

WHARTON PLANNING BOARD
REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING
JULY 13, 2021

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 a statement regarding allowing the remote meeting and the Judicial Proceeding Statement. Chairman Loury stated that there was a 48-hour legal notice in the newspaper stating that this meeting would be in person and not virtual.

ROLL CALL was taken and the following members were present: Chairman Ken Loury, Mayor Chegwiddden, Councilwoman Wickenheiser, Ms. Charlotte Kelly, Mr. Roger Steele, Mr. Marc Harris, Mr. Patrick O'Brien, Mr. Brian Bosworth, Mr. Christopher Fleischman and Ms. Barb Chiappa. Also, present were Attorney Alan Zakin, Planner Jessica Caldwell, Engineer Christopher Borinski and Secretary Patricia Craven. Excused were was Mr. Peter Rathjens.

The Pledge of Allegiance was next.

The reading of the bills was next. A Motion was made by Charlotte Kelly and Seconded by Barb Chiappa to approve the bills as read. YEA – 10 NAY – 0

The Minutes of the June 29, 2021 Special Planning Board Meeting was next. A Motion was made by Marc Harris and Seconded by Brian Bosworth to approve the Minutes
YEA – 8 NAY - 0 ABST – 2 (Chegwiddden & Wickenheiser)

Approval of the Resolution for Grace Martinez/Rigoberto Aguayo was next on the agenda. A discussion followed about the use of the basement. A Motion was made by Roger Steele and Seconded by Brian Bosworth to approve the Resolution. YEA– 8 NAY– 0 ABST 2 (Chegwiddden & Wickenheiser)

Next, under New Business was the Application for Frank Smith Minor Subdivision. Attorney Alyse Hubbard addressed the Board. The minor subdivision application is for Block 1601, Lot 18 and 19 located at 128 and 132 Old Irondale Rd. in the R-75 zone. These are adjacent lots and the applicant has applied for a lot line adjustment to add 12,000 sq. ft. to increase the lot area of the lot he currently occupies at 132 Old Irondale Rd.

Mr. Frank Smith was sworn in. He resides for the last 42 years at 132 Old Irondale Rd. and has owned 128 Old Irondale for the last 28 years. His home is a 2-bedroom home. He has tenants in 128 which is also a 2-bedroom home. He wants to move the lot line 50 feet from 128 Old Irondale and add 50 feet to the adjacent property at 132 Old Irondale. He splits wood for the winter and want more room on his property to store his wood away from his house. To access 128 Old Irondale, you have to come up Mill Street and to access 132 Old Irondale you come up Old Irondale Rd. The roads do not connect as there are woods between the two properties.

The meeting was open to the public. Mr. Michael Besney of 1 Bartek Lane asked about the parking for the tenants at 128 Old Irondale. Mr. Smith stated that it is a dead end and they park on the side of the road which is 45 ft wide.

Ms. Caldwell stated that the part of Old Irondale that they are on is not constructed in front of these 2 lots. They will need a variance because the Land Use Law Section 4055D-35 requires that a building lot has to abut a street and this is not a constructed street. The main criteria is so that emergency vehicles can have access to those 2 properties. Another concern is the driveway on Lot 19 is part of the property being moved over to Lot 18, so they are left with no parking. They currently park on the dead-end street. RSIS requires 2 parking spaces for a 2-bedroom home.

They should provide off street parking. There is room for off street parking on the site.

The applicant, Mr. Smith will add a driveway to Lot 19 which will be separate from the driveway on Lot 18. The applicant agrees making an additional two car driveway on Lot 19 a condition of approval.

Attorney Zakin stated that they can amend the application to include the variance brought up by the Borough Planner. Attorney Hubbard was fine with that and had advertised for any variances the Board deemed necessary.

The meeting was now open to the public. Mr. Luis Rivera, 36 New Irondale Rd. asked if anything was going to be built behind Mr. Smith's house as part of this application, adjacent to his property. Mr. Smith stated no, only the driveway.

The meeting was now closed to the public.

Mr. Gary L. Worley of Worley and Assoc. LLC was sworn in and qualified as a Land Surveyor. Mr. Worley stated that the driveway and shed that are currently part of Lot 18, and will become part of Lot 19 after the lot line adjustment, are not used by the tenant but by Mr. Smith. This is another reason Mr. Smith would like the lot line moved. The tenants do not use the lower driveway they park above on the road. He described the present condition of the properties.

Mr. Worley stated that they are conforming in all of the lot sizes even with Lot 18 going from 35,326 to 23,273sq. ft. where 7,500 is the minimum required. Lot 29 has a dwelling on the property and the tenants park on the street. There is an existing 2 car driveway. He stated that coming from Kice Ave up Old Irondale you can't drive through because of the wooded area. It is a 10-12 % grade. There are some preexisting, non-conforming conditions at 132 Old Irondale they have 2 framed sheds that are 6.8 ft and 14.1 ft off the property line and at 128 Old Irondale they have a block patio on the front lawn of the property adjacent to the right of way. As a condition of approval, they will remove the patio, add a 2-car driveway at 128 Old Irondale and will all be done within 2 years or prior to selling the property. Engineer Borinski stated that he will work with the applicant on the driveway.

Brian Bosworth asked how the tenants park and turn around. Chief Young stated that they probably do a k-turn. Attorney Zakin stated that the new driveway would improve that.

Planner Caldwell said that given the fact that the tenants are parking in the street she would like to see the driveway in sooner than 2 years and/or prior to any sale.

Engineer Borinski asked that they file a new deed with the court office. Attorney Hubbard agreed.

The meeting was open to the public. Michael Bezney, 1 Bartek Lane asked about drainage along Old Irondale Rd. Chairman Loury stated that that is not part of this application. The meeting was now closed for questions.

The meeting was open for testimony. Michael Bezney, 1 Bartek Lane was sworn in. He stated that Mr. Smith is an outstanding citizen, he has known him for years, he has been there forever and let him enjoy his property.

The meeting was closed for testimony.

Attorney Zakin went over the conditions. This is a minor subdivision, lot line adjustment to Block 1601, Lot 18 & 19 in the RM75 zone.

Conditions are - 2 car driveway on Lot 19.

removal of the concrete patio on Lot 19,
both completed within 2 years or sale of parcel.

A Motion was made by Marc Harris and Seconded by Patrick O'Brien to approve the application with the conditions that were listed. YEA – 10 NAY – 0

Next, under Old Business, was the continuation of the Wharton Woods application. Chairman Loury stated for the record that Mayor Chegwiddden and Councilwoman Wickenheisser both stepped down at this time because they cannot sit on a D variance application.

The continuation of the Wharton Woods application was next on the agenda. Attorney Wyciskala addressed the Board. He stated that their Planner John McDonough had gotten through his testimony at the last meeting but was still subject to questions. They will defer continuation of Mr. McDonough's testimony and call their first witness Mr. John Crimi who is the principal of Wharton Woods, LLC and the owner of this property throughout the prior application and the contract seller of the property to the current applicant K Hovnanian. Mr. Crimi took this property through the original approval in 2014 and had started the improvements. Mr. Crimi, 41 Beavers Rd., Califon, N.J. was sworn in at this time. He testified that he has owned this property since 1979. He donated 139 Green Acres of this parcel to the Borough of Wharton which left them with this 10-acre parcel. He had tried to sell this 10-acre parcel to the Borough of Wharton negotiating with the former Mayor Shupe and also the current Mayor Chegwiddden. The Borough said they could not buy it because of the COAH obligation to the property. The site had mining issues and when it was rendered safe, they applied and were approved in 2014 for a 67-unit development which included COAH units. When they took it to the market there was not market for 67 units based on the density and size of the units which were over 3,000 sq. ft. They came back to the town who advised them that they need to keep the same footprint, can't change the roads, the sewer, the water, you can't put the units outside the curb line of each building base, you have to keep everything the same and Mr. Crimi agreed. Mr. Crimi brought in Ryan Homes who had a plan to develop 92 units on this property. After deciding not to do business with Ryan Homes they brought in K Hovnanian who designed the property with 90 units which he says now gives them a marketable piece of property that they are prepared to build and market. They have kept the exact footprint, have not changed the curb line or grade line. All the storm drains, sewer and water are installed on the north side as well as some on the south side.

They then had to deal with COAH. They found property on 57 Main St. and got involved with Cerebral Palsy of New Jersey, now Pillar Care Continuum. This project will have 24 beds and should be coming before the Board in August. They also bought another piece of property on Baker Ave. for a group home but discovered that the property was not wide enough. One of the goals and one of the things that was appealing was that they are going to be able to deliver a for sale type of project as apposed to another rental project in Wharton. The idea of this development is to open it up for seniors, for the young, the middle aged or for someone who wanted to downsize. Wharton was now providing a for sale unit, adding diversity of housing products to the Borough

Chairman Loury stated that it wasn't marketable at 3000 sq. ft and now they are offering 18 to 2200 sq. ft. Is the difference of 800 sq. ft really going to make something not marketable? Mr. Crimi stated he went to all of the main developers in the area and that is what they told him. This is not going to go anywhere. The size units they are proposing is what is marketable. Mr. Steele stated that he was on the board at the informal meeting, which is the Tenancy Review Committee, which, just to make a point, has no authority. He also stated that they did not say they had to stay in the footprint, that they couldn't change the curbs, we didn't say any of those things, we may have suggested it. The original application was for more units and there was a lot of discussion before approval, and we reduced it to the eventual 67 units. When they came before us and said it wasn't marketable, that was pre COVID. It was pre the real estate boom we are seeing now. So, what you are saying is those units at that size, with everything else being gobbled off the market right now, would not sell; it's a different real estate market now, I would think it would be better. Mr. Crimi stated that that is what the professionals are telling him and that is why there are 90 units in front of you today. Mr. Steele asked who is the expert that would be able to answer that question. Mr. Crimi stated that the experts are K. Hovnanian. The experts at Ryan homes were at 92 units, not even 90. Chairman Loury stated that none of those experts on marketability have testified yet. We asked at the last meeting why it's 90 units, why are they all 3-bedroom units and why are they marketable. We have not heard any testimony on this. Mr. Steele stated that it has been 3 years since the Tenancy Review meeting and the market is different now. What he is looking for is someone to validate that in today's market, COVID/post COVID, when the market is booming, how marketable those original units would be. Obviously, we have a problem with density here. He would like to hear from an expert that the original 67 units in the larger size aren't going to sell because what he sees is just the opposite.

Chairman Loury asked why 3 bedrooms. Mr. Crimi stated that K Hovnanian as well as Ryan Homes suggested 3 bedroom which would be 2 bedrooms and 1 would be a den. It is supposed to be the most usable for people and having an extra room is important. Chairman Loury stated it could also be used as a 3rd bedroom and will be sold as a 3 bedroom.

Mr. O'Brien asked about what the medium price they were looking at \$450,000? Mr. Fleischmann stated that they had said \$47,000 which he thought was on the high side. Attorney Wyciskala stated that they were going to have a correction on that.

Chairman Loury asked Attorney Wyciskala if they were going to have testimony from an expert that is going to be able to support that claim that the 67 units weren't marketable. Attorney Wyciskala stated yes, that was correct.

Planner Caldwell stated that they were approved for 67 units, 15 of those were affordable, so that would be 52 market rate units. With the option from the discussions and what they are asking the

Board to approve of offset affordable, the zone allows for 72 units. That is another 20 units. That would give them 72 market units. Did they explore that as a marketable possibility? Mr. O'Brien stated he thought it was 74. Planner Caldwell state they may possibly get 74 market rate units which is 22 more than what was approved by the Board. She is wondering how much the 72 units or 74 units were explored. Mr. Crimi explained all the money that has been put into this site. Chairman Loury stated that all of the infrastructure that is there is not new. That is the risk of owning that land and development and is not our part of the job of approving this. If all that infrastructure was fine and all your investment was fine within these 67 units, you can't use that as an argument of why you need 90 units now. It's the same infrastructure you had for 67 units. Mr. Crimi stated that at the bigger units they were paying more per single lot, with the smaller units they pay less per single lot. The total income to him as the owner is the same whether it 90 or 67 units because the 67 units, they were paying a lot more per door. When they had to get those economics and transfer it to 90 they got a lot less per door to get to where the 67 was, to pay for the infrastructure and all the mine remediation.

Chairman Loury asked Attorney Zakin if the developers finances are part of this application. Attorney Zakin stated that it's more of a planning question that a legal question. The profit the developer makes is of no consequence to us but in terms of getting something built and getting something built that would benefit the town you could consider that. If they are saying, and it is for the Board to decide, that does the evidence they are giving show that they couldn't make it work at 67 units and they are coming for 90 units, then that is something that you can consider. Mr. Steele stated that the commercial liability is not our burden, our burden is to find the right project for this town and it was approved for 67 units. He questions the increase in density. Attorney Zakin said it's the benefits and the detriments. The benefit you'll get from having it occupied and having new residents versus if you believe that it's not feasible to be built at the lower number which is something for the Board to consider based on the evidence presented. Mr. Steele stated that is why he wanted the experts to testify. Mr. Harris asked, in this case could a substantial burden be the inability to actually produce anything on this property and would it be categorized under a burden because the market doesn't support it. Ms. Caldwell stated that on a hardship case you cannot have financial hardship. She stated that 72 is viable and is it viable or not based on 90 units. Or is it more financially viable? She wouldn't have it be the macro reason for the Board's decision. They should be looking at it overall as a project and not just based on finance. She would also like to hear from their other witnesses as well. Mr. Steele stated that the commercial gain is not from 67 to 90, It's from 52 or so to 90. So that is two units gained and 38 commercially salable units from the original application. But there are density questions.

Mr. Bosworth asked Mr. Crimi how he came by the property. Mr. Crimi bought the 439-acre property in bankruptcy from Alan Wood Steel in 1979. 239 acres are now open space for Wharton and Mine Hill, 51 acres are an industrial park, 125 acres are soil removal and this almost 10-acre piece.

Attorney Wyciskala stated that they view the creation of housing for special needs adults to be a significant benefit and one that will yield what would otherwise be a greater unit number that just the straight 20 percent set aside. He stated that the proposed density is not approved, the contract with K Hovnanian will be terminated and there would be no project that the owner has planned to replace.

Chairman Loury asked if it doesn't get approved the land is just going to sit like it is in perpetuity. There is no viable use for that land. Mr. Bosworth stated that they would still have a valid 67-unit project. That can go up to 74. Attorney Wyciskala stated yes.

The meeting was now open to the public. Mr. Bezney did not have a question and will wait for the expert's testimony.

Mr. Frank Smith of 132 Old Irondale Rd. asked if the mine in the middle of the site needs to have a fence around it. Engineer Borinski heard from Gary Gartenberg who is the Borough's Mine Expert, that if the mine is remediated it does not need to be fenced and this mine has been remediated.

Mr. Brian Lance of 113 Old Irondale Rd. commended Mr. Crimi for his philanthropy over the years. Mr. Lance stated that if the project could be approved for 72 marketable units, they could make it more marketable by adding some amenities such as an indoor pool, and gym and still have the smaller footprint and smaller buildings. Mr. Lance will wait for their experts to testify.

Mr. Bezney asked Mr. Crimi if the Green Acre land was donated or given to the town. Mr. Crimi stated they donated half and half was paid for.

Mr. George Schroll of 141 St. Mary's St. asked who the experts were that told Mr. Crimi that the 3000 sq ft was not marketable. Chairman Loury stated that a representative from K. Hovnanian will be testifying tonight.

The meeting was now closed to the public.

Sworn in next was Timothy Richardson who is the Land Acquisition Manager for K. Hovnanian. He finds, negotiates, appraises, and analyzes residential real estate property for "for sale" homes built, for over 30 years. He is representing himself as an expert on valuation and marketability of properties.

Attorney Wyciskala asked Mr. Richardson to speak on the density, why it's required and why it works. Mr. Richardson stated that the original 67-unit plan had very large, wide 2 story units. In today's market, with the cost of construction and materials and \$120.00 per sq ft. an 800 square foot difference is a lot of money. When analyzing a property, he looks at competitors in other towns and make adjustments for the town of Wharton. He also looks at resales. When they stated this process, it was pre COVID. They followed the guidance of the informal meetings and stayed within the footprints and finding something that is marketable that's going to fit into the town of Wharton and make it viable. He looked at the surrounding market. They were staying within the footprint and did not change the sewers, streets or retaining walls. They redesigned and increased the units; without altering the footprint of the aggregated structures by reducing the square footage of each unit. The impervious coverage decreased slightly from the original 67 units, with more units on site. He stated that the cost of lumber has increased \$30,000 per house for lumber. When you're taking a bigger home which requires more lumber and more material to build, they would have to charge a price that is not marketable in Wharton for a townhouse.

Mr. Steele stated that what he is saying is they could not sell the 67 homes on the previous project, they don't think they would sell in today's market? Mr. Richardson stated that he thinks

they would be too expensive for the marketplace. At \$125 a square foot, not including any of your land, times 3,000 sq. ft you're at \$500,000 just to build the house.

Chairman Loury asked why is the 74 units, in our ordinance, the max allowed up there. Why would 74 not be marketable, but 90 would be. Mr. Richardson is not saying that it wouldn't be marketable, but it would require revisions to the plans which the guidance was to stay within the approved plans. If we can fit 90 in the approved plans, why would we do less and have to redesign and redraw? Chairman Loury asked if they would be ok if we said 74 and go back and give us a different plan. Mr. Richardson stated that he is not the landowner and would have to go back to his team to determine whether they would want to move forward with less units. Chairman Loury stated that 74 would be marketable between 18 and 2200 sq. ft. Mr. Richardson stated 20 would be marketable. If he had a 20-home town home community in another town people would buy them, especially in this market. In this particular case he can't make that decision. Can he sell homes in Wharton for \$380 to 420? Yes.

Mr. O'Brien asked why 3 bedrooms. Mr. Richardson stated that that is just the norm, especially with everyone working at home because of COVID and to have more office space or dedicated workspace. It's just the standard, the 3-bedroom town home.

Mr. Bosworth asked if there are any for sale like town home condo complexes in Wharton already. Chairman Loury stated that the only one he knows of is Overlook village. There are also condos on Richard Mine Rd. Mr. Wyciskala stated that that was something that was a consideration when this project stalled in 2016. They recognized that there were a number of new rental projects going in. The discussion at the informal meeting was that it was an opportunity for a for sale project with a national builder, and provide a housing type that they view as needed here in this community.

Mr. Steele asked what date did K. Hovnanian contract to buy this property. They said it was before COVID. Mr. Crimi stated it was 2019 and it expired and they executed a new agreement in 2020, right at the start of COVID. Mr. Steele stated that it was during COVID in 2020. Mr. Richardson stated it was uncertain times they didn't know if this project was going to take off. Attorney Wyciskala stated it is absolutely approval contingent, no approval they terminate.

The meeting was now open to the public. Mr. Bezney asked if they did an appraisal. Mr. Robertson stated that they did not, he analyzed the property. Mr. Loury stated that there has to be some type of market analysis. He said that Mr. Richardson gave testimony that this application is the only way it's going to be marketable but he didn't present us with anything. There has to be some sort of document such as an overall project viability study or something. You are asking the Board to take your word for it and you haven't given the Board anything to say that the 67 units, the bigger units aren't marketable. Mr. Richardson stated that the 67 units weren't marketable because of the expense to build them, plus the engineering, the improvement, the water fees, plus the profit. He compares it with what's selling in other towns and evaluates the value and the marketability accordingly.

Mr. Bezney asked if they thought, over the next couple years, that the construction costs would be going to go down. Mr. Richardson stated that was anyone's guess right now.

Mr. Lance asked if adding a gym and clubhouse like the Ryan Homes in Mt. Olive would make it more marketable. Mr. Richardson stated they would add value but also add cost. Chairman

Loury stated that it also means more money into the price. If you had a rec center, a common area and a pool you could see maybe a 3000 sq. ft. unit. Attorney Wyciskala stated with a 3000 sq. ft. unit you still have the same construction costs, it doesn't work. Without add-ons you're looking at half-million-dollar type unit. Does a clubhouse warrant that in this marketplace?

Mr. Bezney asked if they were going to provide any type of appraisal. Chairman Loury stated that they had walked us through the logic and no they were not going to provide anything else.

Attorney Wyciskala asked for a 5-minute break. Chairman Loury agreed. Recess taken

Following the recess, ROLL CALL was taken and the following members were present: Chairman Ken Loury, Ms. Charlotte Kelly, Mr. Roger Steele, Mr. Marc Harris, Mr. Patrick O'Brien, Mr. Brian Bosworth, Mr. Christopher Fleischman and Ms. Barb Chiappa. Also, present were Attorney Alan Zakin, Planner Jessica Caldwell, Engineer Christopher Borinski and Secretary Patricia Craven.

Attorney Wyciskala stated that their witness Planner John McDonough was unavailable due to another meeting that went longer than expected and they would like to carry and bring him back at the next meeting. The next meeting is August 10th at 7 pm., in person. Chairman Loury told the public that if they have any questions for Planner McDonough regarding his testimony from the at the June 29, 2021 special meeting and that those members of the public with questions will go first. There will be no additional public notice. Mr. Steele asked that Mr. McDonough do a review at the next meeting. Chairman Loury stated that they will start with the review and then ask public questions of Mr. McDonough. Attorney Wyciskala agreed and stated that all of his experts would be accessible. Attorney Zakin stated that if the public has any exhibit for testimony, please get it in ahead of time to the Planning Board and we'll consider it and put it on the website if appropriate. Mr. Lance stated that he has some pictures to discuss in his testimony. Attorney Zakin stated that if they have them electronically, they can get them to the Secretary. Ms. Craven stated that if they are color documents, she is not able to scan them in color but they can email them to her at pcraven@whartonnj.com. Attorney Wyciskala stated that if there is something Mr. Lance wants us to look at or discuss they are happy to discuss it on the way out this evening.

Attorney Zakin had a couple issues he would like to discuss. There were some issues raised by the Chairman and the public regarding some of the conditions of the areas adjacent to the property in terms of some disturbance that may have occurred due to the construction where the applicant may have been the proximate cause of some disturbance to area properties. They discussed with the applicant through their Attorney Wyciskala that there would be some sort of bond posted prior to approval. This is something that we are facilitating, working with the Borough Engineer from Van Cleef Engineers and the Borough Administrator Jon Rheinhardt who will administer it. There will be a process whereby if any of the public has any issues with the adjacent areas, they can contact the Borough who will have a process to address it. This is something that will be memorialized in the resolution and enforced by the Borough and working with the Board Engineer Borinski and Borough Engineer Battaglia.

Attorney Zakin stated that there are conditions in the resolution from 2014 that may have changed or are now no longer appropriate. They will go over them after all of the applicant's testimony is completed. There are 3 conditions specific to Mr. Lance and Mr. Bezney that he would like to go over tonight.

1. Mr. Lance at 113 Old Irondale Rd.- that the lot will be level and extended with a split rail fence from one side of his property to the top of the wall. The fence will consist of materials that are mutually acceptable to lot owner and Borough Engineer. New trees along both sides of his property line will be at least 6 to 8 ft in height. Existing trees on the subject property will not be disturbed.

Attorney Wyciskala confirmed and agreed with that. He said that the reason why a wall has to go in there is because that front is actually part of their property. The split rail fence is for safety purposes. Their plan has trees going down both sides of Mr. Lance's property. The minimum planting height is 6 to 8 feet and actually they have some larger initial planting sizes. Mr. Lance was agreeable to the language. Mr. Lance would like to keep the height of the property in front the way it is. Attorney Wyciskala had spoke to Mr. Hansen about it today and he thinks it will be about 3 to 4 ft high but he will confirm that. Planner Caldwell is okay with that.

2. Mr. Lance – curb cut for a second driveway for approval by our Engineer and Planner to accommodate a preexisting condition.

Attorney Wyciskala had no issue with that. Engineer Borinski thought there was a requirement for the distance between two driveways on one property. He will check on it.

3. Mr. Bezney – 1 Bartek Lane – from the 2014 Resolution “At the southerly entrance, the applicant will work with property owners of 1 Bartek Lane, Block 601, Lot 24 to add additional landscaping at their property and/or along the right-of-way in order to appropriately help to shield property owners therein from oncoming headlights” To the reasonable satisfaction of the Board Planner and Board Engineer.

Chairman Loury thought the applicant had also moved their driveway to accommodate this condition as well. Mr. Bezney can work with our Engineer and Planner on that. A discussion followed and Mr. Bezney will bring up his other concerns during his testimony.

Attorney Zakin said that Attorney Wyciskala had stated that he'd have all his professionals available. Attorney Wyciskala stated that he would have whoever is testifying that night will be there.

A Motion was made by Marc Harris and Seconded by Barb Chiappa to carry this application to the August 10, 2021 Planning Board meeting without further notice. YEA - 10 NAY - 0

A Motion was made by Mr. Harris and Seconded by Mr. O'Brien to adjourn. YEA -10 NAY -0

Meeting adjourned at 9:52 p.m.

Patricia M. Craven – Secretary

Ken Loury - Chairman