

**MAYWOOD PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES
April 7, 2016**

A regular meeting of the Maywood Planning Board was held on Thursday, April 7, 2016 in the Council Chambers of the John A. Steuert, Jr. Municipal Complex, 15 Park Avenue, Maywood, New Jersey at 7:30pm. “This meeting was called pursuant to the provisions of the Open Public Meetings Act. Notice of this meeting was published in the Our Town and The Record newspapers on or about November 23, 2015. In addition, copies of this notice were posted on the bulletin board in the Maywood Municipal Building at 15 Park Avenue, filed with the Borough Clerk and distributed to all persons, if any, requesting copies of the same pursuant to said act.”

Flag Salute

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:31pm with the following members present: Chairman Frank Lichtenberger, Secretary Charlotte Panny, Councilman Rick DeHeer, John Montel, Harry Hillenius, Charles Goebel, John McManus, Ken Terzo and Anthony Klymenko. Also present were Zoning Officer James Mazzer, Board Attorney Kara Kaczynski, Board Engineer Tom Lemanowicz (arrived at 8:20pm) and Board Planner Michael Kauker.

Approval of Minutes

Harry Hillenius made a motion to accept the minutes from the March 24, 2016 meeting. Councilman Rick DeHeer seconded the motion. All eligible members present voted in favor of the motion.

Bills

Councilman DeHeer made a motion to accept payment of the bills. Ken Terzo seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor of the motion.

Correspondence

- New Jersey Planner January/February 2016 Issue (Volume 77, Number 1)
- 3/24/16 letter from Gregory D. Meese of Price, Meese, Shulman & D’Arminio Re: Application for Amended Site Plan Approval for Ani Holdings, LLC, 178 New Jersey State Highway 17, Rochelle Park, New Jersey
- 4/1/16 registration form for the 2016 Annual Land Use Committee Symposium of the Bergen County Bar Association
- 4/4/16 letter from Township of Rochelle Park Municipal Clerk Re: Master Plan and Reexamination Report and Land Use Element
- 3/17/16 letter from New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection Re: Flood Hazard Area Joint Verification & Individual Permit Proposed Site Improvements 301 Mayhill Street, Township of Saddle Brook

Resolution

None

Councilman DeHeer recused himself from the Board prior to the hearing beginning.

Hearing

J. Magnone Auto Group, LLC

29 Essex Street
Block 124, Lot 5

Calendar #2016-01

Variance Application

Jennifer Knarich of Price, Meese, Shulman & D'Arminio is counsel for the applicant, J. Magnone Auto Group. This is a continuation of a hearing adjourned on 3/3/16. The property currently consists of an existing vacant warehouse which was formally occupied by Design Spree furniture store. The application is for site plan approval, use variance and bulk variances including signage and parking. The existing 1 story building is 51,830 square feet and will not be enlarged but the interior will be renovated. The business will be high end used automobile sales and servicing/detailing the automobiles that are for sale. The property is located in the limited light industrial district which permits warehouse, storage and manufacturing uses. Limited light industrial permits new car dealerships and used car dealerships as an accessory to new car dealerships. The specific relief is preliminary and final site plan approval, use variance relief and bulk variance certain for signage and parking. To summarize the signage, two ground signs and three wall signs are proposed. The applicant has a preexisting nonconformity for parking where 200 spaces are required overall and 195 are existing and proposed. Since the previous hearing on 3/3/16, the Board Planner Michael Kauker issued a report dated 3/8/16. The purpose of this hearing is to address the opinions raised in Board Planner's report and allow the applicant's planner to respond in rebuttal to the Board Planner's report.

The eligible Board members are:

1. Chairman Frank Lichtenberger
2. Secretary Charlotte Panny
3. John Montel
4. Harry Hillenius
5. Charles Goebel
6. John McManus
7. Ken Terzo

Board Planner Michael Kauker listed the documents that he reviewed in preparation for his report:

1. A set of engineering plans prepared by Casey and Keller, pages 1-3, dated 6/10/15
2. Architectural Plans prepared by Architectura, Last Submission date 11/19/15
3. Application Addendum prepared by the applicants Attorney, Price, Meese, Shulman and D'Arminio.
4. A Trip Generation Comparison Table prepared by Dolan and Dean, dated 2/3/16
5. An application completeness report prepared by Remington and Vernick, Board Engineer, dated 11/21/15
6. Response letter prepared by Jennifer M. Knarich of Price, Meese, Shulman and D'Arminio, dated 12/23/15
7. A second review letter, prepared by Remington and Vernick, dated 2/2/16

8. A transcript of proceedings for the first Public Hearing, dated 1/7/16
9. A second transcript of proceedings, dated 2/4/16
10. A Truck Turn Analysis prepared by Casey and Keller, dated 1/5/16

Mr. Kauker's report serves as a summary for the Board to determine if the applicant has provided sufficient proofs to justify the granting of a D1 use variance. Mr. Lash testified to the unique marketing program for the proposed business. His projections were the foundation for the applicant's traffic engineer Elizabeth Dolan's Trip Generation Comparison of 60 trips per day (10 customers per day). The site plan and the interior layout propose 332 vehicles on-site. Mr. Kauker believes that there is a large disparity between the estimated customers per day and the volume of vehicles stored on the property. He believes that the proposed business is best described as a Regional Used Car Processing, Sales and Distribution Center. Additionally, the Trip Generation Comparison between the proposed business (60 trips per day) and the ITE Land Use for Automobile Sales (1,674 trips per day) seem incompatible. While Mr. Lash testified to the expectations for the proposed business, no empirical data was provided to validate his estimates. A traffic impact study would need to be done to understand the effect on Maywood Avenue. The scale of the facility is particularly large at 51,830 square feet which suggests that the Trip Generation Comparison would be higher than presented.

Mr. Kauker reviewed the applicant's professional planner George Williams's testimony as it relates to the positive criteria and negative criteria proofs. While Mr. Williams believes that the site is particularly suitable for what is proposed, Mr. Kauker does not see that it is more appropriate for the proposed use and less appropriate for the several permitted uses in the limited light industrial zone. Mr. Williams testified that the proposed business is similar to a new car dealership which is a permitted use in the limited light industrial zone. Mr. Kauker believes that the proposed facility is a significantly different use classification than a new car dealership:

1. The proposed facility as a used car sales use is proposed as a principal use as compared to a new car sales dealership, where the used car sales component is an accessory use.
2. Automobile sales, used, as defined in the Complete Illustrated Book of Development Definitions c. 2015, as the use of land and buildings for the display and sale primarily used motor vehicles, which may include repair and service facilities as well as financing and leasing services. Comment "While the sale of used motor vehicles is customarily incidental to new car dealerships, where used car sales are a principal or primary use, they are often defined as such, (as in the Borough of Maywood's Ordinance) and may be subject to more stringent regulations. Sometimes used car sales are even excluded from zones that allow new car sales."
3. Automobile Sales ie, new car dealerships are defined as the use of any building, land area or other premise principally for the display, sale, rental or lease of new or used automobiles.

Mr. Williams testified that the approval of this application would benefit the general welfare. Mr. Kauker believes that this statement is very broad and is not supported. No need was documented by the applicant.

Jennifer Knarich clarified that Mr. Kauker is testifying as a professional planner and not as a traffic engineer. Additionally, the exterior parking spaces are 195 not 201 and the subject

property is adjacent to 6 not 12 single family homes. Chairman Frank Lichtenberger would like the record to reflect that there are residences across from the adjacent homes on Maywood Avenue. She also clarified that Mr. Kauker's statement below is his opinion:

This potential on-site sales activity seems to suggest that traffic flow in and out of this site would be more in line with the ITE projections shown on Ms. Dolans chart rather than the 60 car projection, also presented on this chart.

Mr. Kauker noted that the gap between the two numbers is too great and does not agree that this is his net opinion. While there is no independent data to support his statement, he noted that the applicant did not provide any data, only testimony was given. When asked if his classification of the proposed business a Regional Used Car Processing, Sales and Distribution Center was a defined term, Mr. Kauker indicated that it was his own creation. Ms. Knarich noted that a previous tenant, FedEx, was classified as a distribution warehouse.

Ms. Knarich was unable to find the quote that he cited in the Complete Illustrated Book of Development Definitions:

While the sale of used motor vehicles is customarily incidental to new car dealerships, where used car sales are a principal or primary use, they are often defined as such, (as in the Borough of Maywood's Ordinance) and may be subject to more stringent regulations. Sometimes used car sales are even excluded from zones that allow new car sales.

She distributed an excerpt from her copy of the Latest Illustrated Book of Development Definitions New and Expanded Edition by Harvey Moskowitz and Carl Lindbloom (second printing 2015) and it was marked as Exhibit A-10. The definition of Auto Sales, Used:

The use of land and buildings for the display and sale primarily used motor vehicles and may include repair and service facilities as well as financing and leasing services. Comment: The sale of used motor vehicles is customarily an accessory to new car dealerships. Used car superstores are a recent phenomenon, akin to the big box retailers. They usually provide one-stop shopping in the sale of used vehicles and include servicing, financing, and similar services. They occupy large land areas, usually on the outskirts of built-up areas. Good access and visibility are critical. As with auto malls, planning considerations include site design, landscaping, lighting, signage, and pollution. ("Acres of Automobiles", *Zoning News*, June 1997)

The definition of Automobile Sales supplied by Mr. Kauker omitted some verbiage. The complete definition:

The use of any building, land area or other premise principally for the display, sale, rental, or lease of new or used automobiles (but may include light trucks or vans, trailers, or recreational vehicles), and including any vehicle preparation, warranty, or repair work conducted as an accessory use.

Board Attorney Kara Kaczynski attempted to determine which verbiage was quoted from the Complete Illustrated Book of Development Definitions versus which is Mr. Kauker's interpretation. She then asked about his description of the proposed business as a Regional Used Car Processing, Sales and Distribution Center. He clarified that used car dealership distribution center is not a permitted use in the limited light industrial zone.

Jennifer Knarich then asked Mr. Kauker if he had used the positive proof of “benefit the general welfare” in any applications where he was an applicant’s professional planner since he believes that this statement is very broad. Mr. Kauker replied that he had. Ken Terzo asked if the applicant was planning to sell light trucks, vans, trailers or recreational vehicles. Ms. Knarich answered that they were not but she felt that it was important to use the entire quote.

George Wheatle Williams is the applicant’s professional planner and responded to Board Planner Kauker’s 3/8/16 report. He feels that there are 3 issues:

1. Clarity about the proposed use
2. Disagreement about the establishment of affirmative criteria aka special reasons
3. Disagreement about the establishment of negative criteria
 - a. Substantial detriment to the public good
 - b. Substantial impairment to the zone plan

Mr. Williams summarized that the application is for a D1 variance, with a used car dealership as a principal use in the limited light industrial district. He feels that the proposed business is unique and does not resemble a typical new car dealership. He feels that the evolution of this land use that was not contemplated by the zoning ordinance. Sometimes uses evolve faster than the regulations that cover those uses can be drafted.

Mr. Williams believes that it is important to view the complete definition of Automobile sales:

The use of any building, land area or other premise principally for the display, sale, rental, or lease of new or used automobiles (but may include light trucks or vans, trailers, or recreational vehicles), and including any vehicle preparation, warranty, or repair work conducted as an accessory use.

In terms of negative criteria detriment to public good, mechanical work would be performed at a new car dealership.

Mr. Williams noted the commentary of the definition of Auto Sales, Used:

The sale of used motor vehicles is customarily an accessory to new car dealerships. Used car superstores are a recent phenomenon, akin to the big box retailers. They usually provide one-stop shopping in the sale of used vehicles and include servicing, financing, and similar services. They occupy large land areas, usually on the outskirts of built-up areas. Good access and visibility are critical. As with auto malls, planning considerations include site design, landscaping, lighting, signage, and pollution. (“Acres of Automobiles”, *Zoning News*, June 1997)

He believes that the application is for a unique form of used car dealership which is a relatively new phenomenon. He cited Mr. Lash’s testimony that the showroom is akin to an Apple Store as it is high-end as opposed to a stereotypically used car dealership. The site layout would be unlike typical used car dealerships. Mechanical work for the application would be limited to tire changes, topping off fluids and prepping the cars for sale which is comparable to new car dealership. According to Section 209-37:

(A) The LL Limited Light Industrial District is intended for light manufacturing, processing, warehouses or enclosed storage. Within this district, no building or structure or area, lot or parcel of land shall be used, in whole or in part, except for

the above-stated purposes, except as hereinafter provided. Uses prohibited shall include but not be limited to:

Used car establishment, except as an accessory use to a new car dealer

(C) Other permitted uses. [Added 6-25-1996 by Ord. No. 5-96]

(1) Within this district, the sale of new automobiles is permissible.

(2) As an accessory use to the sale of new automobiles, the sale of used automobiles is permissible.

Mr. Williams believes that the limited light industrial district is intended for light manufacturing, processing, warehousing and enclosed storage. New car dealership is a permitted use in this zone and would have mechanical work, attendants, traffic and signage. He believes that there is not substantial detriment to the public good if a new car dealership is permitted. He believes the code was intended to prohibit used car dealerships since there is a negative perception associated with that use that does not apply to this application. He cited a Field Guide to Independent Used Cars distinguishes the continuum of used car dealerships:

The Executive Director of the Independent Automobile Dealers Association stated that at an independent used car lot, a customer gets a better selection in a greater price range. On the other hand, at a new lot, the inventory will be restricted to a few years old and whatever they feel comfortable selling.

According to this person, often a used car dealer will develop a preference for a certain brand or type of car and over time his inventory reflects this. In other cases, it is the clientele that dictates the choice of cars on the lot. Examples are used-car lots that sell German cars (Audi, BMW and Mercedes) or perhaps just luxury vehicles. Sometimes these lots will narrow the focus even further, selling classic cars of a certain vintage, for example. While pricing at specialty lots isn't necessarily lower, the variety may be greater. Car collectors and aficionados who are searching for hard-to-find models often buy from such lots as these.

Mr. Williams believes that this is what the applicant was proposing and the Maywood code did not contemplate this type of used car dealership when the code was drafted. He then began citing existing dealerships that have a similar business model to what the applicant is proposing. While none of these examples are owned by the applicant, it speaks to a trend in the auto industry.

According to MLUL, there are special reasons for the granting of a D1 variance under two broad circumstances:

1. When the refusal to allow the project would impose on the applicant undue hardship
2. When a proposed project carries out a purpose of zoning as defined in 40:55d-2

Mr. Kauker believes that the permitted use advances the purpose of zoning, but Mr. Williams disagrees. Mr. Williams believes that the it is approval of the application that would advance the purpose of zoning. Mr. Williams cited the purposes of zoning:

Subsection A: Guide the appropriate use or development of land in the state in a manner which would promote the health, safety, morals and welfare of the public.

- While broad, he feels that the proposed business is appropriate for the site.

Subsection G: Provide sufficient space in appropriate locations for a variety of commercial uses.

- Mr. Williams believes that the current Borough code does not contemplate the continuum of used car dealerships or the new phenomenon.

Subsection I: Provide a desirable visual environment through aesthetic and good civic design.

- Testimony stated that the site would be improved.
- The buffer between the adjacent homes and the site would remain in place.

Mr. Williams believes that the site is particularly suitable for the proposed use. He cited several court cases that supported his statement. Mr. Lash testified that the site meets their needs. Mr. Williams believes that the size of the property supports the applicant's proposal since it would accommodate the cars inventory.

In terms of the negative criteria:

The degree to which a use or structure meet the purposes of zoning promulgated by 40:55d-2 affects both the positive and the negative criteria. The focus of the substantial detriment prong of the negative criteria is on the impact of the variance on nearby properties. In this respect, the statutory focus is on the variance's effect on the surrounding properties and the Board evaluates the impact of the proposed use variance upon the adjacent properties and determine whether or not it will cause such damage to the character of the neighborhood as to constitute substantial detriment to the public good.

Since new car dealerships are permitted, then new car dealerships with used cars as an accessory use would not be substantially detrimental to the public good. The proposed mechanical work would not be substantially detrimental to the public good. Mr. Williams believes that there would be no substantial impairment to the zone plan or zoning ordinance. He cited a court case that he believed supports his argument. He believes that when the Borough ordinance was adopted, this type of land use what not considered. The 2003 Master Plan recommends rezoning to regional commercial zone, however, the rezoning has not occurred. The 2009 Reexamination Plan noted that no rezoning was recommended.

Board Attorney Kaczynski attempted to clarify why the auto sales definitions provided Mr. Kauker was different than the definitions provided by the applicant's professionals. Mr. Kauker was able to find a copy of his version of the quote in his papers. Board Attorney Kaczynski asked Mr. Williams about the similar facilities that he noted in his testimony. He did not know details of the businesses he cited. He did not compare this proposed business to the eight local new and used car facilities in terms of the number of cars on-site. He replied on the applicant's testimony.

Co-owner of J. Magnone Auto Group Javier Abreu testified. Board Attorney Kaczynski asked about the basis for the testimony about the proposed business model in terms of internet sales. Mr. Abreu answered that while it is unique, it is based on their 17 current businesses. These stores are new and used cars but not necessarily high-end. He agreed that the amount of internet sales is a projection and does not have empirical data to support it. He stated that 90% of customers are by appointment and internet sales are qualified over the phone. He confirmed that 30% of customers are internet only and 70% or less would visit the facility. He described a transaction. A customer would see a car on the internet and call a salesperson. They would schedule an appointment to view the car. Despite the multiple signs, he does not believe that there will be a lot of walk-in customers. Ken Terzo asked about what happens after a customer sees a car on the internet. Mr. Abreu responded that they could purchase it without viewing it in

person (60% of customers) or can schedule an appointment (30% of customers). He believes that 70% of car sales leave on the car carrier.

Traffic Engineer Elizabeth Dolan responded to Board Planner Kauker's 3/8/16 report. The Trip Generation Comparison was based on the applicant's testimony and ITE data. The ITE data for Automobile Sales include sales and after sale services but the proposed business will not offer after sales service. She believes that the after sale service data is skewing the total. She does not believe that the expected trips for the proposed business warrants a traffic impact study since the ITE recommends doing this only when 100 trips are expected in an hour. Board Attorney Kaczynski asked if the applicant provided any support for his projections and Ms. Dolan said that she solely relied on his testimony. She personally shopped online for a car for her child. She did not compare the proposed business to any local new or used car dealerships. She does not believe that this is a conventional dealership since it is high-end and customers are appointment only.

Charles Goebel believes that a customer looking to purchase a high-end automobile would visit the facility several times before purchasing which would impact the trip generation numbers. Mr. Abreu disagreed with that observation and provided an example of a customer that purchased a car without visiting the facility. Secretary Panny asked if that was the reason that they wanted such a high volume of inventory and he confirmed that it was. He would prefer to store the cars inside with overflow outside. Chairman Lichtenberger asked about the web address provided by the applicant. He saw nothing on that website that reflected what is proposed in the application. Board Engineer Tom Lemanowicz asked about the amount of internet leads for the proposed business. Mr. Abreu answered that all leads are sourced from the internet while 30% of sales are internet only with no dealership visit. Mr. Abreu cited that 50% of sales are internet only at a Mercedes used car dealership in Maryland. Jennifer Knarich explained that all their other locations are new and used dealerships with some high-end used cars. They are looking to consolidate all the high-end used cars into one facility.

Board Engineer Lemanowicz believed that there are several customer visits to a location when purchasing a used car as to ascertain the condition of the car. He then asked traffic engineer Elizabeth Dolan what the ITE data is based on and she said that it is based on the building size. They then discussed that the Trip Generation Comparison is influenced by the number of employees.

A short recess was taken at 9:41pm. The meeting resumed at 9:49pm with all members present.

Board Attorney Kaczynski noted that pages 44 and 45 of the 2015 Edition of the Illustrated Book of Development Definitions by Moskowitz and Lindbloom are entered as Exhibit PB-1.

Board Engineer Lemanowicz wanted to note that he did not personally witness all of the truck turn videos played for the Board at the 3/3/16 meeting. Additionally, some of the turns that he personally witnessed were not presented to the Board that evening. He personally witnessed the car carrier crossing the yellow line into oncoming traffic when it made a right turn from the Essex Street exit.

Chairman Lichtenberger reminded the applicant of Fire Official Tom Tuttle testimony that for cars in the showroom, the car batteries need to be disconnected and limited to less than 5 gallons of gas. Conrad Roncati, architect for the applicant, confirmed that they would comply with the code. The applicant would stipulate that cars would not be delivered with more than 5 gallons of gas. He confirmed that the facility won't fuel or defuel cars. Fire Official Tom Tuttle is concerned that sprinkler sizing needs to reflect the amount of gasoline in the facility. He requested this information from the applicant at a previous meeting. He would like cars to be parked as in a standard parking lot and not stacked with 18" of space between them. Ms. Knarich said that the applicant would be willing to adjust the interior parking layout. Board Lemanowicz asked about the flow required for this use and Fire Official Tuttle said that he had not prepared those calculations yet.

Chairman Lichtenberger opened the meeting to the public.

Christine Ercolino of 41 Maywood Avenue would like to know about gasoline storage. Ms. Knarich said that the applicant would work with Fire Official Tuttle to comply to the Borough code. Additionally, no gasoline storage tank is proposed since cars will arrive with less than 5 gallons of gas. Ms. Ercolino then asked the traffic engineer about how test drives and gas station fueling would impact the trip generation numbers. Ms. Knarich replied that the applicant was not planning on having test drives so they were not part of trip generation calculation. Ms. Ercolino witnessed and photographed a tractor trailer making the right turn onto Maywood Avenue from Demarest Place. While making the turn, the truck crossed the double yellow line into oncoming northbound traffic. Mary Senia also of 41 Maywood Avenue stated that this tractor trailer parks at the property regularly. The photographs were distributed to the Board. Ms. Knarich objected based on lack of foundation since the truck in the pictures is not the applicant's car carrier and videos of the applicant's car carrier was presented.

Mr. Ercolino then read a prepared statement asking the Board to deny the application in the best interest of the Borough and the Borough's residents.

Mary Senia of 41 Maywood Avenue read a prepared statement listing the reasons that she opposes application approval.

Shekher Saud of 10 West Howcroft Road asked why the applicant picked this location for an online business. He feels that the proposed business would be a better fit elsewhere. Co-owner of J. Magnone Auto Group Javier Abreu replied that the location met their criteria. He asked who was responsible in maintaining the storm water management area since he feels that the area is not being maintained properly. Chairman Lichtenberger explained that it is the property owner's responsibility to keep the area in good condition. Mr. Saud asked the Board to deny the application.

Jose Alfaro of 166 Maywood Avenue believes that approval of the application will lower residential property values and the adjacent property owners should be compensated. Chairman Lichtenberger explained that the Planning Board does not have jurisdiction over property taxes. He asked if an entrance from Essex Street could be added.

Doina Vizireanu of 85 Maywood Avenue works from home and believes that the proposed business will disturb her during the day. She asked how conditions of the approved application are enforced. Board Attorney Kaczynski explained that Construction Official James Mazzer would be an appropriate contact person. If the violation does not apply to him, he would direct you to the correct person. Ms. Vizireanu then asked the Board to deny the application to protect their quality of life.

Rick DeHeer of 18 Hammel Place believes that the applicant's business model has no supported data and has concerns about the fire hazard.

Chairman Lichtenberger closed the meeting to the public.

Jennifer Knarich conducted her summation of the application.

Chairman Lichtenberger provided a summary of reasons that he believes that the application should be denied. Used car dealership is not a permitted use in the limited light industrial zone. He does not believe that the applicant provided sufficient proofs to approve a D1 variance. He thinks the proposed business would negatively impact the surrounding area. Traffic to and from the facility as well as on-site would be heavy. Traffic in the area is already very heavy and queues at Essex Street. The Fitness & Wellness of Hackensack Fitness Center has contributed to the traffic. The fire load and interior car layout is potentially dangerous. He finds some of the applicants' testimony about their business model to be inconsistent and unsupported.

John Montel agreed with Chairman Lichtenberger's summary. Secretary Panny does not believe that the proposed use is positive, safe or healthy. Charles Goebel agreed with Chairman Lichtenberger's summary. Harry Hillenius feels the business model is too risky. John McManus and Ken Terzo agree with Chairman Lichtenberger's summary.

Harry Hillenius made a motion to deny the D1 variance application. John Montel seconded the motion. All eligible members present voted in favor of denying the D1 variance application. Chairman Lichtenberger made a motion to deny the site plan and C variances applications. Ken Terzo seconded the motion. All eligible members present voted in favor of denying the site plan and C variances applications.

Councilman DeHeer rejoined the Board.

Informal Hearing	None
Old Business	None
New Business	None
Open Meeting to the Public	None

Adjournment

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Harry Hillenius. Chairman Lichtenberger seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 11:11pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Tara Grunstra
Planning Board Recording Secretary