

In compliance with the Open Public Meetings Act of the State of New Jersey adequate notice of this meeting has been mailed to The Daily Record and posted at the municipal building.

ROLL CALL:

Members Present: Joe Fleischner, Mayor Robert Greenbaum, Nelson Russell, David Scapicchio, James Staszak, Scott Van Ness, Pat Walsh, Steve Bedell, Howie Weiss

Members Absent: Dan Nelsen

Professionals Attending: Edward J. Buzak, Esq., Catherine Natafalusy, Planning Administrator

Professionals Excused: Chuck McGroarty, Planning Consultant, Eugene Buczynski, P.E., Tiena Cofoni, Esq.

MR. WEISS: Catherine maybe now is an appropriate time just maybe for the record to note that I do have in my possession a copy to you a resignation effectively immediately from Brad Zwigard.

MRS. NATAFALUSY: Yes I got that in an email this afternoon.

MR. WEISS: I have it as well I printed it. Just Mayor as long as you're aware of that.

MAYOR GREENBAUM: I am aware and I'm taking it under consideration.

MR. WEISS: As we discussed okay. That being said let's move on to approval of the minutes.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

February 16, 2012 Public Meeting

Motion: Nelson Russell
Second: James Staszak

Roll Call:

Joe Fleischner - yes
Nelson Russell - yes
David Scapicchio - yes
James Staszak - yes
Scott Van Ness - yes
Steve Bedell - yes
Howie Weiss - yes

March 15, 2012 Public Meeting

Motion: Joe Fleischner
Second: Nelson Russell

Roll Call:

Joe Fleischner - yes
Nelson Russell - yes
James Staszak - yes
Howie Weiss - yes

APPROVAL OF RESOLUTIONS

Resolution #PB 11-27 – Tomasa Jallad – Block 7100, Lot 66

Motion: Scott Van Ness
Second: Steve Bedell

MR. WEISS: Is there any conversation?

MR. BUZAK: Mr. Chairman if I might?

MR. WEISS: Please.

MR. BUZAK: You have on the dais tonight I believe or in your package a letter that was sent today April 12 from Brach Eichler, Susan Rubright who had represented the objectors or the objector. The letter points to six items in which she makes some comment and requests changes. I'd just like to briefly go through them Mr. Chairman if I might and give the Board my reaction and then the Board can decide whether they want to make any amendments to the resolutions.

MR. WEISS: Thank you very much that's a great idea please do.

MR. BUZAK: The first comment in general relates to the designation or identification of the structure on the westerly side of the property is the barn structure. Their contention is that it was never really determined that it was a barn structure. As you know they contended that it was abandoned and we all acknowledged that at one point in time it was a general store and they asked that the structure not be called a barn or that there be some identification that the use of the word barn is simply to identify the building that has no relevance to the actual legal use. My reaction to that Mr. Chairman is that the plans designated that structure as a barn structure that's why we used it in the resolution and I see no reason to go beyond that. So I would suggest that there be no modification to the resolution as it relates to that comment.

MR. WEISS: Of interesting note the attorney claims that it has no relevance to the actual legal use so I would agree with that.

MR. BUZAK: The second item relates to a condition that we imposed that the barn be designated as an accessory structure on the table in the front of the plans it was specifically SP-1 this was a comment that our planner had made in his report of November 28, 2011. The reason for his comment I believe is that you have a situation either having two principal structures on the lot which creates a different legal situation, or you have a principal structure which was the school building that's being converted into a residence and an accessory structure which was this barn structure. The planner suggested that it be designated as an accessory structure, I think it is I don't think it's another principal use and therefore again I don't think that there's any need to make any modification. I think the condition was appropriate it's something we determined that it's an accessory structure; she may not agree that it is and that's fine but I think the Board made that determination. So again I would recommend there be no change.

MR. WEISS: Ed what about the comment where it says according to the request that a note be placed on the plans that the structure is not part of the application. Is there any merit to that?

MR. BUZAK: Well I think she mentions that again later on in her comments and I think we've addressed that pretty clearly in the resolution. So if we can just defer for a minute we'll get to that. The next item number three she says the structure's location, I assume she means the barn structures location is referenced to be both on the easterly and westerly sides of the property this needs to be corrected. To be candid I got this letter this afternoon I did not reread the resolution in full to see what area she is talking about. The section that I looked at, that becomes relevant later on properly described it as being on the northwesterly corner of the property, that's in Item 2. Certainly if I incorrectly designated it as being on the easterly side as opposed to the westerly side that certainly should be corrected and I would simply ask the Board that when they adopt this resolution to adopt it with the caveat that that language be checked and if it is inaccurately identified as to the location that it be corrected. The next comment Number 4 refers to the location of the accessory barn structure in the findings in our resolution. And it's approximately 32 feet from the front lot line and she says it appears to be an error or at least misleading as the structure is clearly not 32 feet from the side of the road. Well that's correct it's not 32 feet from the side of the road but the statement is its 32 feet from the front lot line, and that is an accurate statement. If you look at the survey map and you look at the property line, the front property line you will recall this is the application where our road actually at that end, the westerly end is actually fully within their property or almost fully within their property. And if you measure the distance of the barn from the northerly side of the street back it's approximately 32 feet. So she may want to have other things in a resolution and that's you know when she drafts a resolution she can certainly put it in but I don't see any reason to change what's there I think it's accurate.

MR. RUSSELL: Was that from the northerly side of the street or from the lot line?

MR. BUZAK: I'm sorry from the northerly lot line.

MR. RUSSELL: Thank you.

MR. BUZAK: Number 5 again she makes reference to this barn or accessory structure, she makes the same findings, the same request I think we've designated it as an accessory structure I think that's accurate there's no need to change the resolution. In Number 6 she refers to her notice and her objection to the form of the notice and whether the barn structure was part of the application, etc. Ultimately the Board determined to not consider the barn structure as part of the application and that's Mr. Chairman the cross reference to your comment in Item number 2. And I think our conclusion in paragraph two of our resolution just makes that abundantly clear. It says nothing in this approval relates to any activity on the existing barn in the northwesterly corner of the property fronting on Flanders-Drakestown Road. Any activity related to this structure is not before the Board, other departments and agencies (inaudible) may deal with, etc., etc. We go into that in great detail because you will recall we spend a significant amount of time dealing with that issue and ultimately said it's there, it's a structure and it's really outside of our control there's other issues that impact on that structure and how it can be used or whether it has to be demolished, etc. and we really don't have that before us and we're specifically saying it's not before us, if they have some application that deals with that that would activate the Planning Board's jurisdiction we'll then hear it. So again the transcript will reflect whatever her comments were with regard to the notice I don't think there's any need to put that information in the resolution and certainly I think that it's clear, abundantly clear that the barn structure was not addressed by this Board. Specifically affirmatively not addressed not just (inaudible) and I think that's clear. So with all of that Mr. Chairman I would only ask that the Board, or I would recommend that the Board approve the resolution with the caveat that it be checked regarding the location or reference to the location of the barn structure and to make sure that it's accurately designated consistently on the westerly, northwesterly corner of the property.

MR. WEISS: Has anybody found language that says easterly side? I've been reviewing it I don't see it.

MR. BUZAK: I thought I was pretty careful but you know sometimes as your dictating it you know you look at the wrong side of the map when you

MR. WEISS: Well I think your comment is very well made and certainly simply noted that we will present the resolution to the Planning Board with the understanding that it should be referenced that the structure, the barn, the general store is located on the westerly portion of the property, westerly side of the property. And that being said I will entertain a motion.

MRS. NATAFALUSY: We did already.

MR. VAN NESS: I have no objections to the changes set forth.

MR. BEDELL: And I second it and I feel the same way.

MR. WEISS: Thank you Steve and so based on what Ed just told us does anybody have any comments, any questions?

MR. SCAPICCHIO: Just Catherine I missed a portion of one of these meetings I believe and I did listen to the transcript. I don't recall signing anything I just wanted to put that on the record.

MR. BEDELL: So is that application officially over?

MRS. NATAFALUSY: Yes you did.

MR. SCAPICCHIO: I did? Okay.

MR. WEISS: We are going to vote on the resolution and then our handling of this application would then be complete. Any other conversation? Seeing none; Catherine roll call.

MRS. NATAFALUSY:	Joe Fleischner	- yes	Nelson Russell	- yes
	David Scapicchio	- yes	Scott Van Ness	- yes
	Pat Walsh	- yes	Steve Bedell	- yes
	Howie Weiss	- yes		

MR. WEISS: And Mr. Bedell with the signature on this application and this resolution we will move forward.

2012 MASTER PLAN REEXAMINATION REPORT

MR. WEISS: Our next resolution is resolution is resolution for the 2012 Master Plan Reexamination Report. Do you all have a copy of that I assume and I will entertain a motion.

MRS. NATAFALUSY: We had the discussion last month and it's before the Board.

MR. FLEISCHNER: I move we accept the Master Plan Reexamination Report as written.

MR. STASZAK: Second.

MR. WEISS: Thank you Joe, thank you Jim any conversation, comments? Seeing none Catherine roll call.

MRS. NATAFALUSY: Joe Fleischner - yes
 Mayor Greenbaum - yes
 Nelson Russell - yes
 Jim Staszak - yes
 Pat Walsh - yes
 Howie Weiss - yes

COMMITTEE REPORTS

MR. WEISS: All right let's move on to some committee reports. Our first one is Mayor?

MAYOR GREENBAUM: Thank you I have a couple of items to report on. The 57 acres that's adjacent to the BASF property is hopefully moving forward. We had received notice from BASF that they have gotten the appropriate waiver from the State who is not interested in purchasing the property back. And therefore BASF is now in a position to actually close on the property, let us know that they were ready to do so we immediately sent a letter off to our contract purchaser to let them know that time is of the essence. Had a meeting with the contract purchaser and we indicated that in light of additional restrictions, deed restrictions on the property he needed an additional 30 to 45 days and I indicated to him at that point that I was prepared to give him the 30 to 45 days if he was able to put BASF off and told him that June 1 is the line in the sand. So we should have some pretty good idea as to where we're going with that whole concept on the other side of the Trade Zone that I've been working on for the better part of a year to two years. Also the landfill continues to, as you know that the town entered into a contract with Syncarfa to put solar power generation on the old landfill behind WalMart. There have been some environmental related legal issues that we're trying to wade through and we've made some progress there and we're likely to see some resolution of those issues in the very near future and hopefully some revenue generated from that lease. Also with respect to the Sutton Park shopping center it's my understanding that the receiver actually received approval from the Bankruptcy Court to lease the supermarket to, they have a perspective tenant and I hope to see that space filled within the next 8 months or so. Besides that we are moving forward with the Affordable Housing Trust Fund proposal that we have been working on that was, I think it's been discussed at this Planning Board previously. There's a property in Budd Lake we're negotiating with the property owner right now, we're in the appraisal phase and if we can agree on a price we're going to commit to, as long as the State will allow us Mr. Buzak, we're going to commit to using our Affordable Housing Trust Fund to purchase that property and to partner with an affordable housing entity to actually build affordable housing which will then go to our responsibility under State law to provide for affordable housing. A lot of issues are still up in the air nobody is quite clear as to what the State is going to mandate, what they're going to approve but we are going to be ready to proceed and be in place under the best case scenario which is a plan and a commitment to use the funds so that we don't forfeit them to the State. That's all I have.

MR. WEISS: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Anybody have any questions for the Mayor? Mr. Walsh Council?

MR. WALSH: Yeah one thing I'd just like to mention and there isn't anything direct at this time but the Chamber of Commerce has been very active lately and really picking up a lot of steam. So the only reason I wanted to bring that up here is that they don't have anything right this second but if they do get some business activity and are able to bring some people in that need a little help, whether it be an adjustment or something like that, just I hope we can really be open and . . . I mean are we open to minor adjustments that are you know no big deal if you will quote unquote to help their business come into town?

MR. BEDELL: Are we talking adjustments for what.

MR. WALSH: I have no examples at this time.

MR. BEDELL: You mean like property evaluations?

MR. WALSH: The zoning is "X" and they need it to be "X minus a tad" that's what I'm I don't have anything. Or is this just completely a waste of time question.

MR. WEISS: It's certainly not a waste of time question Pat but I think the best way to answer that question is the Planning Board is extremely friendly and we have been open to looking at each case on its own merit.

MR. WALSH: Sure.

MR. WEISS: And so without a specific question I'm not going to give you a specific answer but I think the answer is general enough that we welcome additional business to Mt. Olive and we will certainly work with them to the best of our ability to make sure that their business needs are reviewed carefully.

MR. WALSH: Yeah but if you get a chance to get involved with the Chamber they are really ramping up they're doing a great job.

MR. WEISS: Mayor you still have an economic development committee correct?

MAYOR GREENBAUM: I do.

MR. WEISS: So I'm sure if we get somebody like that we have the committees that certainly work their way towards the Mayor's office and Administration and ultimately to the Planning Board.

MAYOR GREENBAUM: I think that the real answer to your question is that the Municipal Land Use Law really dictates what can and can't be done and each case has to be decided on its own merits. But I think Mr. Weiss' comment that you know if someone deserves the help and the law favors it then they're going to get it.

MR. WEISS: Do I take that Mayor has agreed with me?

MAYOR GREENBAUM: I think it was kind of mixed actually.

MR. WEISS: Thank you Mr. Walsh. Environmental Commission Nelson?

MR. RUSSELL: We meet Wednesday.

MR. WEISS: Ordinance Committee?

MR. STASZAK: Nothing at this time.

MRS. NATAFALUSY: Can I just make a comment? We do have . . . we're sending a packet of changes to the ordinance committee, review them and let me know if you want to have another meeting or then we'll just take it and put it together.

MR. STASZAK: Okay we'll look at it.

MR. WEISS: You know and maybe now just a quick point on the ordinance committee and something we should really start to look at. I think we talked about in December Catherine was sign ordinances and as they relate to the new type of electronic signs.

MR. FLEISCHNER: And spinners.

MR. WEISS: And spinners, Joe Fleischner and I can get on the same page. I think though seriously we're looking at

MAYOR GREENBAUM: Dunkin Donuts wall hangings.

MR. WEISS: Yeah all excellent points gentlemen. The reality is that signs and electronic signs are becoming a way of life and I don't think that conforms to our sign ordinances.

MRS. NATAFALUSY: Right.

MR. WEISS: And perhaps we should look into that. We know there are some in existence now and rather than fighting it lets see if we can incorporate that into our sign ordinances. So perhaps we'll put that on the agenda to start looking at it. We did have a good conversation about that I think it was in December Catherine I think you and I and maybe Chuck had a conversation about it.

MRS. NATAFALUSY: Okay we'll take a look at it.

MR. WEISS: There's nothing from the street naming committee and Mr. Walsh open space?

MR. WALSH: Not yet but I should have something next week.

MR. WEISS: Perfect. Okay Joe did you want to raise an issue before we just got into our completeness review?

MR. FLEISCHNER: I'd like to know if there's a way if Ed could look into the fact that we can add additional rules and regulations for members of the Board in that one rule which I'd like to see or policy change that no Board member will be allowed to solicit business from an applicant for at least 180 days after approval of a resolution. Right now obviously it is against the law and I have verified this, at least from people I spoke to, before a resolution is approved you cannot approach someone an applicant for business until that resolution is approved.

MR. WEISS: That's correct.

MR. FLEISCHNER: But I'd like to see if we can in the, especially when one opens the newspaper every day and we see this person had this personal interest in this and all the different things that are happening is there a way that we can say in Mt. Olive all Board members this is our Code of Conduct. And I'd like to, maybe Ed could look into this and see if this is actually something that is permissible.

MR. WEISS: So Joe I guess just to simplify what you're requesting is your requesting that we add language to our Rules or Procedure.

MR. FLEISCHNER: Correct.

MR. WEISS: Ed that's what Joe is referencing if you hadn't picked that up.

MR. BUZAK: I have.

MR. WEISS: Okay well that's an internal document correct? That's a document that . . .

MRS. NATAFALUSY: That's the Board's yes.

MR. WEISS: So we wouldn't have to go any higher than this Board correct?

MR. BEDELL: Have there been cases or instances that it's an issue? I don't know.

MR. FLEISCHNER: Let's see what our . . . I'd like to see what the attorney says first and not get into that I don't think that's appropriate.

MR. BEDELL: I mean it's just a topic on the table I mean it's just a generic question.

MAYOR GREENBAUM: Perhaps you want to speak to Mr. Fleischner after the meeting about what his concerns generally are.

MR. FLEISCHNER: I think that would be more appropriate.

MR. BEDELL: Oh okay all right.

MR. WEISS: Nelson?

MR. RUSSELL: Yeah I want to make sure that that doesn't impact anything that Rob is trying to do to bring business into the town. He may not have a personal interest in it but he's lobbying to bring business into town and contacting people and that type of thing.

MR. FLEISCHNER: Well no I'm just saying that this Board sits here and approves applicants and once that applicant is approved I mean it's clearly against the law to approach an applicant before a resolution has been signed. But afterwards to eliminate any possibility of impropriety that maybe we say for an extra . . . it doesn't have to be 180 days maybe for an extra 30 days that no member of the Board approaches an applicant that has appeared before. Because once they have an approval they have an approval or they don't have an approval or they don't have an approval.

MR. RUSSELL: Would that include the Mayor?

MR. FLEISCHNER: The Mayor is a member of the Board.

MAYOR GREENBAUM: Well I think you distinguish, I understand what you're saying Joe and probably Nelson is right as well where there are two different ways to approach an applicant. One is on behalf of the Township and to say listen you're now a neighbor of ours and we're looking to do "X", "Y" and "Z" in the Township which is really the issue that Nelson is raising, rather than Rob Greenbaum as Mayor going to an applicant and saying, you know what, I have a legal practice and I'd like to be able to do work with you which obviously fits into what you're trying to accomplish and which I obviously agree with. I think that there's twofold that this Board can do, one is actually change the rules and regulations which is I think as far as this Board can go in terms of it's for lack of a better term law making ability. Beyond that it would have to go to the Council level for some policy change. But I think what you can do is incorporate into the Township's Code of Ethics which would then go to the Ethics Board the same type of concept. That nobody for personal gain can contact whatever a Planning Board application, anyone that sits on a Board can't approach whatever for

MR. FLEISCHNER: A certain period of time that's all.

MAYOR GREENBAUM: Yeah but I think that we do have a Code embodied that as an ordinance and ethical things which are deemed to be unethical. And it may already be covered, it may already be covered that's the first place that I would look and it would have to be modified ultimately. Because I'm not sure where the violation of the rules and regulations here would ultimately result in short of giving . . . I'm not even sure what it would result in I don't think that this Board has the ability to have anybody removed for a violation of the rules and regulations. Perhaps Ed would be better . . . I don't think that the . . .

MR. BUZAK: I think you're correct that they don't. And I think Mr. Mayor your analysis is accurate, there's a local government ethics law that applies to all public officials, members of Boards, etc. that set for general ethical standards. The law also allows a municipality to create its own Ethics Boards I understand that that has been created in Mt. Olive and I believe, although I don't know for a fact, I believe that if you adopt your own Ethics Code it certainly has to meet at least the minimum standards that are set forth in the Statute. It can be I believe more strict than what the Statute says and more specific but I also believe that the Ethics Code has to be approved by the local Finance Board or by the Division of Local Government Services before it is included in an ordinance if you've created your local Ethics Board. So we can check that and also of course the Statute, especially the Land Use Statute specifically has a conflicts ethics provision in it that essentially says that you can't participate in a matter in which you have personal and pecuniary direct or indirect interest in. But this goes a little beyond that issue.

MR. FLEISCHNER: Right.

MR. BUZAK: So we can take a look at that and get back to the Board.

MR. FLEISCHNER: Thank you.

MR. WEISS: Pat?

MR. WALSH: I just want to say that's an excellent question and an excellent point and I agree with everything the Mayor said also. Thank you.

MR. WEISS: Thanks Pat. Scott?

MR. VAN NESS: Nothing to do with that topic. I have one quick thing.

MR. WEISS: You're up.

MR. VAN NESS: CVS Catherine?

MRS. NATAFALUSY: Yes.

MR. VAN NESS: Can we look into CVS to see if the lighting that they're using was approved in the original plan?

MRS. NATAFALUSY: I can check tomorrow.

MR. WEISS: Do you see a problem Scott?

MR. VAN NESS: Well the whole building is lit up I don't remember us discussing the lighting that lights up the entire wall of the building on all sides.

MRS. NATAFALUSY: Around the rim around the top?

MR. VAN NESS: Yeah. Although I like the way it looks, it lights up the whole neighborhood so I don't know that in the long run it's probably good for the neighbors.

MRS. NATAFALUSY: Okay I'll check tomorrow.

MR. VAN NESS: Thank you.

MR. WEISS: Anything else? Okay with that being said let's move on to our completeness review.

COMPLETENESS REVIEW

APPLICATION #PB 11-32 – IDELPHONSE TCHIAKPE

MR. WEISS: We have PB 11-32 Idelphonse Tchiakpe we have a request for a waiver from condition of completeness. The property is located at 1 Winding Hill Drive, Block 8430, Lot 67 and this evening we have Mr. Wetter?

MR. HAHN: No Mr. Hahn. Mr. Wetter represents the Association.

MR. WEISS: Oh okay yes I'm sorry.

MR. HAHN: That's okay.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Hahn welcome if you would why don't you explain to the Planning Board why you're here and what you're looking for.

MR. HAHN: I will as soon as I unpack my bag. Good evening Mr. Chairman, members of the Board I represent the applicant Mr. Tchiakpe. We are here, as the Chairman said to request a waiver on a completeness item. But before we get into that specifically I just want to make it clear that we came here with the spirit of cooperation. I don't know who understands or if you guys recall the background we talked about it briefly during the Woodfield application. My client constructed a patio in 2005 the fall of 2005 that's how long this has been going on for. I've represented him since 2007 obviously we're trying to get this resolved so that he doesn't have to tear out the patio that he installed seven years ago. We came here if you recall during the Woodfield application and specifically indicated that once you ruled on that application, because initially that did include patios so we were waiting to see what the outcome of that was and then we were going to file a variance application. And I believe there was a discussion, I have the minutes we can get into it if need be, there was a discussion that night that we can go ahead and bring our application once the other one was complete which is exactly what we did. We filed our application on November 21 we subsequently received a letter from your Planning Administrator saying that we were incomplete because now we didn't comply with a requirement that was inserted after the discussion on the record, where I was led to believe anyway from the discussion that the requirement would not be put in the resolution for the Woodfield application. There was a requirement put in that subsequently said any homeowner of Woodfield who wants to come in for relief

now has to have the consent I believe is the term used of the property owners Association before you can proceed with an application here. So that's why we were deemed incomplete. I then called Catherine to discuss it and she said you should better have that conversation with Mr. Buzak and I did. During the conversation with Mr. Buzak I pointed out the Municipal Land Use Act and the Statute that specifically requires that completeness items of completeness must be contained in an ordinance. That's a Statutory requirement and there's case law that deals with that issue and specifically with the issue that a resolution requirement can't be imposed on a subsequent applicant. You can't say something in a prior resolution where he was not a party to the application it's now going to be imposed upon you as a condition of completeness. I asked Mr. Buzak for the opportunity to come before you so we can have a discussion to hopefully come to some amicable resolution of this issue and Mr. Buzak indicated to me that the only way to do that would be to file an application seeking waiver. So we sent in a letter with that request but noting that it's our position, and that's what I want to make clear, we're proceeding with a full reservation of rights and without waiving any rights under the Municipal Land Use Act that my client may have with respect to this issue. We're coming in here to discuss the issue but we do not agree that the resolution requirement can be imposed upon my client as a condition of completeness. It may be and we discussed it the last time we were here on the Woodfield thing, it may be a proper condition as a condition of approval that you want to say as a condition of this approval you have to go back to the Homeowner's Association and get approval from them. We understand that and I recognized that the last time we were here. But to put that condition before we proceed with our application I don't think is permissible under the Municipal Land Use Law and the cases as I've described them. In any event we sent in the letter, we said that we would make the request for a waiver because we believe it's a long time coming my client would like his "day in court" to appear before the Board on the substance of his application to see whether or not he can continue with this patio that he constructed several years ago. In any event after speaking with Mr. Buzak I had my client approach the Homeowner's Association so that's issue one. He approached the Association to request approval, and I don't know if you saw my letter of February 13th, but he approached them to request consent and he was told in writing by the Association Manager Kathy Mulvey that the Board doesn't get involved in giving consent or not giving consent to Planning Board applications so on February 13th I sent in a letter, I brought extra copies this evening with the email which said that. So my client did try again in the spirit of cooperation because Mr. Buzak felt that the resolution required him to seek the prior consent of the Association. He attempted to do that and was told we don't do that, we don't give consent. So my client as has been the case for awhile is caught in this catch 22, as you know we submitted a pretty lengthy application and he's been back and forth between the Association and the Township for quite some time now trying to get this resolved and it seems like, you know he's a ping pong ball. He keeps getting you know the Board wants us to go back to the Association, we went back to the Association and then you know they said no we don't do that so they send us back here and now if you guys don't want to hear us I don't know where we go from here. And again I don't know who has seen my letter, who has seen the emails I did bring extra copies this evening.

MR. WEISS: Yeah Mr. Hahn if you would distribute it I don't have . . .

MR. HAHN: Yeah I don't know if Catherine distributed them.

MRS. NATAFALUSY: I gave them the one letter that you . . .

MR. WEISS: I have the February 8th letter Mr. Hahn I don't have . . .

MR. HAHN: Yeah so on . . . I clipped them together . . . I submitted it and said that we would be referring to this this evening. If there's not enough copies I have extra but I think importantly I'd like to note that on the back in response to my letter of February 13th, and do you want me to shut up for a minute and give you a chance to read it?

MR. WEISS: Yeah take a second.

MAYOR GREENBAUM: Are you referring to the Homeowner's Association's response that they don't get involved one way or the other?

MR. HAHN: So what I was going to point out because I think it's pretty telling the last page of this submittal is an email from Mr. Buzak to the Association's attorney Mr. Wetter on February 22nd asking Mr. Wetter you know basically I'm paraphrasing you know what's going on can you please explain why Mr. Tchiakpe got this response from your Property Manager and as of a couple of days ago when I spoke to Mr. Buzak he had never received a response to this. I don't know if that's still the case but his email clearly asked Mr. Wetter please reply to all, I never received anything from Mr. Wetter and I think the significant of that is if you go back to your resolution when you approve the Woodfield application,

paragraph 10 specifically says that it was represented to the Board, and I presume it was represented to the Board by Mr. Wetter although I took issue with it that night that the Homeowner's Association documents require that consent be obtained from them before a variance application can proceed. Now I've attached to my submittal the two sections of the Homeowner's Association documents that are referred to as well as the May 28, 2009 resolution. Nowhere in any of those sections or the resolution does it say anything about any homeowner being required to get prior consent of the Association before proceeding with a variance application to the Board. So I don't know where that came from but I certainly after Mr. Buzak sent his email was waiting to see what Mr. Wetter was going to say in terms of his explanation and I don't think he has said anything. And that was a couple months ago he was requested to reply so you know here we are.

MAYOR GREENBAUM: Ed did you get a chance to take a look at the legal issue which was raised?

MR. BUZAK: I have, and if I might the question before this Board is whether or not the application is complete. The position that was taken by the Planning Administrator upon my advice to her was that the check list requires that the application be signed by the applicant and that the consent of the property owner also be affixed. In this case the property owner involves as well the Homeowner's Association with regard to the common area. So that was the basis upon which we took the position, we being the attorneys took the position that in order for an application to be complete before this Board in this particular context we needed to have the Homeowner's Association effectively consent to the application. Now in addition to that I have some difference of opinion from Mr. Hahn's position as to the involvement of the Homeowner's Association and we go through this a little bit in the Woodfield application itself. And we cited in that resolution the aspects of the portions of the operative documents that indicated that activities needed to be approved by the Homeowner's Association. Now I do agree that the documents, that is the Homeowner's documents do not say they need prior approval. Our resolution that we adopted says prior approval and in order for an application to be made to this Board you need the consent of the property owner. So there's a distinction that's being made by Mr. Hahn and I want to just point that out I don't think he can test the fact that the Homeowner's Association has to grant its approval. His position is they don't have to grant it prior to coming before this Board, our position is you do have to grant it prior to coming before this Board. And part of the reason as well is that why should this Board as a volunteer Board in a municipality spend time dealing with an issue, particularly a variance and this situation and that's typically what would come before us under the Building Option Plan. If in the end the Homeowner's Association isn't going to consent to it, we ought to make sure that the Homeowner's Association who really has the jurisdiction over that property is on board so to speak with the request before we spend time dealing with whether or not the variance should be granted. So that is generally the position that we've taken and that was discussed at the Woodfield application when they came in to modify the Building Option Plan. And we wanted to specifically set forth in a resolution is that it was abundantly clear as to what this Board's position would be in dealing with requests from homeowner's to deviate from the Building Option Plans. Mr. Hahn is correct as you can see from the documentation that when the applicant here made the request of the Homeowner's Association the response was that they do not do that. I raised the issue with Mr. Wetter because that is not clearly what the Board intended, that was clearly as I see it in the resolution that they adopted and the Building Option Plan and I assumed but did not know that the protocol had not worked its way down to the Administrative people in the Homeowner's Association. They were simply taking a position that they have taken in the past that we don't deal with these issues when in fact in November of 2011 we made it clear that they do. Now that may not be the case, maybe they're just disregarding it, maybe they got the information and they said we don't agree with it but you know it was clearly in the resolution itself and Mr. Wetter on behalf of the Association had the opportunity to review the resolution prior to its adoption, we spent a considerable amount of time on it at this Board's hearings and again I think it was pretty clear. So that's the way I framed the issue that's before this Board. One other thing I want to point out while Mr. Tchiakpe has built his patio in 2005 and as Mr. Hahn has stated this matter has been "kicking around" I'm not even sure if that was the exact phrase he utilized but that it's been around since 2005 and he got involved in 2007. The record should be perfectly clear that an application was filed in this matter on November 21, 2011 so this Board has not been involved in this matter since 2005 and 2007 there's been a myriad of activities that have been undertaken. Mr. Hahn has comprehensively set that forth in a booklet that he submitted and I say that as a compliment not pejoratively at all in which he outlines the history of it and comprehensively follows the tract. But I want to make it perfectly clear this matter has not been before this Board anything more than from November when it was filed and shortly after it was filed we got into the discussions that Mr. Hahn has eluded to culminating in the presentation before this Board. And the issue is given the fact that we have what we have at this juncture and that is a position of the Association that it does not grant any prior approvals or get involved in these applications whether the Board is willing to waive the requirement of prior consent and allow the application to go forward. The application is a variance application to allow for a construction of a patio on a lot within the development that according to the

Building Option Plan is not permitted to have a patio. It's permitted to have a deck, our resolution in November of 2011 limited the size of all decks not to exceed 250 square feet, there was a portion of that application dealing with patios that was ultimately withdrawn so the resolution did not change anything as it related to patios. And the Building Option Plan that affects this particular lot allows a deck but does not allow a patio and the variance is to allow a patio. It should be pointed out that the applicant had originally back in 2004 or 2005 sought approval for a deck, the approval was denied . . . I shouldn't say approval the application was denied because the applicant needed to obtain a variance there was a rear yard or side yard setback violation based upon the proposed deck. And the applicant was told that they would have to seek a variance to put the deck in. Not to put a deck in because a deck is permitted under the Building Option Plan it's just that this deck was going to encroach into one of the side yards or rear yards and you needed a variance.

MR. HAHN: But that wasn't correct though.

MR. BUZAK: I'm just reading the, what the information was and as . . .

MR. HAHN: That's what he was told you're right.

MR. BUZAK: That's what he was told.

MR. HAHN: But it wasn't correct.

MR. BUZAK: And it's my understanding that the applicant, and again this is based upon my reading of the comprehensive history that the applicant asked whether there was a permit needed to construct a patio and was told that there was not and proceeded to construct the patio. And subsequently as a result of the construction of the patio that then initiated a whole series of activities that brought the applicant to where we are today.

MR. HAHN: Correct.

MR. BUZAK: So the issue before you is whether you want to waive the requirement that the applicant obtain consent of the Homeowner's Association prior to proceeding with this variance application.

MR. WEISS: Mayor?

MAYOR GREENBAUM: Yeah thank you very much for clarifying the issue. I certainly have good understanding now of what I believe the law to be here and what it is that the applicant is looking for. I am most troubled by the fact that the Homeowner's Association is taking the position that they don't know anything about it and they're not going to do anything about it which puts the applicant in a no win position unless this Board were to move forward. I also understand why it is required to get approval of the Homeowner's Association in a situation such as this. And really what we're talking about, not whether or not ultimately the applicant is going to be able to prove what is required to be able to get the appropriate variances here ultimately for the construction of the patio and the installation of the patio which will be proofs that will be put on at some other time if and when this application is heard. But whether or not this Board really is willing to hear an issue which otherwise might not be right and certainly in this particular situation the applicant has presented a unique situation where he's gotten an answer from the Homeowner's Association which is inconsistent with what we at the township are trying to do. And I think that can be cured by making it a condition of the resolution ultimately that there is receipt from the Homeowner's Association of whatever action any approval that this Board grants. What we're really doing at this point in this particular unique situation, and I guess here that this is a matter which would have come before the Board of Adjustment had we had one rather than the Planning Board. And the Board of Adjustment function really is to take each case in its unique basis where it doesn't fit into the laws as we have set them forth and deal with each particular applicant, the individual homeowner to see whether or not we are doing the right thing. And I think here the only right thing to do is to move forward with this application, make it a condition of approval ultimately at the end that he receives approval from the Homeowner's Association and if he doesn't receive any word from the Homeowner's Association then it becomes a matter between him and the Homeowner's Association. But in the spirit of what the Board of Adjustment was ultimately enacted for which we eliminated to save money and bring it before this entire Land Use Board I believe that it would be appropriate to move forward, deem this complete in light of the unique facts and move forward.

MR. WEISS: Thank you Mayor.

MR. STASZAK: I just have a question. The email from Kathy Mulvey, who is she?

MR. HAHN: She is the Property Manager she works for the Property Management Company.

MR. STASZAK: She doesn't sit on the Board though right? The Homeowner's Association Board?

MAYOR GREENBAUM: She's the Property Manager she does not sit on the Board.

MR. HAHN: Right she's not on the Board she's not a homeowner she's an outside, as far as I know they have an outside property management company.

MAYOR GREENBAUM: She acts on behalf of the Board though.

MR. HAHN: Right.

MR. STASZAK: So she does act on behalf of the Board that was my question.

MR. HAHN: Oh yeah absolutely.

MR. BUZAK: She acts on the act of the Board what we don't know is whether this is her acting independently, and when I say independently I don't necessarily mean outside the scope of her authority but independently based upon her prior knowledge as to what the Board has done or whether the Board actually affirmatively dealt with this and said we're not getting involved with this despite the fact that the resolution says to do that.

MR. HAHN: And she's been there for years.

MR. STASZAK: But there is a Board President, Vice President?

MR. HAHN: Oh yeah.

MAYOR GREENBAUM: When you go to the Boards you go to the Management person that is the contact person, that contact person brings it to the Board. It's not like you can go to the secretary and say oh I've got this

MR. STASZAK: So once it goes to her if she doesn't put it before the Board it never gets there.

MAYOR GREENBAUM: It doesn't get there.

MR. HAHN: Well that's true but I would also add though as I pointed out your attorney on February 22 wrote to their attorney and said hey there is this confusion created so I believe their attorney could have also brought it to the Board between February and now it's April 12th and then give an adequate response to Mr. Buzak and as far as I can tell he just ignored him he never responded which I found even more astonishing than maybe Kathy Mulvey's response. Because it was Mr. Wetter as you recall that was pushing that issue.

MR. STASZAK: He never responded back to

MR. BUZAK: He did not respond and I didn't follow up.

MR. STASZAK: Well we're not going to chase them.

MR. WEISS: Scott?

MR. VAN NESS: What I find interesting is that all of the houses there have patios or the majority of the houses in the complex have patios. So the fact that it wasn't addressed in the prior application still puzzles me I was not able to sit on that application but every house has a patio. So this is not very clear how it should be handled.

MR. BUZAK: I'm not familiar with the development so I can't tell you what's out there. (Inaudible) so you can indicate what's there. All I'm saying is that when you look at the Building Option

Plan there are a number of lots that are specifically indicated do not have patios that you can only have decks and not patios that's all I'm saying.

MR. VAN NESS: A handful and it also is depended on what options the homeowner chose. If they decided they didn't want a basement walk out they didn't get a patio. If they decided they wanted a basement walk out they got a patio. It's just kind of odd that there's really no rhyme or reason to what they've decided to do up there.

MRS. NATAFALUSY: There are some that had patios and some that had patios and decks. If you look at the Building Option Plan you got a patio and a deck some just had decks because they were too close to the setback line which this property is 50 feet if you look at the plans, I have them in front of me.

MR. HAHN: Right but in your ordinance, in the ordinance that setback doesn't apply to patios or decks and also in your resolution from 2002 you made it clear that those setback lines didn't apply to patios or decks.

MR. WEISS: Nelson go ahead.

MR. RUSSELL: I have some familiarity with patios and decks. In 2005 there was no requirement to have a permit to build a patio, subsequently that has changed. Had he constructed this patio out of wood it would have been declared a deck.

MRS. NATAFALUSY: He did have a deck on the property.

MR. RUSSELL: He has a deck?

MRS. NATAFALUSY: He wanted to expand the deck and we told him he couldn't without a variance. So instead of putting a deck on the property he built a patio because he thought you didn't need permits for patios but you do and that's why he's here. The Building Option Plan showed a deck on this property not a patio and that's why he tried to expand the deck but he couldn't.

MR. RUSSELL: Disregarding the Building Option Plan, in term of the Mt. Olive Code

MRS. NATAFALUSY: I'm looking at the Building Option Plan and for this property Lot 67 shows a deck.

MR. BUZAK: And the way these Building Option Plans are just so that you recall, across the top is a table on each page, across the top they indicate different aspects patio, deck, cantilevered window, outside chimney, a whole series of things, bay windows and then each lot is listed on the left hand column and there's little "x" as to what you can allow on any particular lot. Now as Scott pointed out the fact that you can have a deck that that's checked off doesn't mean you necessarily have one there that was an option that you can have and if you elected not to have a deck that's fine but the point is you can legally construct a deck after getting your building permit because the Building Option Plan allows a deck. On the other hand if that lot does not have patio checked and therefore you couldn't have requested a patio because it wasn't allowed you could not subsequently install a patio without getting a variance from the Building Option Plan.

MR. WEISS: And I have a question, is the Building Option Plan the prevailing document?

MRS. NATAFALUSY: Yes.

MR. BUZAK: In this case that's correct.

MRS. NATAFALUSY: For this development yes.

MR. WEISS: So and can that be superseded by a variance?

MR. BUZAK: Well we got into that whole issue and we started out the Woodfield application with the proposition that the Building Option Plan is going to be amended so that there would not be any applications for variances because the genesis of that application by Woodfield was that we were and the Board of Adjustment before us were being I don't want to say deluged but that seems to be a nice way to express it with these requests for deviations from the Building Option Plan and it got very complicated because of the manner in which this was all developed. So the idea as I understood it was to have the Homeowner's Association come in on behalf of effectively all of the property owners,

change the Building Option Plan to reflect I believe sort of the maximum of what you could actually do there, change it on the Building Option Plan so that then there would be affectively no need for someone to come in here and seek a variance because you wouldn't have been able to get it which is why

MR. WEISS: Well let's do our best then to try to move this forward, and my question is that lets assume we follow the Mayor's advice and we make a determination from the Planning Board that we'll make a waiver from our ordinance that we won't need the Homeowner's Association to approve at this phase. I don't have a problem with that but are we not wasting the applicant's time and certainly your time Mr. Hahn if at the end of the day the Homeowner's Association isn't going to approve it?

MR. HAHN: Well I mean that's certainly a risk that my client has to take. I mean it's like any other application that comes in that gets subject to several conditions. Some of them are other governmental approvals, who knows what conditions get imposed, DEP approval whatever. Obviously my client has paid his fees; he's increased his escrows you know he wants to be here. This is so far the only avenue that you know for relief that we can find because the Homeowner's Association has basically said in a letter, and I've attached that letter to my application, that they're not going to do anything until the Township says it's okay. We were in mediation with them to try to resolve it and according to Mr. Wetter's 2008 letter he says that he was told from someone at the Township that the patio had to come out no matter what and therefore they said we're not going to mediate anymore because it doesn't matter what we agree to the Township is going to refuse to let you have the patio and unless you can get the Township to change their mind that's it. So that was

MR. WEISS: It seems to me it's a difficult thing to request and although we certainly haven't heard any testimony, when the Building Option Plan says you can't have a patio and you come before the Board and ask for a patio

MR. HAHN: Well that's going to be an interesting question because my position is if you go to your Code there's nothing in your Code that says anything about a Building Option Plan. My client never had any notice of the Building Option Plan. The Building Option Plan is not a zoning ordinance and as far as

MR. WEISS: Correct but that's an argument sir for another day.

MR. HAHN: Yeah I understand but it's going to be our position it's not enforceable against my client.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Bedell?

MR. BEDELL: I think we should hear the case I mean he's paid the fees and everything else and if the Board says listen we don't like it then we don't like it. If we say we like it then he goes to the Association and they say listen we're not going for it that's going to be on their end.

MR. FLEISCHNER: I was going to say the same thing as Steve I mean what the Mayor says makes sense.

MR. WEISS: So that's the issue in front of us and I understand all of the peripherals that we'll deal with when you have your day in front of us. I think that we've identified the situation, we understand it, it sounds like the Planning Board . . . I'm sorry yes Mayor?

MAYOR GREENBAUM: Yes I think that after, if we do deem it as complete we should direct the Planning Board attorney to write to the Association to set forth the details that the Planning Board has deemed it complete even though there was a requirement that the Association sign off on it but the Associations response that they do not get involved was contrary to the resolution and if they have anything which they would like to present before, at the beginning of the application that they should be here to present it.

MR. WEISS: Well they can certainly present themselves as an objector.

MAYOR GREENBAUM: Put them on notice that it's moving forward.

MR. WEISS: Nelson?

MR. HAHN: Well we have to notice them.

MRS. NATAFALUSY: You have to notice them anyway.

MAYOR GREENBAUM: Yes but I'm talking about something . . . we all know the difference of what notice is.

MR. HAHN: Oh I know.

MAYOR GREENBAUM: We're talking about a letter from Mr. Buzak saying if you have something to say, and it will actually help your applicant down the road if they don't appear and say something at that point in time. Because I assume that that provision was put in to protect the Association and if the Association is going to take the position hey it's not our business, and they don't come after getting a letter from you then ultimately at the end of the day after you get your approval if that's what you're getting and they say no we don't approve it, you know you have the letter from Mr. Buzak that says come to the Planning Board because there's an issue that's affecting you guys and your ignoring it and we assume that you don't have any problem with it.

MR. WEISS: Nelson, Scott?

MR. RUSSELL: In 2005 there was no requirement to have a permit to construct a patio.

MRS. NATAFALUSY: The Building Option Plan has been in existence since the development was approved.

MAYOR GREENBAUM: You're mixing apples and oranges Nelson.

MRS. NATAFALUSY: Right the Building Option Plan has been since 1999.

MR. WEISS: We can address the merits at that time.

MR. RUSSELL: We're not ruling on the Building Option Plan we're ruling on a variance application.

MR. WEISS: No, no we're simply . . . are we going to waive the requirement to have the Homeowner's Association sign off on it? Let's keep the conversation that simple. Scott?

MR. VAN NESS: My only concern is, although I agree with everybody that we should do it and do what we got to do here today, is as we move forward with this and we get more of these applications where the Homeowner's Association is not responding or is not participating and then suddenly they decide they're going to and then start denying applications or projects that are very similar to this kind or future applicants. How is that going to be addressed by either this Board or by an applicant when they decide to exercise their rights as they have in the existing ordinance to deny applications? You know then is it a fairness issue that . . . do we have to tell the . . . you know what is our position at that point?

MAYOR GREENBAUM: My position, I can't speak for . . . I'm sorry can I speak?

MR. WEISS: No please go ahead.

MAYOR GREENBAUM: My position would be that if they had gone to the Homeowner's Association and the Homeowner's Association had given them a denial that we wouldn't be here for a completeness issue. And ultimately if things change down the road where the Homeowner's Association comes back and starts taking a position it becomes an issue between the homeowner and the Homeowner's Association which has to get resolved. Here the applicant is left, as Mr. Hahn indicated, he is in limbo. And in essence what the Homeowner's Association has done has stopped every single person from coming to this Board by taking a position that they're taking. And that's just not right and it's a mistake on their part. So ultimately each one has to be done on a case by case basis and somebody has to set the Homeowner's Association straight in terms of what their responsibilities are or that they're going to take no position at all. And I don't think it's inconsistent if we were to take the position that the Homeowner's Association after six of these have come. And now they're taking the position that you can't do it, our position is saying listen the Homeowner's Association in that case took a position it can't be before us we don't have a completeness.

MR. VAN NESS: Okay.

MR. WEISS: Pat one more.

MR. WALSH: I just wanted to say number one I basically everything the Mayor said I'd like to say ditto both times he has spoken. But more importantly I just want to say I understand your frustration and sympathize with it. I assume you're the homeowner?

MR. HAHN: Yes he is yes.

MR. WALSH: And I completely understand I for one am happy to hear your application, anything I can do to move this matter forward I think . . . and I can't speak for everyone else but I think you know it's a very simple answer for me absolutely I'm happy to hear it. Anything we can do to move it forward and I think this email that you showed us from the lady saying that she can't look at it until we do ultimately in my humble opinion and I hope everybody realizes this too, that is our boss. We work for him and we can give a hundred reasons up the chain who works for who but we work for the 28,000 people yes and he's one of those 28,000 or whatever the number is. And I just think anything we can do to help, so that's just my humble opinion thank you.

MR. WEISS: Well said Councilman thank you very much. So let's do this, let's entertain a motion to accept the request by the applicant to waive the outstanding condition. Maybe you can help me word that please.

MR. BUZAK: Yeah it would be a motion to waive the prior consent requirement of the Homeowner's Association to allow the application to proceed. With the understanding that if this Board grants any relief that the condition would be the consent, the subsequent consent of the Homeowner's Association.

MR. STASZAK: That's fine. One quick question, Catherine if he gets this approval for the Homeowner's Association it will be complete right?

MR. WEISS: It will be deemed complete upon the Board action this evening.

MRS. NATAFALUSY: Yeah it's deemed complete.

MR. STASZAK: Everything else is done.

MR. BUZAK: Yes this would be one thing.

MR. WEISS: We're not giving any approval for a deck, we're not hearing a

MR. FLEISCHNER: No this is just for completeness.

MRS. NATAFALUSY: This is just for completeness.

MR. STASZAK: Okay.

MR. FLEISCHNER: I'll move the motion as Ed just said.

MR. VAN NESS: I'll second that.

MR. WEISS: Any other conversation? Seeing none Catherine roll call.

MRS. NATAFALUSY:	Joe Fleischner	- yes	Mayor Greenbaum	- yes
	Nelson Russell	- yes	David Scapicchio	- yes
	Jim Staszak	- yes	Scott Van Ness	- yes
	Pat Walsh	- yes	Steve Bedell	- yes
	Howie Weiss	- yes		

MR. WEISS: And Mr. Hahn obviously at this point you'll . . . your application is deemed complete and we'll schedule.

MRS. NATAFALUSY: I will send a letter out tomorrow scheduling it probably for May.

MR. HAHN: Okay and then we'll do the notice and everything?

MRS. NATAFALUSY: I'll send the letter out tomorrow.

MR. HAHN: Yeah and then I'll have to notice the homeowners right. The last housekeeping item I noticed in preparing for today in my booklet that my exhibit E was missing. I don't know if anyone has the same problem?

MRS. NATAFALUSY: I haven't distributed that to the Board I only gave it to the

MR. HAHN: Oh I thought I saw somebody with a booklet.

MR. BUZAK: I have exhibit E and there's something there. And the only thing I saw was that a couple of the exhibits had nothing in them but it was just inadvertently attached to the previous exhibit.

MR. HAHN: I gotcha okay. Yeah I apologize for that but I have extra copies.

MR. WEISS: No, no that's fine.

MR. HAHN: Thank you very much I appreciate it.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Tchiakpe good luck to you.

MR. TCHIAKPE: Thank you very much.

MR. WEISS: My pleasure. Before we adjourn I did have to remind everybody that Catherine does need a copy of the financial disclosure or you can get that to Lisa correct?

MRS. NATAFALUSY: Yes.

MR. WEISS: We'll try to do that the deadline is the end of this month. So those that have not gotten it in did anybody have a problem downloading the form?

MR. WALSH: I actually got one from Council also.

MR. WEISS: Yeah it was a little bit of trouble it wasn't as easy as in the past but ultimately it's

MR. WALSH: It's the same one for both if I give it to . . .

MAYOR GREENBAUM: You can do one just identify both Boards that you sit on.

MR. BUZAK: Please make sure that you do that because there are penalties that can brought . . . or to which you can be subject if you do not file it by the 30th of April.

MR. WEISS: And that being said motion to adjourn?

MR. VAN NESS: Motion to adjourn.

MR. STASZAK: Second.

MR. WEISS: All in favor?

EVERYONE: Aye.

(MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:15 P.M.)

Transcribed by:
Lauren Perkins, Secretary
Planning Board