

**TOWN OF ST. GEORGE
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
MINUES OF MEETING
ONE BARBER ROAD, ST. GEORGE
September 9, 2009**

- MEMBERS PRESENT:** Marie Mastro (Chair); Scott Baker, Ron Arms, Matt Palmer, Lisa Beliveau, Dan Pillsbury, Connie Kendall.
- ADMINISTRATION:** Ed Hanson, Zoning Administrator; Joe McLean, Town Attorney.
- OTHERS PRESENT:** Robert Walker, Cathy Neff, Michael Garvey, Mark Hall, Rick Pierce, Zac Davis, Don Taub, Andrei Leontiev, Rita Martel, Lisa Steadman, Steve & Jane Stowell, Brian Anderson, Ken Couture, Chris LeBlanc, Brian Hoar, Susan & Ray Martel, Tom Walsh, Richard Solomon.
- AGENDA:**
1. Call to Order
 2. Site Visit: 1065 Martel Extension (parcel ID#05-20-07), Steadman
 3. Applications:
 - Conditional Use Review, Antennas, Mount Pritchard, Omnipoint Communications (#09-2)
 - Conditional Use Review, Home Based Business, Martel Extension, Steadman (#09-3)
 - Sketch Plan Review, Three Lot Subdivision, 963 Willow Brook Lane, Pinkham
 4. Zoning Administrator's Update
 5. Approval of Minutes
 6. Other Business
 7. Adjournment
-

1. CALL TO ORDER

Marie Mastro called the meeting to order at 7:45 p.m.

2. SITE VISIT

Prior to the start of the meeting the DRB conducted a site visit to the William and Lisa Steadman property at 1065 Martel Extension (parcel ID#05-20-07).

3. APPLICATIONS

Marie Mastro explained the procedure to be followed at the meeting, reviewed the definition of "interested persons" (interested party status) pursuant to 24VSA4465.B, and swore in those individuals to give testimony before the Development Review Board.

(#09-2): Conditional Use Review for co-location of an array of up to nine additional cellular telephone antennas on the existing American Tower telecommunications antenna tower on Mount Pritchard (parcel ID#05-20-30) by Omnipoint Communications Incorporated (a/k/a T-Mobile)

Connie Kendall recused herself from review of application #09-2 (Omnipoint telecommunications antenna). Mark Hall, Zac Davis, and Rick Pierce appeared on behalf of the application.

APPLICANT COMMENTS

Mark Hall briefly reviewed the proposal to locate three sets of three T-Mobile antennas on the existing cell tower on Mount Pritchard. The antennas are 72” tall, 13” wide, and six inches deep, located at 73’ and 83’ on the tower. There will be three utility box cabinets (to house a self-contained battery pack) on a 5’x 8’ pad within the 60’x 60’ compound to serve the antennas. T-Mobile strives to use existing structures/towers whenever possible, stated Mr. Hall. The antennas are needed to eliminate roaming charges for customers. To fulfill the FCC license T-Mobile had to expand and now has 90 locations in the state. Co-locations are searched out first (including locating in church steeples or silos) before building a tower. Mr. Hall reviewed the coverage area served by T-Mobile and existing gaps in service. With the proposed antennas the coverage will include Burlington, Shelburne, St. George, and down I-89 toward Richmond. The site labeled “357A” (Brownell Mountain) is the alternate site (raw land) where a new structure would have to be built. Exhibit 4 shows the 357A site and the 357B site with coverage. It was noted that the site plan depicts antennas on Brownell Mountain rather than on Mount Pritchard. The Brownell site is the alternate site. Marie Mastro also commented the drawings provided to the DRB are not readable (print is too small). Mark Hall stated a full size set of drawings was submitted.

Mark Hall showed a schematic done by ATC of what is on the tower presently (microwave dishes, antennas). The microwaves are used for telecommunications from landlines, and it is not certain these are in use currently. A condition of approval directing that the microwave dishes be removed is acceptable provided permission can be secured from ATC, said Mr. Hall. Per Act 250 there were four installations to be taken off the tower. Three of these have been removed and one remains. Access to Mount Pritchard is via a private road. ATC has the right to use the road as a landowner. T-Mobile has a lease with ATC and the terms state if damage is caused to the road by T-Mobile it will be fixed, but T-Mobile will rely on ATC for general road maintenance. There was a gate on the road that was removed. T-Mobile supports having a gate to keep people away from the equipment provided the site can be accessed (by T-Mobile) as necessary. Two to three weeks of construction is anticipated for the project, continued Mr. Hall. The antennas need to be installed by winter. Visits to the site are expected once every two months or perhaps once a month if necessary.

Photo simulations have been submitted, noted Mr. Hall. The antennas are grey in color and of a non-reflective material. It is expected people will not even see the antennas. The location is good because the antennas “see” over the top of all in the array. The antennas are short range, 1900 MHz, and do not ‘see’ over hills or around corners. There is the philosophical question of using an existing tower or having three separate towers to accommodate the antennas, said Mr. Hall. The history of the tower put on Mount Pritchard by the Hinesburg Fire Department is not known.

Ron Arms asked if the goal is to have only the tower on Mount Pritchard and not also a tower on Brownell Mountain. Mr. Hall confirmed this. Mr. Arms asked if the coverage will include Route 116 and 2A. Mr. Hall said the antennas will fill in service in Chittenden County including Williston toward Richmond and into Shelburne and South Burlington. Work is being done on the I-89 and I-91 corridor to the Massachusetts border and in the Stowe, Fairfax, Morrisville area. Requirements of the FCC license must be fulfilled. Roaming charge contracts are expiring so the company needs to get the antennas in place. Marie Mastro asked if the reason for the push for the tower is weather (winter) or the expiration date of the contracts. Mark Hall assured weather is the reason and filling in the network.

There was discussion of maintenance activity on the site. The cabinets have air and heating capability. Maintenance consists mainly of changing filters. Once the antennas are installed on the tower they are not touched. There is no heavy equipment at the site. A pick up truck is used to access the site.

Scott Baker referred to the RF EME report, dated June 11, 2009, and questioned the accuracy of the information. Mark Hall stated the measurements in the report (Page 8) were taken from the antennas and show 73' and 83' above ground level. The calculations were based on the measurements. Monitoring was done in February, 2009. Mr. Baker urged the applicant to ensure current information is submitted with the application, noting Photo 1 in the photo simulations do not match what is stated in the key (the photograph is from the Hinesburg Sand & Gravel site). Mr. Hall said the photographs will be retaken or the incorrect pictures will be removed from the submittal.

Marie Mastro mentioned the stamp by the civil engineer and the letter of explanation of why a civil engineer can stamp what appears to be electrical drawings. Mark Hall stated the drawings are civil engineering drawings, not electrical drawings. The drawings involve the location of electrical equipment. The drawings are within the purview of a civil engineer to sign, stressed Mr. Hall.

There was discussion of the structural report for the tower. Mark Hall noted the tower is old, but sound. Marie Mastro asked for an explanation of the statement about '83% structural capacity' noted in the structural analysis, dated June 9, 2009. Zac Davis, construction manager for T-Mobile, explained capacity can go to 130% before structural changes are needed. Terms in the analysis report pertain to the legs, diagonal and horizontal braces on the tower. The analysis provides an inventory of what is on the tower presently. The lease with MCI for space on the tower is still active though the antennae are not in use. There have been discussions with ATC about taking down what is not in use. Ed Hansen interjected a major portion of the wind load on the tower is from the drum antennas. Marie Mastro asked if the company name is on the antenna. Mr. Davis said the panels are for cellular service (Verizon, Sprint) and MCI has the rest. Ms. Mastro asked that the owners and the equipment be identified as well as what is currently active on the tower. Mark Hall stated this information has been requested from ATC and once it is received it will be submitted to the DRB. Indicating time constraints relative to the permit may expedite getting the information from ATC, advised Mr. Hall.

Lisa Beliveau asked about the level of the antenna on the tower. Zac Davis explained 360° is total for the top and lower sectors. The plan is to do A and B first and then C later. Ms. Beliveau asked if the range is to the lake. Mark Hall said short range covers a maximum of two miles. Scott Baker pointed out some areas appear to have greater coverage (10 miles).

STAFF REPORT

Ed Hanson gave a brief history of the tower. In 1965 and 1966 the original towers were up then Eastern Microwave arrived and replaced the towers with a free standing lattice tower. Hinesburg Fire Dept. was allowed to be a tenant on the tower, but this did not happen. A variance was issued to allow a 'non-allowed' use in the district. The proper variance was not issued at the time, said Mr. Hanson.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Don Taub, Mt. Pritchard Lane, stated American Tower (ATC) who is the landlord and responsible for what is happening on the site should provide a report to the DRB, especially since there is a second tower on the site that is not permitted with the original 1986 permit. The tower is 68' high and there is no fence. There are three propane tanks of which two are enclosed and one is not. The building structures are there without permits, said Mr. Taub. ATC should attend the hearings on the application. This is an opportunity for the town to get the site cleaned up, stressed Mr. Taub, adding further expansion of the site should not be discussed until resolution of existing problems. Mr. Taub said he lives 1,000' from the tower and is interested in future plans by ATC. Mark Hall stated the applicant (T-Mobile) should not be held responsible for an enforcement issue against ATC. It was noted there are procedures available to the town and state to resolve the matter. The application by T-Mobile should not be involved. According to Act 250 the tower pre-dated Act 250 regulations so Act 250 does not have jurisdiction. Act 250 advised that the town or the Natural Resources Board be contacted about the matter. Mark Hall stated a letter from Peter Kiebel (Act 250) was received explaining why ATC has not been contacted with regard to what is going on at the site. Mr. Hall reiterated the antennas will allow T-Mobile to provide coverage to St. George and provide competition to the other carriers so there are benefits.

Bob Walker, Mt. Pritchard Lane, said he heard the Hinesburg tower is a replacement of a pre-existing tower.

Connie Kendall, Mt. Pritchard Lane, requested ATC as the co-applicant be required to answer to the violation questions about the site. Ms. Kendall questioned if ATC even knows what is happening on the site and asked when the town will notify them of the matter. There has not been much success in communicating with ATC in the past, noted Ms. Kendall, and it is questionable if the site is safe and secure. To add more to the site may not be such a good idea. Ed Hanson said the issue of the need for ATC to show more concern about the site has been raised in the past. The Hinesburg tower has no legal right to be on ATC's property and this is an insurance liability.

Andrei Leontiev, Mt. Pritchard Lane, mentioned there is other equipment on the site in addition to what is on the tower, and that is a concern. Mark Hall noted from the RF perspective the existing conditions and impacts are shown. A household microwave oven emits more than the antennas which will be 73' in the air. The impact will be no greater than five feet away, diminimus in terms of energy emissions from the site.

Michael Garvey, Mt. Pritchard Lane, asked when the tower will reach capacity and if the antenna from the second tower will be relocated to the ATC tower. Additionally, the information and pictures provide by T-Mobile do not match the application. The applicant needs to provide accurate information, stressed Mr. Garvey. Mark Hall stated how much is on the tower is relative to the technology. The tower height can not be extended per the zoning. Issues related to American Tower are external to the application, reiterated Mr. Hall. Dan Pillsbury asked if T-Mobile increases the value of American Tower. Mr. Hall confirmed this.

DELIBERATION/DECISION

Conditional Use, Antennas, Mount Pritchard, Omnipoint Communications/T-Mobile Northeast, LLC (#09-2)

Correspondence added to the record includes a structural analysis report, dated 6/9/09, and a letter from Ginger Isham, 3517 Oak Hill Road, Williston, dated 9/3/09, as an interested party.

The DRB requested the following information from the applicant:

- Identification of antennas to be removed and anticipated removal date
- Inventory list identifying active and inactive antennas and the owners
- List of the elevations that are leased to date
- Correction of the RF-EME Report and photo simulations
- Correction of the EBI Report that still shows extension of the tower

MOTION by Marie Mastro, SECOND by Scott Baker, to recess the hearing of #09-2 - Condition Use Review for antennas on Mount Pritchard by Omnipoint Communications/T-Mobile Northeast, LLC to October 5, 2009 at 7 p.m. to allow the applicant the opportunity to submit additional/revised information including the following:

- **Identification of antennas to be removed and anticipated removal date**
- **Inventory list identifying active and inactive antennas and the owners**
- **List of the elevations that are leased to date**
- **Correction of the RF-EME Report and photo simulations**
- **Correction of the EBI Report that still shows extension of the tower**

VOTING: unanimous; motion carried.

Connie Kendall joined the DRB.

(#09-3): Conditional Use Review for a home based business (landscaping service operating out of an existing detached accessory outbuilding) on Martel Extension (parcel ID #05-20-07) by William and Lisa Steadman

Lisa Steadman appeared on behalf of the application. Ms. Steadman said her husband, Bill, could not attend the meeting due to a family matter.

APPLICANT COMMENTS

Ms. Steadman spoke in appreciation of her neighbors voicing their concerns and encouraged continued dialogue in order to address matters promptly. Ms. Steadman pointed out there appears to be homeowner association issues and permit issue. The homeowner association issues should be addressed immediately and the permit issues have been addressed. Records with the Williston Police were researched for any infractions by individuals in the Steadman family or employees of the company and no violations were found, said Ms. Steadman. Also, a police officer met with the work crew to discuss the legalities associated with a private road and liability to the company. The business has two crews of three people each. Vehicles and trailers are taken home with the employees after work. This has decreased the traffic to the shop on Martel Extension. A record is being kept of visits to the site by employees and vehicles. The data show one truck visit approximately three times a week to drop off broken equipment for repair. The truck is on site for an average of an hour. There is also a visit to mow the lawn of the Steadman residence which last about two hours, said Ms. Steadman. Employees do come to the site to pick up their paychecks once a month. Ms. Steadman said she prefers less traffic to the site as well. There is a mechanic who works in the shop an average of 19 hours a week and drives his own personal vehicle. There are no business vehicles parked at the shop. With less traffic the safety concern is decreased and there is less wear and tear on the road. The cost is higher to do this, but it is worth it, said Ms. Steadman. Lisa Steadman contended they were operating within the limits and terms of the permit issued by the town. Past conversations with the former zoning administrator, Dick Ward, were mentioned. Parking is allowed per the permit. Parking does not constitute storage. The vehicles have been moved away from the shop. Vehicles/equipment are not visible from the road. Vehicles parked at the house include two personal vehicles (truck and Volvo) and two other trucks. Ms. Steadman mentioned storage, defining the activity as long term placement of an item. The trucks, skid steer, and trailers are moved around so they are not in storage, said Ms. Steadman. The two older vehicles that were on the site are gone (one was sold and one was traded for a new pick up truck). The Blazer is for sale presently. Casella was asked to move the dumpster, continued Ms. Steadman, but did not want to do this. The box trailer behind the shop will be moved to another area. Planting a hedge in front of the shop was investigated. The cost is up to \$2,000 and the plantings will take time to mature and fill in to provide screening. The shop will still be visible when driving up Martel Extension. Planting a hedge along the front of Martel Extension is cost prohibitive, said Ms. Steadman.

The applicant submitted a list of equipment owned by the business. Matt Palmer asked where the equipment is kept in the winter. Ms. Steadman explained the equipment is moved into the shop. The items in the shop are loaded on the trailers and sent to the homes of the employees.

Lisa Beliveau asked about the parking area behind the house being usable in the winter time. Ms. Steadman stated the vehicles are gone in the winter (taken by the

subcontractors). Only one or two parking spaces will need to be plowed. The skid steer can be moved around the area provided it is not too wet.

Marie Mastro asked about the square footage of the garage. Ms. Steadman estimated 2,000 s.f., but stated the structure should be measured. Ms. Mastro asked if the equipment (lawn mowers) fits in the garage or is stored off site. Lisa Steadman said the mulch blower is kept in the house garage and not in front of the shop.

Ron Arms asked about the trailer in back without the tires. Lisa Steadman said the box trailer will be moved when the shelving is complete. Mr. Arms asked about the intention for the disturbed area on the site. Ms. Steadman said the land is being sloped to help with drainage. A retaining wall and reseeding is needed.

Connie Kendall observed the business began with one employee and a couple of vehicles and has grown to six employees and more vehicles. Ms. Kendall asked about future growth plans. Lisa Steadman stated there was a significant number of employees when the business was purchased in 2003 (there were 10 full time year round employees), but the business has decreased in size since then and will remain as such. There is one employee on site on a regular basis. Work crews are off site doing work. Ms. Kendall mentioned parking for employees is not allowed in the front yard. Matt Palmer pointed out frontage is defined as the boundary of the lot along the public road. If the parking is maintained behind the house then the issue of parking in the front yard is eliminated. Ms. Steadman said there are six parking spaces by the shop for temporary parking (to drop off equipment or to mow the lawn).

STAFF REPORT

There was no report from staff.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Jane Stowell, Martel Extension, said the original letter from the Steadmans, dated 9/30/03, stated there will be no outside storage and they will be very conscientious to keep the property neat and clean. This has not been the case, stated Ms. Stowell. The site was cleaned up for the recent site visit, but the Steadmans are trying to hide items rather than remove them, and that is a concern. The building is by the road so it is unlikely they will park by the house. Plowing will be required and there is mud so it is likely they will not continue to park there. The site is in view from the boundary line, continued Ms. Stowell. The north portion can be seen from Martel Extension. The back up beeper on the skid steer can be heard (Ms. Mastro asked if the back up beeper on the trucks can be turned off, but the consensus was that this safety feature should remain). The Steadmans were approached about the condition of the yard and the drivers, continued Ms. Stowell, but nothing was done until the town stepped in. There is great concern the situation will return to what it was. The area is residential, not commercial, and should remain as such. After the clean up that has taken place the site looks the way it did when the Steadmans moved in, continued Ms. Stowell, adding it is nice not to have to drive around trucks on the road in the morning and night. Photographs of the way the site appeared in the past were shown. Lisa Steadman said she personally was not contacted about the issues under

discussion except by Ray Martel. The concerns are valid, conceded Ms. Steadman, adding she does not want the place to be untidy and a good faith effort is being made to appease everyone. Ms. Steadman stated her intention to keep the place nice, but reminded parking is allowed and the mulcher can be outside for a few days at a time. There will not be cars on blocks. Ms. Steadman said they are no different from anyone else in the neighborhood and want the matter resolved for the long term.

Rick Solomon, Martel Lane, stated the issue is whether a commercial enterprise belongs on Martel Road no matter what the place looks like. The Steadmans signed protective covenants to keep the area residential. Scott Baker pointed out the DRB cannot enforce homeowner association covenants, only town zoning bylaws.

Tom Walsh, representing the Stowells, stated the DRB can look at the covenants and the use relative to meeting the character of the area. Marie Mastro noted the DRB has not received a copy of the covenants, but will consider them if received. Mr. Walsh said he will submit a copy to the DRB. Mr. Walsh mentioned the letter dated 6/30/09 regarding the home occupation and no exterior storage being visible from the boundary of the property. Regarding conditional use review, the property is in the Limited Development District and the use does not match the conditional use criteria for the district, said Mr. Walsh.

Chris LeBlanc, Martel Lane, said he has a home business. Mr. LeBlanc said he has witnessed landscaping trailers daily on the road. There are three trucks that are not labeled “Top Dog” so employees are using their personal vehicles to pull the business trailers. Also, there is a Bond Auto truck going up the road daily. Lisa Steadman testified their trucks are not going up the road daily. There is one truck without the “Top Dog” sticker on the door, but the truck is labeled “Top Dog”. Ms. Steadman said they do not do business with Bond Auto. The mechanic drives a black Jeep Cherokee. Marie Mastro asked the number of home businesses on Martel Extension. It was noted there are 12 lots and four home occupations (LeBlanc, Martel, Thibeault, Steadman). Tom Walsh clarified Ray Martel’s activities with his business have no customers or supplies coming to the house. The Thibeault operation does not have town approval and violates the covenants (unauthorized activity). The Thibeault house is in Williston. Lisa Steadman said Ray Martel’s Christmas tree business in winter generates traffic on the road. Ed Hanson interjected Silvicultural activity is allowed. Connie Kendall referred to Section 825.1 of the regulations relating to home occupations and requiring that the home occupation shall not place an undue burden on the road.

Sue Martel, Martel Extension, stated members of the homeowners association pay fees for road maintenance. The Steadman’s business causes more wear and tear on the road than the other residents yet the cost of maintenance is equally shared. Lisa Steadman said the traffic volume to their house can be documented if necessary. Ms. Steadman reiterated changes have been made that greatly reduce traffic to their house.

MOTION by Marie Mastro, SECOND by Scott Baker, to go into deliberative session for 10 minutes. VOTING: unanimous; motion carried.

Deliberative session was convened at 9:40 p.m. and adjourned at 9:55 p.m. The regular meeting was reconvened. Marie Mastro asked how the contribution from each homeowner is calculated for road maintenance. Jane Stowell said prices for the work that is needed (winter maintenance, grading, gravel) are gathered and the total is divided evenly over the 12 property owners. Marie Mastro asked if there is scheduled maintenance for the road. Ms. Stowell said plowing in winter is done after storms, grading is done as needed and usually at least annually somewhere on the two roads (Martel Road and Martel Extension). Ms. Mastro asked if damage to the road as a result of vehicles going specifically to the Steadman's business has been witnessed. Chris LeBlanc said he has seen skid marks which have been repaired. Ray Martel stated there is wash boarding on the road. The DRB asked if the homeowners association has approached the Steadmans for a greater portion of the contribution for road maintenance than 1/12th. The attendees said this has not occurred to date. There was mention of the back up beeper and the legality of disengaging and operating the vehicle in a public area. The residents noted there are children in the area so the beeper should remain. Dan Pillsbury explained different construction jobs may have different decibel ratings so the noise level can vary. Also, the size of the vehicle is related to the sound of the beeper (larger trucks have a higher level beeper).

Marie Mastro referred to the protective covenants, noting there appear to be three sets which apply. Lisa Steadman clarified the family covenants, lots A, B, C, D, E, F apply. The property title confirms this. Tom Walsh explained the family covenants were created when the Martel family was giving lots to family members. The protective covenants came later. A title search of the Steadman lot needs to be done to confirm which applies because the Steadman lot was part of the family covenant when a Martel family member owned the lot.

Ms. Mastro mentioned the hedge planting. Ms. Steadman agreed to plant a hedge along the raised grassy knoll by the driveway.

Steve Stowell, Martel Extension, mentioned the new area where the Steadman's pick up truck is now being parked was used as a collection area (dump) for debris such as brush and cut trees.

There were no further comments.

DELIBERATION/DECISION

Conditional Use, Home Based Business, Martel Extension (parcel ID#05-20-07), Steadman (#09-3)

Additions to the record include:

- Steadman property title
- Inventory list of equipment owned by the Steadman business
- Protective covenants for the Martel Hill development
- Family covenants for the Martel Hill development

MOTION by Marie Mastro, SECOND by Scott Baker, to close the hearing on the home based business on Martel Extension owned by Lisa and William Steadman (#09-3), and further, the DRB will issue a written decision within 45 days. VOTING: unanimous; motion carried.

Ed Hanson will contact the Secretary of State's Office to confirm the Martel Hill homeowners association is still in existence according to the State of Vermont. The inventory list of equipment owned by the Steadmans and the written decision on the home occupation will be emailed to interested parties.

The DRB discussed the issue of a home occupation being customary in a residential setting. Attorney McLean cited examples where the court ruled in both directions on businesses in residential areas. Scott Baker stressed the need to craft meaningful and enforceable conditions to maintain the area if the home occupation is allowed. Ron Arms stated it is reasonable for some items to be seen outside during the transition between seasons, for instance. Ed Hanson suggested there be no parking between the shop and road or on the road. The Steadman house is situated so the accessory structure (shop) is closer to the road. The front of the shop to Martel Road is the front yard of the property so no parking should be allowed there. Marie Mastro observed the lot is open (no trees) so everything is visible.

Connie Kendall will draft a decision statement on the Steadman application.

4. ZONING ADMINISTRATOR'S UPDATE

Ed Hanson reported on the following:

- The change in meeting date to the first Monday of October, November, and December then return to the original meeting day of the second Wednesday of the month will have to be publicly posted.
- Letter from Ken and Martha Pinkham was received regarding the sketch plan and preservation of natural features. There has been no further activity with the Pinkhams. The Pinkhams were to provide their interpretation of wetlands. Scott Baker suggested the town reply by providing the common usage of the term "preservation" per the Webster Dictionary and clarifying "preserved and managed by the town" is not implied necessarily, but the town is willing to listen to any reasonable proposal.
- Application has been received for a new dwelling in town (Couture).
- Application has not been received from the Bingham (solar panels).

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

July 8, 2009

MOTION by Scott Baker, SECOND by Ron Arms, to approve the 7/8/09 minutes with the following corrections/clarifications:

Globally correct the spelling of "T-Mobile";

Page 1, Applications, 1st paragraph – add quotation marks (") around the words "interested persons";

Page 2, T-Mobile application, Staff Report, 2nd paragraph – insert “cell phone provider” after the word “third”, and in the sentence reading: “Mr. Hanson mentioned the structural analysis...” – insert “with the removal of the extension” after the words “structural report”;

Page 3, T-Mobile application, Staff Report, paragraph beginning “Scott Baker referred to the RF Report, 2nd sentence – change “proposed antennas” to “proposed tower” and add “showing the correct tower” to the end of the last sentence in the paragraph;

Page 3, Public Comments – rewrite sentence to read: “Due to time constraints no public comments were taken.”

Page 4, Steadman application, Applicant Comments, 1st paragraph, sentence reading “Ms. Steadman said they were in the process of transitioning...” – change “the Zoning Administrator did a site visit” to read “the current Zoning Administrator, Ed Hanson, did a site visit”, and in the next sentence change “Mr. Ward” to “Mr. Hanson”;

Page 9, Pinkham application, 1st paragraph, sentence referring to a conference call with Steve Stitzel – change “Steve Stitzel” to “John Klesch”.

VOTING: unanimous [Lisa Beliveau not present for vote]; motion carried.

6. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

7. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Scott Baker, SECOND by Marie Mastro, to adjourn the meeting.

VOTING: unanimous [Lisa Beliveau not present for vote]; motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:43 p.m.

RScty: MERiordan