

# MINUTES

MAY 13, 2014

PLANNING BOARD

LONG HILL TOWNSHIP

## CALL TO ORDER AND STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE

Chairman Pfeil called the meeting to order at 7:30 P.M. He then read the following statement: Adequate notice of this meeting has been provided by posting a copy of the public meeting dates on the municipal bulletin board, by sending a copy to the Courier News and Echoes Sentinel and by filing a copy with the Municipal Clerk, all in January, 2014.

## MEETING CUT-OFF

Chairman Pfeil read the following statement: Announcement is made that as a matter of procedure, it is the intention of the Planning Board not to continue any matter past 10:30 P.M. at any Regular or Special Meeting of the Board unless a motion is passed by the members present to extend the meeting to a later specified cut-off time.

## CELL PHONES AND PAGERS

Chairman Pfeil read the following statement: All in attendance are requested to turn off cell phones and pagers as they interfere with the court room taping mechanism.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

## ROLL CALL

On a call of the roll, the following were present:

J. Alan Pfeil, Chairman  
Suzanne Dapkins, Vice-Chairman  
Brendan Rae, Mayor's Designee (arrived 7:45 p.m.)  
Guy Roshto, Member  
Gregory Aroneo, Member  
Timothy Wallisch, Member (arrived 7:47 P.M.)  
David Hands, 1<sup>st</sup> Alternate

Kevin O'Brien, Twp. Planner  
Thomas Lemanowicz, Bd. Engineer  
Dan Bernstein, Bd. Attorney  
Cynthia Kiefer, Board Secretary

Excused:

Guy Piserchia, Mayor  
Ashish Moholkar, Member

Ms Kiefer advised Chairman Pfeil that he had a quorum and could proceed.

X X X X X X X X X X X

EXECUTIVE SESSION - It was determined that there was no need to hold an executive session.

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of April 22, 2014 were approved as amended on motion by Mrs. Dapkins and seconded by Mr. Hands. A Roll Call Vote was taken. Those in Favor: Mr. Aroneo, Mrs. Dapkins, Committeeman Roshto, Mr. Hands, Chairman Pfeil. Those Opposed: None (Dr. Rae and Mr. Wallisch had not arrived at the meeting yet).

## PUBLIC COMMENT OR QUESTION PERIOD

Chairman Pfeil asked if there were any comments or questions from the public on any item *not on* the agenda.

Michael T. Pavlo, 539 Chestnut Street, asked a question in reference to Agenda Item No. 11, "Status of Master Plan Elements" and in particular, the Recreation Element. He questioned if the Planning Board would have to review and approve the Recreation Element portion of the Master Plan before the Township Committee could spend taxpayer dollars on the Central School Sports Complex project.

Mr. O'Brien answered that the Township Committee was free to use whatever materials were at their disposal in order to govern the township.

Mr. Aroneo recused himself and left the room for further discussion on this topic since he lives within 200 feet of the proposed Central School Sports Complex project.

Keith DeMatteo, 451 Chestnut Street, asked how he could get the feasibility studies that were done in the past on this project.

Committeeman Roshto stated that he had the 2008 study that he would send it to him.

Mrs. Dapkins suggested that Mr. DeMatteo ask the Superintendent of Schools since the earlier studies were conducted by the Board of Education. She discussed some of the results of those studies with Mr. Pavlo.

Ms. Kiefer noted for the record that Dr. Rae had arrived at 7:45 P.M. and that Mr. Wallisch had arrived at 7:47 P.M.

Chairman Pfeil asked if there were any other comments or questions on items *not* on the agenda. Hearing none, he closed the meeting to the public.

**RESOLUTION OF MEMORIALIZATION**

**RESTORE MEYERSVILLE LLC**

596 Meyersville Road  
Block 14701 Lot 27

#13-07P  
Prelim/Final Site Plan  
Bulk Variances

Present: J. Delaney, Attorney for the Applicant  
W. Kaufman, Applicant

John J. Delaney, **Lindabury, McCormick, Estabrook & Cooper**, Westfield, New Jersey, attorney for the applicant, introduced himself to the Planning Board and the public. He expressed extreme dissatisfaction with the draft resolution, saying it was “totally arbitrary, capricious, unreasonable, and tainted.” In his opinion, it reflected a “total bias” towards his client and did not reflect the record of the six (6) nights of testimony. He suggested to Chairman Pfeil that he and Mr. Bernstein get together and go through the resolution line by line.

Chairman Pfeil said that this resolution had been removed from the last meeting since he felt there might be some potential concerns on the applicant’s part. He had hoped there would have been dialog since then to at least address those concerns and there had been none.

Mr. Delaney proposed that, since it was a denial and there was no great urgency, he and Mr. Bernstein meet and review those items of concern.

Mr. Bernstein said that resolution was based on the testimony, the ordinance, and what naturally flows from it. He said he would be happy to meet with Mr. Delaney and even if all the matters could not be resolved, they could come back to the Board with a finite number of unresolved issues.

Chairman Pfeil asked Mr. Delaney if he felt it would be possible to resolve this in time for the next meeting.

Mr. Delaney said that he was available until June 25.

Mr. Bernstein stated that he was working on an appellate brief and asked if it would be possible to schedule it for the second meeting in June.

Ms. Kiefer noted that the date for the second meeting in June was the 24<sup>th</sup> and that there was nothing on the schedule at that time.

Mr. Delaney acknowledged that he would be available.

Chairman Pfeil asked if it would be an issue if this resolution was not adopted and the applicant had a new application before this Board prior to that adoption.

Mr. Delaney felt that the second application should stand for itself so he was not sure that the first should have any effect one way or another.

Mr. Bernstein recommended that the Board memorialize the action that it took rather than having that application withdrawn. He felt that that was the appropriate step according to the Municipal Land Use Law and that it would be helpful if the first application was decided before the second one was started.

Mr. Kaufman said that the second application was tentatively on the agenda for May 27, 2014 however there might be an issue with noticing. There were conflicting reports between the zoning officer and the planner so there was some question as to what to notice for.

Mr. Kaufman said for the record that there would be no height variance requested and that the plans would be corrected to reflect that. He indicated that he would be meeting with the Board professionals the following week regarding the design standards with respect to the detention basin and how they apply to the application under site plan approval.

Mr. Kaufman affirmed that they were not noticing for any variances. If the design waivers did not need to be noticed individually, the application would be heard on the 27<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Hands asked what would be the minimum amount of language necessary to get the resolution approved.

Mr. Bernstein said that it was necessary to include enough information to make the resolution as strong as possible so that it could withstand a potential appeal. He felt that to eliminate any information or variances that were currently in the draft resolution would make it vulnerable to appeal.

Mr. Delaney felt that it was not just a matter of “wordsmithing” but that there were some real fundamental differences.

Chairman Pfeil asked if there was a time constraint on the Board to memorialize this resolution.

Mr. Bernstein said that the time limit of 45 days had passed already and that Mr. Delaney had extended the time to the 24<sup>th</sup> of June.

Committeeman Roshto asked Mr. Bernstein if he believed that it was in the best interests of the applicant and the township to have these discussions or should the Board move forward.

Mr. Bernstein felt that it would be very difficult and tedious to review the resolution line by line in front of the Board. He felt it would be much more useful to have a finite list of points of discussion to bring before the Board.

Mr. Aroneo asked, since he was not present for the vote, if he would be able to participate in the discussion.

Mr. Bernstein said that it would be the four (4) people who voted who would make the decision.

Mr. Delaney said that the law allows those who were in dissent to comment on the resolution. However, he agreed that when it came time to vote, only those four (4) would be eligible.

Chairman Pfeil said that the Board looked forward to seeing the revised draft resolution to memorialize Restore Meyersville LLC at the June 24<sup>th</sup> meeting. He asked if the Board could get some written material beforehand.

Mr. Bernstein said that it was his policy to do so. The Board would have a chance to read and review all the points of contention.

Both Mr. Delaney and Mr. Bernstein agreed that the Planning Board would be the ultimate arbiter in this situation.

Chairman Pfeil asked if there were any comments or questions from the public on what was just discussed.

Mr. Delaney disagreed for the record, that the meeting should be opened to the public for comments on this. He felt that if he and Mr. Bernstein ended up in litigation on this matter, the public would have no right to participate because the township's interests would be completely represented by Mr. Bernstein.

There was disagreement between both attorneys on this point.

Mr. Bernstein addressed the Chair and said that he should allow the public to speak.

Chairman Pfeil agreed.

Mr. Delaney noted for the record that his objection still stood.

Elaine Zindel, 317 Meyersville Road, wanted to see in detail everything that the attorneys were concerned about.

Mr. Delaney noted that his silence was not to be equated with acquiescence and that he would be meeting with Mr. Bernstein at the direction of the Planning Board.

Mr. Bernstein said that a communication would be sent to Mrs. Wolfe and be made available to the public.

Chairman Pfeil asked if it was normal to publish a draft resolution for the public prior to it coming to the Board.

Mr. Bernstein said it would not be published. It would just be in the Board file and available to the public via OPRA request.

Rosemary Agrista, 205 Longview Terrace, asked what it would mean when the new application is presented before the June 24<sup>th</sup> meeting, Would it be time wasted on the applicant's part and tax dollars wasted or could something be accomplished.

Mr. Bernstein said the applicant had a right to submit his second application since it was different from the original application.

Mrs. Agrista asked if the Board could make a decision on the new application even though the old application was still not resolved.

Mr. Bernstein affirmed that in this case, the Board could because the new application had numerous changes.

Mrs. Agrista asked if the new application was approved and the old application still not resolved, what would happen.

Mr. Bernstein said that the resolution of memorialization would take place, the applicant would wait the required 45 days, and if there were no comments, he would have a clean approval. He would still have an option to appeal the first application.

Maria McCoy, Meyersville, questioned why the applicant did not advise the Board of his objections to the resolution so that it would be removed from the agenda prior to the actual meeting to save the taxpayers money.

Mr. Bernstein stated that normally he would have received a letter outlining the objections however it did not happen in this case. He felt that rather than have the Board review the objections line by line, it would be a better use of everyone's time if there is one letter outlining each attorney's views.

Ed Zindel, 317 Meyersville Road, said that if the draft resolution held, there would be variances required. He wanted to know why the Board was going ahead with a new application before those issues were resolved.

Mr. Bernstein said that they did not know what the Board would decide on the second application however, he felt that the applicant did have a right to proceed.

Mr. Zindel said he felt that the parking and zoning ordinances were very strong for retail service use.

Chairman Pfeil told Mr. Zindel that this was a comment, not a question, and that there would be an appropriate time for that. He then asked if there were any other comments from the public. Hearing none, he closed the meeting and moved to the next item on the agenda which was Environmental and Stormwater Management.

Mr. Lemanowicz said that the environmental ordinances were first discussed a couple of years back trying to clarify them. As with the handicapped parking situation, the ordinance was written very specifically and based on a prior regulation that had since become outdated. The environmental ordinance did not keep up with the regulation with respect to stormwater. The Planning Board decided to try to organize the ordinance back in 2009 or 2010. The ordinance encompassed the critical areas, stormwater design, among other things and the plan was to modify it rather than redo it. Right now the township requires a grading permit under certain situations when a project does not have to come before a board for approval. But the grading permit is not supported by an ordinance so part of the revamping of the ordinance was the creation of the "land disturbance permit" to have an ordinance behind that process. There were multiple issues discussed at the subcommittee level and it was decided to have these various issues stand alone, referencing each other and regulations that are current.

Mr. Lemanowicz said one issue was that variances for drywells have been granted and by ordinance definition, a drywell is a critical area whereas an environmentally critical area is usually a natural device such as a slope.

In the stormwater ordinance, Mr. Lemanowicz noted that there are three (3) ways to handle stormwater depending on whether it is a major development or not. If it is not, there is a choice of two methods in the ordinance: an infiltration device such as a drywell or utilization of "zero net runoff" calculations. Those two designs are completely different and there is no way to tell which one should be used which is an issue.

Mr. O'Brien said that the "Land Development Permit" process had been sent to the Ordinance Review Subcommittee along with the draft of the Environmental Ordinances that had been passed down. The subcommittee struggled with how they worked together along with the impetus behind them. They realized that the original draft of the ordinance did not properly address the various aspects of critical areas and instead, lumped them together. Each type of critical area has its own unique set of problems and distinct set of solutions. He and Mr. Lemanowicz then discussed it with Thomas Delia, the Zoning Officer, to see how he was affected by it. They were now seeking the advice of the Planning Board as to how to go forward. He wanted to know if the Board felt that each of those environmental concerns should be addressed individually and noted that there was not one critical area chapter that did everything. Instead there was a critical area chapter followed by parts that would address each one of those special areas.

Mr. O'Brien said that currently on the books, there is a requirement that stormwater measures be taken for any development over 400 square feet. In the past, there have been suggestions that a major development (1/4 acre impervious) governed by the Department of Environmental Protection (D.E.P.) was not an issue for the township to worry about. The thought for discussion was whether or not to start at the 400 square feet that is currently in effect and work up to a middle number such as 1000 square feet, and then up to another level that would then go up to the quarter acre and/or one acre.

Chairman Pfeil said that from the subcommittee's perspective, it was very confusing to see a lot of documents and a proposal for a land disturbance permit. He felt it was adding onerous stormwater controls and regulations on very small residential projects which could potentially cost the homeowner extra money. He wanted to know what wasn't working with the current system. Why was there so much paperwork with this proposal; who started it; what were they supposed to do with it? That was why this was being brought back to the entire Board rather than just the Ordinance Review Subcommittee.

Mr. O'Brien said that it started with the Environmental Commission which presented a draft to the Planning Board.

Mr. Lemanowicz said that there were regulations for the big projects but there was no comprehensive regulation for projects that did not meet that level such as a single family house being built on a lot. He said that a lot of little properties could have a big effect if there are enough of them. While there is a process for a grading permit for projects such as these, there is no ordinance that describes the grading permit and therefore it is challengeable. That is why they started with the Land Disturbance Permit because there is nothing supporting it now.

Mr. Wallisch asked if Mr. Lemanowicz had examples of the half-acre, quarter-acre type construction that the Board should be concerned about.

Mr. Lemanowicz said that swimming pools could be a problem since a flat spot must be created for them. In order to do that, the drainage patterns of the property could change. He reiterated that this permit applied to only those projects that do *not* come before a Board. If the pool satisfied all the bulk requirements, the only review would be the grading permit process. There is not a lot of substance to that process.

Chairman Pfeil asked what the process was.

Mr. Lemanowicz answered that they make sure that the grading works.

Mr. O'Brien said that there are two (2) sides. Anything that comes before a Board would get this grade review as part of their relief. Anything that only requires a permit can take care of the grading as necessary by the zoning officer or township engineer and proceed.

Chairman Pfeil asked what was wrong with that process.

Mr. O'Brien said that apparently in 2009, the Environmental Commission thought that there was an inequity between the two.

Dr. Rae asked if there were any examples of where this has caused a problem.

Mrs. Dapkins asked if the construction official had any say.

Mr. Lemanowicz said only with respect to the building, not the grading.

Mr. Bernstein said that in most towns there is a grading and surface water management plan and the township engineer reviews applications to determine what must be done.

Mr. Lemanowicz said that there was no ordinance to say that the township engineer was allowed to do that. That is where the Land Disturbance Permit came in. They renamed the grading permit.

Chairman Pfeil asked if the idea was to formalize the review and support that review with an ordinance.

Mr. O'Brien said that after much discussion, the grading issue would be solved by the Land Development Permit in that it would be supported by ordinance.

As another example, Mr. Lemanowicz said that if an applicant wanted to install a paved driveway. The land would have to be cleared and the topsoil stripped off. There might be a little bit of grading but there is no permit required for that now. But if an area is regarded and paved, a drainage problem might be created.

Chairman Pfeil said that the applicant had to get a permit to get the driveway paved.

Mr. Lemanowicz said that that permit was for the driveway, not for the grading and it was the grading that could cause a problem.

Committeeman Roshto said that as they started reading the Land Disturbance Permit during the subcommittee meetings, they found that it was all encompassing. It was written in a way that made it difficult for laymen to understand. He felt that if the problem was that some existing practice needed to be codified, that seemed like a good first step. The drywell issue would be another area to fix.

Mr. Lemanowicz said that the process being discussed was to deal with the nuisance problems—my neighbor did this and now I am getting water in my yard. This would be one of the things the Land Disturbance Permit would take care of.

Dr. Rae felt that the township had something now to take care of that.

Mr. Lemanowicz reiterated that there was a grading permit that did not have an ordinance to support it. If it is challenged, it would fail.

Dr. Rae said that all they had to do was to memorialize the process now in effect and nothing else. The process has not been a problem.

Mr. Lemanowicz said that he had discussed this with the township engineer since he was the one who would be using this and he had made some changes.

Chairman Pfeil pointed out that it was 11 pages long and that it was an onerous document.

Dr. Rae said that the existing system seemed to be working. All that was needed was to memorialize it in one (1) or two (2) pages. People could read it, understand it, and they would know what they have to do. It seemed that this was going overboard.

Mr. Lemanowicz said the ordinance was compiled from several pieces and open for changes. He felt that they had to start somewhere so he put everybody's ideas into that ordinance so that they could choose those that they liked and delete those that they didn't.

Chairman Pfeil asked how they could get the appropriate information from those ideas to develop an ordinance to support the current grading permit, since the permit seems to work.

Dr. Rae and Mrs. Dapkins agreed.

Chairman Pfeil wanted it to stay on track to be as least onerous as possible but still give the grading permit the ordinance support necessary. He did not want it extended.

Committeeman Roshto said that they needed to start fresh and not pare down proposed ordinance. He asked, based on discussions with Mr. Delia, how would the ordinance be written.

Chairman Pfeil felt that it should be brought back to the Ordinance Review Subcommittee.

Mr. Hands asked Mr. Lemanowicz if they were looking for guidance on the size of the area.

Mr. Lemanowicz said that that was part of the issue. They were dealing with a project that would disturb less than an acre and created less than a quarter acre of impervious. There was a big gap between the 400 square feet and the .999 acre. They would need to be treated differently. One of the issues with the ordinance was whether or not to break these "not majors" into several levels since it could not be a "one size fits all".

Mr. Bernstein suggested that the township engineer be allowed to give waivers much like submission waivers for the Completeness Review Checklist.

Dr. Rae felt that they were drifting away from the concept that the existing process is working for all shapes and sizes of projects that fall into this category.

Mr. Lemanowicz said that there were no standards in the ordinance to support the grading review.

Dr. Rae said that the system in place has worked. He felt that all that was necessary was to memorialize that process.

Chairman Pfeil said that that was the way it should be addressed: a clean ordinance to support the grading permit.

Dr. Rae asked if there were any levels of scrutiny in the current process.

Mr. Lemanowicz said that the ordinance was created with the thoughts and comments from several people along with the ordinances of several other towns.

Mr. Aroneo asked if this was something that was outdated in the Long Hill's code.

Mr. Lemanowicz said that the code doesn't have anything like the proposed Land Disturbance Ordinance. Other towns had adopted this type of ordinance.

Dr. Rae felt that they were creating a solution for a problem that did not exist. He reiterated that the township had something that worked and that should be memorialized.

Mr. Lemanowicz said that he would discuss it with Paul Ferriero to get a handle on what he has been doing.

Dr. Rae said that they should start with a blank sheet of paper and get the procedure done on that one sheet of paper.

There was general agreement among the board members.

Mr. Lemanowicz felt that there should be an appeal process in the ordinance. He felt that it should state that there are different levels so as not to panic the small homeowner.

Mr. Hands advised Mr. Lemanowicz to use his discretion to parcel the area sizes appropriately.

Chairman Pfeil asked if the board members had any other comments on this. There were none. He then asked if the public had any other comments on this issue.

Helena Tielmann, 795 Meyersville Road, commented that she owned property adjoining the Restore Meyersville applicant. She stated that that entire property would be disturbed as far as grading and she was concerned since she felt it was artificially raised because it was a landfill with asbestos.

Mr. O'Brien said that if her comments were specifically directed at that property, they would be more useful at the hearing for that property and that application. It would be appropriate for her to add any comments that applied in a general way to the township at this time.

Mr. Lemanowicz said that this ordinance would not apply to that property because that property was under Site Plan Review. This was a version of an ordinance for applications that don't come to site plan. Everything is in place for a situation as she described at the beginning of her comment.

Mrs. Tielmann asked what type of professional witness she could bring to address her concerns.

Mr. Bernstein answered that a civil engineer would handle that.

Chairman Pfeil asked if there were any other comments from the public. Seeing none, he closed the meeting to the public.

Chairman Pfeil moved to the last item on the agenda, "Status of Master Plan Elements" which was prepared by Mr. O'Brien.

Mr. O'Brien stated that he had sent out two (2) memos. One memo was a listing of the Master Plan Elements and their effective dates. The second memo dated May 9, 2014, described the Master Plan process. The general process is to update elements through background studies. As they are updated, they would be brought forward into the Land Use Plan Element. Mr. O'Brien added that last year the Planning Board used the Reexamination process to include the current goals and objectives of the various elements that were in place.

Mr. O'Brien said that to start fresh, they would have to go back to the background studies and the individual elements that the Planning Board wished to update and then bring that information back into the Land Use Plan.

Mr. O'Brien said that there were Land Use Plan items that could be addressed by the Ordinance Subcommittee or a Master Plan Committee such as whether an area should be rezoned another category. Even though the Land Use Element is the culmination of the process, there could also be a parallel process where these individual items are reviewed or the Planning Board could wait until after the elements are updated and do all that at the same time.

Mr. O'Brien said that he had sent out a list of recommendations from the December 2013 Master Plan Reexamination on February 12, 2014 and revised that memo on May 9, 2014.

Mr. O'Brien noted that the mayor does have the authority to appoint members to a committee to work with the Board on the background studies.

Committeeman Roshto asked if some of the elements were mandatory and some optional.

Mr. O'Brien said that the only mandatory elements of a Master Plan are the Land Use Element, Housing Element, and Goals and Objectives.

Mr. Hands asked if other members could be appointed to a committee. He wanted to know if it would be appropriate to have a standing subcommittee that would continually meet and be focused on Master Plan elements.

Mr. O'Brien said that the Master Plan must be updated every ten (10) years so whether it would be a standing committee that systematically reviewed the elements over the ten (10) year period would be a Board decision. It could be a subcommittee of this body, or one of this body along with others appointed by the mayor, or one that would be appointed by the mayor that was aside from this body.

Mr. Hands felt a standing committee would keep the momentum going since this was supposed to be a vision of what the entire township should look like.

Mr. O'Brien suggested that the Board decide what type of process they wanted to follow and then staff the committee based on that.

There was some discussion as to what type of process to follow.

Committeeman Roshto felt that the Planning Board should come to an agreement at this meeting as to what the process would be and then move forward with staffing based on that decision.

Mr. O'Brien said that it could be a collaborative effort.

Committeeman Roshto noted that the committee that was formed last year was a separate body and that the Board had been waiting for their input as opposed to a collaborative effort.

Mr. O'Brien made the observation that the Board did not know what the committee was doing and the committee did not know what the Board wanted so there must be more communication. He felt that this was the reason that that committee ceased to exist.

Chairman Pfeil asked Committeeman Roshto to create a brief write-up on his proposal so that they could move forward on it. Committeeman Roshto said that he would.

Mrs. Dapkins suggested that a member from the Board of Adjustment should be on the committee. She said that in the past the Planning Board and the Board of Adjustment had joint meetings.

Mr. Hands suggested that members from each of the towns be included.

Committeeman Roshto felt that the first step should be to consolidate all of the background studies.

Mr. O'Brien advised the Board that policy making was their job. They needed enough of the details to make intelligent decisions and for that, a subcommittee could ask a particularly appropriate person to come in and talk to them in a given situation. They need not be a sitting member of the committee.

Dr. Rae was in agreement with Committeeman Roshto as to the process.

Mr. Aroneo moved to authorize a subcommittee of the Planning Board to be formed for the purpose of updating the 1996 Master Plan by 2016. Mrs. Dapkins seconded the motion.

Mr. Bernstein added that the mayor should be asked to appoint a Citizen's Advisory Committee to aid the Planning Board in updating the Master Plan.

Mr. O'Brien said that in consultation with the mayor to appoint those additional members as well as consult with other formal bodies of the township.

A Roll Call Vote was taken. Those in Favor: Mr. Aroneo, Mrs. Dapkins, Dr. Rae, Committeeman Roshto, Mr. Wallisch, Mr. Hands, and Chairman Pfeil. Those Opposed: None. Motion was approved unanimously.

Chairman Pfeil asked for volunteers for the committee. Mr. Hands and Committeeman Roshto volunteered.

Chairman Pfeil asked if there was any other new or old business to discuss. Seeing none, he entertained a motion to adjourn. Mr. Wallisch moved and Dr. Rae seconded. A Voice Vote was taken and the motion passed unopposed. The meeting was adjourned at 9:25 P.M.

---

CYNTHIA KIEFER  
Planning and Zoning Secretary

---

Date