

**MINUTES OF A MEETING
OF THE PLANING BOARD OF THE TOWN OF POMPEY**

November 20, 2023

6:30 PM

Pompey Town Hall

Board Members Present: Sue Smith, Chairperson
Sarah LoGiudice, Board Secretary
Kevin Coursen
John Shaheen
Carl Fahrenkrug
Dan Bargabos
Deb Cook
Roy Smith

Seven members of the Planning Board were present. Also present were Attorney Jamie Sutphen, Town Engineer John Dunkle, and Town Supervisor Renee Rotondo. Tim Bearup, Codes Enforcement Officer, was not in attendance. The meeting was livestreamed via Zoom.

Chairperson Smith called the meeting to order at 6:34 pm.

The minutes from last month were discussed. J. Shaheen requested that his response to C. Fahrenkrug's solar concerns that was presented to the Town Board be added to the minutes. The concerns/article was not discussed at the previous month's meeting, and therefore, J. Sutphen said that it was only appropriate to provide a citation of the article in the minutes. Chairperson Smith motioned to approve the minutes as presented. K. Coursen seconded the motion at 6:38 pm. All in favor, none opposed. The motion was granted at 6:39 pm.

American Tower Site Plan Review:

Continued Review/Public Hearing for a Site Plan review on proposed construction of a standby 80 KW Diesel Generator System, Automatic Transfer Switch, Generator Auxiliary Power Distribution and Remote Monitoring Communications Circuitry for a communication tower tenant (ground work only) located at 7209 Sevier Road Jamesville, NY 13078
(Tax ID 010.-03-48.1)

Present for Qualtek Wireless/American Tower is Kelly Kelsey, who appeared via Zoom. Ms. Kelsey was not the representative that had appeared the previous month.

The applicant has proposed to install a generator at the existing cell site.

The previous representative provided answers to questions that were previously asked by the Board via email. The generator will emit 81.4 DBA at approximately 23ft. from the generator site; a spec sheet was also attached. Regularly scheduled start-ups may last approximately two hours. The Generators are supposed to test once per week, on Wednesday's at 11:00 am EST for approximately 20 minutes.

Ms. Kelsey noted that the current road would be sufficient for fuel delivery and emergencies.

K. Coursen asked about access to fire departments in the event that there was a fire at the generator. Specifically, is there a lock at the gate? Ms. Kelsey did not see a gate on the drawings. If she is wrong, and there is, they will provide the Town with the combination for access. She can verify this.

D. Cook asked if there is an enclosure around the entire site. It seems that there would be for security reasons.

D. Bargabos stated that there were previous questions about the quality of the driveway and the subsequent access. Ms. Kelsey has asked the Tower company and they have said that the quality of the roads as is will be sufficient.

K. Coursen noted that the Town recently had a fire where the homeowner let the trees grow in over the driveway and the fire department did not have access. This is important. Their insurance probably requires that the fire department can bring in a certain amount of water in the case of emergencies. Ms. Kelsey will have American Tower verify this.

J. Shaheen stated that the drawings did show a 16-foot gate at the site. Ms. Kelsey will need to get the lock combination, but obviously in case of emergency, the lock could be broken.

Chairperson Smith asked who maintains the plowing of snow for the driveway. American Tower is the property owner, so they maintain the driveway. They have field techs who make regular visits to the site.

K. Coursen asked Supervisor Rotondo if the Town had been getting the required information from American Tower. Supervisor Rotondo confirmed that every 2 years, an engineer is required to inspect the structure and provide the resulting report to the Town; they are also supposed to provide the Town with copies of contacts for local maintenance. There are requirements in the Town's telecommunications section of the Town Code, and they are not being followed. Ms. Kelsey reported that every time a carrier is going out to the site to do work, they are supposed to check zoning/permits beforehand. They would typically produce a structural analysis report. The Town is looking to make sure that the structure continues to be stable. The Town has not received any of this from American Tower. A Town not too far from here had a large wind tower come down due to structural issues. American Tower has been there for decades, and the Town has no record of ever receiving anything. Supervisor Rotondo confirmed that early on in 2020 or 2021 the Town sent out letters asking for the specific

information from the tower companies and got no response. K. Coursen noted that ECC questioned if financial documents were supposed to be provided as well. J. Shaheen asked if it would be helpful if the letter that had previously been sent were provided directly to Ms. Kelsey; she confirmed that it would be. Ms. Kelsey can make sure that the right people are notified of the requirements. Supervisor Rotondo noted that she would get Ms. Kelsey's contact information and reach out accordingly. Ms. Kelsey also provide the latest structural report.

Chairperson Smith noted that the application stated that the total acreage that would be disturbed would be one full acre-is that accurate? It does not appear that the footprint of the generator would be anywhere close to that. Ms. Kelsey will confirm what the total acreage to be disturbed will be.

The matter was referred to the ECC, and they had several comments and questions. They noted that if one acre or more were disturbed, then the project would require a SWIPP. There are no permits required for the diesel fuel tank. There is no 24-hour contact name on file with the Town-they are typically also posted on signage on the gate. There is no waste generated at the site. K. Coursen noted that perhaps just an oil change. Disposal of waste oil would likely be done off site. Chairperson Smith asked how often they inspect the generator. Ms. Kelsey is unsure. The ECC recommended approving the application, contingent on the Applicant adequately addressing the prior concerns.

K. Coursen noted that Supervisor Rotondo stated that the Town had previously asked the company for information and they have not responded. If this is put on as a condition, what happens if they put the generator in and then just continue to not provide information?

If Codes were to go multiple times and see that the site is never plowed, then the Applicant would be in violation of their site plan. Supervisor Rotondo also noted that a removal bond is required per statute as well.

They did provide a liability insurance policy but the Town is not named on the certificate. The "Certificate Holder" section is blank-the Town should be named there.

C. Fahrenkrug asked who would know whether these items are taken care of. Codes will be aware. The Town Attorney sent the previous letter on behalf of codes/the Town.

Chairperson Smith asked that Ms. Kelsey verify the acreage of total disturbance.

Chairperson Smith motioned to re-open the Public Hearing at 7:14 pm. J. Shaheen seconded the motion. All in favor, none opposed. The Public Hearing was opened at 7:15 pm. As no one wished to speak, J. Shaheen motioned to close the hearing. C. Fahrenkrug seconded the motion. All in favor, none opposed. The Public Hearing was closed at 7:15 pm.

J. Sutphen felt that the Board had enough information to complete the SEQR. The Board could possibly approve the application with conditions. The project must comply with the Town Code before a building permit is issued.

The only OCPB comment was that the Town/Applicant consider possible noise implications to nearby residents.

C. Fahrenkrug questioned the location of the generator to the nearest residence. The maps were reviewed; it appeared to be at least a couple hundred feet. Resident N. Furdock reported that the closest house to the generator is the Murphy's; they are approximately 300 feet away. The area between the location and the house is wooded, and the sound goes down exponentially with distance.

SEQR

1. **Will the proposed action create a material conflict with an adopted land use plan or zoning regulations?**
No, or small impact
2. **Will the proposed action result in a change in the use or intensity of use of land?**
No, or small impact
3. **Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of the existing community?**
No, or small impact
4. **Will the proposed action have an impact on the environmental characteristics that caused the establishment of a Critical Environmental Area (CEA)?**
No, or small impact
5. **Will the proposed action result in an adverse change in the existing level of traffic or affect existing infrastructure for mass transit, biking or walkway?**
No, or small impact
6. **Will the proposed action cause an increase in the use of energy and it fails to incorporate reasonably available energy conservation or renewable energy opportunities?**
No, or small impact
7. **Will the proposed action impact existing: a. public / private water supplies?**
No, or small impact
8. **Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of important historic, archaeological, architectural or aesthetic resources?**
No, or small impact
9. **Will the proposed action result in an adverse change to natural resources (e.g., wetlands, waterbodies, groundwater, air quality, flora and fauna)?**
No, or small impact
10. **Will the proposed action result in an increase in the potential for erosion, flooding or drainage problem?**
No, or small impact.

11. Will the proposed action create a hazard to environmental resources or human health?

No, or small impact

Chairperson Smith made a motion for negative SEQR declaration at 7:25 pm. K. Coursen seconded the motion. All were in favor, none were opposed. The motion carried at 7:25 pm.

K. Coursen made a motion to approve the American Tower application for a diesel generator at 7209 Sevier rd. (Tax Map No. 010.-03-48.1) with the conditions that American Tower comply with 165-10e of the Town of Pompey Code before a building permit is issued. In addition, supply a certificate of liability insurance making the town of Pompey an additional insured based on the insurance limits stated in the certificate with the application if it is required in the Code. The road will be maintained for fire service, the Town will be provided with access codes to the gate and with a 24-hour contact phone number for the site. The applicant must verify that the total ground disturbance is less than one acre. The motion was made at 7:27 pm. J. Shaheen confirmed that 165-10e covers the items that were previously asked by the Town in the letter that was previously sent. The Applicant confirmed that the Town should be listed as the additional insured, and not the certificate holder. The insurance certificate provided with the application is the insurance for the contractor that is installing the generator.

J. Shaheen seconded the motion at 7:32 pm. All were in favor, none were opposed. The motion carried at 7:32 pm

Perry Real Estate Holdings Broadfield Road Subdivision:

Continued Review/Public Hearing for an application for subdivision of land located at 7940 Broadfield Road Manlius, NY 13104 (Tax Map No. 004.-03-44.1 and 004.-03-49).

Present was the applicant, Steven Perry, and Pat Reynolds from Ianuzi and Romans Land Surveying, P.C. Nothing was changed on the plan since the last meeting. Mr. Perry was waiting on the County's updated approval of site distance.

K. Coursen had been by the site at least three times. He did not see how it could possibly work to have four houses off the driveway. Today there were four trashcans; it would be tough to get in and out of that road in the condition that it is in. The steepness of driveway could make runoff coming from the driveway a major issue. He did see that there was a swale that someone put in. There are school buses stopping, trash trucks picking up the trash and the road is narrow. The speed limit is 40 mph in that area. Snow removal would also pose an issue. This was his perspective on the location.

J. Dunkle and Chairperson Smith discussed an email that was sent from T. Bearup after talking to the County. A new driveway access permit would be needed for the additional two homes. The County would need to review the site again. They could not make a decision now. They are saying that it is a concern and needs to be reviewed. The New permit and the plans currently show a 22' wide roadway and the maximum allowed is 20'; it could not be made any

wider. Mr. Perry confirmed that the driveway now is approximately 10-12 feet; it is not 22' as noted in the email. Their plans show future revisions to the driveway at 22'.

K. Coursen noted that changes have already been made to the intersections along this road near the site due to many previous accidents, which were very serious.

C. Fahrenkrug drives by the location frequently, and shared the concern.

D. Bargabos wrestled with what they can mitigate and not mitigate. He agreed with everything that K. Coursen said. What could be mitigated? It would be expensive to do so. It could be a moot point if the County comes back on the site distance. The County will not make a decision at this time.

J. Sutphen noted that the current condition is that they can build one house there on the new lot. What is being talked about is if it is divided, and is residential, they can put another house and then there are two new houses. For the purposes of subdivision, the Board can allow subdivision, and put in a condition that there needs to be site plan approval by the Planning Board prior to any work being done. If it is mitigatable, and it is going to go to the County, then it is possible to allow subdivision. The County may say no in the future, and this Board may say no in the future. J. Shaheen noted that the Board could put future conditions on the roadway that are insurmountable. He is not comfortable putting 4 houses on one driveway. He feels that in that case it should be a Town road. Right now, they are entitled to put one more house there.

Mr. Perry is not interested in coming back for site plan review. He is asking for two buildable lots. He does not think a prospective buyer would be interested in that. He would prefer to move forward with a lot line adjustment to fix the issues with the neighbor's pool etc. and make this one 19 acre buildable lot, which would use the existing driveway. P. Reynolds did prepare a map showing this. J. Shaheen asked if the Board would need to approve adding another house to the existing driveway as well. No, they are entitled to that because they own the lot, and the driveway is already there. The existing driveway is part of Lot 2.

The Board reviewed the maps. The maps showed the applicant conveying an acre. The legal descriptions are in place for ingress/egress with the two people who are already using the driveway. Essentially, they would just be walking away with a lot line adjustment. They would hope to take care of that tonight instead of going through an additional/separate application with Codes.

J. Sutphen explained that technically the application is being amended. They did shorten up the easement because Lot 3 is no longer there. J. Sutphen would like to review the maps with T. Bearup and potentially offer an approval at next meeting. It is her opinion that Lot 1 is fixing something. If the applicant had never come here and went in for a building permit, he would have gotten it. The Board has a responsibility to make sure the ingress/egress easements are sufficient.

K. Coursen asked if using that other access to a single house would be a better option. Chairperson Smith felt that for site distance, it would be better, but for drainage purposes, it would not be; a lot of work would be required related to drainage. P. Reynolds stated that if there is no variance, there is 120 ft. total road frontage. J. Sutphen said that this is a pre-existing, non-conforming lot. It is already there.

Chairperson Smith noted that the new map needed revision dates on it to differentiate from previous maps.

Mr. Perry asked if it could be noted that the second access could not be used without site plan approval, instead of saying that it can never be used. He is not sure what he actually wants to do with the lots at this point. Right now, he just wants to clean up the lot line so that there are no potential future issues. He has the right to do this if the easements are in line. J. Sutphen said that the idea would be that we would look at this internally and then come back.

Chairperson Smith made a motion to re-open the Public Hearing at 8:03 pm. All were in favor, none were opposed. The Public Hearing was re-opened.

Philip Miller 3770 Sweet Road Jamesville, NY. Mr. Miller appeared on behalf of Susan Reisman. Mr. Miller stated that the Board changed the entire dynamic this evening and did not give anyone a chance to consider what has been said. K. Coursen and Chairperson Smith affirm that this is why the Public Hearing was re-opened. If the applicant had come to the town previously and asked for a lot line adjustment there would have been no Public Hearing. That is what is happening now. We are now continuing the Public Hearing even though one would not have been required. This all just changed just now based on several factors. They are welcome to come view the maps etc.

Mr. Miller stated that if you look at ZBA meeting minutes from 6/12/23, the ZBA imposed a condition regarding Lots 1, 2 and 3. The public asked for a SEQR evaluation at that time and they said that this would eliminate the issue for you; we will require all the use to be on the eastern side. Now all of the sudden he has a right to get a permit, he has a right to use that driveway. K. Coursen explained that Mr. Miller might have misheard what was said. No one said that he has the right to flood Ms. Reisman's property. C. Fahrenkrug stated that this has become a lot line adjustment, so this no longer applies. J. Shaheen confirmed that what we said was that Mr. Perry could come back for site plan approval prior to the western route being used for a driveway. K. Coursen also noted that specifically they said that drainage would need to be addressed. P. Miller felt that the ZBA listened to the public. If the Board is going to allow the use of the western side then please ensure that those conditions are imposed. There was also a condition regarding the easements. There is one party now here who says that he is not going to sign that easement.

Dan Reisman, on behalf of his mother, Sue Reisman at 7868 Broadfield Road. He understands the ability to build a house on one lot as it stands. He does not have to go through site plan even though there is nothing there now. Regardless of how much property will be

disturbed? K. Coursen explained that he will have to get a building permit, siting of a well, septic, etc. but no, he will not need to come back for site plan review. J. Sutphen believed that Codes would contact the Town Engineer once the plans were submitted.

K. Coursen felt that the drainage needs to be addressed regardless. The neighbors should go to the County to let them know about the terrible drainage. If you own a piece of property, you pull a permit and codes addresses that. The building of the houses is not the task of the Planning Board. The County really should be attending to these drainage issues.

P. Miller attempts to speak again. Chairperson Smith noted that proper etiquette is to allow others to speak as well. We will circle back to you.

J. Dunkle explained that there is another mechanism where drainage is addressed. If there is more than acre of land disturbed, a permit is to be required by the DEC. If this property were ever developed in such a way, it would likely trigger an evaluation by the DEC.

George Holden, 7932 Broadfield Road-He owns the house just to the west. He is concerned with the increase in use. He has no problem with a house being there and there is no real issue with added water because he is not going to add water. He is concerned with additional use of the driveway. He did get a copy of the draft of the easement. He does not feel he can sign that because he has known for 30 years that there is no sight distance at his driveway. It puts him in a position where he is responsible for maintenance of the driveway. We owe it to the taxpayers, including Mr. Perry, to make sure that this is a lot someone will be happy with in the future. He has made cost effective improvements to his property to mitigate the drainage.

K. Coursen confirmed that there is an easement in place now. Why would that change? Mr. Holden believed that this is so the taxpayers are responsible for the maintenance and not the Town. An addition of one more home would not require the Town to assume maintenance responsibility. Mr. Holden has sight distance on one side. One option is safe and fixable and one is not safe and fixable. The people down the hill who are upset are upset because nothing has been done for them. If applicant would put a swale in then this would fix the issue. He does not want it to be his responsibility to maintain the driveway.

J. Shaheen asked what is the arrangement now with the neighbor to the east that the driveway is shared with. There is no written agreement. They have tried to have people plow in the past but it never worked out.

Kathy Holden, 7932 Broadfield Road-They have lived there going on 40 years. They know a lot about this driveway, including all the accidents. The neighbor across the driveway has never helped. In the springtime, there are days that their driveway out to the road is sheer ice. It is not a safe area.

Karen Burns, 7864 Broadfield Road-she lives on the west side of the creek. They have been concerned with more stuff going in and adding to drainage issues. One of the things they

requested in the beginning was that the property be looked at in regards to the drainage. She agrees that there is no sight distance. It seems that a real road would fix the issue and make the entry safer. The area near Ms. Reisman is much better. Where does the responsibility lie in trying to make the land usable for him as well as trying to protect everyone else?

Colleen O'Leary, 4269 Frasier Fir-she is here for herself and neighbor, Andrew Heppner, who could not be here tonight. Mr. Heppner raises a number of concerns about drainage, environmental concerns. Mr. Perry finds himself to be in possession of a property that does not meet code without the modifications made. Canaan Realty lists this property for sale. She wants to make sure that whatever this Board decides applies to future owners so that they all do not have to come back and go thru this process again. Chairperson Smith reiterated that tonight the decision being made is for a lot line adjustment. The decision will be noted on the maps.

P. Miller stated that he thought Town Law 274a authorizes the Planning Board to approve/disapprove site development plans. J. Sutphen confirmed that this only applies for non-residential properties.

Karen Burns wanted to confirm that the ZBA decided that the lower access is not going to be used. K. Coursen explained that if Mr. Perry chose to have the two lots, which he is not doing, that the variance would apply. He is only doing one now so now it is in the hands of the Planning Board.

Chairperson Smith made a motion to close the Public Hearing at 8:37 pm. K. Coursen seconded the motion at 8:37 pm. All in favor, none are opposed.

Chairperson Smith agreed that if Lot 2 stays at approximately 17 and half acres, then yes, site distance is not good there. The Board talks about what is mitigatable, not mitigatable. The lower access would be far safer for access to Broadfield road. With proper engineering and drainage, the water situation could be helped. If we restrict it back to the easterly access, we could still have some drainage issues but may be making a bad situation worse with access. The whole lot should be looked at when a house is built to identify how the drainage is affected. This is a work in progress. First and foremost, for this Board is subdividing the land, and in this case the subdivision is just moving the lot line. The lot already previously had two 60 ft. openings out into the road. This is the Boards chance to say that Lot 2 is a buildable lot for just one house and she would prefer to see the access on the western side. J. Shaheen and D. Cook both agreed.

J. Sutphen wanted to see the existing ingress/egress easement that is in favor of the Holden's. That may not necessarily prevent this from happening, but it may prevent that condition from being added.

J. Dunkle explained that the Board might add a condition that any building that goes in would require a Town Engineer's overview of drainage. Drainage issues are mitigatable.

Mr. Perry said that if he were to file for a building permit, isn't all that addressed at that time? J. Dunkle confirmed, and said that sometimes he will call the Town Engineer. P. Reynolds said that they would be okay with that; what they want to avoid is requiring site plan review.

Mr. Perry stated that the nicest part of the property is the southeast corner. Using the westerly entrance would require a quarter mile driveway. That is unrealistic unless you are dealing with somebody who has millions of dollars. If he were going to be restricted to the westerly access, then he would not be interested in moving forward at this point. Until he knows where he wants to put the house, then he does not want to be restricted. To penalize him for not being able to use a driveway that he technically owns is not fair. He is not concerned with the shared maintenance issue; he only included that as part of the application because he felt that the Board wanted him to do so. There has been two houses there for 40 years. There are already trashcans, there are already buses stopping. He owns almost 19 acres in the Town of Pompey and to tell him that he cannot build a house where I want is not fair. He has tried to follow the proper procedures and will continue to do so.

D. Bargabos feels that the Board should give Mr. Perry a lot line adjustment and finalize the matter. The Board can further condition the matter as appropriate in regards to the westerly access .

P. Reynolds felt that it would be best to hold off on any decision until next meeting, so that they can discuss what is now before them.

This matter will be tabled until December 18, 2023, per Applicant and counsel. The Board Secretary will need a digital copy of the new map.

El Hindi Subdivision

Public Hearing on an application for subdivision of land located on Ridge Road in the Town of Pompey (Tax Map No. 030.-04-02.1).

Present for the applicant is Ted Spencer. Mr. El Hindi owns a 40-acre lot and would like to gift 10 acres to his nephew. There is no development proposed at this time.

J. Dunkle noted that there was a letter from the County re: the access.

R. Smith asked if the property is on west or east side of Ridge Road. It is on the east side, south of number 5 road.

The Board members and Mr. Spencer reviewed the maps.

There is a farm driveway present. An aerial view of these driveways was presented to the Board.

The ECC has reviewed the application and provided no comments and/or recommendations.

The Board is in consensus that if the applicant could eliminate the 30' sliver of land that is shown on the map that it would be beneficial.

The Board does have enough information to complete the SEQR.

SEQR

1. **Will the proposed action create a material conflict with an adopted land use plan or zoning regulations?**
No, or small impact
2. **Will the proposed action result in a change in the use or intensity of use of land?**
No, or small impact
3. **Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of the existing community?**
No, or small impact
4. **Will the proposed action have an impact on the environmental characteristics that caused the establishment of a Critical Environmental Area (CEA)?**
No, or small impact
5. **Will the proposed action result in an adverse change in the existing level of traffic or affect existing infrastructure for mass transit, biking or walkway?**
No, or small impact
6. **Will the proposed action cause an increase in the use of energy and it fails to incorporate reasonably available energy conservation or renewable energy opportunities?**
No, or small impact
7. **Will the proposed action impact existing: a. public / private water supplies?**
No, or small impact
8. **Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of important historic, archaeological, architectural or aesthetic resources?**
No, or small impact
9. **Will the proposed action result in an adverse change to natural resources (e.g., wetlands, waterbodies, groundwater, air quality, flora and fauna)?**
No, or small impact
10. **Will the proposed action result in an increase in the potential for erosion, flooding or drainage problem?**
No, or small impact.
11. **Will the proposed action create a hazard to environmental resources or human health?**
No, or small impact

Chairperson Smith made a motion for a negative SEQR declaration at 9:06 pm. J. Shaheen seconded the motion. All were in favor, none were opposed.

The matter has been advertised and neighbors have been notified.

Chairperson Smith made a motion to open the Public Hearing at 9:06 pm. K. Coursen seconded the motion.

David Fregly, 1912 Ridge Road-He owns the home immediately next door. He would like to review the map and 30 foot sliver that has been referred to. He would be interested in obtaining the 30 feet.

Chairperson Smith made a motion to close the hearing at 9:09pm. K. Coursen seconded the motion. All were in favor, none were opposed. The Public Hearing was closed at 9:09 pm

If the applicant redrew the map and had Mr. Fregly sign off on it, then that could be approved at the next meeting. Mr. Fregly would also need to sign the application.

Mr. Spencer will speak to Mr. El Hindi and move forward accordingly.

Valetta Subdivision

Review of an application for subdivision of land located at 3001 Gardner Road in the Town of Pompey (Tax Map No. 017.-01-05.1).

Present is Christopher Smith, Esq.

Mr. Valetta is selling off the Parcel A. There has been some logging work done of the property, and they used the 30' strip to gain access to the property. He would like to maintain that access through easement.

J. Sutphen explained that we are trying to clean these issues up because years later it could present an issue.

In this case, there are additional access points. The Board would prefer to see that addressed, as we need to start looking at the reasonable development of land. He will discuss this with the Applicant and submit a revised map if applicable.

The Board will plan on a Public Hearing on 12/18/23. The Board Secretary will provide the applicant with a list of neighbors within 1000 ft. and a sample letter.

Chairperson Smith made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:20 pm. K. Coursen seconded the motion at 9:20. All were in favor, none were opposed. The meeting was adjourned at 9:21 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sarah LoGiudice
Secretary to the Planning Board
Town of Pompey