

WHARTON PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
December 10, 2019

The Regularly Scheduled Meeting of the Wharton Planning Board was called to order with Chairman Ken Loury reading the Open Meeting Statement as required by law as well as the Judicial Proceeding Statement.

ROLL CALL was taken and the following members were present: Chairman Ken Loury, Ms. Charlotte Kelly, Mr. Roger Steele, Mr. Mark Harris, Mr. Peter Rathjens, Mr. Patrick O'Brien, Mr. Brian Bosworth and Mr. Christopher Fleischman. Also present were Attorney Alan Zakin, Planner Owen Bonnet, Engineer Christopher Borinski and Secretary Patricia Craven. Excused were Mayor William J. Chegwidde, Councilman Thomas Yeager and Ms. Barb Chiappa. Planner Jessica Caldwell arrived at 7:50.

The Pledge Allegiance to the Flag was next.

The reading of the bills was next. A Motion was made by Brian Bosworth and Seconded by Roger Steele to approve the bills as read. YEA – 8 NAY – 0

Next, was the approval of the November 12, 2019 Special Planning Board minutes. A Motion was made by Roger Steele and Seconded by Marc Harris to approve the minutes.
YEA - 6 NAY- 0 ABST- 2 (Kelly, O'Brien)

The approval of the November 14, 2019 Special Planning Board minutes was next. A Motion was made by Christopher Fleischman and Seconded by Roger Steele.
YEA – 7 NAY – 0 ABST – 1 (O'Brien)

The reading of the Resolution for Trading Houses, LLC/Castaneda was next.

The following corrections were made:

Page 3 - #8 – 2nd line – change the word further to also

Pate 6 - #3 – change the word constriction to construction and add “from the date of this resolution’ to the end of the sentence.

A Motion was made by Peter Rathjens and seconded by Mark Harris to approve the Resolution as corrected YEA – 7 NAY – 0 ABST – 1 (O'Brien)

Next, under Old Business, was a report from Engineer Borinski on Wharton Industrial. Attorney Zakin stated that there had been some concerns about Wharton Industrial maintaining their timeline. He sent a letter to Ms. Ermel to respond with an updated timeline, which she did. Then an email was sent that we were dissatisfied with some of the vague areas. Attorney Zakin, Engineer Borinski, Planner Caldwell and Attorney Johnson had a phone conference call about a more aggressive timeline. Engineer Borinski made up a new timeline which is what is before the Board tonight for their review.

Engineer Borinski stated that the rock crushing has resumed and should be completed in 2 – 3 weeks. January 10th 2020 is the deadline. If not Mr. Turzi will have to come back before the Board on January 14th, 2020.

#4 - East Driveway - they will construct it per the plan and will be completed before the 5/31/20 deadline. Once the driveway is in, they can restore the east wall area.

#6 – all the fill has been removed. 10/10/19 – DEP approved the fill removal and they can start planting. 7 trees have been planted and they will plant the remainder starting in March and be done by June.

#8 - Outdoor Storage will be completed by the Fall.

Building G – will start construction next summer.

Lights – Buildings A, B, C & D – Light are all up – Buildings E & F in Rockaway – light not up. The buildings in Rockaway will have the same signage and lights.

Engineer Borinski spoke with Mr. Turzi this afternoon and he was fine with this new timeline. Attorney Zakin will send a letter to Ms. Ermel letting her know that the Board is fine with the new timeline.

Next, under New Business was the application for 9th Wave. Attorney John Wyciskala addressed the Board. He is the attorney for applicant – 9th Wave. This is a family business owned by the Ryan Family which includes Kim and Michael Ryan who reside at 25 Cutler Street in Wharton since 2017. They have 3 sons, Kyle, Eric and Michael who are all present and a daughter Lacey who is serving in the Navy and stationed in Norfolk. They are collectively engaged in the business of renovating and investing in residential real estate of small multifamily, 2 family homes, condo's and things of that nature. Being Wharton residents, they are enthusiastic about investing in real estate in the Borough. 9th Wave is the owner of the multifamily building at 22 Baker Ave, Block 1702, Lot 5. The building is at least 130 years old and known as the Pythian Opera House and the Hopewell Lodge Building. It was home to the Pythian Sisters and in 1886 the Masonic Lodge. This information was from Page 76 of a book by Charlotte Kelly.

Mr. Wyciskala marked into evidence:

A-1, 12-10-19 Picture of the building with a brief history of the building and a picture of a Pythian Opera House Ticket.

The Ryan's purchased the property at auction in 2018. It was a distressed property and subject of a foreclosure. At the time of purchase there were 6 apartment units, only 4 of which were legal by the Borough. There was an illegal expansion off the rear of the building. The interior and exterior were both in shambles. The Ryan's have cleaned up and renovated what they could of the building with new windows, doors, etc.

This application is for site plan and variance to permit the renovations for a total of 8 units and would utilize all 3 levels. They need use and density variances, a D-2 expansion of a non-conforming use and bulk variance relief. They will be removing the illegal expanded portion off the rear of the building bringing it back to its original footprint that goes back to at least 1886.

Kyle Ryan, Architect Ken Fox and Traffic Engineer and Planner Matt Seckler were sworn in.

Kyle Ryan gave an overview of the family business. For the past 6 years they have been engaged in purchasing and renovating of real estate and providing quality rental units. They have a 24/7 open communication with their tenants for maintenance and other concerns. They purchased this property in August of 2018. His parents live in town since 2017 and they started looking for investment properties in town. They also liked, for management of the property, the fact that this property is right around the corner from where they live. This foreclosure property was purchased at auction. The property and building were a complete mess when they purchased it, with leaks everywhere, plastic on the windows, most of the heating units didn't work, most appliances were not working and the roof was caving in. He and his brother work in heating and air-conditioning and the first thing they did was make sure the tenants had heat. At the time of purchase there were 2 families living in 2 of the apartment units. There were 6 distinct apartment units in the building. He stated that the 2 families were living in 1 unit on the 1st floor and 1 unit on the second floor. The state of these 2 apartments was in disrepair. The other 2 units on those floors were both a disaster even though tenants had been living in them just a short time before they purchased the building. The illegal unit in the back had the roof caving in. The wet sheetrock and carpeting from this unit were smelling up the entire building. The 3rd floor unit also had the roof leaking and was a complete disaster. There were signs of animals living in the building. There were hoarders living in the building. The first thing they did was fixed the roof and the heating. Then they removed tons of garbage. They put in new floors, insulation, walls, kitchens, bathrooms, windows, new appliances and siding. They gutted 2 of the units and started new. They updated the 2 units that had tenants. The other 2 units they removed all the garbage but have not renovated them yet.

A-2, 12-10-19 – 1 Photo Board with 6 photos

1 – Before photo of building with overgrowth in front.

2 – After photo of building after they removed overgrowth, planted trees in front and power washed the building

3 – Before picture showing tons of garbage taken out from the building – they removed 250 Tons of garbage.

4- After picture of rosebushes that are planted along the driveway and fence area.

5. Before picture of the laundry room

6. After picture of the laundry room with 3 sets of washers and dryers

A-3, 12-10-19 – 1 Photo Board with 6 photos

3 Photos show the before pictures of the kitchen, bathroom and one of the rooms with all the garbage.(The picture of the garbage is what every room looked like when they purchased it.)

3 Photos show the after of the kitchen and bathroom.

Kyle Ryan stated that they look forward to continuing to improve and invest in this property and they assure the Board that it will be a well maintained and managed property irrespective of what may or may not be approved. Kyle described the 3-floor building. It currently has 4 units on floors 1 and 2. The 3rd floor is a bigger layout than floors 1 & 2. The first floor has the laundry room and stairs and the 2nd floor has the storage area which they are proposing to make into 1 unit. They are trying to maximize the space on the 3rd floor which has 20 ft ceilings. It used to be an opera hall. Mr. Wyciskala stated that it is their understanding that this building had, in the past, 4 apartment units and the 3rd floor had been a functioning commercial usage which

continued into more recent years. Kyle stated that they are planning on more landscaping which is on their plans.

The meeting was now open to the public.

Peggy Maiuro, 14 Oak Lane – resident of Wharton for 38 years and has had a lot of experience with renters in the neighborhood and is concerned about the negative impact to the neighborhood. She is concerned about the number of apartments and the parking issue. John Wyciskala stated that their Architect and traffic expert will be testifying next. Attorney Zakin explained to Ms. Maiuro about her testimony and asking questions of the witnesses.

The meeting was now closed to the public.

Architect Ken Fox addressed the Board. He stated that he had looked at and walked through this building. He stated that the Ryan's have been working with the zoning and construction offices of the Borough and have gotten all the permits for demolition and renovations for the building. He described Z-2 of the submitted plans. The photos show each of the sides of the building. The left side is the narrower set back, where they currently have and plan on putting the trash cans. The right side is the parking lot. The far-right picture is the one-story unit that is attached and will be removed. Mr. Fox also did a sheet for each floor with the floor plan for that floor as well as showing on the sheet the other 2 floor layouts. He described the layout of each floor to the Board. He stated that they had met with the tenancy review committee and at that time they were proposing 9 units. They have since decided to remove the one story attached unit on the rear of the building. So, the application is for 8 units. Removing this gave them additional set back to the rear property line, a fire escape for the upper units and an additional parking space. Removing this unit off the back has a benefit. To their knowledge this addition was built many, many years ago and was not a legal unit. There were only 4 C/O's issued to the building. Looking at apartment 1A you have to walk through 1 room to get to another and it is preexisting. Mr. Ryan explained the rooms to the Board. It was set up as a 4 bedroom with the current occupants. When their tenant moves out, they will make it into a 3-bedroom unit.

Mr. Fox stated that they will, as part of this approval, make renovations to 1A to make this a legal 3-bedroom unit whether the tenants are there or not. This can be a condition of approval. Both apartments on the first floor each have a secondary door. 1B has a door and steps that lead to the parking lot and 1A has a door and steps that lead to the side yard area on the other side of the building. 1B is 2 bedrooms and 1A will be 3 bedrooms. On the second floor 2A and 2B are both occupied. The 3rd floor is a very large, wide open area. They are looking to utilize this area and make units similar to the others. There is a small utility basement with crawl space under part of the building. They are also using part of the basement for their recycling efforts. There will be no living area in the basement. They meet all the requirements for room sizes and these rooms are significantly larger than what is required. They are generous size rooms shown on Z-4. 2B and 2C have 2 bedrooms each and 2A is a 1-bedroom unit. Right now, 2C has 2 pre-existing ingress and egress doors and they are willing to change that to have only 1 ingress egress door and remove the one closest to the stairs. Planner Caldwell stated that there are no minimum square footage requirements in our ordinances for bedrooms.

The 3rd floor is wide open space right now. Z-5 shows what they are proposing 3 – 1-bedroom units. There will be a corridor down the center of the 3rd floor to the new fire escape in the rear. They are adding sprinklers throughout the building. All of the new construction is fire separations. They are creating nice apartments and a safe building regardless of how many units are approved. There will be fire suppression system throughout the building. They will take off the unit on the back. They have added generous spaces throughout the building.

A-4, 12-10-19 was marked into as Color Rendition of Z-1. The building sits significantly on the South East, left side of the property with center stairs entering the front of the building and existing parking lot on the right side of the property.

As far as improvements to the property they have worked with the neighbors to remove a tree in the back of the property. They will also be removing the unit on the back of the building. The existing set back now is 0.5 ft. and they are proposing 12.16 ft. setback once it has been removed and will be adding an additional parking space and fire escape to the rear of the building. The unconventional angled parking is existing now and there is no way to expand it. These spaces have been used by 6 units at one time and they have to back out of the spots and back into the street. They have 9 spaces now and they are proposing 10 spaces. There is a fence along the parking lot with recently planted rose bushes in front as well as planters in front of the building. On the left side of the building there is a concrete walkway so that the tenants can wheel their garbage and recycling cans to the curb. Z-2 of the plans shows the roof covering that will go over the recycling and garbage cans.

A-5, 12-10-19 was marked into evidence as 11 photos by Ken Fox – Various Views of the property. Photo #6 shows the garbage cans – there will be 1 can per unit and 1 recycling cans for 2 units. It will be the tenant's responsibility to put out their own garbage to the curb. The chain length fence is on their property and they will remove it and replaced with a 6 ft. vinyl fence. Snow removal – snow will have to be removed from the site. Their plan is for each unit to get 1 parking space and the 1st and 2nd spaces to be handicap spaces. There was a discussion that followed and it was decided that 8 spaces to 8 tenants and possibly 2 others to tenants with 2 cars which can be decided by the management. They will not have any handicapped spaces. They do not intend to charge for parking. There is a 10 ft grassy side yard on the left side of the building. There is access to the basement from the inside of the building. The air conditioning is in the attic which is only accessed by the management. One of the brother's will be living in one of the units on the 3rd floor.

They went over the Engineer's report. The trash will be picked up by the Borough. The wall in the front will not be removed but it is their plan to repair and rebuild it. They will change the wording on the plans to reflect that. They will repair the sidewalk. They have not proposed any lighting. They will put in 2 straight down light boxes on the building so that the parking area will be lit and will not shine on the neighbor's property, to be approved by our engineer. They went over the landscaping that they have done already. It is their proposal not to have to provide a landscaping plan but have our Planner approve their plantings. No signs are proposed. The parking spaces will have numbers on the ground. The cars pull into the parking spots and then have to back out onto the street unless they can k-turn in the parking lot. It is 2 ways in and out.

The letter from Fire Chief Dorr was next. They have created an access to the 3rd floor that was not there before by adding the fire escape that accesses the central corridor on the 3rd floor. Their condition of removing the 1 ingress/egress door from Apt. 2C takes care of one of their concerns. All the rooms have windows and they will correct that error on the plans. They are making the building more fire safe than before, the entire building will be sprinklered. They will meet the code.

There was no report from the police. The applicant is ok with Title 39.

Marc Harris was concerned about the landscaping in the front of the building for site distance when the tenants are backing out. Mr. Fox stated that the planting in front have to be low plantings. He can add a site triangle anticipating forward and reverse egress to the plans to be approved by the Borough Engineer.

Planner Caldwell was fine with her approval of the landscaping as a condition of approval. She asked if they were going to fix up the façade in the front of the building. Kyle testified that they have pressure washed the concrete and vinyl siding and replaced all the trim around the windows. They will be happy to consult with Ms. Caldwell on how to upgrade the façade. This will not be a condition of approval.

The meeting was now open to the public.

Peggy Maiuro of 14 Oak Lane was concerned about potential stackers. She has had issues with stackers in her neighborhood over the years. She is concerned with the parking; she does not see where a tenant would not have a car. Ms. Ryan stated that she has 2 tenants right now that do not have cars. She is there every single day and her son will be living there as well. Ken Fox stated that the Board was also concerned with stacking and they have made 2 revisions to the plan to eliminate doors that could eventually encourage stacking. Kyle Ryan stated that they do background checks on all tenants and that they have a keyed entry to the building. Ms. Maiuro stated that many of the residents on Baker Ave. are parking on her street right now, the streets are already overcrowded and now you are adding more tenants. Kim Ryan was sworn in at this time. She stated that they are redoing the entire apartment building and they definitely do not want stacking. Attorney Zakin stated that they will have a traffic engineer testify and she will be able to ask him questions as well. Ms. Maiuro feel that we are a blue-collar community and is more likely that the tenants will have more than 1 vehicle and will impact the traffic on her street and Baker Ave. She does not think there is enough parking. Ms. Caldwell thinks what really helps that the management has some control over the parking and the fact that the apartments are small. She feels it can be managed if properly controlled.

The meeting was now closed to the public.

Matt Seckler qualified as a Traffic Expert & Planning Expert. He prepared a traffic and parking assessment report date 9-16-19. He went over the finding of the study. He stated there is parking permitted on their side of Baker Ave. which is the southern side of Baker Ave. The speed limit is 25 mph. It is primarily a residential street but is withing walking distance to a mix of retail uses.

This specific block is generally residential. At one time this building was both a residential and commercial use. They are located less than 2 minutes from a bus stop, so that the tenants can commute by means other than private vehicle. The bus also provides access to several train stations. Mr. Seckler went over the trip generation on page 2 of his report, for this property. Based on the Table 1 trip generation the multi-family residential development is expected to generate 3 trips during the weekday morning peak hour, 4 trips during the weekday evening peak hour and 4 trips during the Saturday midday peak hour. Based on the Transportation Impact Analysis for Site Development, a trip increase of less than 100 vehicle trips will not generate a significant amount of traffic.

Mr. Seckler stated that a key part of this application is the parking demand. The New Jersey Residential Site Improve Standard (RSIS) for parking requirement for this site is 16 parking spaces and they are proposing 10 parking spaces. The RSIS does allow for Boards to consider alternate justification for parking demand. Based on the census data for Wharton it shows that the average car per unit for single-family owner-occupied units is 2.15 vs. rental units which are 1.21 cars per units. As mentioned by Ms. Caldwell, there seems to be a correlation between rental units and owner occupied which could be related to the size of the units and number of bedrooms. Utilizing the 1.21 cars per unit that would be right on with the 10 spaces they are providing. Also, based on the ITE Parking Generation they found that the 10-space parking supply proposed on-site would be sufficient to accommodate their parking demand. Both data points, the census and the ITE confirm that the demand for this site would be 10 parking spaces. There is a shortfall of 35% but based on the parking lot count (located within a 5-minute walk and on-street parking utilization observations conducted at 11 pm on Sept. 5, 2019, 52 on-street overnight parking spaces were available and 49 parking spaces were available. 11 pm is when most people are in for the night and is when residential units are at their peak parking demand. They conducted a count within a 4-minute walk of the site and canvassed the general area. The Charts in his report shows the streets and count data. His conclusion is that surrounding streets and parking lots can accommodate any parking demand over the 10 that they have spaces for on site.

Mr. Seckler spoke about the parking and parking lot. He feels it is better to back into this parking lot and pull out but it's not an easy move. Depending on the number of cars in the parking lot and the time you are leaving you may be able to maneuver your vehicle so that you are going forward out of the lot onto the street. The parking spaces are 16ft. and the drive aisle is 20 ft wide. This is a low turnover parking lot. From a traffic/engineering point of view he does not see this development as having a negative impact on the roadway and he feels there is sufficient parking. Mr. Steele, Mr. Louny and Mr. Harris had no concern with traffic.

Mr. Seckler stated that they need a D-2 variance to expand a non-conforming use by adding more units and a D-5 for density. They're a number of pre-existing, non-conformities. The building is larger than what is permitted by ordinance because it pre-existed the ordinances. They are actually reducing the building by removing the rear illegal apartment. The previous uses were residential and commercial and they are proposing only residential use. They are not making any changes to the existing non-conforming front yard and side yard but they are improving the rear yard by removing the illegal apartment. Regarding impervious coverage they are adding 66 ft of impervious coverage for the recycling and garbage container which is a very small amount for

the benefit. This is a 2 ½ story zone and they have 3 stories and that is not changing. They are reducing the building coverage by 5%. As for the D-2 variance, they are not expanding from the outside, it will look the same. The neighborhood has grown around this building, it has always been there. As far as the number of units based on their testimony on the amount of traffic and the parking, he feels there will be no negative impact to the overall public. As far as the positive impact this is a building with a third floor and the most conforming use would be something residential. They heard the concerns of the public and they are making sure they put the proper conditions on this site plans to cover those concerns. They will properly design them to be utilized as conforming as can be, for this zone. Looking at our Master Plan they have met the goal of having a residential use in a residential neighborhood. This is a building that is prime for use as a multi-family use. It was in disrepair and this is clearly maintaining, rehabilitating and reuse of a historic building that has some meaning to the Borough. From a planning point of view this clearly meets the standard of enhancing the visual environment. They are also benefiting the purpose of the adequate light air and open space; they are reducing the building coverage and reducing the variances as it relates to the rear yard setback. He feels they are promoting the health, safety and welfare by bringing it up to the current day standards for construction and fire safety. He feels they have met the positive and negative criteria. For special reasons you are looking at an existing building and putting in residential on the third floor which he feels as a Planner is the most compatible use for that space. For the D5 the testimony of what comes with the additional density of the development can be supported in the parking and traffic generation. He feels the site does support the additional density and that this site currently operates with a density variance. Although preexisting with 4 units, it is not permitted in this zone today. The C variances are all preexisting, non-conforming with the exception of the parking which he testified to earlier and feels it is sufficient and if it is not there is enough on street parking available. The variance for impervious coverage is going up 66 sq. ft. All of the variances are being improved or remaining the same. From his standpoint as the Traffic Engineer and Planner he believes this application is suitable for approval by this Board.

Mark Harris said there is a lot of historical significance to this building and would like to see a historical marker of some type on site. He does feel it is important that the parking is being controlled by the owner.

Peter Rathjens asked Mr. Seckler if he thought any of the other streets in his report should be only 1 side of the street parking. Mr. Seckler stated that Baker Ave. is narrow and has 1 side of the street parking but he cannot speak for any of the other streets. He stated that his study was done at 11 pm and his counts were done based on what is permitted in the Borough as far as parking on 1 or 2 sides of the street. Mr. Rathjens was also concerned about the snow removal as well as adding more cars to the on-street parking especially during a snow storm. Mr. Seckler stated that they estimate their demand to be 10 parking spaces and should not have cars on the street. Ms. Kelly mentioned that there are municipal parking lots. Mr. Rathjens feels 8 units is a lot. Some discussion followed about the angle of the parking spaces.

Roger Steele asked about the runoff of the water from the site. Mr. Fox stated that all the runoff goes to Baker Ave.

The meeting was now open to the public and having no public was closed to the public.

Attorney Zakin went over the conditions and variances.

RM – 75 zone – single family.

Preexisting, non-conforming - they have 4 units and are proposing 8 units.

Need a D-5 variance for density.

Preexisting, non-conforming rear yard setback – will remain non-conforming but will be 12 feet once they remove the illegal apartment off the back.

Preexisting impervious coverage is increasing from 80.99 to 81.81

Max. Building Coverage is being reduced.

Variance for parking – 10 spaces proposed, 16 spaces required.

Conditions:

1st Floor

1 – 1A - converted to 3 Bedroom (now a 4 bedroom)

1 – 2 Bedroom

2nd Floor

2 – 2 Bedroom

1 – 1 Bedroom

2C – egress/ingress door closest to the stairs to be removed

3rd Floor

3 – 1 Bedroom

No Living area in the basement

On Site snow removal – snow will be removed from the site.

Site Triangle added to plans with forward and reverse egress

Plantings not to obstruct site lines

Title 39

No Charge for parking

Roof overhang over the garbage/recycle cans along the left side of the building

No tenant access to attic

Approval of the landscaping by the Planner

Assigned parking spaces by the owner - # on the pavement

Appropriate Historical Marker on site.

Planner Caldwell stated that she would be happy to work with the owners on ideas for the façade.

This is not a condition. Mr. Ryan stated that they had tried to get estimates on replacing the

siding and was told by more than one contractor that it did not need to be replaced. Mr. Ryan

stated that they have power washed it to clean it up and remove the moss.

Some discussion followed about daylighting of the curbing along Baker Ave. It was suggested that the Borough Engineer and Police look at this area and make any recommendation they may have the Borough Council.

Mr. Ryan stated that the number of cars that an applicant has can be one of the top priorities when looking for new tenants.

Attorney Wyciskala stated that now they have owners who live in town and is making a significant investment with full renovations, fire suppression systems and modern amenities that did not exist before in a building that dates back to the 1850's.

Mr. Fox stated that a building of more than 3 units has to be inspected by the state every 5 years. Mr. Ryan stated that they just had their state inspection.

Marc Harris stated that this is close to the schools so a tenant wouldn't need a car. The improvements to this building are more upscale. He agrees with the landlord controlling the parking. The historic significance of the building is unique and adds character to the neighborhood. As far as the parking is concerned, they will be backing out onto Baker Ave. in an area that is less traveled than the other end of Baker Ave. which is wide open. 8 units is a lot to ask for but when you consider the size and scope of this building it is very reasonable.

Planner Caldwell stated that they provided good solid testimony on the parking with both the ITE and census data supporting the 10 spaces. There is available on street parking. Both of those point to the fact that 10 spaces should be fairly sufficient. She also liked the fact that the owners will control the parking. Based on the size of the units and the data she feels that 10 spaces should be sufficient. She agrees with Mr. Harris on the historic significance of the building. She feels there are some good positive benefits of cleaning up the building, taking away the non-conforming issues and bringing the whole building more into conformity in the zone by being all residential. They are maintaining the character of the building. Can it handle the density? She stated that there was good testimony about that. She feels the applicant has presented the best case that they can.

Chris Fleischman stated that he appreciates the significance of the work that has been done and the quality of the work put into the building already.

A Motion was made by Marc Harris and Seconded by Roger Steele to approve the application with all the conditions and variances as noted. YEA – 8 NAY – 0

A Motion was made by Marc Harris and Seconded by Charlotte Kelly to adjourn.
YEA – 8 NAY – 0

Meeting adjourned 10:23 p.m.

Patricia M. Craven – Secretary

Ken Loury - Chairman