinity of”) November, 2017, as an administrative appeal, one based on documentation with no additional testimony taken. The question before the court was whether the selectmen were reasonable and proper in issuing the licenses for the activity, or events, known as “run and gun,” and whether that activity was protected as an agricultural use of the property. The abutters and the town filed cross motions on the proceedings. The court issued a determination that the activity, as it was presented to the court, fell outside of the agricultural interest, that it was commercial in nature, and it was therefore not a protected activity under the current zoning in place. Atty. DeLuca stated that he then met with Mr. Bullock to discuss how to proceed with carrying out the instructions in the decision. Mr. Bullock then issued a Cease and Desist letter [C&D] which “carefully tracked” the decision issued by the Superior Court judge. Atty. DeLuca stated that the court ruled basically that the town was improper or illegal in issuing the licenses, since the events did not conform to zoning. Atty. DeLuca cited MGL 40A, §8, which allows an appeal of a decision by the Zoning Enforcement Officer [EO] of the town, as the reason for tonight’s hearing with the Zoning Board of Appeals [ZBA]. Atty. DeLuca went on to explain that this public meeting is not the same as a public hearing wherein there is input of public comment and opinion; rather the ZBA, in its quasi-judicial capacity, will take in evidence from the EO, the respondent, and the public, only to the extent that such evidence offers facts as to whether or not the activity is within or outside of the agricultural interest of the property. Atty. DeLuca added that the ZBA will have the advantage of hearing testimony, which the court did not, stating that the job of the ZBA is to determine whether or not the Building Inspector’s [EO] decision as it was provided in C&D should be upheld or overturned based on facts and evidence gained in this hearing.

In response to Mr. Wider, Mr. Bullock added that he did not have anything to add to Atty. DeLuca’s summary, and stated that the letter was sent out based on the judge’s decision. Mr. Kulesza asked what the next step would be, if the board upheld the Building Inspector’s decision; Atty. DeLuca responded that the right of review would go back to the superior court who, based on the record of tonight’s

proceedings, would review whether or not the judgement of the ZBA was correct in determining whether or not the EO's decision was right and reasonable. Mr. Kulesza then asked what the next step would be, if the board ruled in favor of the appellants. Atty. DeLuca responded that it would be the same process. Mr. Hanssen, referred to the last sentence of the judgement which states "If a renewed application is submitted ... the Town shall consider and act upon such renewed application, in due course, in conformance with this Court's Decision and Order ...," and questioned under what conditions the Town could consider and act upon a renewed application. Atty. DeLuca responded that the court had determined that the scope and extent of the events permitted exceeded the agricultural interest, transforming it to commercial, but the court did not say that no events at all were to be held. Mr. Hanssen questioned who would be responsible for determining how many events could be permitted, and Atty. DeLuca responded that it would be the ZBA. In response to Mr. Luciano, Atty. DeLuca responded that the scope of the ZBA's job tonight was to determine whether the EO's issuance of a C&D was correct.

Mr. Wider recognized Atty. Brian Almeida. Atty. Almeida concurred with Atty. DeLuca's assessment of the situation, but said they he felt the court decision was narrower than the C&D issued by Mr. Bullock. Atty. Almeida referred to page 5 of the court's decision which states, "...it seems likely that those entertainment activities have become, over time, Mr. Brogan's primary use of the Ranch property. As such, they fall outside of what reasonably can be considered 'incidental'..." Atty. Almeida notes that the court did not have the opportunity to take testimony as to what extent the property is actually used for run and gun activities vs. other farming activities. Atty. Almeida stated that he has been told that the primary goal of the events is not to make money; it is to benefit Mr. Brogan's girlfriend (Paige Whitt) and his daughter who compete nationally in these events. He was also told that the farm generated about \$100,000.00 in revenue last year: \$67,200.00 from rentals, \$28,000 from boarding horses, and \$2,400 grossed from races and events, facts the court did not have. Atty. Almeida said that the court decision is narrow, in that it states "on the facts before me, I determine that the previous entertainment licenses issued do not fit within the farming exception," but that the court lacked the financial information detailed above in making that determination. Atty. Almeida went on to say Mr. Brogan is seeking clarification on what the Town's C&D letter prohibits, claiming that run and gun barrel races and "events" is too vague to be actionable. Atty. Almeida questioned what constitutes an event. Is it only if it is open to the public at large? What about private events? He referred to an instance on November 22, 2017, where the court heard a preliminary injunction on what is called a "jackpot practice," and the court ruled that it was not an event. Atty. Almeida argued that the court's decision to allow the applicant to reapply for a license might in part be to allow further evidence to be presented at that time, to the effect that the events are agricultural in nature. Lastly, Atty. Almeida argued that the court's decision is not a "Final" judgement, because on March 1, 2018, Mr. Brogan filed a Motion to Intervene, stating that because it was his property that was being affected, he should have been a party from the beginning; the court decided to deny that motion because Mr. Brogan should have acted sooner, but that Decision has been appealed by Mr. Brogan, and Atty. Almeida said that until that appeal is decided, the Court's Decision and Order, dated January 25, 2018, is not final.

Mr. Wider asked Mr. Bullock to clarify what is meant by "events" in his C&D letter, if it includes practices or private events. Atty. DeLuca responded that he understood there were a number of horses boarded at the property and that the use of those horses on the property was permissible; what was troublesome was the number of non-resident horses and competitors at the events. Atty. DeLuca said it would be helpful to have a breakdown of public vs. private events from the applicant, with private events being limited to people who board a horse there. Atty. Almeida reiterated that he would like to understand what constitutes an "event," as the court had deemed the "jackpot" practice to not be an event, even though it included horses not boarded there.

Mr. Brogan said what he considers an "event" is a CMSA (Cowboy Mounted Shooting Association) event, which is shown on their website, and at which points are accumulated; practice events do not accumulate points for the participants. He explained the "jackpot" practice, which is considered practice training for the participants, and not an event (even though it includes participants and horses, not boarding at the property.) Mr. Brogan said other practices are held on Tuesday nights. These practices

(jackpot and other) are not open to the public. In response to Mr. Wider, Mr. Brogan detailed the schedule of events at this property: Last year they were licensed for 24 events, but held only 12 due to scheduling conflicts with other venues hosting these events. After explaining "Shoots" and "Barrel Races," Mr. Brogan went on to say that last year, 2 "shoots" were held, 9 "barrel races," and a miniature horse show. Most of the barrel races typically consist of 8-18 competitors and last 1 to 2 hours. However, 2 barrel races per year are events, consisting of about 60 competitors and lasting about 8 hours, and the shoots are about an 8 hour process. Mr. Wider noted that comments have been received from the Police and Fire Chiefs stating that their departments have not been adversely affected by activity at this property. In response to Mr. Hanssen, Mr. Brogan said that there is no parking on the street or that can be seen from the street. In response to Mr. Sebastiano, Mr. Brogan said that there was a limit of 60 contestants per event, per the entertainment license; the number of spectators was not limited, but was expected to be about 100 for the largest events.

Mr. Luciano referred to page 3 of the Superior Court Decision which states, "In particular, residents have complained about the loud music and event announcements played over the Ranch's amplified speaker system, about frequent gunshots during the shooting competitions, about illegally parked cars, overnight campers, and open fires observed near the Ranch, and about the large amount of dust that events at the Ranch stir up in the vicinity." Mr. Brogan responded that there has never been a fire on his property, other than when he cleared it years ago; competitors and spectators are not allowed to stay overnight, other than a friend from Tennessee who has parked an RV on the property once or twice, for up to a week; Mr. Brogan added that the property is deemed 61B, recreational use, which does allow campers onsite. Mr. Brogan said that parking is all on the property, and there is no on-street parking; he elaborated that the miniature horse show moved from Miller Street to his property due to the availability of off-street parking. Mr. Brogan said that the loudspeaker is similar to that used at ball fields, and the announcements are generally, who is up, who is next, what the time of the run was, etc.; music is only played during the two shooting events, where each contestant has their own music for each 15-second run. In response to Mr. Wider, Mr. Brogan said there is no alcohol served on the property. Mr. Wider asked if the horses are a specific type; Mr. Brogan said most are quarter horses, but it is important for them to be trained properly for shooting; horses boarded at this property are shooting horses and barrel horses. Mr. Brogan said that Ms. Whitt is a highly desired instructor.

Atty. DeLuca asked how many horses are boarded on the property; Mr. Brogan responded that he currently owns 3 and boards 4; a high estimate of how many would be boarded at a given time would be 12. When there is a shooting event, or one of the two large barrel racing events, there may be 40 to 60 horses on site; for the other event, 5 to 15 horses (these numbers are in addition to the 7 that reside there). Atty. DeLuca asked what other activities take place at the farm, besides the "events" and boarding, and was told that would include lessons and clinics. Asked if income from lessons and clinics was included in the figures above, Mr. Brogan stated no, it does not go to the farm, it goes to Ms. Whitt. Atty. DeLuca asked if the spectators pay a fee and was told they do not. Atty. DeLuca asked how much time is devoted to events, as compared to other activity at the farm; Mr. Brogan said about 100 hours per year is spent on events vs. general farm duties take about 3 hours per day, 6 to 8 hours per week for lessons. Mr. Wider equated the 3 hrs./day to 1,100 hrs./year for farm duties, and about 100 hrs./year for the event activities (32 hours for four 8-hour events, 16 hours for eight 2 hour events, about 24 hrs. for prepping the fields = 82 hrs.) Also added was 5-8 hrs./wk. for lessons (~250/yr.) and clinics = six 8 hour days (48/yr.).

Mr. Wider asked how many of the 40-60 horses at the large events are trained by Ms. Whitt, and Mr. Brogan responded 20-40. In response to Mr. Hanssen, Mr. Brogan said for the large events, the shooting is for 8 hours per day; there is also shooting on Tuesday nights for lessons (approximately 120 rounds over 2 hours,) and possibly on a Saturday or Sunday, and also if somebody is coming to look at a horse for sale. Mr. Brogan noted that his property is between the Walpole Gun Club and the Noon Hill Gun Club, which have daily shooting.

Mr. Luciano asked what the primary function of the farm is, and Mr. Brogan responded that it is to raise cowboy mounted shooting horses, and barrel racers are feeders to that circuit. Mr. Luciano asked if they

are breeders at the farm and Mr. Brogan responded that they are, but the primary function of the ranch is to train the horses.

Mr. Wider opened the meeting to the public, reiterating Atty. DeLuca's statements that testimony will be taken only to the extent that such testimony offers facts as to whether or not the activity is within or outside of the agricultural interest of the property.

Tara Comendul, plaintiff, stated she had attended all of the Board of Selectmen (BOS) hearings and knew what the court had relied on. Ms. Comendul stated that Mr. Brogan's Motion to Intervene was denied, and he has subsequently appealed that decision, but there has been no "stay" of the Superior Court Order, and it is still in effect, and she believes it is not correct to say it is not a final judgement; because he has not been granted "intervener" status, he is not a party to the decision. Ms. Comendul stated that, in determining his judgement, Judge Davis relied on the administrative record, which was based on several BOS hearings. Ms. Comendul said that she did not think the Superior Court's decision was based on financial revenue information as much as the fact that the contestants and horses come in from the outside, and are not boarded on the property. Ms. Comendul stated that Mr. Brogan is not breeding horses, he is not licensed to breed, and the stud horse Mr. Brogan referred to is not on the property. Ms. Comendul referred to the noise level from the shooting practices and events; Mr. Wider asked if she had had a test done. She had not, but other neighbor's had, and she would provide the data to the Board showing the noise exceeded town limits. Ms. Comendul stated that the shootings occur on Tuesdays and Thursdays. Ms. Comendul said she believed the judge looked at the fact that the participants in the events are members of a private club, and the scope and size of the events is larger than the training and breeding that occurs on the property. Ms. Comendul asked if the horses wear ear plugs. Ms. Comendul said that the BOS license said no alcohol was to be sold on the property, and wanted to verify if alcohol was consumed on the property. Ms. Comendul noted that 2016 barrel race events were much larger in scope and number than in 2017. Ms. Comendul asked to clarify if it was rough board or full board occurring on the property.

Mr. Wider asked Mr. Brogan to answer some questions raised by Ms. Comendul. Mr. Brogan stated that his stud horse is on property, and has been since the day he got him. With regard to breeding, Mr. Brogan stated that he holds a stable license and Ms. Whitt holds a trainer's license, and he was not aware of the necessity for a breeder's license. With regard to earplugs, that is a "to each his own" decision by the participants. Mr. Brogan said that they "rough" board, meaning they provide a paddock and barn, and bales of hay, but he does not clean, feed, or otherwise care for the boarders' horses.

Karen Clark, 130 Seekonk Street referred to decibel testing paid for by the neighbors in 2015, the results of which were compared to the EPA specifications because Norfolk's bylaw is about 60 years old, and the instrumentation used is no longer made. The town then hired an engineer to have testing done, and the neighbors had testing done the same day. Ms. Clark stated that on that day, Mr. Brogan hired a hydraulic jackhammer, and was chastised for that by the BOS, but the results of the testing were still accepted by the town. The neighbors' engineer wrote a rebuttal to that, which was presented to the town.

Atty. DeLuca reminded everyone that the issue tonight was to decide if the EO's Cease and Desist order is valid, and the sound testing played very little role in that Order. Mr. DeLuca's stated his recollection of those proceedings was that there was (and still is) dispute as to the level of noise, but the town did hire its own engineer, who found that the sound levels were within the limits of the Norfolk Zoning Bylaws.

Ms. Clark said that Ron Hall at the Department of Agriculture had told her that the primary activity of agriculture as applies to horses is breeding and raising horses, with boarding and lessons being secondary in nature. Ms. Clark referred to organizations that have frequented the property; the Northeast Six Shooters [NESS], International Barrel Racing Association [IBRA], The CMSA, and the New Hampshire Horse Barrel Association, stating that they, in effect, rent the space from Mr. Brogan, and she assumes that he makes a profit from the events. Ms. Clark said that Mr. Brogan said "breeding did not go well," so therefore, he just raises horses, and does not breed them. Ms. Clark noted that Mr. Brogan is zoned

Recreational, 61B, but appears to be getting the benefits of 61A as well, and issue that was raised with the Assessors. Ms. Clark expressed her opinion that the noise from the indoor arena reverberates, and is as loud as the noise from the outdoor arena.

Mr. Wider referred to Apple Knoll in Millis; the Dover Hunt Club; the Acushnet Cow Farm; and the Essex Horse Club all run similar events, minus the shooting, and they are all deemed agricultural uses, and do not require entertainment licenses. Ms. Clark took issue with listing income received from renting houses as part of the agricultural use income; Mr. Wider asked Mr. Brogan to break down the 15 acres, and how many properties are rented. 119 Seekonk Street is approximately 2 acres, all but 55,000 s.f. of which is included in the 61B; 9 Fruit Street is two lots, a small one the house is located on, and 4-1/2 acres which is being converted to 61B. Mr. Brogan said 7-8 acres is agricultural; he also purchased 127 Seekonk St. and converted all but 55,000 s.f.

Mr. Brogan said he rents to the CMSA, which includes NESS, and NBHA, which is the barrel horse association. He stopped renting to IBRA due to small size of races. Mr. Wider asked if a person could run their own event, without an organization, and Mr. Brogan responded that yes, they had done that for someone, and his payment received was the waiving of his daughter's \$80.00 entry fee. Mr. Wider asked if the events could be closed to the public; Atty. DeLuca stated that the spectators were "the public" as well. Mr. Brogan stated that by law, due to the size of his property, he has the right to shoot on his property at all hours, every day.

Peter Diamond, 84 Seekonk Street, asked how many horses had been sold this year, and how much profit was made, and is showing the horse "live in action" at an event important to the sale of the horses. Mr. Brogan said 6 or 8 horses had been sold in the 6 years they have been doing this, and this past year they sold one, which stays on the property. Mr. Brogan also said that it is important to show the hoses "in action."

Atty. Almeida spoke in response to Ms. Comendul, stating that they had not sought a "stay" of the decision yet, because in his judgement, he felt the ZBA could still find different facts and render a different decision. Regarding the stated fact that the court had relied on the "administrative record," Atty. Almeida said that the decision referred to the administrative record as "disjointed." Atty. Almeida also referred again to page 5, which says the primary use of the property has now become the shooting, and he feels that testimony tonight has shown otherwise. Boarding, riding, training and selling are all activities on the land.

Ms. Comendul said that when the judge said the administrative record was "disjointed," he was referring to the fact that it was not enumerated, or tabbed. Ms. Comendul also added that fact that the Comenduls live within 200' of the shooting.

*Mr. Kulesza made a motion to close the public hearing for 123 Seekonk Street; Mr. Sebastiano seconded the motion; the vote on the motion was unanimous.*

### **82 North Street, Appeal**

Mr. Wider opened the hearing for 82 North Street, and Mr. Kulesza read the public notice into record. Mr. Wider announced that a request for continuance had been received from the applicant.

*Mr. Kulesza made a motion to continue the hearing to April 4, 2018, at 7:00 P.M.; Mr. Hanssen seconded the motion; the vote on the motion was unanimous.*

### **84 North Street, Appeal**

Present were Richard Bremilst, applicant; Joseph Mitchell, Jr., attorney for the applicant

Mr. Kulesza read the Public Notice into record. Mr. Wider recognized Bob Bullock, Building Inspector/Zoning Enforcement Officer, who gave an overview of actions to date.

Mr. Bullock stated that business had stopped operating about 6 years ago, and water service was cut off about 4 years ago, after the pipes froze in the winter. Numerous letters were sent to 82 North Street about the discontinued commercial use of the property, and the case went to district court, which ordered some structures in disrepair be taken down. Mr. Bremilst told them he lives at 84 North Street, not 82 North Street. 84 North Street is not recognized as an address by the Norfolk Assessor's department. The Magistrate asked the Town to send another letter addressed to 84 North Street, which was sent in January. Atty. DeLuca said that the property had preexisting nonconforming status as commercial use, but has since become residential. Atty. DeLuca stated that a preexisting use has protection, as long as it has been continuous; he noted that Mr. Bullock had deemed the use discontinued for reasons stated above, but the question to be determined by the ZBA is whether there has been a continuation of commercial use on this property known as 82 North Street by Mr. Bremilst.

Atty. Mitchell stated that this is a preexisting nonconforming use, and that his client had no notice of the original court proceedings for 82 North Street, which he stated, is the business that was ordered to be torn down. He stated that his client lives at 84 North Street, and although it is taxed as 82 North Street, that is a matter currently in Superior Court. Atty. Mitchell said that his client makes his livelihood as a forester from 84 North Street, and he files his taxes as such, which is an agricultural use. Atty. Mitchell said that the woodcutting business has been continuous since the 1930's when it was started by Mr. Bremilst's grandfather, and subsequently taken over by his father, and then by Mr. Bremilst in the 1969, and it has remained continuous since then. Atty. Mitchell said that Mr. Bremilst built his house, addressed as 84 North Street, and received mail there, including utility bills and personal property tax bills from the Town of Norfolk. He restated that his client had no notice of the original court proceedings because they were addressed to 82 North Street. He said that having no water service is of no consequence to the business. Mr. Bremilst does continue to live on the property.

Mr. Wider stated that the board would be looking for facts, such as taxes with Schedule C's, utility bills, equipment bills, customer lists, all dating back to 1969. Mr. Wider asked if Mr. Bremilst pays real estate property taxes for 82 North Street, and Mr. Bremilst replied that he does, and he can provide cancelled check numbers. Mr. Kulesza asked if Mr. Bremilst owns either the land or the house that he lives in and Atty. Mitchell replied that is a question before the courts right now. Mr. Hanssen asked if the nonconforming use status stays with the property or the owner; Atty. DeLuca said that it can be by a property occupant, not necessarily owner, as long as the business is continuous. Mr. Luciano asked for clarification as to whether anyone has actually claimed that the woodcutting business had ceased for any period of time; Mr. Bullock replied that his letter to 82 North Street was instigated due to the Family Florist business, and he was not fully aware that the woodcutting business was operating separately, addressed as 84 North Street, because this is not a recognized address with the Town of Norfolk. Mr. Hanssen asked if the woodcutting business only needs to show continuous operation since the florist was discontinued 6 years ago, and Mr. Kulesza questioned whether the discontinuance of the florist business also signified discontinuance of any other business on the lot known as 82 North Street. Atty. Mitchell stated that although the town taxes it as one property, the land court recognizes it as two parcels. Mr. Bremilst submitted as evidence, an excise bill addressed to Everyday Trees and Flowers at 84 North Street, which he said is the name of his business. Mr. Sebastiano questioned whether the question of property division and ownership should be settled in court before the ZBA makes a ruling. Mr. Wider said that was not necessary, since there was a use associated with the land, regardless of ownership. Mr. Sebastiano also asked if two different decisions had been made on two different properties, and Mr. Bullock said he treated it as one property until the court said to send a letter to 84. Atty. Mitchell stated that the town census counts Mr. Bremilst at 84 North Street. Mr. Wider said that where mail is sent does not indicate a legal address. Mr. Kulesza asked for clarification if there were two different nonconformities, the florist shop and the woodcutting business; Mr. Bullock responded that there were two uses. Atty. Mitchell stated that he surmised the reference to not selling wood in Mr. Bullock's letter

to 82 North Street referred to the small packets of wood that the Family Florist had been selling during the court proceedings about discontinued use of that business.

Mr. Wider asked if Mr. Bremilst advertises his business, and Mr. Bremilst responded that he has a sign with a phone number outside; Mr. Wider asked if the wood delivery vehicle is commercial, and Mr. Bremilst responded that it is commercially licensed, but not lettered. Mr. Wider said that all commercial vehicles need to be commercially lettered. Mr. Wider asked if the phone was landline or cell, and if there was an answering machine; it is a landline with an answering machine. Mr. Kulesza asked if the current occupant is continuing a business, but the owner has an issue with it, does the owner have any rights. Atty. Mitchell said the owner could evict the tenant business, and in fact eviction proceedings are in process; however, those proceedings are on hold until the proceedings regarding the question of ownership are resolved.

With no further questions from the Board, Mr. Wider opened the hearing for public comment, and recognized Richard K Bremilst, son of the applicant. Mr. Bremilst, of Millville, stated that he fabricates many of the materials used in the business, and he plows the property, which he has been doing since 2000. Ruth Palumbo, 92 Stewart Street, Franklin, said that 82 North Street is her parents' property; Ms. Palumbo said that Mr. Bremilst pays \$100.00 per tax bill, and does not pay toward the mortgage. Mr. Wider said that the Board would hear only facts related directly to the woodcutting business. Pamela Russell, 143 North Street, stated that she and her husband heat most of their house with wood, and have been buying from Mr. Bremilst since moving here in 2005; Ms. Russell said that Mr. Bremilst has been very accommodating and helpful, and they would really miss his services. They spend about \$2,000.00 per year, and could provide cancelled checks, if requested.

Mr. Wider asked what percentage of the property Mr. Bremilst is claiming to own, but that information was unknown. Looking at a plan provided with the application, it was determined the part called 84 North Street totals 2.46 acres. Mr. Howe asked if there is a limit as to the lookback period regarding discontinued use, and Atty. DeLuca responded that he does not believe there is.

Jerome Reinhart, 72 North Street, stated that he has been buying wood since from Mr. Bremilst since 2010. Ray Crosby, 77 North Street, said he can confirm as a neighbor that the business has been running continuously at least since he moved in 35 years ago. Dave Johnston stated that he is a neighbor who grew up on North Street beginning 60 years ago and now lives on Johnston Way, and can confirm that the business has been operating at least since he was a child. With no further questions, Mr. Wider stated that he would like to afford the appellant the opportunity to provide tax information requested earlier.

***Mr. Kulesza made a motion to continue the hearing to May 16, 2018, at 7:15 P.M.; Mr. Hanssen seconded the motion; the vote on the motion was unanimous.***

***Mr. Hanssen made a motion to adjourn the meeting; Mr. Sebastiano seconded the motion; the vote on the motion was unanimous.***

*The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 P.M*

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mr. Joseph Sebastiano, Clerk, or  
Mr. Donald M. Hanssen, Clerk

In accordance with the requirements of G.L. 30 § 22, approval of these minutes by the Board constitutes its certification of the date, time and place of the meeting, the members present and absent, the matters discussed, and the action taken by the Board with regard to those matters (if any). Any other information contained in these minutes is included for context only. Notes memorializing deliberation or discussion of any matter are in the summary form and may include inaccuracies or omissions. Where proof of the content of a statement is required, a tape recording or transcript should be consulted, if available.