A.) CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

The Ordinance Committee Meeting of the Township of Monroe was called to order at approximately 7:02 PM by **Ordinance Chairman, Cncl. Bob Heffner** in the Second Floor Meeting Room of the Municipal Complex located at 125 Virginia Avenue, Williamstown, New Jersey.

This meeting was advertised pursuant to the Open Public Meetings Act of New Jersey (*NJSA 10:4-6 thru 10:4-21*). Notices were placed in the official newspapers for the Township of Monroe (i.e.: South Jersey Times, the Courier Post and the Sentinel of Gloucester County) and copies were posted on the bulletin board at the Municipal Complex.

Present Present Present Present Present Present Present

Present Present Present

SALUTE TO THE FLAG

Cncl. Dilks led the assembly in the Pledge of Allegiance to Our Flag.

ROLL CALL OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS

Cncl. Walt Bryson
Cncl. Frank Caligiuri
Cncl. Marvin Dilks
Cncl. Rich DiLucia
Cncl. Bart McIlvaine
Cncl. Cody Miller
Ord. Chairman, Bob Heffner
Mayor Daniel Teefy
Business Administrator, Kevin Heydel
Solicitor, Charles Fiore
Police Chief, John McKeown
Deputy Clerk, Sharon Wright

(Arrived 7:03 PM)

B.) <u>APPROVAL OF MINUTES</u>

Cncl. Pres., **Miller** made a motion to approve the minutes as submitted of the Ordinance Committee Meeting of February 3, 2016. The motion was seconded by **Cncl. Dilks** and approved by all members of Council.

C.) <u>PUBLIC PORTION</u>

Cncl. Pres., **Miller** made a motion to open the Public Portion. The motion was seconded by **Cncl. Caligiuri** and unanimously approved by all members of Council.

William Skinner, Counsel from the law firm of Flaster Greenberg was in attendance to present the Builder's League of South Jersey's concerns regarding sidewalk fees included in Ordinance O:05-2016 and O:06-2016. The Builder's League is not in favor of developers being charged \$3,000.00 for a sidewalk waiver for a pedestrian improvement fund that would be utilized elsewhere in town. Developers like to build affordable houses and the extra cost for

C.) <u>PUBLIC PORTION</u> (cont'd)

unrelated assessments that have nothing to do with their particular development add to the cost and diminish affordable houses. The Municipal Land Use Law is clear on this, as it states in order to have an assessment for an off-track improvement it is necessary to demonstrate that the improvement is required for the development for which it is being charged and in this particular case that is not possible. Mr. Skinner noted an ordinance like this passed in Berkley Township, Ocean County about two years ago but a year ago the Ocean County Superior Court struck it down. He noted this is not a valid law so we are asking that Council not adopt the ordinances. Cncl. Caligiuri explained in all cases the developer has the option of building the sidewalk in front of the residence; this is an alternate option for the developer, which in some cases will benefit him. The Planning Board leaves it open so the developer can tell us if he would rather provide the contribution in lieu of sidewalks, it is not a requirement, it is just an option. Mr. Skinner noted and that still is not legal. Cncl. Caligiuri commented the alternative is we require everyone to put in sidewalks, which is legal. Solicitor Fiore noted he and the Planning Board Solicitor Joe Rocco will be bringing forth different criteria within the ordinance that may address their legal concerns. Mr. Skinner explained the typical cost for sidewalks is \$1,500.00 to \$2,000.00. Cncl. Caligiuri noted in the R-2 Zone we have 100 foot frontage on the majority of lots and the contribution is usually less so we always give the developer the option. Solicitor Fiore noted this ordinance has been on the books for about fifteen years and what put it up on the radar screen was the amendment dealing with the site plan waiver. The Builder's League is technically challenging the amendment but he didn't know if they would have legal standing at this point in time to challenge the ordinance. They would in the future if a developer asks the court to deem it illegal. This argument is similar to one a few years ago regarding developers paying parks and rec fees that got struck down in all non- Pineland areas. Cncl. Caligiuri felt giving the developer the option was a benefit, as it could be less expensive not to install sidewalks. Mr. Skinner explained if that satisfies the argument then there could be a whole menu of charges towns could extract in so called voluntary contributions. He noted the appropriate thing is to require sidewalks when and where needed. Solicitor Fiore explained if there is no criteria they have to install sidewalks everywhere. This ordinance was well intended and came about when sidewalks were installed along the South Black Horse Pike in the middle of nowhere that only the deer used. Cncl. Bryson questioned if the Berkley case was specific to sidewalks. Mr. Skinner advised that it was but the fee charged was not a fixed number, it was the estimated cost of the sidewalks that were waived and that ordinance was ruled illegal. Mayor Teefy questioned whether the Builder's League would get involved with two or three houses down Winslow Road, where sidewalks would only cause more run off. Mr. Skinner noted this ordinance would apply to that. Solicitor Fiore noted he and Joe Rocco would review this matter and make some recommendations to Council if possible at the March 14th meeting or possibly the end of March.

Debby Simpson, Lorrie Hutchinson and Margie Rennebaum were in attendance to request amendments to Chapter 280 "Animal Control" regarding outdoor maintenance of animals in extreme weather conditions. Ms. Simpson distributed their proposed amendments, which would require animals to be brought inside when temperatures fall below 32° and she spoke about incidents in New Jersey where dogs froze to death when left outside in freezing temperatures. She noted dogs are our companions and also K-9 officers that protect people so

C.) <u>PUBLIC PORTION</u> (cont'd)

Cncl. Pres., Miller explained these ladies took the more we need to protect them as well. stringent requirements from other municipalities and added them to our ordinance currently in affect. He noted he informed the Solicitor and Ordinance Chairman about the proposed amendments in the event Council decides to act upon them. Ms. Simpson noted twenty-eight communities have just approved these regulations. Margie Rennebaum spoke of a dog in Buena freezing to death because the SPCA couldn't take it since it had a dog box and all other things required by New Jersey Law. The law being proposed would allow police officers or the Gloucester County Animal Control to step in and prevent that from happening. Lorrie Hutchinson noted she is State certified and has worked in rescue for approximately five years and what this law does is educate and opens up communication community wide. She noted no one wants to take a person's animal but we don't want to sit back and do nothing so this would provide resources for us to take the steps needed to protect animals. This will not change State law it will just enhance what already exists in Title 4 and Council is allowed to do that. Cncl. Bryson questioned whether there was a provision in the ordinance that would return a dog once the weather warmed up. Ms. Hutchinson advised the animals can be reclaimed within seven days. Gloucester County Animal Shelter charges \$5.00 per day to care for the animal and there is a pickup charge as well. Owners can be cited and fined if the animal is left outside again and it could be confiscated and taken to the shelter for protection. The animal shelter will check to see if the animal is up to date with its rabies shot and if it is registered with the township. Ms. Rennebaum noted the ordinance also covers livestock guardian/protection dogs, which are highly trained dogs that live in barns and fields with the livestock (goats, sheep, chickens) to protect them from predators. The language included in the ordinance states the dog must be present with its flock, not chained to a dog box. She urged Council to consider the amendments because if the ordinance is not amended there is nothing anyone can do on this level to help these dogs. Cncl. Caligiuri questioned the language regarding dogs being tethered more than six hours and he questioned whether that could be changed to "when dogs are tethered outdoors" because some people put their dogs in crates when they go to work. Ms. Hutchinson explained this language is just basic so council can tweak it or modify it. Cncl. Heffner noted Council will review the information presented and Cncl. Pres., Miller noted he would keep in contact with Ms. Simpson, Hutchinson and Rennebaum.

Chief McKeown was in attendance to answer any questions Council had concerning the records clerk position he requested. Mayor Teefy noted he was under the impression that issue would be scheduled for discussion this evening since he brought it up during the last Ordinance Meeting. Cncl. Heffner advised he would definitely schedule it on the next Ordinance Committee Meeting agenda and invited Chief McKeown to attend that meeting to discuss the position. Chief McKeown indicated he would and also noted he would be attending the next Work Session Meeting to answer questions about drug activities in the township and what the Police Department is doing about it. Cncl. Pres., Miller noted Michelle Perez, from the Municipal Alliance would also be in attendance at that meeting.

With no one else wishing to speak Cncl. Pres., Miller made a motion to close the Public Portion. The motion was seconded by Cncl. Caligiuri and unanimously approved by all members of Council.

D.) ORDINANCES FOR REVIEW

 O:05-2016 An Ordinance Of The Township Council Of The Township Of Monroe To Amend Chapter 175 Of The Code Of The Township Of Monroe, Entitled "Land Management" (Section 175-133 Sidewalks)

Solicitor Fiore explained these are the ordinances Attorney Skinner spoke about and the ones that he and Joe Rocco will be reviewing to determine whether we will move forward with the Second Reading. He requested the ordinance be placed on the next Regular Council Meeting agenda and advised it will be addressed in Closed Session at that meeting.

 O:06-2016 An Ordinance Of The Township Council Of The Township Of Monroe To Amend Chapter 175 Of The Code Of The Township Of Monroe, Entitled "Land Management" (Section 175-54 Subdivision, Site Plan & Conditional Use Approval)

Solicitor Fiore noted this ordinance should be moved forward as it was just lumped together with O:05-2016. **Cncl. Bryson** noted it appears this change requires any homeowner changing ownership of their home to be subject to the fees. Mr. Fiore explained this deals with a change in occupancy, use or ownership of a business, it is not generally in a residential setting. There is another ordinance on the books that requires sidewalks to be installed or repaired in the infill areas along Main Street before a CO can be issued. Cncl. Heffner polled Council and all were in favor of moving it forward for Second Reading.

• 2015-2017 Salary Ordinance

Business Administrator Kevin Heydel noted the salary ordinance originally sent out to Council was revised as he created two different ordinances; one that takes the salaries through 2017 to incorporate the collective bargaining agreements and the other through 2016. He explained the same rate of increase given to Local 1360 and the Supervisors was given to the people not in a collective bargaining agreement and a few positions were increased. In 2014 a separate Salary Ordinance was done for the public defender and prosecutor with a max of \$29,000.00 and that was increased by \$1,000.00 in this ordinance. The judge's salary was increased from \$30,000.00 to \$35,000.00 because that position is way underpaid. The Judge has not requested an increase but we want to be able to have an option to increase his salary as well. The camp counselor's salary range was increased by \$2.00 on the high end and other than that everything is on par with the increases negotiated through the collective bargaining agreements. Cncl. DiLucia questioned what is the rationale for going beyond 2016? Mr. Heydel explained the 2017 Salary Ordinance incorporates the raises through 2017 so we won't need to go through this process again in January. Cncl. DiLucia noted even though we pass the ordinance before the physical year has completed we are bound to live within the 2016 increases. Mr. Heydel replied yes and if for any reason the Mayor gave someone an increase that hit the 2017 salary we would need to come back to Council to increase the range for any future increases. Cncl. DiLucia noted he reviewed the ordinance that was included in Council's packet and noticed some calculations were off. That ordinance has now been replaced by the one handed out tonight and he has not had time to review it but is assuming that if he factors the ranges they will all be 4%. Mr. Heydel noted for the most part. He explained there are a couple positions where people retired and the

D.) ORDINANCES FOR REVIEW (cont'd)

replacements are not making what the former employees made so those ranges were only increased by 4% and 4% instead of 4%, 4% and 4%. Cncl. DiLucia questioned would any when factored out be compounded at more than 12%? Mr. Heydel replied yes and he gave the example of the Clerk and Deputy Clerk whose election stipend was increased from \$1,200.00 to \$1,500.00 and included in their base salary as per the collective bargaining agreement so if their calculation was done it would be different. Cncl. DiLucia noted in most instances other than where ranges were rounded up by a couple hundred dollars the salaries will be 4%, 4% and 4% compounded. Mr. Heydel replied that is correct. Cncl. Bryson noted during his twelve years on Council there has been a salary ordinance done every year; a double year ordinance was never done and that was in the event something should change within that year or a new administration would take office. He noted he does not agree to a two year salary ordinance, he will agree to a one year and then if Council or the Mayor wants to make a change it is Council's responsibility to approve or Mr. Heydel explained 90% of what is included in the ordinance disapprove that change. technically does not need to be included because those positions are covered under collective bargaining agreements. Before he initiated this the only positions salary ordinances covered were positions not under collective bargaining agreements and the ranges were really high so Cncl. Bryson questioned what does it take to do a salary ordinances didn't have to be done. ordinance every year? Mr. Heydel noted it doesn't take anything and that's why he was presenting two ordinances; one for 2016 and one through 2017; adding the 2017 ordinance is just a matter of paperwork convenience. Cncl. Bryson disagreed; stating that this would be codifying the ordinance and making it the law and taking away Council's power to say yes or no to anything in the 2017 salary ordinance and he will not approve that. Cncl. Pres., Miller commented that 90% of the salaries are already collectively bargained and Council could not alter those contracts. Cncl. Bryson disagreed, noting you certainly can alter their contracts if you have to and he may be the only Councilman but he will stay with the people of this town. Mr. Heydel noted he hated to bring it up but Cncl. Bryson defends the MMUA all the time and is criticizing what he was doing with the salary ordinance but the MMUA salary ordinance has a keyboarding clerk with a max salary of \$100,000.00. He noted what about the rate payers there. Mr. Bryson replied he was insulted by those comments because he knows what their increases have been over the last ten years and he has never defended those salaries. He added he asked Mr. Heydel at the last meeting how much the actual cost difference would be between insurances and has not received that information. He added he does not care about the MMUA, he cares about the people that he represents up until the end of this year and he will fight for them to try to give them a fair deal because too many people cannot afford to live here, as this State is a disgrace. Mr. Heydel replied Cncl. Bryson does not have to tell him that because he cannot afford to live her either. At that comment Cncl. Bryson stated that is BS, because of the salary and pension that Mr. Heydel At this point Cncl. Heffner stopped the conversation and Cncl. Bryson apologized noting has. he just had to respond to those comments. Cncl. DiLucia noted in a state of emotion Mr. Heydel made a comment about the MUA salary structure and he wanted to point out that longevity plays a big part in skewing the raise. Someone that started out at \$20,000.00 thirty years ago and got a 3% or 4% increase each year will have a hefty salary and that is part of the problem in the MUA. He felt it was unfair for people on the outside to comment on their wages that have compounded over a period of twenty-five or thirty years. Cncl. DiLucia noted as long as Council is in agreement that the 2016 salary ordinance is the only thing applicable in 2016 he would not have

D.) ORDINANCES FOR REVIEW (cont'd)

a problem with adopting the ordinance through 2017 because 95% of it is dictated by collective bargaining agreements. Unless both parties agree to open the contracts up for renegotiations and both parties agree to increase or decrease the rates, the rates will be what they are. There is some latitude for people not covered under a collective bargaining agreement but he will not argue over that. He added if he calculates the salaries and finds mistakes of either too much or not enough he will bring that to Mr. Heydel's attention. Mayor Teefy noted he discussed going out to 2017 with Mr. Heydel because 90% to 95% of the contracts are done. He added it would be stupid for him to move an employee to the 2017 rate because next year that rate would need to be increased again and Council would not approve that. He explained when someone is moved from one position to the next they do not receive the top of the range, which the previous person in that position for ten or fifteen years received. Cncl. Heffner polled Council and all were in favor of moving forward the Salary Ordinance through the year 2017 with the exception of Cncl. Cncl. McIlvaine and Cncl. Dilks Bryson who voted to stay with the 2016 Salary Ordinance. questioned whether they could vote on this ordinance. Mr. Fiore explained they were just voting to move it forward but when the ordinance is actually being voted upon they should stipulate which title they have a conflict with. Mr. Heydel suggested creating separate salary ordinances for those conflict positions. Mr. Fiore felt that should not be done as it could lead to further conflict.

• Department of Community Development and Land Use

Mr. Fiore explained this ordinance, which creates a director of Community Development and sets forth various duties of the department was drafted from what he believed to be the best ordinances from other municipalities. **Cncl. Caligiuri** questioned if we had this position would the township be eligible for grant opportunities from Main Street USA. **Mayor Teefy** explained it may but we will learn a little more tomorrow night at the Main Street Presentation being made by Jef Buehler. **Cncl. DiLucia** noted the ordinance states the director shall establish staffing levels and he felt it should say "*recommend*" because employees are not the ones saying how many people should work in a department. Council agreed and the word establish was changed to recommend in section 84-119 B. (c). Mr. Fiore spoke of how helpful it is when Franklin Township's Director of Community Development submits review letters that add a different perspective than the professionals. Cncl. Heffner polled Council and all were in favor of moving the ordinance forward for First Reading at the March 14th Regular Council Meeting.

Department of Code Enforcement

Solicitor Fiore explained the ordinance removes the Zoning Office from the Department of Code Enforcement and places it under the Department of Community Development. The Department of Code Enforcement will now consist of the Construction Code Official, Building, Plumbing, Electrical and Fire Subcode Officials as well as the Housing Department. **Mayor Teefy** added he met with Code Enforcement Director George Reitz regarding this and he agreed this move should be made. **Cncl. Heffner** questioned whether engineering would stay under the Director of Public Works. Mayor Teefy advised that it would. **Cncl. McIlvaine** questioned whether Mr. Reitz would still be handling the junkyards. Mayor Teefy advised he would because

D.) ORDINANCES FOR REVIEW (cont'd)

that process has been much better since he took over. **Cncl. Heffner** polled Council and all were in favor of moving the ordinance forward for First Reading at the March 14th Regular Council Meeting.

E.) MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION

• Amending Age Requirement In Age-Restricted Districts

Cncl. Caligiuri explained the intent of age-restricted zones was to allow for development with minimal impact on the school systems because older residents are less likely to have school age children. Solicitor Fiore added this falls under the Federal Law "Housing for Older Persons Cncl. DiLucia explained when you buy a home in a 55 and over community by signing Act". the covenant you agree no one 19 or under will live in the home and if a grandchild visits you must notify the trustees. He noted he understands in this economy why the developer wants to broaden his market but this should be confined, it should not have portability to existing 55 and over communities. That would cause a problem in Holiday City because the trustees would not agree to open the age restriction up since people under 55 that purchased a home there have already been taken to court. This request is to allow 20% of the development to be 48 and over and in Holiday City that would amount to 125 homes. Cncl. DiLucia expressed concern that their next request would be to bring in children and as a township we don't want that because the benefit of age restricted homes is the taxes collected are based on the same formula everyone else pays except no children are being educated. He added he would not have a problem if this was done in just the new developments to broaden the developer's ability to sell homes. Solicitor Fiore noted this request is market generated and we need to be careful of requests like this This project was originally an age restricted community because it is almost like spot zoning. until the Builder's league fought for the Conversion Act legislation when the market dried up with over 15,000 age restricted developments on the books in New Jersey. Mr. Fiore noted this particular request is coming from the Hovnanian sales person and his concern in lowering the age is this would be in violation of the Housing for Older Persons Act, which includes all kinds of penalties and exemptions. Mr. Fiore recommended putting the onus back on Hovnanian by drafting a letter requesting an explanation on how this would not be in violation of that federal legislation. Mr. Fiore added he is concerned about the overall development because they do not want to install the pumping station or the sewer infrastructure they want to install portable holding tanks in their sales home and two other homes. The board has no approval process over that but they do need to get approval from MUA and County and he felt that will not happen. He added the burden should be on them to demonstrate that they are not in violation of the Federal Fair Housing Act. He added he is concerned that we may be opening Pandora's Box. Cncl. DiLucia noted in Holiday City only one owner (either the husband or wife) has to be 55 and they can't have children 19 or under. He spoke of an instance where a 35 year old man was living in his mother's home and when she died the son had one year to sell the property since he was under 55. If the covenant is violated Holiday City will take you to court and there is a provision in it that requires people also to pay their legal fees. Cncl. DiLucia felt this request is economically driven due to the shrinking market. The secondary market has stabilized, as homes in Holiday City are selling, not for what they once sold but the prices are going up. Mayor Teefy requested

E.) <u>MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION</u> (cont'd)

clarification of the 80% rule. Mr. Fiore explained 80% must be 55 or older and 20% can be under 55, with 48 years old being the lowest. Mayor Teefy noted the developer wants 20%; he is following the law but just wants Council to change our ordinance to match that law. Mr. Fiore noted he wants him to demonstrate that he will be in full compliance with the law. Cncl. DiLucia felt this might be dangerous because if he is not in compliance with the law the township might be put on the defense so it might be better to say what is in our best interest irrespective of what the law dictates. Mr. Fiore explained the federal law says 80% of the residents must be 55 or older to have a covenant. Holiday City's covenant requires 100% of the residents to be 55 or older. Covenants and restrictions can be included with respect to other age requirements, number of children etc. and he felt the federal law does not need to be a minimum of 48 years old. Only 80% must be 55 or older for it to be an age restricted community and if there are certain exceptions Mayor Teefy noted the developer came like Holiday City has there is not a bottom age of 48. to us and said our ordinance was not allowing them to do what the federal law allows to market themselves. Cncl. DiLucia explained Holiday City is a regulated community, which took advantage of the law because their covenant even prohibits trucks and putting a trash can in front of your house. Hovnanian learned that unless you get a really active community to raise money for cutting grass, snow removal and maintaining the club house the ground fees can be as high as a mortgage so in active communities like Holiday City those fees are kept down to a reasonable amount. Cncl. Caligiuri agreed with the Solicitor sending a letter and also suggested sending this back to the Planning Board to redefine age-restricted zones since not many developers are taking advantage of them. He felt it would be beneficial to encourage them and if changing the age demographic would do that then we would get the benefit of having a lower educational expense. Cncl. DiLucia questioned if Cncl. Caligiuri knew if this developer requested the age be changed because he was having a hard time selling the homes. Mayor Teefy advised the homes are starting to sell but the request was made due to interest from 48 and 50 year olds. Cncl. DiLucia was concerned that if the age was changed the next request would be to allow children and that would defeat the whole purpose of the tax base. It may benefit the developer but at the age of 48 a person could have a 30 year old spouse and children, which would create a burden on the schools. Cncl. DiLucia questioned whether this would be contained to one development. Mr. Fiore advised we would be changing the ordinance so any future development would be eligible. It would not be retroactive unless the residents of Holiday City would want to reopen their by-laws. Cncl. Dilks questioned what happens in Holiday City if a person under 55 buys a house. Cncl. DiLucia noted they would be asked to move and if they don't the trustees take the matter to court and the people will lose because they signed a covenant and they will end up paying Holiday City's attorney fees too. Cncl. Dilks questioned what happens if they didn't move in until they were 55. Cncl. DiLucia wasn't sure what would happen in that instance. He added they would actually be in violation of the covenant but the trustees might not take action against them as long as they paid all the fees and were not living there. Cncl. Heffner questioned if Council wanted the development to remain at 55 or Mr. Fiore to draft a letter to clarify what they are asking for. Cncl. Pres., Miller was okay moving it forward if the letter stipulated what they were actually requesting and as long as their request would not violate any law or have any impact on existing communities. Cncl. McIlvaine was against it and expressed his concerns that this would open up a can of worms. He felt the answer should be no to any change on an already approved plan because developers bring nothing to the township except more traffic, more

E.) <u>MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION</u> (cont'd)

people and fire and police calls. He added he is tired of catering to developers who come here with a lot of money and think they are dealing with a bunch of hicks. This is not even the owner, his attorney or planner asking for this it is a sales lady requesting it and we are looking at catering to her. Mayor Teefy explained she is the mouth piece but Hovnanian did request the same thing because it has been used in other age restricted communities to help them get sales. Cncl. DiLucia explained when 55 and over developments are in the construction phase the trustees are the builders and they set the rules and establish the by-laws. When a certain number of houses are completed a trustee seat is transferred to a resident but due to the transition of trustees the builder controls everything and sets all the rules and regulations to benefit them and after they leave they don't give a dam. He spoke of issues in the Holiday City homes that were found after the developer left and noted they skimmed on everything they built and got away with it. Developers are in it for money not for the township. Cncl. Caligiuri explained the problem is developers are saying our age restricted zones are too restrictive and they don't want to build here but if we can get them to build here then we get ratables. Cncl. McIlvaine noted there are also burdens placed on the police, ambulance and road departments so his vote was no. Cncl. Bryson agreed with Cncl. McIlvaine that the age should remain at 55. Cncl. DiLucia also voted no. Cncl. Caligiuri noted he would like to see what they are proposing and then we could always say no. Cncl. Miller agreed with Cncl. Caligiuri. Cncl. Dilks felt it wouldn't hurt to see what they want and Cncl. Heffner agreed; noting Council always has the right to turn it down. The vote was four to three in favor of Mr. Fiore drafting a letter to Hovnanian. Mr. Fiore will report on this matter at a future Ordinance Meeting.

Chapter 262-16 Removal of Abandoned Motor Vehicles from Public/Private Property

Solicitor Fiore explained Rosemary Flaherty had sent an email questioning whether we could request a tower from the towing list to remove abandoned vehicles from 812 South Main Street. Ms. Flaherty had referred to Chapter 262 in the email but Mr. Fiore didn't know what changes she was requesting. Cncl. Heffner suggested inviting Rosemary to the next Ordinance Committee Meeting to explain how she would like the code amended and all Council members agreed.

F.) <u>NEW BUSINESS</u>

Mayor Teefy noted Clayton gave an age restricted development a five year tax abatement program to help the homes sell and he was approached regarding doing the same here but his first thought was Holiday City residents never got a break like that. **Cncl. Heffner** noted they did it because it was their first age restricted community. We couldn't do that here because of Holiday City.

G.) **OLD BUSINESS**

Cncl. McIlvaine reported he spoke to Sgt. Burton about concerns the Police Department might have regarding one side parking on Library Street and he is going to look into it and get back to him.

Solicitor Fiore questioned whether the Towing Committee wanted to unveil the draft Towing Ordinance at the next Ordinance Committee Meeting. Cncl. Heffner felt the Towing Committee did a good job reviewing and amending the ordinance and anything more should be addressed by the Ordinance Committee. Cncl. McIlvaine requested copies of the draft ordinance be mailed to the towers in case they had any issues they could address them with Council.

Mayor Teefy reminded everyone that the Main Street Committee would be holding a meeting on Thursday, March 3rd with the DCA Main Street Program Director Jef Buehler. He urged Council to invite all their friends to attend this informative meeting.

Solicitor Fiore reported Tim Kernan is very close, within ten units, of resolving the Affordable Housing issue without going to court. He added the number is around 100 units. He spoke of receiving numerous reports from the consortium we joined and how many municipalities have spent thousands of dollars on attorney fees to resolve their issues. He also reported Rowan sold their property in Harrison Township to Inspira, which will be moving from Woodbury to the new location in Harrison Township. Cncl. Bryson questioned whether the old Underwood Hospital would be closing. Mr. Fiore noted they are going to use that as an emergency room and behavior and mental health inpatient treatment center. People do not understand mental health issues so the City of Woodbury is not happy with that because of the negative connotations but there is a real need for it. Mayor Teefy agreed, saying his daughter works as a school phycologist and she says mental health issues need to be addressed, not gun laws. Cncl. Bryson spoke of violent television shows impacting young people.

H.) ADJOURNMENT

With nothing further to discuss Cncl. McIlvaine made a motion to adjourn the Ordinance Committee Meeting of March 2, 2016. The motion was seconded by Cncl. Pres., Miller and unanimously approved by all members of Council in attendance.

Respectfully submitted,

harm Itright Deputy Clerk Sharon Wright, RMC

Presiding Officer

These minutes were prepared from excerpts of the recorded proceedings and hand written notes taken during the Ordinance Committee Meeting of March 2, 2016 and serve only as a synopsis of the proceedings. The official recording may be heard in the Office of the Township Clerk upon proper notification pursuant to the Open Public Records Law.

Approved as submitted	Su	Date 4/6/16
Approved as corrected		Date