

Aquinnah Planning Board Plan Review Committee Meeting December 11th, 2018

Members Present: Peter Temple, Chairman, Sarah Thulin, Berta Welch, Jim Newman, Jim Mahoney, Jo Ann Eccher, Isaac Taylor

Not Present: Jim Wallen

Also Present: Chris Alley, Lawrence Martin, Mark Fortier, Reid Silva, Jim Hickey, Jack Fructman, Kate Taylor, Liz Witham, Ken Wentworth, Nick Peck, Hugh Taylor, Steven Tahan, Kathleen Tahan

Meeting opened at 6:40pm

There was brief discussion concerning Committee member recusal from hearings and their involvement in hearings as a Town resident. Sophia will send out the Mass online conflict of interest training and test to the Committee to complete.

PBPRC opened a meeting to review an MHC letter for Steinberg of 264 Lighthouse Road. In the letter dated November 8th, 2018, MHC determined that although there are no known resources in the immediate area, the Town wide survey has shown that there are along Lighthouse Road under certain conditions and therefore recommend an intensive survey for areas of the lot that haven't been disturbed and will be disturbed. Peter entertained a motion to require an intensive archeological survey for areas that are not disturbed and will be disturbed. Motion was moved by Jim M and seconded by Sarah. **The PBPRC voted 5-0, the motion passed.**

The Committee scheduled their next meeting for Tuesday February 12th, 2019 at 6:30.

Sarah, acting chair, reopened the continued hearing to act upon a request from John Miller of 25 Old South Road Map 9 Lot 175 for Special Permits to site and construct a 144sf addition with a roof deck (hearing was continued from 11/17/18). Without any new information or the applicant present, Sarah entertained a motion to continue the hearing to February 12th, 2019 at 6:45pm. Motion was moved by Jim M and seconded by Jim N. **The PBPRC voted 6-0, the motion passed.**

PBPRC reopened the continued hearing to act upon a request from Sheriffs Meadow Foundation of Moshup Trail Map 9 Lot 4 & Map 12 Lot 1 for Special Permits to site a pedestrian trail, plant seasonal mat for dune crossing, construct signage and a bike rack in the Moshup Trail DCPC and the Coastal District (hearing was continued from April 11, 2018). Peter was recused. At the request of the applicant to continue the hearing, Sarah entertained a motion to continue the hearing to May 28th at 6:45pm. Motion was moved by Jim M and seconded by Jim N. **The PBPRC voted 5-0-1, the motion passed.**

Jo Ann arrived.

The Committee reviewed the 11/7 minutes and requested that Sophia re-listen to the recording to ensure that statements were correctly written in the minutes. With a lengthy agenda, the Committee moved onto the first hearing.

PBPRC opened a hearing to act upon a request from Mark Fortier of 3 Sunset Lane Map 6 Lot

105 for Special Permits to site and construct a 32sf shed in an open and highly visible area where total footprint on the lot will exceed 2,000sf. Berta was recused. Peter gave a brief overview of the project informing the Committee that the shed had been constructed by the applicant before coming to the Committee for a permit. Peter had spotted the shed from the road, but because it was spring, and vegetation was growing in, there probably wasn't going to be a chance to make a proper determination on whether it was visible or not. The Committee found that the shed is not visible from the Cliffs, but the top is visible coming up State Road. The Committee determined that the shed will be adequately screened, and possibly not visible at all, if the surrounding vegetation is allowed to grow. Peter entertained a motion to approve the siting of the shed as it is. Motion was moved by Jim M and seconded by Jo Ann. The PBPRC voted 6-0-1, the motion passed. For the record, the Committee agreed that the application was received in time, therefore no fees are applicable for the zoning violation that was issued by the Zoning Enforcement Officer.

Peter informed the Committee that he had spoken with Town Counsel regarding the pre-existing non-conforming test as it relates to prior hearings and a hearing on the agenda. Counsel confirmed that for pre-existing non-conforming tear downs and rebuilds the test would be that the new construction is no more detrimental to the neighborhood than the existing. The Committee agreed that this is the test that they have been applying. As for additions and accessory structures on pre-existing non-conforming lots and/or buildings, Counsel's opinion was that the pre-existing non-conforming test does not apply because it would be new construction and new construction should be built to current zoning. However, there is one exception within the Coastal DCPC where expansion of weather wall within 100ft of a coastal feature is not permitted unless the use is for marine commercial only. Counsel gave the opinion that the Committee does have some "room" for local deference to interpret use based on the integrity of the use. For example, the Committee's recent decision to approve the addition of a deck on the Gerhard property which is within 100ft of a coastal feature however, the property is different in that it is not in the floodplain and not directly accessible to the water. The Committee agreed that they need to be careful in how they apply this local deference interpretation.

PBPRC opened a hearing to act upon a request from Lawrence Martin of 12 East Pasture Way Map 8 Lots 124, 125 & 126 for Special Permits to relocate and replace an existing shed with a 96sf shed and widen the driveway on a pre-existing non-conforming lot in the Coastal DCPC. Sarah was recused. In reviewing the plans, the Committee found that the new shed will be sited 16ft further from the property line (current shed/pump house is on the lot line). The shed will be sited behind an existing tree which will provide screening from the road and the height will not break the tree line. In addition, the shed will be constructed of natural materials (cedar siding and asphalt roof), will have no windows and no exterior lighting. While the applicant is making the non-conforming shed less non-conforming by moving it further from the lot line, the new shed is expanding and is within 100ft of a wetland in the Coastal District, but the Committee determined that the lot is well above the floodplain and not subject to rising waters. The Committee felt that the shed/pump house is a necessary use to a residence and the expansion is de minimis and can be approved under the Coastal DCPC guidelines. Sarah, speaking as an abutter, informed the Committee that the new shed will not be a pump house (new well has been relocated with directional boring for the waterline and water tanks are within the residential structure) and will be used as a storage shed. The applicant confirmed this. There was brief discussion on the need for clarification on how Committee members, who recuse themselves due to conflict or as

abutters, can participate in discussions, if at all, especially when they have important facts regarding the application. The Committee again was reminded to take the online conflict ethics test. The Committee agreed that the new fact (proposed new structure will not be used as a pump house but for storage) did not change their previous determination.

The Committee reviewed the proposed plan to widen the driveway by removing the existing soil to create a turnout (currently, the septic area is used as a turnout). Approximately 8 cubic yards of material will be removed (driveway widened by 4ft - 4 ½ft). The Committee could not determine if the material was fill or natural. There had been a recent archeological survey done prior to the septic system upgrade, which resulted in no findings. The Committee felt that no survey should be required for removal of the soil but requested that a qualified archeological observer be present at the time of removal. Sarah, as the Conservation Commission Chair, informed the Committee that this project is within 50ft of a wetland and will require an RDA. Based on the findings, Peter entertained a motion to approve the relocation and small expansion of the shed, removal of dirt to expand the driveway turnout area so long as that work is done in the presence of a qualified archeological observer, and approve a permit for the siting of a structure within the Coastal DCPC because the structure conforms in height and design to the current bylaws and is no more detrimental to the neighborhood than the existing non-conforming structure. Motion was moved by Jim N and seconded by Jim M. **The PBPRC voted 6-0-1, the motion passed.** There was brief discussion on the appeal period.

PBPRC opened a meeting to review a Zoning Determination request from Brown of 9A East Pasture Way Map 8 Lot 105 for the drilling of a well to confirm the presence of potable water and adequate yield. Sarah was recused. Reid Silva presented the proposed plan to drill for a well 35ft from the existing road (no trees to be removed and any brush would be removed by hand). MHC has recommended an intensive survey for the lot, but this request would only be for drilling of the well to determine if there is water. The Committee requested that an archeological observer be present at the time of the drilling who would do a 3ftx3ft scraping of the proposed area. Peter entertained a motion to approve a Zoning Determination for the digging of a well so long as it is done in the presence of an archeological observer who has the power to stop the work if he/she determines that it may be a danger to archeological resources and a motion to approve the determination to apply to any location on the lot where the applicant attempts to find a well. The Committee discussed whether this plan would need to be submitted to Con Comm and determined that it will go before the Commission. Peter amended the motion to include the condition that approval is subject to conditions set by the Conservation Commission. Motion and amendment were moved by Jim M and seconded Jim N. **The PBPRC voted 6-0-1, the motion passed.**

PBPRC opened a hearing to act upon a request from Red Gate Farm off Moshup Trail Map 12 Lots 65, 81, 87 for Special Permits to brush cut a 3ft by 330ft connecting footpath within the Moshup Trail DCPC. Berta was recused. Chris Alley presented the plans and requested to amend the plan to increase the width of the path from 3ft to 4ft. The Committee found that the 330ft path will begin on lot 87, continue through lot 65 and meet the existing path on lot 81. The path will be done with a gravelly mower and any trimming will be done by hand (no trees are being removed). At the site visit, the Committee found that the path will not be visible from Moshup Trail (public way). While the lots are located in a Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program (NHESP) area, Chris assured the Committee that NHESP has signed off on the proposed project as well as the Conservation Commission with an order of conditions (area is within 200ft of wetlands). Based on the findings, Peter entertained a motion to approve the plan as presented

and amended to cut a 4ft x 330ft footpath in the Moshup Trail DCPC subject to conditions set by the Conservation Commission and conditions set by NHESP. Motion was moved by Sarah and seconded by Jim M. The PBPRC voted 6-0-1, the motion passed.

The Committee briefly discussed assembling the Moshup Trail view easement committee. Sarah realized that Conservation Commission will be more involved because the area is all within NHESP areas and priority habitat and the Town only has a small right away. Sarah also added that behind various hills there are parking lots where the tree growth along the road helps screen the lots so any trimming and cutting proposed would have to be done strategically. Peter agreed and proposed that the Committee walk along the road and identify what they would like to have done, including work on abutters lands. Then they could go to each land holder and request permission for the work. A master plan would be submitted to Con Comm and NHESP. Sarah noted that each parcel would have to be filed separately with Con Comm. Peter added that the view easement committee could invite the individual land owners along for the walk. The Committee agreed to start in February or March. Peter asked Sophia to update Tom Murphy who was interested in serving on the committee.

PBPRC opened a hearing to act upon a request from Jack and Joann Fruchtman of 42 Hebrons Way Map 12 Lot 144 for Special Permits to site and construct a 165sf addition to an existing structure where total footprint of structures on the lot will exceed 2,000sf and within the Moshup Trail DCPC. Chris Alley presented the plans to construct an 11ftx15ft addition sited on 6 hand dug sonotubes and located off the lower level of the existing structure. The proposed addition will be one level with a shed roof below the existing roof ridge. The Committee found that the addition will be within the mass of the existing structure that faces towards Moshup Trail and will not be highly visible from Moshup Trail. Although the lot is within a NHESP area, the addition is exempt from NHESP because it is within the lots-maintained landscape and there is no proposed increase to the landscaped area. Conservation Commission and Board of Health have approved the project. Isaac recused himself because he does work for the owners. At the site visit, the Committee found that the existing structure has exterior lighting that does not comply with the Towns Exterior Lighting Bylaw. However, due to prior complaints, the owner has removed the bulbs from the light fixtures. The Committee determined that should the owner, or any future owner, ever replace the lightbulbs, the exterior lights must be changed to be made compliant with the Town Bylaw.

Sarah motioned to approve the application for a special permit under sections 3.2 and 11.3-1 to site and construct a 165sf addition to an existing structure where the total footprint on the lot will exceed 2,000sf. Peter amended the motion to approve a special permit to exceed 2,000sf because the addition does not increase the mass of the existing structure and is only slightly visible and include the following conditions: subject to the conditions set by the Conservation Commission, no archeological survey is required, house has non-conforming exterior lighting fixtures, however due to previous complaints the owner has removed all the bulbs and does not use the fixtures but, for the record to future owners if any, if the owner wishes to add lighting for the safe enjoyment of the outdoor spaces of the house they would need to change the fixtures so that they comply with the Town's Bylaws, trim should be natural and/or neutral material. Motion and amendment were moved by Jim M and seconded by Jim N. The PBPRC voted 6-0-1, the motion passed.

The Committee spoke with Chris Alley regarding a request for approval to conduct soil testing off Moshup Trail map 10 lot 12 (property owned by Ann Tagge). Chris informed the Committee that he filed a Project Notification Form with MHC for development on the lot. If MHC does not recommend a survey, Chris requested that the Committee grant him approval to conduct soil testing. There was brief discussion on the sensitivity of Moshup Trail and the proximity of the lot to a pond. Peter entertained a motion to grant permission to do a perc test in the presence of an archeological observer in the event that a letter comes back from MHC with the finding that no archeological survey is required, if MHC requires a survey, then the Committee will make a determination as to how to proceed at the February PBPRC meeting. Motion was moved by Berta and seconded by Isaac. **The PBPRC voted 7-0, the motion passed.**

PBPRC opened a hearing to act upon a request from Kate Taylor of Pilots Way Map 6 Lot 47.1 for Special Permits to site and construct two wells within the Gay Head Cliff DCPC. Chris Alley presented the proposed plan to site two wells on the 2.5-acre lot and informed the Committee that both the Board of Health and Conservation Commission have approved the plan (Con Comm determined that there was no negative impact). The Committee found that both wells are not in heavily vegetated areas, not in areas prone to erosion and will have no adverse effect on the surrounding environment and topography (potential concerns in the Cliff DCPC). There was brief discussion regarding archeology, however, the Committee was reminded by the applicant that a survey had been done years prior and there were no significant findings. The Committee determined that if water is not found in the proposed locations, the applicant must return to the PBPRC for approval of any other proposed locations. Based on these findings, Peter entertained a motion to approve a Special Permit for the digging of the two wells in the Cliff DCPC but only in the locations shown and the applicant will need to return to the PBPRC if other locations need to be tried. Motion was move by Jim N and seconded by Jim M. **The PBPRC voted 7-0, the motion passed.**

The Committee discussed the next steps in the bylaw review. Peter felt that for the Annual Town meeting, the Committee should only present critical changes to the bylaws that would help ease the workload of the Committee. Presenting all of the changes would potentially be too much for the annual meeting but could be done in a dedicated Special Town meeting. Peter told the Committee that he still plans on stepping down as Chair in June but will continue to serve on the Committee and will continue to work on the bylaw changes. There was discussion on how the Committee will determine the next Chair, including the idea of rotating Chair. There was brief discussion regarding an appointed "Zoning Officer" who would have the ability to review applications and development that would not be defined as significant. There was brief discussion regarding the recent CPTC workshop and the need for Committee Rules and Regulations including how the Committee addresses site visits.

PBPRC opened a hearing to act upon a request from UMB Bank NA Trustee and Jessie Benton of 315 State Road Map 11 Lot 47 for Special Permits to site and construct a 675sf addition to an existing structure where total footprint of all structures on the lot will exceed 2,000sf and is within the Coastal DCPC. Chris Alley informed the Committee that the current proposal is to do work on the first building on the lot and within 1 to 2 years they would possibly request to do work on the second building. The Committee reviewed the proposed plans to rebuild the interior layout, site and construct an 8 ½ftx9ft mudroom on the South Side and a one-bedroom addition on the East side (connected by a 11ftx8 ½ft deck on the water side and a 4ft wide new deck along

the side of the structure connecting to the existing deck on the North side). The Committee found that the existing structure has white trim but will be replaced with neutral colors and or natural materials. The Committee reviewed the window schedule which included removal of existing large windows on the North side and installation of windows within the shed dormers. There was concern with the proposed new shed dormer windows and whether they would be similar to skylights and would light the night sky. Chris noted that the applicant, if possible, will transplant the existing Hawthorn tree which is within the proposed addition location. There was brief review of the current septic system and proposed upgrade for both structures on the lot. In reviewing the site plan, the Committee found that the proposed bedroom addition is within 100ft of the top of the bank and, per the bylaws, within the coastal district you cannot add square footage of weather walls within 100ft of a coastal feature and you cannot swap deck for weather wall. However, the Committee policy has been for buildings that are straddling the line and not increasing what is inside the 100ft, the Committee has entertained additions subject to siting and visibility. There was discussion concerning visibility of the existing structure and proposed additions. The Committee found that they do have some flexibility with swapping footprint when the lot is not within the flood plain, as this lot is not in the flood plain. If the applicant presented a swap of weather wall footprint from one structure to the other, the Committee would have some discretion in approving the project (not a guarantee). The Committee again reviewed the proposed window plans (removing the larger windows and adding the two windows within the dormers). The Committee was divided on the size of the proposed new dormer windows. With no firm plans from the applicant and with Committee questions for the applicant, Peter entertained a motion to continue the hearing to February 12th at 7:00pm. Motion was moved by Jim M and seconded by Isaac. The PBPRC voted 7-0, the motion passed.

The Committee discussed the recent Niessen project on Moshup Trail. Isaac questioned whether or not there is a way for the applicant to revisit the decision. Peter noted that the Committee can waive the two-year restriction on a re-application for a denial. If Niessen wants to file an appeal, they should find out if the appeal period is still open.

The Committee again discussed Committee member recusal. Sarah commented that on other Committees she sits on, when there are matters being discussed that have to do with family members, she is asked to step out of the room. Peter stated that for the next hearing, Hugh Taylor, the question that the Committee needs to address is whether Isaac's presence in the room has the ability to shade the Committee's decision making and if so, the Committee should ask him to leave. The Committee agreed that having Isaac in the room would not affect their decision. However, the Committee agreed to get clarification on Committee member recusal from hearings.

PBPRC opened a hearing to act upon a request from Domini Amy L TR and Stanley Lim TR of 42 Lighthouse Road Map 6 Lot 43 for Special Permits to site and construct an 1088sf residential structure with a 256sf covered porch in a location that may be open and highly visible where total footprint of structures on the lot will exceed 2,000sf and within the Gay Head Cliff DCPC. Berta and Isaac were recused. Hugh Taylor presented the plan to site and construct a 1088sf building (2 bedroom with loft), site a curb cut and install a 3-bedroom septic system. Hugh informed the Committee that the curb cut would be 560ft from the existing Outermost Inn driveway (west) and 770ft from the next driveway (East - Pilots Landing). The Committee found that the proposed ridge height of the structure is 18ft. However, the Committee could not determine a final height without an engineer certified mean average grade. The Committee

requested that a mean average grade be submitted to the Building Inspector when applying for a permit to verify that the structures height will not exceed 18ft. Exterior materials will be natural materials and the roof will potentially be metal. The Committee determined that the proposed project is not open and highly visible but would be visible from the nearby public trails. The applicant confirmed that they will maintain a vegetation buffer to aid in screening the structure.

In regard to the curb cut and driveway, the Committee found that it wasn't included in the noticed application and the Committee determined that it was a significant amendment to the plan and would require a new hearing. The applicant assured the Committee that they had submitted a Project Notification Form to MHC but have not heard back yet. The Committee reviewed a letter from the Land Bank regarding the proposed project which included a request that the Committee do their due diligence in siting the house and protecting views of the structure from the public paths. Liz Witham, abutter, noted that the lines of the lot might change overtime and she questioned whether the current plans are dependent on the current lot lines. The Committee felt that, if there are no big changes to the lot lines, then those changes will not affect the siting of the structure and will still meet all setback requirements. With no other comments or questions, Peter entertained a motion to approve the plan as presented with the following conditions: the proposed driveway is not included because it was not advertised and is a significant amendment to the plan and should be advertised and started as a new hearing; applicant must maintain a vegetative buffer between the house and the open areas where the public can view from; subject to the determination of mean average grade to the satisfaction of the Building Inspector that the house will not exceed 18ft above mean average grade; if it requires to go over 18ft the applicant must return to the PBPRC for review and approval; subject to a recommendation from MHC that no archeological survey is required, if an archeological survey is required the survey must be conducted before work can proceed and the survey is subject to review by the PBPRC before work can proceed; area is not open and highly visible, the existing plywood and canvas shack will be removed; exterior materials will be of natural materials and/or neutral in color; all exterior lighting must comply with the Town's Exterior Lighting Bylaw; subject to any Conservation Commission, if necessary, for wetland protection. Motion was moved by Jim M and seconded by Jim N. The PBPRC voted 5-0-2, the motion passed.

PBPRC opened a hearing to act upon a request from Hugh and Jeanne Taylor of 18 Lighthouse Road Map 6 Lot 32 for Special Permits to site and construct a 3,136sf event pavilion for commercial use with drive in basement and roof top deck on an open and highly visible location, and a registered Development of Reginal Impact lot where total footprint of structures on the lot will exceed 2,000sf within the Gay Head Cliff DCPC and Coastal DCPC. Berta and Isaac were recused. Peter informed the Committee that because the lot is a registered DRI, this application is an automatic referral to the Martha's Vineyard Commission and the Committee cannot make a decision on it before hand. However, he noted that the Commission will ask for an opinion from the Committee (although the Committee doesn't have to give one) and that the Committee should make sure that the application is complete before it goes to the MVC. Peter added that there are things being proposed that are directly different from the Town design guidelines such as the structure is sited on top of the hill and the proposed walls of glass, that should be discussed. The Committee confirmed that there was only one abutter letter received (MV land Bank) and that all Committee members had read it. The Committee reviewed section 2.2 of the

bylaws and determined that if the application meets all of the criteria, then the use can be permitted. The committee briefly discussed the other two components of the application: siting of the structure and design of the structure.

In presenting the proposed project, Hugh Taylor noted that the traffic flow will not be any different than what it is now (they cannot have dinners at the Inn and weddings at the same time). He added that the barn on the neighboring lot would no longer be used as storage because the proposed new building infrastructure would have a drive-in basement used for storage and laundry. In reviewing the plans, the Committee found that the structure would be 16ft tall with hip and gable roof and the proposed basement would be 8ft in height. The first level of the structure would be open floor with bathrooms in one corner. There was concern from the Committee on impact of the basement on the environment and ground water. The Committee reviewed section 12.3-B, C and D which outlines the information that should accompany an application for building within the Cliff DCPC, which the applicant did not have ready for the Committee to review. The Committee questioned whether the proposed site is in a National Heritage area and noted that there had been endangered species (Tinker Weed) on the neighboring property. There was brief discussion on whether the applicant needs additional professional guidance in presenting the project. Jim M questioned whether the Selectmen should be consulted for their opinion on the project. The Committee agreed that they wanted to make a well-informed decision but currently there isn't enough information to do so.

Hugh noted that he isn't as shocked at the project because it is going to help in delivering a consistent and safer product compared to the construction of the event tents. Sarah expressed serious reservation with the proposed project and felt that more information was needed to get a better idea of the regional impact it would have. Hugh questioned whether Sarah has a conflict because she sits on the Aquinnah Land Bank Advisory Board where the Land Bank is an abutter. Sarah stated that Counsel has already determined that there is no conflict and that she represents the Town on the Board, this also includes Peter as he sits on the Board as well. Jo Ann commented that there is any doubt with the integrity of the Committee, that is even more of a reason for the Commission to refer the application.

Peter recommended that the Committee refer the application to MVC but in the event that the Commission wants the Committee to do a more thorough review, the Committee should allow room to continue the hearing to February 12th. There was discussion on the use of the structure and limiting the number of events per year. The Committee added that determining the visual impact of the project from the Cliff area will be important as well as addressing the walls of glass. Hugh noted that the topography runs uphill between the public street and the proposed site. As for the glass walls, they will be behind large sliding barn doors and there would be hardly any light at night because the barn doors will get closed. Hugh added that he would be surprised if the structure is used more than 8 times/year and noted that the structure could also be used for Town events and would be a useful structure. Peter noted that Hugh should add to his presentation the quantification of how much business is already there.

The Committee opened the floor to public comments. Isaac stated that he disagreed that the proposed project was out-of-scope with the Town and felt that the structure is as minimal as it can get and will diminish detriment to the land that occurs with the setup of event tents. He added that there used to be an almost identical structure 150 years ago near Pilots Landing which had been a gathering place for people and this proposed building could provide the same. He ended

his comments noting that the Outermost Inn and Hugh employees many people in Town and he sees this being a great addition to the Town. Berta requested that the Committee again look into conflict of interest for Sarah and Peter. Peter noted that he would consult Town Counsel again on the matter. Steven Tahan voiced concerns with sound issues that already exists and felt that the roof top deck could increase sound issues. Kate Taylor noted that sound mitigation is key so that the residential area can enjoy their property. Liz and Kent Witham also expressed issues with sound and that they are already impacted by wedding events that occur on the property but perhaps having a permanent structure with doors could help mitigate sound.

With no further comments, Peter entertained a motion to refer this to the Martha's Vineyard Commission as a DRI and in the event, because the application is not complete at the moment, that if the Commission decides to throw it back to the Committee for further preparation before doing so, the hearing will be continued to February 12th at 7:30pm. Motion was moved by Jim N and seconded by Jim M. The PBPRC voted 5-0-2, the motion passed.

With no other comments, the meeting adjourned at 10:50pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Sophia Welch

Board Administrative Assistant