

## JACKSON TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD MEETING

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 2021

The February 1, 2021 meeting of the Jackson Township Board was called to order at 7:33 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.

<b>ROLL CALL:</b>	Tim Dolan	Terence Wall, Township Representative
	Dr. Michele Campbell	Martin Flemming, Councilman
	Jeffrey Riker	Joseph Riccardi, Mayor's Designee
	Andrew Jozwicki	Len Haring, Board Vice Chairman
	Anthony Luisi- Alt #1	Robert Hudak, Board Chairman
	Manuela Brito- Alt #2	

**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 2/1/21 motioned by RIKER/ Flemming. Yes:** All in favor among those present.

*Mr. Gertner announced the Board is in receipt of several questions and comments and the Board secretary has received them and they have been forwarded to the applicant's attorney and should the questions have not been answered by the end of the testimony, those questions will be asked, and should there be further objections and comments and questions they can be asked at that time.*

Mr. Hudak announced that Alexis Gasorokwski is online as an objector. **Alexis Gasorowski- appearing on behalf of Elenor Hannum.**

**Applications: 1. Jackson Parke (South Section), Block 10401, 17802, Lots 5.04, 57.01** - Mr. Klee stated this is a continuation of the Jackson Parke section involving 549 single and multi-family units, located on the north side of West Veterans Highway and is in the southern portion of the overall Jackson Parke Section, and the last meeting there was homework given and discussion and there was a technical review, and Prospertown road was discussed and where Prospertown Road should go, and the improvements purposed are still in play however there is no easement dedication and there should be testimony or discussion during the technical review, and the issue is what will this look like between the trail and the basin, and the applicant has purposed some exhibits that show the tot lot and beach ball volley ball court and there was circulation and the roundabout, and there was concern of the trees in the median, and there was issues with the trees getting in the way of the vehicles and it was asked that a double wide driveway be looked at that would service 2 cars and across the Board a driveway area in front of a 2 car garage is 20' with 18' being the minimum, and that was based off personal views and a contractor opinion. Peters stated the site is still in the same zone and is still a permitted use. Mr. Tuvel stated the plan for this evening will be to have Mitchel Newman come back and go over the changes that were mentioned specifically the driveway width and then the planner will provide planning testimony and then the direct testimony will be completed, and Mitch can come back if allowed.

**Mitchell Newman- with Lennar which is the managing member of El at Jackson- credentials accepted- sworn-** the goal is to respond to 4 items and Mr. Klee stole the thunder of outlining the items, and there should be clarity and the plan was addressed and the recreation will be addressed and the roundabout, the driveways and the utilities, and lastly the Prospertown Road discussion. Mr. Tuvel mentioned speaking with Mr. Gertner today and there is another meeting next week and a transcript will be filed, and it's requested that the Exhibits be posted on the website. Mr. Newman stated the purpose of **Exhibit A-3** is to highlight the entrance and the clubhouse and tot lot, and the challenge was to add recreation to the back near the townhouses along the back of the property along with an area near the clubhouse and with that challenge in mind there are 2 exhibits that show those areas. Mr. Newman presented **Exhibit A-19** the amenity area which is a blown up image of the portion of the property adjacent to the affordable building, and a tot lot has been added and there is a parking lane, and this shows the recreation added near the multifamily buildings and there was the idea to add additional recreation and there has been a sand volley ball court which is a 40x70' area of playing surface with sand surrounding that and when Prospertown Road has the path it becomes another passive recreation area. Mr. Newman showed **Exhibit A-18** which focuses on the single family section of the community and for perspective this is coming in past the clubhouse and turning onto road 2, it becomes the single family section to a roundabout, and the design hasn't changed other than the concerns that were raised that by plantings and tress in the median, and there was concern if an emergency was in a roundabout there needs to be rounded curbs and this has a depressed curb in the roundabout and there is no landscaping, and the purpose is to show there are no trees rather than low bushes. Mr. Newman continued with **Exhibit A-17** which was to address the concern about how the utilities reach the townhome structure and there were meetings with the JTMUA, and what was addressed is the water and sewer mains in the street and there are 3 gas lines in the 6 home building and there are 3 on the opposite side as well and they are underground and the next item that is being addressed is to demonstrate the driveways, and it was purposed to have a 15' driveway, and the position of the applicant is that 15' is adequate and there is talk in the ordinance provided by Mr. Peters that 16' is the standard and the applicant found 16', and the challenge was to change the size of the driveways and the applicant agreed to change the driveways to 16' and there is only so much that can be done, and it's not intended to be a debate and it would be suggested to come to a solution and the applicant would be willing to increase from 16 to 17', however 18' cannot be accommodated but 17' can be accommodated and there is no desire to get to close to the utilities, so hopefully that proposal is acceptable. Mr. Newman mentioned when driveway widths were discussed it was mentioned that a wider driveway would adjust the impervious coverage and what was come up with and by increasing the driveway by 1', going from 15-16', it's increasing by a 10th of an acre which is .08% and going to 17' which is increasing by a 16th%, so it's a minimal effect to the impervious coverage to this site and the applicant has been hopefully accommodating, and lastly as it relates to Prospertown Town, there is **Exhibit A-7-B**, the purpose is to accept the Board suggestion, and leave the right of way exactly where it is and the path as its purposed would stay in the right of way at all times. Mr. Newman stated there was guidance reviewed, and what's important is the right of way and the purpose is to construct a path in the right of way and that would be something natural, such as some type of sand or natural surface as the path that is constructed can be walked from West Veterans highway to the existing site in the north west edge of the site. Mr. Tuvel asked if there is a need for a road indication or a need to give dedication to the

Township. Mr. Newman advised there is no need, and there would be signage added such as stop signs and there would be signs to designate prospertown road identifying the path so there would be some value, and there would be a place for parking as well and there is the way to accommodate the concern of the right of way. Mr. Tuvel stated the increase in impervious coverage, and asked if it could be discussed that the storm water management can withstand that increase. Mr. Newman stated it can of course withstand, and there would be an updated storm water report. Mr. Flemming asked who is responsible for the boulevard islands. Mr. Newman mentioned it would be delegated to the homeowner's association, and that would be a condition of any approval and would be in the developer agreement. Mr. Wall stated there are 2 tot lots, and asked has there been discussion of an older age group. Mr. Peters advised there was no discussion. Mr. Newman stated there is no preference and the guidance of the Board members would be appreciated, and one can be picked for one age group, and the other can be for another age group and the town professionals can be worked with. Mr. Hudak noted that 2 tot lots is a good attempt at satisfying the needs of the children in this development, there are over 500 units and there is potential of many children of different ages, and the beach volleyball is nice however basketball should be scattered so older kids can play and hang out with friends and not monopolize a small lot for kids not their age. Mr. Wall stated based on the number of units the recreation is very nil and it's unfortunate. Mr. Hudak agreed. Mr. Newman advised it can be worked on. Mr. Hudak stated there should be another option to satisfy what teenagers needs are these days, and the Boards planner Mr. Peters can work with the applicant however what has been presented is not enough for a development of this size. Mr. Haring agreed with the fellow members and stated there needs to be more, there is nothing there, the kids will wonder into the protected areas to make their own play areas so with no basketball courts or general areas where kids can hang out with benches, they will create their own play place. Dr. Campbell mentioned there seems to be enough room where the tot lots have been placed, and there seems to be room for a basketball court with several hoops, and kids like basketball and its good for kids to be outside and there looks like there is room near the clubhouse for basketball. Mr. Newman stated the comments are appreciated and it can be worked on and perhaps there can be a half-court basketball area where the volleyball court is, and there can be another element worked in the development. Mr. Riker stated the Board is always worried about the dumpster enclosure, and there should be bike racks and there should be intermittent racks throughout the trail and there is a huge amount of parking and there is a driveway not even the width of 2 parking spaces and it shows that there will be no room for even trash cans at the end of the driveway and there will be bikes and recyclable cans and there is room for it, and as much as the Board is willing to be worked with there is a lot of density, there will be kids and kids toys and with heavy winds there will be cans everywhere and they have to get to the curb. Mr. Newman stated bike racks are a great idea, and benches can be added, and they can be partially near the recreation area, and in terms of parking it exceeds to the RSIS standards and the dumpsters have been discussed, and when the research was done there is no hard standards at 15' driveways and the applicant has gone to 17'.

Mr. Gertner stated following up on Mr. Riker's point, there is a new development that was approved in town, and in front of the development the developer created a passive pedestrian pathway and put up those workout spots throughout the path and there is some lighting to have WIFI and possibly that type of thing, and there is concern of too much hanging out and movement can be done, and it doesn't add impervious coverage to the tail there will only be a maintenance fee. Mr. Newman stated it has been agreed that the homeowner's association would have control over that and as far as bike racks they can be added however workout gear brings risk and there will be no WIFI as there are data plans to provide service.

**Creigh Rahenkamp- been in the field for 39 years and licensed for 25, holds field expert lectures at Rowman and has appeared before both Jackson Board's- credentials accepted- sworn-** Mr. Tuvel asked Mr. Rahenkamp to go through his role in this project as well as the background in the formation of the affordable housing zone. Mr. Rahenkamp stated the intention is to have a compliant plan and there is an issue from Mr. Peters and there could happen to be variance sought, and Ms. Galvin, Mr. Vederse and Mr. Newman were speaking to the site and there testimony which will not be re hashed, and to link the site from the GDP to now it was once was a much larger parcel and there was open space in between parcels and this has been in the Township plans for quite some time and there is now a north and south central building area that has been approved by the courts, and from that process there came the zone that the site is in now, and the GDP was prepared with the plan and settlement that went with the ordinance, and the application is fully consistent with the GDP, and the master has asked for information as it relates to adorable housing, there are 220 affordable units, 120 in north and 100 in south and the ordinance puts a cap at a minimum of 40% at either site and there is a split between the sites which is appropriate and they are rental family units not age restriction, there will be a rent that is calculated from the ordinance and UHAC which governs that issue, typically under UHAC there are percentage standard that must be followed. Mr. Rahenkamp referenced **Exhibit A-13** which was presented in Mr. Newman's original testimony which shows the size of the units and in the lower left there is the distribution, and there is 20%, and there are 24 units which is appropriate and there are 4 units short which will be located in the other 2 multifamily buildings on the project and one thing that did get tweaked is the phasing plan which is marked as **Exhibit A-15-A**, and it would have required the development to start with phase 2 which created confusion and the phase A was adjusted to create enough infostructure to create the affordable units, so there is no need for an additional phase for the affordable, and there is an affordable plan required not before site plan however before the first unit can be occupied on site and that would be the specific wording. Mr. Rahenkamp stated there will be deed restrictions and that wouldn't be done now, that would happen later as a condition of approval, there are 2 planning issues and the density and bulk requirements are met however there is a conditional use requirement and it was discussed how this meets the criteria and all those conditions have been met and lastly is the issue raised by Mr. Peters in his review date August 10, 2020 which is a comment which is the parking along the one street there was an interpretation taken and that is off street parking which should meet the requirement of the 25' setback, and it appears on another page as well and in foot notes so having sourced where the comment comes from **Exhibit A-14** there is a cutout from the settlement concept plan which is from 2015 and at the bottom of **Exhibit A-14** its approximately the same area not the same scale but the same star from the site plan application and the design issue being dealt with is finding a logical way to find parking with parallel parking along the street and where the townhome driveways become closer there is the upper and lower level units with its own driveway it comes to an issue where there is not enough parking for guests, and if the right of way is adjusted there would be someone in the driveway and if there is parallel parking and drive in there is a right of way issue for both, and whether or not this needs a variance is whether or not the angle creates enough space for a space. Mr. Rahenkamp stated from the interpretation of what on and off street parking means this is not subject to the inter position of the 25' setback from the right of way to parking, and that is believed to deal with the multifamily parking and it doesn't apply based on the angle of parking, and if felt that there should be a 25' setback this was on the GDP plans and if it had been identified then it could have been addressed as a departure and since they are on the plans that the Board approved the departure was granted and if this is a variance it would be a C-2 variance, and this is an affordable housing development and it's designed to allow for that to happen and it would. Mr. Tuvel asked why doesn't it hinder the affordable housing obligation. Mr. Rahenkamp stated there is nothing inconsistent with the master plan. Mr. Tuvel asked if the variance as required if the benefits would outweigh the detriment. Mr. Rahenkamp stated there is no detriment, and since maintenance was addressed one reason a Township doesn't like anything other than parallel spaces is because it's difficult to remove snow, and the home owners association is clearing sidewalks, they have the equipment to deal with smaller areas and there is usually an agreement to take on the maintenance for those spaces, and the issue on the right of way, is there are 2 standards, a 50' with parallel or a 90' right of way with head in spaces and weather

there are parallel or head in spaces it becomes impossible to do. Mr. Tuvel asked if the application is fully confirmative with setbacks, spaces, height and applicable building requirements in the zone. Mr. Rahenkamp advised that was correct. Mr. Tuvel asked for testimony on the amenity space. Mr. Rahenkamp stated there is clubhouse with an exercise room, billiard and yoga room. Mr. Peters stated it would be summarized that first given the right of way is going to be owned and maintained by the applicant it should be agreed to have the correct design solution to the issue and it's the only design waiver or variance that would be on this application and Mr. Tuvel and Mr. Rahenkamp stated, it's a conforming application in the zone and as it relates to the parking there should be some things gone through. Mr. Peters stated as it relates to the GDP, it was not required to go through this design issue and it was agreed to go through this at site plan and it is the correct design solution and the best solution as it relates not only to the town and not who cleans half a parking space and in the end having one entity, the owner the applicant offering to own and maintain this areas works for all involved on a practical perspective, and there were a number of standards addressed and they are not part of Jackson Land Use ordinance, and that is where those issue were and it should be noted that the parking standard under 244-51.2k assuming the is to be off street parking they have to be RSIS compliant, and there is setbacks which is the main portion of discussion and there is 2c which is minimums acceptations that may be granted by the Board.

*Recess taken at 8:57 p.m. reconvened by Mr. Hudak at 9:10 p.m.*

Mr. Tuvel stated that concludes the direct testimony, and the whiteness's have been presented and there is commented to be addressed , there was back and forth about the recreation space and there was a consensus that the Board would like more recreation and the applicant would be more than willing to work with the Board, the special master, and the professionals to make the issue work. Mr. Gertner stated in concept there is no issue however the Board doesn't have to make that determination right now so it should be held.

*Opened public comment.*

Mr. Hudak asked everyone be civil and keep the comments related to the testimony provided, and asked that all the participants try to not duplicate other comments and pleas speak to new issues, comments and questions.

**Damien Carrillo- 20 Oakland Drive- sworn-** said Cooks Bridge has been referenced and if anyone has driven past that development they will see the parking is such a mess there are 40-60 cars parked along Cooks Bridge from County Line passed the development, and driving through the development is impossible to navigate with the on street parking, and there needs to be more places for the children to play, because kids will find a place to play and this is in close proximity to six flags, and currently this site is on well and there was testimony that this won't impact the well and it just doesn't make sense that with another 500 units there will be no effect, the Aquaphor will be depleted.

Mr. Gertner asked Mr. Tuvel if there is any directions to have the comments addressed too. Mr. Tuvel stated the comments have been heard, and there was no question specific to the professionals. Mr. Gertner asked if the water question can be addressed. Mr. Tuvel stated the JTMUA must provide approval and that can be put on the record and in terms of water and sewer the items can be gone through.

**Daphne Galvin- Engineer- sworn-** stated the project has preliminary approval from the JTMUA for water and sewer and there will also be tentative and final approval. Mr. Gertner asked for clarify, are there wells located at this site. Ms. Galvin stated the potable water is not well based and with respect to irrigation for landscaping that hasn't been determined yet and relative to how that would be operated and normally irrigation is done off well however that would be minimal based on the size of the project, it's not a site wide irrigation system. Mr. Gertner asked if there is septic purposed. Ms. Galvin advised there is no septic purposed. Mr. Tuvel stated that Cooks Bridge was only mentioned as it was requested to view, and the parking requirement exceeds what is permitted. Ms. Galvin agreed that was correct.

*Mr. Hudak noted that Ms. Elenor Hannum has her hand raised. Mr. Gertner stated Ms. Hannum should be called once there is objection, and it was asked that she is represented, and this is not a CUPON group, her comments should be addressed with council.*

**Joseph Ricchiuti- 7 Corey Lane- sworn-** asked what will the transition be to Prospertown Road, how will that be accomplished so there are no ruts along the street.

Mr. Tuvel asked to assure the question is correct the areas where West Veterans intersects with Prospertown Road, or where the new road is entered

**Joseph Ricchiuti- 7 Corey Lane-** said the new road.

Ms. Galvin stated as the Prospertown road walkway approaches the roadway it will first cross the sidewalk purposed and there is a curb on either side of the street and sidewalk and there is a change in surface, there is no edge of pavement.

**Joseph Ricchiuti- 7 Corey Lane-** asked if the road will accommodate vehicles

Ms. Galvin advised it would not be possible for normal vehicle to travel the path, its only about 8' wide and is not intended for vehicles to access the path.

**Joseph Ricchiuti- 7 Corey Lane-** said after hearing the testimony for on street parking it was about 300 spots of on street parking for the parking around the townhouse, and it seems like that only adds up to 1 car per townhouse

**Nick vederse- sworn-** advised there are different sections with different parking, there are 299 spaces in that general area and that is for on street and shared paring and to the north west there are 95 on street spaces and the townhouses as you enter there are 54 on street spaces and then there are 94 in the stacked townhouses and the rest are made up of garages and driveways.

**Paula Robertson- 662 Swimming Lane- sworn-** mentioned that Cooks Bridge development was asked to be reviewed, and that should be referenced as what not to do, that development is impossible to navigate, and there is question if the exact number of homes have been spoken to that will be removed for imminent domain.

Mr. Tuvel stated there are no home that will be removed. Mr. Gertner stated that question may be referring to the north parcel and the connector road.

**Paula Robertson- 662 Swimming Lane-** asked if any home will lose part of their property with this development.

Mr. Newman stated no houses will lose any pieces of land, there is no taking of the south section. Mr. Gertner stated it was testified there is no taking on this portion of the project however there are plus or minus 10 small takings relating to the connector road for the north parcel.

Mr. Newman advised that is correct.

**Paula Robertson- 662 Swimming Lane-** said this type of meeting should not be held on zoom, this is no way to handle this size project. Mr. Hudak agreed, and stated this is under court order.

**Jeff nemeth- 387 Perrineville Road- sworn-** strongly opposed to the meeting format, the applicants have a total disconnect, and asked to have any units been sold or are they on a waiting list. Mr. Tuvel stated Mr. Newman will address that. Mr. Newman advised there have been no units sold, there are no units under contract and there needs to be a sales registration and that cannot be done until the approvals are done.

**Jeff nemeth- 387 Perrineville Road-** said there have been biased remarks thrown around about the residents in Jackson, and if there have been no shovels put in the ground, and there are no units sold how can there be a bias. Mr. Tuvel stated this is a subdivision site plan application, litigation cannot be discussed.

**Jeff nemeth- 387 Perrineville Road-** said the people being impacted have been wrongfully directed, and there has been a label placed on the resident of Jackson publicly and it's not fair and the question should be answered. Mr. Tuvel stated the questions will only be answered if they are related to this application.

**Jeff nemeth- 387 Perrineville Road-** asked if there will there be a public form relating to the North parcel. Mr. Hudak stated that application will be heard later. Mr. Tuvel noted to make sure everything is clear, the court already ordered the approval of the north approval, the south is being heard, the court has addressed the north and that will not be coming back before the Board. Mr. Gertner stated the next opportunity the north if it doesn't settle will be at the appellate division and that application will not be coming back, and the north parcel is complete.

**Eric hannum- 7 Evergreen Court- sworn-** mentioned testimony given from Ms. Galvin regarding acres with deed restrictions, and there are 81 acres being reserved what are the other acres, wetlands or transition. Ms. Galvin stated wetlands and repairing buffers are the sensitive areas.

**Eric hannum- 7 Evergreen Court-** asked if every wetlands area is deed recited. Ms. Galvin said yes.

**Eric hannum- 7 Evergreen Court-** said the northern long eared bat has been noted, and there is question as to what is the removal process with regards to vegetation. Mr. Newman stated with reading from the DEP permit from 2018 which indicates a timing restriction of trees during a certain time of the year, and that will be followed.

**Eric hannum- 7 Evergreen Court-** mentioned the swamp pink plant, and asked what the buffer will be to protect that area. Ms. Galvin advised there is a 250' buffer.

**Eric hannum- 7 Evergreen Court-** asked if there will fencing around that. Mr. Newman stated that is not required by the permit.

**Eric hannum- 7 Evergreen Court-** asked if there is no fencing, what is required to keep the area safe. Mr. Newman stated the permits will be followed, however if fencing is required it will be complied with. Mr. Tuvel stated whatever agency that issued the permits will be adhered too. **Laura-court reporter-** said there is a woman that needs to be identified. Mr. Hudak stated whoever is feeding questions, needs to be sworn in.

**Eric hannum- 7 Evergreen Court-** said there was no one reading questions, and there is no one else to be sworn in and continued onto Prospertown road, and said there are wetlands and wet ponds, and asked what is being done to preserve those. Ms. Galvin referenced **Exhibit A-3** which showed Prospertown Road and the area being referred to, there are no disturbance areas, nor is there disturbance purposed.

**Eric hannum- 7 Evergreen Court-** asked what is the water table is for this site. Ms. Galvin stated it varies throughout the site.

**Eric hannum- 7 Evergreen Court-** said this format is not acceptable, the attorney, applicant and professionals are completely dis connected front he residents and their voices.

**Randy Bergmann- 5 Brandy Wood drive- sworn-** asked what the developer's obligation is to replace the trees that are being taken down based off the Jackson tree ordinance. Mr. Tuvel stated the tree ordinance under the affordable housing agreement is not applicable to the Jackson Parke application.

**Randy Bergmann- 5 Brandy Wood drive-** asked if the Board will agree to not have trees removed until all environmental permits are received. Mr. Hudak stated there is an ordinance where all clear cutting cannot be done until the permits are obtained. Mr. Gertner agreed there are applicable ordinances as it relates to clear cutting .

**Randy Bergmann- 5 Brandy Wood drive-** asked what the full buildout time frame is along with the estimated population. Mr. Tuvel stated there is a 20-year GDP approval, and population issues are not addressed at site plan

**Randy Bergmann- 5 Brandy Wood drive-** raised concerns with the parking. Mr. Vederse stated there are 1,374 spaces for the total project with 1,673 being on the south section.

**Randy Bergmann- 5 Brandy Wood drive-** mentioned that is slightly more than 4 per unit.

Mr. Vederse advised that is about 2.0 and 2.4 spaces per unit. Mr. Tuvel asked if the parking is adequate. Mr. Vederse stated that is correct.

**Randy Bergmann- 5 Brandy Wood drive-** asked if the Planning Board will have the opportunity to request an economic report statement. Mr. Tuvel stated it's not part of this application, and was provided at the GDP application. Mr. Gertner stated it was presented in the GDP and since it was provided a copy of it can be sought and since it's a general development plan that relates to this, it can be viewed and there can be questions asked.

*Mr. Gertner announced that Ms. Garner will complete the public comet and there will be opportunity to speak at the next hearing.*

**Denise Garner- 8 Dover Ct, Bear, Delaware- sworn-** said the ground water may have to be controlled when the utilities come in meaning they the high-water table will be hit during construction, how are the contaminants going to be handled.

Mr. Tuvel stated the applicant must comply with DEP requirements and permits. Ms. Galvin stated all construction and trenching will have to follow appropriate standards.

**Denise Garner- 8 Dover Ct, Bear, Delaware-** said the compression of the soils will be affected, and the ground water will be containment from the Diesel fuels, and asked if there is new testing being done since the base study is 15 years old.

Ms. Galvin stated there was supplementary studies done in 2018 which was used for the studies done in 2005-2006.

**Denise Garner- 8 Dover Ct, Bear, Delaware-** said that does not give the impact, and there was a person who spoke about wells and there are over 100 residents on wells surrounding this area, and clear cutting and compressing those soils will impact the wells, and had concerns that the tree ordinance is not being followed.

Mr. Tuvel stated the tree ordinance is not applicable to the project.

Mr. Hudak announced this will be continued on February 8, 2021 at 7:30 p.m. Mr. Gertner stated for members of the Board and members of the public, this matter shall be carried to the February 8, 2021 meeting and the applicant shall not be required to further notice, the public is directed to view the Township website and there has been notice to Alex Gasorowski and the cross examination should be done at the next meeting.

**Motion to carry to February 8, 2021 by DOLAN/ Riker. Yes:** All in favor among those present.

**Motion to adjourn at 10:55 p.m. by HARING/ Dolan. Yes:** All in favor among those present.

Respectfully submitted,

Danielle Sinowitz,  
Planning Board Recording Secretary