

MINUTES
LEWIS COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
September 19, 2024

- (1) **Call to Order:** Chairman Petersen called the regular meeting of the Lewis County Planning Board to order at 2:30 PM in the conference room on the 2nd floor of the Lewis County Court House, Lowville, New York. Mr. Petersen requested a roll call.
- (2) **Roll Call:**
Board Members Present: Timothy Petersen, Eric Virkler, Sarah Metott, Thomas Osborne, and Larry Dolhof (Non-voting member).
Staff Present: Megan Krokowski, Community Development Specialist
Public Present: Clyde Cooke, NRCIL
- (3) **Reading and Approval of Minutes:** The draft July 18, 2024 meeting minutes were received and reviewed before the meeting. Mr. Virkler motioned to approve the minutes; Ms. Metott seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.
- (4) **Correspondence and Communication:**
Ms. Krokowski reviewed the following communications received from the APA:
APA Project No. 2024-0168: Conditional Approval | Permit Issued
Roger and Lori Westerman, Single-family dwelling and accessory barn, Moose River Road, Town of Lyonsdale.
APA Project No. 2024-0202: Certificate for Certain Minor Regulated Activities in APA Jurisdictional Freshwater Wetlands
NYSDEC, Replacement of two existing 12” culverts, Bryant Bridge Road, Town of Diana
APA Project No. 2024-0237: Application Received
David Sly, Two-lot subdivision, Partridgeville Road, Town of Greig

No comments were proposed for submission to the APA

- (5) **Report of Officers:** None

- (6) **Report of Special Committees:**

239-M Review

Ms. Krokowski read the following review:

TOWN OF DENMARK ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS AND PLANNING BOARD

Special Use Permit and Area Variance for a 184’ self-supporting communications tower located on the Merz Road in the Town of Denmark.

Tax Map Parcel #127.00-01-15.110

St. Lawrence Seaway RSA Cellular Partnership – Applicant

The applicant provided the following Project Documentation: 1) General Municipal Referral Form; 2) Agricultural Data Statement; 3) Statement of Intent; 4) Town of Demark Application for an Area Variance and Special Use Zoning Permit; and 5) Long Environmental Assessment (LEAF) Form.

- **Compatibility with Adjacent Uses:**

The submitted General Municipal Referral Form notes that the project is in the AR-2 Zone, which is defined as Agricultural, Residential, Commercial. The submitted FEAF indicated that rural, agricultural, and commercial land uses occur near the proposed action, which is consistent with Article II § 205. This action would most closely be defined as a telecommunications tower/antenna, which according to Article IV § 405, would require a Special Use Permit; however, the definition and zoning requirements for this use are not defined in the rest of the zoning law, which is prompting an Area Variance given the proposed structure height.

According to the submitted Agricultural Data Statement, the proposed use is on a property with boundaries within 250 feet of two (2) farm operations located in Agricultural District 6. Page 4 of the Statement of Intent indicates the road frontage along **NY-26** is 34'; however, the proposed project is not located on NY-26. As part of this review, the applicant was notified of the discrepancy and will be updating this section to reflect the correct road frontage, Merz Road, in the documents.

Should the ZBA grant the requested area variance for building height, road setback and front setback, per Article IV § 410, the above dimensional requirements appear to be met.

While Article IV §405 allows 'Telecommunication Tower/Antenna' uses in all zones with a Special Use Permit, this use is not defined in the Town of Denmark's Zoning Law, which creates interpretation concerns. The following categories are listed in Article IV § 410: dwelling-single family, dwelling-two family, mobile home-single, mobile home-double wide, nonresidential, and accessory structure. Some could interpret the proposed use as not permitted in any of the zones while others could interpret that setbacks do not apply as they are not listed. At the very least, the Town Board should consider modifying the code for further clarity of the intention of the law relative to telecommunications towers/antennas.

Requirements	Non-Residential Use	Proposed
Maximum Building Height	35'	184'*
Min. Area for Structure	2 Acres	27.5 acres
Min. Lot Frontage	200'	3,151'
Min. Structure Setback County/Town Road	50'	34'*
Min. Front YD Setback	200'	34'*
Min. Side YD Setback	30'	36'
Min. Rear YD Setback	30'	250'

*Area variance under review

- *Traffic Generation and Effect:*
According to the submitted FEAF, the applicant has determined the proposed action will not result in a substantial increase in traffic above present levels. A 12-foot-wide gravel access driveway on Merz Road is proposed for egress/ingress; therefore, the Town Highway Department should be consulted prior to the issuance of a permit.

- *Protection of Community Character:*
As noted in the provided FEAF, the applicant has identified that the proposed action is not located in, nor does it adjoin a state-listed Critical Environmental Area. Lewis County currently contains no identified National Natural Landmark designations, no coastal boundaries, or coastal management areas. The IPAC report identified the candidate species Monarch Butterfly. While conducting construction activities, all should be mindful not to disturb protected species, habitats, or populations. According to the Environmental Review Mapper, a federally regulated wetland and check zone were identified at the rear of the parcel for the proposed project.

According to the submitted FEAF, the applicant has indicated that the project is not in a designated sensitive area; however, according to the NY State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the site is located in an archaeological buffer area. Consultation with SHPO should occur before the issuance of any Town approvals.

The EAF also noted the following:

- Federal Waters-(2.11 acres), and Stream 805-107 C
- Principal Aquifer
- Ag District 6

Principal aquifers are afforded special protection by regulations governing the siting of landfills, oil and gas wells, and tire stockpiles and are required to consult with the Division of Water (DOW). Given the project scope, consultation with the EPA or DOW would not be required as the project site is approximately 7.68 miles away from the Tug Hill Glacial Aquifer SSA and the proposed use does not have special regulatory provisions as mentioned previously.

- *Signage:*
Small signs (approximately 1' x1') containing emergency contact information required by the FCC are the only signs proposed for this project, which will be attached to the proposed shelter or the compound fence. This appears to comply with Section 985 Signs, General Standards (All Zones).

- *Drainage:*
According to the Environmental Review Mapper (ERM) and the FEAF, the proposed action will be on a property with identified Federal Wetlands of approximately 2.11 acres and a Class C Stream.

The FEAF noted the ground disturbance will be no more than .31 acres. Being that the ground disturbance is less than 1 acre, a SPEDES permit will not be required.

The FEAF notes that the site is within the 100-year flood zone and proper insurance, considerations and precautions should be taken accordingly; however, when reviewing the Flood Map 360363 B Firm 5, the proposed location appears to be in Zone C, which is defined as “Areas outside 500- year flood.”

- *Parking:*
While Article VIII § 870 lacks standards for Telecommunication Towers/Antennas, given the nature of the use, parking is not necessary as it is an unmanned structure. It is noted that there will be parking available for two to three vehicles as well as a turnaround area. The proposed parking plan appears to be compliant with the intent of Article VIII § 805.
- *Community Facilities:*
Page 3 of the provided application states “*The proposed communication facility is unmanned and will be visited for routine maintenance purposes approximately 1-3 times per year. As such, this project will have no impact on existing water and sewage services.*” Additionally, it was noted that required utilities will be run underground adjacent to the access driveway.
- *Lighting:*
Page 5 of the provided Statement of Intent, the Applicant states “So long as the height of the Telecommunications Tower is at or below 200 ft. above ground level, Applicant believes that no tower markings and/or lighting will be required under Federal Aviation Administration rules and regulations.” It appears that the Town of Denmark Zoning Code does not specify lighting requirements other than within Article VI § 665.B.9 or for specific non-applicative uses.
- *Landscaping and Screening:*
The applicant provided minimalistic landscaping utilizing existing vegetation. The submitted plans note that the proposed tower will be secured with a 56’x57’x6’ chain link safety fence with 1 foot of barbed wire on the top.

The Board shall determine if the proposal has satisfied Article VI § 605 D and § 660 or if additional landscaping and/or screening may be provided to complement the site and surrounding aesthetics.

A viewshed analysis and visual impact considerations were conducted regarding the proposed project. The analysis noted that there are no suitable existing towers or other structures of sufficient height within the search area to provide the necessary level of service so construction of a new telecommunication tower is required. The proposed placement is over 500’ from adjoining residential structures and is a significant distance from public roads (County and State) and the natural screening and topography provide

concealment. The self-supported tower design is proposed to allow future co-locating of additional carriers and equipment.

Recommendation: Approve with the following Conditions

1. A 12-foot-wide gravel access driveway on Merz Road is proposed for egress/ingress; therefore, the Town Highway Department should be consulted prior to the issuance of a permit.
2. The FEAF notes that the site is within the 100-year flood zone, and proper insurance, considerations and precautions should be taken accordingly; however, when reviewing the Flood Map 360363 B Firm 5, the proposed location appears to be in Zone C, which is defined as “Areas outside 500-year flood.”
3. According to the submitted FEAF, the applicant has indicated that the project is not in a designated sensitive area; however, according to the NY State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) the site is located in an archaeological buffer area. Consultation with SHPO should occur before the issuance of any Town approvals.
4. The ZBA must determine if an area variance will be granted for building height, road setback and front setback, per Article IV § 410.
5. The Board shall determine if the proposal has satisfied Article VI Section 605 D and Section 660 or if additional landscaping and or screening may be provided to complement the site and surrounding aesthetics.
6. Site plans should be sent by the applicant to Cathy Fahsel at the Fort Drum Plans, Analysis & Integration Office to rule out any potential interference with Fort Drum military base.
7. Compliance with all Local, State, and Federal regulatory requirements for this type of facility and the products stored.

Non-Binding Notes:

- A) The Town should consider reviewing the definition of Essential Facilities and consider whether telecommunication towers/antennas should be added therein or if they should have a standalone definition, which would also exclude them from the **building** maximum height requirement of 35’.
- B) The Board should consider if the height restriction intent is solely for buildings or if structures should be added. Currently, the law states that the height restriction is applicable for buildings as defined as “*Shelter having a roof supported by column or walls and intended for the shelter or enclosure of persons, animals, or property*” unless specific to solar, or wind.
- C) The Town should consider adding a definition for nonresidential use as used in Section 410 especially if the intent is to use this as a catch-all for all other uses.

Correspondence from James LaValle was received with evidence that correspondence has been initiated with Fort Drum and an updated FEAF has been provided to address recommendations 2 and 6. It was agreed that both items should be removed from the recommendations.

With no further discussion, Ms. Metott motioned to approve with all conditions except #2 and #6, with the proposed non-binding notes. Mr. Osborne seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Ms. Krokowski then read the next review:

TOWN OF MARTINSBURG PLANNING BOARD AND ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

Special Use Permit | Area Variance to install a 199’ wireless communications facility near 6504 Borkowski Road in the Town of Martinsburg.

Tax Map Parcel: #226.00-01-30.200

St. Lawrence Seaway RSA Cellular Partnership – Applicant

The applicant provided the following Project Documentation: 1) FEAF; 2) General Municipal Referral Form with Agricultural Data Statement; 3) Statement of Intent; and 4) Application for Special Use Permit, Site Plan Review, and Rosenberg variance.

▪ *Compatibility with Adjacent Uses:*

The proposed action is identified in the Rural Residential Zone (RR) but the parcel is also within the Forest Zone (F), this should be considered if any location changes occur to the site plan. According to Article III § 240-8, the Rural Residential Zone is an area with low population density and good road access. According to § 240-14, the proposed Wireless Telecommunication Facility use is allowed within the Rural Residential Zone after a Special Use Permit is approved by the Planning Board.

The following dimensional requirements, per Article IV § 240-15, have been met:

	Rural Residential (RR)	
	Required	Proposed
Min. Lot Size	1 acre	95.7 acres
Min. Lot Frontage	200’	>200’
From Road Center Line	60’	228’
Min. Side YD Setback	25’	429’
Min. Rear YD Setback	25’	2,196’

Article IX § 240-66 (4)(b) has further setbacks prohibiting the new wireless communication facility:

- Inside or within 500 feet of a hamlet zoning district.
- Inside or within 500 feet of a special overlay district unless such overlay district specifically provides for regulations governing the siting of wireless communications facilities.
- Inside or within 500 feet of a critical environmental area, as designated under the State Environmental Quality Review Act¹³¹ (SEQR).

The site is not located in an area that would prohibit the proposed use according to Article IX § 240-66 (4)(b).

Article IX § 240-66 (C) further regulates height dimensions, of which the applicant seeks a Rosenberg Variance, a request with justification is documented in Section 3 of the provided Statement of Intent, and the ZBA must determine if an area variance will be granted regarding the proposed height of this structure. The applicant indicates the proposed facility height will also provide colocation space for up to three additional wireless users, which complies with the colocation requirements outlined in Article IX § 240-70(2)(B); however, the applicant should be aware that continued cooperation is also dictated throughout Article IX to sustain well after permits are granted.

The proposed site is not within Ag District No. 6; however, according to the submitted Agricultural Data Statement, there are 3 farming operations within 250 feet of the proposed site. Upon review, the listed farms are not within Ag District 6; therefore, correspondence from the town is not required. The proposed site consists of soils classified as prime farmland; however, the project footprint shouldn't have a substantial impact on the farmland. This action appears to be compatible with the adjacent uses, making it compliant with Article VI §240-43(B1).

Page 2, C.2.a of the FEAF indicates that the Town of Martinsburg does not have a Comprehensive Plan; however, the Town does have said Plan and the FEAF should be updated accordingly.

- *Traffic Generation and Effect:*

According to the submitted FEAF, the applicant has determined that the proposed action will not result in a substantial increase in traffic above present levels.

According to the submitted site plan, the proposed project includes a 12' gravel egress/ingress from Borkowski Road (Town). The applicant shall consult with the Town of Martinsburg Highway Department regarding the proposed driveway. Construction should not commence until a driveway permit is attained to ensure changes to the site plan are not required.

- *Protection of Community Character:*

As noted in the provided FEAF, the applicant has identified that the proposed action is not located in, nor does it adjoin a state-listed Critical Environmental Area. Lewis County currently contains no identified National Natural Landmark designations, coastal boundaries, or coastal management areas. As part of this review, this information was verified through the NYS EAF Mapper portal.

While the proposed site is not considered within critical habitat for threatened or endangered species, the Northern Long-eared Bat, Tricolored Bat, and Monarch Butterfly were identified on the Official Species List

provided by the United States Department of Fish and Wildlife Service. While conducting construction activities, all should be mindful not to disturb protected species, habitats, or populations.

According to the submitted FEAF and the EAF Mapper, the applicant has indicated that the project is not in a designated sensitive area; however, the NYS CRIS mapper contradicted this. Consultation with SHPO should be had prior to the Board's action to ensure there are no findings. If a negative determination cannot be attained, the proposed action will not comply with § 240-68 (B)(1) and should not be approved unless a variance is granted.

- *Signage:*
The submitted referral indicates that the required emergency contact information and RF safety signage will be posted at the gate to the tower yard and/or affixed to the Verizon Wireless equipment platform. No portion of the telecommunication tower or site shall be used for advertising purposes to comply with Telecommunications Law § 260-68(a)(3). Before any Planning Board approval, to comply with Article V § 240-23, the applicant should verify that the signage will not consist of lights that flash or move and is limited to one on-site sign not to exceed 32 square feet per side.

- *Drainage:*
According to the provided FEAF, the property contains one class C stream, Mill Creek/South Branch, and tribs as well as a 1.73-acre freshwater forested/shrub wetland (PFO4/1B); however, according to the Environmental Resource Mapper, the proposed action does not appear to encroach on wetlands. Furthermore, according to the FEMA Floodplain map 360372 B, the site is in Zone C, which is outside the 500-year flood as noted on the FEAF.

The FEAF noted there will be .3 acres of ground disturbance, which does not require a SPDES permit. Should ground disturbance exceed 1 acre, a SPDES permit should be pursued.

- *Parking:*
The proposed action includes a 12' wide gravel driveway, which appears to be appropriate given the nature of the use. According to Article V § 240-24, "No permit or approval shall be issued until the applicant has demonstrated that all uses are provided with adequate off-road parking for all vehicles parked during typical peak use periods. Parking should be designed to eliminate the need to back out onto the public road." The applicant notes that this facility is unmanned and will be visited for routine maintenance approximately 2-3 times per year. Being that there is adequate circulation on site and there will be limited/sporadic parking needs, the proposed action appears to be compliant with Article V § 240-24. The applicant will ensure parking design standards of § 240-68 A(8) are met to the satisfaction of the Planning Board as this section specifically applies to Wireless Communication Facilities.

- **Community Facilities:**

Page 3 of the provided application states that *“The proposed communication facility is unmanned and will be visited for routine maintenance purposes approximately 2-3 times per year. As such, this project will have no impact on existing water and sewage services. In addition, neither pedestrian nor vehicular access will be significantly impacted.”* Additionally, it was noted that required utilities will be run underground adjacent to the access driveway.

The applicant should be aware of Article IX § 240-68 A (9)(b) which states that *“Before commercial transmission begins, the applicant shall acquire certification by a licensed professional engineer that the facility will not exceed the maximum permissible exposure limits for the level of electromagnetic radiation using standards in accordance with the FCC guidelines.”*

- **Lighting:**

According to the submitted FEAF, the site will have a switch-operated LED light fixture attached to the H-Frame at grade, designed to illuminate the area in and around the Verizon equipment only. Given the siting of the equipment, the proposed lighting should not cast negatively into the roadway. The applicant’s lighting proposal seems to comply with Article IX § 240-68 (2), which states, *“Security lighting of equipment structures and other facilities on site shall be shielded from abutting properties. There shall be total cutoff of all such light at the property lines of the parcel to be developed, and footcandle measurements at the property line shall be 0.0 initial footcandles when measured at grade.”*

- **Landscaping and Screening:**

The communication facility will be located within a 75’ x 75’ x 6’ chain link fenced-in area with 3 strands of barbed wire on the top to secure the tower site from unauthorized access, compliance with § 240-40 shall be ensured. The applicant indicates additional landscaping is not necessary to further screen the equipment platform or the lower portions of the tower from view according to Telecommunications Law § 240-68 (A). According to § 240-68 A(6) of the Town of Martinsburg Development Law, Scenic Landscapes and Vistas states *“Wireless communications facilities shall not be located within open areas that are visible from public roads, recreational areas or residential development. All ground-mounted wireless communications facilities **shall be surrounded by a buffer of dense tree growth or shall be camouflaged by design to minimize adverse visual and aesthetic impacts.**”*

An emergency backup generator along with a 10’x12’ structure to store the battery cabinet was included in this site plan. These may be classified as an equipment shelter or accessory structure, depending on the interpretation of the Town of Martinsburg Development Law; however, compliance with Article IX § 240-68 A (4) and/or (5) is required.

A Visual EAF Addendum with visual simulations was not provided; however, the Planning Board may find one necessary to properly evaluate the visual impact of the proposed action.

Article IX § 240-68 A (1) dictates the camouflage standards that do not appear to be met by the proposal and additional considerations must be made by the Planning Board regarding the integration of the landscaping/buffer into the proposal before any approvals are made.

▪ *Termination:*

Section 12 of the Statement of Intent contains a letter to the Town of Martinsburg detailing Verizon's intentions and cooperation, including a reasonable removal bond, the Board/Town Attorney shall ensure compliance with Article IX § 240-68 (A)(10) and (11), respectively, before permit issuance.

Recommendation: Approve with the following Conditions

1. According to the submitted site plan, the proposed project includes a 12' gravel egress/ingress from Borkowski Road (Town). The applicant shall consult with the Town of Martinsburg Highway Department regarding the proposed driveway. If a driveway permit is required by the Town, construction should not commence until a driveway permit is attained to ensure changes to the site plan are not required.
2. Page 2, C.2.a of the submitted FEAF indicates that the Town of Martinsburg does not have a [Comprehensive Plan; however, the Town does have said Plan](#) and the FEAF should be updated accordingly.
3. The applicant will ensure parking design standards of § 240-68 A(8) are met to the satisfaction of the Planning Board as this section specifically applies to Wireless Communication Facilities.
4. While the proposed site is not considered within critical habitat for threatened or endangered species, the Northern Long-eared Bat, Tricolored Bat, and Monarch Butterfly were identified on the Official Species List provided by the United States Department of Fish and Wildlife Service. While conducting construction activities, all should be mindful not to disturb protected species, habitats, or populations.
5. Article IX § 240-66 (C) further regulates height dimensions, of which the applicant seeks a Rosenberg Variance. Section 3 of the provided Statement of Intent formalizes this request and, subsequently, the ZBA must determine if an area variance will be granted regarding the proposed height of this structure.
6. According to the submitted FEAF and the EAF Mapper, the applicant has indicated that the project is not in a designated sensitive area; however, the NYS CRIS mapper contradicted this. Before taking action, the applicant shall consult with SHPO to ensure there are no findings. **If a negative determination cannot be attained, the proposed action will not comply with § 240-68 (B)(1) and should not be approved without a use variance from the ZBA.**
7. The applicant should confirm compliance with the provisions included in Article IX § 240-68 A (9)(b) which states *"Before commercial transmission begins, the applicant shall acquire certification by a licensed professional engineer that the facility will not exceed the maximum permissible exposure limits for the level of electromagnetic radiation using standards in accordance with the FCC guidelines."*

8. An emergency backup generator along with a 10'x12' structure to store the battery cabinet was included in this site plan. These may be classified as an equipment shelter or accessory structure depending on the interpretation of the Town of Martinsburg Development Law; however, compliance with Article IX § 240-68 A (4) and/or (5) is required.
9. Prior to taking action, the Planning Board shall require the applicant to revise the site plan to include suitable landscaping that protects the visual character of the area and minimizes negative impacts on adjacent properties, as required in Article VII § 240-47(F) & (G) and intended by Article IX § 240-68 A (1), which dictates the camouflage standards that do not appear to be met by the proposal.
10. A Visual EAF Addendum with visual simulations was not provided; however, the Planning Board may find it necessary to properly evaluate the visual impact of the proposed action and to ensure compliance with Article IX. It is suggested that a mixture of evergreen trees, low-maintenance shrubs, and mice-repellant plants is between the ROW and eastern gravel accessway, and along the southern and eastern gravel accessways.
11. As noted in Article IX § 240-66 (4)(c), *"It shall be the responsibility of the holder of the special use permit to inform the Town of Martinsburg of any change in or termination of contractual agreements which affect the special use permit within 30 days of such change. Any material change in the conditions under which a special use permit was granted shall result in the immediate termination of the special use permit unless agreement has been obtained from the Planning Board prior to the change"*. Compliance with this section shall be a requirement of the special use permit.

Non-Binding Notes

- A. The proposed site is not within Ag District No. 6, and, according to the submitted Agricultural Data Statement, there are 3 farming operations within 250 feet of the proposed site. Upon review, the listed farms are not within Ag District 6; therefore, correspondence from the town is not required.
- B. Article IX § 240-74 states that *"A special use permit issued for any wireless communications facility shall be valid for five years. At the end of that time period, the wireless communications facility shall be removed by the carrier or a new special use permit shall be required. In reviewing the new application for a special use permit, the Planning Board shall determine whether the technology in the provision of the facility has changed such that the necessity for the permit at the time of its approval has been eliminated or modified, and whether the permit should be modified or terminated as a result of any such change."* The Board should review to evaluate the intent and effectiveness of the permit term limit regarding wireless telecommunication facilities to better reflect the useful life of the structure.
- C. Article IX § 240-71(B) indicates that *"a modification of a wireless communications facility may be considered equivalent to an application for a new facility and will require a special use permit when the applicant intends to add any equipment or additional height not specified in the original special use permit"*; however, § 240-70 requires the ability to add

two additional users antennas, which may trigger another special use permit and could be viewed as burdensome when the municipality requires the capability under the initial review. Consider adding clarification that excludes additional carriers/users utilizing approved structures from the Modification section.

- D. The Board should consider the following grammatical code update to be included in the next proposed amendment -Article V § 240-24, “No permit or approval shall be issued until the applicant has demonstrated that all uses are provided with adequate off-road parking for all vehicles parked during typical peak use periods. Parking should be designed to eliminate the need to back out onto the public road.”
- E. The Planning Board shall ensure all provisions located within Article IX have been satisfied completely and notate if any requirement waivers have been granted.

Similar to the previous review, correspondence from James LaValle was received with evidence that correspondence has been initiated with Fort Drum, and an updated FEAF has been provided to address recommendation #2. It was agreed that item 2 should be removed from the recommendations.

The board had a brief discussion comparing the two review recommendations and the additional Article that the Martinsburg Law had regarding Wireless Communications Facilities, mentioning how it could deter development and hinder the Town’s sustainability. It was suggested that a zoning amendment of the Article could be warranted.

With no further discussion, Mr. Virkler motioned to approve the conditions and non-binding notes presented with the exclusion of condition #2. Mr. Petersen seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

- (7) **Report of County Planner:** None
- (8) **Unfinished Business:** It was discussed that the 4-hour Land Use Training date is September 25, 2024 and all are encouraged to attend to satisfy their annual training requirements.
- (9) **New Business:** None
- (10) **Adjournment:** There being no other business, a motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Ms. Metott and seconded by Mr. Osborne, which carried unanimously. Mr. Petersen adjourned the meeting at 3:03 PM.



Megan Krokowski
Community Development Specialist

Note: *These minutes have been transcribed from a recording but are not verbatim or quoted version, they are rather a documentation of the meeting events.*