

Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Salvadori who read the following statement: “Notice of this meeting was give as required by the Open Public Meetings Act in the Annual Notice of Meetings on January 19, 2019. In addition, separate notice for this evening’s public hearings was provided in writing to the newspaper. 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.”.

The Board saluted the flag.

Roll call: Present – Mr. Cossaboon, Ms. Fox, Mr. Fritz, Mr. McLaughlin, Mr. Sebastian, Mr. Kozak, Mr. Rybicki, Mr. Salvadori. Absent – Mr. Mercado, (excused), Mr. Sander, (excused), Mr. O’Reilly, (excused). Also present – Mr. Coe, Solicitor, Ms. Pellegrini, Planner, Mrs. Farrell, Secretary, Mrs. Orbaczewski, Clerk Transcriber.

Memorialization of Resolutions:

1. #38-19 – App. #465-SP – Redgil, LLC – One Year Extension Approved

Motion by Mr. McLaughlin, seconded by Mr. Kozak to adopt resolution #38-19. Roll call vote: Ayes – Mr. McLaughlin, Mr. Kozak, Ms. Fox, Mr. Fritz, Mr. Sebastian, Mr. Rybicki, Mr. Salvadori. Nays – Zero. Abstentions – Zero.

2. #39-19 -App. #19-23 Yuankai Yang – Use/Lot Area/Front & Rear Yard Variances Approved

Motion by Mr. Kozak, seconded by Mr. McLaughlin to adopt resolution #39-19. Roll call vote: Ayes – Mr. Kozak, Mr. McLaughlin, Ms. Fox, Mr. Fritz, Mr. Sebastian, Mr. Rybicki, Mr. Salvadori. Nays – Zero. Abstentions – Zero.

3. #40-19 – App. #18-07 – WBA Arbours, Jr., LLC – Use Variance Denied

Mr. Coe stated at the time the motion was made to approve the use variance, those who voted to approve stated their reasons on the record; and those who denied the use variance did not state any reason. Based on the testimony, Mr. Coe included what he believes to be the reasoning for the votes against. He read the three reasons included in the resolution and asked that the Board members who voted against the use variance, when voting on the resolution, articulate their reasons for denial or state they agree with the reasons Mr. Coe included in the resolution.

Motion by Mr. Fritz, seconded by Mr. Rybicki to adopt resolution #40-19. Roll call vote: Ayes – Mr. Rybicki stated he concurs with Mr. Coe’s reasons in the resolution and added that the applicant stated the proposed development was an extension of the Arbours but the lot sizes are proposed to be much smaller than the lots in the Arbours. Mr. Fritz stated he voted nay because he thought the new development should be different than what is already there, Ms. Fox stated her agreement with the resolution and added she didn’t think they should deviate from the ordinance. Ayes --Mr. Rybicki, Mr. Fritz, Ms. Fox. Motion passed.

Memorialization of Resolutions: (continued)

4. #41-19 – App. #19-15 – David Schwoyer – Rear Yard Variance Approved

Motion by Mr. Kozak, seconded by Mr. McLaughlin to adopt resolution #41-19. Roll call vote: Ayes – Mr. Kozak, Mr. McLaughlin, Ms. Fox, Mr. Fritz, Mr. Sebastian, Mr. Salvadori. Nays – Zero. Abstentions – Zero.

5. #42-19 – App. #19-27 -Springs of Hope Christian Ministries – Use Variance Approved

Motion by Ms. Fox, seconded by Mr. Sebastian to adopt resolution #42-19. Roll call vote: Ayes – Ms. Fox, Mr. Sebastian, Mr. Fritz, Mr. McLaughlin, Mr. Kozak, Mr. Salvadori. Nays – Zero. Abstentions – Zero.

6. #43-19 – App. #19-29 – NWD Development, LLC – Use Variance Approved

Motion by Mr. McLaughlin, seconded by Mr. Sebastian to adopt resolution #43-19. Roll call vote: Ayes – Mr. McLaughlin, Mr. Sebastian, Ms. Fox, Mr. Fritz, Mr. Kozak, Mr. Salvadori. Nays – Zero. Abstentions – Zero.

7. #44-19 – App. #19-28 – Ryan McDonough – Use/Height Variances Approved

Motion by Ms. Fox, seconded by Mr. Kozak to adopt resolution #44-19. Roll call vote: Ayes – Ms. Fox, Mr. Kozak, Mr. Fritz, Mr. McLaughlin, Mr. Sebastian, Mr. Salvadori. Nays – Zero. Abstentions – Zero.

Public Hearings:

1. #19-31 – John Schiavi – Rear Yard Variance

Present – John Schiavi, applicant.

The applicant is requesting a rear yard variance in order to be allowed to construct two decks; one 18' x 14' and one 11' x 10' on the rear of his existing home that surrounds the sunroom. The required rear yard setback is 20' and the applicant is proposing 3.6'. The property is located at 308 Berrhill Drive, also known as Block 142.0101, Lot 37 in the RA Zoning District.

Public Hearings: (continued)

1. #19-31 – John Schiavi (continued)

Mr. Schiavi was sworn in by Mr. Coe. He testified that he would like to construct two decks on the rear of his home and needs a variance. His rear yard has a slope which makes the back yard virtually unusable. Mr. Salvadori asked Mrs. Farrell if the application can be deemed complete. Mrs. Farrell replied that the application can be deemed complete. Motion by Mr. Fritz, seconded by Mr. McLaughlin to deem application #19-31 complete. Voice vote; all ayes, motion passed.

Mr. Kozak commented that the applicant has already received an approval from the Sterling Glen homeowner's association pending Township approval. Mr. Coe asked Mr. Schiavi what his hardship would be if the variance is not granted. Mr. Schiavi replied that the back yard has a very severe slope. When they purchased the property, they were told there would be a slight slope in the back yard but the pictures will show that the slope is pretty severe and the back yard is virtually unusable. Mr. Coe asked what is behind Mr. Schiavi's property. Mr. Schiavi replied that there is a pretty dense wooded area and behind that is the airport.

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

Motion by Mr. McLaughlin, seconded by Mr. Fritz to grant the rear yard variance of 3.6 feet where 20 feet is required subject to the following conditions: the applicant must obtain construction permits, construction of the decks in accordance with the survey, and maintenance of the escrow account. Roll call vote: Ayes – Mr. McLaughlin, Mr. Fritz, Mr. Cossaboon, Ms. Fox, Mr. Sebastian, Mr. Kozak, Mr. Salvadori. Nays – Zero. Abstentions – Zero.

2. #19-13 – Wood Management, LLC – Use Variance

Present – Daniel Rivlin, applicant's attorney, Steve Smith, applicant, Walter Bronson, applicant's engineer.

The applicant is proposing to construct eight storage buildings containing six storage units, each 1000 square feet for a total of 48,000 square feet along with site improvements including a stormwater management basin, gravel drives, and parking areas. The applicant is also proposing to have contractor storage along with overnight vehicle parking. The proposed dual use is not listed as a permitted use and as such a use variance is required. The property is located on Tuckahoe Road, also known as Block 14301, Lots 8 & 9 in the BP Zoning District.

Public Hearings: (continued)

2. #19-13 – Wood Management, LLC (continued)

Mr. Salvadori stated that this hearing is a continuation from the October 29, 2019 special meeting. Mr. Coe stated that the previous hearing ended while still in the public portion. Mr. Horner, representing the objectors, made his presentation, a member of public did testify in support, and the Board voted to continue the hearing due to the late hour. Mr. Coe stated that the public should be invited to speak as well as the applicant or his professionals with regard to reply or rebuttal.

Mr. Horner addressed the Board. Mr. Coe reminded him that he did present witnesses at the last hearing and they would only be heard for nonduplicative testimony. Mr. Horner replied that his clients would like to testify as well as the planner.

2. Jerry Lodge, 1464 N. Tuckahoe Road, was sworn in by Mr. Coe. Mr. Lodge stated he did not know why he and Glenn are labeled as antidevelopment because they are not opposed to development. They live across the street from Peach Country and attended the meetings for the development on the property. They did not oppose the development; however, since that time, Mr. Smith has not done the things he was supposed to do on the site and has done things he doesn't have approval for on the site. He went to the Planning Board in 2018 for approval of the landscaper storage and was told the landscaper storage containers are an illegal use on the site but they were already there. Now he and the Stanches want to develop the property next door for these landscapers. There are fourteen landscapers at Peach Country, without approval. Mr. Lodge spoke about the size of the proposed storage units and stated he believes that all forty-eight units will be contractor storage units as they are too large for typical household storage. It's very obvious the proposed use is an extension of the operations taking place on the Peach Country site. The Stanches have been using the property in question for a firewood cutting operation. Mr. Lodge stated his objections to the proposed use as being the increased traffic, the before and after-hours traffic, the noise, and the spillage of materials off of the landscaping trucks onto his property. He stated that he and Glenn are not opposed to development in the area. They did go to the meetings for Hamilton Greene and the church project next door to them and they did raise any objections. He is not opposed to Peach Country expanding their business but they should go through with the proper approvals and not just do what they want and then ask the Township to approve it after the fact. Mr. Lodge commented that the proposed storage facility is a bad idea because there are too many opportunities to misuse the storage units and the property, as evidenced by what is going on currently at the Peach Country site. He stated this is not a personal thing against Mr. Smith or the Stanches as they would object to this proposal no matter who the applicant.

Public Hearings: (continued)

2. #19-13 – Wood Management, LLC (continued)

3. Glenn Groves, 1464 N. Tuckahoe Road, was sworn in by Mr. Coe. Mr. Groves stated they are not opposed to change or development. They realize the zoning across the street is planned Business Park. What they are opposed to is businesses that operate illegally. They have seen a lot of goings on over the years on the Peach Country site and that gives them a good idea of what the proposed use will look like if approved. The proposed use will create more harm with no benefit and will be difficult for the town to control. The plan does not show any bathroom facilities and Mr. Groves wondered if all the contractors will have to use the facilities on the Peach Country site. He stated the code does not permit storage facilities and overnight vehicle storage together. The illegal businesses currently operating on Lot 10 only benefit and bring profit to one entity. He and Mr. Lodge have continued concerns on the impact on the environment with regard to the mulching operation as well as concerns with the increased traffic the proposed use will bring to the area.

In March of 2014 Peach Country opened and within three months other businesses were operating from the site. He reported them to the Township and to his knowledge there has never been any permits or approvals for those businesses. In 2016 the Planning Board granted waivers for almost all of the violations with regard to the original site plan approval including allowing the existing gate which is too close to the road. However, no approval or waivers were given to allow the other businesses to operate on the site. In June of 2017 Mike's Driving School was operating its business from the Peach Country site and did so for almost a year before they were made to cease with intervention from the Township. In August of 2018 an application was presented to the Planning Board to allow the existing landscape businesses to operate on the existing site. After some time, the matter was deferred to the Zoning Board. Now there is this application before the Zoning Board and if the Board approves this use it will allow a huge expansion of the illegal operation that exists on Lot 10 with no benefit to the town but a big detriment to the community. Mr. Groves stated that it is not a personal issue against any individual but opposition to an illegal business no matter who owns the business. The type of business proposed will not benefit the area or the town and they are requesting the Board deny the use variance.

Mr. Smith asked if he can speak as a member of the public. Mr. Coe asked Mr. Rivlin if he wished his client to speak as a member of the public. Mr. Rivlin replied that he did not have a problem with his client speaking as a member of the public; however, it was his understanding that the objectors had completed their testimony at the last hearing. Mr. Coe indicated that the public portion was not closed at the last hearing and Mr. Horner's clients had not testified at that time. He stated that Mr. Rivlin will have an opportunity to reply to the public comments.

Public Hearings: (continued)

2. #19-13 – Wood Management, LLC (continued)

Mr. Sebastian stated he was a little confused as he was under the impression the Board was dealing with the use only and whether this particular use should be permitted in the BP Zone. He didn't think the issue of traffic, the number of units, etc. was relevant to the use variance but will be handled with the site plan. Mr. Coe replied that the application before the Board is for the use but as part of that some testimony has to be given as to what it is they are proposing so the Board can determine if the use is appropriate. There will be a certain amount of site issues discussed and testified to, although not in detail, but in order for the Board to have a clear picture of the proposal.

4. Barbara Wooley-Dillon, objector's planner, was sworn in by Mr. Coe. Ms. Wooley-Dillon stated she did some research on self-storage facilities because she wanted to understand the scope of what was being proposed with what is a typical self-storage facility. She researched at least five different known self-storage facilities with regard to the size of the units typically found. The largest unit she found in any facility is a four hundred square foot unit. She prepared a handout which depicted the different size storage units and what they could potentially hold from different self-storage facilities which was marked as Exhibit J. She explained that in comparison to the self-storage units shown in the exhibit and the number of items they can hold including a car and small boat, the applicant's proposed storage units are the size of a small home. She stated she prepared a handout from the Big Book of Small Homes which depicts small home plans under 1200 square feet. Mr. Coe asked the relevance of the proposed exhibit. Mr. Horner replied it supports the testimony just given which is that 1000 square feet is the size of a small home. Mr. Coe replied that the Board is well aware of the size of a small home as it deals with these types of issues regularly and they do not need the proposed exhibit to show them the size of small homes. Ms. Wooley-Dillon stated that the size of the proposed storage units far exceeds a typical storage unit and this goes to the negative impacts of the proposed development. The negative impacts include the size of the vehicles that will access the site and the maneuverability on the site. There is a substantial negative impact to the town by allowing units of this size. She read from the ordinance with regard to the permitted uses in a community commercial zone. She did not believe this use promotes the objectives of the Master Plan. The ordinance does not allow this type of use outright because they are not your typical self-storage units but more of a commercial storage facility. The Board can see from looking at the videos the type of facility that is being proposed only on a larger scale.

Mr. Horner stated that there haven't been any good reasons for approving this use but there have been many negative reasons given to oppose it. There is no connection between the requested use and the public good. He asked that the Board deny this application with hope that a use that is permitted will eventually be built on the property.

Public Hearings: (continued)

2. #19-13 – Wood Management, LLC (continued)

5. Steve Smith, 212 Fish Pond Road, was sworn in by Mr. Coe. Mr. Smith stated that he would like to grow his business with the town. He did not anticipate the business to grow this quickly and they would like to construct these buildings. The landscapers and contractors are good, hard working people. He would like to have this use which will bring in tax dollars to the town. He stated he is just trying to grow his business; he has done farming and dealt with fertilizer and mulch his entire life and the materials he uses are not dangerous.

Motion passed to close the hearing to the public.

Mr. Rivlin gave a brief response to the public comments. He stated that the list of permitted uses listed in the ordinance is not exclusive. There are very specific things listed in the ordinance and Master Plan that are excluded but the proposed use is not one of them. There was a lot of talk about what is going on at the site with regard to other businesses; however, there isn't any business being operated out of Lots 8 & 9 which is why they are before the Board. Mr. Rivlin stated that a self-storage facility is a permitted use in the zone and there aren't any restrictions in the ordinance regarding the size of the units. Vehicle storage facilities are a conditionally permitted use in the zone; so, it is not an excluded use. The drone footage provided by the objectors focused on activity on Lots 10 & 4 and not Lots 8 & 9 because those lots are primarily vacant land. The planner for the objector concluded that, based on the video, an overwhelming number of large vehicles jumped out at her as well as commenting on the footage of the driveway on Lot 10 and the trucks going in and out of that driveway. Mr. Rivlin commented that the Township's trucks utilize the driveway there to bring leaves to the site for recycling. But these vehicles are accessing Lot 10, not Lots 8 & 9. Trucks are going to access Lot 10 due to the nature of the business there; unfortunately, it is across the street from the objector's property. The planner for the objector talked about all the traffic and the potential problems more traffic will cause if the use is granted but she is not a traffic engineer and does not have the credentials to speculate on the impact of the traffic. Mr. Rivlin also commented that the objectors did attend the meeting when the church wanted to grow and they did speak against the proposed project as it was presented. There is an existing airport down the street and how can you argue that a medivac helicopter use on the airport site doesn't make sense, but the objectors spoke against that use at a public hearing as well. The objectors stated that there is no known hardship to allow the proposed use; however, the finding of a hardship is not necessary to substantiate the burden of proof for a D1 variance. There are similar uses going on in other areas of the Township such as in the Williamstown Pavilion. Mr. Rivlin stated that the property is mostly wooded and will remain so with respect the buffering to the neighboring properties as well as the proposed 100 foot buffer to Tuckahoe Road.

Public Hearings: (continued)

He stated that the objectors have said there will be detriment to the town and the zone plan and neighborhood but they have not given one single example of any detriment. But the burden is substantial detriment and they haven't shown any detriment let alone substantial detriment to the Township or the zone plan. Mr. Rivlin stated self-storage is permitted and the applicant could have come in with a site plan and built that; the only thing that requires the use variance is the overnight vehicle storage which is a conditionally permitted use. The plan will show that there is more than enough parking on the site to allow for overnight vehicle parking. In addition, the objectors named all of the subparts of the statute that the use does not fit. The applicant is not required to fit all of the subparts; they only have to fit one of them and the applicant's planner testified that they fit two. Mr. Rivlin commented on whether or not the objectors have received approval for the rental property they have. Mr. Coe interceded and stated that a lot of what Mr. Rivlin is saying is completely irrelevant to the application before the Board. He did not need to talk about the airport, etc., he only needed to talk about Lots 8 & 9 as he has reminded the Board many times. Mr. Rivlin stated that one of the goals in the Master Plan is to bring more ratables and the proposed development will do just that.

Mr. Salvadori asked for a motion to take a brief recess. Motion by Mr. McLaughlin, seconded by Mr. Rybicki; voice vote; all ayes, motion passed. The Board took a brief recess at 8:20 p. m. and was back on the record at 8:29 p.m.

Mr. Bronson, the applicant's engineer, was sworn in by Mr. Coe. Mr. Bronson displayed the conceptual site plan for the Board that depicted some changes since the October 29th hearing. He pointed out the parking areas on the conceptual plan which allowed for 200 parking spaces. Mr. Bronson reiterated the types of uses permitted in the zone such as light industrial buildings, warehouse facilities of 80,000 square feet and commercial buildings of 70,000 square feet. He stated all of those uses would have the same kind of truck traffic accessing the site. Mr. Bronson stated that he has several friends who are contractors and he knows they would love to have a facility where they can store and park their work vehicles. The proposed facility will benefit the community by getting those landscaping vehicles and contractor vehicles out of the street and residential neighborhoods by allowing them to rent space to store their equipment and work vehicles overnight. "There is also car enthusiasts that would love to have a place to store their classic cars or race cars. He stated that are many types of reasons someone would have to rent a unit of this size besides landscape contractors and that it is beneficial to the town to have a facility such as the one proposed. The plan Mr. Bronson displayed was marked as Exhibit A-

Public Hearings: (continued)

2. #19-13 – Wood Management, LLC (continued)

Ms. Pellegrini commented that she disagrees with Mr. Rivlin's assessment that this is a conditional use variance and not a regular use variance since the characteristics of the proposed use is different from a typical self-storage facility. Mr. Coe asked if the applicant's argument that the proposed use is like a light industrial use is on point. Ms. Pellegrini replied that there are components that make it similar to light industrial but the traffic would not be the same. There will be a lot of traffic coming and going; it's the kind of traffic that is not typical of an office or warehouse use. She stated that the hybrid use proposed with its unique impacts should be well thought through and well managed. She agreed it would be a benefit to get contractors out of the residential neighborhoods but you can't create something that's going to be a bigger nuisance. She does not recommend bifurcating the application as the site information is important. The plan submitted was not all inclusive as there is a lot of things discussed as to what may or may not happen at the site so it could morph into many different things as evidenced on the existing site. Having a clear-cut plan before the Board of what exactly will happen at the site would be beneficial. Ms. Pellegrini stated that the applicant testified that the self-storage units will be available for typical household storage but the contractor storage and regular self-storage operate differently and, in her opinion, the site plan would have to show how they would be separated and managed. She stated that it appears the use hasn't been completely thought out and that concerns her. She thought the proposed use could be managed well but the Board should be very careful in their decision with what's been proposed. Mr. Coe added that there is also a use variance required for having more than one principal use on the same property. Ms. Pellegrini agreed. Mr. McLaughlin asked if Ms. Pellegrini has a concern about the intensity of the use proposed.

Ms. Pellegrini responded that you can get a sense of the intensity by the operation next door on Lot 10, and even though it will be a little different, you can get a sense of what it would be. Just as that has grown, this use can grow as well. She stated the intensity has an impact but controlling what goes on is more of a concern. If the use is approved, she would recommend the entire site be fenced and a gate be placed further back off of Tuckahoe Road to prevent the stacking of vehicles trying to pull in and out. These issues do get addressed at site plan but it is important to put them on the record now. Ms. Pellegrini spoke about the proposed second entrance to Lots 8 & 9 but she would recommend they look at how the site is going to function since a lot of the contractors will be patronizing the business on Lot 10 and there are already issues there with trucks trying to get in and out onto Tuckahoe Road. She believes the two businesses should be interconnected so that contractors are not coming out onto Tuckahoe Road at Lots 8 & 9 and then pulling into Lot 10. She stated the applicant should have had more of a planned presentation of the function and operation of the site and how it will be managed.

Public Hearings: (continued)

2. #19-13 – Wood Management, LLC (continued)

Mr. Sebastian asked if Ms. Pellegrini is suggesting the Board should look at a site plan before deciding on the use. Mr. Coe replied that the applicant can bifurcate the application. Ms. Pellegrini stated they do have that option but they also take the risk that the Board doesn't have all the information. A traffic study is going to be very important and how the County weighs in on the proposal. Mr. Sebastian asked if the Board can even have a situation where they ask for the site plan before they decide on the use or will we have to vote on the use and wait to address all the issues at site plan. The site plan will dictate how the site will operate and the Board has the discretion to say what they want or don't want on the site. Mr. Coe responded that the applicant has the right to bifurcate but they still have to sustain its burden and give enough information to demonstrate the positive and negative criteria. The applicant always runs the risk if they do not provide sufficient information to sustain the burden that they may not have their application approved.

Mr. Coe stated that the standard for the Board's consideration is that the applicant must demonstrate special reasons why the proposed use carries out a purpose of zoning or how the refusal to allow the project would impose on the applicant an undue hardship. He continued to read the standard for granting use variances including demonstrating the positive and negative criteria. The request before the Board is the applicant is seeking a use variance to allow the construction of 48 self-storage/contractor storage units, 1000 square feet each, six units in eight buildings, with associated improvements. In addition, the applicant is requesting overnight vehicle parking for contractor vehicles. Condition of any approval will include: consolidation of ownership of the two lots, inclusion of a manager's office on the site, submission of a site plan including any connection to Lot 10 and submission of all site plan checklist items and requirements. Mr. Coe asked that the Board put a time period on when the applicant must submit a site plan of 60 days. No outside storage is permitted, no maintenance is permitted with the exception of routine maintenance, submission of a traffic study, outside agency approvals, and maintenance of the escrow account. There was some discussion on the time limitation for submission of the site plan due to the holidays and it was determined that 90 days would be acceptable. Motion by Mr. Kozak, seconded by Mr. Sebastian to grant the use variance subject to the conditions stated. Roll call vote: Ayes – Mr. Sebastian, Mr. McLaughlin, Mr. Salvadori. Nays – Mr. Kozak voted nay due to the more intense use of vehicle storage and because the applicant did not propose a manager's office or bathroom facilities. Mr. Cossaboon, Ms. Fox, Mr. Fritz stated they voted nay for the same reasons. 3 ayes, 4 nays, motion failed.

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. Mr. McLaughlin asked for advice from the other Board members concerning updates on the IPADS and whether or not they have to check with the IT department before installing any updates. After some discussion, Mrs. Farrell stated she would check with Mr. Varalli concerning updates.

2. Mrs. Farrell stated that the next meeting is scheduled for December 17th and the Board will just be memorializing resolutions. There is a holiday celebration scheduled for after the meeting.

3. Mr. Salvadori inquired about the issue of wetlands for the Arbours application and if the Township can have the property surveyed or have some entity determine if there are wetlands on the property. Mr. Coe stated that there was a lot of testimony that the property is wet so they would have to update their report. Ms. Pellegrini agreed that the Board can require them to submit an updated LOI.

Approval of Minutes:

1. 10/29/19 special meeting.
2. 11/12/19 regular meeting.
3. 11/19/19 regular meeting.

Motion by Mr. Sebastian, seconded by Mr. McLaughlin to approve the minutes from the October 29th, November 12th, and November 19th Zoning Board meetings. Voice vote; all ayes, motion passed.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 9:03 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 proceedings.

Respectfully submitted by: Ninette Orbaczewski, Clerk Transcriber.