

The Regular Meeting of the Planning Board of the Township of Upper Deerfield was held on Monday, June 13, 2011 at 7:00 P.M. in the Municipal Building, Seabrook, N.J.

Chairman Bruno Basile called the meeting to order and read the following notice:

This is a regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Board of the Township of Upper Deerfield. In compliance with the "Open Public Meeting Act" a schedule of regular meetings containing the location and time and date of each meeting was approved at the Annual Organization Meeting of the Board, and within seven days following such Organization meeting, a copy of such schedule of regular meetings was posted in the Municipal Building at Seabrook, New Jersey, which Notice has remained so posted throughout the year, and copies of the schedule of regular meetings have been mailed to The News of Cumberland County and filed with the Township Clerk in compliance with said Act.

Present:

Chairman: Bruno Basile

Vice Chairman: Ed Overdevest

Members: Ernest Holt, Russ Vanella, Pauline Smith, Terry O'Neill, Scott Smith, Jack Waselik alt # 1, Louis J. Bramante, Jr. Alt # 3 Anthony Buono, Sr Alt # 4

Staff: Engineer Robert C. DuBois, P.E., Planner Randy Scheule, PP, AIC, Theodore H. Ritter, Esq. and Matthew Ritter, Esq., Secretary Vicki Vagnarelli.

Absent: Edward Fleetwood, Gene Stoms,

On motion of Russ Vanella, seconded by Ed Overdevest minutes of, May 16, 2011 meeting unanimously approved.

On motion of Jack Waselik, seconded by Ed Overdevest Resolution # 10-2011 (Soos) was memorialized.

RESOLUTION NO. 10-2011
UPPER DEERFIELD TOWNSHIP
PLANNING BOARD

WHEREAS, Applicant, Andrew Soos, has made application to the Upper Deerfield Township Planning Board for a front yard setback variance for his property located at 106 Seeley Road, known as Block 1003, Lot 8.03, and;

WHEREAS, a Public hearing was held by the Board on May 16, 2011, at the Municipal Building, 1325 Highway 77, Seabrook, Cumberland County, New Jersey, and the Board having heard the testimony presented by the Applicant and having heard the sentiment of all persons wishing to speak;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Upper Deerfield Township Planning Board, that the Board does find as facts the following:

1. That all property owners within 200 feet of applicant's premises were properly served with a Notice of Hearing.
2. That compliance has been had with each of the various requirements of the Open Public Meetings Law, P.L. 1975 c. 231.
3. The property affected by this application is located in the Agricultural Zone, which requires a minimum lot area of 6 acres, and lot width of 500 feet for the existing/proposed use.
4. Applicant Soos owns Block 1003, Lot No. 8.03, which is improved with a two-story dwelling, and accessory buildings, all located on a lot measuring 2.14 acres.
5. The undersized lot is a pre-existing, non-conforming condition, as is the existing front yard setback, which is 35.42 feet where 50 feet is now required.
6. Applicant proposes to construct an open porch across the front and south side of the residence, which would encroach an additional 9 feet into the front yard setback, leaving 26.4 feet where 50 feet are required.
7. A front yard setback variance is required for the proposed porch construction. The lot area and lot width were considered existing non-conforming by the Board and as such did not require variance approvals.
8. A framed photo of the residence from approximately 1920, which showed an earlier front porch, which has since been removed, was presented by the Applicant and circulated.
9. Applicant presented several exhibits that were marked. Exhibits A-1 through A-4 were current photos of the front of the residence. Exhibits A-5 through A-7 were architectural drawings of the proposed porch.
10. The Board received and considered the Report of Planner Randall Scheule PP/AICP, dated May 11, 2001.
11. The Applicant, through testimony and Exhibits, explained that the proposed construction was an "open" porch of a traditional design, thus addressing the concerns expressed in Mr. Scheule's Report.
12. No one appeared in opposition to the application.
13. The Planning Board has carefully considered this matter and finds that good cause exists for the granting of a front yard setback variance as requested. The Board further finds that such relief can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good, and that the granting

of the variance will not substantially impair the intent and zone plan of the zoning ordinance of the Township of Upper Deerfield.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this Board does hereby grant a front yard set back variance to applicant, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55 D-70, and the provisions of the Upper Deerfield Township Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 98 of the Code of Upper Deerfield provided that the following conditions are met:

- A. That Applicant comply with all other applicable requirements of the Upper Deerfield Township Zoning Ordinance and Building Code; and
- B. That the Applicant comply with all requirements of any other agency having jurisdiction, as the case may be; and
- C. That property taxes are current; and
- D. That a minimum front yard setback of 26.4 feet be maintained upon the completion of the porch.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a certified copy of this Resolution be furnished to applicants, and notice of this action be advertised as required by law.

**TOWNSHIP OF UPPER DEERFIELD
PLANNING BOARD**

By: _____
BRUNO A. BASILE, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: _____
VICKI VAGNARELLI, Secretary

Roll Call

Bruno Basile – no vote

Russell Vanella – Aye

Pauline Smith – Aye

Terry O’Neill – Aye

Gene Stoms – Absent

Jack Waselik, Alt #1 – Aye

Vacant, Alt #2

Ed Overdevest – Aye

Ed Fleetwood – cannot vote/absent

Ernest Holt – Aye

Scott Smith – Aye

Louis J. Bramante, Jr., Alt #3 – No Vote

Anthony Buono, Sr., Alt # 4 - No Vote

On motion of Ernest Holt, seconded by Pauline Smith Resolution # 11-2011 (Peterson) was memorialized.

**RESOLUTION NO. 11-2011
UPPER DEERFIELD TOWNSHIP**

PLANNING BOARD

WHEREAS, Applicant, Bruce T. Peterson and Peterson Investments, L.L.C., as owner of Block 2001, Lot 4.01, secured Planning Board approval in May, 2008, for a car wash to be erected on Block 2001, Lot 4.01 and

WHEREAS, an applicable ordinance required that Peterson Investments, L.L.C. had to construct a buffer for any residential uses which shared a common lot line, and

WHEREAS, at the time of the approval of the site plan for Peterson Investments, L.L.C. in 2008, there was a residence located immediately to the south of the proposed car wash lot, that being Block 2001, Lot 4 (owner: Bessie Hildreth), and

WHEREAS, the site plan for Peterson Investments, L.L.C. called for the construction of a six foot high solid fence along the entire 200 feet of shared property line between Lots 4 and 4.01 of Block 2001, and

WHEREAS, subsequent to the approval of the site plan in 2008, applicant purchased the property formerly owned by Bessie Hildreth, and known as Block 2001, Lot 4, and

WHEREAS, subsequent to the purchase of Lot 4, applicant demolished the residential structure and other improvements on Lot 4 of Block 2001, and

WHEREAS, Lot 4 is now vacant, and

WHEREAS, Block 2001, Lots 4 and 4.01 are commercially zoned meaning no residence can be constructed on either property, in the future, absent a use variance, and

WHEREAS, Bruce T. Peterson, individually and on behalf of Peterson Investments, L.L.C., wrote to the Planning Board requesting that it rescind the condition of site plan approval that mandated construction of the aforementioned six foot high solid fence on the line separating Lot 4 and Lot 4.01 of Block 2001, and

WHEREAS, Board Planner Randall Scheule and Solicitors Ritter have concurred in a recommendation that the Board rescind its condition of approval requiring the erection of a six foot solid board fence on the lot line between Lots 4 and 4.01, and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board discussed the applicant's request, at its meeting of May 9, 2011, and having received input from the Board's professional staff, and upon motion made and seconded and thereafter carried,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the condition incorporated into the

approval of a site plan for Peterson Investments, L.L.C. rendered in 2008, respecting Block 2001, Lot 4.01, which condition required the construction of a six foot high solid fence along the 200 feet shared property line separating Lots 4 and 4.01 is hereby rescinded due to the above-described changes in circumstances.

**TOWNSHIP OF UPPER DEERFIELD
PLANNING BOARD**

By: _____
BRUNO A. BASILE, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: _____
VICKI VAGNARELLI, Secretary

Roll Call

Bruno Basile – Aye

Russell Vanella – Aye

Pauline Smith – Aye

Terry O’Neill – Aye

Gene Stoms – no vote/absent

Jack Waselik, Alt #1 – Aye

Vacant, Alt #2

Ed Overdevest – Aye

Ed Fleetwood – cannot vote/absent

Ernest Holt – Aye

Scott Smith – Aye

Louis J. Bramante, Jr., Alt #3 – No Vote

Anthony Buono, Sr., Alt # 4 - No Vote

APPLICANT/DEVELOPMENT

Z 8-11 (7 votes) Roy Koerner 817/1 1 Lewis Drive 28x28 garage Front & Rear yard setback Variance.

Upon review of plan the application was found to need a Lot Coverage Variance. After testimony and discussion the Board requested the applicant change the 3 ½ foot side yard set back to 8 ½ .

On motion of Russell Vanella seconded by Jack Waselik the public hearing was opened and no one spoke for or against the applicant. On motion of Anthony Buono seconded by Jack Waselik the public hearing was closed. The applicant agreed to the Boards request and on motion of Jack Waselik, seconded by Louis Bramante the Board Approved the application.

Roll Call

Bruno Basile – Aye

Russell Vanella – Aye

Pauline Smith – Aye

Terry O’Neill – Aye

Gene Stoms – Absent

Jack Waselik, Alt #1 – No Vote

Vacant, Alt #2

Ed Overdevest – Aye

Ed Fleetwood – Absent

Ernest Holt – Aye

Scott Smith – Aye

Louis J. Bramante, Jr., Alt #3 – No Vote

Anthony Buono, Sr., Alt # 4 - No Vote

Z 6-11 (7 votes) Millenium Land Dev. 1301/1, Love Lane & Deerfield Pike USE Variance for Abandoned Nursery 219.3 acres propose Solar Power Production system. Attorney Alan Fox representing the applicant requested consideration for Completeness tonight due to report of Planner Randy Scheule and to announce a date to carry over for the Use Variance. Joseph Raday of ABR Consulting reviewed Randy Scheule's report dated June 9, 2011 in order to resolve Completeness issues. Applicant entered into evidence Exhibit 6/13/11 M. App-1 stating 10 photos, however, it is actually 15 photos. On motion of Russ Vanella, seconded by Pauline Smith the Board approved the applicant for Completeness and scheduled the public hearing for July 11, 2011.

Roll Call

Bruno Basile – Aye

Russell Vanella – Aye

Pauline Smith – Aye

Terry O'Neill – Aye

Gene Stoms – Absent

Jack Waselik, Alt #1 – No Vote

Vacant, Alt #2

Ed Overdevest – Aye

Ed Fleetwood – Absent

Ernest Holt – Aye

Scott Smith – Aye

Louis J. Bramante, Jr., Alt #3 – No Vote

Anthony Buono, Sr., Alt # 4 - No Vote

P 7-11 (9 votes) Sunset Lake 100 LLC 1601/1, 2, 5, 1701/12 conversion of existing Pre/Final Maj. S/D. Attorney Richard Hoff Jr. Esq. represented the applicant. Planner, Randy Scheule reviewed his report of June 9, 2011. After discussion between the Board and applicants attorney on motion of Russell Vanella, seconded by Jack Waselik the Board approved Conditional Completeness and Chairman Basile Announced to carry the public hearing over to a special meeting of July 25, 2011.

Roll Call

Bruno Basile – Aye

Russell Vanella – Aye

Pauline Smith – Aye

Terry O'Neill – Aye

Gene Stoms – Absent

Jack Waselik, Alt #1 – Aye

Vacant, Alt #2

Ed Overdevest – Aye

Ed Fleetwood – Absent

Ernest Holt – Aye

Scott Smith – Aye

Louis J. Bramante, Jr., Alt #3 – Aye

Anthony Buono, Sr., Alt # 4 - No Vote

PROFESSIONALS/COMMITTEE/COMMISSION

Planner, Randy Scheule discussed final review on Landscape, Parking and Fees Final Draft Ordinances, reiterating the Boards role each review time has been to find and report any inconsistencies within these ordinances and the Township's Master Plan.

Final Draft Landscape Ordinance – Planner Randall Scheule's Consistency Review is as follows:

TOWNSHIP OF UPPER DEERFIELD
Master Plan Consistency Report
Introduction –

On June 2, 2011 the Township Committee of Upper Deerfield Township introduced and adopted on first reading an ordinance amending the Township's **Landscaping Requirements**. This Ordinance will be advertised according to law and is scheduled to have second reading and public hearing on July 7, 2011.

NJS 40:55D-26 describes the Planning Board's responsibility regarding the master plan consistency review as follows:

"... the planning board shall make and transmit to the governing body, within 35 days after referral, a report including identification of any provisions in the proposed development regulation, revision or amendment which are inconsistent with the master plan and recommendations concerning those inconsistencies and any other matters as the board deems appropriate."

While formerly only zoning ordinances and amendments thereto were required to be submitted to the planning board, it is now clear from the wording in NJS 40:55D-26 that all "development regulations" must be referred to the planning board for comment and report. The statute requires that every zoning ordinance must "either be substantially consistent with the land use plan and housing plan of the master plan, or designed to effectuate such plan elements." The "master plan" referred to herein is the Upper Deerfield Township Master Plan adopted January 1988, and as subsequently amended by the Planning Board.

Ordinance Summary -

The new **Landscaping Requirements** are found in **Section 405-62.A(4)** of the Township Code. This Ordinance provides for comprehensive landscaping regulations including standards for commercial

and residential properties, yard areas, parking lots, buffers and screening. The ordinance also contains recommendations for plant materials considering site location and landscape function. Landscape Ordinance - Master Plan Consistency Report 2

This Ordinance is intended to:

- a. Foster aesthetically pleasing development that will protect and preserve the appearance and character of the community.*
- b. Increase the compatibility of development with both adjacent development and the natural environment.*
- c. Improve environmental quality by recognizing the numerous beneficial effects of landscaping upon the environment.*
- d. Maintain and increase the value of land by requiring landscaping to be incorporated into development, thus becoming by itself a valuable capital asset.*
- e. Provide direct and important physical and psychological benefits to human beings through the use of landscaping to reduce noise and glare, and to break up the monotony and soften the harsher aspects of urban development*
- f. Eradicate or control certain exotic plant species that have become nuisances because of their tendency to damage public and private works, to have a negative effect upon public health, or to disrupt or destroy native ecosystems.*
- g. Promote innovative and cost-conscious approaches to the design, installation, and maintenance of landscaping.*
- h. Establish procedures and standards for the administration and enforcement of this Landscaping Ordinance.*

Master Plan Analysis -

The Upper Deerfield Master Plan has been prepared in accord with the "Municipal Land Use Law" and serves as a general guide for the physical, economic and social development of the Township. The Master Plan is based upon objectives, principles, assumptions, policies and standards related to land use and development within the community. Preservation of the Township's character, and enhancing the quality of life for residents are two primary goals of the Master Plan. As noted above, the new Landscaping Regulations will have multiple benefits for the Township related to these Master Plan goals.

Summary, Conclusion and Recommendations –

The Planning Board’s responsibility regarding the master plan consistency review is to identify any provisions in this Ordinance which are inconsistent with the master plan, and provide recommendations concerning those inconsistencies and any other matters as the Board deems appropriate.

In defining “substantial consistency” the Supreme Court in *Manalapan Realty v. Township Committee* made it clear that some inconsistency is permitted “provided it does not substantially or materially undermine or distort the basic provisions and Landscape Ordinance – Master Plan Consistency Report 3 objectives of the Master Plan.” The “Municipal Land Use Law” does not define the term *inconsistent*. As noted above this Ordinance proposes new **Section 405-62.A(4) Landscaping Regulations**. This Ordinance provides comprehensive standards that will enable the Township to effectively address landscaping concerns as new development occurs.

Based on the above considerations, it is my professional opinion that this Ordinance does not present any inconsistency with the Master Plan and that it will serve to effectuate the land use plan.

This report prepared for the Upper Deerfield Township Planning Board by:

Randall E. Scheule, PP/AICP

June 7, 2011

On motion of Ernest Holt, seconded by Anthony Buono the Board approved the final draft.

Roll Call

Bruno Basile – Aye

Russell Vanella – Aye

Pauline Smith – Aye

Terry O’Neill – Aye

Gene Stoms – Absent

Jack Waselik, Alt #1 – Aye

Vacant, Alt #2

Ed Overdevest – Aye

Ed Fleetwood – Absent

Ernest Holt – Aye

Scott Smith – Aye

Louis J. Bramante, Jr., Alt #3 – Aye

Anthony Buono, Sr., Alt # 4 - No Vote

Final Draft Parking Ordinance - Planner Randall Scheule’s Consistency Review is as follows:

**TOWNSHIP OF UPPER DEERFIELD
Master Plan Consistency Report**

Introduction –

On June 2, 2011 the Township Committee of Upper Deerfield Township introduced and adopted on first reading an ordinance amending the Township’s **Off-Street Parking Requirements**. This Ordinance will be advertised according to law and is scheduled to have second reading and public hearing on July 7, 2011.

NJS 40:55D-26 describes the Planning Board’s responsibility regarding the master plan consistency review as follows:

“ . . . the planning board shall make and transmit to the governing body, within 35 days after referral, a report including identification of any provisions in the proposed development regulation, revision or amendment which are inconsistent with the master plan and recommendations concerning those inconsistencies and any other matters as the board deems appropriate.”

While formerly only zoning ordinances and amendments thereto were required to be submitted to the planning board, it is now clear from the wording in NJS 40:55D-26 that all "development regulations" must be referred to the planning board for comment and report. The statute requires that every zoning ordinance must "either be substantially consistent with the land use plan and housing plan of the master plan, or designed to effectuate such plan elements." The "master plan" referred to herein is the Upper Deerfield Township Master Plan adopted January 1988, and as subsequently amended by the Planning Board.

Ordinance Summary –

The revisions proposed by this Ordinance effect **Section 405-3 Terms** and **Section 405-27 Minimum Off-Street Requirements** of the Township Code. The new definitions in Section 405-3 address undefined terms presently found in the Code. This Ordinance provides Supplemental Standards addressing items such as motorcycle parking, shared parking, compact car and bicycle parking. This Ordinance also includes parking requirements for residential uses as stipulated by the Residential Site Improvement Off-Street Parking Ordinance – Master Plan Consistency Report 2 Standards (RSIS), and handicapped/accessible parking as required by the *New Jersey Barrier Free Code* and the *Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines*.

Master Plan Analysis –

The Upper Deerfield Master Plan has been prepared in accord with the "Municipal Land Use Law" and serves as a general guide for the physical, economic and social development of the Township. The Master Plan is based upon objectives, principles, assumptions, policies and standards related to land use and development within the community.

The Master Plan envisions Upper Deerfield Township as a planned community where a variety of development forms are realized at appropriate locations. The Master Plan also contemplates that new development will be well-designed and that it will provide the improvements and services necessary to assure compatibility within the community. The Township's land development code, including the Off-street Parking Requirements contain the regulations necessary to encourage development that is consistent with the Master Plan.

Summary, Conclusion and Recommendations –

The Planning Board's responsibility regarding the master plan consistency review is to identify any provisions in this Ordinance which are inconsistent with the master plan, and provide recommendations concerning those inconsistencies and any other matters as the Board deems appropriate.

In defining "substantial consistency" the Supreme Court in *Manalapan Realty v. Township Committee* made it clear that some inconsistency is permitted "provided it does not substantially or materially undermine or distort the basic provisions and objectives of the Master Plan." The "Municipal Land Use Law" does not define the term *inconsistent*.

This Ordinance revises the **Section 405-3 Terms** and **Section 405-27 Off-Street Parking Requirements**. The overall effect of these revisions is a reduction in the number of parking spaces required for most commercial uses. The revised parking ratios were derived from analysis of existing development within the Township, and from published planning studies. The revised parking requirements will translate into less paving, enhanced site amenities including landscaping, improved aesthetics and environmental quality. It is anticipated that these code revisions will also facilitate the Off-Street

Parking Ordinance – Master Plan Consistency Report 3 adaptive reuse and redevelopment of existing commercial sites. These resultant effects are consistent with the Master Plan.

Upper Deerfield Township Planning Board

June 13, 2011

Page 10

Based on the above considerations, it is my professional opinion that this Ordinance and the revisions proposed to **Section 405-3 Terms** and **Section 405-27 Off-Street Parking Requirements** do not present any inconsistency with the Master Plan.

This report prepared for the Upper Deerfield Township Planning Board by:

Randall E. Scheule, PP/AICP

June 7, 2011

On motion of Ernest Holt, seconded by Anthony Buono the Board approved the final draft.

Roll Call

Bruno Basile – Aye

Russell Vanella – Aye

Pauline Smith – Aye

Terry O’Neill – Aye

Gene Stoms – Absent

Jack Waselik, Alt #1 – Aye

Vacant, Alt #2

Ed Overdevest – Aye

Ed Fleetwood – Absent

Ernest Holt – Aye

Scott Smith – Aye

Louis J. Bramante, Jr., Alt #3 – Aye

Anthony Buono, Sr., Alt # 4 - No Vote

Final Draft Fee Schedule Ordinance – Planner Randall Scheule’s Consistency Review is as follows:

TOWNSHIP OF UPPER DEERFIELD Master Plan Consistency Report

Introduction –

On June 2, 2011 the Township Committee of Upper Deerfield Township introduced and adopted on first reading an ordinance amending **Article XIII Fees**. This Ordinance will be advertised according to law and is scheduled to have second reading and public hearing on July 7, 2011.

NJS 40:55D-26 describes the Planning Board’s responsibility regarding the master plan consistency review as follows:

“. . . the planning board shall make and transmit to the governing body, within 35 days after referral, a report including identification of any provisions in the proposed development regulation, revision or amendment which are inconsistent with the master plan and recommendations concerning those inconsistencies and any other matters as the board deems appropriate.”

While formerly only zoning ordinances and amendments thereto were required to be submitted to the planning board, it is now clear from the wording in NJS 40:55D-26 that all “development regulations” must be referred to the planning board for comment and report. The statute requires that every zoning ordinance must “either be substantially consistent with the land use plan and housing plan of the master plan, or designed to effectuate such plan elements.” The “master plan” referred to herein is the Upper Deerfield Township Master Plan adopted January 1988, and as subsequently amended by the Planning Board.

Ordinance Summary –

The revisions contained within this Ordinance pertain to **Article XIII Fees**, of the Township Code. This Ordinance is comprehensive in its scope and has been prepared pursuant to the applicable requirements of the “Municipal Land Use Law.” This Ordinance includes application and escrow fees specific to application type, administrative provisions and an exemption clause. Existing code sections

the provisions of which are being incorporated into Article XIII as revised are repealed by Fee Ordinance – Master Plan Consistency Report 2 this Ordinance. The Township’s fee ordinance was last revised by Ordinance No. 455 in July 1996.

Upper Deerfield Township Planning Board

June 13, 2011

Page 11

Master Plan Analysis –

The Upper Deerfield Master Plan has been prepared in accord with the “Municipal Land Use Law” and serves as a general guide for the physical, economic and social development of the Township. The Master Plan is based upon objectives, principles, assumptions, policies and standards related to land use and development within the community. The Master Plan does not specifically address the administrative aspects of land development activity, such as development fees.

Summary, Conclusion and Recommendations –

The Planning Board’s responsibility regarding the master plan consistency review is to identify any provisions in this Ordinance which are inconsistent with the master plan, and provide recommendations concerning those inconsistencies and any other matters as the Board deems appropriate.

In defining “substantial consistency” the Supreme Court in *Manalapan Realty v. Township Committee* made it clear that some inconsistency is permitted “provided it does not substantially or materially undermine or distort the basic provisions and objectives of the Master Plan.” The “Municipal Land Use Law” does not define the term *inconsistent*.

This Ordinance revises **Article XIII Fees** for development applications. As noted above the Master Plan does not, and is not expected to, address administration provisions (such as fees) pertaining to development applications.

It is my professional opinion that there is no inconsistency between the proposed revisions to **Article XIII Fees** and the Master Plan.

This report was prepared for the Upper Deerfield Township Planning Board by:

Randall E. Scheule, PP/AICP

June 7, 2011

On motion of Anthony Buono, seconded by Jack Waselik the Board approved the final draft.

Roll Call

Bruno Basile – Aye

Russell Vanella – Aye

Pauline Smith – Aye

Terry O’Neill – Aye

Gene Stoms – Absent

Jack Waselik, Alt #1 – Aye

Vacant, Alt #2

Ed Overdevest – Aye

Ed Fleetwood – Absent

Ernest Holt – Aye

Scott Smith – Aye

Louis J. Bramante, Jr., Alt #3 – Aye

Anthony Buono, Sr., Alt # 4 - No Vote

PUBLIC COMMENT: No public comment from the audience

Being no further business, on motion of Russ Vanella, seconded by Jack Waselik the meeting adjourned at 8:30pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Vicki Vagnarelli