

**JACKSON TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD REORGANIZATION
MONDAY, MARCH 2, 2020**

The March 2, 2019 meeting of the Jackson Township Board was called to order at 7:36 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	Terence Wall, Township Representative
	Dr. Michele Campbell	Martin Flemming, Councilman
	Paul Nigro	Len Haring, Board Vice Chairman
	David Inzelbuch - Alt #2	Robert Hudak, Board Chairman

Absent: *Jeffrey Riker, Andrew Jozwicki - Alt #1, Joseph Riccardi, Mayor's Designee*

Also Present: Planning Board Attorney Sean Gertner, Ernie Peters, Board Planner, Denise Buono, Planning Board Secretary and Danielle Sinowitz, Planning Board Recording Secretary.

Payment of Recording Secretary, Danielle Sinowitz, for 3/2/2020 motioned by HARING/ Flemming. Yes: Dolan, Campbell, Nigro, Inzelbuch, Wall, Flemming, Haring, Hudak

Approval of 2/3/20 Planning Board Minutes by CAMPBELL/ Flemming. Yes: Dolan, Campbell, Nigro, Inzelbuch, Wall, Flemming, Haring, Hudak

RESOLUTIONS: 2020-20 Jackson Township, Block 5806, Lot 1, 113 N. New Prospect Road- Approving a 180' Communications Tower with associated equipment- **Motion to approve by FLEMMING/ Nigro. Yes:** Dolan, Campbell, Nigro, Wall, Flemming, Haring, Hudak

BOARD MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION: Land Use Liability Seminar- Mr. Gertner advised that in two weeks there will be a good time to discuss the legal matters during an executive session, and an item that will also be discussed is the land use seminar, and there is a seminar in regards to RILUPA, and Mr. Gertner asked that the Board members to present at 6:30 p.m. to present the seminar, and should everyone be available, there will be notice given. Mr. Hudak asked how long the seminar would be. Mr. Gertner advised it would be approximately 45 minutes, and mentioned that an email was sent to each member explaining what would be discussed.

APPLICATIONS: 1. Solomon Zolty, Block 21702, 21801, Lots 32, 57, 58, 59 & 61, S. Hope Chapel Road- Mr. Klee stated this is an application for a subdivision of a property into 12 lots and 1 storm water management lot, and there has been testimony and revised plans submitted, if the Board recalls, this application left off with questions about storm water, traffic, affordable housing, and revised plans have been submitted regarding the basin, and there is an outlet being provided to the county outlet, and the water quality storm will be held up to ordinance standards and there are no exceptions taken to the revised plans, and the road design, and traffic impact. Mr. Peters mentioned there was discussion about off street parking, and it should be addressed with regards to the front yard setbacks and parking as shown on the plans so the Board can understand how much off street parking is being provided, because in this case a one acre lot with a decent setback it should be able to be indicated how many spaces can be provide.

Adam Pfeffer- attorney for the applicant- stated a revised storm drainage plan was submitted, and with regard to testimony, it would be best to have Mr. Ian Borden sworn in. **Ian Borden- President of Professional Design services- sworn- credentials accepted-** Mr. Pfeffer noted that Mr. Borden had an opportunity to prepare reports for the Board. Mr. Borden stated as Mr. Klee summarized there are 4 items that need to be discussed, 1 was discussed, and item 2 & 3 were discussed, and the ordinance was cited to support those items, this project creates 7 new lots and the only road design is regarding the 30' cart way. Mr. Pfeffer asked with regards to the road design, although it may not be part of the letter, what was agreed to regarding parking. Mr. Borden stated the maximum unit size is 5 bedroom which requires 3 spaces, and anything over 5 bedrooms will have 4 spaces, and the front yard setback minimum is 40', and a single car garage is purposed, and the intent is to have the 3 remaining spaces in the driveway which will be 20', and with a minimum setback there will still be room for 4 cars. Mr. Peters mentioned that on sheet 3 of the plans, it shows a wide enough driveway for a 2 car garage, please make it clear, as it related to the driveway, outside the garage there can be 4 spaces available. Mr. Borden stated that is correct, and stated that as it related to affordable housing, it was explained that in Jackson Township, the ordinance section 244-12-J, it states the areas that are required to include affordable housing, and if they are not in the correct area the fees are mandatory to be paid, which is determined by the tax collector, and 50% is paid when the permits are issued, and the remaining 50% is paid when the house is built, and the ordinance requires anything listed in the housing element to be part of that, and if not the fees must be paid, and in this case the fair sharing housing plan that was adopted in 2015 which obtains the 3rd round obligation running to 2025, and that housing element provides for the construction of 1,250 affordable units and those units rise from a legal obligation made upon by the town council, and there were 8 projects identified to have affordable housing as part of the project and that total number of 1,250, and none of the 8 projects list the R-1 zone or this project, and of those 8 items in the agreement there are 7 projects tied, and the 8th is the remainder of the RG-2 and RG-3 zone, however the R-1 zone is not inclusionary, and this project and others that have been approved are required to pay the developer fees. Mr. Gertner mentioned speaking with Mr. Maczuga, and mentioned that he agrees with that position and what is most important to remember is the settlement that created these density and affordable housing numbers, and applications in the R-1 zone are not required to have affordable housing. Mr. Peters stated there is no right answer one way or another, however it is certainly something to be looked at so if there are new Board members to read through the ordinance. Mr. Gertner noted to this application, it is his opinion that Mr. Borden's position is correct. Mr. Inzelbuch asked why there is a variance being requested. Mr. Borden stated the variance is for the storm water lot, and the corner of the cul de sac on the South Hope chapel lot is to be dedicated to the township, and a lot not being used must still comply to the lot requirements, and the basin lot is 0.7 acres, as well as 2 width variances, and this application is proposed because there is no detriment to the town, and the benefit of the variance is that the basin and the lot would be paid by the township which is in the public interest to not have more area to be maintained by the public, so the lot is adequately sized for the basin lot, and for that reason the grant of variances does not impede the masterplan. Mr. Borden mentioned that files were gone through at the PDS office to compare projects completed in Jackson, and found that 4 projects received variances for basin lots, so it is typical, and the Board has accepted those previously. Mr. Pfeffer asked if all 12 lots meet or exceed the residential requirements. Mr. Borden advised that is correct. Mr. Nigro asked if each house regardless of the size will have 40' long and 20' wide driveways. Mr. Flemming asked if the basin lot is

Good as it is, or should it be bigger, and will there be any effect on the storm water itself. Mr. Klee stated the water can be spread over a larger area. Mr. Wall asked in relation to garages and whether or not it is professionally sound depending on 1 car vs 2 or 3, and if there are any land use ordinances that speak towards controls or constraints, or that the Planning Board has or does not have regarding garages throughout square footage. Mr. Gertner stated there is no design criteria in the current zone. Mr. Wall asked if that would not factor into a vote, from a professional planning perspective. Mr. Pfeffer mentioned that the squares that were previously shown are place holders, but the homes themselves will be custom. Mr. Wall asked if the applicant is UN willing to share the square footage of the homes. Mr. Pfeffer stated it is up to the buyer, and as long as the zoning requirements are followed, it could be 2,000 SF or 8,000 SF, and for any house that is 5 or more bedrooms according to RSIS there should be 3 spaces, however the applicant agreed that should this be 5 or more bedrooms, more spaces will be provided. Mr. Wall asked if a house that was 2,000 SF with 5 bedrooms or larger than 2,000 SF with 5 bedrooms would have a 1 car garage. Mr. Pfeffer stated that size house would have to have a minimum of 4 spaces. Mr. Peters noted that the maximum building coverage is 15%, which is roughly 6,000 SF. Mr. Hudak mentioned that is only the footprint, that does not include an upstairs and basement, and it is out of character to have that size home with a one car garage, and it was requested that like buildings be built in the community, however there is an ordinance requiring a 2 car garage, and the Board would like to see 2 car garage. Mr. Flemming mentioned approval of a house with only a 1 car garage. Dr. Campbell mentioned that all of royal grove only has 1 car garages, and by code there is no mention of a garage at all. Mr. Wall stated the planner indicated that a 1 car garage is appropriate as a professional opinion, however a question to the Board's planner, what is the common standard for garages, is it typical for a 1 car garage with a 4-5000 SF home. Mr. Hudak stated if a home is going in at over 3,500 SF a 2 car garage should be mandatory. Mr. Peters agreed that houses over a certain square footage should have a standard for garages, and a 2 car garage feels appropriate, and if there's a need to revise the land use code, and ordinance, it can be required.

Opened public comment;

Motion to close public comment by FLEMMING/ Campbell. Yes: All in favor among those present.

Mr. Pfeffer stated this is a 12 lot subdivision with all lots fully conforming. Mr. Gertner asked for the conditions to please be gone through for the Board. Mr. Pfeffer stated the only condition was regarding the parking, and should a house be over 5,000 SF, more spaces will be made available.

Motion to approve by CAMPBELL/ Flemming. Yes: Dolan, Campbell, Nigro, Wall, Flemming, Haring, Hudak

2. 220 Faraday, LLC, Block 22112, Lot 5- Sal Alfieri- attorney for the applicant- stated this application was here in November of last year, and since that time there has been revised plans submitted to address the concerns raised by the Board, and there were stipulations agreed to; sidewalks were discussed, and the applicant agreed to install sidewalks subject to county approval, and the applicant also agreed with the technical comments made by the Environmental Commission, and the site will prohibit left hand turns onto Faraday as long as the county agrees to those circumstance, and Mr. Riker wanted "no parking or loading signs" and that was agreed to, however it will need to be requested by the governing body, and there is a corner lot that is owned by the township, and a letter was written to see if the town would consider selling that portion of land, and Mr. Walter Hopkins is present who was sworn previously.

Walter Hopkins- President of WJH engineering, licensed planner in New Jersey- credentials accepted- sworn- mentioned there were revisions made, and there was a meeting with the Township Forester, and there was a letter received by Mr. Dolan, and 80 trees were discussed and 106 is the actual count, as to how many trees that will be removed, and the extra trees being removed is for the emergency access which was requested by the Board, and was also a meeting with the Township Engineer and Mr. Klee's office to discuss the existing conditions, and the Township owned lot acts as a detention basin, and the applicant through Mr. Alfieri's office has sent a letter to the Township asking if the applicant can purchase that property, and there have been small swales provided to get storm water off the road. Mr. Haring asked for those areas to be pointed out. Mr. Hopkins **Exhibit A-3-** dated March 2, 2020 which is a color rendering revised on February 14, 2020 provided additional depression and swale near the Township owned lot and along Edison Avenue as well, and there has also been additional pipes and storage, and there is the punch through from Edison Avenue as requested, and there is a fire lane, and the lane is 20' wide, a there is a refuse area along the back of each unit, and the restricted left turn signage has been marked as requested, and there has been discussion about the additional ways to encourage left only. Mr. Klee mentioned that paving/ striping, an arrow, and additional signage would be additional ways to enforce the left out only. Mr. Inzelbuch asked if drivers are allowed to make a left in. Mr. Klee stated there are no restrictions driving in. Mr. Hopkins mentioned that the sign size has been reduced to 30 SF per the ordinance, and there was landscaping required below the sign, and additional landscaping has been provided by adding 46 trees and 146 shrubs, and an additional 4 trees were added along Edison Avenue along with shrubs, and the sidewalks were not shown on the plans which was an oversight it will be shown as requested. Mr. Hopkins stated a sign has been added along the front of the building for FedEx and deliveries, and there are technical issues which have been addressed. Mr. Alfieri asked for a run through from **Exhibit A-3** as to what is being purposed, because there is an existing building. Mr. Hopkins stated that is correct, there is an existing building. Mr. Alfieri asked if the addition along the rear is going towards Faraday, and the rear did not have a fire lane correct. Mr. Hopkins advised that is correct. Mr. Alfieri asked if the applicant agreed to comply with all technical comments and reviewed Mr. Peter's letter, and all comments will be addressed. Mr. Hopkins stated there are still some things to be worked on however they will comply. Mr. Alfieri asked if there are still variances being required, and if so please discuss the 3 variances being sought. Mr. Hopkins stated there is 1 purposed, and 2 existing, the existing 2 are side yard setbacks, the ordinance requires 30', and the building is 28.9' which will be continued on. Mr. Alfieri asked if that 28.9' will run throughout the entire addition. Mr. Hopkins mentioned that is correct, and there is also a variance for lot width, along Edison Avenue the width is 200'. However along Faraday it is 175' which reflects along the Township owned lot. Mr. Haring asked if the applicant intends on purchasing the Township owned lot. Mr. Alfieri stated a letter has been sent to the mayor and council. Mr. Hopkins stated there is also a front yard setback variance, because there are 3 front yards, and the front yard along Faraday is 99.9' the ordinance requires 100', and the one true variance is for the front setback along Edison Avenue where the ordinance requires 100', and with the variances all exist other than the Edison Avenue front yard setback, and this can be granted as a C-1 variance because it has 3 front yard setbacks, and the building and impervious coverage will still be met, which the maximum is 40% building coverage, and this site is at 27.0%, and maximum impervious coverage is 75% lot coverage, and this site is at 63.7% and there is water quality being provided. Mr. Hopkins stated the negative aspect of this variance is because of the industrial commercial nature, because this lot is already developed there is no impact that will be added, there will be 10 trees removed with the requested variance which will be re planted or compensated with the Township, and this area is not being looked at for tree preservation, this is an industrial/ commercial use in an industrial commerce site. Mr. Alfieri asked for the waivers to be described. Mr. Hopkins stated a loading zone is required, where none are required with this type of use, and there is no anticipation of loading other than FedEx or UPS trucks, and the flex space provides over

head doors, and although there is no striping, the vehicle will pull in or will park, and there are no deliveries in the front yard, and the purposed area where deliveries will be will have signage along Faraday, and with regards to sidewalks there is a partial waiver being requested, and should extra be required, funds would be provided, and the applicant is also proposing bumper blocks or wheel stops. Mr. Hopkins stated the ordinance requires a driveway to be offset, and also requires 100' from a drive isle which 50' is being provided as it is already existing, and there is also parking along a drive isle and 30' is being purposed, and a 10' landscaping strip is required and a 4.7' strip is provided along the township owned lot. Mr. Alfieri mentioned those items were marked at the last meeting on the **Exhibit A-2**, the rendering. Mr. Klee mentioned not be present at the previous meeting, and noted dumpsters were spoken on, and asked where they are going to be located. Mr. Hopkins stated they will be located at the back of the building. Mr. Klee asked if on trash pick days, up the dumpsters wheeled to the front. Mr. Hopkins stated they will remain in the back. Mr. Peters asked how garbage trucks will get there. Mr. Hopkins advised they would get there through the fire lane. Mr. Peters mentioned that is along the grass paver, and asked who is responsible where it fails. Mr. Hopkins stated the owner of the property would be responsible. Mr. Klee asked if the grass paver area is sound enough to support a garbage truck, and then asked how they would get out of the site. Mr. Hopkins mentioned they would use the grass paver because the desire was to use storage for the storm water, and a paved surface could be provided, and refuse could be contained internally. Mr. Klee asked if the addition of the grass paver was a fire concern. Mr. Flemming stated the Board wanted a fire lane, however there is UN certainty as to how a grass paver will work, and there are 3 parking spaces at the end of the fire lane. Mr. Hopkins noted it was asked that the parking spaces be lost. Mr. Peters mentioned that this is an industrial zone, and it should be made better not reduced. Mr. Flemming mentioned the 3 spaces should be removed. Mr. Hopkins noted that was the Board's idea to have those spaces there. Mr. Wall asked if the drainage on the Township owned lot changed, and will that be the area that gets wet. Mr. Klee stated it is a drainage basin for Faraday, and an easement needs to be provided, however it makes sense to just sell the whole piece, and the plan requires at least an easement. Mr. Gertner asked if that is a condition of approval, to have the Township review the approval if granted. Mr. Alfieri stated that is correct. Mr. Klee stated an easement would need to be obtained regardless. Dr. Campbell asked if that would change the situation of the impervious section to pave the area in the back. Mr. Hopkins mentioned the impervious would still be under the maximum percentage. Mr. Inzelbuch asked what would happen with the septic tanks. Mr. Hopkins stated the owner would abandoned it, and it would be under the Board of health. Mr. Wall noted this is supposed to be office space, and that should be open and welcoming, there is no windows, how is the look and feel, and there are many advanced designs for such things, and this is very closed in, and very un-attractive, this is going to be looked at for the next 100 years. Mr. Peters mentioned the land use ordinance does have requirements for looks, however they are not specific by zone, but they are subjective, and should the Board have concerns or wishes, this is the industrial zone in town and in the past it's be done so that landscaping and buffering is the key to industrial uses which was the band aid approach to the disease. Mr. Alfieri stated this building is far more attractive then what exists. Mr. Haring stated this is mixed use, and asked could each section be an office. Mr. Alfieri advised that is correct, however the front of the building is office on Faraday Avenue. Mr. Gertner stated the Board is talking about this coming back for administrative approval, and there is talk about light and air being added to the front portion of the office, there should be a more light and air feel to the application, since pursuing there is a favorable vote it could be conditioned for an updated rendering, there would be time to review additional plan. Mr. Wall mentioned that these buildings are tired looking in that area. Mr. Gertner stated the idea is that the roadway to Faraday, is to have this be a gateway project to draw more into that zone. Mr. Haring noted there are small areas that will be rented/ leased, and there is question as to whether or not there will be chemicals inside the building. Mr. Alfieri stated the Township ordinance prohibits those. Mr. Klee mentioned the rear driveway is requested for fire, but with regards to the driveway to Edison, was that requested by the Board. Mr. Alfieri said that is correct, it was requested by the Board.

Opened public comment;

Jim Bezanson-12 Melissa Lee Drive-sworn- asked with regards to parking, is the number required driven by the individual units, otherwise how much parking is determined without knowing who will be in the building.

Mr. Alfieri stated the ordinance drives the parking requirements, and there is a specific number of spaces provided

Jim Bezanson-12 Melissa Lee Drive- asked if there could be uses where there wouldn't be enough parking

Mr. Hopkins advised that what was shown was specific to warehouse and office, and if that is exceeded the application would have to come back before the Board

Motion to close public comment by CAMPBELL/ Flemming. Yes: Dolan, Campbell, Nigro, Wall, Flemming, Haring **Recused:** Hudak

Motion to approve by FLEMMING/ Campbell. Yes: Dolan, Campbell, Nigro, Flemming, Riccardi, Haring **No:** Wall **Recused:** Hudak

3. 2050 W. County Line, LLC, Block 7309, Lot 11- Mr. Klee stated this a continuation of an application heard in November, and the project involves a building addition to a commercial building, and there are existing variances and conditions, and there are parking stalls, and revised plans to show those spaces to be removed and parking to be added to the back, and calculations have been reviewed. Mr. Pfeffer stated this application has been before the Board previously, and it was for a one story addition, however the Board had concerns about the parking, and there were 13 parking spaces then and there are 13 now, however the parking was on the side of the building and the spaces were undersized, and a new parking lot has been created, and the existing parking spaces were removed from the side of the building to make for easier access for fire trucks.

Glenn Lines- Engineer/ Planner- practicing since 1988 and owner of new lines engineering- sworn- credentials accepted- presented **Exhibit A-1** dated March 2, 2020, sheet 3 of 13, the layout dimension plan for drawing plans submitted to the Board. There was a same square footage addition purposed, and at that time there was parking from the back of the building to the front, and there were parallel parking spaces along the side of the building, and what has been done is the lot was expanded along the back and all 13 spaces were wrapped around the lot which has 1 handicap space, and there is also an enclosures for 2 dumpsters, and the parking was removed along the side so the fire trucks and emergency vehicles can get in and get out without encroaching any spaces. Mr. Lines stated the variances outside the building are existing, and there are two, one is for a minimum side yard setback, because the existing building is 23.1' on the survey and 23.3' on plans, and the second is a side yard setback for the existing shed which is towards the back of the property and that has been moved to the side of the building, and there is an 11th of a foot side yard setback. Mr. Pfeffer asked Mr. Lines to please go through existing variances. Mr. Lines stated there are existing variances with are for minimum lot area which is 18,951', and lot width of 100' wide, and minimum lot frontage of 100.08', and lot depth of 200' is required and there is 187.6', and the minimum front yard setback as 31.3' is existing. Mr. Lines stated the parking area set back is also existing as 10' is required from nonresidential property lines,

and there is 2.5' along the west property line where there is an existing curb line on the original plan. Mr. Pfeffer asked if the minimum side yard is a new variance, or is there one today. Mr. Lines stated the variance to the east has a 23.31' setback, and the west side is as 24.05' which does not meet the minimum requirement of 25' which is an existing side yard setback. Mr. Haring asked if the applicant is asking for 2 new variances, and one is for the shed, and there is questions as to what the function of the shed is. Mr. Lines advised the shed is for landscape equipment. Mr. Pfeffer noted there is grass area that does need to be maintained. Mr. Lines stated the front and sides are grass and to the rear of the parking lot there is grass and in the back there is a slope and trees. Mr. Haring asked if the shed needed to be moved for the parking lot. Mr. Lines stated that is correct. Mr. Pfeffer advised the applicant would like the shed to maintain the property, and asked Mr. Line if there is anything that cannot be complied with. Mr. Lines stated the planner and engineer's reports have been gone through and the applicant will comply with all technical comments. Mr. Inzelbuch asked if the shed can be moved anywhere else. Mr. Lines mentioned it was chosen to be where it is because it keeps it out of view. Mr. Nigro asked what the current square footage of the building is now, and what is purposed. Mr. Pfeffer stated the addition is 1,095 SF. Mr. Nigro stated the building will be double the size, is 13 spaces really enough. Mr. Pfeffer stated the current tenant is taking over the new space, and there are currently 7 employees and there will be room for 3 or so more employees.

Opened public comment;

Motion to close public comment by FLEMMING/ Campbell. Yes: Dolan, Campbell, Nigro, Wall, Flemming, Haring **Recused:** Hudak

Motion to approve by WALL/ Flemming. Yes: Dolan, Campbell, Nigro, Wall, Flemming, Haring **Recused:** Hudak

4. Berk Holdings, LLC, Block 22010, Lot 6, Faraday Avenue- Mr. Klee stated this is an application for administrative approval, the application that was approved back in 2016 for a contractors office and warehousing use, and the applicant is asking for all permitted uses in the zone to be allowed to occupy the building, however the Board ask that no outdoor storage be provided and the parking be satisfactory. Mr. Peters stated the issue with allowing all uses is parking, there is no exception to allowing this however the Board should understand the responsibility of this Board granting this here needs to be enough parking, and if all uses are allowed, someone will show up without room for parking. Mr. Pfeffer stated if there is no parking provided, there can be no permit. Mr. Gertner asked if the original approval was for the original uses. Mr. Pfeffer stated this application came before the Board for a second building on site, 1 was for main tenant which is an electrical contractor, and the second building was for a specific use, and there was discussion as to what would go there and it was only for industrial uses, and both buildings are up and there have been tenants interested, and the problem is that the uses permitted are not the uses sought.

Graham Macfarlane- Professional Design Services- Planner/ Engineer- sworn-credentials accepted- stated the application came before the Board previously, and it was understood that the space would be able to be filled with someone who fits the zone requirements as long as the parking complies, and this went through in detail the worst case parking situation, and building 1 is occupied, and building 2 is a multi-tenant building, and basically there are 4 primary categories defined as business office/ warehouse, and building 2 had office space totaling to 2,400SF, and each of the 19 permitted uses in the zone were gone through to confirm there is room for parking spaces, and the goal is that should there be a tenant change the client doesn't have to come back before the Board for approval, and the first potential tenant was a baker, and the zoning officer noted that the resolution doesn't state "bakery", so the tenant was denied, and there have been 3 or 4 other offers however because they are not in the resolution the zoning permits were denied. Mr. Macfarlane stated If building 2 is a warehouse, the site requires 60 spaces, and if there manufactures there is 67 required and on site there are 102 spaces required, and the client would have the right to fill the space with any permitted use, and permitted use 18 will be skipped as there will be no need to raise horses or live stock on the property. Mr. Wall asked if the Planning Board resolution was in-accurate. Mr. Macfarlane mentioned that the resolution did not seek specific clarification. Mr. Klee stated the resolution would have to indicate that all uses in the zone are permitted as long as there is adequate parking. Mr. Macfarlane mentioned that should the zoning officer see there is no parking available it would be brought back for this Board for clarification. Mr. Gertner stated the zoning officers review of the resolution led him to the conclusion that the uses that are permitted are generally articulated, and then it was not specified, and the zoning officer's input is being sought.

Motion to carry to March 16, 2020 by CAMPBELL/ Haring. Yes: All in favor among those present.

Motion to adjourn by DOLAN/ Haring. Yes: All in favor among those present.

Adjourned: 9:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Danielle Sinowitz,
Planning Board Recording Secretary