

MINUTES
Planning Board
June 14, 2010
7:00 PM

Members Present: William Horton, Chair; David Fowler, Donna Hovey, Lynne Potter and Frank Braman

Staff Present: Elwin Thorpe – Code Enforcement Officer; James Seymour – Planning Board Consultant and Sandy Fredricks – Secretary.

Members Absent: Jim Macklin (alternate)

Public Present: Theresa Cosgrove, Linda Horton, Angela Moen, Kay Lawson, Barry Hobbins, Esq.; Lew Wetzell, Fred Huntress, Jr.; Pat Cayer, Larry Chute, Erika Frank, Esq.; Pat Troy, Bob Gashlin

7:00 P.M.

Bill calls the meeting to order.

Minutes from May 10, 2010

Lynne moves to approve the Minutes of May 10, 2010 as written.

Dave seconds the motion.

Any discussion? None.

All in favor? 5 yes – 0 no

Chute, M 6, L 6-5

Bill states Land Services, Inc. has submitted a Revised Plan on behalf of Larry R. and Elizabeth M. Chute to reduce the number of lots in their proposed Subdivision. The property affected is a portion of Map 6, Lot 6-5, known as 42 Lilac Lane and is located in a Residential Zone. He continues that he is sure everyone remembers this matter from the last meeting and he understands there were changes required to be made to the Notes on the plan. Bill further states, as this matter was tabled at the last meeting, he needs a motion to remove it from the table.

Dave moves to remove the matter from the table.

Lynne seconds.

Any discussion? None

All in favor? 5 yes – 0 no

Bill invites the applicant's representative to present the matter to the Board.

Pat Cayer states at the last meeting he presented revised subdivision plans to the Board and asked to have the previous subdivision approval rescinded. After discussions with the Planning Board and consideration of the

recommendations by the Board he has revised certain items and brings them here tonight asking for final approval.

Pat states in regard to the land area from the previous plan, Lot 6-12 is shown on the plans to be merged with The Chutes' existing house lot which is not part of the subdivision. The Right-of-Way turnaround terminus is shown on the plan and Lilac Lane's Right-of-Way ends at that turnaround. Further, Pat states he has added the lines and notes to the maps as requested by the Board. Pat continues that there is a secondary Right-of-Way that extends up to a point to provide frontage for the Willey property.

Further, Pat states that the common boundary running down the center of the road on one side was part of Larry Chute's original lot created some confusion and he has eliminated that boundary line down the center and created fee ownership to simplify matters. Next item changed is they have revised the acreage for Lot 6-10 indicating it includes the land mass of the Right-of-Way area of Lilac Lane.

Pat continues, the approximate location of the woods haul road off a section of the Willey driveway has been clarified on the plan that it is for forestry uses only. Further, added to Note #1 a conveyance to be recorded from Larry Chute to Larry & Elizabeth Chute for the portion of the Right-of-Way to be merged with their current home lot.

Additionally, Note #9 was amended to include language regarding road maintenance as well as language relative to a future Homeowners' Association. Note #13 was also amended to include language related to restriction for further development on Lots 6-9 and 6-10 per discussions with the Board at the May meeting.

Pat continues, regarding the road construction issues, Dave Morton (Casco's Road Commissioner) has reviewed the revised road construction letter submitted by Mark Gray and provided his input to the Board. In light of Mr. Morton's comments, Note #15 has been added to the plan stating: *"Lilac Lane was constructed prior to the review and approval of Lots 6-9 & 6-10 shown hereon. While the roadway appears to substantially conform to the standards set forth by the Town of Casco and in general with those depicted on the Subdivision Plan, there were no field tests or engineering inspection services provided during construction to verify compliance with the road cross section detail as provided. In lieu of test results, a letter from Mark Gray – Maine PE #3997 of JAMM Civil and Structural Engineering dated May 11, 2010 stating his opinion and observations of the condition of Lilac Lane and statement of conformance to design intent shall be deemed acceptable to the Board. However, the Board by the approval of this plan does not accept that the private road has met all Town standards, or will be acceptable for a Town approved road. In addition any further encumbrance (sic) or burden on the road known as Lilac*

Lane, as shown on this plan, will require engineering evidence such as, but not limited (sic) to, a full depth testing of all aggregate gradations, field measuring for depths of specified materials, verification of compaction and density results of road surface and sub-base sections, and any other material properties or standard testing per Maine Department of Transportation Specifications, the Town of Casco Road Standards, or as deemed necessary by a third party engineering inspector with certified knowledge in road construction and soils testing shall be submitted to and approved by the Town of Casco Planning Board or Road Commissioner.”

Pat states regarding the issue of the Homeowners’ Association, Larry submitted the documents to the Town for review by the Town’s attorney. The Board received a review of said documents from Natalie Burns of Jensen Baird Gardner Henry dated June 7, 2010. Ms. Burns requested three minor additions to those documents and Larry Chute’s attorney will incorporate those additions into the Homeowners’ Association agreements.

Bill asks Jim if there are any other concerns to be addressed. Jim states the only item is clarification of when the Homeowners’ Association documents should be executed.

Donna asks if she understands correctly that based on formation of the Homeowners’ Association and contingent upon all fees being paid, everything else submitted on the plan is in order. Jim states she is correct.

Donna moves to accept the plans and recommended stipulations to the Homeowners’ Association documents as follows:

A. “1. There should be a specific reference in the Association Bylaws to the specific DEP stormwater maintenance and reporting requirements. Exhibit A to the Declaration should also be made an exhibit to the Bylaws.

2. Section 1.2 of the Declaration establishes certain setbacks. . . . there should be a statement that the zoning setbacks established by the Town’s Zoning Ordinance must be complied with if they create a greater setback than those established by the Declaration.

3. The third sentence of Section 9.1 should be amended to add the language ‘and may also require prior Town approval’ after the words ‘shall require prior approval of the Declarant”

B. Requirement of all fees being paid per regulations of the Town

C. Per Jim Seymour’s Memo of June 7, 2010 to Grant Waivers as follows:

1. Section 9.4.3 Landscaping and buffering.

2. Section 9.4.5.B. All road angle monuments shall be constructed of 4-inch by 4-inch by 4-foot long stone (granite).
3. Section 9.4.7. Pavement width shall be 20 feet for a private minor street and include 6-foot wide gravel shoulders.

Lynne seconds.

Any discussion? None.

All in favor? 4 yes - 0 no - 1 abstain (Frank)

Frank states he would like to make a recommendation to the Board to establish a policy now of not accepting roads that have been constructed before they come in before us. This is the second one we've had. All you have to do is have someone go out and build a road knowing they are going to go for a subdivision and come in and say "oh, I didn't know". We need to establish a policy that if the road is built before the subdivision, tough luck.

Larry Chute states he did not build the road prior to coming before the Board to go around policies. He built it as his driveway originally and had no thoughts of a subdivision.

Frank and Larry engage in a brief discussion about roads constructed prior to application to the Board and that if there is documentation there is no issue.

Bill states the next item on the agenda is Barry J. Hobbins, duly authorized attorney for AT&T Mobility a/k/a New Cingular Wireless, has submitted an application for Site Plan Approval for a Wireless Communication Facility located at 190 Tamarack Trail. Said property is known as Map 6, Lot 34-7 and is titled to Robert and Shellie Symonds.

Bill states at this time he will recuse himself from participating as a Board member as he is a direct abutter to this application and as such has a conflict. Bill moves from the table to the audience.

Donna nominated Dave to act as Chairman in this matter.

Lynne seconds.

Any discussion? None.

All in favor? 3 yes - 1 abstain (Dave)

Dave states the next order of business is the cell tower.

Barry Hobbins, Esq. Introduces himself to the Board and audience. He hands out copies of the Exhibits which are referenced in Jim Seymour's Memo of June 7, 2010. Mr. Hobbins states he also will be asking Bob Gashlin to speak to the Board in regard to this matter as Mr. Gashlin is the person who actually

goes out and finds the locations for AT&T and can explain why this site was chosen and why it is needed.

Mr. Hobbins continues that the Board has received an extensive Memo from Jim Seymour regarding this application and Jim has extensive knowledge in wireless communications. Further, he has been involved with other matters with Jim, sometimes on opposite sides and sometimes on the same side.

Mr. Hobbins states he understands and respects our policy and did not submit the Exhibits tonight to be considered per se but in case they may answer any questions.

Continuing, the property is owned by Robert and Shellie Symonds. In order to meet the telecommunication requirements of the area is why AT&T has submitted this application for this location. We have listed numerous Waiver Requests (Exhibit 7), some items are missing and will be submitted at a later date. We have letters regarding historic issues etc. We also didn't receive the Radio Frequency Information and report as yet. We have submitted photo simulations and aerial photograph and we have the Town landmark maps and habitat areas.

Mr. Hobbins states the narrative of the project is a proposal to erect a tower 150' in height although the Town's ordinance permits a tower to be 180' high. The applicant proposes to construct a 408' long, 12' wide driveway to access the compound site location. The compound itself will be 50' x 50' surrounded by a 6' high fence and barbed wire. This is typical if you look at any wireless communications facility. You must have this for security purposes as well as co-location of the providers.

The tower will have six (6) panels and in this case we are proposing a flush mounted antenna area to minimize the visual impact. The panels are approximately 55" high, 11" wide and 5" deep and are covered by non-reflective fiberglass. Exhibit 14 is the Antenna specifications. There is a proposed diesel generator on a 4' x 11' concrete pad 10' from the equipment shelter. The specs for this are Exhibit 15. Jim Seymour recommends propane rather than diesel in his Memo and the applicant does not object to this change.

Continuing with the narrative, Mr. Hobbins states the specs for the equipment shelter are Exhibit 16. The antenna will be connected to the shelter with coaxial cables that will cross an ice bridge and run into the shelter to connect to the radio transmitters and receivers inside the shelter. Regarding lighting issues, it is highly unlikely the FAA will require any markings or lighting at the 147' mounting level of the 150' tower. Anything over 200' triggers FAA lighting requirements and we have photo simulations as well.

Mr. Hobbins states this will be an unmanned facility once it is built so there will be no vehicle or pedestrian traffic other than once or twice per week for inspections. There will be minimal noise from the small fan in the equipment shelter and would be about the same noise generated by a 10 x 10 room sized air conditioner. This facility will produce no other noise, or any dirt, dust, glare, odor, fumes, smoke, gas, sewage, refuse, vibration or danger of explosion or fire.

Mr. Hobbins turns the presentation over to Mr. Gashlin at this point.

Mr. Gashlin states he is the guy who finds the locations for AT&T and puts together a lot of the documents you have before you in your binders. He asks the Board to look at Exhibit 17, Radio Frequency Report and Coverage Maps. He continues that in Casco everyone can visualize the lay of the land and what's going on in Town. AT&T currently has antenna on Quaker Ridge and another off 302 and on a tower over the Poland boarder on Black Cat Mountain. Along Route 11, in the middle, is Rattlesnake Mountain and Tamarack Trail. That section creates a ridge that blocks AT&T's signal from the Quaker Ridge and Black Cat Mountain sites. The traffic count in this area is 6700 vehicles per day and we are not providing adequate service for that number. The color coverage maps show existing coverage and proposed coverages after this facility is constructed. As the Board can see, it will be greatly improved. These maps represent both in vehicle and in building signals. A stronger signal is required in buildings as you have to pass through the structure. Further, it has been noted that a large number of homes no longer have land lines and only utilize cell phone service.

Mr. Gashlin reiterates the information presented by Mr. Hobbins i.e. monopole, flush mount antenna and 30' decrease in allowable height of the tower. He continues that Rattlesnake Mountain is difficult as the Ordinance requires when siting a tower all efforts must be taken to keep off ridge lines. This specific site is different as it gives us the ability to site the tower down off the hill 740'. Continuing, he states that while the ordinance allows for a 180' tower, AT&T looked at the coverage needs and made the 150' tower work to show some good-faith. Not only is AT&T cutting 30' off of the tower, most are stand alone 18' – 20' base while this proposal calls for a clean tower, a monopole that is 60" in diameter at the base and tapers up to 24" at the top. A typical tower where you affix antenna at the top utilize 12' wide racks that you bolt the antenna on. The monopole creates better visual by using flush mount antenna. Once you are down on 85 or 11 further this shows little visual impact. These are the reasons, basically, that AT&T chose this site.

Mr. Hobbins states that in the course of doing their due diligence in this matter, they research prior applications for towers in Town. In this search they determined that this site was previously proposed and received approval by MCI as a microwave tower site. He continues that their research also indicated

that the last time Casco approved a tower was nine years ago and that was a time when there was a rush on cell towers before any towns had ordinances regulating them. Those days are gone as many towns have now adopted ordinances regarding wireless communications. In this case, this site was one such site that was going to be utilized but MCI abandoned their plan.

Dave asks if this tower will help provide coverage for other providers. Mr. Hobbins states it will; Casco's ordinance requires co-location and AT&T has submitted a letter stating they will comply with this requirement. He further states the Telecommunications Act of 1996 prohibits carriers from discriminating against other carriers.

Dave asks if the 150' height is adequate to allow those provisions in the future or if it would provide better service at 180'. Mr. Hobbins states this site is being leased from family members of the abutters and the abutters are concerned about the visual impact. In making the tower shorter we have probably dropped the co-locators by two and essentially cutting it in half by allowing for two co-locators rather than four. Mr. Gashlin states the monopoles are extendable and there is nothing that will prevent either AT&T or another carrier coming back before you for an extension.

Jim asks if when they design the tower if the base will be designed to accommodate the full 180' to allow for the possible additional height over the 150'. Mr. Gashlin states he is not sure if AT&T is willing to do that, but the base could be expanded in the future as well.

Jim asks if the co-locators will be restricted to the flush-mount antennas or could they have the rack type. Mr. Hobbins states that could be a Condition of Approval that other carriers must be flush-mount antenna as well. Further, any Condition of Approval requires an applicant to come back if there is any amendment to the Tower, be it the number of co-locators, type of mount or type of waves.

Dave states he feels the foundation issue should be addressed in this initial application rather than coming back at another time. He continues that the different type of foundation for the monopole is a concern to him. Mr. Hobbins states that is an engineering decision.

Frank asks if the base for the 150' monopole is the same as for a 180' monopole. Mr. Gashlin states it is not and explains the monopole design and bases. He states that flush-mounting makes a difference.

Mr. Hobbins states there is a Catch-22 here. AT&T is trying to be good neighbors and minimize the impact.

Bill Horton states he has a question for Mr. Hobbins and states one of his concerns is the road. Bill states he would like to know the agreement regarding the use of the road between AT&T and Bob Symonds. Mr. Hobbins states that if you look at the exhibits he presented to the Board this evening you will see we did a full title search and there are no covenants or restrictions on the use of the road. There is a maintenance agreement which currently shows there are three lots. He continues, in their situation, they would pay a proportionate share for the road maintenance agreement. AT&T will not shirk their responsibilities and will work with the Town and the abutters so as not to over burden the easement. It is their position that twice a week crossing over the road for inspections will not constitute an over burden of the road.

Mr. Hobbins states that Jim Seymour raised very valid points in his review of the plans and they will address each of them.

Dave asks if AT&T would just be taking over the current owners' share of the road maintenance. Mr. Hobbins states no, they will be the fourth participant. There is a provision in the agreement for a lot owner to construct a second dwelling on their lot and if they do so the additional dwelling will pay 2/10ths of the maintenance so it is based upon the percentages of the use. He further states that as far as improving and building the 408' Right-of-Way into the site, AT&T will pay all those costs.

Erika Frank, attorney for Bill Horton, states the road to access the approved subdivision has existing conditions and this is an approved residential subdivision with conditions and boundary lines. She continues that before we even get to how many times they are crossing over this road or talk of any expansion to the tower and co-locaters, we need to come to an agreement that it is a permitted use. I do not believe there is anything contained in these documents that indicates a telecommunications tower is a permitted use and it has been my experience if it is not shown as a permitted use, it is not permitted. This is not an all inclusive agreement, it is an access agreement to one residential lot sold to The Symonds. This is a private way. Mr. Hobbins states this agreement provides for commercial use and a cell tower is a commercial use. Ms. Frank continues that before we get to engineering studies and all that, we need to establish if they even have the right to cross over this road and if they have legal access to the site. This is clearly a 3-lot subdivision and there are implied covenants and restrictions and warranties in the deeds and the plans. Further, Ms. Frank states, the ownership of the road is not in any one person, it is a private way chopped up in different ownerships.

Mr. Hobbins cites the case *Thompson v. Pendelton*, Maine Law, Title 22 MRSA 30312, which states "any person acquiring title to land on a subdivision plan acquires rights-of-way over the ways in that subdivision . . .". Mr. Hobbins continues that any person who buys or leases property on a private right-of-way gets full access.

Dave states it is his opinion that the Board may wish to seek an opinion from the Town's attorney before we get too far down the road on this. Jim points out that this is merely an informational presentation tonight and the Board does not have to make any decisions at this time.

Ms. Frank states that perhaps there should be discussions if this is an amendment to an approved subdivision.

Fred Huntress states he is an abutter to this property and he would like to know where this will be on Bob Symond's property. Mr. Huntress is shown Page C-1 of Exhibit 8 (Site Plan) which indicates the location of the wireless communication facility and tower. Mr. Huntress states that the existing ground elevation is 731' and the proposed ground elevation is 727' or approximately 4' below existing grade and that it is 784' above sea level above Bob's property, is that correct. Mr. Gashlin states it is as they can't get the signal through all the trees.

Mr. Huntress asks if anyone is familiar with the Legend of Edgar Welch at which time Mr. Huntress entertained the Board and those present with a narrative of this legend.

Mr. Hobbins states that Exhibit 24, which he presented this evening, is the three deeds for the lots on Tamarack Trail and asks the Board to note there are no legal restrictions in those deeds.

Linda Horton states she would like to point out that Mr. Hobbins talked about clearing the trees and Mr. Gashlin talked about all the trees; they can't have it both ways.

Jim asks Mr. Hobbins if he sent letters to the public entities. Mr. Hobbins states they have requested a waiver of this requirement. He continues that if the Board wants them to do so, they will do it. Further, Mr. Hobbins states that Exhibit 17 shows AT&T on every tower in Town except the WGME tower and it also shows that that would not work for them.

Jim asks if they have explored alternative sites such as church steeples or the like which may be available. Mr. Hobbins speaks about looking at alternate locations and expounds on other places they have placed antennas that were not towers. Mr. Gashlin states that the areas where the roads cross is where the site needs to be and there were no other possibilities.

Ms. Frank states the ordinance puts a higher standard on showing there is no alternative to building a tower and she would like to know if there are any possibilities of raising the height of the existing towers. Mr. Gashlin states that is not a possibility as technology provides a signal that only has the capacity to

travel 1.8 miles. Further, the other towers can't be extended as they are already at 180'.

Dave states he is not one who typically drives up costs for developers, but he has no idea of radio frequencies and would like a peer review of your site. Jim states in his experience it is documented and is a well-known fact that cell phone coverage is about two miles due to the frequencies they are using.

There is discussion about different carriers utilizing different frequencies. Some are analog which are in the 800s range, but newer technology is in the 1900 band. The Telecommunications Act, knowing there would be expansion of the bands provides that the higher bands can't be discriminated against and the higher the frequency the more sites you need.

Dave again asks how they came to the determination of the 150' height. Mr. Gashlin states they can do this because they have the tower in Poland near the Casco line. Mr. Gashlin directs the Board's attention to the color coverage maps in Exhibit 17 and states the yellow and blue areas are where they have problems with reception and of course, the red areas are the worst reception and explains the mapping at length. He reiterates that this site is necessary as there is a signal reception issue in that area as neither the Quaker Ridge site nor the Black Cat site can travel far enough and there is a high vehicle count as well and this tower would bridge the gaps.

Dave asks about a location in Raymond. Mr. Gashlin states that U.S. Cellular is going through this same process in Raymond as AT&T is here in Casco. The U.S. Cellular site would cover the Raymond Hill area. Dave asks if it would cover this area as well. Mr. Gashlin states that it would not.

Frank asks if the green area is the best coverage, how is it that the area that is approximately 5-6 miles out be green also. Mr. Gashlin states that the Radio Frequency Engineer may have included the area in Otisfield that would come down there because there is no other way this proposed facility could cover 5-6 miles out. Mr. Hobbins states this is an attempt to get coverage that is not there now.

Jim recommends that the applicant provide the Board with maps showing 1/2 mile rings around the tower. Mr. Hobbins states there are also roaming agreements with other carriers.

Jim states the first order of business is to determine if they are looking for co-location or a new tower and it is probably best to take this matter one step at a time.

Lew Wetzel states he sat on this Board for several years and he is neither for nor against this project. He continues, often times while serving on the Board

he would have appreciated more technical information and that is why he is here tonight. He states he has 55 years in communications experience. There are two types of radiation, ionized and non-ionized. Lew goes on to explain the differences in these types of radiation and where you most likely would find each one. Lew then explains cell phones are not walkie talkies as most think, they have a computer in them that receive signals and from the room we are in you could not reach a car on Leach Hill Road and if you leave it the battery is dead, but if you take it to an area with a good signal and your battery is useable again. Lew continues that with so many children having cell phones in school, some are thinking that the towers would be best if located within a ¼ of a mile of the schools. Lew provides the Board and those present with copies of a magazine article entitled Tower-mounted Antennas Improve RF Safety for Cell Phone Users, written by Richard R. Strickland who is an RF safety consultant in New York. Lew then tells the Board about an incident that happened to him years ago regarding exposure to radiation before there were any standards for radiation. In these times, so long as you are within the standards for radiation, you are safe.

Mr. Gashlin states they will be submitting a Radio Transmission Report. The FCC puts out threshold limits and typically towers emit about 3% out of 100% threshold. He continues that with respect to health concerns these are not reasons to deny a tower, however, it does not take away the personal concerns for themselves or their children.

Theresa Cosgrove states that as a nurse she has read about several studies about radiation and health issues. She continues that her children have ear phones with their phone to cut down on the risks of radiation and they will be exposed involuntarily to this radiation. Ms. Cosgrove states certainly there is nothing the Board can do, legally, to restrict the tower based on these concerns, but she is also concerned about the property value of her home. She continues if she were in the market she probably wouldn't choose a home with a 150' tower so close.

Lynne asks Ms. Cosgrove what types of radiation and emission levels are in these studies. Ms. Cosgrove states they are microwaves and she can get the information for the Board's review.

Jim states there are guidelines in the Wireless Communications Ordinance that need to be followed and more information will be needed for the Board to be comfortable.

Donna moves that the Board submit the road issues and if this matter is an amendment to an approved subdivision to Natalie Burns, the Board's attorney, for review and legal opinion.

Lynne seconds.

Any discussion? None.

All in favor? 4 yes – 0 no

Jim states he would like to see rings on the plans to show coverage, a profile of the tree canopy vs. tower height vs. distance from Mr. Horton's house. Jim further states that at some point he would recommend the Board conduct a site visit. Mr. Horton states he believes they will be revising the contours significantly, and perhaps the Board should wait to see what is submitted. Dave states he would like to do a site walk now and if necessary a second time. Mr. Gashlin states the underlying plan is pretty much set. Jim states he would like to know where the Board could park for this site visit as it is located on a curve and it is a private road. Mr. Hobbins states the Board members could park at Mr. Symonds' home to conduct a site visit.

The Board members discuss possible dates and times for a site visit. At this time it is determined that they will wait until after the next meeting to schedule a site visit.

Mr. Hobbins asks when the filing deadline is for the next meeting and is informed it is Monday, June 21st. Mr. Hobbins asks for more time to complete his submittal in light of this meeting. Jim suggests they only submit the items which appear to be incomplete or not fully rectified for the Board to be able to deem it a complete application, which are as follows:

1. Estimated costs to complete the project.
2. Letter from AT&T stating they will be specifically funding the project.
3. Notices to Alternative Tower Structure Owners

Pat Troy states she is sensing a feeling of rush and slashing. These two honorable gentlemen don't realize that in Casco we do things slowly and carefully. I would like to know what their time frame is. Mr. Hobbins states that he has done hundreds of these applications and he is sorry if they appear to be rushing the project, all they want to do is move the project along, but his concern is that they will be four months down the road and not have accomplished anything.

Discussions return to what the Board needs to deem the application complete. Jim states that the applicant either has to send out notifications or we need something for the Board to rely on to grant a waiver. He continues that under the Town's Wireless Communications Ordinance there is a waiver provision that has clear instructions of what the Board needs to grant a waiver (Article 8, §8.15).

Frank states it would be helpful if they got a satellite picture of that area and mark where the site is and mark a two mile radius and if there is nothing in that ring it would give you a pretty good indication.

Donna asks if she is correct that Natalie is going to give input regarding if this is an appropriate use and if it is an amendment to a subdivision as well as addressing the private road issue. Jim states she is correct.

Mr. Hobbins goes back to the filing deadline date being too soon and discusses a possible extension with the Board.

Ms. Frank states she and her clients want every possible precaution taken in this matter; if the ordinance requires an engineer's report, that is what they want to see. If the date doesn't work, it gets moved out to another meeting date.

Jim states once we get information to deem application complete, we can schedule a site walk internally and work out the date and time with the applicant as well.

Frank moves to adjourn.

Lynne seconds.

Any discussion? None.

All in favor? 4 yes – 0 no