

APPROVED
TOWN OF PELHAM
PLANNING BOARD MEETING
February 20, 2014

The Vice Chairman Roger Montbleau called the meeting to order at approximately 7pm.

The acting Secretary Tim Doherty called roll:

PRESENT: Roger Montbleau, Paddy Culbert, Tim Doherty, Jason Croteau, Selectmen
Representative Robert Haverty, Alternate Mike Sherman, Planning Director
Jeff Gowan

ABSENT: Peter McNamara, Paul Dadak, Alternate Joseph Passamonte

Mr. Montbleau appointed Mr. Sherman to vote.

NEW BUSINESS

PB Case #PL2014-00002

**Map 9 Lot 13-145 - PELHAM FISH & GAME, INC. - 100 Simpson Mill Road - Site
Plan Review of Proposed 600 yard range.**

Mr. Doherty read the list of abutters aloud. There were no persons present who asserted standing in the case, who did not have their name read, or who had difficulty with notification.

Mr. Peter Schauer of Schauer Environmental came forward to discuss the site, the work that had been done and the proposal for completion. Also present was Pelham Fish and Game President Mitch Kopacz. He told the Board he had been working with Pelham Fish and Game ('PFG') on the project since 2002 and went on to provide a brief history of the site. In 2002 Mr. Schauer was hired by PFG to mitigate some wetland impacts that were identified by a member of the Conservation Commission and reported to the State. The State issued a letter of deficiency for wetland areas that were shown in a green color on a plan displayed for the Board. It was explained PFG cleared approximately eighteen acres of land prior to 2002 for the reason of building a 600 yard (1800ft) shooting range. An aerial photograph was displayed that showed the entire PFC parcel and the location being discussed. During the course of the mitigation, plans were created for the State. They have gone through review by the Army Corps of Engineers, the Environmental Protection Agency ('EPA'), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and other associated agencies during the timeframe of 2004-2007 at the time PFG received permits. Wetland mitigation began in 2007. Wetlands (including five vernal pools) were created along the sides of the shooting ranges that had been very successful.

Mr. Schauer described the proposed 600 yard range that consisted of stations located at 100, 200, 400 and 600 yards. There is also a bunker at the end of the range where signs are located for shooters. To date 94% of the project has been completed; it is all vegetated, the stations are all built, and the wetland mitigation has been accepted as 'complete' by the State and Army Corps

of Engineers. They are presently working on the bunker portion of the project (equating to approximately 4% of the project cost). To date (since 2002) the project cost has been close to a half million dollars.

In meeting with the Conservation Commission in 2002, Mr. Schauer said the Pelham Planning Director at the time (Will D'Andrea) had been notified regarding the project. He said there was also a lady from the Town he spoke to, but at no time had anyone from the Town informed them they needed a Site Plan review.

Photographs of the site during construction were shown to the Board for reference. Materials for the project came from areas within the site. The wetland creation area (compensatory mitigation) along the side of the range was shown. Due to the economy there was a period of time the project languished. A photo showing that sediment and erosion controls were in place was displayed.

Mr. Montbleau questioned how the bunker would be used. Mr. Kopacz stepped forward to provide further comment as to the function of the bunker. He said the proposal was for a standard bunker (pit) that had been used since the 1800's. A person is positioned in the bunker lower than bullets that would impact a target displayed on an impact berm. That impact berm (above the bunker) would be feet above anyone's possible height. When people are shooting, the person handling targets is down within the bunker below the level of the bullets. When targets are being scored there is no shooting; it's a controlled process. Mr. Montbleau asked if there were trenches at each of the stations. Mr. Kopacz answered no; targets stay at one location and the shooters move to different stations. Mr. Gowan said he had viewed the depth of the bunker and the manner in which it was being constructed. He said it contained native boulders and understood it would also have pre-cast concrete sections. The people changing the targets would be located below grade. Mr. Kopacz noted that his children were in the bunker at eleven years of age. As a shooting instructor, he said it was the safest place to be on a shooting range. He then explained to the Board that Camp Perry Ohio held a shooting competition. The proposed area mimicked what they used. During that competition youth are paid to pull targets during practice, which was a manner for them to make money. The bunker is a proven safe design used since the 1800's.

Mr. Kopacz told the Board that shooters using the 600 yard range would be required to go through a qualification process prior to being allowed to use that range. This process is also used with other ranges at PFG. Shooters will have to have a Dope Card with information on ammunition being used. A Dope Card lists the ammunition manufacturer, bullet weight, muzzle velocity and lot number, then based on the range yards information is logged as to elevation (mills), wind (mills) and elevation (clicks). Anyone shooting at the 600 yard range will have to be knowledgeable in that area.

Mr. Croteau questioned if the range had been professionally engineered. Mr. Kopacz answered yes. He said the National Rifle Association and National Shooting Sports had a recommended design for ranges. Nashua Fish and Game Club has a similar 600 yard range. Using those resources along with the expertise of a professional engineering firm, the range design was drafted. While the proposed range was being done the other ranges were reviewed to ensure they were as safe as possible. Mr. Croteau asked if there were any State permits required. Mr. Kopacz said during the project process there had been four presidents at PFG. He said in the

beginning they didn't realize what involvement was required of the State and Town. Once they became aware, the PFG went to the State and Town and also hired an engineering firm to handle the wetland mitigation items. Mr. Croteau asked if there were any required permits. Mr. Schauer said they had all the required State and Federal permits. Mr. Kopacz reiterated that the Army Corps. of Engineers and the Department of Environmental Services ('DES'), Fish and Wildlife were all involved with the project. He said the Town was invited to the site when those agencies came to the site and the PFG thought they were doing what they were supposed to do. They believed they were permitted to do the work and if something more was required by the Town, such as a Site Plan review, they would have been told.

Mr. Gowan couldn't speak to why his predecessor didn't feel the PFG needed to come before the Planning Board to build a range because the language was very clear in the Site Plan Regulations. He believed there were violations that the Town didn't realize took place; however member(s) of the Conservation Commission contacted DES. The DES got involved and heavily fined PFG. After which PFG hired a consultant and had done mitigation work. Mr. Gowan believed once DES was involved, the Town probably backed off to let them handle the situation. He became aware of the work on site through a phone call from a neighbor. He believes that the applicant felt they had the right to do the work on site because of the State's oversight. He explained to them that there had to be Planning Board oversight and the pit would need a building permit along with appropriate inspections by the Building Inspector. He said the concern was the way the pit would be constructed, not the bullets. He said the applicant had come forward clearly in the spirit of cooperation.

On the plan submitted Mr. Gowan saw what was believed to be a seasonal stream, but was unsure of where the actual wetland boundaries were located. Mr. Schauer replied that the dark green colored section was the edge of the wetland. He pointed to the plan and showed a grey area that had been stumped for one of the shooting stations; this was permitted as part of the wetland mitigation and offset in another area. He noted that the grey areas on the plan were wetland violations that were permitted. Mr. Gowan appreciated the DES involvement, but believed the wetland crossing and encroachment areas would require Variances from Zoning through the Board of Adjustment. He said with those areas already in existence, he would speak to the Zoning Board Chair and perhaps consult with Town Counsel to understand the situation. He didn't feel that the areas were major encroachments. The Conservation Commission will be asked for non-binding comment. Mr. Gowan said the Planning Board could grant a Special Permit for the wetland crossing and encroachment, but not independently. He will work with the applicant and the Zoning Board regarding the matter.

MOTION: (Haverty/Culbert) To accept the plan for consideration.

VOTE: (6-0-0) The motion carried.

Mr. Schauer told the Board they had met with the Conservation Commission in 2003 and they provided input to the State Wetland Bureau. He said the Conservation Commission wrote a letter to the State requesting that the project be denied. The State indicated they would take the comments under advisement, and informed they would settle the matter with PFG in accordance with State and Federal Regulations. Mr. Kopacz added that the areas being pointed out as wetlands were no longer wet because PFG did a land transfer for the mitigation. He said they purchased swamp seeds to create vernal pools. Through the mitigation process the previous

‘wet’ areas were now considered dry lands because the vernal pools had been successfully created. Mr. Gowan felt the information was relevant. He felt an important fact was that the DES was okay with what was going on. He wanted the process to be procedurally correct. Mr. Kopacz said they had gone to the State. The State told them what they needed to do, which included sending copies to the Town, so they continued along with the project as shown on the plan. Mr. Gowan suggested that the current wetland be flagged. Mr. Schauer told the Board the PFG had to create a 5-year plan that delineated the wetlands on the parcel and provide such ‘as-built’ plan to the State. This plan will show if PFG reached the mitigation goals and instructed. Mr. Montbleau questioned if the State had instructed PFG on other soil disturbance issues/high-dry area, other than the wetland issues. Mr. Schauer answered no. He said they met on site with the department of Alteration of Terrain and reviewed all the plans; in turn they had given PFG a ‘clean bill of health’ in regard to sediment and erosion control issues. Mr. Gowan pointed out that the DES was focused on the wetland aspects, not the range itself. Mr. Schauer said the Alteration of Terrain department was concerned with all aspects, including the range.

Mr. Gowan told the Board he didn’t make the assumption that they would want peer review engage in the process. He said if they wanted to involve peer review he would obtain an estimate. Mr. Montbleau didn’t feel it was necessary given that the Town would be receiving copies of the State plan and reports from structural engineers. Mr. Schauer noted that the plan in front of the Board had been prepared by an engineer (Anthony Costello).

Mr. Culbert recalled PFG had planned on the range a long time ago and believed that the project was sanctioned. He said they believed they were going about the project correctly. Mr. Montbleau questioned when the project began. Mr. Kopacz provided a brief historical summary of how PFG began. The PFG has a copy of a plan dated from 1988 showing the location of where the range would be constructed. The Town’s copy of that plan may have been lost in a basement flood at the old Town Hall. Mr. Kopacz discussed the process taken by PFG through the years to bring the plan to fruition, such as forestry, logging through sound land management and management for sound.

For the record, Mr. Gowan stated he had no problem with the building and facility. He said another relevant piece was that the Wetland Conservation District (‘WCD’) didn’t get put into place until 1991. He said if the crossing was there prior to the WCD it would be ‘grandfathered’. He said they would sort out the berm construction. Before the project began, Mr. Kopacz recalled walking the site and using a stone arch structure for crossing. He said there is a similar crossing structure they used in the area of Robinson Road. The crossing was done in the same location so as to have the least impact on the environment. He explained they designed the area with the berms for safety and for the best use of the natural contours of the land. For reference, a photograph of the target impact area was displayed. The topography was summarized.

Mr. Gowan confirmed that PFG owned all the property being discussed and that it was marked as such so people wouldn’t wander into the area. Mr. Kopacz replied that the entire PFG property was posted ‘No Trespassing’ for safety purposes.

Mr. Montbleau opened the hearing to the public for comment.

Mr. Warren Fox, 28 Surrey Lane told the Board that the proposed range was located close to his property. He was dismayed at the process taken by PFG and wondered if they gone through the

process to get a good piece of property. He said shame on them for the money they spent reclaiming the land. He said there wasn't a clear set of plans showing what would occur, the wetlands or the aquifer. He heard that it was one of the biggest aquifers in Pelham that couldn't have any hard metal sinking pollution; each time a gun was fired it would be approximately ½ pound to 1 pound of lead going into the berm. He questioned what would save the sinking contaminants from getting into the wetlands and/or aquifer and if they would be recycled. Mr. Fox told the Board he would like to see a set of plans certified by someone who had built a similar project. He was concerned with the bullets going over the berm and wanted to know if there was something to stop firearms from being lifted over a certain point. He had no objections to the range, he wanted it done right. Mr. Fox spoke about the concern for residents. He wanted to know the allowed hours of operation and what training, if any, a person needed to use the range. There were certain times shooting was done during evening hours. He felt residents should be notified when that would be occurring. Mr. Fox questioned if it was the right location for the proposed range. He reiterated his concern for protecting the aquifer. He believed there were too many unanswered questions for the Board to make a decision at this time.

Mr. Frederick Robinson, 50 Robinson Lane told the Board his property was in line with the current rifle range. He discussed his concerns. He spoke about four incidents he knew of where projectiles had come onto properties on Robinson Lane. He said with the new range, his property would no longer be in the line of fire but it would be closer making the noise a factor. He displayed .9mm and .7mm bullets to show the difference in size between the two. Mr. Robinson said he let Mr. Kopacz know when a projectile came onto his property. He said there were nine houses on Robinson Lane and six had an occurrence. He was concerned with safety given that the proposed range faced in the direction of Surrey Lane, which had more houses than Robinson Road. Mr. Robinson was surprised that the NH Fish and Game allowed PFG to build based on the wildlife habitat in the area. He said established wetlands were filled. He requested a site walk be conducted so the project could be understood better. He shared Mr. Fox's concern for lead buildup possibly getting into the aquifer. If a site walk is scheduled he asked that abutters within a one mile radius be notified. He reiterated the concern regarding noise. Mr. Robinson said he enjoyed shooting and did so all the time in his back yard; he has sixteen acres of land. He spoke of an instance when he wasn't home and friends were over shooting in the wrong direction. He said he apologized to Mr. Kopacz and told him it wouldn't happen again. Mr. Robinson disagreed that the crossing was over a 'seasonal' stream. He said the stream flowed year round and was used by his cows. There were a few times it got low in the summer. Mr. Robinson reiterated his request for a site walk when the snow melted so the property could be viewed.

Mr. Doherty asked for clarification as to if larger guns would be used than what was currently being used at PFG. Mr. Kopacz replied they would be using the same size firearms as were allowed to be used currently. He said he would be concerned if people were shooting a .7mm magnum toward PFG. Mr. Robinson said he had never done so. Mr. Kopacz told the Board they were building the berms to National Rifle Association standards.

Through testimony, Mr. Haverty understood the people using the range would be familiar to the Dope Card and understand how to judge for wind, temperature and elevation based upon caliber. He also understood the people shooting would be very familiar with the range, what they were shooting at and the implications of what they were doing. Mr. Kopacz said PFG had a plan for training. Mr. Haverty questioned Mr. Robinson what qualifications he had for people shooting

in his back yard. Mr. Robinson said there were none. Mr. Haverty stated PFG was going through every necessary precaution to make sure the activities at their ranges were safe. He said Mr. Robinson was complaining about something PFG was doing on their property that he was also doing on his property. Mr. Robinson said he didn't shoot that much on his property anymore, he spoke about an instance from years past. He noted there were four houses on Robinson Road that had been hit from the old range and now PFG wanted to do a larger range.

Mr. Kopacz discussed Mr. Fox's concern regarding lead. He said PFG would be taking lead collection into consideration, which is why professionals were being hired for the project. Mr. Gowan asked if there were rules/regulations for reclaiming lead and things of that nature. Mr. Kopacz said they were getting input from companies that did lead reclamation. He said sometimes it was better to leave things in the ground; sometimes when things are disturbed it can cause more trouble than what would be solved. He said they had a long-term environmental management plan that included a stewardship plan. Out of curiosity, Mr. Gowan asked what maximum caliber was allowed at the PFG. Mr. Kopacz said anything that was allowed in a rifle that a common person could purchase. Mr. Gowan asked if there were any hours of operation. Mr. Kopacz answered general membership hours followed the State Hunting Regulations of allowing shooting a half hour before sunrise and a half hour after sunset; however on Sunday shooting may begin at 9am. Exceptions are given for the Police Department or special tactical training. Notification is generally posted on the Pelham Message Board if shooting occurs after specified hours.

Mr. Doherty questioned if PFG bordered Pelham's old land fill. Mr. Kopacz answered yes. Mr. Doherty asked if there were any ranges close to the land fill. Mr. Kopacz answered yes. He said PFG had discussions with the owners of the land fill and were informed that there were test wells monitored regularly by DES that ran along the border of the property to the animal shelter. Approximately five years ago DES pumped a well down to conduct testing. DES had to obtain PFG's permission to cross their property to do the testing.

For transparency, Mr. Haverty asked if there were any voting members of the Board that were active members of Pelham Fish and Game that used the premises. Mr. Doherty said he was a member of PFG and shot possibly once per year, and as recently as five years ago. Mr. Montbleau said he was not a member and had not shot at the facility.

Mr. Robinson asked if the Board would schedule a site walk to review the proposed new range and understand what the applicant was doing. Mr. Gowan said if the Board decided to conduct a site walk it would be discussed during the meeting so there would be no legal requirement for a separate notification to the public. Mr. Montbleau asked Mr. Robinson if, as a courtesy, he was receptive to coordinating a site walk with the Planning Director at a later date. Mr. Robinson hoped the residents in the area could also be invited so they could know what was going on. Mr. Culbert asked Mr. Robinson if he could notify residents when a site walk was scheduled. Mr. Robinson at first answered no, but then said he would try to notify as many people as he could. Mr. Montbleau said the Board would take the request under consideration.

Mr. Montbleau asked if there was anyone else in the public that would like to offer input. No one came forward. He asked the applicant if they had any additional comments.

Mr. Kopacz told the Board they had wildlife, such as Blue Heron. He said they had been visited by the Geological Association and New Hampshire Fish and Game biologists who were looking at the reintroduction of endangered species. The property has locations, as grants become available, that will be set aside to help with endangered species. Mr. Kopacz stated PFG was an environmentally friendly organization. He said they may have made mistakes in the past, but have since contacted professionals to walk the property to view what had been done. With regard to the proposed range, they are being as safe as they could by means of measurements and requiring Dope Cards; people won't be allowed to shoot at positions where they don't know what they're doing.

Mr. Haverty questioned if a Range Officer would be on site when the range was open. Mr. Kopacz answered yes; trained people will be trained as Range Officers, which will provide oversight. He noted they would be setting up a communication system using walkie-talkies. They follow the National Shooting Sports and the NRA safety guides. The range will have buzzers and lights similar to other ranges on the property. Review will be done to ensure they are constructing the range in the safest way possible.

Mr. Croteau asked Mr. Gowan if Zoning relief was needed. Mr. Gowan was unsure, given the fact that the wetland crossing apparently pre-dated the implementation of the WCD in 1991. He said he would study the plan and possibly consult legal on the issue. He said as Zoning Administrator he had to make a determination, which if someone disagreed could be appealed to the Zoning Board of Adjustment. He said he would probably speak with someone at DES regarding the plan to confirm what had been presented (to their satisfaction). Mr. Gowan said if he made a determination the applicant had to go to the Zoning Board, he would work through that process with the applicant and the Conservation Commission would then be involved. He said he needed to consult prior to making an official determination.

Mr. Doherty questioned how far along the range had been constructed. Mr. Kopacz said it was 96%-97% complete. Mr. Doherty understood that the plan had been reviewed by several planning directors prior to Mr. Gowan's employment as such. He also understood the plan had gone through review by the Town's Conservation Commission. He asked if the Board had ever done a site walk on a project that was approximately 90% complete. He believed site walks were usually conducted at the beginning of the review process. He had reservations about coming into what past member of the Planning Department and other boards had done with a project that was nearly complete. Mr. Gowan replied it was an unusual circumstance and up to the Board to decide. He said the plan required at the least a discussion with the present Planning Board so they were aware of what was going on. He said he had to write an official Administrative Decision and it would be a little problematic for the Board to approve the plan until that was done. Mr. Montbleau asked for clarification. Mr. Gowan explained that the Planning Board didn't have the authority to approve a plan that had a Zoning deficiency. He noted that there were aspects of the plan that weren't as clear to him until after discussion at the present meeting. He said he needed to study the plan and speak to DES. He was inclined to say Zoning relief this far after the fact seemed 'silly'. That fact needed to be written as part of the record, not just verbalized.

Mr. Culbert informed he heard talk of the range going through for the twenty-six years he served on the Board. He was not in favor a site walk. He noted that experts had provided advice throughout the process and the range was 96% complete. Mr. Montbleau added that the State

had provided oversight and the applicant was given the 'green light' to proceed in the early stages. Mr. Doherty said there was a legal aspect of vested interest that PFG had spent a considerable amount of money thus far on the project.

Given that the applicant had to do a wetland study and 5-year plan for DES, Mr. Sherman would like to see that plan presented to the Board before accepting the plan for the range. Prior to him voting for the plan, he would like to see an official plan for how lead and other hazardous materials would be reclaimed from the aquifer area. Mr. Culbert questioned why he wanted that information prior to voting. Mr. Sherman asked Mr. Culbert whether he thought the material was hazardous. Mr. Culbert said he couldn't make that statement. Mr. Schauer told the Board that the lead would be in a controlled bunker, not in the shooting stations. The bunker area was in bedrock and glacial till, not an aquifer zone, which were usually sandy areas.

Mr. Montbleau summarized the testimony. The PFG had numerous boards and past planning directors (prior to the present Board and Planning Director) giving direction through the plan. Some of the present day Regulations were not in effect when the plan started. Due to land disturbance and wetland issues the State became involved so the situation could be corrected. With the project close to completion the Planning Director went through the Regulations and felt that the applicant needed to come before the Planning Board to discuss what was going on. Mr. Montbleau said given that the PFG had made investments based on receiving a 'green light' from previous boards and planning directors, he didn't feel the present Board could start requiring information that wasn't included in the original approval. He felt Mr. Sherman's concern was valid, but not part of the current program. Based on the prior history, he believed it was premature to require the applicant to provide the 5-year plan in order to receive approval of the site plan. He gave the Board direction to be positive and proactive with the plan given the applicant's due diligence to be good stewards of the property. The Board heard the abutter's issues and was assured there would be oversight with the shooting that would occur.

In addition to Mr. Montbleau's points of PFG being good stewards to the property and doing all due diligence to maintain a safe operation, Mr. Haverty said the organization had always been a good neighbor to Pelham. As Selectmen Representative to the Board, he always appreciated the PFG giving up aspects of their range for several days each year to train Pelham Police Officers in various aspects. He said PFG also had the Town's animal shelter on their property.

Mr. Croteau said he had a hard time voting on something that he didn't have all the details. He was unsure if State approvals had been received by the Town. Mr. Schauer said the State permits were submitted to the Town's files. Mr. Croteau understood that the range was probably safe, but didn't have knowledge for how far specific projectiles could travel. At this point he said he would abstain from voting because he didn't feel he had enough information. Mr. Kopacz said they've made the safest range possible. To answer the question for how far a projectile could travel, he said ammunition boxes contained information. There are many books containing information of various types of ammunition; the reality is bullets would go into the berm. He reiterated through the process they had used experts to determine the safest manner to do the project. Mr. Croteau asked if consideration was given to the surrounding residents when the location of the range was determined. Mr. Kopacz said within their property, the range location was the best place for it. He said the recommended berm height was 20ft. and for safety, they made the proposed berm three times that recommended height.

Mr. Culbert made a motion to approve the plan conditioned upon Mr. Gowan checking the wetland setbacks and allowing the abutters to walk the property when the snow melts, which would be hosted by PFG. For insurance purposes, Mr. Kopacz wanted it understood anyone coming onto PFG property was required to sign a hold harmless waiver. Mr. Haverty seconded the motion with the friendly amendment that the 5-year plan be submitted to the Town when it is complete. Mr. Schauer said one of the State's conditions was that they had to supply the Town with a copy of the plan.

Mr. Gowan asked if a report was required by the State because of the wetland reclamation. Mr. Schauer said they had done three reports in consecutive years; the fifth year they had to do a plan that documents whether the wetlands were in fact wetlands. He noted that was a condition (#13) of the permit they received in 2007. Mr. Kopacz noted each time a site walk was conducted the Town received a copy of the permit. He asked from what time the motion would be valid from, either from the time the project started, or from today's date. Mr. Gowan said with regard to Zoning, he was much more comfortable with the plan after reviewing the submitted plan. He would be writing a formal administrative decision after consulting (with legal). If it was determined that Zoning relief was required the applicant would need to go through that process and come back to the Planning Board. Mr. Kopacz asked if they would be held accountable based on the time they started, not on what's happening today. Mr. Gowan said that was true and the way he wanted to interpret it. He said the thing to remember was when there is an approval on a plan, and the applicant decides to change it, they would have to come back to the Board. He said that didn't happen. Despite the earlier approvals this one was required.

The Board reviewed the proposed motion, which was to approve the plan conditionally: 1) so that Mr. Gowan would have the ability to determine if there are any Zoning issues; 2) when the 5-year (as-built) plan is complete for the State (under State's condition #13) it shall be submitted to the Town; and 3) when snow melts, the abutters will be allowed to walk the property. Mr. Gowan said if the site walk is part of the motion, clarification should be made that the Board didn't have the authority to give people permission to walk private property.

The Board did not include a site walk in their motion. Mr. Kopacz made a verbal good faith agreement to specify a date for neighbors to visit the site. Mr. Haverty asked that he be notified (through the Selectmen's office) of that date. Mr. Gowan would also like to be notified.

The following motion is the language used in the Notice of Planning Board Decision dated February 20, 2014.

MOTION: (Croteau/Haverty) To approve the plan conditioned upon:

- 1) Final determination by the Zoning Administrator regarding zoning compliance;
- 2) Provision of 5 year As-Built Department of Environmental Services plan to the Planning Department for file.

VOTE: (4-1-1) The motion carried. Mr. Sherman voted no. Mr. Croteau abstained.

MINUTES

January 23, 2014

MOTION: (Croteau/Haverty) To approve the January 23, 2014 meeting minutes as written.

VOTE: (6-0-0) The motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: (Croteau/Haverty) To adjourn the meeting.

VOTE: (6-0-0) The motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:55pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Charity A. Landry
Recording Secretary