

City of Rochester Planning Board
Monday, August 7, 2023
City Hall Council Chambers
31 Wakefield Street, Rochester, NH 03867
(These minutes were approved on August 21, 2023)

Members Present

Robert May, *Vice Chair*
Alan Dews
Matthew Richardson
Dave Walker
Peter Bruckner
Don Hamann
James Hayden
Keith Fitts

Members Absent

Mark Collopy, *Chair, excused*
Michael McQuade, *excused*

Alternate Members Present

Alexander de Geofroy
Rick Healey

Staff: Shanna B. Saunders, *Director of Planning & Development*

(These are the legal minutes of the meeting and are in the format of an overview of the meeting. A recording of the meeting will be on file in the City Clerk's office for reference purposes. They may be copied for a fee.)

I. Call to Order

Vice Chair, Robert May, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

II. Roll Call

Planning Department Director, Shanna B. Saunders, conducted roll call.

III. Seating of Alternates

Mr. May asked Rick Healey to vote in place of Mark Collopy.

IV. Communications from the Chair

Mr. May stated that there were no communications from the Chair.

V. Approval of Minutes for

A. July 10, 2023

A motion was made by Mr. Walker to approve July 10, 2023, meeting minutes and seconded by Mr. Hamann. The motion carried unanimously.

VI. Opening Discussion/Comments

A. Public Comment

There were no comments from the public to discuss.

B. Discussion of general planning issues

There were no general planning issues to discuss.

VII. New Applications

A. [RBV Realty, LLC, 324 Blackwater Road](#) (by Berry Surveying & Engineering/Chris Berry & Kenneth Berry) PRELIMINARY Design Review 9-Lot Subdivision Case# 264 – 11 – A – 23 **Public Hearing**

Mr. May stated that the project was a preliminary design review and would not require a vote from the Planning Board.

Chris Berry, Berry Surveying and Engineering, presented the proposed project to the Planning Board and explained that the project would include a subdivision of 11 lots for single family homes. Mr. Berry stated that the project is a conservation subdivision and will have a large amount of open space. Mr. Berry explained the plan for stormwater and drainage, as well as utilities for the property. Mr. Berry briefly explained the types of buildings that would go on each lot, stating that they would be smaller and affordable. Mr. Berry stated that the applicant, Rebecca Mathews, held a meeting with the abutters and explained the project to them and that the abutter to the north of the property asked if a fence could be placed along the property line rather than a vegetation buffer and Ms. Mathews agreed on placing a fence. Mr. Berry said that this plan change would be in the submitted plans with the formal application.

Mr. May opened the Public Hearing. There were no comments from the public and Mr. May closed the public hearing and asked the Board for their feedback on the proposed project.

Mr. Dews asked if the homes would be on slabs or foundations. Mr. Berry answered that the homes would be on foundations.

Mr. Dews asked if the road could be moved further from the abutting household's driveway. Mr. Berry stated that would be difficult because the well requires a 50-foot setback and that the plan was presented to the abutter and that a fence would be placed in between the subdivision and the abutter's property.

Mr. May asked for further clarification on the sewage plans for the project. Mr. Berry stated that each home would have its own septic tank and that some homes would require a pump and that a leach field would be shared between homes.

Mr. Dews asked for clarification on the swale proposed along one of the boundaries. Mr. Berry stated that the boundary would be managed as a swale and that the swale will be completely on the subdivision's property.

B. Fieldstone Land Consultants, PLLC, 303 & 305 North Main Street (Michael Ploof) 3-Unit Condominium Conversion Case# 114 – 8 – HC – 23 *Public Hearing ACCEPTANCE/FINAL DECISION**

Michael Ploof, Fieldstone Land Consultants, presented the project to the Planning Board. Mr. Ploof explained the current buildings are leased businesses within the single parcel and stated that the plan is to separate the parcel into a 3-unit condominium. Two units would be the existing units and the third unit would be vacant land. Mr. Ploof stated that this project is not proposing any improvements at this time and that the application is strictly for the condominium conversion. Mr. Ploof read the requirements of the lot per the Zoning Ordinance.

Ms. Saunders stated that this project is a condominium conversion, also considered subdivision, and that the Board was limited on making changes to the plan. Ms. Saunders stated that staff request the applicant delineate the common areas on the plan, show the water quality monitoring wells and existing sewer and water services in the plans, and include parcel numbers in the final plans. Ms. Saunders stated that draft condominium documents are required before final approval. Ms. Saunders stated that all other conditions are standard conditions for a Condominium Subdivision and that the Planning Department Staff recommend the application to be accepted as complete.

A motion was made by Mr. Walker and seconded by Mr. Hamann to accept the application as complete. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Saunders stated that the Planning Department Staff recommend the application for approval by the Planning Board with the conditions cited earlier and outlined in the staff report.

Mr. May opened the Public Hearing. There were no comments from the public and Mr. May closed the public hearing and asked the Board for their feedback on the proposed project.

Mr. Hayden asked if there were any easement requirements for the parking areas. Ms. Saunders explained that the application for a Condominium Subdivision was meant to keep the ownership as one lot and that a condominium does not require lot lines. Ms. Saunders stated that the condominium documents would lay out who had the rights to pass over who's exclusive use area, what area is common lands, and how the spaces are shared and maintained.

Mr. Healey asked for clarification regarding the condominium conversion. Mr. Ploof stated that the units would be staying the same, that the units would be a conversion in title only.

Mr. Ploof stated that the current businesses would own their buildings, but that the land remains under the declaration of condominium as one ownership.

Mr. May asked for clarification regarding the third unit to the rear of the property. Mr. Ploof stated that there is no building there currently and that the "unit" is considered a land unit.

Mr. Dews asked for clarification for the proposed limited common areas regarding parking. Mr. Ploof showed the space on the plan that was considered common area and gives customers access to both businesses. Mr. Ploof also stated that specific information will be explained in the condominium documentation as requested by the Planning Department.

A motion was made by Mr. Bruckner and seconded by Mr. Healey to approve the project with the conditions as stated. The motion carried unanimously.

C. [New England Gaming and Consulting LLC, 7 Milton Road](#) (by Altus Engineering/Norway Plains/DMAC Architecture) Site Plan to construct Charitable Gaming Facility Case# 222 – 94 – HC – 23 **Applicant requested continuation to September 11, 2023 Planning Board Meeting**

Mr. May stated that the applicant has asked for a continuation to the Planning Board meeting on September 11, 2023.

A motion was made by Mr. Walker and seconded by Mr. Richardson to continue the application to the September 11, 2023 Planning Board Meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

D. [GNM Solar 17, LLC, 60 Shaw Drive](#) (by Norway Plains Associates/Scott Lawler) Amendment to Approved Site Plan to shift Solar Trackers' locations to comply NHDES Alteration of Terrain requirements for ground slopes. Case# 240 – 49 – A – 22 **Public Hearing ACCEPTANCE/FINAL DECISION***

Packy Campbell, GNM Solar 17, LLC presented the proposed amendment to a previously approved project. Mr. Campbell stated that he has applied for an Alteration of Terrain Permit for this lot and one of the requirements was to shift trackers for slope changes. Mr. Campbell stated that he also applied for a NHDES Wetlands Permit and NHDES asked if there were further changes that could be made to further limit impacts to wetlands and the changes are shown in the plan presentation of this project by running power through 60 Shaw Drive to relocated trackers rather than having to improve Shaw drive all the way down to the RR tracks.

Mr. May verified that the current proposed project was for 60 Shaw Drive. Mr. Campbell verified that the project he was explaining was for 60 Shaw Drive.

Ms. Saunders reviewed the project and staff recommendation and stated that the application was an amendment and included moving the placement of some solar trackers. Ms. Saunders stated that access to the solar trackers is limited by the wetlands and wetland buffers. Ms. Saunders stated that the plan is to minimize crossing impacts to the wetlands and that this was a violation site and the Planning Department is actively working with the applicant to restore the wetlands and that the restoration project is being monitored by the

State as well. Ms. Saunders stated that the recommendation is to accept the application as complete.

A motion was made by Mr. Walker and seconded by Mr. Hamann to accept the application as complete.

Mr. Healey asked how often maintenance is performed on solar trackers. Mr. Campbell stated that maintenance can be once or twice per year, but the trackers do not require much maintenance.

The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. May opened the Public Hearing. There were no comments from the public and Mr. May closed the public hearing and asked the Board for their feedback on the proposed project.

Ms. Saunders reviewed the staff recommended conditions of approval for the project. Ms. Saunders stated that the changes must be reflected on new final plans, acknowledging that the applicant already submitted "final plans". Ms. Saunders stated that the Fire Department requested that the road be made accessible for emergency vehicles and that turnaround plan include dimensions and cross sections. Ms. Saunders stated that there must be a snow fence at the wetland buffer to assure no further impacts to the violation restoration area and that construction details be provided for the concrete washout shown on the current plans. Ms. Saunders stated that the Assessing Department requested that a current use map be provided as part of the conditions of approval. Ms. Saunders read the standard conditions for the project. Ms. Saunders stated that Staff recommends approval for the project with the conditions as stated.

Mr. Walker asked how much of Shaw Drive is currently paved. Saunders stated that she was not sure if the road was paved to the property line. Mr. Campbell explained the placement of the currently paved road and stated that the pavement ends on the abutting lot and that there is a gravel road on his property that ends at the first wetlands crossing.

Mr. Walker asked if the homes on Shaw Drive were on the paved road. Mr. Campbell answered that the homes were on the paved road.

Mr. Walker asked if there would be any demolition to the Shaw Drive road. Mr. Campbell answered no.

Ms. Saunders asked for clarification on the statement that Eversource clear cut the lot and impacted the wetlands, as she was aware the cutting was done by the applicant. Mr. Campbell stated that an Intent to Cut was filed, a Timber Harvest Permit was obtained, and a NHDES Wetlands Permit for temporary crossings in the wetland and that these permits were obtained in February in an effort to prevent ruts through the wetlands. Mr. Campbell stated that he will be restoring the wetlands as required by NHDES.

A gentleman was unaware that the Public Hearing was opened and Mr. May noticed the gentleman's attempt to be able to speak and reopened the Public Hearing.

Merrick Lane, 12 Little Falls Bridge Road, asked for further information on what impacts he may have as an abutter to this proposed project. It was noted that Mr. Lane's question

pertained to the 17 Sterling Drive Project and would be brought into consideration when the Public Hearing for 17 Sterling Drive was opened.

A motion was made by Mr. Walker and seconded by Mr. Hamann to close the Public Hearing and approve the project with all conditions as stated. The motion carried unanimously.

E. Packy's Investment Properties, LLC, 17 Sterling Dr (by Norway Plains Associates/Scott Lawler) Amendment to Approved Site Plan to relocate 6 solar trackers from wetlands to wetland's buffer. Case# 208 – 18 – GRD – 21 **Public Hearing ACCEPTANCE/FINAL DECISION***

Packy Campbell, Packy's Investment Properties, LLC presented the proposed amendment to a previously approved project at 17 Sterling Drive. Mr. Campbell stated that a wetlands permit was obtained to place 6 solar trackers in the wetlands and NHDES requested a review of the impacts to the wetlands to minimize impacts as much as possible. Mr. Campbell stated that he also obtained a Conditional Use Permit to cut the 50-foot buffer, have conduit and access points into the Wetlands. Mr. Campbell stated that in an effort to minimize wetland impacts, a site plan revision was proposed to move solar trackers from the wetlands to the wetland's buffer. Mr. Campbell stated that in the initial approval, no buildings or structures could be built within the wetland's buffer, however as per the recent Solar Ordinance, the requirements in the wetland's buffer have changed. Mr. Campbell stated that a Variance was received to build trackers 30 feet into the wetland's buffer. Mr. Campbell explained that there would be concrete foundations in the wetland's buffer. Mr. Campbell stated that moving the solar trackers to the current plan, the need for a wetland permit is voided.

Ms. Saunders stated that the project is an amendment to a previously approved site plan and that there is no Conditional Use Permit because the applicant applied and was awarded a Variance by the Zoning Board for that section of the ordinance. Ms. Saunders stated that the Variance requested was for the entire section of the Conservation Overlay District and that the Zoning Board of Adjustment made it clear that their approval was only for a specific section of the ordinance that requires the Conditional Use Permit process and that the Variance set out 4 criteria, the conditional use criteria, that the applicant would have to meet to have as little impact to the wetlands as possible.

Ms. Saunders explained that the original Conditional Use Permit that was approved was only for the buffer because the Conservation Commission only has jurisdiction over the buffer and they do not have jurisdiction over the wetland.

Ms. Saunders stated that the applicant submitted revised plans showing a new access road which was not part of the ZBA approval and he will be required to construct the access road as it was shown on the original plan.

Ms. Saunders stated that the Conservation Commission submitted a letter in opposition to the project and expressed concern that the Variance was granted by the Zoning Board.

A motion was made by Mr. Walker and seconded by Mr. Dews to accept the application as complete. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. May opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. May reiterated the concern from Mr. Lane, who spoke at the Public Hearing for 60 Shaw Drive by mistake. Mr. Campbell explained the location of 17 Sterling Drive and stated that there is no view of the trackers from Little Falls Bridge Road and that there are current trackers on this property that have been present for 2 years; that this application is for the addition of more solar trackers. Mr. Campbell stated that there should be no impact to abutters from this project.

Mr. Campbell explained the placement of the access road and asked if the location of the required access road could be to the left of the retention pond to lessen impacts on the drainage and temporary structures. Mr. Campbell stated that he would support having the temporary access road as an additional Condition of Approval. Ms. Saunders explained that the access road that is shown on the Planning Board submittal was not shown on the Variance request that was submitted to the Zoning Board. Ms. Saunders stated that the Variance request did not include the temporary buffer impacts associated with the access road that was submitted to the Planning Board. Ms. Saunders explained that a small access road across the drainage structure and 4 solar trackers were submitted and approved by the Zoning Board. Ms. Saunders stated that Scott Lawler stated at the Technical Review Group meeting that the plans would be changed to reflect what the Zoning Board approved to prevent a resubmission to the Zoning Board. Mr. Campbell stated that he did not want to leave an access road if it was not necessary and wanted to remove the access road when the work was finished to restore the area.

Mr. Campbell stated that he did not feel that access roads were necessary to stay on the property and he would prefer to restore the area once construction is completed.

Ms. Saunders stated her concerns with the error of communicating these changes before presenting them to Planning Board. Ms. Saunders explained that the purpose of the Technical Review Group was to review the plans that would be submitted to the Planning Board in order to make changes to plans before being presented to the Planning Board. Ms. Saunders stated that at the TRG meeting a week prior, the applicant's engineer agreed to move the access road and that the plan that was presented and discussed in TRG is the plan that will be voted on in this meeting.

Mr. Campbell asked if the access road must be left in its planned location or if it can be removed upon completion of the construction. Mr. Campbell gave an extended explanation on why he would prefer to remove the access road at the completion of the construction.

Mark Jennings, Conservation Commission member, introduced himself as being on the Conservation Commission for 12 years. Mr. Jennings explained his understanding of the project and what jurisdiction the Conservation Commission has regarding wetlands and wetland's buffers. Mr. Jennings explained the wetlands on his personal property and explained the purposes of wetland's buffers. Mr. Jennings stated that having solar trackers is not an allowable use of the wetlands buffer. Mr. Jennings stated the requirement of placing signs in wetlands area, signifying wetlands buffers.

Mr. May asked the Board for their feedback on the proposed project.

Mr. Hayden asked for further explanation on the layout of the solar trackers and why the amended layout was not 25 feet from the wetlands, it was 20. Mr. Campbell explained that the distance between the solar trackers was as close as they could be without shading each other.

Mr. Hayden stated his concern with the placement of a temporary access road through an existing stormwater system and he felt that it could cause long-term issues. Mr. Hayden recommends stating in the plans that the disturbed areas will be re-vegetated and restored after construction.

Mr. Dews asked for clarification on the digging for power lines in relation to the cemetery buffer. Mr. Dews asked if the cemetery buffer was restored from cutting. Ms. Saunders stated that landscaping escrow was held for the restoration of cutting around the cemetery. Ms. Saunders stated that the landscape restoration in that area has been completed and escrow has been requested to be released. Mr. Campbell explained the landscape escrow that was held and stated that the restoration was complete.

Mr. Dews asked if, from the new construction, the cemetery buffer would be disturbed again. Mr. Campbell answered no, and that the conduit goes towards the building and away from the buffer. Mr. Campbell stated that there would be no further disturbances to the cemetery buffer. Ms. Saunders confirmed that the landscape was completed along the cemetery buffer.

Mr. Walker asked for verification of the Variance to lessen the wetlands buffer from 50 to 20 feet. Mr. Campbell stated that was correct.

Mr. Walker asked for the specific locations of the foundations for the solar trackers, where they would be in the wetland's buffer. Mr. Campbell stated that the foundations would be in the 20-30 feet of the buffer that is allowed by the Variance. Mr. Campbell explained the location of the stone wall on the property with regards to the wetlands.

Mr. Walker asked if the Zoning Board approval was worded to prevent the project from being reviewed by the Conservation Commission. Mr. Campbell answered that submitting to the Conservation Commission is not required because there is no Conditional Use Permit due to the Variance being granted.

Ms. Saunders explained that the Variance was granted to eliminate the process of going to the Conservation Commission. Ms. Saunders stated that, as a condition of the Variance, the 20 feet buffer to the wetlands was agreed upon.

Ms. Saunders explained that some facts were misstated previously and in fact any ground mount solar system in the wetlands buffer is still required to be reviewed by the Conservation Commission per the Solar Ordinance.

Mr. May asked if the solar ordinance applied to the current proposed project. Ms. Saunders answered that the solar ordinance did apply.

Mr. Campbell explained his understanding of the solar ordinance and asked if with a Conditional Use Permit, solar trackers could be built in the wetland's buffer. Ms. Saunders stated that was correct, a conditional use permit is required.

Mr. Campbell explained that the plan amendment called for the solar trackers to be outside of the wetlands.

Mr. Hamann asked for verification of the size of the concrete platform for the solar trackers. Mr. Campbell stated that the concrete structure is 8 feet by 8 feet.

Mr. Hamann asked how the land is covered over. Mr. Campbell stated that the land is back filled.

Mr. Hamann asked how deep the cover is over the platform. Mr. Campbell answered that the cover is 2 feet. Mr. Campbell briefly explained the drainage of the surfaces.

Mr. Campbell stated that the project will hit the threshold of an Alteration of Terrain Permit and that he will apply for the state permits necessary, including the Alteration of Terrain Permit.

Mr. Dews asked if there was a reason that the 4 solar trackers were not pulled to the front of the property and completely away from the wetlands. Mr. Campbell stated that the grade of the project varies and that the trees in the front area block the solar trackers from the sun. Mr. Campbell explained that the solar trackers that are to be installed at the front of the property will produce less power because of the shade.

Mr. Hayden asked if the UGE (underground electric line) could be run a different direction so that it was not being run under the detention pond. Mr. Campbell asked what trackers were being asked about. Mr. Hayden explained that the plan has underground electrical going through the detention pond in the plans. Mr. Campbell stated that the conduit can be moved and stated that moving the conduit could be added as a condition of approval, but that he plans to fully restore the pond once the conduit is run.

Mr. Fitts asked for clarification on the impact changes between the current plan and the previously approved plan. Ms. Saunders explained that the wetland's buffer impact in the previous plan was the temporary access road. Ms. Saunders stated that the trackers were in the wetlands in the previous plan and so not under the jurisdiction of the City. Again a misstatement of fact but it was her understanding that NHDES was not going to approve them to be placed in the wetlands. Ms. Saunders stated that each of the trackers in the wetland buffer of the current plan will have an 8 feet by 8 feet platform with a trench, making the impact space 10 feet by 10 feet total for each tracker. Ms. Saunders also explained that the access road in the current plan comes in through the sewer pump station and is significantly longer than the original access road through the buffer. Ms. Saunders stated that the impact is significantly greater to the wetland buffer in the amended plan.

Mr. May stated his understanding of the locations of solar trackers and what approvals may be required by NHDES and the City of Rochester for either plan. Mr. Campbell further explained the changes that were made between the previously approved plan and the presented amended plan.

Mr. Campbell stated that he felt that, with regards to long-term impact, there would be less of an impact with the amended plan.

Mr. Dews asked for clarification of the trackers' location on the plan. Mr. Dews stated that the plan shows possible disturbance to the wetlands with the location of the solar tracker platforms and the fencing against the wetlands. Mr. Dews stated that he would recommend a line of silt fence along the back side of the trackers to prevent any disturbance to the wetlands. Mr. Campbell stated that he could place a natural fence to prevent any disturbance and welcomes the fence to be added as a condition of approval.

Ms. Saunders explained that the Variance for the CUP process does not mean that the Planning Board Members cannot deny the site plan application if they think the impact is too great. Ms. Saunders reviewed the recommended conditions of approval listed in the staff recommendation and what conditions were added from the conversation of the Board members. Ms. Saunders also reviewed the subsequent conditions as required before building permits will be issued. Ms. Saunders explained the staff recommendations to the Planning Board for approval or denial of the amended project.

Mr. Walker asked for clarification on the condition pertaining to the access road. Ms. Saunders stated that the access road was to be temporary.

Mr. Walker asked if the applicant was precluded from restoring the land used as an access road once construction is completed. Ms. Saunders stated that the applicant was not.

Mr. de Geofroy stated his concerns for the process that took place for Variance granting and that he was also concerned about the precedent that is set by allowing construction in the wetland buffer. Mr. de Geofroy stated that the City of Rochester has no jurisdiction over the wetlands but do have jurisdiction over the wetland's buffer and that the Planning Board has an obligation to consider impacts to the wetland's buffer.

A motion was made by Mr. Walker and seconded by Mr. Bruckner to approve the project with the conditions as stated, as well as those discussed and close the public hearing for the project. The motion carried unanimously by a roll call vote.

VIII. Continued Applications

A. [42 Front Street, LLC, 42 Front Street](#) (by Norway Plains Assoc./Ashley Rowe) 2-Lot subdivision. Case# 102 – 41 – R2 – 23 **Continuance to September 11, 2023 Planning Board Meeting.**

Mr. May stated that the Planning Board must vote to continue the application to the date specified, September 11, 2023.

A motion was made by Mr. Walker and seconded by Mr. Hamann to continue the application to the September 11, 2023 Planning Board Meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Walker asked how many continuances have been made for this project. Ms. Saunders answered that this was the third continuance request. Mr. Walker stated that this would be the last approved continuance request.

IX. Extension Application

A. [Wesson Realty, LLC, Pickleball Facility, 389 Gonic Road](#) Extension request to meet Precedent Conditions Case# 262 – 73&74 – HC – 22 **EXTENSION TO 1/11/2024**

Ms. Saunders stated that this request was the second extension request to meet precedent conditions.

A motion was made by Mr. Walker and seconded by Mr. Hamann to extend the requirement to meet precedent conditions to the January 11, 2024. The motion carried unanimously.

X. Zoning Amendments

A. Proposed amendments to Granite Ridge Zoning District Setbacks

Ms. Saunders stated the original intent of the Granite Ridge Zoning District Setbacks was to try and keep development behind Marketplace Blvd to avoid large retaining walls facing Rte 11 and that the intent of the amendment to the setbacks is to decrease them to 50 feet but list requirements for the space between the setback and Marketplace Blvd. Ms. Saunders listed the requirements as the maximum buildable area be 40 percent so that there is a view shed beyond buildings along the roadway, to require access from Marketplace Blvd to prevent traffic issues at business entrances, and that the buildings be 1-story or less than 25 feet tall.

Ms. Saunders stated that the dimensional standards do not currently list a setback for Marketplace Blvd and that the Planning Department requests a 10-foot setback implemented with a grass strip.

Ms. Saunders stated that the ordinance also does not list maximum building height for mixed use buildings, which are strongly encouraged in the ordinance, and the Planning Department recommends the maximum building height be the same for residential buildings.

Ms. Saunders stated that, at the Workshop meeting, the Planning Board can review and discuss changes and make recommendations to City Council for amendments.

Mr. Dews stated his concerns for snow removal and listing the setback at 15-20 feet, rather than 10 feet.

Mr. Hamann proposed that mixed use buildings have a max height of 125 feet if they install a garage underneath the residential portion. Mr. Fitts stated his support for this change.

XI. Other Business

A. Planning Update

Ms. Saunders displayed and explained the Poet Laureate Book that was creating by the Arts & Culture Commission by their Poet Laureate, Ed Pacht.

Ms. Saunders stated that Mr. Pacht writes a poem each day and that they are very Rochester oriented.

The books are free and several PB Members requested copies.

B. Other

There was no other business to be discussed.

XII. Adjournment

A motion was made by Mr. Walker and seconded by Mr. May to adjourn the meeting at 8:41pm. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Jaclyn Millard,
Administrative Assistant II

and

Shanna B. Saunders,
Director of Planning & Development