

JACKSON TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD MEETING

Monday, June 20th, 2022

The June 20th, 2022 meeting of the Jackson Township Planning Board was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Board Chairman Robert Hudak 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 Robert Hudak, Board Chairman
Martin Flemming, Councilman Mr. Canderozzi-Alt # 2
Jeffrey Riker Joseph Riccardi, Mayor’s Designee
Mordechai Burnstein Len Haring, Board Vice Chairman
Tsvi Herman –Alt #1

Also Present: Sean Gertner, Planning Board Attorney, Ernie Peters, Board Planner, Doug Klee, Board Engineer, Anthony Jacob, Township I.T. Representative, and Irina Darrar, Planning Board Recording Secretary, Laura Morrison Planning Board Secretary.

Absent Mr. Wall and Dr. Campbell

Payment of Recording Secretary, Irina Darrar for June 20th, 2022 meeting. Motioned by Riker/Haring Yes: Mr. Flemming, Mr. Burnstein, Mr. Riker, Mr. Riccardi, Mr. Haring, and Mr. Hudak.

Board entered onto executive session at 7:35 PM.

Motioned by Riker/Flemming Yes: Mr. Burnstein, Mr. Riker. Mr. Riccardi, Mr. Haring, Mr. Flemming, and Mr. Hudak

The regular session was resumed at 7:45 PM.

No Engineering/Planning matters were discussed.

Legal matters for discussion:

Application Block 7306, Lot 5 - Good Friend Electric/Dazey Investors, LLC

Mr. Klee stated that this is an application for a preliminary and final major site plan approval. The applicant is proposing to establish a Good Friend Electric showroom including a 2,357 sq. feet warehouse addition on the property. Mr. Klee said that he can probably review this somehow as a rehabilitation project, which is old 7-11. He believes Zoning permits were issued already for the conversion from the 7-11 building to a Good Friend Electric. So the applicant is here tonight for the addition of a 2,357 SQ feet warehouse to the building. Several variances are related to the dimensions of the lot and existing setbacks. The applicant should provide some testimony. Environmental Commissions indicated no concerns. The building is already

connected to public sewer and water. Testimony is needed from the applicant regarding the proposed site utilization and operations, days and hours, EV stations, number of employees, and rooftop solar. The project is utilizing an existing driveway. Professionals do have recommendations, that the existing driveway collection closest to Steuben Lane and West County Line Road be eliminated and closed. The applicant is proposing a new driveway connection further to the North of Steuben Lane, basically to access the warehouse. Mr. Klee said for basic safety, it seems like a good idea to eliminate that driveway connection.

Mr. Peters stated that the report came to his office on May 20, 2022. The property is located in the HC Highway Commercial Zone. In regards to the variances, the professionals report listed two new variances, one for the maximum impervious coverage and the other for the minimum rear yard setback. There is no rear yard on the corner lot, so there is only one variance being created by the site plans before the board this evening. Mr. Peters asked Mr. Stevenson to give some testimony reconciling the Architectural plans and the site plans, and some testimony about the existing sign that is on the site and whether or not it's going to be used, or updated. Professionals noted that there are parking spaces on the side of the building, they're of minimum size and there is no overhang. Mr. Peters suggested putting some ballads over there. If one is standing on County Line Road, looking at the site, there is an old dumpster, looks like the applicant is trying to reuse it. Mr. Peters stated he would like to reconcile the old dumpster and its landscaping, fencing, and protection with the current Land Use Ordinance.

Mr. Michael Jedziniak attorney with Carluccio, Leone, Dimon, Doyle, and Sacks on behalf of the applicant Dazey Investors LLC, commonly referred to as Good Friend Electric. The attorney stated that the applicant is simply looking to get approval to put the warehouse in the back. In addition to Mr. Stevens, the applicant has available Rick Tokarski –the architect of the project.

William Stevenson was sworn in, Vice President of PDS, an engineering firm from Lakewood NJ. Professional Engineer and Professional Planner licensed to practice in NJ. Mr. Stevenson stated that the project is a significantly less intense retail use than a 7-11. Typically, a GFE store will have 2 employees and have 2-3 customers at a time. This is what the applicant expects. Mr. Stevenson had an opportunity to speak with both professionals and go through their concerns. The 7-11 property is in a highway Commercial Zone. This Zone requires 40,000 SQ feet, whereas the lot is 21,589 SQ feet. Because of that, there are existing variances, and existing conditions, that the applicant can't do anything about it. The applicant is asking for one variance, a C2 variance. The applicant is seeking an increase in impervious lot coverage, where the applicant is allowed to have 75% and the applicant is looking for 76.7%. It is a small variance that the applicant is seeking, taking into consideration that the applicant is improving an abandoned property. Mr. Stevens thinks that variance can be granted.

Mr. Stevenson stated the applicant is seeking several variances. A variance for lot area, where 45,000 sq. feet is required and 21,584 is existing, variance for minimum lot frontage, where 200 feet is required and 121.54 feet is proposed, is existing. The applicant is also seeking a front yard

setback variances where 60 feet is required and where the existing building is at 41.7 feet. The applicant also has a side yard setback variance, back to A & M Auto property where the applicant is required to have 25 feet and currently has 19.6 feet. Also, there are some parking setback variances, conditions of 7-11. The applicant is proposing to utilize the existing building, and existing facilities while making some changes. The aerial exhibit shows that the property is surrounded by highway Commercial uses. There is one Residential property that abuts this property on Steuben Lane that is where the addition will go. It is the only house in the highway Commercial zone. The site plan shows Oak Drive which defines the end of the highway Commercial Zone and all the properties from County Line back to Oak Road. The single-family house does about us in the highway Commercial Zone. The site plan exhibit shows the existing driveway on County Line Road. The applicant is proposing to put an addition to the back of the building to use as a warehouse for retail operations. It will have a new driveway out to Steuben Lane. The applicant has preliminary approval from JTMUA. The applicant will utilize Municipal sewer and water for the site. The applicant has preliminary approval and needs tentative approval. No outdoor storage is proposed. Employees are generally 2, but it could be as many as 10. Days of the operations will be Monday to Friday 7 to 6 and Saturday 7 AM to 4 PM. Delivery will be conducted once a week every day. The building itself will be secured with alarms, video, and site lighting as well. No overnight parking of the vehicles. There is an existing trash and recycling enclosures on the right side of the building. It is dilapidating and falling down. It will be reconstructed and will be screened, and will handle recycling as well. The applicant is currently not proposing any electrical charging stations or solar. Mr. Stevens stated that Mr. Klee and Mr. Peters had the same comment about the driveway out of Steuben Lane. The applicant is proposing to put another driveway further to the North of Steuben Lane into the new additions. Both professionals asked the applicant to close up the first driveway, the one closest to County Line Road. The applicant would agree to relocate that driveway to the rear and close up the one in the front.

Mr. Klee talks in his review letter about the loading Zone that the applicant is proposing. He thinks that could potentially require variance release. Mr. Stevenson said that the existing 7-11 is at 47.7 feet off the right-a-way of Steuben Lane. The applicant wants to continue that with the proposed addition, so that the loading area, which is going to be in front of the roll-up door, will be closer than the required 60 feet to Steuben Lane because the applicant just simply does not have room and that is the best they can do. Some of the variances are C1 variances, which mean that it is a hardship variance; the applicant cannot do anything about it. But in this case, the applicant is creating something that is not there today, so really it is a C2 variance which means, that board would need to find that the benefits outweigh the determinants for granting that variance. Mr. Stevens and Mr. Peters had a conversation. Mr. Peters reinstated some of the things that the applicant already is willing to do. Mr. Klee suggested striking two existing parking stalls as a no-parking area to allow the vehicles to have additional access to and from the rear entrance of Steuben Lane. Mr. Stevenson stated that the applicant is required to have 18 parking spaces, and they currently propose 23. So the applicant already exceeds what is required by 5. They can

lose two spaces and increase the circulation as Mr. Peters asked the applicant to do and still end up with the correct number of parking stalls. Mr. Stevens said that the applicant is proposing to reutilize the existing pylon sign. There is a 7-11 pylon sign located in the corner of the intersection that the applicant is proposing to reuse and reface. The applicant is also proposing, that it is on the Architectural rendering, mounted sign, just the words “Good Friend Electric”. The applicant is seeking whatever is necessary to reutilize the existing pylon sign and the applicant believes that building mounted signs comply.

Mr. Riccardi asked if there are sidewalks in front of the Mechanic shop that is next to the project.

St. Stevenson said no.

Mr. Riccardi asked if there are sidewalks in the mall.

Mr. Stevens said no. He stated that so much ground was lost during County widening then that it makes it difficult but on the positive side parking lot is paved and people can walk.

Mr. Gertner brought up a connectivity issue because Jackson particularly, along the County Line continues to grow; there is at least the need to provide that pedestrian connectivity. Mr. Gertner asked Mr. Stevenson to, as a professional Engineer Planner, bring people east to West and West to East, is there any design painting, or striping that can be done?

Mr. Stevenson stated it will be very hard for him since this is 5 feet more or less between the face of the curb on County Line Road and the face of the curb in the parking lot. It is very narrow. The applicant would intend to keep its landscaping. Connectivity really would not work because the site is kind of offset as we move along there and the site is paved along the Steuben Lane

Mr. David Rosen was sworn in, President of Good friend Electric. He stated that the company delivers 2 to 3 branches every day. One delivery is at the store. It is on the company’s box truck, one or two pallets. It is not a tractor-trailer. It is not an 18-wheeler or anything like that.

Mr. Stevenson said that the applicant still needs outside approvals. Some they have, some of them they are still waiting for.

Mr. Flemming asked about the access on the right side next to A.M. if that has always been open, the only thing that stop access was Tony parking his truck there. Other than that it is wide open. Mr. Flemming would like to know if it can be closed.

Mr. Stevenson said that the site has cross access between the two sites and as an Engineer Planner, likes a cross-access site because it allows people to move from one place to another.

Mr. Flemming suggested closing it off, despite a low traffic flow for the pedestrian’s safety.

Mr. Stevens said he can take a look. Point taken.

Mr. Klee needed clarification in regards to closing up one driveway.

Mr. Stevenson confirmed closing.

Mr. Klee stated that he is going with establishing some type of grass, the landscaping island in that area between the property line and the existing curb. Once the driveway is closed up, the new driveway connection to the North of the site that the warehouse will be accessed from, there is an existing curb, there is a light, that looks kind of like it is right on the property line. Mr. Klee is proposing extending that curbing all the way up to the front where the existing basic sign is and tying in the curbing there and removing the paving in that area between that new curb line and the existing curb line of Stueben Lane.

Mr. Stevenson said if Mr. Klee feels strongly about it, they will say okay. The reason for his hesitation is that the area between the back of those parking stalls along the side of the building and the property line itself is less than the required 24 feet; it will be more like 20 or 21 feet. The applicant thinks those places can be utilized for employee spaces.

Mr. Klee stated that this would be his suggestion. Although the pavement that will be removed is not in the right-a-way, it is a part of the lot area. He said that it will be a significant reduction in impervious granted in the public property, which could offset the landscaping or the impervious variance that the applicant is looking for. Also, Mr. Klee asked the applicant if he is willing to include a recycling coordinator as an outside agency.

Mr. Stevenson said yes.

Public comments opened, but no one came forward.

Public Comments are closed. Motion to close Riker/Burnstein Yes: **Mr. Burnstein, Mr. Riker, Mr. Riccardi, Mr. Haring, Mr. Flemming, and Mr. Hudak**

Motion to approve Riker/Burnstein Yes: **Mr. Burnstein, Mr. Riker, Mr. Riccardi, Mr. Haring, Mr. Flemming, and Mr. Hudak**

The application was approved.

Application Block 21901, Lot 5 White Road Minor Subdivision

Mr. Klee stated that it is an application for minor subdivision approval. Testimony was heard on March 21, 2022. The application consisted of 3 lots and minor subdivisions. All lots require variances for area width and depth. Revised plans have been provided. Mr. Klee said that now it is down to 2 lots, minor subdivisions. Lots of width variances have been eliminated in the side yard setback variances, but there are still depth and area issues. It is proposed to provide curbing

and sidewalks throughout and Mr., Klee believes, that at the last meeting, an applicant agreed that the septic system for the new homes will be a pinelands type model.

Mr. Peters stated that given the 2 lot configuration, he would ask if they had any details on architectural plans. Number of bedrooms as it relates to the required parking off-street parking per RSIS.

Mr. Salvatore Alfieri on behalf of the applicant. He stated that Mr. Macfarland was sworn in and qualified at the last meeting and he is the only witness. Mr. Alfieri asked Mr. Macfarland to summarize the revisions that were done from the last hearing.

Mr. Macfarlane stated that on the screen there is exhibit A-8, which shows the minor subdivision plan. He revised the minor subdivision plan that was submitted for the application. This plan now shows 2 lots being proposed. That would be proposed lots 5.01 and 5.02. Lot 5.01 is 1.24 acres and lot 5.02 would be 1.45 acres. This application does not have any variances, other than those for the lot area and those for a lot of depth. Lot depth is something an applicant can't control. About the lot area, there was a long discussion at the last meeting and the discussion was to come back with this application for two lots instead of three. During the original application, the applicant was also seeking relief for a side yard setback. The plan that was submitted does incorrectly show the side yard setback of 5.01 and still has that variance. The applicant is not seeking that, was just an error on the applicant's part. Exhibit A- 9 is an improvement plan that was submitted in support of the application. It is dated June 3, 2022. This plan shows 2 houses that are proposed with the application. It also shows the improvements to White Road including the curb and sidewalk that will be proposed. White the road is a County roadway, the road would be widened to the standards of County requirements. It also shows some landscaping that the applicant is proposing along both of these lines, side property lines as well as the street trees according to the Ordinance. Two house footprints are shown by the applicant who would like to construct on those two lots. Exhibit A-10 shows Architectural plans for the homes. The first one is for the home that is proposed on lot 5.02. The home is L- shaped. It is a two-story home with a two-car garage. There was some discrepancy regarding whether those homes will have garages, one-car or two-car garages. In the rendering of the elevation view of the side entry garage doors that would be proposed, this plan shows the first floor and second floor and it does show the unfinished basement that is proposed as part of this application. The square footage of the living area is 5,377 sq feet, surrounding the development homes that were developed some time ago. Existing homes in the area are generally between 2,500 and 3,000 sq feet. The home that has been built recently is between 2500-2800 sq feet.

Mr. Dolan asked if the unfinished basement has plumbing.

Mr. Macfarlane stated there is no bathroom proposed in the basements, nothing is finished at this time. The applicant is proposing 6 bedrooms, a well, and a septic. Five parking spaces. Garages are 20 X 23, two car garages.

Mr. Flemming asked in the approval will be conditioned upon the board of health's approval.

Mr. Peters commented that the internal Jackson Township safeguards if something happens without permits are the Building Department. It is standard course, that if someone comes in on a house with a septic system and wants to add bedrooms the building Department and Zoning officer kick them to the County Board of Health. The applicant indicates that the houses are unfinished, will include unfinished basements and they're listed on each of the Architectural plans. A number of bedrooms are all part of the records, so when the applicant comes in to do additional work the Zoning officer will have it, Building Department will have it and the County Board of Health will have it as well.

Mr. Hudak asked if the windows in the basement are egress.

Mr. Macfarlane said it was eliminated from the Architectural plans. That was shown on the plans that were initially presented by the applicant. He continues that Exhibit A-11 is Lot 5.01. This is the other home, the square footage is about the same. This one is 5,420 sq. for the living area, two car-garage on this plan is 23 feet by 24 feet. This plan is proposing a total of seven bedrooms.

Mr. Alfieri asked Mr. McFarland if parking would meet the RSIS requirements.

Mr. Macfarlane said Exhibit A -12 rendering on the elevation, shows that the house has a front entry garage. Also, the front and side elevation is visible on the exhibit for the proposed home. Mr. MacFarlane stated that his office received a letter that outlined a few comments that were already addressed. There were two variances required for the lot area for the two lots and the lot depth. Any other variances that the applicant was seeking initially have been eliminated from the plans.

Mr. Alfieri stated that the board wanted a condition that there could be no bedrooms in the basement, the applicant has no issues with it because there is no intention to have bedrooms in the basement. If the board was willing to entertain the flexibility of having an exterior entrance to the garage and the basement. The applicant would agree that no bedrooms can go in the basement to alleviate the concern of the intensity of the use. If the board says they don't want exterior access, then Mr. Alfieri will look at his client and will get an answer.

Mr. Riker asked if there is a third floor.

Mr. Macfarlane said their two-story house.

Mr. Riker asked Mr. MacFarlane that his testimony is, that no third floor, therefore is no occupancy, no basement nothing other than mechanical space?

Mr. Macfarlane said yes.

Mr. Hudak stated that one of the buildings has a dormer and window there on the side.

Mr. Macfarlane said correctly, that is not uncommon for an Architectural feature to break up the roof line.

Mr. Hudak said he understands, but he wants to have the applicant's testimony that it is only Architectural and it is not to be designed for additional living space right down the road.

Mr. Macfarlane said that both of those plans clearly show a foundation plan. A first-floor plan and second-floor plan, don't show any third floor, they only show a two-story structure with a basement.

Mr. Hudak stated that this is a neighborhood with single-family homes and he would not like to see a boarding house.

Alfieri said that they are not permitted in the Zone and the applicant understands fully the space can not be converted to anything other than mechanicals on the third floor. Mr. Alfieri thinks that the attic is really what it is.

Mr. Gertner asked the applicant to restate that applicant is a proper single-family residence.

Mr. Alfieri said yes.

Mr. Hudak thinks that it is not allowed in mother-daughter houses.

Mr. Gertner said that is why he tried to articulate and be concise that it is single-family residences.

Mr. MacFarlane stated that those plans don't indicate any mother-daughter type arrangements, no knockouts of separate kitchen or bathroom, or anything along those lines. It is presented as a single-family home.

Mr. Alfieri stated that if the board is concerned about the exterior entrance to the basement. The applicant would agree as a conditional approval not to allow that and if they wanted to, they would come back for relief.

Mr. Hudak said okay

Public Comments are open. No one came forward. Comments close.

Public Comments are closed. Motion to close Riker/Burnstein Yes: **Mr. Burnstein, Mr. Riker, Mr. Riccardi, Mr. Haring, Mr. Flemming, and Mr. Hudak**

Mr. Gertner said in terms of trying to assist any deliberation, it should just be concise that the applicant has made a certain stipulation related to the size of each building, each dwelling unit. It's that size of the dwelling as represented that correlates to the drainage calculations, the RSI calculations, and the overall use of the site of each site as a single family Residency, that is the limitation, that is the catch, so to speak for the protection of the board, if it's for the board to

determine whether or not notwithstanding the deviation and size generally, at least from what is proposed to the existing neighborhood event in of itself is sufficient to support the lot variances. Mr. Gertner said it is applicant planning testimony, that some of the changes to the neighborhood that was testified to previously coupled with these stipulations with regards to the lack of outstanding access, the size of each home, the relation of the size of the home, and the bedroom to the provision of parking and the existing drainage calculations, that's applicants articulation to support these conditions are matters to the board, should the board determine to grant. Those conditions would be maternal to the provisions for two lots requested.

Motion to approve Riker/Burnstein Yes: Mr. Burnstein, Mr. Riker. Mr. Riccardi, Mr. Haring, Mr. Flemming, and Mr. Hudak

Application approved.

Application Block 4601, Lot 4 and 5, DM Equity LLC

Mr. Klee stated that the application was first heard on May 2, 2022. It involves an office warehouse building of 38,285 sq. feet and 3,800 sq. feet of office. Board had some testimony from the applicant and some board comments regarding the location of a loading zone. Board has received a revised plan; the loading zone was relocated to the rear of the property. There is also an indication that in adjacent Wetlands areas the resource value causes an increase in a buffering of 50 feet to 150 feet. Testimony from the applicant regarding the relocation of the loading zone to the front from the rear of the site.

Mr. Peters stated that based on the revised layout, professionals asked the applicant to provide some testimony regarding the largest size vehicle it is going to access the site and the ability of the vehicle to either park or circle through the revised layout.

Mr. Adam Pfeffer on behalf of the applicant stated that Mr. Borden will answer all questions and comments that the board might have.

Mr. Borden was previously sworn in, president of professional design services, licensed in NJ. He stated that Exhibit A-5 which is on the screen is a new signed plan that the applicant had submitted. Previously a loading dock was in the front of the building along North County Line Road; also it was on the rear of the building. Both those loading docks were eliminated. There is an isolated Wetlands area on the adjoining property that was delineated. DEP performed their site visit and found out that the definition is accurate, however, they did advise Mr. Borden that the buffer from this isolated Wetlands pocket is 150 feet. They have determined that the isolated Wetland pocket is an exceptional resource value for Wetland, so the applicant has addressed that on the plans as well. As a result, the entire building area was 42,085 sq. feet. The building as presented tonight on the plans is 40,000 sq. feet. Mr. Borden stated that there are two components, the warehouse, and shop area, which was 38,285 sq. feet, it has been reduced to 36,400 sq. feet. The office has been reduced from 3,800 to 3,600. The applicant has 9 different

tenants. The applicant is required to have 53 parking spaces and 53 are provided, so the applicant complied with the parking. While the project does not provide any loading dock, the applicant could not preclude the possibility that a WB55 truck might access the property. There is the main driveway to the road that remains unchanged from the original site plan and the applicant has the same loop driveway that goes around the building as the original site plan, but the traffic circulation plan which is included in the set does show safe circulation of the WB55 around the building. Another comment that the applicant had was a single refuse enclosure in the back and there were questions about the distance from the front of the building. The suggestion was made that the applicant have a refuse enclosure adjoined to the front corner of the building with a masonry wall to hide in from the highway, so now the applicant has two refuse enclosures. It is not an accessory structure, so there are no setbacks.

Mr. Gertner asked why Mr. Borden's opinion it is not an accessory structure.

Mr. Borden said it just has masonry walls with a concrete floor, no roof, and open gates on the floor. It is not occupiable. A question was raised about the curb and the sidewalk on County Line road. Mr. Borden believes the applicant asked for the waiver with payment to, the safety fund. If the board tells us that sidewalks are important, will certainly provide them. There was a question about the overhead doors on the architectural plans, apparently not lining up. The North is the right of this plan, so the west side at the top of this building, shaded or hatched pavement area is the location of the overhead doors for each tenant space. One more item is the storm water basin which was on the other side of the Wetlands buffers. When the Wetland buffer was shown on the previous plans, so the basin was moved up closer. The applicant had 50 feet buffer to this wetland, which allowed a small space here for a pipe to go through, but now the site is 150, the two Wetland buffers overlap each other, so the basin was moved up closer to development. It makes it more compact. As far as the performance standards of the site, there is no outdoor storage. The use is in the permitted zone. The use will not provide any traffic congestion based on the traffic report. All the activities will be performed within the buildings.

Mr. Gertner asked Mr. Borden to explain since now the buffers are 150 feet. Mr. Gertner sees through some of the turning radiuses, that the applicant has a modified transition area, limit reduction area, and there is an expansion area, and a modified transition limit area. Mr. Gertner asked to explain all that, what it means in conjunction with the fact now that the riparian buffer is 150 feet.

Mr. Borden stated that Exhibit A-5 buffer is 100-250 feet, the shaded area here. It is permitted under the Freshwater Wetlands Act regulated by DEP to modify the shape of the transition area. The applicant is permitted to modify the shape of the transition area.

Mr. Peters asked Mr. Borden on the traffic circulation plan if it could be part of Resolution compliance to show the vehicle coming in off of County Line Road and getting back out onto

County Line Road. Mr. Peters asked to Mr. Kennel tell him, that a tractor-trailer can get around this site.

Mr. Scott Kennel was sworn in. He is with McDonogh and Rea Associates, office located at 1341 Lakewood Road, Manasquan NJ, a principal with McDonogh and Rea associates with over 35 years of traffic and transportation planning experience Mr. Scott Kennel stated that the building that's going to be will have individual users. It is not expected tractor trailers to be there on a regular basis, box trucks are anticipated. Should there be delivery, there would generally be WB 50-type tractor trailers. There has been a traffic circulation plan provided by Mr. Borden's office that shows how the access would occur off of E. County Line Road with a right turn and then circulation around the site in a counterclockwise pattern; this will also be subject to Ocean County review when we deal with the access design.

Mr. Hudak asked Mr. Kennel if that is his professional testimony that a tractor-trailer and a fire truck of Jackson's normal size will be able to negotiate around this building.

Mr. Kennel said that in his expert opinion that is yes. He stated that the site has been designed to accommodate the large wheelbase vehicle consistent with the fire truck apparatus for Jackson Township as well as for a WB50 tractor trailer.

Mr. David Collins was sworn in. He also testified at the last meeting. The credentials were accepted at that time. He started if we look at the drawing 82.01, which is divided into 10 spaces. The end spaces are two structural bases, so that's a little confusing looking, but it is 10 units. Mr. Collins believes the applicant only required 52 parking spaces and 53 are provided. That one extra space, we have left over will cover that one extra unit.

Public comments were open, no one came forward.

Public Comments are closed. Motion to close Riker/Burnstein Yes: **Mr. Burnstein, Mr. Riker, Mr. Riccardi, Mr. Haring, Mr. Flemming, and Mr. Hudak**

Motion to approve Riker/Burnstein Yes: **Mr. Burnstein, Mr. Riker, Mr. Riccardi, Mr. Haring, Mr. Flemming, and Mr. Hudak**

Mr. Hudak stated before the meeting is over he would like to make a statement that this is the last meeting for Mr. Dolan. He has been with the board for a number of years, he has been a valued member of this board and has contributed heavily over 10 years. Mr. Hudak said that the board appreciated his service.

Respectfully submitted by

Irina Darrar

Planning Board Recording Secretary