

**Call to Order:**

The regular meeting of the Monroe Township Zoning Board of Adjustment was called to order at 6:05 p.m. by Chairman Sebastian who read the following statement: “Notice of this meeting was given as required by the Open Public Meetings Act in the Annual Notice of Meetings on January 8, 2021. In addition, notice for this evening’s public hearings are published in the newspaper in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act. 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.”.

**Roll call:**

Present – Mr. Cummiskey, Mr. DelCampo, Mr. Kozak, Mr. Salvadori, Mr. Sebastian, Mr. Powers, Mr. Adams. Absent – Mr. Cossaboon, (excused), Mr. Rybicki, (excused). Also present – Mr. Coe, Solicitor, Mr. Sander, Engineer, Ms. Pellegrini, Planner, Ms. Fox, Council Liaison, Mrs. Farrell, Secretary, Mrs. Orbaczewski, Clerk Transcriber.

**Memorialization of Resolutions:**

1. #23-2021 – App. #21-08 – Marvin Tucker – Lot Frontage & Width Variances Approved

Motion by Mr. Salvadori, seconded by Mr. Powers to adopt resolution #23-2021. Voice vote; all ayes, motion passed.

2. #24-2021 – App. #21-05 – Thomas R. Fox, Jr. – Use & Height Variances Approved

Motion by Mr. Kozak, seconded by Mr. Salvadori to adopt resolution #24-2021. Voice vote; all ayes, motion passed.

3. #25-2021 – App. #21-12 – Patrick Jones – Use Variance Approved

Motion by Mr. Salvadori, seconded by Mr. Cummiskey to adopt resolution #25-2021. Voice vote; all ayes, motion passed.

4. #27-2021 – App. #21-09 & WSP-03-21 – Use Variance/Site Plan Waiver Approved

Motion by Mr. Cummiskey, seconded by Mr. Salvadori to adopt resolution #27-2021. Roll call vote: Ayes – Mr. Cummiskey, Mr. Salvadori, Mr. Kozak, Mr. Powers, Mr. Adams. Nays – Zero. Abstentions – Zero.

**Public Hearings:**

1. #21-07 – 322 Motors (Thomas Spaulding, III) – Use Variance

Present – Thomas Spaulding, applicant, Len Schwartz, applicant’s attorney.

The applicant is requesting a use variance to continue to operate a used car facility that was previously granted a site plan waiver. The property is located at 33 West Black Horse Pike, also known as Block 6301, Lot 33 in the RD-C Zoning District.

Mr. Sebastian asked if the application can be deemed complete. Mrs. Farrell replied the applicant is requesting a waiver from providing the Pinelands Certificate of Filing until a use variance is approved. Mr. Spaulding was sworn in by Mr. Coe. Mr. Sebastian asked for a motion on the waiver request. Motion by Mr. Kozak, seconded by Mr. Powers to grant the waiver for the Pinelands Certificate of Filing. Voice vote; all ayes, motion passed. Motion by Mr. Cummiskey, seconded by Mr. Powers to deem application #21-07 complete. Voice vote; all ayes, motion passed.

Mr. Schwartz introduced himself as the applicant’s attorney. He stated that the previous Zoning Officer indicated the property was used as an RV dealership at one time and advised Mr. Spaulding he would need a site plan waiver for his proposal to have the used car dealership. He appeared before the Planning Board in 2018 for the site plan waiver and was approved with conditions. Since that time, Mr. Spaulding has been operating 322 Motors without any issues or complaints until the current Zoning Officer informed him that the site plan waiver he received was not the proper application and that he technically needed a use variance and had to appear before the Zoning Board.

Mr. Schwartz displayed a photograph of the front of the used car dealership for the Board. Mr. Spaulding testified that one of the conditions is that a valid motor vehicle license must be obtained which he does have and it was included in the Board member’s packets. Mr. Spaulding stated that the surrounding properties to the left and right and across the street are commercial properties and behind the property is a lake but it is currently dry. There are also residential uses behind the property located on Francis Drive and as such, one of the conditions of the site plan waiver was to install a fence with a locked gate so there would be no access to and from Francis Drive.

With regard to positive and negative criteria, Mr. Schwartz stated the property has been utilized as a used car dealership since 2018 without any problems. Prior to Mr. Spaulding opening his business there the property was a vacant property along the Black Horse Pike. The operation of the used car lot has not had any negative impact to the surrounding neighborhood. Mr. Schwartz displayed another photograph of the front of building showing where there are a couple of parking spaces for display of the cars at the front of the building.

**Public Hearings: (continued)**

1. #21-07 – 322 Motors (continued)

Mr. Schwartz also displayed photographs of the site depicting the fencing and gates leading to the area where the cars are parked as well as the locked gates which remain operable. The vehicles are stored behind the gate on a paved surface. Mr. Spaulding testified that he does not perform any maintenance or repairs on the cars at the site. With regard to trash removal, Mr. Spaulding stated he uses the regular trash and recycling receptacles provided by the Township. Additional photographs were shown which depicted the garage and area at the rear of the site as well as the location of the septic system, which is in the rear, and the well which is located at the front of the site. Mr. Spaulding stated he has approximately twenty vehicles on the site right now, but it can easily hold up to fifty vehicles on the paved area. Mr. Schwartz stated they are trying to clear up the issue they thought was resolved from two years ago and they would like the approval to stand and to be granted the use variance.

Ms. Pellegrini and Mr. Sander were sworn in by Mr. Coe. Ms. Pellegrini reviewed her report for the Board. She stated most of the comments in her report were covered in testimony. She asked for confirmation that no gasoline or oil sales is conducted on the site. Mr. Spaulding confirmed there are no sales of gasoline or oil on the site. He also confirmed the office building has a bathroom facility. The site does not have an indoor display area and she stated since this is an existing facility, she wanted the Board to acknowledge the nonconformance to that requirement. She asked Mr. Spaulding to testify as to how vehicles are brought to the site. Mr. Spaulding testified that they are brought in by a small car carrier that can hold two or three cars. There are two access drives on the site and they enter and unload the cars at the rear of the site. She asked if Mr. Spaulding received sign permits for the existing signage. He testified that he did receive the proper permits. Ms. Pellegrini's report contained the conditions of the site plan waiver approval in 2018 and Mr. Spaulding has testified to all of the conditions listed. Mr. Kozak asked the applicant if he is aware the car carriers cannot unload along the Black Horse Pike. Mr. Spaulding replied he understands that is not permitted.

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

Mr. Coe reviewed the use variance for the Board. Motion by Mr. Cummiskey, seconded by Mr. Powers to grant the use variance conditioned upon the applicant obtaining all outside agency approvals necessary including Pinelands, maintenance of the escrow account, and that the applicant continue to comply with all of the conditions contained in the Planning Board resolution granting the site plan waiver in 2018. Roll call vote: Ayes – Mr. Cummiskey, Mr. Powers, Mr. Kozak, Mr. Salvadori, Mr. Adams, Mr. DelCampo, Mr. Sebastian. Nays – Zero. Abstentions – Zero.

**Public Hearings: (continued)**

2. #21-10 – Frank Andruzzi – Use Variance

Present – Frank Andruzzi, applicant.

The applicant is requesting a use variance for his existing 25' x 30' x 16' detached garage which he constructed in the front yard of his property. Accessory structures are not permitted to be constructed in the front yard; however, Mr. Andruzzi received a zoning permit in August 2016 by the previous Zoning Officer for his garage. The property is located at 490 Huber Avenue, also known as Block 4901, Lot 29 in the FD-10 Zoning District.

Mr. Andruzzi was sworn in by Mr. Coe. Mr. Sebastian asked if the application can be deemed complete. Mrs. Farrell replied the application can be deemed complete. Motion by Mr. Powers, seconded by Mr. Salvadori to deem application #21-10 complete. Voice vote; all ayes, motion passed. Mr. Andruzzi stated he is before the Board because he constructed his garage in the front of his property. He stated he received the permits and inspections from the Township. He placed it there because there is a business next door to him and he wanted to shield his property from that business.

Ms. Pellegrini reviewed her report for the Board. The garage conforms with all of the setback requirements. She stated there are design and performance standards required and asked for testimony as to the use of the garage. Mr. Andruzzi testified that he uses the garage for his personal gym and his wife uses it for her art studio; there is no business being operated from the garage. He also stated the garage is not in any buffers, drainage areas, or easements. Ms. Pellegrini stated she observed the garage and the materials used and the shape of the roof are compatible to the house and that the garage is very nicely done. She stated that no living space is permitted in the detached garage. Mr. Andruzzi replied there is no living space in the garage. There also is no overhead garage door on the building. Mr. Kozak asked Mr. Andruzzi to testify to the hardship to move the garage with regard to the cost. Mr. Andruzzi stated it would be very costly to move the garage. Mr. Coe asked what type of business is located next door to him. Mr. Andruzzi stated that it is a towing business.

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

Mr. Coe reviewed the use variance for the Board. Motion by Mr. Cummiskey, seconded by Mr. Powers to grant the use variance conditioned upon the applicant having received all necessary zoning and construction permits, the maintenance of the escrow account, no commercial use in the garage, compliance with the design and performance standards. Roll call vote: Ayes – Mr. Cummiskey, Mr. Powers, Mr. Kozak, Mr. Salvadori, Mr. Adams, Mr. DelCampo, Mr. Sebastian. Nays – Zero. Abstentions – Zero.

**Public Hearings: (continued)**

3. #21-15 – Tilghmans Auto Parts II – Use Variance

Present – Michael Ronayne, applicant, Charles Fiore, applicant’s attorney.

The applicant is requesting a use variance to operate a junk yard which requires a used car license by the State of New Jersey in order to be allowed to purchase or acquire cars for parts. The junkyard is a second principle use on the property which is located at 1623 Glassboro Road, also known as Block 15202, Lot 17 in the Commercial and Business Park Zones.

Mr. Fiore introduced himself as the applicant’s attorney. He stated Mr. Ronayne is the contract purchaser of the property as well as being the owner of the company. The property was formerly known as Midway Auto Parts and has been in operation as a junkyard since the late 1960’s. Mr. Fiore stated they are before the Board requesting a use variance and site plan waiver. A used car license is a necessity today in the junkyard business because you have to have the ability to purchase licensed and unlicensed cars which are then dismantled. As far as the physical nature of the property, Mr. Fiore stated nothing is changing with the exception of Mr. Ronayne having been cleaning it up. As part of the license requirements for the State there has to be parking spaces on the site to display cars, however, this is not going to be a used car lot.

Mr. Ronayne was sworn in by Mr. Coe. He stated he has been leasing the property since July 2020. In his business he purchases automobiles at salvage auctions that have been in collisions. He brings them back to the property inside the building where they test them and properly drain all the fluids. They inventory and catalog the vehicle online and then dismantle the vehicle and put the parts into racking and warehousing for distribution. Mr. Ronayne stated he has obtained a junkyard license from the Township and a copy was provided to the Board office. In order to purchase a car at the salvage auction he has to have a dealer license and in order to get the type of product he is looking for, going to the auctions is necessary. It is not his intention to open a used car lot and they do not repair cars. Mr. Ronayne testified that when he first started leasing the property it was in disarray; the fencing out front was in poor condition and looked horrible from the street, there was fencing down around the perimeter which he has replaced, they installed the slats so its opaque, he has replaced the roof on the building, the heating and air conditioning, and all the electric. His plans are to continue to improve the property.

Mrs. Farrell stated the application should be deemed complete. Motion by Mr. Powers, seconded by Mr. Cummiskey to deem application 21-15 complete. Voice vote; all ayes, motion passed.

Mr. Fiore asked Mr. Ronayne if it would impose a hardship on him if the use variance is not granted. Mr. Ronayne replied that he would be out business. Mr. Fiore asked if the granting of the use variance would cause any detriment to the public good. Mr. Ronayne replied nothing is changing; the same type of business has been here for many years.

**Public Hearings: (continued)**

3. #21-15 – Tilghmans Auto Parts II (continued)

Mr. Coe asked if his business is a much needed service in the community and if it provides employment opportunities. Mr. Ronayne replied it is a needed service and he does employ ten people besides himself.

Ms. Pellegrini reviewed her report for the Board. Ms. Pellegrini asked if the prior owner had a used car dealer license in order to operate the business. Mr. Ronayne replied that he did have the license but they are not transferrable. She commented on the need to have two vehicles for sale on the site. Mr. Ronayne stated the requirement is not to have two vehicles for sale but you have to have the ability to have two vehicles for display. Those spaces will be provided inside the fence; nothing will be outside the fenced area. Mr. Kozak asked Mr. Coe to place a condition on the approval that no vehicles will be parked outside the fenced area along Route 322 with the exception of customer parking.

Motion passed to open the hearing to the public.

1. Frank Lauletta, 1651 Glassboro Road, was sworn in by Mr. Coe. Mr. Lauletta stated he likes that no cars will be placed out front for sale and he welcomed Mr. Ronayne to the neighborhood.

Motion passed to close the hearing to the public.

Mr. Fiore stated they are requesting the use variance in order to continue to operate the site as it's been operated for decades and without the condition of having a site plan. Mr. Coe reviewed the use variance for the Board. Motion by Mr. Cummiskey, seconded by Mr Powers to grant the use variance conditioned upon the applicant keeping all items including the vehicles behind the fence, maintenance of the escrow account, and all work done on the property is in accordance with plans or surveys submitted. Roll call vote: Ayes – Mr. Cummiskey, Mr. Powers, Mr. Kozak, Mr. Salvadori, Mr. Adams, Mr. DelCampo, Mr. Sebastian. Nays – Zero. Abstentions – Zero. Mr. Fiore asked if the vote included the waiver of a site plan. Mr. Coe asked if the applicant submitted a site plan waiver. Mr. Fiore replied they did not submit for one but noticed for any and all other waivers or variances. Mr. Coe stated the Board should vote on a site plan waiver. Motion by Mr. Salvadori, seconded by Mr. Cummiskey. Voice vote; all ayes, motion passed.

**Reconsideration/Limited Rehearing:**

1. #20-06 – JK United Group, LLC – Use Variance

Mr. Coe stated approximately one month ago, the applicant appeared before the Board for a conditional use variance. At the end of the hearing, he framed the motion as though they needed two use variances; the conditional use variance and a use variance for the expansion of a second use.

**Reconsideration/Rehearing: (continued)**

1. #20-06 – JK United Group, LLC (continued)

He stated he was not aware the property received an interpretation from the Zoning Board in 1988. That interpretation stated that the vehicle repair and vehicle storage were one use on the site. He displayed the 1988 resolution which permitted the multiple uses on the site. If that application came before the Board today, it would require a use variance for multiple uses on the site. Mr. Coe also displayed the minutes showing the motion to approve the interpretation which passed. The applicant proceeded to appear before the Planning Board for site plan approval.

The site plan was displayed for the Board. Mr. Coe pointed out the basin on the approved site plan from 1988 and then displayed an aerial photograph from 1995. He pointed out the stream leading to Crystal Lake and where the residential uses are located on Wildwood Avenue. Also very clearly depicted is the stormwater management basin that was part of the 1988 site plan approval. Mr. Coe then displayed an aerial photograph from 2002 which shows the basin no longer exists and trucks are parked in the area where it was located. He stated these are facts and important information that was not available to the Board at the hearing in February and they do have an impact on both the motion on the use and the site plan.

Mr. Coe stated had he been aware of the prior resolutions and minutes, he would have framed the motion before the Board as strictly the d(3) conditional use variance for less than the entire perimeter opaque fencing around the vehicle storage area. That is the limited question before the Board to be determined in accordance with the standards in Ms. Pellegrini's report with regard to the positive and negative criteria. The positive and negative criteria is only on the conditional use issue with regard to the fencing. All of the other issues raised are directed towards the site plan and whether the site plan as proposed should or should not be approved.

On the site plan issue, Mr. Sander has issued a revised report concerning the information he believes is necessary for the Board to make an informed decision. He is asking for additional information concerning drainage calculations and the changes in the property as depicted in the photographs must be supplied by the applicant as part of their burden of proof. Mr. Coe stated he would like Ms. Pellegrini and Mr. Sander to briefly discuss the two issues.

Ms. Pellegrini stated the issue of the conditional use variance is for the fence screening. She stated the applicant's argument for not providing the fencing along either side of the vehicle storage yard was due to the neighboring properties being commercial uses. They did propose fencing to the one residential use with discussion to move the fence directly behind the proposed parking spaces in that corner. The applicant did agree to provide the fencing along the back of the property along the residential zone. The issue before the Board is whether not having the fencing along the sides will create a detriment to the adjacent commercial properties. The actual limits of the opaque fencing and the exact location can be addressed at site plan.

**Reconsideration/Rehearing: (continued)**

1. #20-06 – JK United Group, LLC (continued)

Mr. Kozak questioned what the Board was voting on with regard to the fence. Ms. Pellegrini stated that the Board is only voting on whether not having the opaque fencing along the adjacent commercial property line is a detriment to those commercial uses. The question of how much fencing to the residential is to be determined at site plan.

Mr. Sander stated his comments are directed solely toward the site plan. The applicant will have to get use variance approval first but for the site plan the applicant will be required to submit drainage calculations and revised plans showing existing conditions at the site based upon the prior site plan approval and not what is there now. He stated what is there now is not approved and they are in violation. The site plan application is considered incomplete until the drainage calculations and the revised plans are submitted for review. They are going to have to reduce the stormwater runoff from the site below what it would be if they still had the basin. If they just put the basin back in, it would not be enough, they have to reduce it lower than that. In addition, the vehicle storage area is supposed to be a paved surface which would increase the runoff but a waiver from the Board would be necessary to leave it as stone. Ms. Pellegrini asked Mr. Sander if they will have to comply with the new stormwater regulations since the site plan will not be coming in before the March 2, 2021 deadline. She also commented whether the vehicle surface is paved or not, they will still have to provide for water quality. Mr. Sander agreed and stated he assumes they have never made a submission to the State for this project so the new regulations will be in effect.

Motion passed to open the matter to the public.

1. Kenny Link, 601 Wildwood Avenue, was sworn in by Mr. Coe. Mr. Link asked if the Board is just discussing the fencing and then there will be another meeting concerning the site plan. Mr. Sebastian replied the only issue before the Board is whether the Board will allow them to not have the opaque fence around the entire perimeter of the site. Mr. Link stated that the photograph shown from 2002 depicting the trucks parked on the site is not how it is now; the trucks are further back.

2. Irene Link, 601 Wildwood Avenue, was sworn in by Mr. Coe. Mrs. Link asked what is going to happen with regard to the noise. Mr. Sebastian stated that issue will have to be addressed at site plan. Mrs. Link replied they were told they are not supposed to be parking the trucks back there but they are still doing it. Mr. Sebastian reiterated that those issues will be addressed with the site plan. Mr. Kozak asked Mr. Coe if the original site plan can still be enforced so that the Zoning Officer can handle any violations. Mr. Coe replied that the prior approvals still stand and any violation can be enforced by the Zoning Official. That goes to the site issue of the location of the parked trucks and all the other issues. Mr. Kozak stated that the parking was limited to just behind the building as per the approved site plan. Mr. Coe agreed and stated it will be up to the Zoning Official to look at the prior approvals and then enforce those approvals.



**Reconsideration/Rehearing: (continued)**

1. #20-06 – JK United Group, LLC (continued)

3. Andy Potopchuk, 605 Wildwood Avenue, was sworn in by Mr. Coe. Mr. Potopchuk submitted a petition signed by the residents that live in the area which was dated September 2020 and concerned the noise and trucks parked on the site. Mr. Potopchuk stated he spoke with Mr. Neri who constructed the original basin and it was built so that the water would not runoff onto other people's property which is what's happening now. Mr. Sebastian stated the Board is not dealing with that this evening. Mr. Potopchuk asked if any members of the Board, other than Mr. Kozak, or from Council, been out to the site to see what the neighbors are talking about. Mr. Sebastian stated he has been and Mr. Cummiskey also stated he visited the site. Mr. Potopchuk replied that all of the issues can be stopped if someone would just look at what is out there.

Mr. Coe stated that the petition cannot be considered by the Board. Anyone who wants to address the Board must come before the Board and be sworn in as a witness. Mr. Coe also stated the hearsay testimony of what Mr. Neri may or may not have done cannot be considered. Any testimony by Mr. Neri has to be done by Mr. Neri in an appearance at the Board. Mr. Potopchuk stated that he will be in attendance at the future hearing. He stated no one really cares about the people in Crystal Lake and their concerns and this was getting him nowhere. Mr. Coe stated he is trying to advise Mr. Potopchuk on the proper manner for bringing evidence to the Board. If other people in the neighborhood want to be heard, they need to appear before the Board and be sworn in as witnesses and testify.

Motion passed to close the matter to the public.

Mr. Coe stated the first motion in the reconsideration is for conditional use approval for having less than the entirety of the vehicle storage yard to be enclosed with an opaque fence pursuant to the standards from Ms. Pellegrini's report. The motion would be conditioned upon the applicant submitting a site plan, the site plan addressing the issues raised in Mr. Sander's revised report, and the applicant maintaining the escrow account. Motion by Mr. Powers, seconded by Mr. Cummiskey to approved the condition use variance as stated by the Solicitor. Roll call vote: Ayes – Mr. Powers, Mr. Cummiskey, Mr. Kozak, Mr. Salvadori, Mr. Adams, Mr. Sebastian.

Mr. Coe stated the next issue is when and how they are going to conduct the site plan hearing as the Board has the authority to bifurcate the application. The Board has the authority to require the applicant to submit the information asked for by Mr. Sander in his revised report. Any and all bulk variances will be addressed at that time. Mr. Coe stated that due to timing issues of 120 days he stated a meeting should be scheduled as soon as possible. After some discussion, it was decided the Board would hold a special meeting on April 27, 2021 at 5:00 p.m. The applicant can ask for an extension if they choose. Motion by Mr. Powers, seconded by Mr. Cummiskey to hold the meeting for site plan concerning the JK United application. Voice vote; all ayes, 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. Mr. Coe stated that Mr. Horner, the objector's attorney, for the Wood Management application submitted a five-page document that shows an alternative proposal for ingress and egress to the Peach Country property as well as an alteration to the internal circulation. Mr. Horner has requested that the Board's professionals review that alternative plan at the applicant's expense. The applicant objected to that as they should not be required to pay for the objector's proposal. There were further submissions by both the objectors and the applicant. Mr. Coe determined that the objectors have the right to submit a proposal, as long as it's relevant, to the Board for their review. Mr. Coe also determined that the applicant is not required to pay for the review of an objector's proposal per the MLUL. He stated the MLUL is silent on whether the objectors should have to pay so by default it will fall to the Board. Mr. Coe recommended the objector's document be reviewed by the Board's professionals at the Board expense. He stated that will eliminate any argument by the objectors that the Board is not giving full and complete consideration to what they are proposing. Mr. Sebastian asked if that means an objector can continuously keep objecting and keep submitting stuff for review. Mr. Coe stated the objector is constrained by the relevance and materiality of what they are presenting to the Board. Mrs. Orbaczewski commented that while Mr. Coe stated the Board is responsible for the costs, technically it is the taxpayers who will be responsible. Mr. Coe stated the taxpayers fund a certain amount of overhead and the fees should be such that the office is self-funding but that's a matter for the municipality. He commented that the Board has a responsibility to entertain the objector's submission. There was discussion on the possible cost of review with the professionals indicating it could be about a \$1000.00. Mr. Coe stated that is better than giving the objectors a reason to appeal which will cost more in legal fees. Mr. Coe stated his recommendation is for Mr. Sander and Ms. Pellegrini to review the document; he stated that they do not have to submit a written report but to report their findings at the hearing. Motion by Mr. Kozak, seconded by Mr. Powers to authorize the Board's professionals to review the objector's documents at the Township's expense. Roll call vote: Ayes – Mr. Kozak, Mr. Powers, Mr. Cummiskey, Mr. Salvadori, Mr. Adams, Mr. Sebastian. Nays – Zero. Abstentions – Zero.

2. Ms. Fox asked if the Board has any questions or concerns for her to take back to Council. Mr. Sebastian asked Mr. Coe if he has done his annual report so that it can go to the Planning Board. Mr. Coe stated he should have it done in the next week; he did complete the 2019 report. Mr. Sebastian asked Mr. Coe to copy Ms. Fox on the reports.

**Approval of Minutes:**

1. 3/2/2021 regular meeting.

Mrs. Farrell stated that the minutes listed are for February 23, 2021; however, they are not completed, but the March 2, 2021 minutes are completed and submitted. Mr. Sebastian stated that the meetings have been long and Mrs. Orbaczewski has been inundated with the work doing the minutes. He stated he sent a letter to the Mayor's office with praise for the office staff and the job they are doing for the Board. He stated he has been dealing with a personal issue at another township and it's taken him eight months to get through the process. He believes our Township handles matters more efficiently and that is due to the staff in the office. Mr. Coe also addressed the matter of the minutes and how long it takes to complete minutes from a long meeting. He stated it has to take a multiple of five hours to complete minutes for a five-hour meeting. In doing his resolutions he reviews the minutes in detail to make sure they are correct and to make sure they coincide with the resolutions. He stated in all the years he has been reviewing Mrs. Orbaczewski's minutes he has never had to correct them. Mr. Sebastian agreed with Mr. Coe on the issue of the minutes.

Motion by Mr. Cumiskey, seconded by Mr. Powers to approve the minutes from the March 2, 2021 regular meeting. Voice vote; all ayes, motion passed.

**Adjournment:**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:25 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