**MINUTES**

**GILFORD PLANNING BOARD**

**MONDAY**

**APRIL 19, 2021**

**CONFERENCE ROOM A**

**7:00 P.M.**

The Gilford Planning Board met on Monday, April 19, 2021, at 7:00 p.m. in Conference Room A of the Gilford Town Hall, and via telephone and GoToMeeting video conference under emergency order provisions related to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Chair Wayne Hall welcomed everyone, led the Pledge of Allegiance, and read the rules of procedure for the meeting.

Planning Board Members present in Conference Room A were Chair Wayne Hall; Vice-Chair Carolyn Scattergood; Regular Members Jack Landow, William Johnson, and Isaac Howe; and Alternate Members Emily Drake, Gaye Fedorchak, and Rick Notkin. Planning Board Member present on GoToMeeting was Selectmen’s Representative Chan Eddy.

Planning Board Member absent was Secretary Richard Vaillancourt. E. Drake was asked to take the place of R. Vaillancourt as a voting member.

Also, present in Conference Room A were John Ayer, Director of Planning and Land Use, and Sandra Hart, Technical Assistant.

# PUBLIC HEARINGS

W. Hall introduced the first application.

**1.1 Stones Throw Realty, LLC** – Applicant proposes to remove the existing restaurant structure and build a new 5,200 square foot restaurant building with a porch and an open deck for dining to be located over the porch, to repair and pave the parking lot, and to make other related site improvements on property located at 40 Weirs Road on Tax Map & Lot #223-539.000 in the Resort Commercial (RC) Zone, Aquifer Protection District, Island and Shore Frontage District, and Airport District. Site Plan Review. Application #2020000552. *Tabled from the March 15, 2021 meeting.*

Motion made by C. Scattergood, seconded by I. Howe, to take the application off the table. Motion carried with all in favor.

J. Ayer explained that Craig Bailey of Turning Point Land Surveyors and Planners submitted a request to be tabled again to the May 17, 2021 meeting. Motion made by C. Eddy, seconded by C. Scattergood, to table the application to the May 17, 2021 meeting. Motion carried with all in favor.

**1.2 Northeast Self Storage, Inc**. – Applicant proposes an expansion of the existing self-storage/ boat storage facility by constructing an additional two (2) self-storage/boat storage buildings at 184 Old Lakeshore Road, each building being approximately 12,000 square feet in area; by constructing a service road to access all phases of the site; and by making other site-related improvements on the properties located at 184 Old Lakeshore Road on Tax Map & Lot #225-014.000, and at 10 Gilford East Drive on Tax Map & Lot #214-050.000, in the Resort Commercial (RC) Zone, Commercial (C) Zone, Aquifer Protection District, and Airport District. Site Plan Review. Application #2020000640. *Tabled from the March 15, 2021 meeting.*

I. Howe recused himself from this application. R. Notkin was asked to stand in for I. Howe as a voting board member.

Motion made by C. Scattergood, seconded by R. Notkin, to take the application off the table.

Motion carried with all in favor.

Presentation

Jon Rokeh of Rokeh Consulting, LLC, was present on behalf of the applicant. Also present were Attorney John Cronin and applicant Richard Letendre. J. Rokeh said that they got their Alteration of Terrain comments back and they are trying to turn everything back into the State tomorrow. J. Rokeh presented a revised landscape/buffer plan showing the entrance, area of preserved trees, and the location of the additional plantings. He said the trees have all been ordered that they are proposing to add. J. Rokeh said they have gone to the two abutters directly next to them and one of them said that she was happy with the buffer that exists right now and he presented a letter to that effect from the owner. He said they were unable to get ahold of the actual property owner of the other house.

J. Rokeh said there was an issue brought up with regard to dust pollution on the site. He said they are trying to close up the site up and so they have planted grass seed, and slopes are loamed and seeded. He said one other thing they did last week was to crush the last remaining pile of rocks that needed to be crushed. They did that in one afternoon and now there are no more rocks to be crushed on site. J. Rokeh said there shouldn’t be much more of an issue with the dust and noise with regard to that.

J. Rokeh said that another thing brought up at the last meeting was the pitch of the roof. He said that it has to stay at the height and pitch it is currently shown at because if they increased the pitch to a 5/12 pitch they would have to lower the roof around the eaves and that would affect the inside around the edges and they’ll end up losing the entire upper level of storage. The building height could not be increased to accommodate the steeper pitch because it is at the maximum height allowed.

C. Scattergood asked about the building and what it would look like. J. Rokeh said that this is proposed to be a red building with white doors and trim, and a black roof.

J. Cronin said that he’s been at the last few meetings. Most of the issues have been engineering and some talk about the design standards. He said he’s been working on how is this going to work. He did some research and went back to 2016 and it shows that these two buildings that are going to be built are like the two buildings that were already built, and there’s been no secret about that. The Zoning Board of Adjustment granted the special exception for this use knowing what the buildings would look like. To his knowledge it seems that there have been no issues with the buildings that are there. J. Cronin said that when you look at Article 17 of the Gilford Zoning Ordinance, it appears that this has been on the books for a while. When looking at this property and right on the same road you have a Bank of NH operations center building, a home furnishing store, heading up the road you have a lumber yard, storage buildings, coffee shop, hair salon, tax accountant, car detailing, etc. This proposal fits that location and even the ZBA agreed with that. He said that the time to have raised some of these issues would have been several years ago when this first started like back in 2016. He said that he understands how being on the Planning Board is a difficult job, but this is something the lake community really needs, an indoor storage facility. He said that if the Board chooses to deny this, we would like to have findings regarding that.

J. Ayer said that Article 17 was created before he began working for the town in 2001. J. Landow said that the buffer is what he still has a problem with.

Public Input

W. Hall asked if there were any members of the public wishing to speak.

Andrew Howe, abutter, of 300 Gunstock Hill Road, said that he lives across the road. He said that they haven’t been opposed to the use, because the use is allowed, but they are trying to lessen the impact on the neighborhood on his side of the road. He said it occurred to him with a point of order as he was reviewing the case that the original site plan was actually approved conditionally and one of the conditions was a buffer. The original approval was conditional on the buffer, and there isn’t a buffer. A. Howe said anything that can be done that makes the building look less like a box is great, but he wants the buffer because that will protect them from the wind and the noise. He said it’s startling the difference from before work began on the site to today and it’s been 4-5 years of this going on. He said the buffer will be for the future to protect them from all that goes on at that property. It’s a conditional approval and he said he doesn’t think that they should do anything until the condition is met.

J. Ayer said that the original site plan had a buffer requirement but that the Board decided to approve the as-built site plan with the buffer as it was and require that the applicant address completing and improving the buffer with this application when it was submitted. J. Ayer also explained the proposed conditions of approval he included with the possible motion in the staff report, one of which proposes to require that the buffer be planted prior to a building permit being issued for either building.

J. Rokeh said based on what A. Howe just said with regard to everything that had been presented before, there would have been half the trees planted that are now proposed to be planted, but by the applicant coming come back to this meeting there will be a lot more trees. There will be evergreen trees staggered back and forth and at an angle and all the gaps will get filled in.

J. Cronin said that D. Letendre wasn’t sure when the mature trees will be coming in and be available for planting, so he would like to know if they could modify that motion with regard to the buffer so it would require planting the buffer prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy instead.

W. Hall closed the public hearing portion of this application and introduced the next application.

I. Howe returned as a voting board member.

**1.3 Dave Farley** – Applicant is proposing to construct a two (2) bedroom apartment/single-family residence in the existing commercial building where a retail showroom, repair shop, and business office are already located, and to make various site changes as shown on an as-built site plan on property located at 1985 Lake Shore Road on Tax Map & Lot #223-535.000, in the Resort Commercial (RC) Zone and Aquifer Protection District. Amended Site Plan Review. Application #2021000030. *Tabled from the March 15, 2021 meeting*.

Motion made by C. Scattergood, seconded by I. Howe, to take the application off the table. Motion carried with all in favor.

Presentation

Applicant David Farley was present to discuss the application. D. Farley noted the recent on-site meeting and said there was discussion with regard to drainage, parking, storage, etc. He said that he would like to finalize this application. He said the fire alarm is fully functional and has a Knox box and key, so that’s all set. He said he needs to get his parking striped. He explained that there was a lot of stuff on the site when they first purchased the property and that he moved the trailers that were onsite to use them for storage and recently painted them. There has been a lot of work done to make the property look nicer that it was. D. Farley submitted pictures showing drainage issues. He said he would like to create a curbing low to the ground to the point of the property pin, and create an edge, which would corral 100% of stormwater.

J. Ayer explained the application before the Planning Board is to review the as-built plan and to allow the apartment as an additional part of the site. The changes being proposed would need a separate application for an amended site plan at a later time. D. Farley replied that he would like to complete whatever is necessary to complete this original site plan. J. Ayer said that he has suggested some possible conditions of approval. The Planning Board looked at the original site plan which showed parking of vehicles and equipment in the back that now has outdoor storage, and there are some other differences on the site. Board members expressed concern over some of these things so we had a site visit and everyone was able to look at the site. J. Ayer said the parking needs to be striped and D. Farley said he would review the actual uses on site and see if the parking requirements table should be revised. An apartment requires two parking spaces that should be labeled for apartment use only. There was a condition of approval with the original site plan to remove the storage trailers. Painting and repurposing them for storage onsite is creative, but is it ok? Does it work? The Board would need to answer that. He said the drainage should also be addressed.

C. Scattergood said that in the past and over the years the Board has required an engineer to look at things for the Board which it questioned. She said she also heard the applicant comment concerning having the planning office design the parking requirements and she said she doesn’t know that she thinks the applicant should do that. It’s not our responsibility to determine how many parking spaces they would need, that’s part of the research of the applicant. It comes to us as a plan showing parking, how many are needed, and where they are normally. The last thing is the apartment and she said she doesn’t know who would rent it, but if a child is involved there has to be someplace outside for a child to play.

G. Fedorchak suggested some sort of a fence around the area would be essential for life safety, if they are renting to children.

D. Farley said that Jon Rokeh did the engineering on this and that he could have him take a look at it and attest to its functionality. He said he doesn’t need water problems. He also said that they only have two or three employees onsite who would need parking and that the parking is based on square footage. Even though the building has a lot of square footage, there isn’t a need for those additional parking spaces. He said he would need the two parking spaces for the apartment. He said he understands the concern of renting to families with children, that children are explorers and he said he will do his best to make sure they would be safe. He said he doubts that this location would attract people that have children.

J. Landow said that he thought D. Farley was going to have a retail business there as well. D. Farley said that is the goal as they go forward. Discussion ensued regarding parking.

D. Farley said that they’re trying to get out of the boat supply business completely. The goal is to have more of a showroom, which he explained.

J. Landow said that there was a list of items that might be junk. D. Farley said that some things have been removed, and they’ve been poring through the list. J. Landow said that this stuff has to go. D. Farley said that he has interest in making room, so he’s been going through the list. He said they want to utilize the stuff that has value such as tires.

W. Johnson asked if the trailer storage is maxed out. D. Farley said it is and the goal would be to remove the trailers and build a very large building to store everything instead.

J. Ayer said that the as built plan doesn’t show any parking and the parking is not striped on the site and some of the site couldn’t be striped because there are materials stored in the way. J. Ayer said D. Farley was concerned that the number of parking spaces required is well beyond what is needed. He said the parking table on the site plan showed various uses which D. Farley said were going to be on site. If that table doesn’t accurately describe what D. Farley is doing there then the table needs to be changed. He said that retail requires more parking than other uses.

## Public Input

W. Hall asked if there were any members of the public who wished to speak.

Attorney Stephan Nix was present representing the property owners directly abutting this property at East Coast Welding. He said that there are several issues. First it’s premature to approve this, even conditionally. There are many outstanding issues here. One issue is the two plans that are on file are different. The approved site plan from 2014 shows a well that is actually on his client’s property. He said his clients would like to make sure that the boundary is corrected. They also would like to see topo on the site plan. The parking requirements per Article 7 are not met. He said the requirement is for the site plan to show all parking proposed. A statement of existing land uses and a table showing parking should be added. That’s in the Gilford Zoning Ordinance and it’s not something the Board can waive. S. Nix said they are raising these concerns so that they can be straightened out.

S. Nix said that it sounds like what is happening on this property is more like a construction yard. He read the definition to everyone and said it fits the description of a construction yard. He said this application was approved in 2014 for retail sales, and now all of a sudden retail sales is not important. It would be nice to narrow down what is happening at this location. S. Nix stated that his client does have a welding company that’s been there for 20 years, and pointed out that he works on weekends and he doesn’t want to deal with complaints from whoever ends up renting the apartment.

J. Ayer said he agrees that this site is currently functioning as a construction yard, but it’s not a permitted use in the zone.

With no further comments from the public W. Hall closed the public hearing and introduced the next application.

**1.4 A to Z Fitness, LLC** – Applicant proposes to amend the site plan for the Gilford Hills Tennis and Fitness Club to add two (2) new outdoor U12 sized (210’ x 135’) soccer fields to the site. The proposal includes a request for a Conditional Use Permit, pursuant to Section 15.5.2 of the Gilford Zoning Ordinance, to allow excavation and/or filling within the 25 foot wetland buffer. The property is located at 314 Old Lake Shore Road on Tax Map & Lot #224-068.000 in the Resort Commercial (RC) Zone and Aquifer Protection District. Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit Review. Application #2021000083. *(This item was not heard at the March 15, 2021 meeting due to a noticing issue.)*

J. Ayer explained that there was an issue with the abutter’s notification at the previous meeting and this item had to be re-noticed. He also said that the application was complete and ready to be accepted.

I. Howe recused himself and R. Notkin was asked to stand in for him as a voting board member.

Motion made by J. Landow, seconded by C. Eddy, to accept the application as complete. Motion carried.

Presentation

Chris Nadeau, PE, with Nobis Group was present to explain the application. He explained that they are looking to build two practice soccer fields behind the existing building. They will be clearing some trees and leveling off the area. He said that in 2019 there was some fill put in the wetlands and that an after-the-fact permit was done and approved by the NH DES Wetlands Bureau. He explained that they need to restore the wetland buffer and would be seeking a condition use permit for that. C. Nadeau said the plan is to eventually build indoor soccer fields which he said is shown on the proposed plan C-3 as a Phase II, but they are not seeking approval of Phase II at this time. They will return for separate approval if they decide to move forward with Phase II. He said these fields won’t be used for kid’s games, so there won’t be any spectators, but may be rented to adult leagues for practice and that’s really it. C. Nadeau said the site is located in the aquifer protection overlay district. He said that the wetlands were filled without a permit, so they made a mistake and now they would like to restore the area and create a buffer.

J. Ayer asked if the area shown in red is the wetland buffer. C. Nadeau said it is. J. Ayer said that DPW Director, Meghan Theriault, PE, expressed a number of concerns which she submitted in a packet which everyone should have. C. Nadeau said that they addressed the majority of those concerns and they will need to have a site visit with the Public Works Director. C. Nadeau also said that there were a lot of dead trees that were cleared out from this area.

C. Scattergood wanted to know if this proposal would need additional parking. C. Nadeau said that the existing facility at peak only fills the parking at 50%, so the existing parking is really underutilized. They are expecting that only 14 people or so will be coming to use the soccer fields. They have 112 parking spaces currently on site. J. Ayer said that in his opinion, they need one (1) space for each employee and then one (1) space for every four (4) person design capacity.

J. Ayer said that there is no parking requirements table provided on the plan. He said the Zoning Ordinance allows the Board to approve shared parking typically if the two uses won’t be happening at the same time, under Section 7.2, Shared Parking. Discussion ensued. J. Landow said that the uses would happen most likely at the same time, so it’s not like one is during the day and one is at night. J. Ayer agreed but said that some offset may help and the Board could monitor it for a short time to see if it works or not.

C. Nadeau said that he agrees that these uses will probably be around the same time and that they will have enough parking. He said they tried to do the calculation, but they just couldn’t get it to work with regard to the site. He then described the site for everyone.

C. Nadeau said that there is no plan to light the soccer fields.

C. Scattergood said parking information should be provided on each plan, and the Board needs to be consistent with that so it’s clear how they come up with the required number of parking spaces. J. Ayer said that the main use applied here would be Club use. C. Nadeau said that the use of the fields will be limited to members of the club or guests. He said they can look at a reasonable parking calculation and come up with a number that is factual. C. Nadeau said that the only occupancy rating is for the lounge and they can definitely come up with parking for this and come back to the board with that information.

Public Input

W. Hall asked if there were any members of the public who wished to speak.

A. Howe said that he has a few concerns. He said that he is not an abutter, but he does lease the abutting property. He was wondering if there was any buffer proposed. J. Ayer noted that there is no requirement for a buffer.

A. Howe said that this property abuts conservation land where there is active farming and forestry.

That land is abutting over 700 acres and it’s a place for all kinds of wildlife and he farms near this area. He said he would suggest that the applicant put up a fence around this area. He said there are some real significant wetlands in this area. He said he would ask for them to leave trees there to protect the conservation area. A. Howe said when he drives by this area around 2-3 AM there are lights on which seem to constitute a nuisance, and he asked why the lights are on at that time. A. Howe asked if the board would please consider the abutters and the wildlife because it’s a really sensitive area and at the very least he would like to make sure the proposed activity stays in the area provided.

S. Nix said that he represents an abutter, Heidi Kephart, and that they have a list of concerns, many of which the board has brought already. He said that the use is for a club, but the description is more like outdoor amusement (he read the definition). He said this is a sports center under that use. S. Nix said the fields may be leased to adult teams, therefore it wouldn’t be a club. He said this is an outdoor amusement which would require a special exception. He said another thing is the parking. He agreed that there is a very large parking lot and, as a former member of the club, he knows that the parking is never full, but the plan should provide a parking requirements table.

S. Nix said the plans don’t show the abutting structures and noted that everything stops at the property line. He noted that the applicant said that he has not spoken to the Department of Public Works and he wondered how drainage concerns would be addressed and how the stormwater was going to be maintained. He also asked about toilets which are not proposed on the plan. He asked where people will find bathroom facilities. Will everyone be going in and out of the club, or are there going to be portable toilets? He said they would also request that if there will be no lighting of the fields, they would like to have a time certain established for field use to end.

S. Nix said that H. Kephart has pointed out a well that is close to the property line and she is concerned as to how the proposed soccer fields are going to be maintained and fertilized. He said they would like to see it in writing. S. Nix brought up Section 6.5 regarding buffers. He said this section discusses requiring a 50 foot buffer next to a residential use in a residential zone, and he said since this zone allows residential uses he would submit that it is a residential zone and said some type of design with a buffer would be great. S. Nix also said that there may be folks going to watch the practices. Are they going to stand and if so where will they stand. He said from a practical standpoint there is always going to be someone there, whether it’s a wife or kid or whatever. S. Nix said he wanted it to be clear that Phase II is not part of this proposal tonight. He said they would like to see the operational plan. He asked how emergency vehicles are going to get to people on the fields. He also asked if there will be a new door on the building to more easily access the fields.

J. Ayer said the buffer regulations were changed to allow commercial uses in commercial zones, such as the Resort Commercial zone, to operate without a requirement for a buffer along a boundary line within the zone. He said the thought was that someone living in a residence in a commercial zone should expect to have a commercial use next door which should be able to operate without a buffer unless it is abutting a residential zone.

S. Nix said that they would appreciate if the applicant were to propose a reasonable screening.

Isaac Howe of 264 Old Lake Shore Road said that he is an abutter to this property. He said that generally they consider Gilford Hills as part of the community and that he grew up going there. He said it’s a diverse club and they like it. He said they purchased their property five years ago and they knew what was there. He said their biggest concern with this proposal is the wetlands. He said they couldn’t picture it without the wetlands in that area. I. Howe said in the packet that the board was given to look at the plan that shows the blue lines on it from the Public Works Director. He said the site is at the bottom of Meeting House Hill which is a steep hill and the effect is that a tremendous amount of water that that steep slope sheds is phenomenal. I. Howe referred to three different culverts in that area and that there is already a tremendous amount of water in that area. Anybody who has driven there can see how washed out it is. He said that there is a reason that the aquifer in this area is protected. He said Belknap County is considered a wet county in NH. I. Howe said that the applicant mentioned the trees being dead by water damage and added that that is what happens when you have a lot of water – it kills off the trees.

I. Howe displayed a 2014 plan done by Craig Bailey that was available in the Planning Office and showed how different the wetlands delineated in 2014 are from those delineated in the current application. He said the plans that were submitted with this proposal only show a small amount of wetlands. He said the fact that they are so different raises concerns. He recommended that the Board go on a site walk. He said there is an area that has been filled with gravel and those wetlands are all gone. He said that this is concerning for him. Soccer fields are great, but there are other playing fields less than a mile from this property that are free to use.

W. Hall closed the public hearing and introduced the next application. I. Howe rejoined the Board.

**1.5 PEM Real Estate, LLC –** Applicant proposes to amend the original site plan approved on 9/21/20 to reconfigure and reduce the size of the proposed Storage/Warehouse Building from 9,630 square feet to 9,076 square feet, and to eliminate phased development of the site. No other changes to the original site design for roads, water, sewer, or stormwater drainage are proposed. Property is located at 351 Hounsell Avenue on Tax Map & Lot #204-003.007 in the Industrial (I) Zone, Aquifer District, and Business Park District. Amended Site Plan Review. Application #2021000155.

J. Ayer said that the application was complete and ready to be accepted. Motion made by C. Eddy, seconded by E. Drake, to accept the application. Motion carried with all in favor.

Presentation

Peter Howard of Steven J. Smith and Associates was present to represent PEM Real Estate LLC. He explained that this is a minor change from a previous approval. He said all they are proposing is a change in the building footprint. P. Howard said the outline of the new building is 9,076 square feet. He said the plan shows an overlay of both the old and new building proposals to illustrate the change. There will be some minor adjustments to the drainage, but basically they are making the building a little bit different and that’s all they are here for. He also said that they are no longer doing the phasing as well.

J. Ayer said that an earlier condition of approval would not apply anymore because of the changes that have taken place. He said the new plans address those conditions.

## Public Input

W. Hall asked if there were any members of the public who wished to speak. Hearing none W. Hall closed the public hearing and introduced the next application.

**1.6 Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless –** Applicant proposes to install an FCC Licensed, 150 foot tall Personal Wireless Service Facility (“PWSF”) radio tower (a monopole cell tower with antennas) and accessory ground equipment (includes a diesel back-up power generator) pursuant to the plans, statement, and supporting materials incorporated into and made part of the application, on property located at 1328 Cherry Valley Road on Tax Map & Lot #271-002.100 in the Limited Residential (LR) Zone, Natural Resource Residential (NRR) Zone, and Wetlands District. Site Plan Review. Application #2021000156.

J. Ayer said that the application was complete and ready to be accepted. He noted that the applicant has requested waivers on this application that will need to be reviewed. Motion made by I. Howe, seconded by C. Scattergood, to accept the application as complete subject to the waivers. Motion carried with all in favor.

Presentation

Carl Gehring of Gehring & Associates, LLC, representing the applicant, stated that he had a letter from the property owner that he would like to submit for the record. C. Gehring then went through the several tabs in the application binder that he had submitted. He said that they received approval from the Zoning Board of Adjustment for a special exception. He explained that the general process of construction is to dig out a cellar hole for base of the monopole, fill in the foundation with a lot of steel reinforced concrete, bolt the monopole to that, and then add the antennas. He said there is no water or sewer and there is less activity than a residence.

C. Gehring reviewed the waivers they were requesting under Tab 2 in the binder. He said they are leasing a very small portion of the lot which includes rights of access. He said they will be using the same driveway and path that is currently there. He said it’s an easy site to use and they will improve the path so they can access their cell tower site with the least impact possible.

C. Gehring referred to Tab 7 which discusses how low power this cell site will be. He said the FAA came back with no issues and said this is not in a flight path, so they don’t even need a flashing light. He said Tab 9 discusses the generator which he reviewed. Under Tab 10 there is a real estate appraiser evaluation stating that property values will not be negatively affected. Under Tab 11 is a wetlands report. He said they hired a wetland scientist who delineated two wetlands but noted that they will not be with any of those, including the Prime Wetland which appears to be on the neighboring property.

C. Gehring said Tab 12 is the stormwater report which shows they will improve stormwater treatment. Tab 13 is a photo-stimulation. He said they floated a balloon and then went around and took photos to show different views as to where you might be able to see the future antennas. Tab 14 is a site plan & the elevation drawings showing the property.

C. Eddy asked if this is will provide 4G service. C. Gehring said it will. C. Eddy asked how many carriers could they have and C. Gehring replied that they show capacity for four antenna colocations.

I. Howe asked about the color. C. Gehring said that they thought that a bland gray would blend in and be most versatile. He said it’s not a lattice type tower like the one on top of Gunstock.

## Public Input

W. Hall asked if there were any members of the public who wished to speak.

Gretchen, who lives in the area, said that both she and her husband have issues with dropped calls in that area. She said they also have a small camp on Diamond Island and there are issues getting service there. She thought that this would be a good opportunity to improve the cell service, not only for residents but business owners, visitors, etc.

With no other members of the public wishing to speak, W. Hall closed the public hearing.

He asked what the members wanted to do because it is just about 10 PM.

Motion made by C. Eddy, seconded by C. Scattergood, to reconvene to next Monday, April 26th. Motion carried.

Motion made by J. Landow, seconded by I. Howe, to table all of the items to the April 26th meeting. Motion carried.

# ADJOURNMENT

Motion made by C. Scattergood, seconded by J. Landow, to adjourn the meeting at 10:05 p.m. Motion carried with all in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandra Hart, Secretary