

The Planning Board for the Town of Derry held a public meeting on Wednesday, April 05, 2023, at 7:00 p.m. The meeting was broadcast from the Derry Municipal Center, 14 Manning Street, Third Floor meeting room.

Members present: John O'Connor, Chairman, David Nelson, Vice Chairman; Andy Myers, Secretary; Randy Chase, Town Administrative Representative; Dave Granese, Town Council Liaison; Mark Connors, Chris Feinauer, Richard Malaby, Members; Daniel Healey, John Morrison, Alternates

Absent: Joe Tremper

*Denotes virtual attendance.

Also present: George Sioras, Planning Director; Elizabeth Robidoux, Planning and Economic Development Assistant; Mark L'Heureux, Engineering Coordinator

Mr. O'Connor opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. The meeting began with a salute to the flag.

Election of Officers

Motion by Granese, seconded by Nelson to elect John O'Connor as Chairman. There were no other nominations.

Chase, Malaby, Feinauer, Granese, Connors, Myers, Nelson, and O'Connor voted in favor and the motion passed.

Motion by O'Connor, seconded by Granese to elect David Nelson as Vice Chairman. There were no other nominations.

Chase, Malaby, Feinauer, Granese, Connors, Myers, Nelson, and O'Connor voted in favor and the motion passed.

Motion by Granese, seconded by Connors to elect Andrew Myers as Secretary. There were no other nominations.

Chase, Malaby, Feinauer, Granese, Connors, Myers, Nelson, and O'Connor voted in favor and the motion passed.

Mr. O'Connor then introduced the staff and Board members.

Mr. Morrison was seated for Mr. Tremper.

Escrow**#23-04****Project Name: Annual Review of Cash Escrow**

#11-12	T-Mobile Northeast	\$17,400.36
#14-16	Samuel Kershaw	\$44,933.22
#19-39	11 Tsienneto Rd.	\$22,777.20
#20-16	High Meadows, LLC	\$71,597.52
#20-20	Prime Storage Derry, LLC	\$79,554.96
#22-21	John Cooper	\$15,837.12
#22-22	Betty Cooper	\$15,837.12
#23-03	Shade Tree Farm	\$22,718.88

Motion by Granese, seconded by Nelson to find the list of open cash escrows are held in amounts which provide adequate security for the proposed length of the project. The amounts listed above are the ending principal and interest amounts as of February, 2023. Discussion followed.

Mr. Nelson, after confirming the first two numbers of the escrow number indicated the year the escrow was established, or the year the last release occurred, inquired why the Town would hold escrows for so long. Mrs. Robidoux said escrow could be in place for a long time if a project is not completed or the plan revoked. Mr. L'Heureux explained some, such as the T Mobile Northeast, would be open ended as the escrow is held for site restoration for a cell tower; the other projects are in various stages of development. Because these are cash escrows, there is no renewal (such as with a Letter of Credit).

Chase, Malaby, Feinauer, Granese, Morrison, Connors, Myers, Nelson, and O'Connor voted in favor and the motion passed.

#23-05**Project Name: McCarran Lot Line Adjustment****Developer: Joseph McCarran****Escrow Account: Same****Escrow Type: Cash Escrow****Parcel ID/Location: 56001, 13 Field Road and 52005, 55 North Shore Road**

The request is to establish cash escrow in the amount of \$3,952.80 for the above noted project. This escrow account is non-interest bearing.

Motion by Granese, seconded by Nelson to approve as presented. Discussion followed.

Mr. Connors wondered why escrow was being held for a lot line adjustment plan. It was explained the escrow is for the bounds which have yet to be set.

Chase, Malaby, Feinauer, Granese, Morrison, Connors, Myers, Nelson, and O'Connor voted in favor and the motion passed.

Minutes

The Board reviewed the minutes of the March 15, 2023, meeting.

Motion by Granese, seconded by Nelson to approve the minutes of the March 15, 2023, meeting as written.

Chase, Malaby, Feinauer, Granese, Connors, Myers, Nelson, and O'Connor voted in favor; Morrison abstained, and the motion passed.

Correspondence

Mr. Myers reported the Board has not received any external correspondence but has been provided an updated member listing with updated contact information.

Other Business

Review of Planning Board Policy & Procedures

Mr. O'Connor advised each year the Board is required to review its Policy and Procedures. He asked the members to review the document and provide any suggested changes to Mrs. Robidoux by Friday, April 14, 2023.

Continuation of Discussion of March 15, 2023, Town of Derry, PID 02020, 38-53 Transfer Lane, Pursuant to RSA 674:54, Governmental Use of Land, Review of proposed solar installations on public land

Mr. Sioras stated there had been some basic questions following the discussion of the solar field project at the landfill. Planning staff reached out to Attorney Matthew Serge to request his interpretation on whether this project was a governmental use of land. Attorney Serge met with members of the Zoning Subcommittee (Mr. Sioras, Mrs. Robidoux, Mr. Nelson, Mr. O'Connor) and his interpretation is that this is a governmental use of land, as use of land as a solar field provided a public benefit. The Director of Public Works, Mr. Fowler is willing to meet with abutters who have questions or concerns. As of today, none of the abutters have reached out to him following his presentation on March 15, 2023, with the exception of Ms. Fredrick who phoned the office. The Planning Board has 30 days to provide additional input on the project, following the informational meeting. The Board is being asked this evening to determine if a site plan application is required for this project or not. As Mr. Fowler was not in attendance this evening, Mr. Sioras read an email from Mr. Fowler into the record.

“Following up on the March 15, 2023 Planning Board meeting where we provided the Board with information of the Town’s plan to build a solar panel field on the municipal landfill. We do not anticipate having anyone from the Town or Encore present at the April 05 meeting. There has been additional discussion of the comments from the Planning Board members and abutters. From the March 15th meeting, there would be responses to the following questions:

1. Applicability of the Governmental Use – RSA 674:54 – we would be looking for Planning Board concurrence with legal opinion that a full site plan review is not required as the production of electricity is a permissible governmental use under this statute.
2. Abutter Visual Concerns – A further review of the proposed site indicates that the elevation of the existing landfill plus the 10-12 feet high solar panel frame would be visible from Kendall Pond Road. There is no practical way to visually buffer the panels. There has been no outreach to the abutter at 1 Michael Avenue as the issue was directed toward past construction of the capped landfill sections in the 1980’s and 1990’s.
3. Glare – with a south-southwest alignment of the panels and the general concept that the panels will absorb the sunlight as opposed to reflecting it, there does not appear to be any impact to abutters or motorists.

The proposal will be subject to submission of multiple permit applications to NHDES once the site plan has been completed after confirmation of items #1 - #3.”

Mr. Connors asked if a formal letter had been provided by the attorney stating his interpretation of the RSA? That would be helpful to have in the record in the event anyone questioned the Board’s decision. Having heard the concerns of the abutters with regard to visual impacts, he went by the site again. He agrees the landfill sits up higher than the surrounding homes, and it would be hard to do anything to block the views. However, the abutters located across the street from the project have some depth to their frontage and they have the ability to plant some trees. He acknowledged it is important to assist the abutters, but there is a public benefit to this project.

Mr. Sioras suggested any interested abutters reach out to Mr. Fowler with any questions.

Mr. Myers thought he recalled the proposal was not for the Town of Derry to operate the project. He thought the Town is leasing the land and Encore will be placing panels and providing the energy. Mr. Sioras stated the Town is leasing the land to Encore but there is a direct public benefit. Governmental entities are exempt from their own regulations. If the Town leases the land to a non-governmental agency, the lessee needs to comply with the local regulations and the Planning Board determines if it would like to see a site plan or not. Because the Town is purchasing the energy produced on this land for its own use, there is a public benefit.

Mr. Nelson stated the Land Development Control Regulations regulate the use. The use is to generate electricity for use by the town during the length of the contract.

Mr. Myers commented in the State of Massachusetts, municipalities operate their own power generating facilities. He does not see there is any question that this project is a governmental function or why anyone would not recognize that generation of electrical power can be a municipal function. Mr. Connors agreed the generation of electricity for the town buildings is a governmental benefit. With regard to the site plan, he recalled concrete bases will be placed on the cap, and the panels will be placed on the bases. Nothing is really being constructed; does there need to be a site plan? Mr. L'Heureux stated a site plan is needed to show the layout and the plan for the cable runs; the site plan does not have to be vetted by the Board. Mr. Nelson felt a better question is, does the Planning Board have jurisdiction to compel site plan review and put conditions on an approval. New Hampshire is not a Home Rule state and it is not enough to say the Town "can't"; the Town needs explicit permission from the State to do it.

Motion by Nelson, seconded by Granese to find the solar project as presented is a Governmental Use of Land, a site plan is not required, and documentation should be executed by the Town of Derry and Encore Renewable Energy that states Encore is responsible for the removal of infrastructure and the restoration of the site at the end of the lease term. A site restoration plan shall be included with the project documents. Discussion followed.

Mr. Connors asked if the Board was confident it did not need to review a site plan. Mr. Nelson stated based on the legal opinion that this is a governmental use of land, the Board can't compel more than the presentation that it heard.

Chase, Malaby, Feinauer, Granese, Morrison, Connors, Myers, Nelson, and O'Connor voted in favor and the motion passed.

Connors noted he was voting yes based on the opinion this is a governmental use; Myers voted yes as he believes global warming is a crisis and this project should be initiated as soon as possible.

Mr. Sioras reminded any abutter with questions or concerns should reach out to the Public Works Director.

Chairman and Planning Director Updates

Planning Director

Mr. Sioras stated the Budget reviews begin next week.

Planning Board Chairman

Mr. O'Connor requested Mrs. Robidoux send a copy of Riffin's Rules to the Board members. The annual Planning and Zoning Spring Conference is scheduled for Saturday, April 29th. There are many topics offered and the training counts toward the members' annual training requirement. There is one alternate position open on the Board if any members of the public are interested in applying.

Public Hearing

To AMEND the Town of Derry Zoning Ordinance, Article XIX, Independent Adult Community Overlay District, specifically provisions related to the age of residents, and general development standards.

Mrs. Robidoux stated the Board had been asked in December to review the requirements of the Independent Adult Community Overlay District to ensure compliance with the recently passed HB 1661. Any provisions in the Adult Community Overlay would automatically apply to workforce housing development proposals as of July, of 2023. The Adult Community Overlay was not quite in compliance with State and Fair Housing requirements; those issues have been addressed. The proposed changes have been reviewed by legal counsel and the recommendation is to approve the changes and move them forward to Town Council.

Since there is a declining population in the school system, the clause requiring the development to have “less impact on the school system” can be removed from the Purpose. The definition of Independent Adult Community has been amended to include those 62 and older and 55 and older. The Board also removed the prohibition on anyone under the age of 18 living in the development, as that was a Fair Housing issue. The locations of the zones that allow the developments have not changed, nor have the lot sizing requirements. The Board added the ability for those 62 and older to solely occupy a development, where prior it had been 55 and older. In the 55 and older developments, at least 80% of occupied units need to be occupied by someone 55 years of age or older. Twenty percent of the housing would not have that restriction. This meets the Federal definition. There were a few other amendments to the wording that clarified the type of single family home that was allowed in the development.

Motion by Granese, seconded by Nelson to open the public hearing. The motion passed with all in favor and the floor was open to the public.

There was no public comment.

Motion by Connors, seconded by Granese to close the public hearing. The motion passed with all in favor and review of the amendments returned to the Board.

Mr. Nelson explained that there are two options for development. One is 55 and older, the other is 62 and older. The 62 and older can be restricted to those solely 62 and older, as allowed under the Federal rules. That option was not previously in the ordinance. The developments where the residents are 55 and older are restricted to 80% of the residents being 55 or older. This provides options for senior housing.

Mr. Connors noted a scrivener’s error on page 2 of the document: the verbiage should be “paragraph” rather than “subparagraph” at item ii. Mr. Nelson noted since this is correction of a scrivener’s error, the change does not require a second public hearing.

Motion by Granese, seconded by Nelson to accept the proposed amendments to the Town of Derry Zoning Ordinance, Article XIX, Independent Adult Community Overlay District, as noted this evening, and move the amendments forward to Town Council for consideration and approval.

Chase, Malaby, Feinauer, Granese, Morrison, Connors, Myers, Nelson, and O'Connor voted in favor and the motion passed.

Golden Acres Land Trust
Red Tundra, LLC, Trustee
PID 17005, 356 Island Pond Road
Acceptance/Review
2 Lot Subdivision

Mr. Sioras provided the following staff report. The purpose of the plan is for a two lot subdivision located in the Low Density Residential District, which has a 3 acre minimum lot size, and 200 feet of road frontage. The ZBA granted a variance on May 20, 2021, to allow for the lots to have less than the required area, frontage and lot width. One parcel is 3 acres; the other parcel is 2.85 acres. There is an existing single family home on the parcel. One new building lot is being created. All town departments have reviewed and signed the plan. There are two waiver requests outlined in the letter from Benchmark dated March 14, 2023. NH DES Subdivision approval, NH DES Wetlands and Non-Site Specific Permit, and the NH DOT Driveway permit have all been secured and copies are in the file. It should be noted Island Pond Road is under State jurisdiction, not the Town. Staff recommends approval of the waivers and the subdivision plan. The applicant is represented by Nick Loring of Benchmark and Attorney Leonard Foy, III, of Foy Law Office.

Nick Loring, Benchmark Engineering, stated this is a 5.8 acre parcel, located on the east side of Island Pond Road and is in the low density residential district. A variance was granted to have a lot with less than the required frontage and lot area. A new home will be constructed behind where the lot meets the 200 foot setback, and the home will sit about 415 feet from Island Pond Road. On the south, there is the existing dwelling, driveway, well and utilities. The proposal is to keep the existing home and put the new home on the northern lot, utilizing a shared driveway. The existing driveway will be removed. Island Pond Road is under NH DOT jurisdiction for the curb cut. There are a significant amount of trees to be cut to achieve the appropriate sight distance. They will also be removing a stone retaining wall to meet the DOT and Town of Derry standards for sight distance. An easement will be created and recorded with the subdivision that will clarify the access and maintenance responsibilities for each of the lots for the shared driveway. Three State permits have been obtained for the project. These include the wetlands crossing for the new driveway for which they met with the Conservation Commission. They have also received State subdivision approval, and the NH DOT driveway permit.

There are two waiver requests. The regulations state each driveway needs to be through its own frontage, so they will need a waiver to meet the DOT requirement for a shared driveway. The second waiver is from the requirement for underground utilities. All new lots need to place the

utilities underground. They are requesting permission to utilize overhead utilities for the northerly lot as the majority of homes on Island Pond Road use the same. This allows the owner flexibility. They may not utilize overhead utilities, but the new driveway is over 600 feet long.

Motion by Nelson, seconded by Granese, to accept jurisdiction of the two lot subdivision plan before the Board for Golden Acres Land Trust, LLC, PID 17005, 356 Island Pond Road.

Chase, Malaby, Feinauer, Granese, Morrison, Connors, Myers, Nelson, and O'Connor voted in favor and the motion passed.

Motion by Nelson, seconded by Granese, to find pursuant to RSA 36:56 that the proposal at this time meets the definition of a development of regional impact.

Chase voted no, stating he did not agree the development met the definition of a development of regional impact. Malaby, Feinauer, Granese, Morrison, Connors, Nelson, and O'Connor voted no for the same reason; Myers voted no stating the development is very localized and will have no impact outside of the two lots. The motion failed and there is no regional impact.

Motion by Nelson, seconded by Granese to open the public hearing. The motion passed with all in favor and the floor was open to the public.

Neil Hitter, 354 Island Pond Road, stated they are in favor of the project. He was surprised to hear the existing home will remain as it appears to be in rough shape. Will it be removed? His other concern is that his land drops off abruptly at the lot line and he would not want anything to wash down from the new lot into his yard. There have been issues in the past during heavy rain events.

Melissa Giuffrida, DiPietro Group Real Estate, stated she would not foresee the rehab of the existing home. The plan would be to tear it down and rebuild on the lot.

There was no further public comment.

Motion by Granese to close the public hearing, seconded by Nelson. The motion passed with all in favor and review of the plan returned to the Board.

Mr. Loring noted Ms. Giuffrida addressed the question about the existing structure. He had been under the impression that the new owner would decide if they wanted to raze the structure or not. The necessary permits would be secured for renovation or construction. With regard to the runoff that currently goes toward the Hitter lot, the grade on Island Pond Road will have a good cut. The first 200 feet of the new driveway will be in the cut area and take the water that flows to the abutter now and send it to the street drainage system. Once out of the cut, the driveway will no longer change drainage patterns, as it is at grade.

Mr. L'Heureux advised all of DPW's concerns and comments had been addressed.

Mr. Connors was baffled as to why the ZBA found hardship to reduce the frontage in the manner in which it did. It made more sense to divide the frontage at the common driveway more evenly if the existing home is to be razed. He understands the Planning Board needs to work within the ZBA decision. Mr. Sioras stated because Island Pond is a State road, State requirements supersede the Town requirements, so the Board has to accept the common driveway. Mr. O'Connor noted driveway easements will be created for the shared driveway. Mr. Connors asked if the Planning Board will review the location of the new building if the existing structure comes down and something new is constructed. Does the Planning Board have control over where that structure is located on the lot? Mr. Sioras said the Planning Board does not look at the location of the home on the lot, and the location will depend on the required setbacks such as the well radius and septic setback. Mr. Connors asked, given the set of plan showing the shared driveway, if the existing home is razed, can the new owner move the location of the access to Lot 17005 from what is shown on the plan. Mr. Nelson stated the driveway permit falls under State jurisdiction. Mr. O'Connor did not believe the access off the shared driveway to Lot 17005 would change based on the location of the existing well and septic. Mr. Sioras stated once the plan is approved, the curb cut location could be amended but there can only be one curb cut for these two lots. This area used to have 1 acre zoning with 125 feet of frontage which is why there are frontage variance requests. Mr. L'Heureux stated the location of the driveway has been set by the plan and also by the wetland crossing. That will not change; the rest of the items on the plan are malleable.

Mr. Myers felt the topography seemed to be the reason as to why the home was placed in the upper portion of the new lot and not in the center. Mr. L'Heureux stated the location is the result of the grades and elevations. Mr. Myers understood the other homes in the area are serviced by overhead utilities but did not believe that just because everyone else has it that way is a good enough reason to allow the waiver. The regulations require the utilities to be underground. Perhaps that is a good precedent to set for this new development. Mr. Loring stated the utilities will likely follow the driveway. Before the wetland crossing, there are no large trees that would have to be trimmed to keep the electrical lines clear.

Mr. Feinauer inquired why the utilities cannot go underground. Mr. Loring stated cost is a factor, along with the ability to be flexible during construction, and the wetland crossing. Usually, the utilities go overhead up to about 150 feet from the home where they drop underground to the house. They may have difficulty in obtaining the transformers depending on whether they need pole mounted or ground transformers. Mr. Feinauer inquired about the runoff. He understands with the current configuration of the existing home, runoff is not an issue. If the location of the house changes on the southerly lot, would drainage issues be reviewed and addressed with the building permit? Mr. L'Heureux explained the owner would apply for a building permit and comply with the appropriate code enforcement inspections. There are no requirements with regard to grading, they just can't create a hazard for the abutter.

Mr. Loring stated the proposed driveway for the first 200 feet is in a cut. He pointed out the location on the plan, which is near the intersection of the driveway with the tree line. That is the high point of the driveway. Any water from above that will drain from the driveway to the street, not to the abutter. Improvements in that area will flow to Island Pond Road.

Mr. Chase inquired if DPW was in favor of the waiver request to allow overhead utilities. Mr. L’Heureux stated DPW has a neutral position on the waiver; the Board will need to decide if there is a hardship. This is a long run and electrical components are hard to come by at this time. Underground utilities are less likely to be impacted by storm events, but are slightly more costly. It is likely they will need two transformers, given the distance from the road to the home.

Mr. Chase stated there is a lot of water going to Island Pond Road; he is not aware of closed drainage in this location. That could present a problem in the winter if there is any icing in the roadway. Mr. L’Heureux stated this was discussed during Technical Review and with DOT. The grades pitch to the north of the driveway and the land slopes to the wetland.

Mr. Connors inquired as to fire protection and if the driveway, given its length, had adequate area to allow for the required turnaround area. Mr. L’Heureux stated those issues were addressed with Fire Department and new homes would be equipped with a residential sprinkler system.

Motion by Granese, seconded by Nelson to grant a waiver from LDCR Section 170-25.A (5) to allow a common driveway as Island Pond Road is under State jurisdiction and all driveways and curb cuts are approved by NH DOT; additionally, a driveway easement will be recorded which defines the easement location and shared maintenance agreement. After review of the waiver request the Board finds that specific circumstances relative to the plan, or conditions of the land in such plan, indicate that the waiver will properly carry out the spirit and intent of the regulations.

Chase, Malaby, Feinauer, Granese, Morrison, Connors, Myers, Nelson and O’Connor voted in favor and the motion passed.

Motion by Granese, seconded by Nelson to grant a waiver from LDCR Section 170-31 (A) to allow overhead utilities as this is a frontage lot on an existing road and a majority of the homes in the area are serviced by overhead utilities. After review of the waiver request the Board finds that strict conformity to the regulations would pose an unnecessary hardship to the applicant and the waiver would not be contrary to the spirit and intent of the regulations.

Chase voted yes, stating due to the fact there is a wetland crossing and there are possible delays in obtaining the appropriate equipment; Malaby and Feinauer vote yes; Granese voted yes, citing the same reasons as Chase; Connors voted yes; Myers voted no, stating just because all of the existing homes have overhead utilities does not create a hardship and the applicant should follow the regulations; Nelson voted yes, stating based on his read of the applicable section of the regulation that the requirement is more to transition for multiple lots and he is sympathetic because of the infill in an existing area; there is also no public benefit to enforce the regulation; O’Connor voted yes and the motion passed.

Motion by Nelson, seconded by Granese to find the proposed plan does not significantly alter existing conditions which would affect access to the lots, ensuring the health, safety, and welfare of the neighborhood remains unchanged; the proposed plan provides safe and efficient vehicular access, and the design and construction of the driveways are adequate to accommodate the

anticipated volume of traffic proposed by the development; and the frontage is adequate as a variance was granted on May 20, 2021, to allow one of the lots to have less than the required frontage in the zone.

Chase, Malaby, Feinauer, Granese, Morrison, Connors, Myers, Nelson, and O'Connor voted in favor and the motion passed.

Motion by Nelson, seconded by Granese to approve as presented pursuant to RSA 676:4, III, Expedited Review, with the following conditions:

1. Subject to owner's signature
2. Revise the Parcel ID numbers on the plan sheets to properly identify the lots as assigned by the Assessing Department. (The parcel ID numbers are switched on the plan)
3. Subject to on-site inspection by the Town's engineer
4. Establish escrow for the setting of bounds or certify the bounds have been set
5. Note approved waiver (s) on the plan
6. Obtain written approval from the Planning Director/designee that the GIS disk is received and is operable and it complies with LDCR Section 170-24.C
7. Subject to receipt of applicable state or local permits relating to the project
8. Conditions precedent shall be met within 6 months.
9. Submission of the appropriate recording fees, payable to the Rockingham County Registry of Deeds. [This includes the \$25.00 LCHIP fee, recording fees for the mylar and the Notice of Decision.]

Discussion followed.

Mrs. Robidoux inquired if escrow should be held for work along the roadside. Mr. L'Heureux stated there will be work involving the wetland and the culvert that should be held in escrow. When asked, he explained he would calculate the final number off the final plan, but it would likely be less than \$20,000.

The following friendly amendments were moved and seconded by Nelson and Granese:

10. Supply a copy of the recorded easement and maintenance agreement for the shared driveway; the document shall be recorded at the Rockingham County Registry of Deeds
11. Establish appropriate escrow as required to complete the project as related to drainage and the wetland culvert crossing.

Mr. Connors inquired if there should be any mention of the potential removal of the existing driveway. Mr. L'Heureux stated there is a note on the plan and the applicant has to follow the conditions as outlined in the NH DOT driveway permit.

Chase, Malaby, Feinauer, Granese, Morrison, Connors, Myers, Nelson, and O'Connor voted in favor and the motion passed.

Board Member Comments

Mr. Malaby noted he has been an alternate for the past year and has learned a lot. This is his first meeting as a full member of the Board. He thanked the members of the Board and Planning staff for their assistance.

Mr. Connors welcomed the new full members and the alternate to the Board and encouraged other members of the public to apply for the open position. He noted there will be a Marathon held in Derry on April 16; funding will be provided from the marathon sponsor for the Rail Trail. Course Marshal volunteers are needed and he asked for people to step forward and volunteer. He advised DPW has installed a pedestrian beacon at the South Avenue rail trail crossing, which was made possible by grants and donations.

Mr. Nelson welcomed the new members to the Board and thanked the standing members for their continued service.

Motion by Nelson, seconded by Granese to adjourn. The motion passed with all in favor and the meeting stood adjourned at 8:13 p.m.

Approved by: _____
Chairman/Vice Chairman

Secretary

Approval date: _____