

JACKSON TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD MEETING

MONDAY, MARCH 1, 2021

The March 1, 2021 meeting of the Jackson Township Board was called to order at 7:35 p.m. by Planning Board Secretary, Denise Buono with a salute to the flag by all present. Attorney Sean Gertner read the Open Public Meetings Act Statement noting that adequate notice has been provided and advertised in the manner prescribed by law.

ROLL CALL: Tim Dolan- *virtual* Terence Wall, Township Representative
Dr. Michele Campbell Martin Flemming, Councilman
Jeffrey Riker Len Haring, Board Vice Chairman
Andrew Jozwicki Robert Hudak, Board Chairman
Anthony Luisi- Alt #1
Manuela Brito- Alt #2- *virtual*

Absent: *Joseph Riccardi, Mayor's Designee*

Also Present: Planning Board Attorney Sean Gertner, Mr. Peters, Board Planner, Doug Klee, Board Engineer, Denise Buono, Planning Board Secretary, and Danielle Sinowitz, Planning Board Recording Secretary.

Payment of Recording Secretary, Danielle Sinowitz, for 3/1/21 motioned by HARING/ Flemming. Yes: All in favor among those present.

Motion to approval Planning Board regular meeting minutes of February 8, 2021 by CAMPBELL/ Riker. Yes: All in favor among those present

Resolutions: Courtesy Review: Ocean County Utilities Authority - motion to approve by RIKER/ Flemming. Yes: Campbell, Riker, Jozwicki, Luisi, Wall, Flemming, Haring, Hudak.

Mr. Hudak announced that the first application **1. Cedar Swamp Plaza, LLC, Block 4201, Lot 3, Cedar Swamp Road** has requested to be carried to the March 22, 2021 meeting. Mr. Gertner announced for the public, everyone is directed to check the municipal website for log in information and the matter is being carried without the need for further notice. Mr. Gertner stated the Board has received transcripts, and this is a remand on a narrow issue and it's asked that members who participated review the transcript.

2. Dubin Contracting, LLC, Block 6501, Lot 42.04, 2180 W. County Line Road- Mr. Klee stated this is an application preliminary and final approval for a 6,000SF 2 story office building, and the project is complete and there are some existing variances such as lot width, and frontage, and there has been no environmental impact statement however the comments that have been received from the Environmental Commission should be reviewed, and there will be public water and sewer, and there should testimony as it relates to the hours of operation. As it relates to site access there is a single 2 way access along County Line Road and any approval the Board may grant there should be reviewed from the Ocean County Planning Board, and there is a single drive isle with parking spaces and there is an design waiver for minimum driveway width, there is a grass paver and there is facilitated access, there are 30 spaces being provided, and the storm water management will be owned and maintained by the property owner and the site lighting has been reviewed and there should be some testimony from the applicant and the applicant should review the architectural and there is a storage space in front of the facility and recycling should be discussed. Mr. Peters stated there is a February 9, 2021 report and the property is in the Highway Commercial Zone and there should be a detailed description of the use and commercial professional offices are permitted in the zone, and there are existing variances on site, minimum lot width, lot area, and frontage and that should be discussed, there is also a design exception which is the location of the solid waste dumpster in the front yard. **Donte Alfieri- attorney for the applicant-** stated present is the planner, traffic engineer and architect who will provide testimony this evening.

Jason Burneyko- licensed professional engineer with the firm DW Smith associates, licensed in New Jersey and have been before this Board and numerous Boards in Monmouth county- credentials accepted- sworn- Mr. Alfieri asked for an explanation of the site and surrounding areas. Mr. Burneyko presented **Exhibit A-1** the cover sheet of the site plans and this is to show the vicinity of the site, and the site is on a 0.06 acre property, and is located in the HC zone, and the applicant is purposing a 6,000SF 2 story office, and a professional office is permitted in the zone and the site does meet the bulk requirements, however the existing lot is undersized and does require lot area, width and frontage, and the existing lot is 100' wide by 280' long and the site frontage is on county road route 526 with a center median with a travel lane and a shoulder in each directions. Mr. Burneyko showed **Exhibit A-2** the layout and dimension plan of the site plans, the purposed office building is at the rear of the property and there is one stall required for every 200' of area, and this site will have 30 spaces, and the ADA standards require 2 of the 30 to be ADA accessible which are adjacent to the building, and there is a 26' drive isle and 24' is the minimum, and there are improvements along the front, and there is curbing along West County Line Road, there is an area near the building for small truck loading which will be for UPS and FedEx trucks, and there were suggestions made by the fire department to have access to the side of the building, and there was an approval letter provided on February 18 from the fire commissioner, and the trash enclosure is technically in the front and it's 150' from the roadway frontage and there is adequate landscaping and a privacy fence. Mr. Burneyko stated the purposed grading follows the existing draining patterns which is to the front and down county line road, and the requirement for storm water management must be reduced to levels of run off, and **Exhibit A-3** is the landscaping plan and it shows the system with the roof drains that tie into the ground system and provides an over flow, as well as towards the side of the building, and since there are chemicals that fall from vehicles there is a water quality system and once its filtered it will bubble out onto county line road. Mr. Burneyko referenced back **Exhibit A-2** there is an adjacent system at mavis where the inlet will added too, and there are no constraints on this site and the environmental commission found the plan acceptable and the JTMUA is who will be providing the utilities to the site and there is a fire hydrant purposed, and it was requested by the county to be provided and the plans have received preliminary approval from the JTMUA. Mr. Alfieri asked have the professional letters been reviewed, and were there any comments that cannot be complied with. Mr. Burneyko advised the 10' wide safety island, there is 8' being provided and the reason there is not 10' is because it would push the existing parking closer to County Line Road and the 20' setback off County Line was the desired setback. Mr. Alfieri asked if there was anything else

besides that that cannot be complied with and Mr. Peters asked why the building was put in front of the trash enclosure. Mr. Burneyko stated it is felt that this was the best design for the building, the building was dressed to be set back. Mr. Alfieri asked if there would be setback issues if the building was flipped. Mr. Burneyko stated the building is set at setback constraints. Mr. Alfieri asked if there were any purposed tenants. Mr. Burneyko said no. Mr. Alfieri mentioned since any tenants would be permitted uses in the zone, if the hours could be touched on. Mr. Burneyko stated the hours would be Monday-Friday from 6 a.m.-10p.m, and 6 a.m.-6 p.m. on the weekends and the tenants are UN known however that is the desired hours of operations. Mr. Alfieri asked if there would be private trash pick-up. Mr. Burneyko advised that is correct, and the area is a 12x12 enclosure. Mr. Alfieri asked if the anticipated deliveries could be touched on, will there only be UPS size truck with no tractor trailers. Mr. Burneyko stated that is correct only the delivery services will be typical but no tractor trailers. Mr. Flemming asked if the issues would be taken care of if the building size was reduced. Mr. Burneyko advised that would work although this is at the setback limitations. Mr. Hudak asked Mr. Flemming if he was conformable with the fire trucks. Mr. Riker asked what is the alignment or the setback from this building, and mavis. Mr. Burneyko advised Mavis is shown on the one exhibit. Mr. Riker asked if it's approximately 100'. Mr. Burneyko mentioned 60-65'. Mr. Peters asked the distance from front to front. Mr. Burneyko advised 100'. Mr. Riker stated the desire typically is to keep things aligned, having a dumpster in front of a building is not appealing, and a dumpster enclosure is an enclosure, nothing can be done to dress that up. Mr. Peters stated in further to Mr. Riker's comment, the testimony that was given, if the Board really wanted to see the building move forward, there would need to be side yard relief, and the Board would have to consider flipping this and there would need to be a side yard setback in order to get a road passed the building to the dumpster, yes the building can come forward however there would need to be confirmation for that yield. Mr. Hudak asked what would the professional opinion be to yield it, and how. Mr. Peters stated there is access to 3 sides and there are benefits to this layout and the building can't be right on the street frontage, and it may need to be re sketched, and there is some give an take from variance relief to see a better product on the field. Mr. Hudak mentioned that it behooves the Board to see the businesses are lined up along that road. Mr. Peters stated this could be an in fill project, it's a deep lot not wide lot, and if other areas were looked at such as Freehold and Toms River, and the questions were sprung, and it's better to see a building then a parking lot. Dr. Campbell stated to Mr. Flemming's comment, the building can be smaller and there would be room for a driveway situation and 3 sides of a protection. Mr. Flemming mentioned there could also be another shape, a rectangle rather than a square. Mr. Burneyko stated with the parking in the rear there is not much room for a turnaround area and that is why the parking in the front was chosen. Mr. Peters suggested parking parallel to the building. Ms. Brito asked why in a 2 story building was there not an elevator purposed. Mr. Burneyko stated that would be addressed by the architect.

Laurence Schreiber- licensed senior architect, has been licensed in NJ for over 33 years and is licensed in 9 states and has testified on many stated Boards- credentials accepted- affirmed- Mr. Alfieri mentioned that colored renderings have been passed out which will be marked as **Exhibit A-4**, the colored elevation. Mr. Schreiber stated the prominent is a light color with a wood grain panel on the second floor and the entrance area is a glass aluminum face with reflective tint glass with dark stucco on the top of the glass area. Mr. Alfieri asked how the interior accommodating ADA accessibility is. Mr. Schreiber stated the first floor is ADA compliant and the second floor is not required for this size building, 10,000SF is when its required of an office building to have an elevator, and there are 2 restrooms on each floor. Mr. Alfieri asked with regards to the elevation, the layout itself continues throughout the front building aside from the front portion. Mr. Schreiber advised that was correct other than the glass area. Ms. Brito asked regarding the elevator, with understanding because of the building size it's not a requirement however given that there are no purposed tenants there is a certain amount of assumption that the future tenants may have an issue. Mr. Schreiber stated this is a standard requirement throughout the United States, and an elevator is not required, and this is a standard requirement that most buildings are doing and unless it's a healthcare facility it is not a requirement. Mr. Hudak asked if this building has a basement. Mr. Schreiber said no. Mr. Hudak asked if this is set up for 2 suites on of each floor. Mr. Schreiber advised that is correct. Mr. Hudak asked given the potential the idea is to have 2 tenants. Mr. Alfieri stated that is correct. Mr. Riker asked in the world of 2021 how is the applicant going to deal with the exclusionary of someone being handicap, someone could have a bad knee or could be a veteran, and even someone with a broken ankle won't even be able to go to work, and the code is the minimum requirement and that's not a best practice. Mr. Alfieri stated the site is compliant with the code requirement and the concerns are heard and there will be a conversation with the client.

John Rea- traffic and translation engineer, and has been before this Board on numerous occasions- credentials accepted- sworn- stated the property is on the North side of County Line Road, and is in between Brewers Bridge and Villanova and there will be a U-turn at those locations and there were traffic counts at Villanova and county line road which permit only right in and right out and there will be a level service A and there will be county approval and there will be less than 10 peak hour trips and there has been comment and as far as site plan from traffic there is adequate parking and from a traffic perspective the site is designed and laid out appropriately. Mr. Peters stated the original report dealt with 7,900SF and 39 spaces. Mr. Rea stated it was revised. Mr. Peters asked if there are improvements on the county road way. Mr. Rea advised there is possibly a partial dedication and curbing and widening. Mr. Gertner asked if will there be a need for a decell or just a shoulder. Mr. Rea asked if the shoulder will suffice. Mr. Gertner stated the tenants have yet to be delineate, if one space is divided will that change the mix of tenants and parking counts. Mr. Rea said no.

Recess taken at 8:30 p.m. and reconvened by Mr. Hudak at 8:41 p.m.

Mr. Alfieri stated there was discussion with the professionals and there were options explored to different site alignments and what is being presented to the applicant, and rather than having more testimony it's being requested to carry and there will be another look taken at the site. Mr. Hudak asked if April 26, 2021 was a good date. Mr. Alfieri advised that is acceptable. Mr. Gertner stated if there is anyone participating on application **2. Dubin Contracting, LLC, Block 6501, Lot 42.04, 2180 W. County Line Road**, this matter is being carried at the request of the applicant to the April 26, 2021 meeting and the public is directed to the municipal website for the zoom information along with any documents related to the application.

3. Centrastate Healthcare System, Block 5601, Lot 65, Bartley Road-Mr. Klee stated this is an application for preliminary final major site plan approval for a 3,000SF building addition to the existing medical office building that was previously constructed, and there are a number of variances that are existing and there is a new variance request for parking area setback, along with a minimum sign setback, there are no environmental concerns and there are no objections to the proposal, the application will protect the water and sewer and operations should be discussed, this site access is full movement in connection to Bartley Road and the project is along County Line Road so there will be approval from the Ocean County Planning board, this is a medical office use and there should be testimony on the parking design exception, there are curbs and sidewalks, and there should be testimony on the site lighting and landscaping. Mr. Peters stated there is a report dated December 29, 2020, and the site is in the HC zone and the zone permits business offices and commercial offices in the zone, and the applicants attorney and professionals should discuss the history of the site, there were approvals that go back to the 70's and the proposal should be discussed, this is an existing site that is being expanded and the applicant was asked to go through what is currently on site and

how the proposal will either comply or not with the township requirements and there is landscaping, lighting and trash waivers requested.

Michael Vitiello- attorney for the applicant- advised the application has been summarized, there is an existing office that Centra State uses and they are the contract purchaser, and are seeking an addition to the building, and there are representatives from Centra State, and if it pleases the Board the civil engineer witness can be brought forward, and the site was approved by a doctor and a Planning Board and the municipality doesn't have much on the prior approvals however the doctor does have records going back and forth and the planner is testifying virtually and the doctor's office is part of that and the priority for the Planning Board is just that.

Mark Lescavage- project manager at Maser Consulting, testified before this Board of several occasions- credentials accepted- sworn- Mr. Vitiello asked if the plans were done under Mr. Lescavage control. Mr. Lescavage said yes. Mr. Vitiello stated the exhibits were provided electronically and noted there are hard copies available as well. Mr. Lescavage presented **Exhibit A-1** an aerial location map, showing the site as it exists and for the benefit of the Board and the public, North is shown on the top right hand portion of the page, and to the right is north and the left is south, and there a piece of the site that is not compliant which was taken from the County to make the off ramp from County Line Road and the lot is in the HC zone and surrounding to the south east there is the assisted living facility and there is Hampshire Hills which is in the R-1 zone and there is Bartley Manor to the east and to the southwest there is a bank site, and there is an existing medical office building, which includes the basement which is only used for storage and the access is through a 24' wide driveway off Bartley Road and that driveway traverses through the south east end of the site with a shared driveway. Mr. Lescavage stated off that access drive there is a parking area with enough room for 39 spaces including 3 handicap spaces which exists on the east end of the building, and the site is flat and there are several non-conformities and the lot depth of 200' and the setback of the existing building from the off ramp there is 48.9' where 60' is required, and there is a requirement for a parking setback to the residential property line and the parking on the north east, the setback is required at 20' and existing is at 19.6', and there are also existing monument signs at the south west end of the site. Mr. Lescavage presented **Exhibit A-2** a color rendering of the site overlay of the site aerial, which showed what is seen in the existing building which is in the center of the site which is a tan color and to the east there is a darker representation of the one story addition to the medical building and in addition there is the 49SF vestibule enclosure, and there are some changes to the parking area, in the area on the proposed addition there were 7 spaces and 3 handicap spaces, and there will now be 4 spaces including handicap spaces and the new parking spaces will be adjacent to Bartley Road where 12 spaces are going and 4 spaces will be lost along the existing parking area and there will be 2 spaces added to the eastern parking area and there is a net increase of 7 spots, and this will require 70 spaces and this is the nature of the variance being sought, and the handicap stalls are being maintained, there are 2 at the southeast end of the building, and there is a trash enclosure which is a 10x18, and with speaking with the client the circulation and trucks are known and what is proposed is what is existing, there is a lab corp which comes to pick up and drop off and it's the understanding it's 2 times a week and there is a box truck to deliver and there are FedEx, and UPS trucks and with the existing and proposed conditions a dedicated loading zone is not required and based on the limited deliveries of smaller deliveries this will suffice, and in terms of the ground signs of the project, there are 2 proposed ground signs. Mr. Vitiello asked if one of the new signs is replacing an old sign one. Mr. Lescavage advised that is correct, one is new and one will be replaced, the proposed sign is 30' wide and 6' high and because this is proposed along Bartley Road and the parking is there, it can only be an 8' setback and there is a canopy of trees and with that if there was a setback and the parking setback was not proposed it would be difficult to see that sign south on Bartley road and that is why there is the desire to have the second sign coming off county line road, and in terms of operations the existing operation has a 5 day a week weekday from 7 a.m.-7 p.m. other than 2 days the hours are 7 a.m.-4:30 p.m. and with the proposal the proposal is to have 5 days a week from 7 a.m.-7 p.m., and the maximum is 9 employees a day and the number of patients is about 16 and with the expansion there is 12-16 employees and 19 approximate patients, and in terms of drainage and grading, this is not a major development, the expansion of the parking area increases in .5 acres and in terms of the expansion there is an underground infiltration system with a 36" pipe and this will manage the 2 and 10 year storm as well as provide ground water recharge, and there will be a new sanitary level to attach to Bartley Road and the plan is to utilize the existing water line. Mr. Lescavage stated in terms of the landscaping plan there are native species around the perimeter to enhance the existing landscaping including the street frontage on Bartley Road, and the monument signs have been dressed up, and in terms of lighting there are 10 pole mounts and wall mounts and there are 15' poles and 10' wall mounts and the candle is slightly below .5 and there is a waiver in that regard, and to move to the reports starting with the planners report, the traffic section there are several waivers that are requested, in regards to the parking area in specific to add to an existing parking area, and one waiver being sought is the stalls and in the North East end there is the handicap stall and its being asked that the waiver of that requirement be waived and the 100' from the street right of way entrance drive because of the limited size that cannot be complied with nor the distance of 60' from the exit drive, and there is a requirement where a 10' wide landscape isle is required at the end of the drive isles and that is asked to be waived as this is an existing space, and a waiver is the minimum 5' landscape area along the refuse area, and going to the Engineer report, the only thing the engineer report is the issue of sidewalk and that is felt to be un warranted and specifically there is an off ramp across the front of the project and there is Hampshire Blvd which takes up most of the frontage on Bartley Road and there is no way to connect sidewalks safely across the street. Mr. Hudak asked if the applicant will be contributing to the sidewalk fund. Mr. Vitiello stated the applicant will do that. Mr. Peters stated the new parking parallel to Bartley Road, it's about 2' off the building, and asked if it should be moved further then 2' away. Mr. Lescavage advised that would require some relief, and it can be agreed to go to 4'. Mr. Vitiello stated in the building now, there are doctors' offices and a lab and the building will stay that way and there might be the addition to physical therapy and there will remain the private lab and physical therapy. Mr. Flemming asked if all of the restrictions and setbacks are from things that happened after that building was put up. Mr. Lescavage advised that was correct.

Mr. Gertner stated there was brief discussion and for members of the public for application **4. Solomon Zolty Investments, Block 19501, Lot 35, Grawtown Road**, will be carried to the March 8, 2021 meeting. **Adam Pfeffer- attorney for the applicant-** stated it does not appear this will be reached at a reasonable hour and this will need to be carried. Mr. Gertner advised this matter will be carried to the hearing, and will be behind adventure crossing. Mr. Pfeffer asked if that is with no further notice. Mr. Gertner advised that was correct, and stated that application shall be carried to the March 8, 2021 meeting without further notice and the public should be directed to the website for access to the exhibits and zoom link.

Mr. Hudak advised the currently application may continue. Mr. Vitiello stated the applicants architect will be sworn next. **Michael Savarese- licensed architect since 1987', licensed in NY, PA, NJ, VA, FL, DE- credentials accepted- sworn-** Mr. Vitiello asked if the exhibits were submitted as part of this application under his direction and control. Mr. Savarese said yes. Mr. Vitiello asked for Mr. Savarese to describe what currently exists. Mr. Savarese stated the building exiting can be shown on **Exhibit A-3**, and the first part is the existing foot print for the existing practice and there is a main entry door and there is the lab area and there is regular medical practice in these buildings and the second sheet is sheet 1 of 1 and this shows the actual existing offices and the width of the addition is 78'x38' and it combines the 2 areas of practice and there is the common area, and there is speech therapy and it's a very simple addition and it takes the architecture to another level. Mr. Savarese presented **Exhibit A-4** is the exhibit that shows the existing side of the building and it is to show the brick base and roof

and there will be a covered entry way and there will be glass for a brighter waiting area and **Exhibit A-5** shows the main entry way with a set of stairs and the handicap ramp. Mr. Vitiello stated there is a re branding and the ordinance 4 color requirement will be complied however there is a big re branding so the colors will be changed. Mr. Savarese advised that **Exhibit A-6** shows the purposed sign, and there is the brick on the sides with the roof shape over the top and there will be 2 like this and the last rendering zooms in on the front door which is **Exhibit A-7** which shows how the ramp works along with the front door and it's a pleasing design and it's not over powered. Mr. Vitiello asked what the basement is used for. Mr. Savarese stated it is used for storage. Mr. Vitiello asked if the applicant will agree to stipulate that the basement will only be used for storage. Mr. Savarese said of course.

Michelle Briehof- assistant department manager at Maser Consulting, civil and environmental engineer, and traffic engineer- credentials accepted- sworn- Mr. Vitiello asked with regards to the questions raised in the reports, the traffic circulation and parking purposed how will the functions function. Mr. Briehof stated the site access is proposed to maintain on Bartley Road and after reviewing the parking layout plan it is dealt that the 2-way drive will accommodate vehicles, and there was peak parking demand suggested which would come out to 48 spaces and referencing that its believed the parking is adequate and referencing the engineering and data this would generate 26 peak hour trips. Mr. Vitiello mentioned that the reports reference a cross access easement and there is common ownership with the site behind and the purchase will be done to allow for those facilities to travel between sites. Mr. Gertner asked in terms of cross access, will it provide for maintenance. Mr. Vitiello stated there are 2 items with a line right down the middle and each owner will maintain their own site and if one owner fails to maintain the other would have the right to maintain. Mr. Dolan mentioned on the corner of the ramp coming off county line its purpose to have a sign and the visibility is concerning, how will the sign be installed to minimize problems. Mr. Briehof stated the purposed sign is well outside of the site triangle to make a turn safely, its set back far enough from the road there would be no disturbance to site.

Debra Lawlor- licensed planner in NJ, and hold the national credentials with the state planners with over 40 years of experience- credentials accepted- sworn- Mr. Vitiello advised there has been testimony heard regarding the variances requested and waivers. Ms. Lawlor stated she believes they meet the criteria to satisfy the variances and believes that the waivers that were mentioned earlier are warranted, as mentioned this is a 3,000SF addition on the existing building that is along with 49' vestibule and the adjacent land uses are compatible with medical professional offices such as Bartley Health Care, and across the roadway there are residential developments and the subject property is known as Bartley corner, and the modifications to the existing parking area including the removal of parking spaces is a change that deals with waivers to the landscaping being purposed, such as the 2 ground signs, and there is also a 64SF wall sign and in terms of zoning the purposed use is permitted and as noted earlier the professional offices are permitted in the neighborhood commercial zone and all the neighborhood is incorporated in the highway commercial, and in terms of the variances that are being requested there is the c variance for the setback from the right of way and there are preexisting non conformities that will remain; minimum lot depth, and frontage and there is a preexisting non comforting setback on the preppy line, and in terms of the c variance the C-2 is for a parking setback from the right of way, and there is 20' and 19.6' is existing. There is also 123' to the North County Line ramp and then the proposed would be 23' to Bartley and 18.8' to the North County Line Road ramp, and the 18.8' is the minimum being purposed and it's required to be 20', and the use will not be changed in any way and it's believe that the proposed parking would be screened by trees, and the parking area is setback 1.2' then what is permitted, there will be shade trees and there are preexisting conditions that exist on site, the minimum lot depth is 200' required and 146.79' is existing, and some of the non-conformities are from the ramp and along the edge of the property is the minimum front yard setback and its required to be 60' and 48.9' is existing and the minimum parking setback is 10' and there is 9.8' existing, and it does not encroach in an yard setbacks or increase the building coverage and the existing parking spaces are not purposed to be modified and there are no changes to modify the lot depth and there will be no detriment to the neighboring sites. Mr. Vitiello mentioned there was a request / suggestion that the new parking lot may be slid over 2' making it 2' closer however it should be noted that it pushes the parking lot closer to the road and there was a sign variance for 8' and it will be 6' and it would be asked that waiver be added. Ms. Briehof stated it wouldn't change and that is because that location if driving to the south it would not impair anyone's visibility. Mr. Vitiello stated this is the direct testimony, and the reports were spoken too.

Opened to the public; seeing no one use the "raise hand" function, motion to close public comment by RIKER/ Haring. Yes: All in favor among those present.

Motion to approve by RIKER/ Haring. Yes: Dolan, Campbell, Riker, Jozwicki, Luisi, Wall, Flemming, Haring, Hudak

Motion to adjourn at 10:20 p.m. by RIKER/ Haring. Yes: All in favor among those present.

Respectfully submitted,

Danielle Sinowitz,
Planning Board Recording Secretary