

**Codes and Ordinances Committee**

Councilor Peter Lachapelle, Chair  
Councilor Skip Gilman  
Councilor Ashley Desrochers  
Councilor Steve Beaudoin  
Councilor Tim Fontneau (excused)



**Others Present**

Mayor Paul Callaghan  
Terence O'Rourke, City Attorney  
City Councilor Chris Rice  
City Councilor John Larochele  
City Councilor Don Hamann  
Jenn Marsh, Asst. Director of Economic Development

**CODES AND ORDINANCES COMMITTEE**  
Of the Rochester City Council  
**Thursday, February 3, 2022**  
**Council Chambers**  
**6:00 PM**

**Minutes**

**1. Call to Order**

Chair Lachapelle called the Codes & Ordinances meeting to order at 6:00 PM. Deputy City Clerk Cassie Givara took a silent roll call. All Councilors were present except for Councilor Fontneau, who was excused. Additionally, Mayor Callaghan, Councilor Larochele, and Councilor Rice were present.

**2. Public Input**

Robert Benoit, owner of Mitchell Hill BBQ, addressed the Committee in regards to outdoor dining. Mr. Benoit spoke about the amount of money his business spent in order to accommodate comfortable and safe outdoor dining for patrons. He spoke in support of extending or making permanent the provisions which had been put into place by the City to allow outdoor dining in front of establishments.

Marc Saxby, owner of Collectiques, spoke in support of the permanent establishment of outdoor dining. He suggested that the removal of the trees lining the street downtown would allow plenty of room for sidewalk dining in addition to room for pedestrians and ADA compliance.

Chair Lachapelle stated that he supported outdoor dining downtown and outlined the process which could be taken with the suggestions made this evening.

Councilor Rice spoke about the countless hours of work and discussion which had gone into the outdoor dining ordinance; both by City Staff and and the Codes & Ordinances Committee over the past couple years. He agreed that outdoor dining brings charm and vibrancy to the downtown area and emphasized the need to continue the discussion on the issue.

### 3. Acceptance of the Minutes

#### 3.1 December 2, 2021 *motion to approve*

Councilor Beaudoin **MOVED** to accept the minutes of the December 2, 2022 Codes & Ordinances Committee meeting. Councilor Desrochers seconded the motion. The **MOTION CARRIED** by a unanimous voice vote.

### 4. **Discussion:** Chapter 80 – Outdoor Dining ordinance

Jenn Marsh, Assistance Director of Economic Development, stated that she had reached out to the downtown businesses to get an idea of their outlook on outdoor dining and to inform them that it would be discussed at this meeting. Ms. Marsh gave an overview of the work that had taken place over the past several years in regards to outdoor dining. She stated that the majority of business wanted to continue with outdoor dining; however, some businesses had felt that outdoor dining utilizing the areas originally intended for parking spaces had been a lot of work and instead wanted to try using the sidewalks if possible. She stated that the dining within the parking spaces was something new that had come about due to COVID, however, there is nothing prohibiting its continuation. She reported that 28 restaurants, both public and private, had taken part in outdoor dining since it began. Ms. Marsh clarified that private properties do not fall under this ordinance and they would instead need to submit project narratives and go through the process of a site review or City approval. She stated that the majority of other non-food related businesses downtown had been supportive of outdoor dining; although several had expressed concerns with patrons needing to walk longer distances to reach their establishments due to the dining areas taking up parking spaces.

Ms. Marsh stated that applications for outdoor dining are due by March 1<sup>st</sup> for staff review before going to the City Manager for approval.

Chair Lachapelle asked if any changes would be needed to the Outdoor Dining ordinance in order to allow a restaurant to place tables on the sidewalks. Ms. Marsh indicated that there would be no changes necessary to the ordinance to allow for this use. She did report, however, that the liquor commission would be doing inspections this year in addition to the existing City inspections.

Ms. Marsh summarized a couple things that could potentially be changed within the ordinance: She suggested that the definition of “barrier” be included. She also suggested that there be clarification on the height restrictions of barriers. Currently in the ordinance, there is a minimum of 30” and a maximum of 36”; however, it could be clarified whether this height is for

the barrier alone or if it could include decorative elements or planters along the top of said barriers. Ms. Marsh stated that City staff wanted to include a requirement for a special events permit for not only outdoor entertainment, but also for outdoor games in order for staff to be able to review these activities. She also stated that the Fire Department had given input that if there is outdoor dining on the sidewalks, there should not be allowance for open flames or heaters due to the limited space. Mayor Callaghan asked if it would be suggested that a business receive a special events permit each time they wanted to offer a game, such as corn hole, or if it would be a one-time application. Assistant Director Marsh said that with the outdoor entertainment, it had been suggested that the permit be applied for and issued monthly, and she said the outdoor games permit was envisioned in the same way. She stated that the special events permit application has no associated fees and is very simple to complete.

Chair Lachapelle asked Assistant Director Marsh if she would be able to bring recommendations back to the committee in regards to height requirements. He agreed with Mr. Saxby's comments during public input that there could be a special committee formed...

Councilor Beaudoin inquired about the requirement in the ordinance for a 5-foot radius of clear space in front of a restaurants front door as well as a 36" sidewalk width, and questioned if that would prohibit the placements of tables in front of establishments due to limited space. Ms. Marsh stated that her understanding of this stipulation was that it was a requirement in case of emergencies for entering and exiting the establishment unobstructed and for handicap access; however, outside that radius, tables could be placed on the sidewalk. Councilor Beaudoin asked if "barriers" were defined within the document. Ms. Marsh said that there is mention of "enclosure systems" but they are not defined which should be rectified.

Councilor Desrochers spoke in support of accommodating the future of outdoor dining in Rochester and expressed interest in serving on the aforementioned committee.

Chair Lachapelle asked for clarification on the sidewalk width requirement and whether it was 36" as stated earlier, or if the law required 48". City Attorney O'Rourke indicated that the ordinance references the ADA requirements as opposed to a specific height, so that is the information which would be deferred to as needed. Councilor Rice read the ADA specifications for sidewalk dimensions.

Councilor Beaudoin referenced the 36" minimum height which had been discussed by Mr. Benoit during public input. He stated that in the City ordinances it requires a 36" *maximum* height. He suggested this be revised for clarity. Councilor Rice stated that the State liquor commission has requirements for enclosures and space surrounding outdoor dining areas, and these requirements would need to be written into the ordinance. Ms. Marsh reported that the ordinance does already include requirements to comply with State liquor licensing and food licensing. Councilor Rice reiterated that the City should ensure the correct measurements are listed within the ordinance to prevent and future issues.

## **5. Review of the City Council Rules of Order**

City Attorney O'Rourke directed the Committee to the portion of the Rules of Order regarding remote participation. He stated that in the current format, there is quite a bit of more

technical language, but City staff had felt that there should be more practical direction for those needing to connect remotely. He stated that the portions which were suggested to be removed referenced entire sections of the State RSA, which would be followed without question because it is already the law and it is not necessary to state this within the Rules of Order.

Councilor Beaudoin directed the Committee to page 2, section C, subsection 1, which starts “with the exception of an emergency...” in regards to why a member may need to connect remotely and the time requirement for said member to notify the Chair. He stated that the term “emergency” is not defined and, the reasons given for connecting remotely, if considered emergencies, could be too broad. There was a discussion of the wording and it was clarified that members would need to notify the Committee Chair of an absence at least two days prior *except* in the case of an emergency. Attorney O’Rourke said that, if needed, the Chair could suspend the rules to allow any other exceptions.

Councilor Hamann asked if there was a limit to the number of members who would be able to connect remotely for any one meeting. Attorney O’Rourke stated that in the absence of a declared emergency, there would just need to be a quorum physically present; depending on the board of committee, there could be multiple members permitted to connect remotely.

Councilor Beaudoin referenced the use of the word “impractical” as used in subsection 6 and felt that it should be changed to “impracticable.” Attorney O’Rourke stated that the State RSA uses the word “impractical” which is why it was used in the Rules of Order.

Councilor Desrochers suggested that there be a ninth permissible reason added to the list for remote connections, which would state “At the discretion of the Chair.” Attorney O’Rourke said that using the verbiage “As determined by the Chair” would be keeping with the RSA and could be added as an additional reason if the Committee desires.

Chair Lachapelle asked for a motion to accept the changes and deletions of section 1.4 “Remote Participation during Council and Board Meetings.” Councilor Desrochers **MOVED** to recommend the changes in section 1.4, as discussed above, to full Council. Councilor Beaudoin seconded the motion. The **MOTION CARRIED** by a unanimous voice vote.

Attorney O’Rourke directed the Committee to section 1.5 “Order of Business.” He stated that in review of many other NH communities’ order of business, there was not an agenda item for “other” and it does not seem to be defined anywhere to give direction on which items should be covered under this section. He suggested removing “other” from the order of business to eliminate the Chair of a committee needing to determine, without notice, the terms of what should be discussed under “other.” He clarified that there is already a process in place for Committee member to add items to the agenda. This process should be followed for the sake of transparency and to avoid something substantive from being brought up without no prior notice to allow other members and the public to attend and respond. Attorney O’Rourke said the more minor items such as school fundraisers and similar announcements, which occasionally occur under “other”, could be brought up under “Communications from the City Manager” or “Communications from the Mayor.” Chair Lachapelle pointed out that if the item qualifies, it can also be submitted ahead of time to be placed under “Presentation of Petitions and Council Correspondence.”

Councilor Beaudoin questioned the submission date for meeting materials, which is being moved from 7 days prior to a meeting to 11 days prior to the meeting, which would potentially make items being submitted for the agenda (which would have previously fallen under “other”) more onerous. He felt it was a disservice to constituents, whose concerns voiced to a Councilor past the submission date, would need to wait until the next months’ meeting to be addressed on the agenda. He also stated that in order to call for a Special Meeting and receive a 2/3 vote of Council, the time to do so would be under “other.” Chair Lachapelle clarified that to call for a Special Meeting, the request would need to be submitted in writing to the City Clerk’s office with signatures by a 2/3 majority of Council.

Chair Lachapelle stated that he felt that submitting items for the agenda instead of utilizing “other” would allow more adequate time to research the issue, confer with department heads, and potentially refer the item to an appropriate committee for review prior to coming to City Council. Councilor Beaudoin acknowledged that for motions requiring Council action, items could be raised under “New Business,” however for discussion items there would not be opportunity if “other” were removed.

Attorney O’Rourke referenced section 4.1 “Agenda Preparation” which stipulates when submission would need to be received to appear on the agenda. He explained how other communities formatted their agendas to allow discussion items and action to be placed under the name of the Council member submitting the issue. This would allow supporting documentation to be disseminated for review prior to a meeting, which is not the case with items brought up without notice under “other.”

Councilor Larochelle acknowledged that “other” is potentially used to air grievances and bring up items that could be addressed in a more efficient manner. He suggested that Councilors bring these discussions to the appropriate Committee meetings where there can be a more open dialogue, and at which time recommendations can be made to full Council. Mayor Callaghan stated that if there were last minute concerns or announcements, if he is notified prior to the meeting he would allow these items to be discussed under “Communications from the Mayor.”

Councilor Rice stated that his understanding of “Council correspondence” is communications coming to Council from constituents or outside sources, not correspondence being conveyed by a Councilor. He suggested that item 8 in the order of business could be changed to “Presentation of Petition ~~and~~, Council Correspondence, *and Announcements.*”

Councilor Hamann asked if the removal of “other” would be for subcommittees as well as City Council. Attorney O’Rourke indicated that subcommittees typically follow the Council Rules of Order. Councilor Hamann stated that at the Committee level, “Other” is utilized much more regularly, giving each member an opportunity to bring up items that may have been received from constituents and to open discussions. Attorney O’Rourke stated that each board and commission would have the ability to vote on their own order of business and maintain “other” if desired. Councilor Larochelle stated that the City Council would still be able to utilize “other” if the rules were suspended and it received a 2/3 majority vote.

Councilor Beaudoin **MOVED** to recommend to full Council the removal of #14 “Other” under section 1.5 “Order of Business.” Councilor Desrochers seconded the motion. The

**MOTION CARRIED** by a unanimous voice vote.

Councilor Rice reiterated the potential of adding “Announcements” to order of business #8, Presentation of Petition and Council Correspondence. It was clarified that, as proposed, any announcements could be approved by the mayor or city manager prior to the meeting and stated under their communications on the agenda.

Councilor Beaudoin referenced the fact that agenda is being created 11 days prior to the meeting and asked, if he had an item which came up after the creation of the agenda, if it could be submitted to the Mayor to be handled under “Communications.” Attorney O’Rourke said if the item required Council action, it would require a 2/3 majority vote to be added to the agenda. Otherwise, discussion items and announcements could be brought up by the Mayor or City Manager.

Attorney O’Rourke directed the Committee to section 4.1 “Agenda Preparation” and the change, referenced by Councilor Beaudoin earlier in the meeting, which will require agenda items to be submitted eleven days prior to the meeting as opposed to 7 days. It was explained that this proposed change was due to scheduling conflicts with members of the agenda settings committee. Councilor Rice suggested a change to have the agenda and packet distributed to Councilors seven days prior to the meeting as opposed to five days. He said that this would allow Councilors picking up paper versions of the packet from City Hall more time to obtain the packet and review. Chair Lachapelle and the City Attorney stated that the City Clerk’s office is often waiting on department reports and other backup in order to complete and post the packet; it would likely not be plausible to complete the process any sooner. Councilor Rice stated that the City Manager could enforce these submission guidelines in order to rectify these delays. Mayor Callaghan stated that the City Manager is implementing a new uniform report format for some of the department’s reports, and this may alleviate some of these delays. Attorney O’Rourke advised that, rather than voting changes into the Rules of Order regarding deadlines for submissions, this should be addressed by the Mayor and City Manager with City staff. If the policy is changes by the City Manager, these changes for the Rules of Order could potentially be voted on in the future. Councilor Rice questioned the requirement for Councilors to submit items 11 days prior to a meeting if they do not receive the packet until 5 days prior.

Councilor Desrochers referenced edits to the Rules of Order which had been submitted by a constituent, one of which asked for clarity on whether number of days when an item is due are calendar days or business days. Attorney O’Rourke stated that the way the law is written, “days” are presumed to be calendar days unless otherwise specified. Councilor Beaudoin MOVED to change the wording to “calendar days” in two sentences in section 4.1 “Agenda Preparation” and to change the meeting submission deadline from seven days to eleven days. Councilor Desrochers seconded the motion. **MOTION CARRIED** by a unanimous voice vote.

Attorney O’Rourke directed the Committee to section 4.12 “Ordinances and Resolutions.” He explained that the practice of the Council is to read resolutions by title only; rarely are they read in their entirety. The recommendation being made is that, in order for a resolution to be read in its entirety, there would need to be a motion and a 2/3 vote in order to do so. Otherwise the presumption would be that it is being read by title only. With this process, the Mayor would

read the resolution title as it appears consecutively on the agenda without a motion to do so by Council. It would then be seconded by a Councilor and voted upon. Councilor Desrochers **MOVED** to recommend the addition of the paragraph to section 4.12 as detailed by the City Attorney above. Councilor Gilman seconded the motion. The **MOTION CARRIED** by a unanimous voice vote.

Attorney O'Rourke recommended that section 4.13 "Codes and Ordinances Committee, Ordinance Enrollment" be removed in its entirety. He reported that this is not a process that has taken place for many years and detailed why it is no longer necessary to retain this verbiage. It was discussed how, with many of these changes, there would be need to be revisions made to numbering and format. Councilor Desrochers **MOVED** to delete section 4.13 "Codes and Ordinances Committee, Ordinance Enrollment" in its entirety. Councilor Beaudoin seconded the motion. The **MOTION CARRIED** by a unanimous voice vote.

Chair Lachapelle directed the Committee to section 1.1 "Regular Meetings." He made a recommendation that the start time of the meetings be moved from 6:30 PM to 6:00 PM. He said that although there had been a request from a Councilor to move the start time later, to 7:00 PM, he felt that it would be more beneficial for City Staff facilitating and working at the meetings to have an earlier start after the end of their work day. Councilor Rice agreed that a 6:00 PM start was likely better for City staff and it could potentially alleviate late adjournments for longer meetings. Chair Lachapelle **MOVED** to recommend the revision to section 1.1 "Regular Meetings" to change the start time of meetings from 6:30 PM to 6:00 PM. Councilor Desrochers seconded the motion. The **MOTION CARRIED** by a unanimous voice vote.

Councilor Beaudoin said that it was beneficial for Councilors to receive backup documentation for the non-public sessions; however, it would be better to receive these materials at the same time the Council receives the public meeting packet, 5 days prior to the meeting, in order to have adequate time to review and research. He read the following suggested verbiage for addition:

"Non-public sessions shall be held in strict adherence to the requirements of NHRSA 91-A:3. Items being considered for action in a non-public session shall be submitted and dealt with in accordance with Council Rules of Order sections 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3. Therefore, any supporting documentation, contracts, or proposals being considered during non-public session shall be submitted to council members at least five days in advance of consideration. Such documentation shall be placed in a sealed envelope separate from the normal agenda and clearly marked "confidential material not for public disclosure." This requirement shall not apply to non-public session held for emergency actions pursuant to NH RSA 91-A:3, I  
(i)

It was discussed that the above section may need some additional editing, as the portions referencing the RSA are unnecessary because these laws are already followed. Additionally, it was stated that the verbiage should specify "calendar days" in this section as well. Attorney O'Rourke suggested that this verbiage could be interspersed as the new section 1.3 "Non Public Session." Councilor Hamann stated that often times, non-public sessions are held to handle items requiring immediate action and may have only come up within a day or two prior to the meeting; therefore, there would be no way to distribute the materials 5 days in advance. Chair

Lachapelle stated that, when needed, the Council could suspend the rules for these situations. Councilor Beaudoin **MOVED** to recommend the addition of a new section 1.3 as listed above. Councilor Desrochers seconded the motion. Councilor Larochelle expressed concern that if this requirement is put into place, the Council could potentially receive *less* information if City staff is rushing to gather materials to meet the deadline. Chair Lachapelle reiterated that there could be a suspension of the rules for urgent matters that need to be added past the submission deadline. Otherwise, if there is a known item for non-public session planned for the agenda, staff could adhere to these submission deadlines.

Councilor Beaudoin requested that the Deputy City Clerk re-read the passage so revisions and additions could be made to potentially rectify the concerns raised by Councilor Larochelle. Ms. Givara re-read the previously cited passage. Councilor Beaudoin suggested the following change: “Therefore, ~~any~~ **all** supporting documentation...” Councilor Larochelle asked if this change would preclude the Council from receiving a PDF version of the packet. Attorney O’Rourke stated that in use of the term “confidential,” the definitions would apply regardless of the format of the packet. He further explained how the materials could be appropriately redacted if there were RSA 91:A requests for the associated matters. Councilor Larochelle suggested adding the verbiage “in a confidential manner” to the paragraph. Councilor Rice recommended the following revision: Such documentation shall be ~~placed in a sealed envelope separate from the normal agenda and~~ clearly marked “confidential **communications** material not for public disclosure.” The complete changes appear below:

~~“Non-public sessions shall be held in strict adherence to the requirements of NH RSA 91-A:3. Items being considered for action in a non-public session shall be submitted and dealt with in accordance with Council Rules of Order sections 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3. Therefore, **all** ~~any~~ supporting documentation, contracts, or proposals being considered during non-public session shall be submitted to council members at least five **calendar** days in advance of consideration. Such documentation shall be placed in a sealed envelope separate from the normal agenda and clearly marked distributed **in a confidential manner** material not for public disclosure.” This requirement shall not apply to non-public session held for emergency actions pursuant to NH RSA 91-A:3, I (i)~~

The **MOTION CARRIED** by a unanimous voice vote.

Councilor Beaudoin stated that Council does not formally accept their non-public meeting minutes. He requested a change to allow Council to review these minutes prior to a vote to release them to the public to ensure accuracy. Attorney O’Rourke summarized why certain meeting minutes are sealed and in which circumstances they may be released. He clarified that this is dictated by State RSA and stated that all the City’s non-public meetings which are eligible to be unsealed have been unsealed. Attorney O’Rourke detailed the current process in place for Councilors to review the minutes prior to the vote to unseal.

Chair Lachapelle referenced recommended changes submitted by Councilor Gray, the first of which is section 1.1 to change the meeting start time from 6:30 PM to 7:00 PM. It was determined that this had already been discussed earlier in the meeting and an alternate recommendation was made. Councilor Gray’s second suggestion had been a rewrite of the remote meeting procedures, which had also been covered earlier in the meeting with

recommendations from the City Attorney. Councilor Gray's final suggestion was a change to section 2.1 to "define decorum and include word about personal attacks being prohibited." Chair Lachapelle stated that there was a great deal of verbiage regarding definition of decorum in the Code of Ethics, which had been voted down by Council. He cautioned against defining each individual aspect within the Rules of Order and stated that some of these terms are subjective, differing from member to member. Attorney O'Rourke agreed that this information was already included within the Code of Ethics which Committee members and City staff had worked on diligently. He stated that he would distribute a copy of the Code of Ethics to the current Codes and Ordinance Committee and City Council for review and potential recommendations for a future meeting. Councilor Beaudoin reiterated that "decorum" could be a subjective term and Robert's Rules allows for the Chair's discretion in determining and enforcing decorum.

Councilor Rice directed the Committee to section 4.19 "Functions of the Public Safety Committee" which currently reads "Functions shall include: Police, Fire, Parking, Traffic, Street Signs, Animal Control, and Public Health Services." He stated that he would like to add "and Ambulance Services" to the end of the sentence now that there is a contract with Frisbie and the City is receiving a quarterly report from them. He indicated that, as Public Safety Chair, he intends to review this report with the Committee and believes that review of ambulance services should be contained within the Rules of Order. Councilor Beaudoin agreed that having this verbiage in the Rules of Order would allow an appropriate committee for review if the City does opt to look into changing ambulance service in the future. Councilor Beaudoin **MOVED to recommend the change outlined by Councilor Rice as follows: "Functions shall include: Police, Fire, Parking, Traffic, Street Signs, Animal Control, Public Health Services, and Ambulance Services."** Councilor Gilman seconded the motion. The **MOTION CARRIED** by a unanimous voice vote.

Chair Lachapelle referred the Committee to the document of edits which a constituent named Bill Elwell had submitted. He stated that the large majority of the edits were formatting and grammatical changes which did not need to be reviewed individually. Mr. Elwell had questioned the portion of section 1.2 regarding when the Mayor should be seated and call to order a Special meeting. Mr. Elwell felt this should be the same for a Regular meeting. Attorney O'Rourke clarified that there are potentially non-meetings or subcommittee meetings prior to a Regular meeting, and the Chair may not be able to be seated and call to order at an exact time.

Chair Lachapelle directed the Committee to Mr. Elwell's suggestion on section 1.6 "Public Hearings" subsection 4 regarding adding a five-minute time limitations on public speakers. There was a discussion in Committee regarding the legality of imposing a time limit on speakers. Councilor Laroche recalled that he had formerly enacted the 5-minute limit during public input of workshops; however, he thought that there could not be limitations within a public hearing setting. Attorney O'Rourke stated that there is no such stipulation in the law that says someone addressing a committee can speak indefinitely. The consensus of the Committee was that there should not be time limits imposed on speakers at a public hearing, regardless of how long they wished to speak and on how many item .

Attorney O'Rourke stated that if the Committee felt it was appropriate, the City Clerk's office could be given the authority to go through the document and make all grammatical and

formatting issues within the document so the Committee will not have to spend time going over non-substantive changes.

Councilor Rice referenced a suggestion that had previously been raised which would allow a Committee Chair, in the absence of a quorum, to appoint a Council member who may be present at the meeting as a temporary voting member of said Committee. Chair Lachapelle said that while he had initially agreed with that suggestion, however upon further thought he felt that it left room for malfeasance if a member or members potentially did not want to attend a meeting or preferred a different board or committee. He emphasized the importance for elected officials to perform their due diligence and give their best effort in attendance to serve the constituents who voted for them. Councilor Hamann agreed that allowing non-members to serve temporarily could cause unintended problems.

Councilor Laroche questioned if the presence of the Mayor, as an ex officio voting member of a committee, would affect the number needed for a quorum; he questioned if the quorum would remain the same number even though the Mayor's presence increases the membership by one, thus potentially increasing the number needed for a quorum.

Councilor Beaudoin inquired if, in the instance of repeated absences from appointed boards/committees, if the Mayor would have the authority to remove and replace a member. Councilor Rice stated that according to Robert's Rules there would need to be a 2/3 majority to remove a member in a case of dereliction of duty. The Mayor has the authority to appoint, but not to remove.

## 6. Other

Chair Lachapelle asked for a sense of Committee on whether "other" should be retained on the Codes and Ordinances Committee agendas. Councilor Beaudoin **MOVED** to keep "other" in the Codes and Ordinances order of business moving forward. Councilor Desrochers seconded the motion. The **MOTION CARRIED** by a unanimous voice vote.

## 7. Adjournment

Councilor Beaudoin **MOVED** to **ADJOURN** the Codes and Ordinances Committee meeting at 7:50 PM. Councilor Gilman seconded the motion. The **MOTION CARRIED** by a unanimous voice vote.

Respectfully Submitted,

Cassie Givara  
Deputy City Clerk