

**MINUTES
MANCHESTER-BY-THE-SEA
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**

Meeting May 22, 2019

Members Present: Bridget Murray (Chairperson), James Diedrich, (Clerk), Sarah Mellish, and Kathryn Howe. James Mitchell (Alternate).

Members Not Present: John Binieris.

Ms. Bridget Murray, the Chairperson, called the Meeting of the Manchester-by-the-Sea Zoning Board of Appeals ("ZBA") to Order at 7:02 p.m. Ms. Murray introduced the ZBA members to those in attendance. Ms. Murray stated that this meeting will be digitally recorded by the ZBA Administrative Assistant. It is noted that the typed minutes represent the permanent record of the Board. The format of the hearing was explained to those in attendance by the Chairman.

Ms. Murray explained the standard ZBA meeting procedures to the applicants and to the members of the public.

CONTINUED APPLICATIONS

Ms. Murray introduced the application of **84 Old Essex Revocable Trust, MJP Properties, Inc. Trustee (Michael Panzero)**, for a Special Permit under Sections 6.1.2, and 7.5.2 of the Zoning By-Law, and/or other relief as may be necessary, for removal and reconstruction of a pre-existing, non-conforming, single-family residence on a non-conforming lot, at **84 Old Essex Revocable Trust, MJP Properties, Inc. Trustee (Michael Panzero)**, Assessor's Map No. 58, Lot 32 in District B, filed with the Town Clerk on March 27, 2019.

Ms. Murray explained that the applicant has requested that this application be continued to the next ZBA meeting.

Mr. Mitchell made a motion to continue the application of **84 Old Essex Revocable Trust, MJP Properties, Inc. Trustee (Michael Panzero)**, for a Special Permit under Sections 6.1.2, and 7.5.2 of the Zoning By-Law, and/or other relief as may be necessary, for removal and reconstruction of a pre-existing, non-conforming, single-family residence on a non-conforming lot, at **84 Old Essex Revocable Trust, MJP Properties, Inc. Trustee (Michael Panzero)**, Assessor's Map No. 58, Lot 32 in District B, filed with the Town Clerk on March 27, 2019.

Mr. Diedrich seconded the motion. Vote: Ms. Murray, Mr. Diedrich, Ms. Mellish, Ms. Howe, and Mr. Mitchell voted unanimously in favor of continuing this application to the May 26, 2019 meeting.

NEW APPLICATIONS

Ms. Murray introduced the application of **Andrew and Liesl Hawley** for a Special Permit under Sections 6.1.2, and 7.5.2 of the Zoning By-Law, and/or other relief as may be

necessary, to change the use of the existing building from mixed use to residential use, renovate the existing non-conforming structure and construct additions to the existing structure, and construct a new attached 2-car garage, , at **48 Central Street**, Assessor's Map No. 44, Lot No. 19 in District G, filed with the Town Clerk on April 24, 2019.

Mr. Brian Stein introduced himself as the architect on this project, and stated that the applicants, Mr. Andrew Hawley and Mrs. Liesl Hawley are present as well.

Mr. Stein explained the project as follows: The original house was built in the 1760's (front structure), with a rear, three-story addition from the 1980's. This house has had a commercial use, with a rental residence on the third floor. Presently, the rear of this structure is entirely paved with asphalt for parking vehicles, a small boat house, a deck on the harbor, and a small shed located in the rear corner.

The proposed project involves adding a two-car garage (13 feet, 2-1/2 inches in height, from the driveway grade to the top of the railing—lining up with the existing deck railing) in the rear of the house, with a one-story addition on top of the existing addition lower level deck on top of the first floor, with a six foot connector. The first floor will have an addition that is approximately 9-1/2 feet, leaving 5-1/2 feet remaining space on the deck. The deck will extend over the garage on the same level to provide the clients with more deck space and also to keep the height of the garage down, the roof line and railing is about the same height as the existing railing on the existing deck, which will be 3-1/2 feet up from the deck. The rear addition windows will be replaced with new windows. The rear stairway (driveway side) will be widened to access the deck. The main brick structure of the house will remain as is, with the exception of removing all the stucco siding that is not original to the house and replace with clapboards, to make it more in keeping with the historical nature of the house. The west side of the house is close to the neighbor's house, and we plan to remove some of the windows on that side. Most of the existing driveway will be replaced with landscaping.

Ms. Mellish asked if the applicants have met with the Department of Public Works ("DPW") regarding the sewer easement. Mr. Stein replied that he had met with the DPW and was told that the sewer line is a little bit more than 10 feet below grade (the proposed garage is 4 feet below grade), and didn't have an issue with the location of the proposed garage. In addition, the DPW will be relining these sewer pipes. Ms. Mellish asked if the applicants would have an issue if there would be a condition of the Special Permit that the sewer easement part of the project be subject to approval by the DPW, and the applicants agreed.

Ms. Murray asked if the applicants have gone before the Historic District Commission ("HDC"), and Mr. Stein replied that they filed an application to the HDC last month, but there application wasn't heard, due to lack of a quorum; however, this application will be heard by the HDC tomorrow evening (May 23rd).

Ms. Murray asked if the public has any questions or comments. Mr. Christopher Williams, 50 Central Street, stated that he is concerned about the proposed roof deck on top of the garage blocking his harbor, Central Street, and downtown views and creating a privacy issue, because anyone on the deck can look right into his house, and the setbacks.

Ms. Murray explained that there is a pre-existing setback non-conformity, and the proposed project will not make the non-conformity worse, so the ZBA will not require the applicants to change the setbacks.

Mr. Michael Storella, 119 Pine Street, stated that he is not an abutter, but a friend of Mr. Christopher Williams, expressed concern about the size and scope of the proposed project and the roof deck, and the effect of the Williams' views and privacy.

Brian Sollosy, 11 Central Street, expressed concern about the roof deck above the garage. Mr. Stein explained that it will look better to have some sort of roof over the garage, then just all railing, and it will provide more privacy for 48 and 50 Central Street homes.

Ms. Murray stated that the non-conformities are lot width, frontage, and both side setbacks. The building height is okay. The lot coverage by structure is okay, but will be increased by a significant amount. The impervious surface will be decreased.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the architect and the owner have done a reasonable job trying to keep the proposed garage as low as possible. They are also eliminating a third floor existing roof deck, which also impairs views, in an effort to keep the scale lower and be sensitive to the neighbors and their views.

Ms. Murray closed the public meeting and opened the meeting for ZBA members' discussion.

Ms. Murray explained that this is a non-conforming lot and a request to do a significant improvement, resulting in a significant change to the existing structures, with neighborhood opposition.

Ms. Mellish stated that this proposed project will be a challenge since 48 Central and 50 Central Street are close together and both within the setback. The garage is in the setback, but if it wasn't in the setback at all, it would be perfectly legal—they could go up 2-1/2 stories. They can't help that the house next to them is encroaching into the setback. The proposed design is reasonable in trying to keep the scale low, and doesn't have a problem with it.

Ms. Howe stated that this is a lovely design. It will be a big change to go from a mixed use building to a single-family building and wondered if there might be some room for compromise regarding the deck over the garage, and if this deck is impacting the neighbors' view that much, then maybe there is a way to eliminate it or make it smaller. Ms. Murray stated that it is the garage itself that will be blocking the views, and the deck has a privacy issue.

Mr. Diedrich stated that Ms. Mellish is correct about the setback issue and the garage could be taller, without violating the Zoning regulations. Removing the deck over the garage is not going to make the garage any lower—it would be just railing on top, rather than something that is more attractive. The ZBA is not charged with dealing with views or privacy issues. These issues occur when you live in a "village." I do not see any reason to deny an application based on loss of view. Having a garage and getting cars off the street is a good thing. Mr. Diedrich concluded that he is sympathetic to the neighbors, but doesn't have any issues with this proposed project.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the design has been carefully considered and agrees with Mr. Diedrich's comment about the ZBA not having jurisdiction over views. However, if the garage deck was removed to afford a lower level garage by as much as three or four feet, that might afford the neighbors more of a view, but the question is a view of what? Having the solid deck wall does afford some privacy for the neighbors. The applicant has made concessions aesthetically and architecturally by removing the third floor deck to make the building a better design and more appropriate for the age of the building, which would have had spectacular views. If you look at another issue of privacy, this house currently being a multi-unit and consider the number of vehicles and people that have been using this building, as opposed to it being converted to a single-family residence. As Ms. Mellish pointed out, the applicant can construct a 35 foot garage structure by right. The proposed project seems to be a substantial improvement to the property, and I have no objection to the proposed project.

Ms. Murray stated that her only comment would be that there are many residences in Manchester-by-the-Sea that do not have any garages at all, so the idea that every new development or proposed renovation project has to have a two-car garage is a non-issue. Ms. Murray explained that she is very sympathetic to the neighbors. It is a very pretty design and an improvement over what is there now. We do not have view easements, and the ZBA is looking at the setbacks and what is allowed according to the By-Laws. The applicants can slightly shift the garage and build it up to 35 feet.

Ms. Murray made a motion to approve the application of **Andrew and Liesl Hawley** for a Special Permit under Sections 6.1.2, and 7.5.2 of the Zoning By-Law, and/or other relief as may be necessary, to change the use of the existing building from mixed use to residential use, renovate the existing non-conforming structure and construct additions to the existing structure, and construct a new attached 2-car garage, , at **48 Central Street**, Assessor's Map No. 44, Lot No. 19 in District G, filed with the Town Clerk on April 24, 2019. With the condition that any work on the utility easement will be done with coordination with the DPW, and also on the condition that the Historic District Commission ("HDC") grants approval for this project. This is based on the finding that the proposed project is not substantially more detrimental to the neighborhood than the existing building, and also based on the proposed construction be in compliance with the plans that were presented to the ZBA.

Ms. Mellish seconded the motion. Vote: Mr. Diedrich, Ms. Mellish, and Mr. Mitchell voted in favor of approving this application. Ms. Murray and Ms. Howe voted against this application.

The application was not approved, and Ms. Murray asked for further discussion from the ZBA members.

Ms. Howe stated that this design is beautiful, and I do think to everyone's point that the applicants have been considerate to keep the proposed project on a lower scale. At the same time, I am very sympathetic to the neighbors, and suggest finding a way to ameliorate the view and privacy issue, and at the same time not compromise the applicants' proposed project. The other issue is that this proposed project involves construction of an additional building into the setback—expanding into the setback, which in this case is more detrimental to the neighborhood, based on the neighbors' response and input about the current design. Ms. Howe explained that

the issue is the garage, and not any of the other proposed renovations to the existing structure. Ms. Howe suggested the possibility of producing a photos or drawings that will show the existing structure superimposed by the proposed structure to demonstrate if or how the proposed project will affect the neighborhood.

Mr. Mitchell made a suggestion along the lines of Ms. Howe's suggestion that an existing photograph of the existing structure, superimposed by a 3D photo of the proposed structures would be helpful. A potential solution is for the applicant to pay for the extension of the neighbor's deck to create a new view or a better view, as a concession for their loss of view and to improve their property.

Mr. Stein suggested taking a photograph from Mr. Williams' deck, if he agrees, and one from the Hawleys' property, to offer both points of views.

Ms. Murray explained that this is a Variance application, requesting an exception to the Zoning By-Law. The motion to approve this application didn't pass, because only three out of five ZBA members voted to approve this application, and two ZBA members voted against this application, with the finding that this proposed project is significantly more detrimental to the neighborhood than the existing building. The options are to deny the relief, in which case this same application cannot be heard by the ZBA for two years. The other option is to continue the application to afford the applicants the opportunity to negotiate with the neighbors and revise their plans.

Ms. Murray made a motion to reconsider the vote in order to continue the application of **Andrew and Liesl Hawley** for a Special Permit under Sections 6.1.2, and 7.5.2 of the Zoning By-Law, and/or other relief as may be necessary, to change the use of the existing building from mixed use to residential use, renovate the existing non-conforming structure and construct additions to the existing structure, and construct a new attached 2-car garage, , at **48 Central Street**, Assessor's Map No. 44, Lot No. 19 in District G, filed with the Town Clerk on April 24, 2019, to the June 26, 2019 ZBA meeting.

Mr. Diedrich seconded the motion. Vote: Ms. Murray, Mr. Diedrich, Ms. Mellish, Ms. Howe, and Mr. Mitchell voted unanimously in favor of continuing this application to the June 26, 2019 ZBA meeting.

The applicants signed the Continuation Form.

Documents Produced: Town of Manchester-by-the-Sea Site Map, dated April 23, 2019, and Plan of Land in Manchester, MA for 48 Central Street, signed and stamped by Jay Jarosz, dated March 21, 2019.

Existing Plans: Existing Basement Plan, Existing First Floor Plan, Existing Second Floor Plan, Existing Third Floor Plan, Existing Front Elevation, Existing Rear Elevation, Existing East Elevation, and Existing West Elevation.

Proposed Plans: 48 Central Street Site Plan, Lower Level/Basement Plan, First Floor Plan, Second Floor Plan, Third Floor Plan, Front (Central Street) Elevation with Fence, Front (Central Street) Elevation – Fence Removed, Rear (South) Elevation, East Elevation, and West

Elevation. All prepared by Tucker Architecture & Landscape, Marblehead, MA, dated April 22, 2019.

All documents one page each, 8.5" x 11" in size.

Color Photo: Proposed Front/North Elevation, West Side Elevation, Rear/South Elevation, East Side Elevation, 1 page 11" x 17" in size.

Ms. Murray introduced the application of **Henri Deguillebon** for a Special Permit under Sections 6.1.2, and 7.5.2 of the Zoning By-Law, and/or other relief as may be necessary, to construct new alterations and additions to a non-conforming structure and non-conforming lot, at **9 Washington Street**, Assessor's Map No. 46, Lot 10 in District G, filed with the Town Clerk on April 25, 2019.

Mr. Remko Breuker introduced himself as the agent and designer of this proposed project. Mr. Deguillebon, the owner, is not in town today. Mr. Breuker distributed updated plans with revised dimensional elevations and photographs of the house to the ZBA members.

Mr. Breuker explained the project as follows: This is a 1-1/2 story building that drops down in the back to a 2-1/2 story building with enclosed porch and located close to the adjacent building, with a deep sloping back yard—7-1/2 feet from the driveway area to the rear, and another 3 to 4 feet at the other end of the rear of the property. Its overall height based on average grade height from the rear of the house is 27 feet. It is the smallest building on Washington Street in terms of footprint, height, and ridge line. This building has had a number of additions constructed over the years.

The owner would like to add one living space and two bedrooms by filling in the basement area in the conforming area and underneath the non-conforming area (proposed new footprint and addition with a new balcony), as well as a second floor addition on the existing first floor. We will also be going before the Historic District Commission ("HDC") tomorrow evening. There is a small gable end and a porch in the rear of the house, with a low slung roof. The plan is to maintain the ridge line and build an addition in the lawn area under the posts and out 5 inches past the existing corner of the house and add two dormers to the side closest to the house next door. Mr. Breuker explained that he is aware of the neighbor's letter, but has not had a chance to make any revisions to the plans. The owner would like to have a more contemporary expression in the rear of the house, with additional windows and skylights.

Ms. Murray read a letter from a neighbor to the ZBA for the record, partially in support of the project, but expressing a concern about the dormer close to their existing window that will obstruct sunlight into their home and requesting that the project be altered in some way to avoid blocking the sunlight. The letter also requesting that the large tree that grows over the property line be removed to provide more light. The letter expresses concern over drainage issues that may be exacerbated by the proposed addition.

Ms. Murray asked Mr. Breuker what he knows about drainage issues, and he replied that he will have to investigate this issue further, but stated that there is ledge between the two

properties. Mr. Mitchell stated that he noticed at the site visit that some of the runoff coming from that space between the two buildings has found its way into the neighbor's basement, and they have temporarily mitigated it by installing an extended gutter/downspout. Mr. Breuker replied that he will investigate and see what can be done about the runoff issue.

Mr. Breuker stated that Mr. Deguillebon plans to have the large tree taken down as part of the renovation. It obscures the view of many neighbors and there is concern about the tree coming down as result of storms.

Ms. Mellish stated that she is concerned about the general mass of the house and wondered why the square footage needs to be increased by 43.5%. Mr. Breuker replied that it is a small house. Ms. Mellish replied that 4,149 square feet is a very big house, and the existing 2,891 square feet is not super small. Mr. Breuker stated that this is a two-family house, which is allowed in that district, and it is on a high footprint. One unit would be approximately 1,600 square feet, and one would be approximately 2,400 square feet. This district allows for a fairly high density. Ms. Mellish stated that the proposed project will add mass in two different directions.

Ms. Murray opened discussion to the public.

Andrea Fish, 8 Washington Street (across the street) stated that this is a project that is moving from a small 13 x 13 foot room bump-out on stilts, with very low impact and mass, that is going to be replaced with a three-story addition. Ms. Fish explained that she has a problem with building into the setback any further than is necessary. A house can be 2-1/2 stories tall or 35 feet tall, whichever is less. You are removing a one-story porch and replacing it with a three-story structure. Mr. Breuker replied that our zoning code does not refer to a 2-1/2 story, but does refer to a half-story. A half-story can be defined by "no bigger than 12 feet tall," and in this case it is defined by 50% of the bottom floor is allowed to be above ground, and the first floor is allowed to be 3 feet above grade. When you have a sloped site, like this one, you have basement conditions, and that is why some of these houses look like they are three stories, but because the site slopes back so far, that in the front they are 2-1/2 story. Ms. Fish stated that all of these buildings that have the exposed three-stories in the back were built before the Zoning Ordinance existed. This proposed project is going to result in a brand new structure, adding a basement where there is no basement right now, there will be living space at grade. It is not being constructed as a walk-out basement, it is being constructed as living space. Our Zoning Code specifically defines that a half-story is 4 feet up the wall, and the area has to be no more than half the area of the floor below it. Mr. Breuker replied that the additions done to this house over the years were definitely done while our Zoning Code was in place.

Ms. Murray asked that the focus be on the building at 9 Washington Street.

Mr. Breuker explained that the front façade is a 1-1/2 story building, because the eave is not more than 4 feet, so if you are adding a half-story to the basement and technically a full story for the second floor, you end up at 2-1/2 stories. Ms. Murray asked why it is not considered a three-story structure on the back. Mr. Breuker replied that the Building Inspector would look at the entirety of the building, from the point of view of the front being 1-1/2 stories, and because

of the basement clause, it is a half-story, so the total is 2-1/2 stories. Fifty percent of the basement perimeter of the basement space cannot be 3 to 4 feet above grade.

Ms. Murray asked if there is a discrepancy between the neighbor's contention and your contention, I presume that the Building Inspector is the one who will make the final determination. Ms. Fish stated that the Board of Appeals is responsible for the final determination. Ms. Murray explained that she likes to get the information from the person who looks at this on a daily basis, and that is not me, but the Building Inspector. I would like to hear from the Building Inspector, even if the ZBA is required to make the final decision.

Ms. Fish, a member of the Planning Board, stated that this may be the smallest house on that side of the street, but it is also the smallest lot on that side of the street. The Town Boards are trying to support a policy that if it is a small piece of land, it should have a small building on it.

Mr. Breuker stated that in this case, we can confer with the Building Inspector for his determination.

Mr. Mitchell suggested continuing the line where the skylights are, chop the dormer down, wouldn't that mitigate some of the neighbor's loss of the daylight? Mr. Mitchell added that all the skylights may cause a privacy concern.

Ms. Murray suggested that Mr. Breuker clarify the 2-1/2 story vs. 3 story with the Building Inspector, and make sure that your calculations match what the Building Inspector thinks the regulation is. Take a look at some of the runoff questions, because that is a big issue, since the houses are so close together. And, give some thought about the massiveness in the back. Ms. Murray explained that the plans do not look terrible, in comparison to the other existing houses in the neighborhood, but we obviously have some opposition, so you should take another look at the plans. Ms. Murray stated that she wonders why the neighbor who wrote the letter didn't attend the meeting.

Ms. Mellish expressed concern over the closeness of the houses and addition an additional mass—replacing a porch with real living space on all levels. Ms. Howe stated that she sees the neighbor's issue as a request to tweak the proposed plans a little. Ms. Mellish replied that the ZBA has to be concerned about adding so much to a house on such a small lot. The proposed project will result in 78% of the required size allowed, and they are adding 43.5% to the building.

Mr. Diedrich stated that the proposed project will not appear more massive from the Washington Street view. It is a nice design, and the mass is in the back. It only looks massive, because the property drops off almost a full story in the back. It's not going to extend any further back than the current building—it will go up a bit. I don't have an issue with the mass, because there is mass there now.

Mr. Breuker explained that the only windows that are impacted are on the third story. The windows on the second story already face a wall, so there is no change there. I am not sure

about the first floor, but I will find out. Mr. Breuker stated that he will consult with the neighbors.

Ms. Murray stated that Mr. Breuker is willing to go back and look at some of the concerns raised by the neighbor who wrote the letter and the neighbor who was here and try to address some of the massing concerns.

Ms. Howe asked if Mr. Breuker goes to the Building Inspector for some clarity about the story issue, could you request a letter from him, giving his interpretation. Mr. Breuker agreed and added that he will have the property surveyed, but he added that if he has to go that far, he doesn't know if he will be ready to present at the June meeting. Mr. Breuker expressed concern that if Ms. Murray will not be present at the next meeting, there will only be four members present who attended this meeting. Ms. Murray replied that Mr. Binieris will be present and this issue can be resolved by Mr. Binieris reading the minutes from this meeting in advance of the meeting.

Ms. Murray made a motion to continue the application of **Henri Deguillebon** for a Special Permit under Sections 6.1.2, and 7.5.2 of the Zoning By-Law, and/or other relief as may be necessary, to construct new alterations and additions to a non-conforming structure and non-conforming lot, at **9 Washington Street**, Assessor's Map No. 46, Lot 10 in District G, filed with the Town Clerk on April 25, 2019, to the June 26, 2019 or July 24, 2019 meeting.

Mr. Diedrich seconded the motion. Vote: Ms. Murray, Mr. Diedrich, Ms. Mellish, and Ms. Howe voted unanimously in favor of continuing this application.

Mr. Breuker signed the Continuation Form.

Documents Produced: Plan of Land signed and stamped by Kirk Benson, dated May 20, 2018. Plans: Plan T0.1 Proposed Site Plan, Plan E2.0 Existing Elevations, Plan A1.0 Proposed Plans, Plan A2.0 Proposed Renovations—Elevations, Plan A2.1 Proposed Elevation and Sections.

All documents 1 page and 11" x 17" in size.

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

ZBA Meeting Minutes: Review and approval of the April 24, 2019 minutes. Tabled to the June 26, 2019 meeting.

ZBA Application Revisions: Final discussion and vote regarding revisions to the ZBA Application. Tabled to the June 26, 2019 meeting.

Changes in Chairperson and ZBA Clerk

Ms. Murray stated that she will not be attending the June 26, 2019 ZBA meeting, due to a vacation planned in advance. Ms. Murray also announced that her term as Chairperson is over

on June 30, 2019, and would like to step down as Chairperson, but will remain a ZBA member until June 30, 2021.

Ms. Murray made a motion to nominate Ms. Mellish to be the new ZBA Chairperson for the Town of Manchester-by-the-Sea. Mr. Mitchell seconded the motion. Vote: Ms. Murray, Mr. Diedrich, Ms. Howe, and Mr. Mitchell voted unanimously in favor of Ms. Mellish's appointment as the new Chairperson.

Mr. Diedrich stated that he would also like to step down as the ZBA Clerk.

Ms. Murray explained that the ZBA Clerk is responsible for reviewing the agendas when the ZBA Administrative Assistant sends it out, e-mails reminders about site visits, etc. The ZBA Clerk's job is to work with the Chairperson to make sure that things do not fall through the cracks. Ms. Howe agreed to be nominated for the position as ZBA Clerk.

Ms. Murray nominated Ms. Howe to be the new ZBA Clerk for the Town of Manchester-by-the-Sea. Mr. Diedrich seconded the motion. Vote: Ms. Murray, Ms. Mellish, Mr. Diedrich, and Mr. Mitchell voted unanimously in favor of Ms. Howe's appointment as the new ZBA Clerk.

Mr. Diedrich offered to assist Ms. Howe with her new position.

Adjournment: Ms. Murray made a motion to adjourn the May 22, 2019 ZBA meeting at 9:12 p.m. Ms. Mellish seconded the motion. Vote: Ms. Murray, Mr. Diedrich, Ms. Mellish, Ms. Howe, and Mr. Mitchell voted unanimously in favor of adjourning the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,
Adele Ardolino, Administrative Assistant
Manchester-by-the-Sea Zoning Board of Appeals

These Minutes were approved by the members of the Zoning Board of Appeals on June 26, 2019.

N.B. These minutes are not verbatim. They are the clerk's interpretation of what took place at the meeting.