

**READINGTON TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES
January 8, 2007**

- A. Valerie Kimson, Esq. called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. announcing that all laws governing the Open Public Meetings Act had been met and that the meeting had been duly advertised. The Board saluted the flag.**

Roll Call:

Mrs. Allen	present
Mr. Cook	present
Mrs. Duffy	present
Mrs. Filler	present
Mr. Gatti	present
Mr. Klotz	present
Mr. Monaco	present
Mr. Smith	present
Mrs. Flynn	present

**Michael Sullivan, Clarke – Caton & Hintz
Valerie Kimson, Esq. Purcell, Ries, Shannon, Mulcahy & O’Neill
H. Clay McEldowney – Hatch, Mott & McDonald**

REORGANIZATION:

NOMINATIONS FOR NEW MEMBERS:

Valerie Kimson, Esq., swore in the following Planning Board members:

**Julie Allen Class III for a term of one year.
Ronald Monaco Class II for a term of one year
Frank Gatti – Class I for a term of one year
Ben Smith – Class IV for a term of 4 years
John Klotz – Class IV for a term of 4 years**

NOMINATIONS FOR CHAIRPERSON, VICE CHAIRPERSON, SECRETARY, and PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER.

Mrs. Filler nominated Marygrace Flynn for Chairperson. Mr. Monaco seconded the motion.

Attorney Kimson asked if there were any more nominations for Chairman. None were indicated.

Roll Call:

Mrs. Allen	aye
Mr. Cook	aye
Mrs. Duffy	aye
Mrs. Filler	aye
Mr. Gatti	aye
Mr. Klotz	aye
Mr. Monaco	aye
Mr. Smith	aye
Mrs. Flynn	aye

The meeting was turned over to Chairman Flynn.

Mrs. Filler made a motion to nominate Elizabeth Duffy Vice Chairman. Mr. Monaco seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

Mrs. Allen	aye
Mr. Cook	aye
Mrs. Duffy	aye
Mrs. Filler	aye
Mr. Gatti	aye
Mr. Klotz	aye
Mr. Monaco	aye
Mr. Smith	aye
Madam Chair	aye

Chairman Flynn entertained the nomination of Secretary. Mrs. Allen made the motion to nominate Linda Jacukowicz. Mr. Cook seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

Mrs. Allen	aye
Mr. Cook	aye
Mrs. Duffy	aye
Mrs. Filler	aye

Mr. Gatti	aye
Mr. Klotz	aye
Mr. Monaco	aye
Mr. Smith	aye
Madam Chair	aye

Chairman Flynn entertained the nomination for Engineer. Mrs. Allen nominated H. Clay McEldowney who is with the firm of Hatch, Mott & McDonald. Mr. Smith seconded the motion. Motion was carried with a vote of Ayes all, Nays none recorded.

Roll Call:

Mrs. Allen	aye
Mr. Cook	aye
Mrs. Duffy	aye
Mrs. Filler	aye
Mr. Gatti	aye
Mr. Klotz	aye
Mr. Monaco	aye
Mr. Smith	aye
Madam Chair	aye

Chairman Flynn entertained the nomination for Professional Service Contracts.

The first nomination is for the solicitor. Mrs. Filler nominated Valerie Kimson, Esq., Purcell, Ries, Shannon, Mulcahy & O'Neill.

Mrs. Duffy made a motion to nominate Edwards & Kelcey as Traffic Engineer.

Mrs. Filler nominated Michael Sullivan of Clarke, Caton & Hintz as Professional Planner.

Mrs. Filler made a motion to nominate H. Clay McEldowney as land surveyor.

Mrs. Duffy made the motion to nominate KeyTech Inspection and Testing Services.

Mrs. Filler nominated Dr. Steve Souza of Princeton Hydro as Environment Consultants.

Mrs. Duffy made a motion to nominate Ostegaard Acoustical Associates as Acoustical Consultants.

Mrs. Filler seconded the motion for all of the above mentioned professionals.

Roll Call:

Mrs. Allen	aye
Mr. Cook	aye
Mrs. Duffy	aye
Mrs. Filler	aye
Mr. Gatti	aye
Mr. Klotz	aye
Mr. Monaco	aye
Mr. Smith	aye
Madam Chair	aye

Chairman Flynn set the schedule for the Planning Board Meetings for the year 2007. Development applications will be heard on the second Monday of each month. The fourth Monday of each month will consist of planning and administration work. If a Monday falls on a holiday, the meeting will take place on the succeeding day. There will be no meeting the fourth Monday in December. Chairman Flynn asked for a motion to accept these dates. Mr. Cook made the motion. Mrs. Filler seconded the motion. Motion was carried with a vote of Ayes all, Nays none recorded.

B. TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE:

Madam Chair stated that these meetings are generally held just prior to the Planning Board meetings. There are occasions when there will be additional times that the Technical Review Committee would have to meet.

Mrs. Filler nominated Julia Allen. Mrs. Allen nominated Cheryl Filler and Mrs. Duffy nominated Marygrace Flynn. Mr. Smith seconded this motion. Motion was carried with a vote of Ayes all, Nays none recorded.

C. MINUTES

1. November 27, 2006 Mr. Cook made a motion to approve the minutes. Mrs. Duffy seconded the motion. Motion was carried with a vote of Ayes all, Nays none recorded.

2. **November 27, 2006 – Executive Session Minutes** Mr. Cook made a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. Smith seconded the motion. Motion was carried with a vote of Ayes all, Nays none recorded.

D. CORRESPONDENCE:

Madam Chair reminded everyone that there is a NJPO spring education offering. This would be held at Hunterdon Central.

On another matter, Mrs. Filler wanted to inform the board that there was a denial for the Wastewater Treatment plant in Tewksbury on the site that Readington was concerned about because it would have emptied into township waters.

E. PUBLICATIONS:

Hunterdon Democrat
Hunterdon Review
Courier News
Star Ledger
Express Times

Mrs. Filler made a motion to approve the publications. Mr. Klotz seconded the motion. Motion was carried with a vote of Ayes all, Nays none recorded.

F. TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

1. **Adner Ebeb Realty Corp.**
Minor Subdivision
Block 39, lot 8.01
Action date: January 11, 2007

Mrs. Filler stated that the TRC recommended that this matter be deemed complete. But they have recommended that Dr. Steve Souza review the application for drainage issues. Mrs. Duffy made a motion to deem the application complete. Mrs. Filler seconded the motion. Motion was carried with a vote of Ayes all, Nays none recorded.

G. OLD BUSINESS:

**1. Omnipoint Communications
291 Route 22, Block 20, Lot 6
Amend Resolution request**

Raymond Zierak, Esq, stated that he represents the applicant. He is requesting that the board amend their resolution that was memorialized in September 2006, to allow his client to obtain a building permit upon the submission of a bond to cover the work that has been agreed upon to the detention basin that is located on this property. The resolution that was adopted back in September 2006 provided that the implementation of the work on that basin be completed prior to the issuance of a building permit. Following the adoption of that resolution the applicant's professionals examined the detention basin and met with Mr. McEldowney and Dr. Souza and an agreement was reached. The difficulty arose because Dr. Souza felt that the work could not be implemented until the spring time. It creates a hardship for the applicant. The applicant is willing to perform the work that is required in the detention basin and they are willing to post a bond to satisfy the board's and the municipality's concern, but it is imperative that the applicant begin work immediately. The applicant is requesting that they be allowed to obtain a building permit upon the submission of a bond that would cover the work on the detention basin.

Dr. Souza stated that he is in total agreement with the applicant. He informed the board that they could not forecast that the weather would have been so favorable. He would allow with the applicant proceed under these terms.

Mr. McEldowney stated that he has no problem with allowing the applicant to proceed, based upon the applicant posting a performance bond. The work should be completed by June of this year. The resolution should stipulate a completion time.

Mr. Zierak stated that the June 1st. date for completion of the work on the detention basin would be acceptable.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

There were no comments from the public.

Mr. Monaco made a motion to amend the resolution to accept the bond with the approval of the engineer. Mrs. Duffy seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

Mrs. Allen	aye
Mr. Cook	aye

Mrs. Duffy	aye
Mrs. Filler	aye
Mr. Gatti	aye
Mr. Klotz	aye
Mr. Monaco	aye
Mr. Smith	aye
Madam Chair	aye

**2. Luberto/Minor Subdivision
Block 60, Lot 2
Extension request**

Attorney Kimson stated that this matter is in pursuant to the letter dated December 14, 2006 from Lloyd Tubman, wherein an extension was requested. Ms. Kimson stated that there was an issue since this board had requested that they respect some of the existing trees. The applicant is still working with the County on the access and the trees. They have requested a 60 day extension of time to file the deeds.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

There were no comments from the public.

Mrs. Filler made a motion to grant a 60 day extension. Mrs. Duffy seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

Mrs. Allen	aye
Mr. Cook	aye
Mrs. Duffy	aye
Mrs. Filler	aye
Mr. Gatti	aye
Mr. Klotz	aye
Mr. Monaco	aye
Mr. Smith	aye
Madam Chair	aye

H. OTHER BUSINESS:

1 Voucher approval

Mrs. Filler made a motion to approve the vouchers as submitted. Mr. Monaco seconded the motion. Motion was carried with a vote of Ayes all, Nays none recorded.

- 2. Responsibilities of board members and policies – Madam Chair announced that this would be carried to the next meeting.**

I. RESOLUTIONS:

- 1. Emmet
Block 12.01, Lot 14.01 & 15
Resolution #2006208
Request for an Extension**

Attorney Kimson stated that the board heard this matter in November. The resolution was scheduled to be memorialized at the December meeting. The December meeting was canceled. This is a 90 day extension of time to file their deeds.

Mr. Gatti made a motion to approve the resolution. Mr. Cook seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

Mrs. Allen	aye
Mr. Cook	aye
Mrs. Duffy	aye
Mrs. Filler	aye
Mr. Klotz	aye
Mr. Monaco	aye
Mr. Smith	aye
Madam Chair	aye

J. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- 1. Rockaway Creek, LLC
Preliminary Major Site Plan
Block 39, lot 57
Action date: January 11, 2007**

Ernest A. Renda, Esq., stated that he is the attorney for the applicant. This is an application for a preliminary major site plan. The applicant is proposing to construct a

10,000 square foot day care center with related play area. It is physically located at the corner of Route 22 eastbound and County Line Road. Proof of the appropriate notice was provided to the board's secretary. The applicant has received permit approval from the Department of Transportation. They have a Letter of Interpretation which will expire in June 2007. The applicant was conditionally disapproved by Hunterdon County Planning Board subject to their receipt of the DOT permit. This has been submitted to the Hunterdon County Planning Board.

Attorney Kimson swore in the following witnesses:

**Doug Polyniak, Dean and Dolan
Gregory Redington, Redco Engineering and Construction
Richard Weissman, The Learning Experience
David Chewey, Garden Associates
Matthew Jarmel, Jarmel-Kizdel Associates, Architects
H. Clay McEldowney, Hatch, Mott & McDonald
Dr. Steve Souza, Princeton Hydro
Brent Krasner, Clarke Caton & Hintz**

Greg Redington stated that he is a licensed engineer in the State of New Jersey. He is currently employed at REDCO Engineering & Construction Corporation which is located in Westfield, New Jersey.

Mr. Redington stated that the property is located on the southwest corner of County Line Road and Route 22. It is approximately 11 acres in size. The property is zoned RO. The applicant is proposing a 10,000 square foot; single story building that will be utilized as a child care center. There is a single point of ingress and egress off of Route 22. The parking lot is located in the front of the building. They are proposing 45 parking spaces. They are proposing a 5,800 square foot play area that will be located to the rear of the building. The site has a natural grade to the south so that the detention basin and the septic system are located in this area.

Regarding the report from Clarke, Caton & Hintz dated January 3, 2007. The applicant is proposing 45 parking spaces. The ordinance has a requirement of one space for every 3 students at the school. The needs of the tenant are only in the area of 40 parking spaces. They are proposing to provide "banked" parking spaces to meet the ordinance requirements. They will provide the grading to the parking area. A note will be added to the plan indicating that some of the parking spaces have been banked. Mr. Redington stated regarding §148-70 which speaks about non-residential uses and that the parking can not be closer than 20 feet. Unfortunately, the applicant missed this item. In the landscaping plan, it has been demonstrated that they have tried to accommodate the board

by adding additional landscaping. He stated that this is a previously developed lot. He did not feel that this would be a detriment. Mr. Monaco informed the board that due to the size of the lot there is so much area to the east and for the board to not require the 25 feet is not acceptable. Mr. Redington placed on the record that they would shift the parking so it is 25 feet at the nearest point to any property line. The handicapped parking spaces will be located close to the entrance of the building. The plans will be revised to reflect the drop off/pick up area. The sidewalks are proposed to be 6 feet wide. They will also provide 6 foot side walks on the west side of the building. The sidewalks will not lead to the play yard.

Exhibits:

A-1 Preliminary and final site plan Rockaway Creek LLC, with the latest revision date of 10/27/06

A-2 Rockaway Creek Landscaping Plan, by Garden Associates dated October 2006

Mr. Redington addressed the landscaping around the parking area. They will add the additional 3 shade trees that are required around the perimeter of the parking lot. They are not proposing landscape islands. This is a small parking lot. The fire official's report indicated that he was concerned about the proper access for the fire trucks. Additionally, they were concerned about the maintenance of the islands as well as snow plowing.

Regarding the 50 foot screening buffer adjacent to the residential zone or use, they tried not to touch any of the existing vegetation along 50 feet of the property line. They are proposing plantings along this area. They are proposing 2 light poles in the parking lot. The trash enclosure will match the building.

Mr. Redington described the architecture style to the board members.

Exhibit

A-3 Elevations "Learning Experience" sheet number A-2 with a latest revision date of 5/23/06

Mr. Krasner was concerned about the scaling of the windows. They are proposing a free standing sign that conforms to the ordinance.

Dr. Souza stated that regarding the shifting of the parking lot, the applicant will have to go back and check the flow paths and the drainage that will be entering the swale. This will not involve an encroachment into the transitional buffer. Dr. Souza suggested that the applicant provide another layer of erosion control practices. Perhaps a set of "hay bales" in concert with the other practices.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Timothy Scoville, Block 39, lot 54 - wanted to know how this development would affect the value of his property. Additionally, he wanted to know how many lateral fields were proposed in the septic field.

Mr. Redington did not know if the development would impact the value of his property. And regarding the septic design, it was submitted to the Board of Health. He did not have the information with him this evening. There would be approximately 150 children at any given time.

CLOSED PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Redington addressed the report from Princeton Hydro, dated January 4, 2007. Dr. Souza stated that he had discussed his concerns with the applicant and that they will provide him with additional justification for the selection and use of the curb numbers.

Dr. Souza informed the board that his primary concern was about the dimension of the swale along Lot 58. Based upon his analysis it seemed too shallow. It can be corrected with an alternation to the berm. This has been discussed with the applicant and they have agreed to make the change if needed.

Mr. Redington informed the board that presently they have proposed a detention basin that is 50 feet away from the property line. At the detention basin they have a large rip-wrap open flume triangular area that will accept the water. At the largest point, it is about 35 feet wide. During the meeting that took place with Dr. Souza, they have agreed to widen the flume to about 60-70 feet. The applicant is willing to make the revisions to meet Dr. Souza's recommendations. Dr. Souza stated that he is requesting a stability analysis in the design to insure that you won't have an erosive condition as the water is exiting the basin. They have also discussed altering the design to the discharge to the outflow to make it into a manifold system or something that would be equivalent to a level spreader. The applicant has agreed to comply with the board's professionals requirements.

Dr. Souza stated that he had requested a letter from Mr. Kuc discussing the potential for vernal pools on the site given the nature of the isolated wetlands. A letter has been addressed dated January 5, 2007 that provides more detail and more insight into whether that wetland could be a vernal pool. It is Mr. Kuc's conclusion that it is not. Dr. Souza stated that he does agree with Mr. Kuc's determination based upon the soil conditions, hydrology and also what the reported sightings on the lot were on the types of species.

The last section of Dr. Souza's report deals with what the board should review regarding this type of use on the sight. His intent for including this data was for informational purposes for both the board and the applicant.

Mr. Renda suggested that the applicant would add a note to the plan that cites the new regulations and that the application will comply with same. The applicant would have to satisfy the DEP requirements.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Timothy Scoville, Block 39, lot 54 – wanted to know what the ages of the children are. Additionally, would the play area have a fence surrounding it?

Mr. Redington answered that the children would range in age from 6 weeks to 5 years old. Regarding the fence it will be installed just around the play yard.

END OF PUBLIC COMMENT

Dr. Souza stated that he would like to have an opportunity to discuss with the landscape architect a modification to the seed mix that is proposed for the basin and for the cover on the sand filter area.

Mr. Redington stated that he would comply with that report.

Regarding the fire official's report, Mr. Redington informed the board that they will comply with all of his requests.

Mr. Cook wanted to know if the fire trucks could access the rear of the building. Mr. Redington answered yes.

The board took a break. The board resumed the hearing at 9:04 p.m.

Mr. Redington stated that the next report to address is from Hatch, Mott & McDonald. Regarding the issue of parking, the applicant is proposing to pave 45 parking spaces and bank the rest of the parking spaces.

The board agreed that the "banked" parking spaces should be graded now, but not paved.

Mr. Redington stated that he would rather provide plans to show the proposed drainage so that they know there is no conflict if the banked parking would have to be paved. Dr. Souza did not recommend that this area be paved at this time.

**Exhibit A-4 Construction plan “the Learning Experience” sheet #A-1 revised
Date 5/23/06 – Architectural floor plan for the building and play area.**

Mr. Redington stated that regarding the tricycle path and the picnic area, this area was not included in the impervious coverage calculation. He informed the board that the plans will be revised to show that calculation. The banked parking and the sidewalks were included in the impervious coverage calculations. The applicant agrees to comply with the 25 foot setback property line. The applicant agreed to comply with all of the conditions of Mr. McEldowney’s report dated January 4, 2007. However, regarding the car pavement detail, Mr. Redington requested that other alternatives be presented to Mr. McEldowney for his review. He felt that this was excessive. There will not be heavy trucks in the parking lot, only cars. Mr. McEldowney stated that he informed Mr. Redington that he did not have the authority to approve a paving structure that would be less than what is in the ordinance. However, a different pavement could be proposed of equivalent structure. Mr. McEldowney informed the board that they should re-exam their ordinance and then decide if they felt that a lesser standard would be appropriate for a smaller site. Other townships have a lesser standard for the smaller parking lots. Madam Chair stated based on the poll of the board, they are not in favor of adjusting their standard.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Ingelore M. Krug – she stated that she was concerned about the depth of the parking lot surface.

CLOSE PUBLIC COMMENTS

Doug Polyniak, Dolan & Dean Consulting Engineering– stated that he graduated from Lehigh University with a Bachelor of Science Degree in Civil Engineering. He has worked as a traffic engineering consultant for approximately 8 ½ years. He is a licensed engineer in the State of New Jersey.

Mr. Polyniak stated that he participated in the preparation of the traffic study and the Department of Transportation application with regard to the site. There is a separate right in and right out driveway. The peak hour for the daycare is the a.m. and p.m. commute. There are approximately 60 vehicles visiting the site during each of those peak hours. That would equate to 120 trips.

Mrs. Duffy asked if they proposed a de-acceleration lane. Mr. Polyniak answered no. There is a wide shoulder along side the road.

Mr. Polyniak stated that they analyzed the intersection of County Line Road and Route 22. They looked at the existing conditions when they took the traffic counts. For the proposed future conditions they took into account the background growth for the other projects in the area. The estimate it to be 2.25 percent increase in traffic per year. They included traffic association with the proposed age restricted development. He stated that there is a minimal impact associated with this development on that intersection. There are intersection improvements proposed from that age restricted development and with those improvements, the intersection will operate much better than what it does today.

Madam Chair wanted to know how many cars could be queued in the parking lot. Mr. Polyniak answered that it could be a 5 car queue.

Mr. Monaco stated that this entrance and exit will not be the issue, but the problem will arise when the rest of the lot is developed. Could this entrance be the entrance for the entire 11 acres? Mr. Polyniak answered that this driveway entrance is approximately 480-500 feet from corner. The DOT requires 100 feet of corner clearance. Mr. Monaco stated that regardless if there is room for another driveway, he felt that another driveway would be problematic.

Mr. Renda stated that the owner has not ruled out that idea to use one driveway. Additionally, they could seek access onto County Line Road for a new development.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Ingelore M. Krug – stated that she had a concern relating to the 60 cars per hour.

CLOSED PUBLIC COMMENT

Julia Allen wanted to know if there was any application approved in Branchburg Township on the northeast quadrant of Route 22/County Line Road.

Mr. Polyniak answered that he was directed to obtain DOT approvals for approximately 200-300 age restricted units.

Richard Weissman, The Learning Experience – stated that he is the president of the Learning Experience. He stated that he has been in the child care business for 27 years. The headquarters is located in Parsippany, New Jersey. Currently they have 16 operating centers with 83 centers in various forms of approvals or under construction.

Mr. Weissman stated that this center would be approximately 10,000 square feet. It will be licensed for approximately 175 children. The reason they speak of 150 children, is because

the child care center cannot obtain occupancy greater than 85 or 87% of its occupancy level. Children grow at a rapid rate. At times they have to rotate to another classroom. If every classroom was filled 100% occupancy, they won't have the luxury of rotating those children as they mature during the course of a year. This center is their pro-typical center. The maximum amount of parking that they have used is 33 parking spaces. Children get dropped off at the center between 6:00 am. – 9:30 a.m. They require every parent to park their car, take their child into the facility. There is a double door entrance. The second door is locked. A magnetic key pad opens that door. Typical turn around is 5 to 7 minutes for a person to park, and escort the child into the facility. If they are an infant, the parent registers the child and then walks into the infant/care room which is in the front of the facility. Pick up runs from 3:30 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. The bulk of parents arrive between 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. He has never seen more than 7 cars stacking which occurs during the pick-up times. They have video surveillance cameras of the entire school and play ground area. They execute fire drills twice a month.

Madam Chair Flynn asked if they were anticipating any drop offs from the local schools. Mr. Weissman answered that some children have ½ day kindergarten. They are dropped off in “compact” school buses.

Underneath the playing structures, they are proposing to install a “wood carpet” which is certified wooden mulch. The size of the wood is small enough that a child could not choke on it. The wood is cleansed in a specific technique so that it is safe for children. There is a small section of the play area that will have a rubberized surface installed.

Mrs. Filler wanted to know when the lights would be turned on in the morning and turned off in the evening. Mr. Weissman answered that usually 5:45 a.m. the lights are turned on and then shortly after 6:00 p.m. they are turned off. A cleaning crew does work every evening. They might be at the building some time around 8:00 p.m. Once the facility is cleaned, they will turn off the lights.

Madam Chair Flynn asked why there are no shade trees in the play area. Mr. Weissman answered that the problem with trees is that the leaves shed. There are bugs in the trees, the trees have to be maintained, and they have to be fertilized. All of these things are not positive for a child. They do provide canopies that are certified for shade quality in the environment.

Dr. Souza wanted Mr. Weissmann to address what they have at the other sites for example soil contamination, etc. Mr. Weissmann stated that it is required in his leases that they have to perform a phase one analysis. If the outcome of the analysis determines that this is an historical basis and that there was something else on the site, then they have to go to phase two.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Timothy Scoville – wanted to know the ages of the older children. Additionally, if a child got hurt on his property, where would the liability fall?

Mr. Weissman answered that usually the ages are 6 to 9 years old. He testified that he has been in this business for 27 years a child has never escaped from the facility.

END OF PUBLIC COMMENT

Madam Chair Flynn asked if this was a prototype of how most of the facilities appear. Mr. Weissman answered yes. Ms. Flynn stated that she is the liaison to the Board of Adjustment and they work very hard to have the Route 22 corridor not look branded. Mr. Weissman stated that the building is setback 200 feet from Route 22. Also, they are proposing a significant amount of landscaping.

The board felt that they would carry this matter in order to obtain the comments from the planner, Michael Sullivan. Therefore, this matter was carried to January 22, 2007. Mr. Renda signed an extension to that date.

Mr. McEldowney informed the board that technical issues were raised this evening and perhaps the applicant's engineer could resolve some of these issues prior to the next hearing.

- 2. Wilmark Building Contractors
Final Major Subdivision
Block 25, lot 38.01 – Carried to January 22, 2007**

Madam Chair announced that this matter was carried to February 26, 2007.

K. ADJOURNMENT:

Mrs. Filler made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Cook seconded the motion. Motion was carried with a vote of Ayes all, Nays none recorded.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda A. Jacukowicz