

Florence, New Jersey 08518-2323  
February 27, 2018

The regular meeting of the Florence Township Planning Board was held on the above date at the Municipal Complex, 711 Broad Street, Florence, NJ. Chairperson Hamilton-Wood called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. followed by a salute to the flag.

Chairperson Hamilton-Wood then read the following statement: "I would like to announce that this meeting is being held in accordance with the provisions of the Open Public Meetings Act. Adequate notice has been provided to the official newspapers and posted in the main hall of the Municipal Complex."

Upon roll call the following members were found to be present:

Mildred Hamilton-Wood	James Molimock
Thomas McCue	Ray Montgomery
Mayor Craig Wilkie	Council Representative Ted Lovenduski
John Pagano, Alt. #1	

ABSENT: Wayne Morris; Carl Mattson, Alt. #2

ALSO PRESENT: Solicitor David Frank  
Planner Barbara Fegley  
Engineer Hugh Dougherty

#### SWEARING IN AND SEATING OF NEW MEMBERS AND/OR ALTERNATES

Solicitor Frank administered the Oath of Office to John Pagano as a Class IV member, Alternate #1 for a 2-year term (unexpired) expiring December 31, 2019.

#### RESOLUTIONS

- A. **Resolution PB-2018-07:** Approving application PB#2017-06 for Firenze Properties, LLC (Modern Store Equipment) for Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for expansion of building on property located at 20 & 50 Harkins Lane, Florence Township, Block 159, Lots 5.01 & 5.04.

It was the Motion of Councilman Lovenduski, seconded by Mr. Montgomery to approve Resolution No. PB-2018-07.

Upon roll call, the Board voted as follows:

YEAS: Lovenduski, Montgomery, McCue, Molimock, Wilkie, Hamilton-Wood  
NOES: None  
ABSTAIN: None

Motion carried

- B. **Resolution PB-2018-08:** Approving application PB#2017-04 for Academy Woods Apartments, c/o Bryan Hunsberger for Amended Final Major Site Plan to

construct additional parking on property located at 95 Cedar Lane, Florence, NJ 08518, Block 148.01, Lot 3.01.

It was the Motion of Vice Chairman Molimock, seconded by Mr. McCue to approve Resolution No. PB-2018-08.

Upon roll call, the Board voted as follows:

YEAS: Molimock, McCue, Montgomery, Lovenduski, Wilkie, Hamilton-Wood  
 NOES: None  
 ABSTAIN: None

Motion carried

### MINUTES

It was the Motion of Councilman Lovenduski, seconded by Mr. Molimock to approve the minutes of the reorganization/regular meeting of January 23, 2018 as submitted. Motion unanimously approved by all those present.

### CORRESPONDENCE

- A. Informational Notice of Section 106 Filings dated 1/24/18.
- B. US Home/Lennar Conformance Review letter from Planner Fegley dated 1/31/18.
- C. US Home/Lennar Compliance Review No. 1 from Engineer Dougherty dated 2/1/18.
- D. Burlington County Planning Board letter regarding Modern Store Equipment dated 2/9/18.
- E. Burlington County Planning Board letter regarding Cedar Lane South Industrial Park (Amazon) dated 2/9/18.
- F. Burlington County Planning Board letter regarding Modern Store Equipment's withdrawal of application dated 2/13/18.

It was the Motion of Vice Chairman Molimock, seconded by Mr. Montgomery to receive and file correspondence A through F. Motion unanimously approved by all those present.

Chairperson Hamilton-Wood stated that before hearing the application on the agenda this evening, the meeting was going to move ahead to the Master Plan Review/Discussion portion of the meeting for the COAH presentation to be done at this time. The application portion of the meeting will immediately follow.

### MASTER PLAN REVIEW/DISCUSSION

Mayor Wilkie introduced Mary Beth Lonergan, the township's COAH planner. He explained she has been working on our COAH plan diligently and has been involved in a number of court cases and everything else to get us where we are today. Today is a preliminary review of our COAH plan and eventually we will end up at the courts to finalize everything; hopefully, by the end of this year.

Solicitor Frank stated that this COAH presentation was just informational and not requiring any action of the Board. Ms. Lonergan confirmed it was just informational.

Ms. Lonergan addressed the Board and began by handing out the township's Fair Share Plan Summary. She stated the township has always participated in petitioning the Council on Affordable Housing (COAH). The township has a first-round affordable housing plan; a certified second-round affordable housing plan (1990's); and an expanded third-round time period from 1999 – 2025, literally a 26-year period where it's normally a 10 to 12 period at most.

Ms. Lonergan explained there have been a number of court cases; the most recent NJ Supreme Court case was in 2015 where it, in so many words, put to the side the Council on Affordable Housing which was a state agency. This required towns, including Florence Township, to file its affordable housing plans with the Superior Court. Florence Township is under the jurisdiction of Judge Harrington in Burlington County. Florence Township has settled with a state-wide affordable housing advocacy group called Fair Share Housing Center. The Fair Share Housing Center was deemed by the Supreme Court to represent the housing needs of low and moderate income households throughout the state. In 2016, and with an amendment in 2017, Florence Township entered into an agreement to establish the township's 3-part third round obligation. That agreement was approved by the court in December 2017, and that settlement agreement triggers the Planning Board to revise the third-round housing element and fair share plan. The last housing element that the township did was in 2008. Ms. Lonergan stated she and Kendra Lelie from her office will be working on the township's third round plan.

Ms. Lonergan went over the Fair Share Plan Summary that she had handed out. The agreement has established a three-part fair share obligation. The first part was called a Rehabilitation Share and it literally is a census figure on the number of housing units, that may be substandard in the municipality, that are potentially occupied by low and moderate income households. Florence Township's figure is 96 units. The township's prior run obligation, the first and second round for the time period when it was COAH (1987-1999), was 114 units. For this expanded third round time period, 1999-2025, the township's obligation is 378 units. Because the township has done such a great job of staying ahead of the curve and addressing its fair share obligations, the township has literally addressed, with completed units and bonuses, well over half of the third-round obligation; almost hitting  $\frac{3}{4}$  of that obligation. Simply, the township will be addressing its 96 Rehabilitation Share through participation of the County's Home Owner Occupied Rehabilitation Program and the township will also be establishing a local Rehabilitation Program for Renter Occupied units.

Ms. Lonergan stated the chart shown on the handout explains the township's means that it used to address its prior round obligation of 114 units and is happy to report that obligation is completely satisfied; to include the Roebing Arms (Multiple Sclerosis units), Roebing Inn [Burlington County Community Action Program (BCCAP) - affordable senior units], and a number of alternative living arrangements (group homes).

Ms. Lonergan then explained the third-round obligation chart which shows how the township has either addressed or proposes to address its obligation. She pointed out that almost  $\frac{1}{2}$  of surplus Regional Contribution Agreement (RCA) was used to address the prior round obligation with the remaining 61 credits being used towards the third-round obligation. Although these credits are no longer allowed to be used under the NJ Housing

Act, the courts have approved the use of those surplus RCA credits for the third-round obligation. The township has also completed 100% affordable housing development; the main one being the Marcella Duffy School which is now a beautiful affordable senior complex. One of the proposed sites is at the corner of Route 130 and Hornberger Avenue. It is approximately a 10-acre site with the thought being to keep the frontage along Route 130 for commercial purposes and in the rear, with access to Hornberger Avenue and Route 130, would be the affordable family rental units. The township will contract with an experienced affordable housing tax credit developer to help produce the funding that will help to build the affordable housing family rental units. There are also a number of inclusionary developments (majority rate market rate units with subsidizing affordable units) which is usually anywhere from 80% market rate and 20% affordable; Legacy at Meadowcroft and McHugh Court are two that are already completed, as well as a proposed inclusionary redevelopment site that this Board has reviewed for the Weiss development at the corner of Cedar Lane and Route 130. There are also a number of smaller units spread throughout the municipality. The Market to Affordable Program is a successful program in the township as there are already 7 completed units, and the township is working with non-profit developers to purchase existing market rate non-restricted units subsidizing the cost down to affordable level and putting that restriction on it. The township started this program and the court was very pleased that the township has shown success with this program.

Ms. Lonergan continued with saying there are a number of other significant terms within the township's agreement with the Fair Share Housing Center. One thing she brought to the Board's attention is that there is a statutory requirement for very-low income housing and she will be working with the Board to show them how that will be addressed, as well as additional monitoring requirements and affirmative marketing requirements.

Ms. Lonergan's office will be preparing a draft Housing Element and Fair Share Plan for the Board's review. Mr. Montgomery asked Ms. Lonergan to explain what the bonus units are. She stated COAH's rules, as well as within the courts, have accepted a bonus for the production of affordable rental units. The thought is, rental housing is an important part of addressing your affordable housing obligation. In the third round you can receive bonus units up to a certain number. The township's bonus cap is at 95 units. So, for the township producing 95 affordable rental units, the township got a 2-for-1 credit, a bonus. It is a solid mechanism and the court has accepted this for the past 30 - 35 years.

Ms. Lonergan thanked the Board and stated she would be back in a month or two with the draft Housing Element and Fair Share Plan.

### APPLICATIONS

**Application PB#2017-07 for James Heupel, 1011 Potts Mill Road for Minor Subdivision of adjoining lots and Bulk variance for non-conforming road frontage lot width on property located at 1011 Potts Mill Road, Florence Township, Block 166, Lots 17.02 & 18.02**

Chairperson Hamilton-Wood recused herself from hearing this application due to a conflict and left the meeting 7:52 p.m. Vice Chairman Molimock then chaired the meeting.

Erin Szulewski of Parker McCay for the applicant, James Heupel, stated they are here tonight with an application for a minor subdivision on Block 166, Lots 17.02 & 18.02. The property is located in the R – Residential zone. They are proposing to subdivide the two existing lots into two new lots; proposed lots 18.03 & 18.04. With her tonight is James Heupel, the property owner and Daniel Patterson, the engineer that prepared the site plan.

Solicitor Frank swore in Mr. Heupel and Mr. Patterson. Mr. Patterson stated he has degrees in civil engineer and in land surveying and has been licensed as a professional land surveyor since 2012 and as a professional engineer in the State of New Jersey since 2013. Vice Chairman Molimock stated Mr. Patterson qualified as an expert witness.

Engineer Dougherty stated that the application would need to be deemed complete prior to hearing the application. He stated that he addresses the completeness of the application on page 2 of his review letter dated 1/9/18.

He continued by stating there were two checklists submitted with this application, one for the minor subdivision and one for the variance because there is one variance being sought once they create the new lot. Under the Minor Subdivision Application Checklist, there are some provisions in the checklist for an environmental impact statement that the applicant is seeking a waiver for. The applicant has indicated that there is a single-family dwelling currently on the two lots that has a septic field, a creek and wetlands. The wetlands were identified under a state letter of interpretation finding, so that has been documented and is now recorded as far as a state approval. The application indicates that there will be clearing of trees on the site so from an environmental impact standpoint, Engineer Dougherty had no objection if the Board chooses to grant that waiver. The flood hazard area zone shall be provided. Generally associated with the creek, there is not only the wetlands but there is also a flood elevation associated with that creek; a portion of that property is in the zone A and one of the issues with the zone A is there is no elevation defined in that zone A. On the technical side, the applicant really should provide testimony on the location of the proposed improvements in relation to what he believes the flood hazard area is. There are some different means of calculating the flood hazard area and in this situation, an approximate method could be done and a detailed analysis would not need to be done. The applicant's engineer would agree to provide testimony in regards to the flood hazard area, he would have no objection to deferring this to the testimony stage or even as a condition of approval.

Engineer Dougherty stated that the Board could hear this application this evening if the Board wished to grant the waiver for the environmental impact statement and to defer the flood hazard zone determination to the engineer's testimony.

It was the Motion of Mr. Montgomery, seconded by Councilman Lovenduski to grant the waiver for the environmental impact statement, defer the flood hazard zone determination to the engineer's testimony and to deem application PB#2017-07 complete.

Upon roll call the Board voted as follows:

YEAS: Montgomery, Lovenduski, McCue, Wilkie, Pagano, Molimock

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

Motion carried

Mr. Patterson began his testimony by presenting exhibit A-1 which shows the existing conditions of the two lots and the existing lot lines. He stated the intent is to extinguish the lot line and add a flag lot instead to make it more useful given the existing improvements that are on the property.

Exhibit A-2 shows the proposed subdivision line and proposed one-story house back towards the edge of the woods and the flag lot with an access drive back to the house; which is where the variance is required because of the lot frontage width. The exhibit also shows the two banks of the creek that were referred to on the flood hazard plan. Also shown is the wetlands line and the buffer which were approved by the NJ Department of Environmental Protection. Nothing being proposed will be near the wetlands line of the buffer, avoiding any environmental concerns. Mr. Patterson continued by explaining that essentially, they are creating a one-acre lot around the existing dwelling and the remainder of the property would go to the creation of the second lot.

Ms. Szulewski asked Mr. Patterson if the width that will be provided for the northern lot is constrained due to the existing improvements on the property. Mr. Patterson confirmed that is the case and with the existing improvements to the existing house and to maintain proper setbacks, it is also the reason for the flag lot and narrow drive.

Ms. Szulewski asked if the shape of the overall property constrained the width of the frontage. Mr. Patterson answered yes and explained that was reason for the variance request. If it could have been configured another way, it would have been. He stated this property was already two lots and can be utilized as two lots.

Ms. Szulewski asked if Mr. Patterson what the approximate lot width at the building line for the new proposed dwelling was and would it be in excess of the requirement for lot frontage of 125 feet. Mr. Patterson referred to exhibit A-3, which was an enlarged version of what was submitted with the application and showed what Ms. Szulewski was referring to, and stated it is well in excess of the required lot width by having 70 feet on one side of the proposed dwelling, 60 feet on the other side, and the width of the house being 70 feet; the total lot width is 200 feet.

Mr. Patterson then addressed the flood hazard questions and showed where the flood hazard would be based on the FEMA map. He explained that the proposed finished floor would be at 35 feet and that the bank was approximately at 30 feet, stating that the bank is quite steep. In his professional opinion, the new dwelling is above flood hazard level. Solicitor Frank asked if the measurements Mr. Patterson was referring to was above sea level. Mr. Patterson answered that is was. Engineer Dougherty asked Mr. Patterson what he would say the difference between the creek, top of bank, and where the proposed dwelling is located. Mr. Patterson stated that the contour shown on the exhibit is elevation 30, so the dwelling finished floor would be at 39 feet and the top of the creek is about 13 or 14. There is a proposed full basement for the new dwelling so from the basement to the creek elevation would be about 15 feet. All were in agreement with that amount.

Planner Fegley asked where Mr. Patterson thought they were in relation to the maximum riparian buffer that could be imposed with the proposed improvements. Mr. Patterson stated he checked to see if this branch of Craft's Creek was a Category 1 waterway, but it

was not on any list he could find. The distance from the top of the bank is approximately 200 feet plus. Planner Fegley stated the riparian buffer would probably be at 50 feet which Mr. Patterson agreed, so it is well outside the wetlands buffer.

Planner Fegley asked who was going to provide testimony on the lot width variance and the reason for it. Ms. Szulewski stated the reasoning for the lot width variance was due to the triangular shape of the property, the existing improvements on the property, and to maintain a lot width at the building line in excess of that 125-foot requirement. Planner Fegley asked Mr. Patterson if by having the lot width on the northern proposed new lot at 60 feet, are they able to have conforming areas for each of the lots. He stated yes.

Planner Fegley asked about the availability of sewer and if that had any bearing on anything that needs to be mentioned. Mr. Heupel stated he met with the Water & Sewer Department and there is 2" force main that runs across the front of the property. He stated they propose to minimize the utilities in one area to make everything as smooth as possible. As far as the 2" sewer lateral that goes right across the front of the property, and is actually in the right way, that can be run to the back to pick up the proposed dwelling. Electric is provided and will be run underground to the proposed dwelling. Also in the vicinity of the sewer, the end of the water main from across the street was extended to a corner of the property. Mr. Heupel stated he had met with the township water department to look at possibly connecting to the water main at some point in the future. If he was not able to get water or suitable water, he would drill a well. He stated he could run off the end of the line and run a 2" tap down to the right-of-way, about 2' into the right-of-way; that way the water line would be there with the ability to cut it in right along the road in the event they ever do run a water line to there. Mr. Heupel stated they've taken into consideration the future of whenever the township can afford to put the water main in. The existing house has a septic and at the time the existing house was built, Mr. Heupel wanted to connect to the forced main that had been put in for the development down the street but wasn't allowed to because his house would have been the only one on that forced main which was about a mile long. Because of this, he put a septic in and will do so with the proposed dwelling.

Mr. Heupel stated they do plan to put all the utilities in one area; water, electric, gas. The density of all the utilities in one area will be an issue of where to put in new shade trees. He is willing to accommodate to whatever the Board wishes in regards to trees. However, he stated a line of sight for the neighbor's driveway should be considered. He stated he is proposing the new driveway to be alongside the neighbor's driveway, with a 15' space between the driveways, and he will be landscape as the Board wishes if made a part of the condition of approval. He felt that the best area for the new driveway was to be alongside the neighbor's driveway because it was the least obstructive and the best scenario for him and his neighbors. The existing lot will be one-acre, which is required in the zone. For the new lot, all required setbacks will be met with the exception of the frontage, which is the variance they are seeking.

Ms. Szulewski referred to Planner Fegley's review letter and the outstanding points to be addressed. General comment #5 is in regards to shade trees and Mr. Heupel has indicated he is willing to work with Planner Fegley's office to determine the best location for shade trees along the frontage of both lots with the understanding that he'd like to keep them a safe distance from the driveway entrance and the existing utilities. Mr. Heupel stated

there are also overhead power lines that need to be taken into consideration as well. If shade trees are wanted, he is proposing to put them back 15' onto the property to not interfere with the utilities and the overhead power lines. There are existing trees now at about 10' off the property line that don't interfere with anything so that is why he is proposing this. He would also prefer not to put them in the area of the septic. Planner Fegley stated her office will work with him on this.

Planner Fegley asked for testimony regarding the installation of a sidewalk. Mr. Patterson stated they would like to request a waiver in regards to installing a sidewalk. He stated there is no sidewalk on either of the adjoining properties or across the street. There is sidewalk across the street for the development, but it is approximately 750 feet away from Mr. Heupel's property. Mayor Wilkie stated that the township just got a grant for the paving of Potts Mill Road which will start at the Old York Road end of Potts Mill. They are hoping to do paving up to at least the creek this year. It is most likely 2 to 3 years away from paving to be done near Mr. Heupel's property, but the plan is to eventually have sidewalk along Potts Mill Road, but he is not sure which side of Potts Mill Road the sidewalks will go. Mr. Heupel stated there is a storm drain in the front of his property. Mayor Wilkie stated Potts Mill Road will be redone with curbing and sidewalk and may still be a few years away.

Solicitor Frank stated that towns are not permitted to grant sidewalk waivers and then require funds from developers to use for sidewalks somewhere else in town. But if the funds are segregate to be used specifically for a project that is focused on that particular site and improvements that is necessitated by that particular development, then you are allowed to collect funds in lieu for sidewalks. The Board has the authority to require sidewalks, it has the authority to permit an applicant not to build sidewalks; but, the ordinance says that if you allow the applicant not to build sidewalks, you ought to be collecting if you have a project in mind. If you do not have a project that's immediately possible in mind, then you ought not to be collecting. Mayor Wilkie asked Mr. Heupel what his plan was for the existing lot? Mr. Heupel stated they plan to sell that lot and build a house for them on the new proposed lot. They are looking to downsize.

Engineer Dougherty stated in looking at the right-of-way, if there is sufficient right-of-way to add the road improvements, a curb and a sidewalk, and the Board is concerned about having a sidewalk there, perhaps an easement along the front would accommodate a sidewalk to be constructed in the future. Mr. Heupel stated the property line is about 12' off the road. He did not know if there were plans to widen the road, if they even could. But basically, based on the existing storm drain, the curb would be 12' off the property line which would give you an ample grass strip and ample sidewalk line. Engineer Dougherty stated that would all depend on if the road was going to be widened. Mayor Wilkie stated it's too early to know.

Engineer Dougherty stated that there is one correction to the plan and that is to refer to the zoning table. Mr. Patterson stated he will make that correction.

Engineer Dougherty stated that this development is too small to require stormwater management to kick in; but the applicant is providing a dry well, which he does encourage them to do, which will try to get water circulating back into the ground water table as opposed to just running off.



Engineer Dougherty commented on the flood damage protection. There is basically 15' above the bank, so water would have to rise 15' above the bank to be even get close to the basement elevation. But there is a method under NJDEP regulations that allows for an approximate method of calculation to be done. He is requesting that as a condition of approval, that approximate calculation should be included. An approximate method calculation will show where the creek could flood to. Mr. Patterson stated he will show that calculation.

Engineer Dougherty asked that when utilities were mentioned, are there 2 separate laterals coming off serving one house and the other house? One 2" lateral is not serving both houses, correct? It was confirmed that there will be separate taps and lines for each house.

Vice Chairman Molimock asked Planner Fegley if she had anything else. Planner Fegley stated that she and Solicitor Frank were discussing an issue. Solicitor Frank stated that somewhere in the presentation, it was stated that "we only need a variance for the lot frontage to be reduced to 60' because we want to avoid the improvements already on the lot with the existing house." He stated he wanted everybody to be clear and to understand how we get to this. There is a total of roughly 268' of frontage. With the lots in the zone that are on septic, there is a minimum lot frontage of 150' required. It's proposed that the existing dwelling remain on septic so conceptually, it requires 150' of the frontage that is available. With 268' available, there isn't a sufficient amount to provide the 275' that's actually required to create these 2 lots as of right. Unless both houses were on sewer, then you'd only need 250' and then there would be surplus frontage. The Board is talking about a lot frontage variance no matter what is being done, he just didn't want there to be an impression that the only reason that the applicant needs that lot variance is to provide a better shaped lot in the front that better accommodates the existing improvements. Part of the reason Mr. Frank is saying this is so the Board understands exactly what they are doing and also so he knows what section under Section 70 of the MLUL it falls under. If we're talking about existing improvements and that's the principal driver, then we're talking probably C1. If we're talking a better zoning alternative, better configuration, then we're talking probably C2. He stated he wanted to disentangle that and wants the Board to appreciate the sort of the steps along the way and not be under the misimpression that the applicant only needs a lot frontage variance in this instance because they want to create a better shape for the existing improvements. Unless the existing house also goes on sewer, they can't create two lots here as of right; they can come get a variance, but not as of right. If they were to go onto sewer with the existing dwelling, they have sufficient frontage to simply get this subdivision as of right, but not with where they want to put it presently with the line at 125' and that's where Mr. Heupel's explanation of getting a better configuration with a narrower front kicks in, but only then.

Thinking out loud, Ms. Szulewski stated that if they were to split it right down the middle so they each lot had the 125' frontage, that would possibly encroach into side setbacks for the existing improvements and would require a variance for that. Solicitor Frank stated it may; but, what triggered his thinking was that as of right, you could do two lots if the 125' was provided for the new proposed lot, but you don't have the 150' needed for the existing dwelling as long as it's on septic. If it were to be on sewer, then all of a sudden you have ample frontage to get an as of right subdivision. Solicitor Frank stated he just wanted everybody to understand the parameters as they are.

Seeing no other questions or comments by the Board or its professionals, it was the Motion of Mr. Montgomery, seconded by Councilman Lovenduski to open the meeting for public comment. Motion unanimously approved by all those present.

Seeing no one wishing to be heard, it was the Motion of Councilman Lovenduski, seconded by Mr. McCue to close public comment. Motion unanimously approved by all those present.

After some discussion, it was decided by the Board to waive the requirement by the applicant to put in sidewalks and to not require a contribution towards the sidewalk fund due to the construction of sidewalks to be done on that part of Potts Mill Road would most likely not be done for several years.

Solicitor Frank stated the conditions would be: the applicant to work with Planner Fegley in regards to planting of shade trees; the applicant to make the plan and detail design changes as outlined in Engineer Dougherty’s review letter; perfecting the subdivision by deed with review to be done by the Board Attorney and Engineer; and the usual conditions with escrow and taxes.

It was the Motion of Mr. Montgomery, seconded by Mr. McCue to approve the application with the conditions mentioned.

Upon roll call the Board voted as follows:

- YEAS: Montgomery, McCue, Molimock, Lovenduski, Wilkie, Pagano
- NOES: None
- ABSTAIN: None
- ABSENT: Morris

Motion carried

OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

PUBLIC COMMENT

It was the Motion of Mr. Montgomery, seconded by Mr. McCue to open the meeting for public comment. Motion unanimously approved by all those present.

Seeing no one wishing to be heard, it was the Motion of Councilman Lovenduski, seconded by Mr. Pagano to close public comment. Motion unanimously approved by all those present.

ADJOURNMENT

It was the Motion of Councilman Lovenduski, seconded by Mr. Montgomery to adjourn the meeting at 8:41 p.m. Motion unanimously approved by all those present.

---

Karen Federico, Acting Secretary