

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES**  
**July 10, 2023**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

**VINCENT GRASSI, VICE CHAIRMAN**  
**WILLIAM BENSON**  
**DAVID WALSH**  
**RUSSELL FRANK**  
**JAMES HAGER**  
**DAVID BURROWS**

**STAFF PRESENT**

**CAROL EYERMAN, TOWN PLANNER**  
**DAMON YAKOVLEFF, ASSISTANT**  
**TOWN PLANNER**

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

**JAMES ANDERSON, CHAIRMAN**

Vice Chairman Vincent Grassi called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

The roll was called, with 6 members present and Chairman James Anderson absent. Vice Chairman Vincent Grassi served as Acting Chairman.

---

**APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 5, 2023 PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

**David Burrows MOVED and Russell Frank SECONDED a MOTION to approve the June 5, 2023 Planning Board minutes as drafted. 6 AYES, 1 ABSENT (ANDERSON)**

---

**COMMITTEE REPORTS**

- A. Ordinance Review Committee**  
This committee did not meet
  - B. Comprehensive Plan Implementation Committee**  
This committee did not meet
- 

**ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW REPORT**

No Minor Site Plan review meetings were held, and none are scheduled.

---

## CONSENT AGENDA

- A            **Bramblewood Estates (Baxter Lane)** – a request to amend the original site and subdivision plans. Map 25, Lot 7.001, Zoned UR. The applicant is represented by Craig Sweet, P.E. with Terradyn Consultants.

Town Planner Carol Eyerman explained to the Board that this item was originally approved by the Board in August, 2016 for 10 duplex condominium units, with plans modified in 2021 to include 2 duplex units and 8 single family style condominium units. The project was recently sold, and the applicant is the new owner. They are seeking to amend the plans to include the name change, right title and interest, and financial and technical capacity. The proposed amendment also makes minor changes to slightly reduce the size of the building footprints.

**David Burrows MOVED and David Walsh SECONDED to remove the item from the Consent Agenda. 5 AYES, 1 NAY (FRANK), 1 ABSENT (ANDERSON)**

Craig Sweet from Terradyn consultants explained that the applicant is proposing several minor amendments to the plan, as explained by Ms. Eyerman.

Mr. Burrows asked about details on the differences in the sizes and whether any other changes were proposed.

Mr. Sweet explained that the buildings were being changed from 28' x 50', to 24' x 40' with added decks and bulkheads which make the building slightly wider. The overall decrease in impervious area is 600 square feet for the project from the 2021 plans.

Mr. Hager asked that the drawings be made clearer in terms of labeling. Ms. Eyerman stated that this could be added as a condition of approval. The applicant stated that this would be acceptable. Mr. Burrows stated that the construction drawings should have more detail added.

The Board asked whether there were any comments from Staff on the project, with Ms. Eyerman stating that there were none and that the applicant had provided all of the necessary information.

**David Walsh MOVED and James Hager SECONDED to grant final subdivision and site plan approval for J. Brown Investments, LLC request for Bramblewood Estates Subdivision and Site Plan amendments (and finalizing revisions to the plan). 6 AYES, 1 ABSENT (ANDERSON)**

---

## ITEM 1        **Public Hearing – Land Use and Development Code Amendment – Underground Utilities** – a request to amend the Land Use and Development Code to require Underground Utilities for any new subdivision, private way or site plan.

Tom Poirier, Community Development Director, explained that intent of this item is to codify longstanding policy, over at least 20 years, to require installation of underground utilities.

PUBLIC COMMENT OPENED

No comments were received

**PUBLIC COMMENT CLOSED**

The Board discussed the item. Mr. Poirier clarified that the only ordinance language proposed to be changed was shown in red, other language in the ordinance sections being amended not in red was not proposed to be changed.

Mr. Walsh suggested that there was a not a lot of additional discussion needed, since this was discussed at the last Planning Board meeting and had two opportunities for public comment.

Mr. Poirier clarified that the waiver granted for underground utilities by the Planning Board at its May meeting was the first time in over 20 years he had seen a waiver for the underground utility requirement granted for a residential project. Some waivers had been given for commercial projects.

Mr. Frank asked about how “large-scale” was defined. Mr. Poirier explained that this would be Site Plans that would be reviewed by the Planning Board.

The Board did not have any further questions or suggestions for changes to the proposed amendments.

**David Burrows MOVED and Russel Frank SECONDED to recommend adoption by the Town Council of the Zoning Amendment to the Land Use and Development Code under Chapter 1, Sections 11, 13, 16, 24 and 25; Section Chapter 2, Sections 4, 6 and 10; Chapter 3 Section 3; and Chapter 4 Section 8 and 9 (as amended by the Planning Board). 6 AYES, 1 ABSENT (ANDERSON)**

---

**ITEM 2      Public Hearing – Site Plan – Patriot Holdings – Self Storage and Contractor Flex Space** – a request for approval to construct eight 6,900 sq ft self-storage buildings, a 9,900 sq ft contractor flex building and associated infrastructure. Map 77, Lot 5. Zoned RC. The applicant is represented by Chris Taylor, P.E. at Sebago Technics.

Assistant Town Planner Damon Yakovleff introduced the item for the Board. He noted that this project had been before the Board in January, 2023 for sketch plan review. The applicant has made several adjustments to the project. There are several items of note that should be addressed:

- The applicant is now proposing an additional entrance be added to the project from Ossipee Trail. The Town’s Land Use Ordinance requires entrances only on the street of lower classification unless “no safe alternative exists”. The Town’s 3<sup>rd</sup> Party Traffic Engineer review recommended that an entrance be provided from Dingley Springs Road only.
- No ADA accessible spaces are provided
- No pedestrian accommodations are made in the proposal, as required by the Land Use Ordinance, which may not be waived by the Planning Board. Either the accommodations have to be made or a variance is needed from the Zoning Board of Appeals.
- Water supply calculations need to be resubmitted showing a full built out scenario, not just what is being proposed

- The applicant plans to split the lot on the northwestern corner of the parcel for future development. The proposed stormwater system is being designed to accommodate that future development.
- An updated photometric lighting plan, submitted at 11"x17", is needed as a full-size plan
- Inconsistencies in impervious area were noted in the stormwater analysis shown in the Hydrocad modeling vs. the submitted plan.
- Parking requirements should be addressed by the applicant – 12 spaces are proposed. Review of the Land Use Code indicates 10 spaces are required for the "contractor flex space". No parking spaces are allocated to the storage units themselves but the Planning Board may make a finding that fewer spaces are needed.

The applicant was represented by Chris Taylor, P.E. with Sebago Technics. He provided an overview of the project and discussed differences between the current proposal and the sketch plan presented in January 2023 as follows:

- The area of the parcel on the corner of Ossipee Trail and Dingley Springs Road is proposed to be broken off as a separate retail development.
- The proposal now includes a "contractor flex space" building along with a self-storage facility.
- The number and size of the self-storage buildings is smaller than originally proposed in the sketch plan.
- Stormwater for the site is to be treated through 2 wet ponds sized to treat future development on the corner lot.
- Two access driveways are now included off Ossipee Trail and Dingley Springs. This is intended to provide better access to the site and due to the residential nature of Dingley Springs Road. This is also proposed because of site geometry, which creates a longer driveway from Dingley Springs to the developed area.
- The applicant intends to revise the plans to include pedestrian access, such as through adding gravel shoulders, based on further discussion. Very low numbers of pedestrians are expected at the development.
- An application has been made to the state for a SLODA and NRPA permit for wetland impacts on the site. The site geometry has been adjusted to minimize wetland impacts.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT OPENED

No comments were made

#### PUBIC HEARING CLOSED

The Board discussed the proposal with the following comments made:

- Mr. Walsh asked about the distance the proposed entrance on Ossipee Trail was from Dingley Springs. Rd
  - Mr. Taylor replied that it was 575 feet center-to-center
- Mr. Walsh asked about the access for the corner lot to be broken off
  - Mr. Taylor replied that it would have an entrance off Dingley Springs Rd.
- Mr. Walsh asked whether there could be a shared entrance between the corner lot and the self storage facility, assuming access was granted via Ossipee Trail.

- Mr. Taylor stated that the intent was to have two separate developments but this may be possible and would depend on the Planning Board.
- Mr. Walsh asked what the nature of the occupant of the contractor flex space would be.
  - Mr. Taylor stated that it would typically be electricians, HVAC, or landscape business. It is being designed as up to two occupants. 12 parking spaces are proposed for the space. Impervious areas around the building could potentially be used as a lay down area or parking for equipment.
- Mr. Burrows stated that compliance with the Town's Land Use Code regarding access would allow for retaining the forested buffer along Ossipee Trail. It would possibly mean that the access drive via Dingley Springs would be wider. Also, the lot to be split off would need to have access via Dingley Springs also. The driveway via Dingley Springs could potentially serve both sites. He asked whether the development had been moved east to avoid impacts to forested areas.
  - Mr. Taylor stated that the development is shifted east in this proposal to allow for space to develop the corner lot
  - This allows for relocation of the snowmobile trail that is currently on the site
  - This allows for space for the septic system
- Mr. Frank noted that the application refers both to "8" and "12" self-storage builds and asked for clarification
  - Mr. Taylor noted that the proposal was for 8 buildings and this was a typo
- Mr. Walsh asked about the length of the driveway from Dingley Springs Rd.
  - Mr. Taylor stated it was about 300 feet
- Mr. Walsh asked whether the applicant would still be required to connect to Dingley Springs Rd. if it were blocked by a lot split
  - Ms. Eyerman replied that it would still be required based on the lot as it currently exists
  - Mr. Taylor stated that the lot could be split differently, such that the center portion of the lot no longer had frontage on Dingley Springs Rd.
- Mr. Burrows asked whether areas to the south of the development would remain natural
  - Mr. Taylor replied that it would be based on what is proposed
  - Future development may be limited, but could be assessed as part of the full built-out scenario for calculations of water extension feasibility
- Mr. Burrows asked for clarification about project phasing
  - Mr. Taylor stated that Phase 2 would include the 5 self-storage buildings on the right side of the building, and would be built later based on demand
- Mr. Grassi asked for the reason why the additional entrance was proposed on Ossipee Trail
  - Mr. Taylor stated that it was due to the size of Dingley Springs Rd. The self-storage facility would be accessed by larger vehicles.
- Mr. Grassi asked staff about whether a waiver was required for the access via Ossipee.
  - Ms. Eyerman stated that the Board would need to make a determination, and that the applicant would need to prove that "No safe alternative exists". Reasons might include site distance issues due to a curve or hill. Solutions might include changes to the road itself, such as an expansion, such as along the length of the applicant's property. Information is needed from traffic engineers regarding this matter.
- Mr. Grassi stated that he did not see a reason why access via Dingley Springs was unsafe. Current residents of the street may use a truck when moving. Mr. Walsh stated that this section of Dingley Springs is very straight and the safety argument is difficult to make. He

also noted that many other businesses opposite the site had entrances on Ossipee trail, and one has entrances on both Ossipee and Dingley Springs.

- Ms. Eyerman noted that that development predates the current requirements. The current requirements were put in to limit further access, and the Town is also developing a new access management ordinance to further control the number of driveways along the main roads.
- Mr. Benson asked for clarification about what the applicant may bring to the Board of Appeals
  - Staff clarified this was the pedestrian access requirements
- Mr. Grassi stated that the area had a lot of traffic and complexity and it was hard to support adding another connection. He asked for clarification regarding standards for pedestrian connections
  - Ms. Eyerman replied that the land use code includes those standards, including road sections
- Ms. Eyerman added that the Board may want to consider how this parcel will connect with other developments nearby, for example the new Amato's location across the street which workers at the flex space may want to access.
- Mr. Walsh asked for more information about the water/sewer calculation.
  - Mr. Eyerman explained that the calculations needed to be completed for the full build out of the parcel based on ordinance allowance, not based on what is proposed. The new form needs to be submitted.
- Mr. Taylor stated that staff comment noted that the buildings should face Dingley Springs Rd., but that the applicant believed it is more appropriate for the buildings to be oriented to face Ossipee Trail. He asked whether this would be a waivable item.
  - Mr. Burrows commented that these buildings don't have a front or back and that this doesn't apply.
  - Ms. Eyerman noted that specific standards are found in the zoning standards, that do require a front.
  - Mr. Taylor stated that the building faces oriented to Ossipee Trail could have the 3 materials.
  - Mr. Burrows stated that the long side of the building could be the front.
  - Ms. Eyerman clarified that the ordinance requires the buildings to face the street they access.
  - Mr. Benson asked whether the buildings could face Ossipee Trail if it had a pedestrian access point.
  - Ms. Eyerman noted that the Board can waive the requirement for 3 materials to 2 materials if the Board finds sufficient architectural details are included.
  - Mr. Burrows stated that this standard should only apply to the 2 outer buildings
- Mr. Benson asked for clarification about whether the building orientation requirements could be waived.
  - Ms. Eyerman stated that this requirement is tied to which road is used for access
- Mr. Benson asked whether the short end of the building could be considered the front
  - Ms. Eyerman replied that it could be done
  - Mr. Frank asked whether the applicant has total freedom to determine this. Ms. Eyerman replied that a clever design could make any of the sides look like a front, and that another storage facility built on Main St. was configured such that the short faces were considered the front.



- Mr. Taylor stated that the geometry meant that it didn't make sense for the buildings to be oriented toward the contractor flex space and Dingley Springs Rd. and that it would make more sense to orient toward Ossipee Trail.
- Mr. Walsh stated that, if a pedestrian access way were constructed to Ossipee Trail, it would make sense for the buildings to be constructed to face Ossipee Trail.
- Mr. Hager stated that Ossipee Trail may still be used for access to improve safety, such as for fire and police
- Mr. Walsh asked whether there would be just one entrance off Dingley Springs Rd. if access on Ossipee Trail were not allowed, and how this would interact with an entrance gate.
  - Mr. Taylor stated that there would not be an entrance gate for the self storage facility
  - Mr. Grassi stated his agreement that it is better to have two entrances
  - Mr. Benson added that he is reluctant to grant full access to Ossipee Trail but would consider a gated entrance, or perhaps two entrances to Dingley.
- Mr. Hager noted that the turn radii off the driveway shown connecting to Dingley Springs appeared to be too tight and be difficult for fire access. He asked whether the buildings were required to be sprinkled.
  - Mr. Taylor stated that based on the Fire Chief comments sprinklers would not be required
- The Board Discussed possible actions to take regarding the proposal. Members were of a consensus that more information was needed regarding the access drive locations before the proposal could be approved. Further consideration is needed about whether a gated entrance only could be added on Ossipee Trail in addition to a public access off Dingley Springs Rd. A full review of various solutions by a 3<sup>rd</sup> party traffic engineer would assist the Board in considering this matter further, based on safety criteria. Other unresolved items were also noted.

**David Burrows MOVED and David Walsh SECONDED to table the review until a future meeting. 6 AYES, 1 ABSENT (ANDERSON)**

---

**ITEM 3      Special Exception - Cummings, Tabitha – Creative Explorations** – a request for a child care center in an existing building serving preschool through 5<sup>th</sup> grade with an estimated 85-100 children. Map 32, Lot 4. Zoned RC. The applicant is represented by David Willis with Willis Real Estate.

Ms. Eyerman introduced the item for the Board. She explained that this applicant has previously come before the Board for approval of a day care at a separate location which was approved by the Board but did not move forward. The location of the proposed daycare is in the former Moderne Rug location. The applicants are planning to stagger the pick up and drop off schedule due to limited parking.

The applicant is represented by David Willis, their real estate agent. Mr. Willis explained that the operation would consist of separate programs and there would not be 85-100 students present all at the same time. The applicants have presented traffic counts based on both a 30 minute and 15 minute scheduled interval.

The Board discussed the application as follows:

- Mr. Frank asked about whether there would be a stove on the site, and whether the building would need to be sprinkled.
  - Tabitha Cummings, applicant, stated that there would be no stove on site and that their discussion with the State Fire Marshall has indicated that the building does not need to be sprinkled.
- Mr. Walsh asked whether there were any plans to widen the driveway.
  - Ms. Cummings explained that they had no plans to widen the driveway. Their preference would be not to do that right away but would do it later as necessary in the future.
  - She also stated that drop-off times were expected to be 2-3 minutes given the age of the population of children served.
- Mr. Burrows asked about the recommendation from the Town Engineer to widen the driveway from 15 feet to at least 20 feet and stated that this may be necessary.
- Mr. Walsh asked about school bus pick up and drop off, whether they would be turning up the driveway, and whether there would be adequate turn around.
  - Ms. Cumming stated that there would be school bus drop off and pickup. They did not look at turn-around capacity.
  - There is a school bus drop off sign on Main St.
  - Mr. Walsh stated that this is a reason the driveway should be widened
  - Mr. Willis clarified that it is most likely that the school bus would drop off students at the bottom of the driveway and not enter the facility.
  - Mr. Walsh asked whether the buses would stop only on the eastbound side of Main St. or also on the westbound side
- Mr. Walsh asked about why this is considered a Special Exemption and he saw nothing special about it.
  - Ms. Eyerman explained that this is a specific requirement in the zoning ordinance. Daycare centers are a special exception anywhere in town. There are other special exceptions as well.
- Mr. Benson stated that he is glad to see another daycare facility proposed for the town. He has concerns regarding traffic, with multiple buses dropping off from different schools around town.
  - Ms. Cummings explained that the proposed location would allow for a day care bus to service both this and the new daycare center being opened in the industrial park.
- Mr. Frank stated that the law requires stopping for school buses. He asked whether there is any plan to require bus drop-offs only on the eastbound side of Main St. Mr. Benson stated that he believes this is school policy.
- Mr. Hager stated that on other busy street locations there are crossing guards. He stated that he did not want to see any children dropped off on the westbound side of Main St. and having to cross Main St. especially in the winter. There should be coordination with the school department on this to determine how they can be safely accommodated, such as widening the road or adding a slip lane.

The Board Discussed whether or not to approve the proposal and what conditions of approval to include as follows:

- Mr. Walsh stated that he and many other Board members expressed significant concerns regarding transportation safety



- Ms. Eyerman explained that the Board could consider tabling approval considering the questions that have been asked about bus transportation, traffic movement on site, driveway width, and parking.
- Mr. Walsh asked whether a horseshoe driveway could be added to accommodate drop off by buses and parents.
- Mr. Willis stated:
  - That the applicant would be willing to work with the school department on bus transportation safety as a condition of approval
  - Also, the applicant could widen the driveway without installing a new culvert
- Mr. Hager stated that he would agree to table so the applicant could work to address the outstanding concerns
  - Mr. Willis stated that the applicant would be willing to work with town staff to address issues brought up by the Board. He stated that a delay would be a challenge for the applicant.
- Mr. Yakovleff clarified that the 15 minute drop-off increment brings the applicant closer to meeting the requirements in the land use ordinance and this has been confirmed with the Town Engineer. The larger issues are school bus access and driveway width.
  - Ms. Cummings stated that they would be agreeable to widening the driveway if necessary.
  - She stated that 57 students are dropped off at another location they operate on River Road in Windham. The bus drops those students at the end of the driveway, and does not enter the facility. The school has stated that this is safer than an on-site drop off in a horseshoe.
- Mr. Benson asked if there was an opinion by a 3<sup>rd</sup> party engineer
  - Ms. Eyerman stated that there was not, but there was a comment from the Town Engineer
  - Mr. Benson Clarified that his concern is regarding traffic on Route 25
  - Ms. Eyerman stated that there was no comment on this concern from the Town Engineer
- Mr. Walsh asked for clarification on the applicant's timeline – it was stated that they are planning to open the facility by the start of the next school year
  - Ms. Eyerman stated that the applicant could not begin any work until they get approval and there would be several follow-up actions needed.
  - She stated that if the Board approved the project at this meeting, the conditions of approval required by the Board should be specific
- Mr. Hager stated that he was hesitant to offer conditional approval because it could lead to cost overruns and be overly specific and inflexible. Mr. Walsh stated that he shared those concerns.
  - Mr. Willis stated that such a delay would likely eliminate a path forward for the project. There are other uses for the building that may not require special exception approval.
- Mr. Hager expressed willingness to work on a resolution.
- Mr. Grassi in conjunction with other Board members expressed willingness to grant approval with conditions of approval as follows:
  - Widening driveway and adjusting turn radii
  - Developing a busing protocol in conjunction with the Gorham School Department
  - Adjustments to parking as needed
  - Address traffic impacts to Main Street

**James Hager MOVED and David Burrows SECONDED to grant approval with Findings of Fact and Conditions of Approval as drafted by the Town Planner and amended by the Board. 6 AYES, 1 ABSENT (ANDERSON)**

---

**ITEM 4      Public Hearing - Site Plan Amendment – Cross Town Energy Storage**– a request for approval to construct a battery energy storage system. Map 12, Lot 22-1. Zoned, I. The applicant is represented by Norman G. Chamberlain, II, P.E. at Walsh Engineering Associates, Inc.

The item was introduced by Ms. Eyerman. The site plan for the project was approved in April, 2022. The applicant is requesting approval for an amendment because they have determined that a pre-load of the site is now required, which changes the footprint of disturbed area from what was originally approved. The applicant is applying for a Tier 3 Wetland Alteration Permit. The site is located in the MS4 area.

Steve Barna, lead developer for Plus Power, gave a presentation outlining the project and introducing other members of the project team present, including Bill Walsh with Walsh Engineering and Paul Rodgers from the Energy Safety Response Group. Mr. Barna's presentation included the following information:

- Introduced Plus Power, based in Huston Texas
- Plus Power has developed 3 systems similar to the proposal for Gorham, plus 5 more under construction throughout the US
- Described battery energy storage systems. The system stores electricity when demand is low and discharges it when demand is high.
- Stated that the system helps Maine meet its clean energy goals. Meets half of the State's goals for energy storage.
- System has 350 MW output capacity, 175MW of storage, and the site is adjacent to an existing Central Maine Power substation
- Request for amendment is due to soil constraints identified subsequent to approval. Changes include:
  - A geotechnical engineer recommended preloading the site, which involves adding soils on top of the soils on site to compress them
  - The preloading procedures creates a 2:1 slope which extends the project area beyond what was originally approved, extending past a retaining wall that had been proposed.
  - Expansion of the footprint will lead to additional wetland fills. The applicant is working closely with the Maine Department of Environmental Protection and the Army Corps of Engineers to develop a plan and amend the SLODA, Army Corps, and NRPA Permits.
  - The original plan called for paving the majority of the project area, with drainage into filters that drained sub-grade before discharging. Further design led to another idea developed by Central Maine Power which involves a filter across the entire pad, using crushed stone and course gravel instead of pavement leading to an under

drained system. This provides both treatment and storage of stormwater. The net result is a significant decrease in stormwater runoff rates.

- As a result of the proposed changes to remove the retaining wall, the front view is softened and more natural in appearance. At a neighborhood meeting with abutters, one of the abutters, Mr. Montalvo, stated that they were pleased with the change to remove the wall.
- The net increase in the project footprint is 1.14 acres, primarily as a result of the extension of the embankment to support the preloading.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT OPENED

No public comment was received

#### PUBLIC COMMENT CLOSED

The Planning Board Discussed the Proposal as follows:

- Mr. Hager remarked that pre-loading has been used on several other developments in the area. He also requested a correction on the map, which currently mislabels Libby Ave. as Brackett Road north of the roundabout intersection with New Portland Road.
- Mr. Hager requested clarification about whether Planning Board members who were not present for the original approval can vote on the matter. Ms. Eyerman stated that all members present this evening were eligible to vote because this is an amendment to the originally approved proposal.
- David Walsh asked whether the material used for loading would be removed after the process were completed – Bill Walsh replied that it would be. David Walsh noted that this would generate a large amount of truck traffic. David Walsh also asked how long the preloading process would take – Bill Walsh stated that this would be 4-6 months.
- Mr. Frank asked whether the preloading process is temperature dependent. Bill Walsh replied that it is important to initiate the process before the ground froze. Once loaded, the process is not temperature dependent and it can be done through winter.
- Mr. Grassi stated his appreciation for the clear presentation. He asked whether snow storage would be added to the plans. Bill Walsh stated that this would be added.

**James Hager MOVED and David Walsh SECONDED to grant Cross Town Energy LLC request for site plan amendment approval to construct a 175 MW battery energy storage system, associated substation equipment, and a short generation tie-line to the existing 115KV Mosher's substation located at 61 Hutcherson drive on Map 12 Lot 22-1 in the Industrial zoning district with Findings of Fact and Conditions of Approval as written by the Town Planner. MOTION CARRIED, 6 AYES, 1 ABSENT (ANDERSON)**

---

#### ADJOURNMENT

**Bill Benson MOVED and James Hager SECONDED to adjourn at 9:30pm. MOTION CARRIED, 6 AYES, 1 ABSENT (ANDERSON)**

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Damon Yakovlev", written over a horizontal line.

Damon Yakovlev, Assistant Town Planner

August 9, 2023