

CALL TO ORDER:

Mr. O'Leary called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m. and stated it was open to the public in compliance with Public Law 1975, Chapter 231, sections 4 & 13.

FLAG SALUTE

ROLL CALL: Members Present: Hughes, Fette, Randazzo, Corcoran, Hahn, Straub, Leuthe, Taylor, O'Leary.

Members Absent: Luthman, Didyk.

Also Present: Ursala Leo, Esq.
Nevitt Duveneck, PE

Mr. O'Leary introduced Mr. Jeff Fette as Lafayette Township's new Construction Official, Zoning Officer and Board Member. Mr. Fette was sworn in by Ms. Leo.

HEARINGS:

1.) AES Property Holdings FSP09-8 B:17 L:2.05

Mr. John Philips, Esq. of Sills, Cummis and Gross stated he was representing AES Property Holdings. He presented a letter from the owners of AES Property Holdings stating he was now the Attorney in this matter. Mr. O'Leary noted proper notice had been filed with the Board Secretary. The Board Secretary confirmed that both the escrow and taxes have been paid to date. Mr. Duveneck went over the waivers of his two completeness reports and said if the Board was in agreement to grant the requested waivers then he was recommending the Board deem the application complete and move forward with the hearing.

A motion to deem the application complete with a temporary waiver of checklist items 16, 17 & 18 was made by Mr. Corcoran. It was seconded by Mr. Hahn and passed with a roll call vote. Ayes: Hughes, Fette, Randazzo, Corcoran, Hahn, Straub, Leuthe, Taylor, O'Leary.

Ms. Leo made a disclosure that Michael Garafalo of her office Laddey, Clark & Ryan did represent the former owner of the property Tower Alpine and she has spoken to Mr. Philips and Mr. Sweeney and they feel there is no conflict in this matter. She said Tower Alpine no longer owns the property. Mr. Philips said these were not related companies. It was only a question of his client holding the mortgage on the property so he does not feel there is any relationship between the two and he had no objection.

Mr. Philips said there is the issue of the affordable housing units that permeates both their request for amendment of the preliminary approval that was extended recently and the final approval. He felt there was no issue with the technical comments of the Board Engineer with regards to the final plan.

Mr. O'Leary said he put together a history of the preliminary approval for the benefit of some of the newer members of the Board. He said the original applicant was Tower Alpine whose application was deemed incomplete August 25, 2005 and in September of 2005 they asked to be carried. They attended the October 27, 2005 meeting and presented a COAH concept that included a subdivision of the property which included two separate septic systems and two separate buildings. They returned in November with more testimony to address the Board's former Engineer, Mr. Biggs comments. There was a vote at that meeting to grant preliminary approval based on some of the COAH issues which included putting COAH units above the commercial space on the lower level. He said a preliminary site plan was granted with conditions. The first resolution was memorialized January 26, 2006. There was an amendment to that resolution addressing the COAH units which was memorialized May 26, 2006. He said recently Mr. Sweeney, Esq. came before the Board to request an extension of the preliminary approval.

Mr. Philips agreed that Mr. Sweeney was granted the extension however there is language in that resolution that the applicant is to further investigate the possibility of

adding the residential units to the top of the buildings and he is prepared to address that issue. He said the original approval was for a subdivision of the property however that is no longer the concept because it was not what was approved by the Board. Mr. Philips said their final plans conform to the preliminary plans which do not show any COAH housing. He said they are asking for a waiver of that condition because they do not think it can be built.

Mr. George Gloede, PE was sworn in by Ms. Leo and gave his qualifications to the Board which were accepted by the Board. Mr. Gloede said if they start to add the COAH units, which to his understanding was a one bedroom unit over each of the buildings with a total of two one bedroom units on the site they will go over the 2000 gallon per day limit. He said presently the septic system that was designed and approved was for 1875 gallons per day and with the addition of the residential units it would add an additional 350 gallons to that amount which would put them over the 2000 gallons per day limit which would mean they would have to apply for a treatment works application through the State of NJ and the Lafayette Township Wastewater Management Plan would have to be amended to include this. Mr. Philips asked Mr. Gloede in order to avoid that could a subdivision be done as recommend by Mr. Biggs before this application was approved. Mr. Gloede said it could be done depending on the size of the buildings and the area that would be allotted for a septic system. He said there is a possibility that could be done. Mr. Philips asked that in light of the current design of the buildings and without redesigning the entire site would it be possible to subdivide this into two conforming lots that would have the area to carry a septic system. Mr. Gloede said with the current configuration of the plan it would not be possible. He said building B would be fine however building A would not have enough area for a septic system and meet the requirements of the code. Mr. Philips noted that this site is no longer in the Lafayette Township Mount Laurel compliance plan. Mr. Hughes asked what a Mount Laurel compliance plan was. Mr. Philips said it is the plan Lafayette submitted to the Council on Affordable Housing

Mr. Philips said based on the information given that the site would need to be redesigned, the applicant is not willing to move forward with those units at this time and they are asking that the Board amend the resolution to remove the requirement to investigate the building of the unit. He said they have investigated the building of the units and found it is not practical for the site.

Ms. Leo asked which resolution the applicant was seeking the amendment for to which Mr. Philips said the extension resolution which was condition #1 of the resolution dated February 26, 2009. Mr. Philips read condition #1.

Mr. O'Leary asked if Mr. Gloede had looked at the site plan drawings done by Dykstra to which Mr. Gloede said he had. Mr. Gloede said when he first got involved in the project he was not aware of the set of plans that had been submitted in February 2008. He said the original set of plans he submitted to the town were based on the original set of plans submitted back in 2005. Mr. Gloede said that subsequently he had duplicated some of the revisions that he had submitted as an amendment to the details on the Dykstra plans of 2008 which had a lot of the conditions of approval such as landscaping but had not addressed some of the stormwater details that he had added to his amendment of the preliminary plans and also the amendment to the stormwater management report. Mr. O'Leary said he was referring to the COAH units and he recalls the plans did have viable COAH units. Mr. Gloede said the 2008 plans by Dykstra did not have COAH shown in it because the septic system that was approved and included in that set of drawings was the same as what was included in the original set and was for a 1875 gallon septic.

Mr. Philips said there is another issue and that is weather or not in the Highway Commercial zone, residential is a permitted multi-purpose use along with commercial. He said he was aware of a provision in the HC ordinance that was in existence in 2006 that allows for one apartment over each building but it requires a separate residential septic and well which is another issue that would be difficult from an engineering standpoint. He said he was not aware of any ordinance that allows mix-use in the HC zone.

Mr. Hughes said Lafayette Township did pass an ordinance that allows for more residential units in the HC zone as long as they were deeded as affordable housing. He said it does allow more than one unit. He said it was also submitted to COAH. Mr. Philips said it was a growth share ordinance which Judge Bozonelis ruled as not valid. Mr. Hughes said the ordinance was submitted to COAH in 2005. Mr. Philips said it would be permissible for the housing not mandatory and as he has indicated the applicant is not in a position to put affordable housing over these commercial units.

Mr. Duveneck asked Mr. Gloede if there was any consideration given to a pump system on the property that abuts Route 15. He felt that was a substantial area that could support a septic system between building A and Route 15. Mr. Gloede said without doing soil testing in that area he did not know how the soils would accept it. He said he did not know if it would meet the setbacks. He said they would have to relocate the dry wells. He said the plan he has does not show the culverts coming across Route 15. He said he was not sure if they would meet the distance requirement. Mr. Duveneck felt that since the Board felt this was an important issue that at least a concept plan be prepared showing that it could not fit in there. He felt in other areas of the site they are restricted however he felt the property between building A and Route 15 was a substantial area. He said the area in question was not steep and possibly could support a septic field. He felt there should be some further investigation of this matter. Mr. Philips said the A550 Roberts Bill precludes the Board from requiring them to build affordable housing and they are exercising that option.

Mr. O'Leary noted the ordinance Mr. Hughes was referring to was 12-21.12 dated 2005 which reads growth share is a permitted conditional use.

Mr. Hughes asked Mr. Gloede if he had reviewed the engineer's reports from the past testimony on preliminary as to the units being placed above the commercial space and the septic. Mr. Philips said he will let Mr. Gloede answer the question but he did not feel it was relevant because the Board had approved the preliminary site plan application with the requirement that they investigate affordable housing. He said they have investigated affordable housing and the applicant does not want affordable housing and they still have a site plan that was approved subject to that one condition. He said he did not feel it was appropriate for this Board to compel the applicant to build that housing. Mr. Gloede said no he did not review the testimony that was given before this Board at that time. Mr. O'Leary asked Mr. Gloede if he review Mr. Dykstra's testimony. Mr. Gloede said what he did see was the resolution and the comment letter from Mr. Biggs that was part of the resolution. Mr. O'Leary asked Mr. Gloede if he reviewed the plans from Mr. Dykstra which were amended a few times. Mr. Gloede said he did see the original set of plans that were submitted and the revised plans that were submitted in February 2008. He said he reviewed the plans that were approved by the Board.

Mr. Hughes said that at that time the Municipal Engineer had done some calculations with the applicant's engineer Mr. Dykstra, in regards with calculations for the two septic fields and with that they did confirm that it was feasible with a number of units going above. He said the Township had approached COAH for determination and waiver requests for going from the one, two or three bedroom to allowing four or five one bedroom units. He said it was pursued by both the applicant and the municipality and it was in the Affordable Housing Plan that was submitted to COAH. Mr. Hughes said it had not been added to the latest COAH amendment because the applicant had not done anything with the property. He said there were funds by both the Township and the applicant invested in the affordable housing for this site. Mr. O'Leary said he remembers testimony that the reason for the subdivision was to keep the gallons under the 2000 limit. He said Mr. Dykstra did make the representation that it was feasible. Mr. O'Leary said the units were even reduced in size to make sure the wastewater would be within the limit. Mr. Philips said the applicant is not interested in proceeding with the affordable housing aspect of this site.

Mr. Duveneck said he was puzzled as to why the originally approved septic system was not shown on the Dykstra plans that were submitted in 2008. Mr. O'Leary recalled seeing plans with two septic fields shown on it. They were the plans submitted prior to the plans submitted by Dykstra in 2008.

Mr. Philips said that at the time the plans showing the two buildings with the two septic systems were submitted there was no ordinance in place. He said it was pending but not in place and it was the Town's Growth Share Ordinance that has subsequently been ruled invalid. He felt the Board did not have the authority under the law to impose the obligation.

Ms. Leo asked if there was a copy of the approved plans that the Board could look at. Mr. O'Leary said the only drawing the Board had was the more recent drawing that was submitted which is the final site plan and did not have a lot of detail with respect to lighting, landscaping. Ms. Leo said she had Dykstra plans dated 5-10-05 with no revision date. Mr. O'Leary said he remembers there being architectural plans as well.

Mr. Philips said in the May 25, 2006 resolution of approval, on page 4 at the top it says "Mr. Speulstra testified that in order to do so, the property would need to be subdivided into two lots to increase septic capacity with one mini-mall and five proposed overhead COAH apartments on each property. The Board found this concept to be of interest." Mr. Philips said the language in this resolution was after there had been an approval of the septic plans which did not show a subdivision. He said the approved plans did not show a subdivision. Ms. Leo said the Board has to interpret the resolution and the resolution says the applicant will pursue building affordable housing on the second story of the two mini-malls which have received preliminary site plan approval. She said for final approval the Board needs to confirm that the conditions of the preliminary approval have been met and the standards as they existed. She felt it was an interpretation issue.

Mr. Randazzo felt he would need to review the resolution in order to make an interpretation of it. Mr. Hughes felt he would need to see all of the previously submitted and approved plans to make a determination. He said he knew it was feasible based on all of the calculations done by the Applicant's Engineer and the Municipal Engineer. Ms. Leo said the Board needs to base its decision on the language of its resolution. Ms. Leo read condition number 1 of the February 26, 2009 resolution.

Mr. Philips said of the two mini-malls that have received approval, they cannot put affordable housing on without going through the situation of an amendment of the wastewater management plan and a N.J.D.E.P. permit.

Ms. Leo read through all of the conditions of the May 25, 2006 resolution. She said they are under the preliminary conditions. Mr. Philips said he was asking for the removal of condition number 1. Mr. Randazzo asked why Mr. Philips wanted the condition removed if he felt he met the condition and has testimony that says it is not feasible. Mr. Philips said in the over abundance of caution rather than have an interpretation question, they want that condition removed. He said his client wants to start the development of the property and in order to do that they need to get final approval and there are some D.E.P. permits which will expire later on this year. They have to move quickly so he did not want a situation where they came in and there was a question if this condition did or did not apply. He wanted it resolved one way or the other. Mr. Randazzo asked why it could not be resolved by the Board agreeing the testimony the applicant's engineer gave meets that condition rather than having it removed. Mr. Philips said they have asked for that condition to be removed, he has indicated a number of reasons why it can't be met and why it probably is not valid. He said he is asking the Board to remove it and if the Board chooses not to remove it then he will do what he has to do. He said if the Board removes it they will ask for final approval because the testimony was very simple.

Mr. O'Leary said one of the problems is there was a switch in council and he felt the Board was not prepared to address the removal of the condition. He said Board members may want to review minutes or listen to the tapes of the original meetings. He felt the applicant did not advise the Board they were seeking the removal of the condition regarding COAH. He felt the applicant was asking the Board Members to make a decision whether or not this was an absolute condition on the original preliminary approval. Mrs. Straub felt the Board was caught by surprise with this request. Mr. Hughes felt the testimony given tonight that the septic calculations were not feasible contradict the testimony in the original hearing stating it was feasible. Mr. Philips said

the notice included the language to amend the resolution. Ms. Leo said the application was just for final major site plan.

A motion to have condition number 1 from the February 26, 2009 resolution not be removed was made by Mr. Randazzo. It was seconded by Mr. Hahn and passed with a roll call vote. Ayes: Hughes, Fette, Randazzo, Corcoran, Straub, Hahn, Leuthe, Taylor, O'Leary. Mr. O'Leary said he voted yes because of the inconsistent testimony of the two engineers.

Mr. Philips continued with his testimony for the final site plan approval. Mr. Philips asked Mr. Gloede if the final plans submitted and reviewed with the final comments of the Board Engineer comply with the preliminary plans that were approved to which Mr. Gloede said yes. Mr. Duveneck said the applicant agreed with all of the comments in his technical review of the application. He said there is work that needs to be done with regards to stormwater management but that can be handled directly through himself and the applicant's engineer. Mr. Philips had no objection with this. Mr. Duveneck asked the Board if the revised landscape plans with regards to building B were what they were looking for. He felt there was a fair amount of landscaping shown and the tree selection was fine. Mr. O'Leary said the Board had a concern with the visibility of the building from the Paulinskill walking path behind the proposed building B. Mr. Duveneck felt the landscaping was fine.

Mr. Duveneck said he did not have architectural plans and he said there was mention of a clock tower. Mr. Philips said the clock tower will not be lit. Mr. Duveneck said there is a question about COAH and how it plays into the architectural plans. He said that remains an open item.

Ms. Leo said so long as the applicant conforms to the ordinance standards and the conditions of preliminary approval they are entitled to final approval. Mr. Duveneck felt the Board would want to see what the look of the building will be and he would not feel comfortable with the jurisdiction of approving the architecture of the buildings. Mr. O'Leary said there were architectural drawings presented to the Board in 2005. Ms. Leo said the engineer's report of December 29, 2005 specifically made that a condition of approval. Mr. Duveneck said he reviewed the report and has referenced it in his report.

Mr. O'Leary said the trash enclosure is not shown on the drawings. He said there was a conservation easement that has not been addressed. Ms. Leo asked if the conservation easement was shown on the plans. Mr. Gloede said the plans reference the Dykstra plans. Ms. Leo said the conservation easement was to protect the wetland buffers. Mr. Gloede said he believed it was shown on the revised plans by Mr. Dykstra. Mr. Duveneck clarified that the original Dykstra plans stand for preliminary. He said Mr. Gloede then submitted plans with addendums to it. Mr. Gloede had prepared preliminary site plan addendums. Mr. Duveneck said septic details need to be addressed and can be handled with addendum plans.

Mr. O'Leary asked Mr. Philips if he would afford the Board some additional time to look into the septic issue and possibly submit some additional plans. Mr. Philips said they had no intention of submitting additional plans. Ms. Leo said all the Board can do is make sure they have met the ordinance standards and conditions of approval.

Mr. O'Leary said the problem he has is that the applicant is asking for final approval without the COAH issue intact and having insufficient plans. Ms. Leo said the issue before the Board is if the applicant has pursued COAH not the COAH units themselves. She said they only need to comply with the condition. Ms. Leo asked Mr. Gloede what preliminary plans were approved. Mr. Gloede said the site plans that do not show a subdivision or show two separate septic systems which is dated 5/10/05 with a revision of November 2008. He said the revised plans were submitted. Mr. O'Leary said he has the originally submitted plans and the two sheets drawn by Mr. Gloede that deal with sign detail and one other sheet. Mr. Gloede said he was working off of the original set of plans from 2005. He then discovered there was a second set of plans that were submitted in 2008. Mr. O'Leary said the applicant submitted those plans dated 2008 and they were never given to the Board Members due to the fact that the applicant never paid the

application fee or posted escrow. Mr. Philips said the engineer works out the details of the preliminary approval and comes to final with all of the details worked out on the plans and makes sure the conditions were met. He said once the applicant gets approval the two engineers work towards compliance. Mr. Philips said that their final site plan drawing that was submitted to the Board is fully compliant to the statute and the Town's ordinance for final site plan. There was a discussion on what was provided to the Board in the application package.

Mr. Randazzo said the applicant's engineer testified that the COAH housing cannot be built because of the septic calculations. He asked Mr. Duveneck if he felt there was enough information to come to the same conclusion to which Mr. Duveneck said no. Mr. Duveneck said there was a lot of work done by the applicant's former engineer to prove the COAH housing could work.

Mr. O'Leary asked if Mr. Philips would afford the Board time to look at these reports and the plans they have not received.

Mr. Randazzo felt the applicant needs to come back with some information and demonstrate that the COAH housing is not feasible. Mr. Philips said adding the COAH units would bring them over the 2000 gallon limit and would require them to redo the plans and they are not willing to provide new plans to the Board. He said he did not believe the ordinance is valid and therefore the Board cannot impose the COAH housing. He was hesitant to provide the Board any more time because they are not going to provide the Board with any more documents. Mr. Duveneck asked if they could provide the plans that related to Mr. Biggs report. Mr. Philips said they are not going to provide it.

Mr. Hughes said they do not have enough information and it appears the applicant has not complied with condition number 1 of the resolution. Mr. Philips said he will afford the Board until July 23, 2009 to make a decision. The matter was carried to the July 23, 2009 meeting date.

2.) Barsumyan MNR08-16 B:14 L: 15.07

Mr. O'Leary noted the application had been dismissed without prejudice.

3.) Peck, Harold MNR09-1, VAR09-2 B:14 L:11.01

Mr. O'Leary noted the application has been deemed incomplete.

4.) Handwerg Drive Realty VAR08-14 B:14 L:7

Mr. O'Leary noted the application has been deemed incomplete.

5.) Casagrande MNR09-3, SP09-4, FSP09-5, VAR09-6, VAR09-7 B:15 L:6.01

Mr. O'Leary noted the application has been deemed incomplete.

6.) Lentini Redi-Mix AFSP09-9 B:1.10 L:1

Ms. Leo disclosed she had used Mr. Lentini's services two months ago however it did not affect her role in this matter.

Ms. Megan Ward, Esq. stated she was representing the applicant. She said they were looking for an extension of an approved site plan for the concrete facility at the quarry. She said they did not notice in time for this meeting and are requesting the hearing be carried to the July 23, 2009 meeting date.

Mr. Hughes made a motion to carry the Lentini Redi-Mix application to the July 23, 2009 meeting date. It was seconded by Mr. Straub and passed with a roll call vote. Ayes: Hughes, Fette, Randazzo, Corcoran, Straub, Hahn, Leuthe, Taylor, O'Leary.

7.) Lafayette Asphalt SP09-10, FSP09-11 B:1.02 L:1

Ms. Megan Ward, Esq. stated she was representing the applicant. She wanted to address the matter of completeness. Mr. O'Leary noted the application was deemed incomplete on May 28, 2009. Ms. Ward said they agreed to the conditions and temporary waivers in the engineers report. Ms. Ward explained that waiving the EIS requirement for the

matter of completeness does not mean the Board cannot ask for it in the future. She asked if it was possible to make the revisions to the plans after the hearing so all of the changes can be made at one time. She asked that the Board deem the application complete.

Mr. Duveneck asked how the Board will determine the extent of a variance for buffering without the line drawn on the plan. Ms. Ward said the plan shows the setback. Mr. Duveneck said it shows a 100 foot setback. Ms. Ward said that is a valid point and the 200 foot setback was not on the plan due to the fact that they had not requested a variance when they submitted the application. Mr. Duveneck said he could not do a review if he did not have a plan that showed how much of an encroachment it would be. He said this may have been overlooked in the original approval. Ms. Ward said they will submit a revised plan however she is still seeking to be deemed complete. Mr. Duveneck said he can do a completeness review and a technical review and then be prepared to deem the application complete at the next hearing date and move right into the hearing so long as the information was presented to him with enough time for his review. Ms. Ward said she will notice for the July 23, 2009 meeting date.

Mr. O'Leary said the Board would want an EIS. Ms. Ward said she expects questions about the processing of the asphalt and they will be prepared to answer those questions. Ms. Leo said the Board wanted an EIS done as a matter of completeness. Ms. Ward said she understood there are environmental issues that the Board may have a concern with. Ms. Ward asked if there are any other specific issues they should be address. Mr. O'Leary said they should address traffic, the number so truck trips per day and the hours of operation. Mr. Hughes asked about the 10,000 square foot concrete pad. Ms. Ward said that would be the only disturbance. Mr. Randazzo asked that she address the materials that are brought into the site to make the asphalt.

Mr. Corcoran asked about the proposed electrical plant. Ms. Ward said she will address that at the hearing.

8.) Jiggetts, Danita VAR09-12 B:22 L:20.06

Mr. O'Leary noted the applicant will be present at next month's meeting.

AUDIENCE:

Mr. O'Leary opened the meeting to the public. With nobody coming forward, the meeting was closed to the public.

OLD BUSINESS:

1.) Residential Zone

Mr. O'Leary noted the Board had been provided with revision two of the proposed changes to the residential zone section of the ordinance. Mr. O'Leary noted Ms. Leo had submitted to the Board a memo on unconstrained land. Ms. Leo explained her memo to the Board. There was a discussion on whether the well and septic should be allowed to be placed in constrained land.

Mr. Fette noted the issue of traffic safety with regards to the roadside stands is not something he is licensed to handle. There was a concern on how the Engineer would handle the inspection of the roadside stand and how he would get paid for his effort. Mr. Fette noted anything over 200 square feet requires a footing and becomes a permanent structure. He said the Board can limit the size to 200 square feet and anything over that would require a site plan. Mr. O'Leary said they were trying to allow residents the opportunity to have a roadside stand without making them go through the Board to get it. Mr. Fette suggested limiting the size to 200 square feet and have it enforced by the construction office. Mr. O'Leary said if they want something more permanent they will need to come for a site plan. Mr. Duveneck suggested the Board look at how the ordinance determines when a site plan is required. The Board agreed to change the size of the roadside stand to 200 square feet.

The Board agreed to carry this matter to the next workshop meeting.

NEW BUSINESS:

Mr. Hughes asked if any of the Board members had received the report on the wastewater amendment written by Cerenzio & Panaro. Mr. Corcoran said only the Committee had received a copy. The Board Secretary will get copies to the Board.

RESOLUTIONS: None.

ORDINANCES: None.

ZONING REPORT:

Mr. Fette reported he sent a violation to 83 Decker Road for parking three commercial trucks on the property.

Mr. Fette said he has put together a pool packet to hand out to anyone who is considering an in ground or above ground pool. He said he will be looking very closely at the pools in town. He explained the fencing and barriers that are required for pools.

BILLS: List #9

1.) Old Bills

Mr. Leuthe explained the H2M bills to the Board. He said he has spoken to the Chief Financial Officer regarding the amount of money in the budget for these old bills. Mr. Leuthe proposed sending a letter to H2M Group stating what is left in the budget or escrow to pay their bills and see if they will accept the amount we are proposing. He suggested we also ask for the work product for the ordinance revisions. The Board Secretary will send the letter to H2M.

A motion to pay the bills with what is left in the budget and various escrow accounts after sending a letter to and getting confirmation from H2M within 10 days of the receiving the letter that the amount will be acceptable was made by Mr. Leuthe. It was seconded by Mr. Hahn and passed with a roll call vote. Ayes: Hughes, Fette, Randazzo, Corcoran, Straub, Hahn, Leuthe, Taylor, O'Leary.

EXECUTIVE SESSION:

CORRESPONDENCE:

1.) From: Anna Rose Fedish, RMC
To: Nancy Reading, Esq.
Re: Past Due Bills

2.) From: Megan Ward, Esq.
Re: Lentini Redi-Mix

ADJOURNMENT:

A motion to adjourn at 10:27 p.m. was made by Mr. Hahn. It was seconded by Mr. Corcoran and passed with everyone saying aye.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephanie Pizzulo
Land Use Board Secretary