

THE MARTHA'S VINEYARD COMMISSION

BOX 1447
OAK BLUFFS
MASSACHUSETTS
02557

DATE: March 5, 1987
TO: Building Inspector, Town of Oak Bluffs
FROM: Martha's Vineyard Commission
SUBJECT: Development of Regional Impact
RE: Expansion of Existing Development
APPLICANT: Sea View Vineyard Associates
c/o Al Siner
Box 7782
Warwick, R.I. 02887

DECISION OF THE MARTHA'S VINEYARD COMMISSION

SUMMARY

The Martha's Vineyard Commission (The Commission) hereby denies permission for the development contained in the Application of Sea View Vineyard Associates, c/o Al Siner, Box 7782, Warwick, R.I., 02887 for the expansion of an existing development in the Town of Oak Bluffs as shown on the plans entitled: "The Seaview, Oak Bluffs, Martha's Vineyard, Massachusetts, By David P. Handlin and Associates, 44 Brattle Street, Cambridge, MA 02138, Dated Dec. 12, 1986," Consisting of thirteen (13) sheets; "Title same, Dated Dec. 13, 1986," Consisting of ten (10) sheets; "Title same, Dated Dec. 17, 1986", consisting of five (5) sheets; "Title same, Site Plan, Dated 1-19-87," Consisting of Two (2) sheets; "Title same, Elevations, Dated Jan. 20, 1987," Consisting of four (4) sheets; "Title same, Site Plan, Dated 1-26-87" Consisting of one (1) sheet; "Title same, Elevations, Dated Feb. 20, 1987" Consisting of five (5) sheets; "Title same, Site Plan, Floor Plans, Dated Feb. 23, 1987" Consisting of seven (7) sheets; "Title same, East Elevation: Open Viewing Proch, Dated March 2, 1987" Consisting of one (1) sheet; "Coordinated File Plot Plan Prepared by Smith and Dowling, submitted March 2, 1987" Consisting of one (1) sheet; "Seaview Condos Sewage Disposal System, By G.L. Wey Engineering Consultants, Oak Bluffs, MA., Dated January 15, 1987", Consisting of one (1) sheet; Making a total of fifty (50) sheets (the Plan).

The Building Inspector of the Town of Oak Bluffs shall not grant the appropriate development permits.

The Decision is rendered pursuant to the vote of the Commission on March 5, 1987.

FACTS

The proposed development is a Development of Regional Impact as defined by the Commission's Standards and Criteria, Developments of Regional Impact, Section 3.301 and Section 3.401. The Application was referred to the Commission by the Building Inspector of the Town of Oak Bluffs for action pursuant to M.G.L. Chapter 831, Acts of 1977 as Amended (the Act). The application and notice of public hearing relative thereto are incorporated herein. Martha's Vineyard Commission staff document exhibits are incorporated by reference.

A duly noticed public hearing on the application was conducted by the Commission pursuant to the Act and Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 30A, Section 2 and as modified by Chapter 831 on January 29, 1987 at 9:00 P.M. at the Commission offices, Olde Stone Building, New York Avenue, Oak Bluffs, Massachusetts. The proposal is for an addition to an existing building which will accommodate more than ten (10) dwelling units.

Mr. Evans, Chairman of the Land Use Planning Committee, read the public hearing notice and opened the hearing for testimony at 10:43P.M.

Mr. Evans asked for a presentation from the Applicant.

Carol Borer, Executive Director, stated, for the record, that due to a possible conflict, Roger Wey, Commissioner is not present at the hearing.

Mr. Siner, Applicant, presented the proposal, referencing a handout, stating the existing habital square footage of 14,000 and the proposed habital square footage of 16,000, old porches of 1,100 square feet vs. new porches of 5,600 square feet. Further, he stated the uninhabitable existing square footage is 4,700 and the new proposal's uninhabitable square footage of 11,000. Further, he discussed the height of the existing building as 44 feet to eave line, 55 feet to observation area; proposed height as 54 feet to eave of hipped roof, 65 feet to ridge of hipped roof. He explained this was done to bring the square footage to code and also to

make this project economically feasible. He discussed the history of the Old Seaview as a hotel (100 person restaruant, 100 person hotel, and 45 rooms). Further, he stated the proposed project would have 19 units with 2 bedrooms, 5 units with 1 bedroom, a total of 43 bedrooms. He then stated the project is in the B1 zone which requires only a 5 foot setback off street and no height restrictions. Mr. Siner then said the building is 135 feet from high water level, site elevation 10', Flood Plain elevation 9' and the first level is at 14'6". He then discussed the general downgrade of the proposal regarding the use by people and use of septic system. Further, he spoke of the upgrading regarding the tax base. Mr. Siner discussed impact on the school as being none as there will be no year-round residence, trash pickup will be private as will be the septic system and the Town water system will be enlarged. He further discussed the resident homesite issue and stated that he would contribute \$100,000. to a fund making payments of \$5,000. each at the time each of the first 20 units are sold. Mr Siner stated that building materials will be purchased as often as possible on the Island, and manpower has been hired from Island residents.

Mr. Siner read a letter from the Oak Bluffs Selectmen, signed by Roger Wey and Jessie Law stating approval of this project for 24 condominiums. Further, he stated he had several letters speaking in favor of this project (approx.15) and submitted them for the record.

Mr. Siner said he feels he has a valid building permit. He then read a letter from the Oak Bluffs Building Inspector, regarding decrease in waste generation, traffic generation and decrease in intensity of use.

David Handlin, Architect for the Applicant, discussed reasons for increasing the size of the building which were made to comply with regulations of the Town regarding staircases, egress, elevators and storage. He discussed the entrance to the building on Pennacook Avenue, two parking lots, 1 paved, 1 peastone, also he discussed the worst scenario shadowing and further that the shadow would not touch any other properties. Mr. Handlin spoke of the original building and its aesthetics and the new proposal being more victorian style (i.e. railing, detail of porches). Mr. Handlin spoke of there being no open porches because of the building being too close to the road and porches would not be feasible.

Commissioners questioned the habitable and unhabitable spaces and new codes which the existing Seaview does not have.

Mr. Siner stated that one staircase in the existing building was in no way to code.

Mr. Evans asked for staff presentation. Barry Didato, MVC staff, gave a slide presentation which showed the Old Seaview which is now existing and further showed the size difference of the Old and Proposed building. He then referenced a handout and discussed the existing vs. the proposed dimensions of this project. Mr. Didato further discussed access and traffic route to parking area, parking equalling one space per unit, no drop off or loading zone has been proposed. He discussed traffic generation, site elevation, velocity zone and proposal subject to wave action and further suggested breakway walls on the first floor, as per the Oak Bluffs Zoning By-law. He discussed the soils in the area being classified as Urban Land, groundwater below 12 feet, wastewater design does meet Town and Title V standards. He then discussed development concerns: impact to the gateway to Town, impact on residential neighborhood, adequate parking, long term vs. short term benefits and detriments and question of occupants per units. He showed plans of existing and proposed structures.

Mr. Evans asked if there was testimony from Town Boards.

Linda Marinelli, Selectmen of Oak Bluffs, stated she is not in objection to renovation, however she objects to the manner which permits have been obtained. Mrs. Marinelli, stated that she had sent a copy of a letter to the Oak Bluffs Building Inspector to the Commission to be entered into the record regarding procedures which have been overlooked and requesting an answer from Mr. Haigazian within fourteen days. She then asked the Commission not to act on this proposal until she receives a response in writing. Further, she said this proposal is not in keeping with the neighborhood.

John Bradford, Planning Board, addressed zoning issues regarding Section 13, Section 6.1 and Section 5.1.

Peter Martell, Fire Inspector, stated he was satisfied with the plan and it does conform to code.

Mr. Evans asked for proponents and opponents. There were none.

Mr. Evans asked for other testimony. Mr. Mechur, resident, discussed zoning issues, the additional stories that are proposed fitting in with the neighborhood and architecture of the neighborhood.

Mr. Martell, Abutter, stated that regarding the height issue, zoning allows it and no views will be obstructed. Regarding the porches, he stated that porches cause leaks and other problems. He further stated he was in favor of the project.

Commissioner Widdiss, discussed extensive modifications of the Wesley House and questioned the reason that this building did not have to be brought to code. Peter Martell, Owner, stated that the Wesley House is in the National Historic District, so therefore he did not have to bring the building up to code.

Mr. Ferraguzzi, Commissioner, questioned the height of the building regarding fire protection.

Mr. Martell, Fire Chief, stated that their ladder can reach the top floor and also the owner of the building will provide the Fire Department with keys to the elevators.

Mr. Jason, Commissioner, discussed the Oak Bluffs Zoning By-law, Sec. 5 as it states 2 units for the first 5,000 square feet of lot area and 1 unit for each additional 1,000 square feet of lot area. He then stated that zoning would allow 14 units.

Larry McCavitt, Commissioner, questioned the design and styles? Mr. Handlin, Architect for the Applicant, discussed the existing roofline and said the proposed building will be more picturesque, will have some characteristics of the surrounding buildings. He further discussed the roof construction and stated at the 4th floor level they would be forced to build an urban style roof.

Al Haigazian, Building Inspector, stated the history of the building permit for a hotel and how it became a permit for condominiums. He stated that when it became apparent to the owner that a hotel would not be economically feasible, the owner approached him with the idea of condominiums. He stated that because the exterior was not going to change that much, the reduction of use, dropping the restaurant and bar, and all building codes were met he issued the permit. Further, he said everything was done above board.

There was discussion of the amount of time a person had to appeal after issuance of a permit.

Sanford Evans stated that correspondence was received by: The Hanna Family - opposed; Harvey Thomas - opposed; Favorable letters from: Eliot Sherr, Kelly Regan, Ara Sakayan, Edward Jigarjian, Peter Martell, Laurie Whitehill, Barbella Davis, Thea Hanger, Ada Daniels, Dr. Robert Thorne; request for all meeting notices from Ronald Mechur; letters from Mr. Siner and Turner Construction regarding contribution to housing fund, use of Island labor and DRI impacts; Letter from Oak Bluffs Conservation Commission with a request to file Notice of Intent; letters between Oak Bluffs Selectmen and Oak Bluffs Building Inspector regarding zoning enforcement.

Commissioners discussed the building permit, what the permit was issued for, and further, questioned if it is valid or not. There was also discussion of the process to order a cease and desist on the project. There was discussion regarding whether or not construction was on going at this point.

The applicant stated that some structural work was still going on regarding bracing of the existing building, however, there is no vertical construction at this point.

To the question was there a Public Hearing with the Selectmen on this proposal. The answer was there was a public meeting at the Selectmen's office.

Sanford Evans continued the public hearing to a later date.

Sanford Evans, Chairman of the Land Use Planning Committee, read the continuation of a public hearing notice scheduled for 8:30P.M. and opened the hearing for testimony at 9:20 P.M. on February 26, 1987.

Mr. Evans requested that the Applicant explain modification of the proposal since the last public hearing.

Mr. Al Siner, Applicant, stated that he would leave all discussion of the changes to David Handlin the Architect of the proposed project and stated that he would first like to speak to the items asked about at the last meeting. He stated that letters have been written by the engineers in regards to both the flood plain and Conservation Commission. Addressing

concerns of existing structure being tied into the new structure, Mr. Siner stated that it would be. Another concern was zoning and Section 5L regarding a Special Permit from the Zoning Board of Appeals, to this he stated that a packet has been filed with the Board requesting the special permit. Further, Mr. Siner stated that the major concerns seemed to be the overall size and scale down of proposal, he stated the old proposal had 24 units; new proposal has 21 units, old proposal had 43 bedrooms and new proposal has 32, the square footage results in a reduction of one full floor or 6389 square feet, roof pitch old 5/12 new proposal 6/12, roof height 64', new at 57'. Further, there will be a reduction of taxes paid to the Town. He stated that the major concern now is to get the building back on its feet.

David Handlin, Architect, referenced a model of the proposal, and explained that 4 or 5 changes have been made:

- reduction of building height by one story
- towers were reduced by one story
- back elevation redesigned in keeping with residential area
- open space porch area has been added and will screen parking area
- the entire front of the building will be set back a little more off the street.

Mr. Handlin stated that with the design of open space porch/viewing area, the parking lot had to be redesigned, however, it is essentially the same, back lot being pea stone, front lot to be hard top with drainage to existing system.

Mr. McCavitt, Commissioner, asked the Applicant what material would be used on exterior walls. Mr. Siner stated it would be white cedar shingles.

Mrs. Eber, Commissioner, asked the difference in height between the new proposal and the original Seaview. Mr. Handlin, Architect, stated the eve height is the same and the ridge is within 1 foot of the original.

Barry Didato, MVC Staff, referenced a handout and stated that the structure is 2 feet taller than the original building. He further discussed the reduction from the original proposal, roof pitch slightly steeper, explained Section 5-1L of Oak Bluffs Zoning By-law, if applicable. He further discussed the wetland setback and concern regarding the 10 foot

contour and whether it runs through the building. He said that a stamped site plan with the 10 foot contour would be required and stated he had no figures at this point.

Mr. Evans asked if there were any comments from Town Boards.

Ann Mechur, Board of Appeals, discussed the 10 foot contour, building setback from edge of beach, concerns of septic system being able to meet 5 foot separation, and if a test pit could be dug to see if groundwater is within the area that the septic system would be placed.

Mr. Handlin stated that a septic permit has been granted by the Board of Health.

Bruce Aris, Engineer for George Wey, discussed the septic system design and stated that critical elevations are listed on the drawing with the lowest point at 9 feet. He stated he did not know where groundwater elevation is at this time.

George Turner, Turner Brothers Construction, stated that there is an existing hole, well below 12 feet and there is no water which brings water to 1 foot above or below sealevel.

Linda Marinelli, Selectmen from Oak Bluffs, referenced previously submitted correspondence and that her testimony was still the same.

Ann Mechur, resident and member of the Board of Appeals, finds it difficult to accept a comment from a person employed by the Applicant and feels that the Commission should hire its own professional expert and/or surveyor to find where the groundwater is, and further that there is no engineer stamp on the new plan.

Mr. Evans called for proponents and opponents. There was none.

Mr. Evans called for other testimony. Elizabeth Talbot, Oak Bluffs Conservation Commission, asked if the application will go before the Zoning Board of Appeals? Mr. Evans stated that this was his understanding.

Mr. Evans stated that there were several letters of correspondence in the file and there were many technical letters concerning the safety of the building between the Executive Director and David Handlin. Other Correspondence: Turner Brothers Construction concerning building safety; Handlin to Oak Bluffs Building Inspector regarding the stop work order and building safety; Elizabeth Lawrence concerns of property lines and property usage; David Handlin concerning Conservation Commission jurisdiction and

Flood Plain Regulations; George Wey, Engineer, explaining his view of the project with respect to FEMA Regulations; Mr. Wey to Oak Bluffs Conservation Commission regarding the issue of jurisdiction; Al Siner to Board of Appeals concerning the special permit issue of number of dwelling units permitted; request from staff concerning the impact of shadowing on residential neighbors, parking specifications and loading zones.

Mr. Evans asked the applicant to discuss the parking and loading zone plan.

Mr. Siner stated there are now 21 units and the proposal is now for 22 parking spaces, one to be used for loading. He further showed where the dumpster will be located. Commissioners asked the setback of the dumpster to lot line and questioned how often the dumpster would be emptied. Mr. Siner stated pick up would be no less than once a week and then asked Mr. Handlin if he knew the setback of the dumpster. Mr. Handlin said it was a couple of feet from the property line and approximately 12 feet from the closest residence.

Mrs. Marinelli asked if the building permit has been revoked. Mrs. Borer stated not to her knowledge, however, a stop work order was issued.

Sue Custer, Commissioner, questioned the safety of the building as it now stands and who's responsibility it is to ensure its safety.

Mr. Siner stated that they were forced to stop at an inopportune time and that he is not comfortable with the way the building has been left however, he stated they have complied with all orders.

Mr. Jason, Commissioner, asked the applicant to explain what was being done when they were ordered to stop.

Mr. Siner introduced the contractor on the job, Rick Pomroy of Turner Brothers construction for his explanation.

Mr. Pomroy, stated that at the time the stop work order was issued his firm had approximately 75% of the buildings structure isolated, undermined and ready for permanent piers and the form trucks were ready to come in.

Mr. Jason requested that Mr. Pomroy explain what he was stating using the Plan. Mr. Pomroy showed the existing footprint as it stood, further that the rear part of building was being isolated so a full basement could be dug out and new piers could be put in. He discussed isolation of each position and various step ups in elevations which hold the building in

position. Mr. Pomroy further stated that all precautions have been taken, however, he can not guarantee how long the building will stay isolated.

Mr. Pomroy discussed the trench surrounding the existing building and that the intention of Turner Brothers Construction had been to get the foundation in and tied in with the existing building to give some lateral support.

Mr. Widdiss asked if there was any chance of the building collapsing prior to excavation. Mr. Pomroy stated he didn't think there was a chance of it collapsing during excavation, and further he discussed the lateral bracing of structure and that a structure should not be left as is with bracing for a long period of time.

Kerry Scott, resident, questioned Mr. Pomroy's credentials. Mr. Pomroy stated an engineering firm out of Boston has been hired and has all the credentials needed to do this kind of work and has a constructional engineer at the site. Kerry Scott then stated concern of the issue of safety.

Sue Custer, Commissioner, stated that she felt the safety of the building is the responsibility of the Building Inspector, and asked whether there has been any correspondence from the building inspector.

Sanford Evans said that there was a letter on file dated February 25th to Mr. Pomroy from the MVC asking for specific plans to be submitted to the Commission for review regarding the stabilizing of the building.

There was further discussion of concerns and responsibility for the safety of the building.

Mr. Jason asked the Applicant if this project falls within Article 127 of the State Building Code, regarding quality control.

Mr. Evans then asked Mr. Pomroy in his opinion, what kind of measures would have to be taken to protect this project from disaster. Mr. Pomroy stated that all of the existing interior piers and footings be rebuilt to secure the structure vertically and the new exterior perimeter footings, foundations and first floor deck be installed to secure the structure horizontally.

In response to Mr. Jason's question regarding Article 127, Mr. Handlin, Architect, stated that he and George Wey have submitted all

required information to the building inspector, and further that it was not up to Mr. Wey or himself to make specifications for the result.

Mr. Evans asked Commissioners if they had any suggestions as to how the monitoring of stabilizing the project would be done.

Mr. Ferraguzzi asked if the Building Inspector was concerned. Carol Borer stated that the Building Inspector has a concern that the building is not stabilized, but should be.

Al Siner read a letter from the Oak Bluffs Building Inspector stating recommendation of repairing the foundation.

After lengthy discussion of responsibility of stabilizing the building and making the building safe, the Commissioners asked Mr. Siner what would have to be done to secure the building. Mr. Siner stated that the building could be stabilized staying at groundlevel or below grade.

Commissioners discussed concerns of allowing certain construction regarding the Commissions review and final decision. Mr. Widdiss stated that allowing the building to be stabilized does not mean the Commission endorses proposed plan.

Mr. Evans summarized the two positions:

1. To stabilize at minimum even if this means redoing things.
2. To stabilize as program now states as a more efficient way of stabilizing in the long term.

Mr. Young stated that he feels that the stabilizing to the current plans to satisfaction of the engineers and building inspector is fine and if the Commissions decision after review causes change then they will have to be made.

Mr. Morgan requested that the Applicant tell the Commission how they proposed to stabilize and how far the building will have to go.

David Handlin, Architect, stated that the perimeter foundation, piers and deck to the first floor would have to be done. Further, he stated that the applicant has made changes and reductions in good faith, would like to resolve the issue of safety and feels that so much time has been spent on safety and not on the issue of the building. Further, that they have no intention of proceeding without permission.

Mr. Evans stated that considerable design changes have been made since the last meeting.

Larry McCavitt, Commissioner, asked if there is a sidewalk easement in front of the building or a layout in the Assessors Plans.

Jim Young stated the sidewalk is on the other side of Sea View Avenue.

Mr. Evans then read a list of requests from the MVC Staff: a registered plan indicating the 10 foot contour, drainage plan for parking lot, viewing porch plan and depth to groundwater.

Commissioners asked Russell Smith, MVC Staff, to locate groundwater depth.

Mr. Ferraguzzi asked how the applicant will address the Resident Homesite Issue. Carol Borer stated that a donation has been offered of \$100,000., \$5,000. at the time of closing each unit.

Mr. Evans asked if all questions of the Commissioners have been addressed.

Mr. Handlin stated that he will meet with the Oak Bluffs Architectural Assistance Committee.

Mr. Evans stated that since time is an element for safety concerns and normally if certain items were missing a continuation of the public hearing would occur. He then asked if the Commissioners felt it would be alright to close the hearing and take missing information under the open record to be reviewed by Land Use Planning Committee and then discuss with full Commission under discussion at a meeting. Consensus of the Commissioners was to close the hearing.

There being no further discussion Mr. Evans closed the public hearing at 10:30 P.M. and left the record open for one week.

Following the close of the public hearing, correspondence for the record was received from: Edward Jigarjian regarding financial and economic Town concerns; Douglas Dowling regarding elevation datum; David Handlin amending the number of units; David Handlin miscellaneous elevations of open viewing porch.

FINDINGS AND CONDITIONS

The Commission has considered the Application and the information presented at the public hearing, and based upon such consideration, makes the following findings pursuant to Section 14 of the Act:

THE COMMISSION FINDS THAT THE PROBABLE DETRIMENTS OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT WILL EXCEED THE PROBABLE BENEFITS OF THE PROPOSAL IN LIGHT OF THE CONSIDERATIONS SET FORTH IN SECTION 15 OF THE ACT. SPECIFICALLY, THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT IS FOUND NOT TO SERVE THE GENERAL PURPOSE OF THE ACT AS STATED IN CHAPTER 831, ACTS OF 1977, AS AMENDED, NAMELY THE PROTECTION OF THE HEALTH, SAFETY AND GENERAL WELFARE OF ISLAND RESIDENTS AND VISITORS, BY PRESERVING AND CONSERVING THE ISLAND'S UNIQUE NATURAL, HISTORICAL, ECOLOGICAL, AND CULTURAL VALUES AND BY PROTECTING THESE VALUES FROM DEVELOPMENT USES WHICH WOULD IMPAIR THEM OR CAUSE IRREVERSIBLE DAMAGE TO THEM.

Pursuant to Section 15 of Chapter 831 of the Acts of 1977, as Amended, THE COMMISSION HAS CONSIDERED THE QUESTION OF WHETHER DEVELOPMENT AT THE PROPOSED LOCATION IS OR IS NOT ESSENTIAL OR ESPECIALLY APPROPRIATE IN VIEW OF AVAILABLE ALTERNATIVES ON THE ISLAND OF MARTHA'S VINEYARD. THE COMMISSION FINDS THAT THE DEVELOPMENT, AS PRESENTED, IS NOT ESPECIALLY APPROPRIATE OR ESSENTIAL AT THE PROPOSED LOCATION. SPECIFICALLY, THE PROPOSAL, AS PRESENTED, WILL CHANGE THE RURAL CHARACTER AND CULTURAL VALUES OF THE TOWN.

FURTHER,

THE COMMISSION HAS CONSIDERED THE QUESTION OF WHETHER THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT WILL FAVORABLY OR ADVERSELY AFFECT OTHER PERSONS AND PROPERTY, AND IF SO, WHETHER, BECAUSE OF CIRCUMSTANCES PECULIAR TO THE LOCATION, THE EFFECT IS LIKELY TO BE GREATER THAN IS ORDINARILY ASSOCIATED WITH THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE TYPES PROPOSED AND FINDS THAT, THE SCALE OF THE PROJECT WILL BE MORE DETRIMENTAL THAN BENEFICIAL TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD AND THE TOWNS HISTORIC CHARACTER.

The Commission disapproves the Development Application and denies permission to the Building Inspector in the Town of Oak bluffs for the granting of the necessary development permits.

The Applicant may modify the development proposal and or submit a new proposal to the Building Inspector in the Town of Oak Bluffs.

The Decision is written consistent with the vote of the Commission on March 5, 1987.

Any party aggrieved by a determination of the Commission may appeal to the Superior Court within twenty (20) days after the Commission has sent the development Applicant written notice, by certified mail, of its decision and has filed a copy of its decision with the Town Clerk in the Town in which the proposed development is located.

1106

Michael Lynch

Michael Lynch, Vice Chairman

3/19/87

Date

Norm Friedman

Notary

3/19/87

Date

**NORMAN FRIEDMAN
NOTARY PUBLIC
My commission expires Nov 2, 1990**

Edgartown, Mass. - March 20 19 87
at 10 o'clock and 01 minutes A M
Received and entered with Dukes County Deeds
book 469 page 732

Attest: Beverly W. King

Register