

**TOWN OF ALTON PLANNING BOARD
PUBLIC HEARING
Public Hearing Minutes
February 15, 2011
Approved 4/19/11**

Members Present: Tim Roy, Chair
Bill Curtin, Member
Cindy Balcius, Member
David Collier, Member

Others Present: Mike Garrepy, Interim Town Planner
Ken McWilliams, Town of Alton Planner
Randy Sanborn, Secretary, Planning Department
Members of the Public

I. CALL TO ORDER

T. Roy, Chair, called the Public Hearing to order at 6:02 p.m.

II. APPOINTMENT OF ALTERNATES

There are no Planning Board Alternates to appoint.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

K. McWilliams stated there were no changes to the agenda.

B. Curtin made a motion to approve the agenda. D. Collier seconded the motion which passed with 4 votes in favor and none opposed.

IV. PUBLIC INPUT

There was no public input at this time.

V. REVIEW OF CONCEPTUAL APPLICATIONS AND OTHER MINOR ITEMS

Case #P10-03 Cathy McCauley	Map 52 Lots 1 & 2	Lot Line Adjustment Route 11D
--	------------------------------	--

She is here to amend two conditions of approval. She received approval for a lot line adjustment on March 3, 2010. The first is to record just the first page of the three plan set which is the survey plan. The second plan is an existing conditions plan which is typically not recorded. The conditions said both the mylars would be recorded. The second condition she would like to change is #8 which is a condition that she have a shared driveway to serve both lots. Since then she has worked with the Town Road Agent and has secured a separate driveway permit to the second lot so she now has driveway permits to serve each individual lot so is asking to eliminate that condition for a shared driveway and the maintenance agreement with that.

C. McCauley asked a question regarding the Planner's request to put the driveway permit on and change the page numbering but she has already had the mylars delivered to the Planning Office and would like them to waive putting the driveway permit number on the mylar.

K. Williams asked if she was planning to record both sheets of the mylar.

C. McCauley stated no because it stated sheet 1 of 3 so sheet 2 is the existing conditions and sheet 3 was the topo.

T. Roy asked if sheet 1 was adequate for recording.

K. McWilliams stated yes that sheet 1 was adequate to record the subdivision. He read a note at the bottom of the sheet that read “the subdivision plan contains a total of 3 sheets which in its entirety constitutes a subdivision plan as approved by the Town of Alton Planning Board. Sheets number 1 thru 2 are recorded at the Belknap County Registry of Deeds. The remaining sheets are filed at the Alton Planning Department.”

T. Roy stated that that would have to be changed or would create confusion.

K. McWilliams stated that she would either have to record both sheets or change the note on the plan.

C. McCauley thought because it said sheet 1 of 3 and the other two would be on file at the Planning Office.

B. Curtin stated that if someone went to the Registry of Deeds and it stated that there were two recorded they would be looking for two sheets.

C. McCauley stated that she would have them take the note off and have them reprint new mylars for the recording.

K. McWilliams stated that she would have to change the note to reflect that she was only recording only the first page of the three plan set.

B. Curtin stated that if she is going to do that then she should add the driveway permits on there also.

B. Curtin made a motion to accept the waiver to record the first page only and add the driveway permits. D. Collier seconded the motion which passed with four votes in favor and none opposed.

VI. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

Case #P10-23 Industrial Communications & Electronics Inc.	Map 14 Lot 21	Final Site Plan 486 East Side Drive
--	----------------------	--

The new plans have been reviewed. The applicant has brought some plans that have been revised to adjust some of M. Garrepy's comments. The plans before the Board were submitted on January 8th that addressed Pete Julia's sixth review letter. Pete Julia has reviewed the final plans. His last memo is dated February 7, 2011 and indicates that he may still have concerns about the driveway design but he is deferring those concerns and comments to the Planning Board and the Fire Department. His drainage concerns have been addressed. At the last meeting there was a question about whether or not there would be a requirement for a State DES Alteration of Terrain permit. The plans reflect that the level of disturbance would be below that threshold and there is a notation accordingly on the plan and the applicant's engineer's stamp on the plan. M. Garrepy thought that should be sufficient. There has been a slight modification of the road alignment which eliminates about 300 feet or so of access drive and limits the impact of design. The applicant has taken the time to align the utilities to run along the access drive entirely.

B. Curtin asked if the power company came back with something in writing regarding the 10 feet.

Chad Branon stated that they switched the design completely so there would not be a swath separate going up the hill. It would actually follow the road way.

The applicants introduced themselves before their presentation. On behalf of the applicant Steve Grill, Manchester, NH Counsel; Kevin Delaney, Industrial Communications and Electronics; Chad Branon with Fieldstone Land Consultants, Design Engineer; Rick Mosey, Industrial Communications.

Chad Branon spoke regarding the plans he was showing. They were hired to redesign the driveway. His job was to avoid and basically minimize impact and address erosion control and drainage concerns as outlined in the Town of Alton Site Plan Regulations. In order to realign the driveway they had to perform an on site survey. They obtained additional data to shift the alignment of the driveway to the north and additionally reduce the overall length of the driveway by approximately 300 feet. They also regraded the driveway and redesigned the cross slope for the driveway so they could control the runoff a lot better. P. Julia was concerned about the velocity and the depth of flow in the driveway swales so he was looking for them to break out smaller areas modeling the individual swales within the multiple subcatchment areas on the side of the hill so they ended up doing that. They closed the majority of the alignments with the exception of Station 300 to 1400. They pulled it further away from the

wetland to the north and that can be viewed on Page 3 of 9 or SP1. They proposed level spreaders along the way basically ditch turnouts to minimize the length of flow in the drainage swales. Their modifications to the plan were minor and they held in the most part the center line that existed prior to them getting involved with the exception of the area that they ditched the alignment to the north that reduced the overall length of the driveway. They did a complete design on all the storm water.

C. Balcius asked where and what grades of slopes they were using blankets on their erosion control plan.

C. Branon stated that they are proposing blankets be used on slopes of 3 to 1. To improve any potential for erosion on sections where there are relatively steep slopes, like in the switch back area, they have tipped the driveway to drain to the inside ditch so there will be no contributing water off the driveway to the down hill side.

C. Balcius asked if their storm water pollution prevention plan has a construction sequence that doesn't expose all the roadway at once and if they are going to work on segments in sequence, stabilize them and move on to the next segment.

C. Branon responded that it would be his recommendation that it is built as they go into the site.

T. Roy asked if the second level spreader was dumping water onto the next lot because it was close.

C. Branon stated that the level spreader would be converting the water to sheet flow and would be spreading water down hill, parallel to the abutter's property.

Catherine Broderick spoke for Dave and Marilyn Slade who are abutters to this application. She asked the Board to look again Farmhouse's fifth review which asked the Board to look again because of the steepness of the slope and the drainage issues. The sixth review stated referred to drainage report comments and requested that the Board look at drainage report comments if there are any out there.

M. Garrepy responded to the report regarding the drainage comments. That was something that Attorney Fitzgerald asked of him to inquire from Pete Julia as to what he was referring to in that box that says please refer to drainage report comments. He spoke with P. Julia this evening and he indicated that was just a carryover from his previous review comments and that there are no drainage report comments for his sixth review. The comment should not have been in the box. It was just a typographical error.

C. Broderick wanted to make it clear that the Slades oppose this application. As to the some of the underlying litigation the parties were in the District Court of Appeals on the 10th and are waiting on that decision. This case is about the question of whether the Slades are proper interveners in the agreement between the Town and ICE.

M. Garrepy stated that at this point that they have been advised by their counsel to proceed with this application unless otherwise instructed by another counsel or court; they are to proceed as with any other application. P. Julia has voiced his concerns about the driveway design that he feels it should be designed for something different than what the applicant is proposing. The Board has expressed in previous meeting that the design is adequate and suitable for the proposed use. There is a notation on the plan that there is no liability to the Town. It is not intended to be all season safe travel for vehicular use. All required waivers have been granted by the Board and the plans do comply with all zoning requirements and the court decree. The Town Engineer has signed off on revised plans. There are no department head concerns and the Planning Department has no further concerns.

T. Roy asked if they were going to limit this to just drainage and roadway issues.

M. Garrepy stated that his recollection was that they were going to limit it to those issues with respect to drainage and the AOT permit for public comment. The plans have changed, not substantially, they have changed at least the access drive has changed so with respect to that he would suggest the Board open the public hearing and entertain comments from the public with respect to any issues that might be remaining of concern from the public but keeping in mind that they have vented most of these issues already. The drainage is the primary concern.

T. Roy stated that he had one issue that has not been brought up basically because it is not really shown on these new plans but on one of the original plans there was an enlargement of the compound showing at least three generators going there. He asked if those could be synchronized with in a specific time so they don't go off in the middle of the night or get away with one generator for all three.

Steve Grill responded that they have no problem with limiting it to one specific time but each company wants their own generator.

T. Roy asked if there was any one else from the Public to comment. Seeing none he closed the Public Input.

M. Garrepy read the precedent conditions to the Board.

1. All Site Plan Review Regulation waivers granted so noted on the plan.
2. Reference to Federal Court decree so noted on the plan.
3. Security per Section 9.5 of the ordinance for removal of the tower shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department staff and town counsel.
4. The following note shall be added to the plat prior to plan signing. "This site plan is subject to the Subsequent Conditions of Approval itemized in the Notice of Decision dated February 15, 2011 on file in the Town of Alton Planning Department
5. A copy of all necessary Federal, State and/or local permits shall be received by the Planning Department and the permit numbers shall be added in a note on the plat prior to plan signing.
6. Change 4" crushed gravel base spec for access drive to "ledge pack".
7. Add a note to the plan that stipulates that the timing of any routine generator cycling shall be limited to between the hours of 11 a.m. and 4 p.m. weekdays only.

Subsequent Conditions:

1. Final building, plans subject to review and approval by the Building Department.
2. As-built plans, foundation certification and final engineering inspection shall be provided prior to certificate of occupancy for the facility.
3. A preconstruction meeting shall be held with the Planning Department and the Applicant prior to any site construction.
4. All site improvements shall be constructed per the approved plan as determined by the Planning Department prior to a certificate of occupancy being issued for the proposed building additions.
5. Any additions to the tower or compound area or other changes to the site plan shall require subsequent Site Plan approval.

The conditional approvals are good for 365 days to achieve all of the conditions precedent and their mylar signed.

B. Curtin so moved the motion. D. Collier seconded the motion which passed with four votes in favor and none opposed.

Case #P10-35 Roberts Cove Inc.	Map 48 Lot 4 & 8 Map 18 Lot 27	Lot Merger & Lot Line Adjustment Basin Road (Roberts Cove)
---	---	---

There is a completed application that has been accepted. M. Garrepy asked to put it on hold and look at the Currier application until he gets back.

Case #P10-33 Kathleen & Michael Currier Sr.	Map 2 Lot 19	Final Site Plan 55 Prospect Mountain Road
--	---------------------	--

She was not successful in getting the use variance approved so she cannot move forward with an approved use for the site plan so is cancelled.

B. Curtin asked the audience if anyone was here for the Peter Holmes application. He told them that it was continued until March 15th at 6:00 p.m.

Continuing with Case #P10-35.

M. Garrepy handed out his most recent review to the Board. The applicant requested an extension for the January meeting while he was waiting for DES Subdivision approval. There were some revisions to the plan and his second review reflects those changes. He has no issues but has recommended conditions of approval.

1. Plans require stamp and seal of Certified Wetland Scientist who prepared the plans.
2. NH DES State Subdivision approval required for approval.
3. All bounds shown as TBS shall be set prior to final approval.
4. NH DES subsurface (for construction) issued prior to building permit issued for either lot.
5. List all waivers on final plan.

6. Application vested upon receipt of NH DES approval for construction of septic system for Map 48, Lot 8

Eric Roseen spoke on behalf of the application. He had no problems with the conditions. He had a copy of the State Subdivision Approval. He has a copy which the soil scientist did seal it.

B. Curtin asked which sheets he wanted recorded.

M. Garrepy stated that only sheet 1 would be required for recording. Said that there could be a condition added that states that a note be added that states there is a sheet 2 on file with the Planning Department.

D. Collier stated that there was a note 5 on the plan that says sheet with topographic information so it is already on the plan.

B. Curtin had an issue with the way the note read regarding sheet 1 and 2 being recorded.

M. Garrepy suggested the note be clarified to state where the sheet is filed. He commented that the application had been accepted as complete and the waivers have been granted, other than the recommendation of conditions for approval he sees no other problems.

W. Curtin made a motion to accept this with conditions previously stated. C. Balcius seconded the motion which passed with all votes in favor and none opposed.

Case #P11-03 Roberts Cove Inc.	Map 15 Lot 77A	Final Minor Subdivision Drew Hill Road and Chesley Road
-----------------------------------	----------------	--

This was continued from the last meeting. Chris Berry had an appointment with the Conservation Commission. Conservation Commission looked at both of the driveways; One that would impact the buffer of one of the wetlands and the other that would be a dredge and fill over a wetland. The Conservation Commission reviewed and discussed and did not have any problems with it.

Christopher Berry, principal member of Berry’s Surveying and Engineering representing the applicant Robert’s Cove Inc spoke on behalf of the application. One of the driveways is just over 700 sq. ft. of impact within the buffer and the second proposes about 650 sq. ft. of jurisdictional impact in a man made wetland and the reason for both impacts is if they moved these impacts out of the jurisdiction they would create larger impacts to slopes and cuts and fills and potentially generate impacts to other jurisdictional wetlands that are potentially more valuable resources.

C. Balcius asked if the application was accepted. Yes it was. She stated that the only thing she was concerned with in the zoning on impacting the wetlands and the 25 foot buffer so he could show them a sediment and erosion control plan for that particular driveway crossing and asked if he had done it.

C. Berry stated that they provided a grating plan and the package will go to the Wetlands Bureau will have the sediment and erosion control details.

B. Curtin mentioned that there was no wetlands stamp on the plans.

C. Berry recalled that at the last meeting they stated that they would have Mark Jacobs stamp the final revisions of the plans.

C. Balcius had no issues except to have the sediment and erosion control plan as part of the conditions.

Beth Copithorne 31 Chesley Road read a letter not in favor of the subdivision. Letter was submitted as part of the minutes.

C. Balcius stated that wetland scientist will consider their concerns when they look into a project and will check all the wetlands before they stamp it.

B. Copithorne was concerned with the ditches at the bottom of the hill that are completely overflowing after a rain and remain full for weeks after the rain and the Town has been out several times to work on it but it does not drain off.

C. Balcius stated that she knows the area and knows that that area is sloping down towards Chesley Rd. She feels those ditches intercept the water table so when the water table is high it receives runoff from the adjacent uplands and will receive runoff.

B. Curtin asked if the Highway Agent had any concerns.

K. McWilliams read the comment from the Highway Department stating that all driveways will require culvert work in this area.

C. Berry stated that the owner would need to install culverts with their driveway permits.

Lois Smedley stated that her concerns were also because of the water situation there. Stated that there are huge culverts and drainage areas and is afraid that if the land is disturbed it would make it worse.

C. Balcius responded to her concerns. She stated that there would be minimal size houses built and there would be some runoff of the roof but it is not so large that it would have a huge impact on the water level. The State program Alteration of Terrain looks at the subdivisions and the houses and look at the negligible amount of additional water that would come off the roof of the house in a normal size driveway. People that purchase will design their driveways to avoid drainage problems. The Town Road Agent would insure the culverts would be put in appropriately.

Steve Copithorne asked them to look at one thing that shows up on the plans that there is one house close to Lois and one house close to them because that is where they can get their approvals but when someone decides to build there they will be asking for a variance because they are not going want to build there house some where else, so he asked that the plans be more realistic and have them go for the proper approvals that they need instead of the easy route..

T. Roy stated that they wouldn't be coming to them for a variance.

C. Balcius stated that it shows the 4 K areas for the leach field not the house. The house is closer to the road. The leach field area is closer to the property boundary.

C. Berry responded that they show that the lots be built on the easiest way possible but it is up to the individual to build the house and go for the approvals that they wish.

C. Balcius stated that they cannot that once this goes into the subdivision for a wetlands crossing they will have on their permit there will be no further wetland crossings for that purpose. They would have to come back if they wish to build on another crossing.

Sylvia Leggett responded to what C. Balcius just said that the middle lot is the only one that has a true wetlands crossing. Lots 1 and 3 do not, so on those two lots they can still apply for a crossing.

C. Balcius stated that the way when this goes in for approval for the subdivision it will show that one lot crossing and the permit will be issued with the stipulation that there will be no further impact to the wetlands for these lots. So on the front side they will need to show that there is no impact in that area that they decide to build.

K. McWilliams read the conditions:

Conditions Precedent

1. A copy of any necessary Federal, State, and/or local permits shall be received by the Planning Department and the permit numbers shall be added in a note on the plat prior to plan signing. This includes the Dredge & Fill Permit from NHDES for the driveway filling a wetland.
2. A note shall be added to the plat prior to plan signing stating that Best Management Practices shall be utilized during any timber cutting on site.
3. The following note shall be added to the plat prior to plan signing: This subdivision plan is subject to the Conditions of Approval itemized in the February 15, 2011 Notice of Decision on file at the Town of Alton Planning Department.

Conditions Subsequent

1. The applicant shall comply with all of the Town of Alton's Subdivision Regulations.
2. The approval is based upon the plans, specifications and testimony submitted to the Planning Board. Any alterations, additions or changes to the plans are not authorized and require additional Planning Board approval.

3. A subdivision plat, which has been filed and approved, conditionally or otherwise, may be revoked, in whole or in part, by the Planning Board when an applicant or successor in interest to the applicant has performed work, erected a structure or structures, or established a use of land, which fails to conform to the statements, plans, or specifications upon which the approval was based, or has materially violated any requirements or conditions of such approval. It would be valid for one year from the date of approval.

C. Balcius requested to add on to the first section the Sediment and erosion control plans for the driveway construction.

B. Curtin requested to also add the wetlands stamp

C. Balcius moved a motion. D. Collier seconded it. All were in favor with none opposing.

VII. COMPLETENESS REVIEW OF NEW FINAL APPLICATIONS AND PUBLIC HEARINGS ON NEW APPLICATIONS (If applications are accepted as complete):

Case #P11-06 Foulkes Corporation	Map 3 Lot 18	Final Minor Site Plan Prospect Mountain Road
---	---------------------	---

K. Williams did not see any issues with items they are requesting to waive. He feels it is a simple, straight forward application. What they are asking is to switch out one of the antennas at the 50' level and to do some changing of some equipment at the tower base.

B. Curtin read the waivers 7.2.9, 7.2.10, 7.2.11, 7.2.12, 7.2.13, 7.2.14, 7.2.15, 7.2.16, 7.2.17, 7.2.19, 7.2.20, 7.2.21, 7.2.22, 7.2.23, 7.2.24, 7.2.25, 7.2.26, 7.2.27, 7.2.28, 7.2.29, 7.2.30, 7.2.31, 7.2.32, 7.2.33, 7.2.34, 9.14, 7.4.5.1, 7.4.5.2, 7.5.1.1, 7.5.1.2, 7.5.1.3

Pete DeMarco from Campton, NH represents Main PCS; spoke on behalf of this application.

B. Curtin motion to accept the waivers. C. Balcius seconded the motion. All were in favor, none opposed.

C. Balcius made a motion to accept the application. D. Collier seconded the motion. All were in favor, none opposed.

P. DeMarco stated that RCC World Cellular is coming off this tower at the 54 foot level and there are presently six antennas and Maine PCS which is T Mobile is going to take that slot. Identical antennas so the visual effect on the tower is zero and the structural load on the tower is zero. There will be no lights.

B. Curtin asked if the knox box at the bottom of the gate is taken care of. P. DeMarco said he would check with GTP about the lock box. He thought it was installed.

T. Roy stated that they needed to make it a condition to be sure it will be done.

B. Curtin asked how old the antennas are. P. DeMarco noted about 4 years old.

K. Williams read the conditions.

Conditions Subsequent:

1. The applicant shall comply with all of the Town of Alton's Site Plan Regulations
2. The approval is based upon the plans, specifications and testimony submitted to the Planning Board. Any alterations, additions or changes to the plans are not authorized and require additional Planning Board approval.
3. A site which has been filed and conditionally approved may be revoked, in whole or in part, by the Planning Board when an applicant or successor in interest to the applicant has performed work, erected a structure or structures, or established a use of land, which fails to conform to the statements, plans or specifications upon which the approval was based, or has materially violated any requirements or conditions of such approval.

K. McWilliams noted he will add in the condition on the knox box.

D. Collier made a motion to approve Case P11-06 based on the conditions read as well as the Knox box being resolved with the Alton Fire Department C. Balcius seconded the motion. All were in favor, none opposed.

Case #P11-05 Peter Holmes	Map 6 Lot 43	Final Major Subdivision Stockbridge Corner Road
--------------------------------------	---------------------	--

This has been continued per request of the applicant until March 15th at 6:00 p.m.

Case #P11-04 Wentworth Cove Road Realty, LLC	Map 12 Lot 2	Amended Final Major Subdivision Pearson Road and NH Route 28
---	---------------------	---

Brad Hunter has an approved nineteen (19) lot major subdivision known as Baywinds. The subdivision plat has been recorded with no security provided for subdivision improvements. On November 16, 2010 the Planning Board extended the case to February 15, 2011 subject to the applicant coming back with an amended application.

K. McWilliams stated that there was an amendment made to the Subdivision Regulations last September that provided options rather than security for subdivision improvements. One of the options that was provided was instead of security a signed agreement that the developer would not sell lots or get building permits until he either built the improvements and got them inspected and approved or came in with the security to do those improvements and then he could release of that agreement. They are working with Brad and his attorney to get an agreement that the Board would approve. There is a copy of a form that Ken put together from another town to use as a draft to develop an agreement. They have not received an agreement yet. He suggests that the Board continue this for two months to give B. Hunter time to get together an agreement, have Town Counsel review and approve it and do any needed changes and bring it back to the Board for their approval and recording.

Melissa Guldbrandsen attorney for the applicant has no objection to that plan. She stated her e-mail was down so did not get the Planner Review. B. Hunter had picked it up today and looked at it.

K. McWilliams requested that they give it until April.

B. Hunter stated that he wanted to build houses in a development where people would want to buy them but the market is not there yet. The market was on its way under when he finally got his approval.

M. Guldbrandsen stated that B. Hunter has extended his state permits and has dates for them.

B. Hunter reported that the Army Corp has been extended to April 11, 2013; DES Wetlands is April 11, 2013; and Alteration of Terrain is February 12, 2015.

M. Guldbrandsen stated that she could get it back here in a week and a half but doesn't know what kind of review process it would go through here.

K. McWilliams suggested that they should talk about the other issue in his Planner Review; namely the time frame for satisfying the conditions of approval. In September 2010, Ken checked and noted that was correct. The Subdivision Regulations were amended to clarify the length of time after approval to meet the conditions of approval. It was set at 180 days (6 months) with the option of extending that for another year. If they went back to the original approval date in 2005 they would have well extended that time frame. If they take a more reasonable approach and look at it from the date of approval they might give either March or April and a year and a half out from there to meet their conditions of approval.

T. Roy stated that it was a total of one year extension.

M. Guldbrandsen read the Zoning Ordinance which stated that in no case shall such extension exceed 365 in total. So that would be the 180 and 185.

B. Curtin made a motion to continue this case until the March 15th meeting at 6:00p.m. and shall put in first on the agenda. D. Collier seconded the motion. All were in favor, none opposed.

VIII. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Old Business

There was none.

B. New Business:

K. McWilliams spoke of the Site Plan Regulations changes for the checklist to separate the checklist from the subdivision checklist.

C. Approval of Minutes

November 16, 2010 –

The November 16th minutes were approved as the November 21st minutes on December 21st. Just for the record to be in the minutes that the November 21st minutes that were approved were actually the November 16th minutes.

W. Curtin made a motion to accept the November 16th minutes as the November 16th minutes with the changes that were approved as the November 21st minutes. D. Collier seconded the motion which passed with four in favor and none opposed.

December 23, 2010 Site Walk Minutes –

C. Balcius made a motion to approve the December 23, 2010 Site Walk Minutes as presented. B. Curtin seconded the motion which passed with three votes in favor and one abstaining (D. Collier).

January 18, 2011 –

Just before the adjournment Dave Hussey made a motion to continue the meeting to January 26th, it should be Dave Collier seconded it.

Wanted to add in why the meeting was continued to the 26th due to a snow storm.

B. Curtin motion to accept the January 18th minutes as amended. D. Collier seconded it. All were in favor, none opposed.

D. Correspondence

There was none.

E. Any other business that may come before the Board

Several meeting procedures that the Board wished of K. McWilliams were discussed.

It was also discussed about finding alternates for the Planning Board.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

C. Balcius made a motion to adjourn. D. Collier seconded the motion which passed with all in favor.

The public hearing adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Randy Sanborn
Recorder