

READINGTON TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
October 26, 2015

The Meeting was called to order by Chair Flynn at 7:38 p.m. stating that the requirements of the Open Public Meetings Law have been met and that this meeting has been duly advertised.

Members present: Julia Allen, Jerry Cook, Elizabeth Duffy, Marygrace Flynn, Betty Ann Fort, Christopher John, Ronald Monaco, Benjamin Smith

Members absent: Cheryl Filler

Also Present: Steven B. Bolio
Victoria D. Britton, Esq.
Dr. Stephen J. Souza
Michael F. Sullivan

MINUTES:

A Motion was made by Ms. Allen, seconded by Ms. Duffy, that the Minutes of October 13, 2015 be approved as circulated. Motion was carried with a vote of ayes all, nays none recorded. Ms. Fort, Mr. Monaco and Mr. Smith abstained from the vote.

A Motion was made by Mr. Cook, seconded by Ms. Allen, that the Executive Session Minutes of October 13, 2015 be approved as circulated. Motion was carried with a vote of ayes all, nays none recorded. Ms. Fort, Mr. Monaco and Mr. Smith abstained from the vote.

RESOLUTION:

Arkoulakis
Minor Subdivision / Lot Line Adjustment
Block 11, Lots 1.06 and 3

Chairwoman Flynn asked if there were any comments or corrections. None were noted. A Motion was made by Ms. Allen, seconded by Ms. Duffy, to approve the resolution. Motion was carried with the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Ms. Allen, Mr. Cook, Ms. Duffy, Ms. Flynn, Ms. Fort, Mr. John, Mr. Monaco, Mr. Smith

Nays: None recorded.

PUBLIC HEARING

**110-112 Main, LLC
Preliminary Site Plan
Block 34, Lot 5**

Present for Applicant: Stephen P. Gouin, Esq.
 Jeffrey Fiore, Traffic
 Richard Kenderian, Engineer
 Peter Cucci, Architect
 Mr. Vitale, Owner/Applicant

Attorney Gouin described the application for preliminary site plan approval for a multi-use commercial/residential structure. The proposed development is a permitted use in the Village Commercial Zone ("VC Zone").

Ms. Fort inquired if Applicant had been heard before the Historical Preservation Commission ("HPC"). Attorney Gouin indicated that Applicant was seen by the HPC on October 13, 2015; at which time approval was given.

Applicant and Townships' professionals were sworn in.

Exhibit A-1 was introduced: Site Plan Rendering, dated October 26, 2015

Mr. Kenderian described the site as consisting of 1.09 acres located at the corner of County Road 523/Main Street and Willow Court. The site currently has a two story masonry frame structure consisting of two (2) commercial uses and three (3) apartments; and a one and one half story framed residential dwelling with a detached garage. The site topographically slopes from north to south from a high point of approximately 161 feet to a low point of approximately 151 feet.

Mr. Kenderian proceeded to discuss Applicant's proposed 8,875 square foot two story structure. The first floor will be comprised of 4,700 square feet of commercial use, and the second floor will be comprised of two (2) luxury apartments totaling 3,675 square feet. The types of commercial uses are essentially mom/pop stores/services. The property will be serviced with a twenty-four (24) foot wide driveway on Main Street, located approximately thirty (30) feet from the southeast corner. The site will include twenty-eight (28) 9x18 foot parking stalls, including two (2) handicapped stalls. A 10x20 masonry trash enclosure is proposed, ample enough to accommodate both a trash and recycling container. A buffer of approximately thirty-one (31) feet will be planted adjacent to the VC Zone. The plantings allow for a mixture of textures and colors that would create a pleasing visual focal point and include 25 deciduous trees (5 varieties), 62 evergreens (3 varieties) and 370 shrubs (12 varieties).

Lighting is kept to Illuminating Engineers Standards (“IES”) to provide security and safety. Applicant will use LED lighting as it has a focused parameter and is energy efficient.

Mr. Kenderian referenced the review letter prepared by Clarke Caton Hintz (“CCH”), dated October 22, 2015. He testified as to the parking stall size being 9x18, rather than 10x18 as required by Township Ordinance §148-70.C.2. He indicated that the New Jersey standard is 9x18, allowing for ample room for opening doors of all sized vehicles. In addition, the proposed stall size allows for less impervious coverage.

Mr. Monaco inquired about the parking lot aisle width. Mr. Kenderian testified that it is twenty-four (24) feet. An 18x9 foot stall and a 24 foot aisle meets Institute of Traffic Engineers (“ITE”) standards.

Ms. Flynn inquired about the number of stalls for the residents. Mr. Kenderian testified that Residential Site Improvement Standards (“RSIS”) requires two (2) stalls per residential unit, and Applicant complies.

Mr. Kenderian testified that the sight triangles meet Township ordinance requirements and exceeds the sight triangles required by the ITE.

Mr. Kenderian indicated that pedestrian circulation has been provided on-site and connects to the current sidewalk on Main Street. The application includes adding a sidewalk along Willow Court.

Mr. Kenderian advised that Applicant will provide covered bicycle parking.

Mr. Kenderian addressed the concern of delivery vehicles maneuvering on-site. He advised that it is likely that a UPS truck will be used for deliveries to the retail stores. Applicant has provided designated parking for delivery vehicles.

Exhibit A-2 was introduced: Truck Turn, dated June 22, 2015

Mr. Kenderian described **Exhibit A-2** as showing a 33 foot tractor trailer traversing the site. Mr. Sullivan questioned **Exhibit A-2** and the representation of the lines. Mr. Kendarian explained that the lines represent the outside parameters of the truck. Mr. Sullivan held the remainder of his questions for the traffic engineer.

Mr. Kenderian testified that because of the size and topography of the site, in order to adequately design pedestrian access, detention basin grading, and ADA access Township Ordinance §148-60.1.A relating to topographical changes was violated in an area of approximately 500 square feet.

Exhibit A-3 was introduced: Grading, Drainage & Utility Plan, dated October 22, 2014

Attorney Gouin explained that **Exhibit A-3** highlights the specific areas of topographic change. Mr. Kenderian confirmed that he will submit plans depicting landform deviation to CCH for review. Mr. Sullivan explained that a review must be completed to determine the exact relief requested for the Board to make an informed decision.

Mr. Kenderian indicated that new sidewalks are proposed in the right of way, leading to existing sidewalks. As such, Applicant seeks a variance as it pertains to Township Ordinance §148-60.1.C. relating to topographic modification setback.

Ms. Duffy asked for clarification of a scour pad. Mr. Kenderian described it as the outflow of the drainage pipe where water hits it, slows to a standstill and then gradually trickles out. It is a shallow, stone pad in order that it does not erode with the outflow of water.

Ms. Fort questioned the number and type of trees by the sidewalk. Mr. Sullivan testified that there is no specific tree, unless planted more than five (5) feet from a sidewalk, which will not upheave the sidewalk. Mr. Sullivan suggested planting hearty trees such as honey locust, which applicant has proposed.

Mr. Kenderian testified that Applicant will prepare a tree preservation plan. He advised that it would be difficult to preserve trees that are within the site, but they will preserve mature trees along the perimeter. Attorney Gouin inquired about providing shade trees. Mr. Kenderian advised that the required number of shade trees will be planted.

Mr. Kenderian clarified the variance required for the scour hole and indicated that the scour hole will be moved to the development side, negating the variance requirement.

Mr. Kenderian indicated that Applicant may not be able to comply with Mr. Sullivan's recommendation for interior planting islands. There are proposed light poles in the center of the parking lot for efficiency, and they would interfere with one another.

With respect to solid waste, Mr. Kenderian advised that there would be two (2) steel containers with lids, located in an enclosed area. The enclosure will be compatible with the building design and colors.

Mr. Kenderian testified that the lighting meets Illuminating Engineering Society ("IES") standards and is adequate for security and safety. The proposed lighting does not create a harsh glare for the surrounding properties.

Ms. Flynn inquired as to what time the exterior lights will be on. Mr. Kenderian indicated that they will be on when the businesses are open, but security lights will remain on throughout the evening hours.

Mr. Sullivan questioned if there would be lighting for the residential units. Mr. Kenderian indicated that LED can be left on all night because of its precise lighting diameter. Mr. Sullivan advised that light pollution should be reduced, but there is a safety aspect to operating a vehicle in a parking lot at night. He suggested a two (2) tiered lighting structure, and Ms. Duffy suggested motion lights. Mr. Kenderian agreed and advised that designated residential parking would be provided to allow for proper lighting. He agreed to work with CCH to finalize the lighting plans.

As for wall-mounted lighting, Mr. Kenderian proposed different types of lights. The lights on the building are architectural, and those in the parking lot are utility. Applicant agreed to make lighting fixtures consistent.

Mr. Kenderian indicated that Applicant is seeking a variance for the occupant signs in accordance with Township Ordinance §148-116.8.B. Applicant is requesting up to four (4) occupant signs on the ground floor, as that would be the maximum number of businesses the building would house. Applicant is also requesting two (2) identifying façade signs, one facing Main Street and one facing the parking lot. The size of the sign is in accordance with Township Ordinance §148-116.8.B.

OPEN to PUBLIC

Mr. John asked Mr. Kenderian to walk through site drainage. Mr. Kenderian testified that there are trench grates along the front to pick up any storm water flowing towards Main Street, and an underground chamber with filters/structures that filter out total suspended solids. Water will discharge at the site where water currently discharges, but at a slower rate.

Dr. Souza asked Mr. Kenderian to clarify the area with the jelly fish component. Mr. Kenderian was unable to answer as it is something that the hydrology specialist in-firm designed. Dr. Souza and Mr. Bolio requested to meet with Applicant's engineers to discuss details. Dr. Souza advised that the jelly fish physically filters out pollutants, requiring replacement. The system is a manufactured device accepted by the Department of Environmental Protection ("DEP").

Ms. Duffy inquired who would be responsible for maintaining the system. Mr. Kenderian advised that the landlord will be responsible for system maintenance per manual requirements. Dr. Souza testified that this is the type of system that must be properly inspected and maintained as per the manufacturer's specifications (maintenance intervals). The subsurface infrastructure and maintenance will have to be clearly stated in the deed.

Mr. Bolio questioned the correspondence from John Hansen dated October 25, 2015. Mr. Kenderian agreed to all requested recommendations.

Mr. Bolio inquired about feedback from the fire official. Mr. Kenderian believes Applicant has made all of the requirements, but has not received correspondence confirming same.

Mr. Bolio inquired about County approval. Attorney Gouin advised that conditional approval was given.

Mr. Bolio questioned the maintenance of the pavement over the detention system. Mr. Kenderian advised that Applicant will work closely with the Board's engineer to design and maintain the pavement.

OPEN to PUBLIC

Mr. Smith asked to clarify the maximum impervious coverage. Mr. Gouin testified that it is not more than fifty percent (50%).

Mr. Sullivan inquired about the right of way. Mr. Kenderian testified that it is a fifty (50) foot right of way. Mr. Sullivan asked for confirmation from the County, and Mr. Kenderian advised that it will be provided.

Mr. Cucci testified that he received approval from the HCP, but wanted to see specific color samples. The HPC indicated that they were interested in Applicant using Hardie Plank, a certain gutter, and shingles with dimensions. Attorney Gouin advised that Mr. Sullivan asked Applicant to provide color samples this evening.

Exhibit A-4 was introduced: Paint Sample – Sail Cloth (building)

Exhibit A-5 was introduced: Paint Sample – Super White (trim)

Mr. Gouin inquired about CCH's report dated October 22, 2015; in particular, Section 7.0 Architectural Design. Mr. Cucci testified that Applicant will comply with all of CCH's comments.

Ms. Fort inquired if the building height complies with the Township ordinance. Mr. Sullivan advised that the building is thirty-four (34) feet in height, and thus, complies. Mr. Cucci advised that chimneys are not included in building height. The ordinance addresses the height be measured to the mid-point of the roof.

Ms. Flynn inquired about what makes the residential units "luxury" apartments. Mr. Cucci advised that it often is dependent on room size. These units offer a generous sized living room, an exercise room, open floor plan, an island in the kitchen, and a 24x16 bedroom. The material quality will be chosen by the Applicant; however, they will be on par with a luxury apartment.

Exhibit A-6 was introduced: Architectural Floor Plan, dated October 7, 2015, Revision 3

Mr. Cucci described the building as being 108x53.2 in exterior dimension containing retail/light business on the first floor, and 3,675 square feet encompassing two (2) apartments on the second floor. The building has large windows on the first floor facing Main Street and covered porches at the entrance areas to give the building character. The rear of the building will have gated access to the apartments. The retail space will have entrances in the front and rear of the building for pedestrian and car traffic.

Exhibit A-7 was introduced: Color Architectural Rendering of Front/Rear Elevation of Building

Ms. Flynn inquired as to what is above the windows on the side of the building. Mr. Cucci testified that it is a metal roof to change the texture of the roof line and add character.

Exhibit A-8 was introduced: Color Rendering of Side Elevation

Mr. Cucci testified that as you approach the building from Route 22, you will not see a large mass; there is a break-up of elevation. Applicant has given the building residential character, and added a red chimney to make it look classic. Conversely, driving north on Main Street there is a similar elevation; soft and gentle. Applicant proposed small signs along the top of the retail space fed by a gooseneck lamp. The signs will be made of composite material with channel cut letters, reflecting a simple character.

Mr. Sullivan indicated that for emergency response, there should be an address on the building. Mr. Cucci confirmed that there is a requirement by the County Office of Emergency Management for a specific size of the building number for identification. In addition, each store will have an identifying suite numbers on the door or window.

Ms. Flynn inquired as to where tenants will get their mail. Attorney Gouin advised that he will have to find out.

Ms. Fort recommended that all tenant signs be uniform. Attorney Gouin concurred and advised that all signs would be uniform in color and size, and be in keeping with the architectural style of the building.

Ms. Flynn inquired if the building had a basement. Mr. Cucci advised that it does not.

Mr. Monaco addressed concern about a subsequent owner converting the one (1) bedroom apartment into a two (2) bedroom apartment as the sewer capacity; well size and parking are all based on a one (1) bedroom apartment. Mr. Sullivan indicated that the way to confirm a one (1) bedroom apartment is through a deed restriction. In terms of impacts, the most overt

impact is a parking and parking requirements are based on the number of bedrooms, as is the well and the sewer.

Mr. Smith questioned the number of dwelling units currently on the property. Mr. Vitale testified that there is a two (2) bedroom single family house, and three (3) two (2) bedroom apartments. Mr. Smith estimated that the property will be reduced from approximately fifteen (15) people to four (4) people.

Attorney Gouin indicated that the apartment leases will contain verbiage advising tenants to not make any alterations without landlord approval. Presumably, if the owner wanted to convert the apartments to two (2) bedrooms, he would be required to submit an application for amended site plan approval. Mr. Sullivan inquired about the implication if the apartments were converted to two (2) bedrooms. Mr. Cucci advised that Applicant completed well capacity calculations. Currently there are two (2) wells on site; one feeds the rear building, and one feeds the front building. An analysis was performed comparing the number of people versus amount of water to confirm compliance. This proposal will use less water, but Applicant would not comply with the well capacity code if tenancy was increased. Applicant confirmed that he has more than enough sewer capacity for the proposed building.

Mr. Cucci advised that there will be a 25,000 gallon water storage tank under the parking lot. This is required as the apartments will have automatic fire sprinkler systems.

Dr. Souza confirmed that the water usage/consumption will be reduced relative to the existing conditions. Applicant has received a will serve from the Sewage Authority. What it comes down to is Code Enforcement will be responsible for a conversion of the exercise room to a second bedroom if and when it happens. Mr. Monaco questioned the future need of five (5) sewer units. Mr. Vitale confirmed that the property is presently using five (5) sewer units. Attorney Gouin testified that this application will use less than five (5) units, and will return unused units to the Township.

OPEN to PUBLIC

Break at 9:13pm
Reconvene at 9:23pm

Attorney Gouin confirmed that Applicant will comply with all of the recommendations in the Hamal Associates report dated October 22, 2015. Mr. Fiore testified that in October 2014 he performed a traffic study and counted vehicles on Main Street during peak times: 7a.m. to 9a.m. and 4p.m. to 6p.m. Monday thru Friday, and 11a.m. to 2p.m. on Saturday. He used the ITE trip generation manual to determine traffic patterns associated with the proposed development. The retail space square footage and number of residential units was used to determine that there could be approximately 25-33 peak hour trips in and out. Applicant

complies with the Township parking ordinance in that there is one (1) stall per two hundred (200) square feet of retail space, plus two (2) stalls per residential unit. Mr. Fiore advised that the required site distance at the site access point is 200 feet. Applicant exceeds that in both directions.

Exhibit A-9 is introduced: Hunterdon County Planning Board letter dated 4/21/15

Mr. Fiore advised that **Exhibit A-9** suggest that Applicant relocate access to Willow Court. The original concept before the Board of Adjustment provided access on Willow Court, but the Township did not approve. By placing site access on Main Street, it (i) consolidates existing curb cuts; and (ii) site distance is improved because you are closer to the crest along the site frontage. A formal submission has not been provided to the County, but Applicant will submit a site line profile for their approval.

Mr. Fiore indicated that deliveries would be tenant specific, but occur during off-peak hours. Attorney Gouin questioned the required signage for resident parking. Mr. Fiore confirmed adherence to this request.

Mr. Smith questioned the ability to bring an 18 wheeler on-site. Mr. Fiore advised that an 18 wheeler would not be brought on site. The retail space is 4,700 square feet of the building. The building does not have enough storage space to accommodate a tractor trailer load. A 33 foot tractor trailer will fit, but it's more likely that a single use box truck will be used for deliveries.

Ms. Flynn questioned if Applicant discussed each of Mr. Maltz's comments. Mr. Fiore did not address each, but did confirm that Applicant will comply with all of Mr. Maltz's comments.

Mr. Sullivan inquired about **Exhibit A-2** and its preparation. He described the Exhibit in that there are three (3) lines: an arrow and two (2) lines that straddle the arrow. Mr. Kenderian had indicated that the outside lines represented the parameters of the truck. Mr. Fiore indicated that the center line is the center line of the truck path. Mr. Sullivan testified that according to the truck path it would encroach on parking spaces and over curbs. If the parking spaces were full, the truck would not be able to move freely through the site. Mr. Fiore advised that during deliveries, the parking lot would not be full based on off-peak hour volumes. Mr. Fiore advised that **Exhibit A-2** would be revised to show the exact path wherein the truck would not encroach on parking stalls.

Mr. Sullivan questioned the ability for Applicant to control delivery to off-peak hours. Mr. Fiore advised that it is tenant based and restrictions would be placed in the lease agreement.

Mr. Sullivan requested a definition of a mom/pop store. Mr. Fiore advised that this type of store is not part of a chain, and is designed to serve the immediate needs and market area of the town.

Ms. Flynn questioned the type of store that would require delivery by tractor trailer. Mr. Sullivan advised that a tractor trailer does not have to empty its load at one location. Mr. Fiore reiterated that the types of businesses they anticipate would not warrant tractor trailer use. Ms. Duffy questioned if the site could restrict tractor trailers.

Exhibit A-10 was introduced: Truck Turn for 110-112 Main LLC.

Mr. Fiore indicated that **Exhibit A-10** shows a refuse vehicle on the right and a standard fire truck on the left. Based on the circulation of the fire truck, there is no encroachment on any parking stalls. It is a forty-five (45) foot long truck. Mr. Sullivan noted that a tractor trailer does not need to circulate the parking lot; it could back onto the site if necessary.

Mr. Cook expressed concern about any trucks, albeit box or tractor trailer, parking on Main Street. Mr. Bolio indicated that John Hansen advised a condition of approval to prohibit loading or unloading from either Main Street or Willow Court. Ms. Fort indicated that it could be a condition, but it would be unenforceable.

OPEN PUBLIC

Bill VanHeuse – 42nd street – questioned truck traffic using the church parking lot to access Washington Avenue and then cross over Main Street directly onto the site. Mr. Fiore stands by his testimony that a forty (40) foot truck can enter and exit the site, circulate around and not encroach on parking spaces.

Dr. Souza testified that he submitted a report in September and received a response from Maser Engineering as to his comments and recommendations. Applicant did make a significant change to their Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”), and Dr. Souza approved it. Dr. Souza suggested that he and John Hansen sit down with Applicant’s design engineer to discuss the geo storage system. He has questions pertaining to structure of the system. The underground system is of a concern because it requires frequent inspection and reporting.

Ms. Fort questioned who would be responsible within the Township to monitor the underground system. Dr. Souza advised that three (3) reports are submitted annually on April 1st. A report is provided to the Township Committee, building inspector and township engineer.

Attorney Gouin suggested that Applicant’s engineer who created the operating and maintenance manual sit down with Dr. Souza to discuss it, so that it then becomes part of the property records. This will allow every owner in perpetuity to know what to do with the detention system. The system is designed by Geo Storage, a company based in New Jersey. Attorney Gouin suggested that Applicant’s design engineer, Dr. Souza and John Hansen meet with Geo Storage to discuss technical issues.

Mr. John questioned the demolition of the two (2) buildings. Mr. Kenderian testified that it is a standard demolition job using a licensed demolition company. Mr. Cucci indicated that the HPC requested an as-built of the house and commercial building and Mr. Vitale and I agree that would be done. The HPC would then approve it and sign off on demolition.

Mr. Sullivan advised that Applicant has not indicated the extent of the variances required for the landform protection. The Board cannot grant relief if they do not know the extent of the relief requested. Applicant also needs to clarify the right of way, there is uncertainty that CCH and Ferriero Engineering raised as to the dedication of the right of way that will impact the front yard and the Floor Area Ratio.

Dr. Souza made it known that the application will not satisfy recharge requirement of the stormwater ordinance.

Attorney Gouin testified that confirmation from Hunterdon County regarding the right of way will be provided. The existing fifty (50) foot right of way was used to measure setbacks. Mr. Sullivan questioned the difference between an easement and right of way. Attorney Gouin advised that a right of way is a dedication. Applicant will be giving a portion of the property to the County and said portion cannot be used for calculating lot area. An easement allows the County to use a portion of the property for things such as road widening. Easement property is used to calculate lot area.

Our public notice identifies three (3) variances pertaining to landform protection standards one of which is that 513 square feet of property has elevation changes greater than two (2) feet. Mr. Sullivan advised that Applicant doesn't comply with the ordinance, and questioned the exact nature of the change. Attorney Gouin indicated that the severity would be less than one (1) foot. Mr. Kenderian indicated that **Exhibit A-3** has the existing topography and the proposed topography. Mr. Kenderian testified that the degree of variance is less than twelve (12) inches.

The second variance relates to the fact that ninety-two percent (92%) of the site has topographic changes wherein only thirty-five percent (35%) is permitted. Mr. Kenderian advised that the site is small. The VC Zone is specific in the purpose and intent of what can be developed, in order to comply, nearly all of the site has to be disturbed.

The final landform variance requested is elevation changes within five (5) feet of the property lines. The variance is for the northeast and northwest side of the property because of the proposed sidewalk.

Mr. Monaco advised that the number of sewer units needs to be established. His estimation is four (4) units based on the proposed use of the site. Attorney Gouin agreed.

Attorney Gouin advised that the mailboxes located across the street would be removed and replaced with on-site tenant designated mailboxes.

Board members conferred and advised that the proposed development would be an asset to the community. Though several conditions would have to be met for Resolution approval.

Attorney Britton discussed the conditions:

1. Applicant agrees that if the game room/library/exercise room is converted to a second bedroom, they must submit an application for amended site plan approval.
2. Applicant shall provide a fire report prepared by John Barczyk.
3. Dr. Souza and John Hansen shall meet with Applicant's engineer to discuss the operation and maintenance of the geo storage system in order that it be recorded in the property title. This will allow all owners in perpetuity to know the maintenance and repair of the system.
4. Dr. Souza and John Hansen shall meet with Geo System to become familiar with the subsurface system.
5. Applicant shall submit an exhibit to enable verification of the 513 square feet of disturbance.
6. Applicant shall provide clarification of right of way dedication from Hunterdon County.
7. Applicant shall relocate tenant mailboxes to an on-site location.
8. Applicant shall submit sewer capacity calculations.
9. Applicant shall request a waiver from the stormwater recharge requirement.
10. Applicant agrees to comply with professional review letters submitted by Hamal Associates, Ferriero Engineering, CCH, and Princeton Hydro.
11. Applicant agrees to two (2) occupant signs per tenant and one (1) identification sign for each of the front and back building elevations.
12. Applicant agrees to the Township affordable housing fees.
13. Applicant agrees that all tenant signs will be the same size, color and style.
14. Applicant shall submit a lighting plan to be approved by Mr. Sullivan and John Hansen.
15. Applicant shall submit an exhibit showing the percentage of property to be disturbed.

A Motion was made by Ms. Fort, seconded by Mr. Smith, to approve the preliminary site plan, grant variances and with conditions. Motion was carried with the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Ms. Allen, Mr. Cook, Ms. Duffy, Ms. Flynn, Ms. Fort, Mr. John, Mr. Monaco, Mr. Smith

Nays: None recorded.

ADJOURNMENT:

A Motion was made by Ms. Duffy, seconded by Mr. Smith, to adjourn the meeting at 10:21 P.M. The motion was carried with a vote of ayes all, nays none recorded.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Rebekah Harms". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looped initial 'R'.

Rebekah Harms
Planning Board Secretary