

MINUTES - ZONING BOARD

May 9, 2016

The meeting was called to order at 8:10 P.M. by Mr. Marotta, Chairman.

ROLL CALL:

Members Present:

Mr. Marotta
Mr. Bovasso
Mr. Pistol
Ms. Hay
Mr. Higgins

Members Absent:

Mr. Illing - recused
Mr. Salomon

Alternates Present:

Mr. Weisgerber
Ms. Dehnhard

Alternates Absent:

None

Also in attendance: Ruthanne Della Serra, Robert Hudak and David Weeks, Esquire.

COMMUNICATIONS:

None

RESOLUTIONS OF MEMORIALIZATION

Application #ZBA 15-040:

Christopher and Ana Chervenyak, Applicants

102 Riverside Drive, Block: 264, Lot: 16, Zone: R-4

To permit construction to increase volume of the attic to create a full third story and expansion of front porch on subject property with the following variances: increasing volume of the attic to create a full third story (§ 136-30 Sch. 1 Attachment 1.); less than the minimum required front yard setback (§ 136-30 Sch. 1 Attachment 1).

The Resolution of Memorialization (attached and made part of these minutes) as amended was reviewed by the Board. After discussion, a motion to approve the resolution was made by Mr. Higgins, seconded by Mr. Bovasso and passed with the

following voting in favor of the motion: Mr. Bovasso, Mr. Pistol, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Bovasso, Mr. Weisgerber and Ms. Dehnhard.

MINUTES:

Motion to approve the minutes of April 25, 2016 (as amended) was made by Mr. Bovasso, seconded by Mr. Weisgerber and passed on unanimous voice vote.

OLD/NEW BUSINESS

None

The workshop portion of the meeting concluded at 8:14 P.M.

PUBLIC MEETING:

A public meeting of the Cranford Board of Adjustment was called to order by Mr. Marotta on May 9, 2016 at 8:15 P.M. in Room 107 of the Municipal Building, 8 Springfield Avenue, Cranford, New Jersey. Mr. Marotta announced in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Open Public Meetings Act, the Westfield Leader or Star Ledger has been notified and the agenda posted in the municipal building as required.

Mr. Marotta explained the protocol, purpose and procedure that will be followed during the hearing.

Application #ZBA-15-026: Continuation

310 Centennial Avenue, LLC, Applicant

310 Centennial Avenue, Block 525, Lot 5, VC Zone

Site plan approval to permit construction of a new mixed-use building with the following variances: to exceed the maximum allowable height and number of stories (§136-30 Schedule 1, Attachment 1) and NJSA40:55D-70(1); less than the minimum required area for a parking space (§136-23.6(3)[a][1]; tree island breaks not provided (§136-23.6(8)[c]; granite block curbing not provided (§136-23.6(8)[g]; loading/unloading zone not provided (§136-23.6(12); less than the minimum required front yard setback (§136-30 Schedule 1 Attachment 1 (front yard setback); and less than the minimum required rear yard setback (§136-30 Schedule 1 Attachment 1 (rear yard setback).

Mr. Pistol signed a certification that he has reviewed the application, hearing of March 21, 2016 and is able to participate in hearing and deliberation process of the application.

Joseph J. Triarsi, Esquire appeared on behalf of the applicant.

Previous witnesses:

Gehane Triarsi, spokesman on behalf of Applicant
Joseph Steiger, Traffic Engineer
Ed Dec, Engineer

Exhibits:

Exhibit A-1 rendering of project when developed
Exhibit A-2 dated July 6, 2015 consisting of all architectural drawings, 7 sheets.

Mr. Hudak explained for the benefit of those in attendance and the Board the proposed parking of 35 on site and 3 on-street which is permitted to be included in the calculations. Research conducted due to error in the ordinance regarding off-street parking spaces. Indicates, only need to provide parking for residential units and therefore would affirm the error. If not an error, even if the commercial piece was included would need 36 spaces, and applicant is providing 38 spaces and therefore no need for a variance and parking provided is in compliance in either case.

Questions posed by the public as to parking:

Sally Kleeman – Confirmed applicant is allowed to use spaces on Centennial/North Lehigh and is allowed to count those spaces towards the parking requirements. Three off-street spaces included in calculations.

Mr. Triarsi agrees with Mr. Hudak's comments and determination, and believes per ordinance 30 are required and applicant is providing 35 on-site and 3 on-street. Complies in either calculation.

Site Plan marked as Exhibit A-5.

Mr. Hudak explained ordinance was written incorrectly, and if read as applicant indicates commercial space would not be required to be included in calculations.

Mr. Triarsi advised two witnesses to be heard this evening: Paul Donovan, Operations Manager and Michael Tobia, Planner

Paul Donovan, Real Estate professional and operations manager of numerous facilities, appeared and was sworn.

He manages units such as proposed regarding staff, contractors, preparing budgets, processing applications, income guidelines, concerned with quality of tenants. Assigning parking spaces would typically be handled by the supervisor onsite and usually assigned one per unit, and others are first come first serve.

Mr. Triarsi explained at first meeting, Mr. Donovan sought to testify regarding pick-up of refuse. Discussion held afterward to obtain prospective of how these things are managed in real life, and wanted him to speak as to garbage removal and reservation parking, maintenance of site and entire management process.

Mr. Donovan provided the following information as to the operations of the facility: Building of this size requires a part-time superintendent. Usually, 1 full time super for every 70 to 100 units. Could be a tenant onsite.

Pamphlets distributed. Mr. Donovan examined site plan and location of trash area. He would propose two 2-yard plastic containers and one 3-yard for recycling. All are on rollers that can be rolled out to be picked up, less noise, no rust and light weight.

Exhibit A-6 (pamphlet) would be his recommendation for storage of trash until removed. Specifically, what is shown on page 2. Trash would be picked up between 2 and 3 times per week, garbage truck would pull alongside of the building, roll out containers to be emptied and truck would leave. Typical of what happens at facilities of this size and would be adequate method of removal and far more sanitary.

Maintenance - part-time superintendent (possibly living on-site) duties would encompass: review of tenants, giving out rent notices, supervision of repairs and for any that they could not accomplish would arrange for expert repairman. Is typical way smaller facilities would run.

Questions posed by the Board ascertained the following:

Was in attendance and questioned expert as to garbage storage and pick up. Removal of individual cans is a disaster, do not want to see that, would like to see clean facility. He recommends plastic garbage containers. Had not thought about commercial element. Since not looking at a restaurant, refuse would be minimal and could have their own dumpster that could also be accommodated in same space. Pick up would depend on usage, could be 2X or 3X per week.

There were no further questions posed by the Board.

Mr. Marotta opened the application to the public for questions of the witness with the following appearing:

Lee Robinson – Confirmed type of tenant in commercial space has not yet been determined, however will not a restaurant.

Sally Kleeman – Clarified Mr. Donovan is not an employee of the company that is building the development. These are his professional opinions that were requested by Mr. Triarsi and/or the developer. Questioned why the developer did not have this

information and believed odd. Mr. Triarsi advised fact is this aspect became an issue at last meeting and was reason he reached out to Mr. Donovan.

No else appeared and this portion of the hearing was closed with the matter referred back to the Board.

Michael Tobia, Appeared and was sworn. His credentials were presented to the Board and he was accepted as an expert witness in the field of professional planner.

Received commission from applicant to conduct study of site.

As exists: 21,000 square foot parcel with abandoned service station
Exhibit A-3 – Dated 8/26/2015 – depicts existing site from Centennial Avenue with one-story building, overgrown, multiple curb cuts, no landscaping.

Exhibit A-4 – Dated 8/26/2015 – shows site from North Lehigh Avenue, shows boarded, broken windows and overgrown. Has not been in productive use for years.

Inactive and neglected site. 165 feet of frontage on Centennial Avenue, corner lot, allows traffic in a circular fashion, flat and devoid of environmental characteristics. Superb asset in middle of zone.

Applicant proposes (A-1 rendering of proposal): 20 rental units for residential housing, ground would be on-site parking and in front corner 1952 square foot retail presence that gives site pedestrian activity as others in the area. VC zone and does permits retail on first floor as well as residential on upper floors. Not a use variance proposal.

Related 2009 Master Plan created the VC zone that before was a B-3 zone. Master Plan had vision that some of activity such as along train station should be brought along Centennial Avenue. VC district is envisioned as pedestrian friendly area. Goals and Objectives - to create attractive gateways, wide range of housing, adequate parking and infill development that is done in a manner that is consistent with the neighborhood, retail space and residential above.

Zoning ordinance gives parameters as to height, bulk variances, generally a zone that is specific to Centennial Avenue from train trestle to Lincoln school.

Height up to 38 feet - no height variance is required.

Far of 1.8 - below with no variance is required

90% coverage – proposing 84.9% with no variance required

Side yard setbacks are met,

Front yard setback – providing less than required and variance is required.

Modestly dense development 3 stories high, close to street to promote pedestrian activity, separated from street by sidewalk and landscaping.

Proposal before the Board enhances Master Plan and zoning ordinance.

Density - both are permitted uses. Board has the power to hear variances as to permitted density. Allows 20 units per acre, applicant proposes 41 per acre. Per ordinance would permit 9.7 units, while applicant proposes 20 and only applies to second and third floor which use is permitted. D variance in this case is for density and question before the Board is whether proposed is appropriate. Case law has studied this issue – says when density is only D variance, do not need to justify the use. When becomes an issue, is when higher density will result in substantial detriment to area. Density is tied to wellbeing of persons in the neighborhood. Several indicators of when density is right or wrong – one is parking and applicant is compliant. Another is whether structure exceeds height requirements and here does not and variance is not required. Another indicator would be coverage, with proposal less than allowable coverage. Another would be floor area, and again proposal is approximately one-quarter below allowable. Density should not be an issue.

Reverse logic when in downtown areas, one would like more density, more households, when in residential zone would want less. Business and village commercial works when you provide activity and promotes community atmosphere.

In conclusion, referring to the Master Plan, when previously was designated as a B-3 zone had similar zoning scheme that would have permitted 27 units on this site with applicant proposing 20 units. Master Plan seeks mixed use buildings, pedestrian friendly activity and thriving retail activity in this area.

Additional Bulk variances being sought:

Sheet three of site plan (Exhibit A-5, June 29, 2015) parking variance removed.

Rear yard setback – required 25feet, proposes 16.9 feet on a foot portion of the building that is 60 feet in length, nearest structure is a detached garage that is 2 to 5 feet off the property line, dwelling is another 10 feet off the property. Fence and landscaping are proposed.

Required parking setback is 25 feet from property line, if met would reduce half of the proposed parking. Proposes 2.3 feet at its nearest point and will be separated by fence and landscaping.

Technical items – in addition to addressing the Master Plan, Land Use Law advises on the topic of intent and purpose, a proposal that seeks a density variance that we believe is a benefit to the area as site is .6 miles from train station; promotes more efficient use of land (currently blighted); is first property that is seen when entering the area and is

gateway entrance with proposal being a mass improvement; have activity just north of the area and proposal could be catalyst or anchor use; landmark building in this zone.

Are variances going to create a substantial detriment to public good or substantial impairment to zoning ordinance. This is a permitted use, meets coverage, FAR, building height, satisfies parking, available on-street parking with nearby parking lots available. Proposal is an asset not a detriment and is doing what the Master Plan/Zoning Plan specifically seeks.

Questions posed by the Board ascertained the following:

Biggest issue is density, and traffic in area resulting from planning standpoint - Traffic expert testified at last meeting, in simplest terms more traffic, more pedestrian activity, things that slow down promote business activity. Mr. Triarsi reviewed traffic testimony given at last hearing that resulted in A service. FAR that is contemplated – relates to total floor area divided by site area and is indicator that proposal is about one-quarter below allowable. Retail is proposed on ground floor as is permitted and if active, contributes to other existing businesses in the neighborhood.

With regard to density, was study performed as to what density of existing apartment are in Cranford – was not, is old standard around garden apartments and proposed is more what would be seen in business areas with parking above. Mr. Hudak indicated would be comparing apples and oranges as Riverfront and 555 South Avenue were redevelopment zones, some units in downtown are 63 units per acre. Not relevant as superseded the zoning and different set of facts. Member believed squeezing in due to set back variances required indicates too dense - Mr. Tobia explained case law, did not pave too much of site, does not exceed height, parking met, di mini mus front yard variance, rear yard required for 60 feet when building is 148 feet long. Application meets most of zoning short on a few, to remove what is on site now, is his conclusion density is appropriate for the site, what Master Plan and Zoning Plan indicate is appropriate. Mr. Triarsi explained originally sought 27 units that was reduced to 20, and when everything is put in prospective, proposal meets all requirements with the exception of a few minor bulk variances.

As a professional planner, downtown district and VC district is not interchangeable, downtown would have higher density, Master Plan set down a bit more in downtown area. Not every bit as big or as dense as across from the train station.

Mr. Triarsi confirmed traffic study was prepared in August, 2015.

There were no further questions posed by the Board.

Mr. Marotta opened the application to the public for questions of the witness with the following appearing:

Lee Robinson – requested clarification on side yard setback variances, believes too much in the area, why can't a building be built that meets the requirements. Mr. Tobia explained any applicant has the right to request variances, if all were to be met, would lose half the parking and then half the units. This is a property mired in environmental clean-up that results in risks, no one in 35 years has presented a proposal to clean up the property. Did not seek large number of units and is balancing act the Board will deliberate on. Questioned traffic and school children and whether pets will be permitted. Mr. Tobia stated he cannot testify to pets being allowed. Clarified restaurant is not being proposed, retail type tenants to keep the parking demand low.

No else appeared and this portion of the hearing was closed with the matter referred back to the Board.

Mr. Marotta opened the application to the public for comments with the following appearing:

Lee Robinson, appeared and was sworn in. Regarding parking spaces that are being credited to the application, three spaces are currently public parking spaces and anyone can use then but they are in front of the applicant's property.

Chiara Siliato, appeared and was sworn in. On behalf of Centennial Avenue Village Group, read statement dated March 17, 2016 into the record. Mr. Triarsi clarified must speak on herself and not on behalf of a group. Asked members of Zoning Board to consider Centennial Avenue streetscape when deliberating, and include an additional cross walk with pedestrian sign across Centennial Avenue, such as on Elm Street with one of similar nature be installed as a calming device. Mr. Triarsi commented if Police Department believes it is a benefit, will install. Also requested a light (flashing sign) such as on Springfield and Miln. Mr. Weeks explained cannot attach as a condition except to discuss with the Traffic Department.

Marie Mayer, appeared and was sworn in. As a neighboring property owner, is thrilled that someone wants to do something with the site, but there has been no discussion as to easement they have for 8 feet to gain access to their property and presented information to the applicant and has not heard anything since then. Has been discussion as to variances but not to address the easement. Mr. Triarsi stated plans do not call for any encroachment in that area, and recorded easement gives them the right to use with applicant not intending to encroach in that area and will honor the easement. Ed Dec explained the building is 5 feet off the property line and easement is for 8 feet from property line. Discussion held on same. Should the application go forward, title company will conduct search. Mr. Weeks explained the easement is a private issue between the Mayers and the potential owner, and will be resolved if and when it arises. Understands not a Board issue, information was provided by email and again in January with book and page provided recorded in 1930. Mr. Triarsi explained applicant

conducted a title search that did not reveal a recorded easement. Mr. Triarsi requested phone number to discuss.

Michael Chuley, appeared and was sworn in. As owner of neighboring house, several reasons why people come to Cranford to raise their family, rated higher than other towns for safety and school system. Proposing to construct a 20 unit building that results in child safety issues, traffic concerns etc. When he asked if study should have been done when school was open, and expert indicated yes. Believes this results in concern with the study. Believes trips generated will be 120 per day onto Lehigh Avenue where his children walk every day. Noise and pollution will create an urban town that is not a benefit to the town or the neighbors. If we wanted party life or excitement, would have moved to a different town. Village Commercial district visions relayed. Does it improve pedestrian and automobile safety, small town character, does it create a core, transitional buffer zones, limit traffic, preserve and protect small town character. Applicants burden to show, and simply did not do it. Just this morning, corner of North Lehigh at 8:05AM has photo depicting line of cars. Does not believe beneficial.

Brenden Deoliveira, appeared and was sworn in. He stated lives behind the potential development. Quiet family orientated neighborhood, and applicant stated apartments are to improve the neighborhood, but will be negatively impacted. Apartment complexes on every corner, moving away from Tree City USA. Traffic will increase. Fears property value will lower.

Eric Shaw, appeared and was sworn in. Comes down to safety to and from school. With that many people moving into the area, comes down to safety.

Thomas Boger-O'Bryan, appeared and was sworn in. Lives on far end of Lehigh, his family does not need to worry about the traffic, but he does as he needs to make a turn onto Centennial. Needs a full traffic light. Traffic is a problem, did not take school time traffic study and without that, does not get the full picture of what exists and how the neighborhood is used to avoid turns onto Centennial. All can attest when you get to Centennial – most will avoid the intersection and traverse the neighborhood street. Not a true traffic survey, not getting a full picture. If seeking variances, clearly too large. If variances are provided, if Centennial is considered VC, how far down does that go, can think of two more properties where we could be back here in 6 months. Mr. Hudak explained VC zone lines.

Thomas Planer – appeared and was sworn in. Laws are in place to protect the future of the community, what happens if the project does not succeed. What happens if sold? Does not think this giant building needing all these variances is protecting the future.

Amanda Storti, appeared and was sworn in. She stated agrees with everything that has been said. Is an existing community, lives on corner of big feeder street and safety is always an issue. Nice to have new business there, but smaller unit, believes too big. Should not gamble with neighborhood community, and believes apartments would be a detriment to the area with many concerns.

Louis Kleeman, appeared and was sworn in. Basically comes down to a quality of life, understands where applicant is coming from, but other side of coin is what the people in attendance are speaking of. Does not take into consideration hours of permitted parking. Lost 3 spaces due to fire code, that are occupied 24 hours per day, and with those gone will push the vehicles further down the street and that infringes on his quality of life and value of the property. Whose is more valuable, theirs or mine? Realizes something needs to be done. Knows history of the town, knows side streets, and they are feeders to avoid. Need to contain what will happen if this is developed.

Brian McCarthy, appeared and was sworn in. Believes something does need to happen with the property, but this is just too large. Behind this proposed building is a large community with families and great neighborhood that already experiences traffic cutting through. And proposal will only add to the traffic.

Sally Kleeman, appeared and was sworn in. Question of the Board – is overnight parking permitted on Centennial? No and during snow removal would require finding another place to park. Fails to see how one small retail unit fits into the master plan, would like to see more retail. Would not discourage any one from moving to Cranford, but this is too dense. Proposal turns area into an urban area. If this is approved, will this set precedent for the rest of Centennial Avenue, with need to look ahead as well as back and take that into account.

Dalber Pereira, appeared and was sworn in. Lived in Cranford for a decade and two years volunteered with rescue squad, stretchers are about 6 feet long, and will elevator accommodate. Mr. Hudak explained that is covered under state building code. Unfortunately, elevators are becoming more compact, new buildings barely fit stretchers let alone the rescue squad, would need well sized elevator. Could be catastrophic. Mr. Marotta and Mr. Hudak clarified must comply with both the state building code as well as ADA requirements.

Martha Sturm, appeared and was sworn in. Lovely and beautifully designed building , if designed for 20 could be designed for 10 like the zoning calls for. Believes when coming to request variances, is on the applicant to prove no detrimental impact on the community. Like to mention traffic does not flow easily in this area as limited exist routes. Lived there for 17 years, turning left onto Centennial Avenue as very difficult, when need to exit from the garage anyone wanting to turn left on Centennial will eventually give up and will go through out Lehigh Avenue neighborhood. Is concern

with proposed configuration, as well as traffic to and from school and the parkway. Does not live adjacent to proposed building and can understand realistically would be concerned, light and air will be eliminated to many families that live close, noise will be factor due to size, could be built for 10. Live with the gas station, and an improvement would be welcome, but not at his size.

John Quick, appeared and was sworn in. Beautiful building, but does not belong in our neighborhood. No available off street parking. This belongs on North or South Avenue, not against residential housing. Trying to show horn a maximum development in small area. Does not fit there, nice quiet neighborhood with many children, and cars – who knows what will happen.

Janet Ashnault, appeared and was sworn in. The current owner is the Estate if Steve Cymbaluk as she serves as administrator, grew up in town and shared her family's history. Cymbaluk family has close to 100 years of service in the Police Department. Station was a very busy place, over the years family members worked at the station. Family was part of the original Centennial Village. This is her first time selling commercial property and wanted to sell to someone who would do something good to the neighborhood. For many months 7-11 showed interest and then withdrew, which was benefit as she did not believe appropriate. After much time, was contacted by contract purchaser and was relieved with mutual trust developed and belief proposal is compatible with what was on Centennial Avenue. Would be an asset to the people on Centennial and the area.

No one else appeared and this portion of the hearing was closed with the matter referred back to the Board.

Mr. Triarsi presented his summation.

DELIBERATION OF APPLICATION #ZBA-15-026:

Application #ZBA-15-026:

310 Centennial Avenue, LLC, Applicant

310 Centennial Avenue, Block 525, Lot 5, VC Zone

Site plan approval to permit construction of a new mixed-use building with the following variances: to exceed the maximum allowable height and number of stories (§136-30 Schedule 1, Attachment 1) and NJSA40:55D-70(1); less than the minimum required area for a parking space (§136-23.6(3)[a][1]; tree island breaks not provided (§136-23.6(8)[c]; granite block curbing not provided (§136-23.6(8)[g]; loading/unloading zone not provided (§136-23.6(12); less than the minimum required front yard setback (§136-30 Schedule 1 Attachment 1 (front yard setback); and less than the minimum required rear yard setback (§136-30 Schedule 1 Attachment 1 (rear yard setback).

Mr. Marotta reviewed the testimony.

Board comments consisted of the following:

Definitely a challenging application, dilapidated building with proposal to improve the area with a density issue and not feasible to do anything other than what is proposed. Clearly a dense property, clearly a traffic issue and impact on residential homes. Trying to balance expert and public testimony. What would be preferred, not feasible to build 10 units. Traffic is a big issue. What is going back and forth is what is bigger traffic risk - proposal or Dunkin Donuts, 7-11 and proposal seems to be the better of those choices. Facts are that it is a permitted use, height is met, parking is met, the word "substantial" is very specific word, recognize there will be issues, if another structure would have other repercussions. Presently nothing attractive nor inviting to bring others into the town. Something needs to be done, huge balancing act.

Not that difficult, likes the concept and is consistent with the Master Plan but at a much lower density and if not feasible, would rather not approve the application, would rather see one retail with adequate parking that would not close off the area. Proposal will have tunnel affect, if half or maybe $\frac{3}{4}$ density possibly. Technically meets parking requirements, not enough. Last night at midnight, 2 cars were parked in area and those spaces will be lost. Traffic brought up by the public is real concern. Business in the area has improved over last decade. Very nice looking proposal just needs to be smaller.

Chances of single story retail is not possible, from a real estate standpoint. Only thing that may work would be a Dunkin Donuts and would have 5 times the amount of traffic.

Would prefer 5 retail/commercial and 5 units. More commercial would generate far more traffic. Will only go into a place that is viable, residential will have less traffic than commercial. Applicant will incur large expense with clean-up, etc. If denied, property could sit in current condition for 10 or more years. Cost of EPA clean-up is huge investment. Heard testimony as to cost of making the site viable, has made a lot of concessions to minimize the variances and propose a viable option. Traffic in the area is a challenge discussion as to "millennials" being tenants and traffic potential. Does not believe traffic will be as intense during school hours as believed. Has been in Cranford for 25 years and site is an eye sore. Believes much more viable than 7 – 11.

Traffic is extensive at all times not just during school hours. No matter what goes there, is going to result in traffic with only option would be to remain vacant. 20 units will not result in a significant detriment to current situation, if 100 would be different.

Received good information as to garage collection, also sufficient parking provided. Not an easy vote.

Motion to approve preliminary site plan Application # ZBA-15-026 was made by Mr. Bovasso with the following conditions:

1. Will provide Fire Lane as per report recommendation.
2. Will agree to the enforcement of municipal motor vehicle laws on the site.
3. Will reduce light poles to 10 feet and include design change to colonial type pole.
4. Change to recessed lighting at entry point rather than a pole light.
5. No right turn from driveway exit onto Lehigh Avenue (left turn only)
6. Title 39 access to be provided to Police Department.
7. Applicant will discuss with Traffic & Safety Department re: cross walk with flashing pedestrian light on Centennial Avenue.
8. Fence and plantings to meet recommendations.
9. Review easement issue with neighbors.
10. Lack of windows shown on plans facing out on both sides.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Dehnhardt with the following voting in favor of the motion: Mr. Marotta, Mr. Bovasso, Ms. Hay, Mr. Higgins and Ms. Dehnhardt. Voting in opposition to the motion: Mr. Pistol and Mr. Weisgerber.

PUBLIC PORTION:

None

CONCLUSION:

There being no further business, a motion to adjourn the meeting was regularly made, seconded and passed. The meeting concluded at 11:20 P.M.

Jeffrey Pistol, Secretary