

**Call to Order:**

The regular meeting of the Monroe Township Planning Board was called to order at 7:05 p.m. by Chairman Schwaiger. The Board saluted the flag. Roll call was as follows:

Present – Mr. Cotton, Mr. Crane, Mayor DiLucia, Mr. J. Garbowski, Mr. R. Garbowski, Mr. Helsel, Mr. Kozak, Mr. Masterson, Mr. O’Brien, Mr. Scardino, Mr. Schwaiger. Also present – Mr. Boraske, Solicitor, Ms. Pellegrini, Planner, Mr. DeFrank, Engineer, Mr. Stettler, Engineer, Mrs. Farrell, Secretary, Mrs. Orbaczewski, Clerk Transcriber.

Mrs. Farrell read the following statement: “Notice of this meeting was given as required by the Open Public Meetings Act in the Annual Notice of Meetings. In addition, notice for this evening’s public hearing was sent in writing to the South Jersey Times by the applicant’s attorney on February 16, 2019”

Chairman Schwaiger read the following statement: “Be advised no new item of business will be started after 10:30 p.m. and the meeting shall terminate no later than 11:00 p.m.”

**Memorialization of Resolutions:**

1. PB-11-19 – Tony M. Height, Jr. – Site Plan Waiver Approved

Motion by Mr. Scardino, seconded by Mr. J. Garbowski to adopt resolution PB-11-19. Roll call vote: Ayes – Mayor DiLucia, Mr. J. Garbowski, Mr. R. Garbowski, Mr. Kozak, Mr. Masterson, Mr. O’Brien, Mr. Scardino, Mr. Schwaiger. Nays – Zero. Abstentions – Zero.

2. PB-12-19 – Landfill Redevelopment Area Approved

Motion by Mr. R. Garbowski, seconded by Mr. Kozak to adopt resolution PB-12-19. Roll call vote: Ayes – Mr. Crane, Mayor DiLucia, Mr. J. Garbowski, Mr. R. Garbowski, Mr. Kozak, Mr. Masterson, Mr. O’Brien, Mr. Scardino, Mr. Schwaiger. Nays – Zero. Abstentions – Zero.

**Public Hearing:**

1. #392-SP & #1850 – Summerfields West, LLC – Amended Site Plan and Minor Subdivision

Present – Brian Temple, applicant, Paul Witthohn, applicant’s engineer, George Matteo, applicant’s attorney.

**Public Hearing: (continued)**

The applicant is proposing to amend his approved site plan to redesign the road layout which will eliminate cul-de-sacs, add 41 pad sites, reorient the clubhouse, and construct a maintenance garage and office. They are also seeking minor subdivision approval to adjust the lot lines of existing lot 20 and consolidate existing Lots 18, 31, and 17.01 to create a new lot 31 and a remaining Lot 20. The property is located at Block 3901, Lots 17.01, 18, 20, and 31 in the RG-RA Zoning District.

Mr. Crane commented that he would be recusing himself from participating in the application due to a conflict of interest.

Mr. Matteo introduced himself as the applicant's attorney. He stated that Summerfields West received site plan approval in 2006 for a 55 and older community and there are currently residents living in the development. They are before the Board asking for an amended site plan approval as well as a minor subdivision for what is known as Phase II of the project. The applicant is proposing to construct a clubhouse that will be for the residents of the community only. Mr. Matteo stated that there are units being provided in Summerfields West that are part of the Township's affordable housing plan. In addition the property is located in the Pinelands and they do have a Certificate of Filing.

Mr. Witthohn and Mr. Temple were sworn in by Mr. Boraske. Mr. Witthohn stated that Phase II will use the same entrance off of the Black Horse Pike as Phase I. It will utilize the existing stormwater basin however a new basin will be constructed next to the clubhouse. This phase also includes site lighting, open space, storm sewer, sanitary sewer, public water, and in the commercial portion a proposed maintenance building/office. Mr. Witthohn described the proposed changes with regard to the street orientations and stated the new design allows them to have a more regular street pattern. There will be additional landscaping and buffering around the site. Mr. Matteo stated that they are asking for amended preliminary and final. They have received the Board professional review letters and they are extensive. If possible they would like to address most of the comments this evening however they will amend their request and ask for preliminary this evening as well as the minor subdivision approval and then they will come back for final approval. Mr. Matteo stated that before going through the professional review letters he wanted to know if any of the Board members had any questions concerning the amendments to the plan.

Mr. Masterson asked if the applicant had an exhibit depicting the original site plan so that everyone can see where the changes are in comparison. Ms. Pellegrini provided the previously approved site plan for the Board which was displayed next to the amended plan. The amended plan was marked as Exhibit A-1 and the previously approved plan was marked as Exhibit A-2; Mr. Witthohn marked the colored rendering as Exhibit A-3.

**Public Hearing: (continued)**

Mr. Witthohn described the changes between the two plans. He stated that the previous plan showed an access off of Corkery Lane as well as the boulevard access on the Black Horse Pike. That plan also showed an open space lot across from Bergen Avenue. The changes include the addition of a clubhouse which allows for active recreation as opposed to passive recreation in the open space by the basin. Included in the design for the clubhouse is parking which exceeds the required number of spaces. There is additional roadway for Gloucester Lane and Monmouth Lane which are being realigned to better fit the site. There is an additional basin that is designed so that it integrates with the flow of the existing basin. The design was adjusted to accommodate the clubhouse and the additional housing and there are also more buffer areas on the site. The 350 foot utility easement is on property owned by Summerfields West and is serving as a buffer for a future development on what is known as the Katz track.

Mr. DeFrank reviewed his report for the Board. He stated that based on the submittals by the applicant they do find the application can be deemed complete. No waivers or variances have been requested however there is a question on the calculation of the open space and impervious coverage which Ms. Pellegrini will address in her report. With regard to the technical review Mr. DeFrank asked the applicant to provide a copy of the topographic survey as well as corrections made to the plans where the cover sheet shows 46 acres and the phasing plan shows 43 acres. He asked for highlighted plans showing the open space and the impervious coverage calculations so the Board can determine if they are in compliance. Mr. Matteo stated they will provide those plans. Mr. DeFrank also asked the applicant to provide architectural plans for the amended phase and for the newly proposed maintenance garage/office. Mr. Matteo commented that they will provide the architectural plans.

The applicant should provide the calculations with regard to the adequacy of the sewer and water systems for the amended construction. Mr. Matteo stated that the applicant will submit an amended Form B to the MMUA to address the changes. Mr. DeFrank asked for a copy of the amended application to the MMUA; Mrs. Farrell asked that they provide the copy to the Planning Office and they will submit it to the professionals. Mr. DeFrank asked the applicant to explain the differences in the two reports for the environmental assessments on the property for the Board. Mr. Matteo replied that there are questions in Mr. DeFrank's report concerning the environmental reports and they would proposed that their engineer work with Mr. DeFrank's office to address any questions or concerns between the two reports. Mr. DeFrank agreed to their proposal. With regard to lighting, the applicant agreed to work with Mr. DeFrank on his concerns with the lighting on the roadways, the clubhouse, and the maintenance garage/office. Mr. DeFrank also requested input from the fire official as the plan does not show a fire lane with regard to the clubhouse. Mr. Matteo stated they will provide that information from the fire official.

**Public Hearing: (continued)**

Mr. DeFrank commented that there isn't any sidewalk along Corkery Lane or along the Black Horse Pike. He raised the issue since there is an amendment to the original approval and to address any need for sidewalk that may exist now. Mr. Matteo stated that the applicant was granted a waiver from providing sidewalk along the Black Horse Pike and Corkery Lane and asked that the Board continue that waiver. Ms. Pellegrini commented that she covers sidewalks in her report so they can discuss the specifics during her review. Mr. DeFrank stated that the comments in his report concerning the stormwater management would be better handled between him and the applicant's engineer instead of going through them at this meeting. Mr. Schwaiger asked if there are any major issues with regard to the basins. Mr. DeFrank replied that there are no major issues but questions between their reports and the plans as well as some calculations. He did ask that the operation and maintenance manual be submitted for review even though this is a private development. Mr. Matteo indicated that they will provide that information to the Board.

Mr. DeFrank commented that the applicant has not provided an updated traffic study or circulation plan as part of the amendment. He asked the applicant to provide some testimony concerning the circulation and parking as it relates to the clubhouse. Mr. Witthohn stated that they did submit the traffic reports to the Township but the additional 41 pad sites will not change the traffic or service levels previously reported.

Ms. Pellegrini reviewed her minor subdivision report for the Board. She explained that the property originally did not have any frontage on Corkery Lane except for the small driveway that was proposed to go out to Corkery Lane. With this new application they have acquired two additional lots that were between their property and Corkery Lane so they incorporated those properties and adjusted the lot line which gave more property to Lot 31 and pushed the lot line for Lot 20 to the edge of the utility easement. In doing that it gave the applicant more room to provide a nice clubhouse, improve the circulation within the site, and add a few more units. With the lot configurations proposed, both of the lots meet the minimum tract requirements for the RG-RA zone. Therefore the minor subdivision complies with the ordinance and does not need any variances nor were any variances created by the minor subdivision. She asked the applicant to make the minor subdivision a standalone sheet one of one and to include all of the information required on a minor subdivision plan. Mr. Matteo replied that the applicant will provide a separate sheet for the minor subdivision.

With regard to the issue of sidewalk, the applicant was granted a waiver as part of the original approval. With this minor subdivision they are adding approximately 517 feet of frontage on Corkery Lane and the Board should determine if they want to continue the waiver. At the previous approval the applicant was able to make a payment in lieu of providing sidewalk, which is no longer permitted, but they did make a sizable contribution to the sidewalk fund. Ms. Pellegrini commented that it would be appropriate to continue the waiver for the additional frontage.

**Public Hearing: (continued)**

Mr. Schwaiger asked how much frontage there was along Corkery Lane on the previous approval that received the waiver. Ms. Pellegrini replied that the waiver was granted for fifty feet of frontage. Mr. Matteo commented that the 517 feet of frontage is for the site plan not the minor subdivision and the site plan shows that the rear of the units will be facing Corkery Lane. Ms. Pellegrini replied that the two lots included in the minor subdivision are being incorporated into Lot 31; however there is no sidewalk in the area and it's her opinion that providing 517 feet of sidewalk that doesn't connect to anything isn't necessary and is in keeping with the previous decision made to waive the sidewalk. Ms. Pellegrini stated that there is a sanitary sewer line that runs through Lot 20, which is owned by the applicant, but if there is an existing easement it should be shown on the minor subdivision plan. If there is not an easement then one should be considered in the event the applicant ever sells the property so there is an appropriate easement along the sanitary sewer line. Mr. Matteo replied that they will show the easement area on the plans.

Ms. Pellegrini stated that the applicant is required to comply with COAH; however there isn't a COAH requirement for Lot 20 since there isn't any new development. Mr. Matteo stated they are included in the Monroe Township's affordable housing plan which has received court approval. They will be providing affordable units on site.

Ms. Pellegrini reviewed her site plan for the Board. She stated that mobile home parks are a conditionally permitted use in the RG-RA zone. The maximum gross density of 4.5 per acre is being met as well as all of the requirements for pad site area, width, distance, and setbacks have been met. The RG-RA zone requires fifty foot buffers along the perimeter; she was not fully aware of all variances and/or waivers previously granted with the original approval. However it does not appear the original plan followed the fifty foot perimeter buffer requirement and this plan does not follow the fifty foot buffers. She asked for testimony regarding this issue because if they previously requested variances they will have to ask for them again for this expansion. Mr. Witthohn testified that the buffering has not changed along the commercial portion next to the basin or along the cul-de-sac Cape May Terrace. There were other areas he pointed out on the plan but he did not specifically indicate where they were located and the plan was not visible to the Clerk Transcriber. He did refer to the utility easement as serving as a buffer and commented that there is a fifty foot buffer along Corkery Lane. There are plantings shown on the plan as part of the buffer which meets the objective of the ordinance. They are willing to work with the Board's Planner concerning the type of plantings and a landscape plan. Mr. Matteo stated that since this is an amendment to a prior approval they are seeking any waivers on discrepancies on the design elements if they are inconsistent. Ms. Pellegrini stated that she agrees that the left side of the property has the same buffers and she is assuming they received a variance for the buffer along the road that goes out to Corkery Lane as well as assuming they received a variance for buffer along that property line. She commented that she will leave the issue to the Solicitor but stated they added property so they could meet the buffer requirements albeit they would lose units.

**Public Hearing: (continued)**

Mr. Matteo stated that they did not provide the buffer along the property line where the utility easement is because the applicant does plan to develop Lot 20 and they will address any buffering at that time. Mr. Schwaiger asked if there are areas where they do not meet the buffer requirements. Ms. Pellegrini stated that there are areas where they do not meet the buffer requirement but they are consistent with areas where buffers were not provided before. The left side of the property is exactly the same as the previous plan; however they changed the road layout but the units back up to the line without a buffer which is consistent with before. There was some question as to whether variances were granted previously. Mr. Boraske replied that the Board would have had to grant variances since the buffers in areas do not meet the ordinance but the applicant received approval.

Ms. Pellegrini stated that driveways are supposed to be a ten feet from a property line; the one cul-de-sac that is below the clubhouse does not meet the ten foot requirement but it is the same as what was approved so she assumed the variance was granted. In the parking around the clubhouse the applicant is proposing 9 x 18 spaces where 10 x 20 is required. The Board has the option to approve the reduced sized spaces. With regard to the open space, the plan indicates that they comply with the minimum reserved open space requirements. There isn't anything on the plan that indicates where these areas are in order to tell if they comply. She asked the applicant to provide an exhibit to show where the reserved open space areas are located. Mr. Matteo stated that they will provide that exhibit to the professionals. Ms. Pellegrini stated that if the reserved open space does not meet the requirements, the applicant will have to come back and ask for a variance. Mr. Boraske replied that the Board can vote on the preliminary approval if they choose and after the applicant works with the professionals, they can come back to the Board before final to ask for a variance, if necessary. The applicant is not proposing any new development signage. Phasing is addressed on the plan; Phase I proposes 79 units, Phase IIA there are 55 units, and Phase IIB there are 52 units. The connection to Corkery Lane is proposed to be installed in Phase IIA and the clubhouse will be installed in Phase IIB. The plan does not show when the proposed maintenance building will be constructed; that information should be shown on the plan. Mr. Matteo stated that a lot of the project is being built concurrently even though they are in two different phases and the maintenance building will be built concurrently as the project moves forward.

Ms. Pellegrini stated that there are several minor clean up items that can be addressed between the professionals. There are also prior approval obligations such as the applicant providing their fair share contribution for improvements to the Malaga/Corkery Lane intersection, providing an as-built certification of the completed stormwater facility and storm sewer collection system, providing a well abandonment letter from NJDEP and other items listed in her report. She asked the applicant to provide testimony as to which of these obligations has been satisfied to date. Mr. Matteo stated that the contribution for the intersection has been met. They will provide information to the Planner for the other obligations listed in her report.

**Public Hearing: (continued)**

Ms. Pellegrini commented that the applicant did receive outside agency approvals previously but any outside agency approvals that are affected by the amendments to the plan must be provided to the Board. Mr. Matteo replied that they will comply.

Mayor DiLucia commented that originally the commercial portion of the site was put aside for commercial development; however the applicant is proposing a maintenance building in the commercial zone with this new amendment. He stated that the township needs and wants commercial property available on the Black Horse Pike. Mr. Matteo replied that the proposed building is approximately 150 feet from the Black Horse Pike which leaves 150 feet of commercial space in front of the building. The other side of the boulevard entrance which is also commercial is not proposed for any development. He stated that the rest of the site contains all the residential and they did not want the maintenance building stuck in the middle of the residential uses. Mayor DiLucia replied that they are taking away square footage for what could potentially be revenue for the town and that poses a problem. Mr. Schwaiger asked the applicant if there are any objections to moving the maintenance building. Mr. Matteo replied that they do not see where else they can locate it on the site. Mayor DiLucia suggested the corner at the rear of the site next to the utility easement where there are two odd shaped pad sites proposed. Mayor DiLucia stated he thought there was an agreement as part of the original approval that they would not use the commercial portion of the property. Mr. Matteo replied that it was not a condition of approval but the commercial portion was not part of the original plan or approval. Mr. Schwaiger commented that there is also some opportunity to move it to the area near the proposed clubhouse.

Mr. DeFrank suggested that the applicant extend Cape May Terrace into Lot 20 and locate the building in that area so it will be centrally located on the site considering there is future development proposed on Lot 20. Ms. Pellegrini commented that the original approval only allowed the density to be calculated in the RG-RA zone not the commercial area. Mr. Matteo stated that if they move the maintenance building they will have to amend the plans and the engineering. Their idea was to place it in the wooded area in the commercial zone where it will not be seen from the residential area or the Black Horse Pike. He stated that the applicant wants to keep it where it is shown on the plan. They may be able to tweak it a little bit and push it so there is more commercial area in the front. Mayor DiLucia replied that it is very important to him and town that the commercial property is preserved especially since it is on the Black Horse Pike. A reasonable suggestion has been made for the applicant to relocate the building that will service the whole facility including the future expansion. Mr. Kozak asked if the applicant has had anyone interested in the commercial portion. Mr. Matteo stated that no one has inquired about the commercial portion to date. Mr. Kozak asked if the commercial properties have been marketed for commercial development. Mr. Matteo replied they have not been marketed. Mr. Matteo asked if the Board would be amenable to bifurcate the approval and leave that maintenance building off the approval until they come back to the Board for final.

**Public Hearing: (continued)**

Mr. Schwaiger stated that he understands that the relocation of the maintenance building will require them to do some research and redesign; however the plan they want approved includes this maintenance building. Mr. Matteo replied that he is suggesting they exclude that portion from the site plan. Mr. Boraske commented that if the Board excludes the commercial portion from any approval this evening and the applicant is proposing to address it at final, are we talking about something that is a substantial amendment and if so what will the preliminary approval get them this evening. Mr. Matteo replied that a conditional preliminary approval will allow them to move forward on the residential portion which is not in contention as they have other steps they have to take care of such as the Pinelands no call up letter; so anything that will delay the process can be problematic. Mr. Boraske stated that if the Board wants to separate the application to not include the commercial portion with the maintenance building then the resolution can reflect that type of vote. Mr. Kozak asked if it's better to table the application. Mr. Boraske replied that the tone of the Board suggests the applicant may not receive a preliminary approval which includes the maintenance building where it's currently proposed so if the Board wants to entertain a preliminary vote on everything but the maintenance building the Board can do that.

Mr. Masterson commented that if the applicant does move the maintenance building it will be on a portion of the property he is trying to get preliminary approval on so they will have to redesign the site anyway. So the question is what is the preliminary approval going to mean if they have to do a redesign to accommodate the maintenance building? Ms. Pellegrini replied that if they do a redesign they will have to come back to the Board with an amended preliminary. She stated that they would have to come back for final without it or come back for an amended preliminary if they have substantially changed the plan. Mr. Matteo stated that they are going to look at everything not to have to change any aspect of the plan since there are units in place right now to the north of the proposed maintenance building so they are not going to tinker with the residential part of the plan. Mr. Schwaiger stated they have two options, they can run through the vote on the application as it stands or they can offer to exclude that portion of it and the Board can vote on that. Mr. Matteo discussed the issue with his client and replied that they would like to take the vote without the maintenance building included in the plan. Mayor DiLucia stated that he is willing to find a compromise, however if the Board approves the preliminary this evening they are essentially agreeing on the number of added units so there will not be an option for the applicant to move the maintenance building onto the residential portion of the site. He has not heard that they are willing to locate the maintenance building on Lot 20 either. He stated there is one question for them to answer and that is are they willing to move the maintenance building off of the commercial portion of the site because if they're not willing to make that happen this evening he doesn't believe they will make it happen later. Mr. Matteo replied that they are asking to be able to look at where else it can go; perhaps out of the commercial area, perhaps into the other area, or perhaps eliminate it; he does not know at this point. He understands the Mayor's concern but he does not know what the engineering will be to move it on Lot 20.

**Public Hearing: (continued)**

Mayor DiLucia commented that the applicant is asking for approval of the whole project with the exception of the maintenance building/office. He asked if the applicant is in a position to come back and say they want to amend the approval, to hypothetically remove two or three units and move the maintenance building in their place, once this is approved this evening. Mr. Schwaiger replied that it's his understanding that if they want to add the maintenance building back into the plan in the same location they have to come back for an amended preliminary or they have to completely take that portion as a separate item. Mayor DiLucia responded that he understands the options based on the interpretation of the professionals.

Motion passed to open the hearing to the public.

1. Donald Cullen, 2317 Corkery Lane, was sworn in by Mr. Boraske. Mr. Cullen expressed his concern with regard to the disturbance of the protected fish and game lands that are near this site. He also expressed his concern with regard to the capacity for Corkery Lane and the fact that it will be a cut through that comes right out across from the soccer fields. He asked that they make the access out to Corkery an emergency access only. Mr. Cullen commented that when they put in the sewer they didn't stay within the roadway they cut across people's yards. He also commented on the danger of fire in relation to how close these units are to one another.

2. Mike Gabbianelli, 1521 Larch Avenue, was sworn in by Mr. Boraske. Mr. Gabbianelli commented that he was the Mayor when this project came before the Board and the commercial portions of the site were to be set aside strictly for commercial development. He commented that they have already encroached into the commercial area with the cul-de-sac which is why he did not vote for the project. Mr. Gabbianelli stated that the maintenance building for Friendly Village is in the back of that development and the office is well off the Black Horse Pike. He asked the Board to think about those things when they vote.

3. William Kettleon, 2052 Corkery Lane, was sworn in by Mr. Boraske. He inquired as to the detail of the landscaping on Corkery Lane. Ms. Pellegrini stated that the applicant has provided a landscaping plan for that area along Corkery Lane and she showed Mr. Kettleon the plan. She explained the ordinance requirements for the plantings and the height requirements for each type of planting. He stated that the rear of the proposed units back up to Corkery Lane and asked the Board to keep in mind the homes across the street that front on Corkery Lane with regard to a buffer. He also commented on the integrity of Corkery Lane with the added traffic and the construction traffic when they develop Lot 20 in the future.

Motion passed to close the hearing to the public.

**Public Hearing: (continued)**

Mr. DeFrank commented that he has raised the question of operation with regard to the maintenance building/office in his report. He also commented that if the project is approved without the maintenance building and the applicant decides not to build one at all what situation does that leave them in with regard to storing of maintenance type materials and tools. Mr. Matteo replied that he does not have the answer to that until they assess the situation. Mr. Kozak commented that the clubhouse is not be constructed until the last 52 homes are in so they could utilize that space until then for maintenance equipment. Mr. Matteo replied that the site improvements will be constructed simultaneously for all of the area after they receive approval. Ms. Pellegrini commented that no improvements or construction can be done on the second phase until the applicant comes back for final approval so the issue of the maintenance building has to be resolved before they come back for final. Mr. O'Brien commented that he does remember they agreed to keep the commercial area set aside for commercial development.

Mr. Boraske summarized both of the applications for the Board. Mr. Schwaiger stated that the vote will exclude the maintenance building in the commercial area. Motion by Mr. R. Garbowski, seconded by Mr. J. Garbowski to grant minor subdivision approval subject to any conditions stated in the Planner's report or agreed to on the record. Roll call vote: Ayes – Mayor DiLucia, Mr. J. Garbowski, Mr. R. Garbowski, Mr. Kozak, Mr. Masterson, Mr. O'Brien, Mr. Helsel, Mr. Scardino. Nays – Mr. Schwaiger. Abstentions – Zero. 8 ayes, 1 nay, motion passed.

Motion by Mr. R. Garbowski, seconded by Mr. O'Brien to grant preliminary amended site plan approval acknowledging that the maintenance building has been removed from the site plan approval being requested by the applicant this evening along with the waivers requested for depicting lighting that extends 100 feet beyond the property lines and for the installation of sidewalk along the Black Horse Pike and Corkery Lane. There was a question concerning impervious coverage and the applicant indicated they will address that issue before final where a variance might be required. Previous variance approvals for buffering are extended to this approval. As a condition of approval the applicant must comply with comments and conditions in the Board professional review letters and any stated on the record. Roll call vote: Ayes – Mayor DiLucia, Mr. J. Garbowski, Mr. R. Garbowski, Mr. Kozak, Mr. O'Brien, Mr. Helsel. Nays – Mr. Masterson, Mr. Scardino, Mr. Schwaiger. Abstentions – Zero. 6 ayes, 3 nays, motion passed.

**Public Portion:**

Motion passed to open the meeting to the public. There being none, motion passed to close the meeting to the public.

**Reports:**

1. Mrs. Farrell stated that the Board members should pick up their IPADS before they leave the meeting.
2. Mrs. Farrell stated that the Director is interested in having a joint meeting between the Planning Board and the Zoning Board concerning ordinance changes. The meeting is tentatively scheduled for the second meeting in April. No other business will be scheduled on that meeting and it will be advertised.

**Approval of Minutes:**

1. 1/24/19 regular meeting.
2. 2/14/19 regular meeting.

Motion by Mr. O'Brien, seconded by Mr. Crane to approve the minutes from the January 24, 2019 regular meeting and the February 14, 2019 regular meeting. Voice vote; all ayes, motion passed.

**Adjournment:**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:17 p.m.

These minutes are an extract from the meeting that was held on the above date and are not a verbatim account or to be construed as an official transcript of the meeting.

Respectfully submitted by:  
Ninette Orbaczewski  
Clerk Transcriber