

**LAKWOOD PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
MAY 24, 2005 • 6:00 P.M.**

CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE

Chairman Banas called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M. with the Pledge of Allegiance and Mr. Kielt read the Certification of Compliance with the NJ Open Public Meetings Act:

“The time, date and location of this meeting was published in the Ocean County Observer and the Asbury Park Press and posted on the bulletin board in the office of the Township of Lakewood. Advance written Notice has been filed with the Township Clerk for purpose of public inspection and a copy of this Agenda has been mailed, faxed or delivered to at least two of the following newspapers: The Asbury Park Press, The Ocean County Observer, or The Tri-Town News at least 48 hours in advance. This meeting meets all the criteria of the Open Public Meetings Act.”

ROLL CALL: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Long, Mr. Banas, Mrs. Wise, Mr. Dolobowsky, and Mr. Ackerman.

Also present were: Attorney John Jackson
Engineer Maxwell Peters
Planner Stan Slachetka.

Mr. Banas asked if there were any changes and Mr. Kielt replied that Mr. Shea requested that Item 3, SD #1471, be carried to the June 7, 2005 technical meeting.

Mr. Jackson stated that item 3, SD #1471, shall be carried to the June 7, 2005 technical meeting at 6:00 p.m. No further notice was required of the applicant.

III. OLD BUSINESS

1. SD #1446A (No variance requested)

Applicant: Joseph Gutterman

Location: Miller Road, between Shady Lane & Carasaljo Drive
Block 12.02 Lot 18

Extension of previously approved minor subdivision

Mr. Peters stated that the application was for a minor subdivision. As part of the Ocean County Planning Board approval, the applicant was to widen Miller Road along the property's frontage. This approval is a condition of the Lakewood Township Planning Board approval. The time required for the road widening design has caused the applicant to seek an extension of approval which he recommended granting.

Mr. Slachetka stated that the applicant should present testimony addressing the statutory criteria outlined in paragraph a “project description.

Brian Flannery, P.E., was sworn in and his credentials were accepted. He stated that the applicant is requesting an extension. You get 190 days normally. Dealing with the County and road improvements, they ran out of time and were requesting an extension.

Mr. Banas asked if this was the first extension and Mr. Flannery replied it was.

Mr. Banas asked if he had to open this to the public. Mr. Jackson replied no.

On motion by Mr. Dolobowsky and seconded by Mrs. Wise, the requested time extension of 190 days was hereby granted.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Herzl, yes; Mr. Franklin, yes; Mr. Long, yes; Mr. Banas, yes; Mrs. Wise, yes; and Mr. Dolobowsky, yes.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

- 1. SD #1467** (Variance requested)
Applicant: Karl Hanson
Location: Eleventh Street, east of Clifton Avenue
Block 111 Lot 9
Minor subdivision to create two lots

Mr. Flannery stated that Mr. Penzer is the attorney who is not present yet. Mr. Banas stated this would be postponed until later.

- 2. SP #1809** (Variance requested)
Applicant: Toyota World of Lakewood
Location: Route 88, east of New Hampshire Avenue
Block 569 Lot 110

Amended site plan to replace existing free standing sign and addition of driveway entry direction signs

Mr. Peters stated the applicant is seeking amended site plan approval for the construction of one free standing sign and one entrance sign. The free standing sign will be constructed in place of an existing free standing sign at 1188 Ocean Avenue which is an existing automobile dealership in the B-4 zone. The applicant has requested variances for maximum sign height and area. A maximum sign height of 25 feet is permitted, a height of 42 is proposed. A maximum of 100 square feet sign area is permitted, an area of 420 square feet is proposed. An additional variance will be required for minimum sign setback. A minimum setback of 42 feet is required, 15 feet is existing and proposed.

Mr. Slachetka stated an illuminated entrance sign detail is provided on sheet 2. The sign face is approximately 8 square feet in area, the sign is 5 feet in height and setback is 15

feet from the property line. A variance is required from the provisions of section 18-16.9a which allows a non-illuminated directional sign a maximum of 3 square feet in area. The applicant must address the positive and negative criteria for the requested variance. The narrative in the application form refers to a 10' x 12' freestanding sign. This is not consistent with the sign detail and should be changed to be consistent with the plan.

Ray Shea, Esq., appearing on behalf of the applicant.

Charles Witte, P.E., was sworn in and his credentials were accepted. Mr. Shea stated it was a straight forward application. Mr. Witte stated it was an existing business. There is a small grass island in front of the building where there is presently a sign of the same height that they were putting up now. They were replacing the sign with a new sign and add a small directional sign in the northeast corner. This sign is very similar to the one that is across the street. It is keeping with the area. Mr. Shea stated they were here because this amends the site plan that was previously approved.

Mr. Banas asked how this sign would differ from the Honda sign across the street. Mr. Witte stated it was the same shape and size. It was a different color.

Mr. Banas opened the application to the public. Seeing no person wishing to speak for or against the application, Mr. Banas closed the public hearing.

On motion by Mr. Long and seconded by Mr. Herzl, the application was hereby approved.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Herzl, yes; Mr. Franklin, yes; Mr. Long, yes; Mr. Banas, yes; Mrs. Wise, yes; Mr. Dolobowsky, yes; and Mr. Ackerman, yes.

1. **SD #1467** (Variance requested)
Applicant: Karl Hanson
Location: Eleventh Street, east of Clifton Avenue
Block 111 Lot 9
Minor subdivision to create two lots

Mr. Peters stated the applicant is seeking a minor subdivision at 241 Eleventh Street within the R-10 zone. A variance is required for minimum lot area, 10,000 square feet is required and 7,500 square feet for both lots is proposed. A variance will be required for minimum lot width, 75 feet is required and 50 feet for both lots is proposed. A variance will be required for the minimum front yard setback, 30 feet is required and 19.8 feet for 9.01 is proposed. This is an existing condition. A variance will be required for minimum side yard setback, 10 feet one side and 25 feet combined are required, and 7.7 feet one side and 19.7 feet combined for lot 9.01 is proposed. A variance will be required for maximum lot coverage, 25% coverage is permitted, 27.7% coverage is proposed. The applicant has indicated that Ocean County Planning Board approval was obtained on March 2, 2005 and evidence of the approval will be submitted under compliance review.

Mr. Slachetka stated the applicant must address the positive and negative criteria of the variance requests. Testimony concerning compatibility of the proposed lots with the

surrounding neighborhood should be provided to the planning board in support of the requested variances. Ocean County Planning Board approval has been obtained.

Abraham Penzer, Esq., appearing on behalf of the applicant. He stated that many lots in the area are the same amount of footage or less.

Brian Flannery, P.E., was sworn in and his credentials were accepted. He stated the application is for a minor subdivision of an existing 15,000 square foot lot on Eleventh Street. The property currently has a dwelling and a garage on the lot. Half of the lot has no development. This is an application in a neighborhood where most of the lots were smaller. A lot of the lots have been combined. These two lots were formally separate but were merged. They are in common ownership right now. An exhibit was made that shows the development pattern. Exhibit A-1 was a rendered version of a minor subdivision plan submitted. Exhibit A-2 is a rendering showing the block bounded by Clifton Avenue on the west, Lexington Avenue on the east, Carey Street to the north, and Eleventh Street to the south. The subject property is surrounded by a heavy boundary line. The lots that are currently 50' wide x 100' deep are shown in red. This is consistent with the subject property. Six of the adjoining lots within the block are 50' x 150' consistent with what they were asking for. There are other lots which exceeds the ordinance requirements. The lots on the corners are larger. The smaller lots are internal. Half of the lots are 50' x 150' and the others are either larger or more conforming. It is an area that had a lot of older houses. The older houses are being replaced. The MLUL indicates that the variances can be granted by the planning board. The C-2 variance indicates that the purposes of the act would be advanced by the deviation from the zoning ordinance requirements and the benefits of the deviation would substantially outweigh the detriments. The benefits of the application from the MLUL fits under e to promote the establishment of appropriate population densities and concentrations that would contribute to the well-being of persons, neighborhoods, communities, and regions. He felt that it was an appropriate population density. He thought most people knew about the housing shortage. The lot can be subdivided and a second house constructed without any substantial detriment to the zoning plan or zoning ordinance. It would be consistent with the pattern of development in the area. The alternative would be the raising of the existing house and putting a very large house, out of character with most of the adjoining houses to the east, or a house of worship or school. This would not be the best use of the property on a side street. He felt the board could grant the variances without any substantial detriment to the zoning plan or zoning ordinance. He felt there were no negative criteria based on the location of the property. The remainder of the comments from the professionals were minor in nature. He reviewed the variances outlined in the reports. The second lot would have a 30' setback. On the lot with the existing dwelling the lot coverage would be 27.7%. The variances fit in the category of a C-2 variance. Mr. Penzer stated that one lot is only 48'. Mr. Flannery stated lot 8 is less than 50' and the dwelling is located near the rear of the lot, which is typical of the area. It is a much older neighborhood. When the lots were developed, the development pattern was different than what they are today.

Mr. Dolobowsky stated he felt the appropriate population density was a R-10. Some lots are R-10 or greater. On sheet 1 of 1, all of the lots across the streets are larger. Sheet 1 of 1 was marked as Exhibit A-3. He did not see why the application should be approved. He felt it should be left as R-10 or greater.

Mr. Long stated that it was indicated there was a housing shortage. Just because there is a housing shortage does not mean they have to over-populate the community. He felt if all the applications were granted in the area, eventually the area would be over-populated. He agreed with Mr. Dolobowsky.

Mr. Herzl asked if the property was original separate. Mr. Flannery stated it was combined when the owner of lot 9.02 purchased the adjoining lot. If the lots were purchased by two separate owners, it would not be an issue. They would appear before the zoning board. Because they were combined, there is a 15,000 square foot lot in the R-10 zone and is oversized for the zone. The relief they were seeking makes it undersized.

Mr. Long stated that the Environmental Commission indicated that the lots were undersized and do not conform with the neighborhood. Mr. Flannery stated that was a statement of fact. He provided testimony for the same.

Mr. Banas stated using Exhibit A-3 were the lots across the street the same size as on the north side of Eleventh Street. Mr. Flannery stated that it does not show the depth of the lots. The depth is the same and the map shows everything within 200 feet. Within 200 feet, the lots are all conforming in size.

Mr. Banas opened the application to the public.

Irwin Wenger, 235 11th Street, was sworn in. He stated he was the neighbor next door to this property. There were a number of neighbors from the area that were here to oppose the subdivision. He appreciated some of the comments from the members. He lives on a smaller undersized lot. He did not subdivide to create the lots. He bought it as it was and has been living there for twenty years. He thought he lived on one of the most beautiful blocks in Lakewood. He did not want anyone to take an existing lot and make it less than R-10. He felt the lots would be too small. They are asking for variances for the lots. They were creating the hardship for the variance itself. They want to split the lot which creates the problem. He recently put on a deck and had to get a variance. The engineer did not want him to build the deck to the corner of his house because it would be too close to his neighbor. He did not create it though. If they wanted to build a house on the lot, he had no problems. The owner of the property lives in Florida and there is no inherently beneficial use. This is a simple matter. They want to subdivide the property in order to sell it. This would set a precedent on the area. Investors would come over and buy the properties and then subdivide it because the precedent was set. They did not want that. The neighbors were not consulted about the application. He was opposed to the application.

Mr. Kielt asked that all individuals to speak in the microphones.

Greta Oppenheimer, 1113 Clifton Avenue, was sworn in. She stated that she agreed with Mr. Wengner. She had a full size lot. They were approached countless time to subdivide her property. The few smaller lots have been there for over 45 years. She had no problems with putting up a larger house. She felt the subdivision would be unfair.

Seeing no further person wishing to speak for or against the application, Mr. Banas closed the public hearing.

On motion by Mr. Long and seconded by Mrs. Wise, the application was hereby denied on the basis of the size of the lots would be smaller and the zone should be maintained as much as possible to avoid variances.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Herzl, yes; Mr. Franklin, yes; Mr. Long, yes; Mr. Banas, yes; Mrs. Wise, yes; Mr. Dolobowsky, yes; and Mr. Ackerman, yes.

4. **SD #1474** (No variance requested)
Applicant: Pine Projects, LLC
Location: County Line Road East & Lanes Mill Road, east of Joe Parker Road
Block 187 Lots 53.01 and 53.02
Minor subdivision to create two lots

Mr. Peters stated the applicant is seeking minor subdivision approval to transfer 28,695 square feet land from existing lot 53.02 to existing lot 53.01. The lots contain an existing single family home and a single family home under construction. Existing lot 53.01 fronts on Lanes Mill Road, existing lot 53.02 fronts on County Line Road East. The properties are located in the R-15 residential zone. It appears that the applicant will be required to obtain approval from Ocean County Planning Board. No other outside agency approvals are anticipated.

Mr. Slachetka stated that the plat has been revised to grant a road widening easement of 5.25 feet to Ocean County, therefore the front yard setback is in compliance with the zoning requirements. The applicant has addressed the reasons for the subdivision and the same should be put on the record.

Abraham Penzer, Esq., appearing on behalf of the applicant.

Brian Flannery, P.E., was sworn in and his credentials were accepted. He stated the application was for a subdivision. No variances are required. The property has frontage on Lanes Mills Road and County Line Road. There is currently a house under construction on County Line Road. The applicant wishes to make that a conforming lot and transfer the excess area to the other lot which has frontage on Lanes Mills Road. They would comply with all the minor comments from the professionals.

Mr. Banas opened the application to the public. Seeing no person wishing to speak for or against the application, Mr. Banas closed the public hearing.

On motion by Mr. Dolobowsky and seconded by Mr. Herzl, the application was hereby approved.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Herzl, yes; Mr. Franklin, yes; Mr. Long, yes; Mr. Banas, yes; Mrs. Wise, yes; Mr. Dolobowsky, yes; and Mr. Ackerman, yes.

5. **SD #1472** (Variance requested)
Applicant: Yosef Lipschitz
Location: corner of Vine Avenue & Elm Street
Block 764 Lots 12 & 13
Minor subdivision to re-align two existing lots

This was postponed until later in the meeting.

6. **SP #1812** (Variance requested)
Applicant: Stratford Holdings 101 LLC
Location: corner of Fourth Street & Monmouth Avenue
Block 128 Lot 7

Preliminary and final site plan for 3,080 square feet addition to existing commercial building

Mr. Peters stated the applicant is seeking preliminary and final site plan approval for the construction of a 3,080 square foot addition to the existing Center Deli Food Market at Fourth Street and Monmouth Avenue within the B-2 zone. The applicant has requested a variance for minimum side yard setback for the existing structure. A minimum side yard of seven feet is required, the existing and proposed side yard is 0.1 feet. The applicant should provide testimony as to the proposed uses for the three units and how deliveries to the units will be accommodated. The applicant has revised the plans to indicate splash blocks will be provided to at all down spouts. The plans should be revised to indicate the down spouts in the front of the building will be collected underground and piped to the existing inlet in the adjacent street. The plans have been revised to indicate a new building mounted light fixture. It appears the new light fixture will cast more than one foot candle of light onto the adjacent residential properties causing an unacceptable condition. The output of the proposed light is difficult to determine from the detail as it appears to be scaled incorrectly. The detail should be revised and the isolux lines added to the site plan. The applicant has added a note to the plans indicating all proposed signage will be building mounted, compatible with the building's architecture, and in accordance with all township standards. The applicant should indicate where garbage containers will be stored, the garbage container location should be added to the site plans, in addition to the testimony provided.

Mr. Slachetka stated the applicant should address the positive and negative criteria of the requested variance. The site contains parking for four vehicles, one of which is a handicapped space. Off-street parking is not required in the B-2 zone per section 18-14.2c. The site plan indicates that the west side of the site abuts a proposed residential development. In order to screen the rear of the building from the proposed residential dwellings, a six-foot stockade fence is now proposed along the westerly lot line behind the proposed addition. In accordance with ordinance no. 04-41, the fence height should be reduced to 4 feet in the front yard setback. The planning schedule on sheet 4 of 7 is not readable and should be enlarged. The chain link fence on the north side of the site has been replaced with a solid fence to screen the parking as previously recommended. The applicant has submitted architectural elevations and floor plan of the proposed addition for board review. Three new tenant spaces are proposed in the addition. The front facade will primarily consist of windows with split block along the bottom. The applicant should indicate

where trash and recyclables will be stored on site and the manner in which they will be collected. The lighting on the rear of the building has been revised to provide two wall-mounted fixtures rather than the three fixtures previously shown on the plan. In addition, the wattage of the light fixtures has been increased from 35 to 50 watts and the mounting height has been increased from 8 feet to 10 feet. It is not clear, based on the information provided, whether this is an improvement from the prior plans. The testimony should be provided concerning the illumination provided by the fixtures and the impact, if any, on the proposed dwellings on the adjacent parcel. The detail of the fixtures should be larger to make it more readable. In addition, the isolux lines should be shown on the plans.

Abraham Penzer, Esq., appearing on behalf of the applicant. He stated that the two proposed tenants are existing now on Clifton Avenue. One is Bagette and Photo Express. They are located one store over. The leases have been signed if the board approves the application. In addition, the deli that is there now would remain because they have a long lease.

Brian Flannery, P.E., was sworn in and his credentials were accepted. He stated the application is for an addition to the existing building. Three units are being proposed in addition to the existing deli. A variance is needed for the existing dwelling which is existing. They were not proposing any new variances. They were proposing a ten foot setback and an access way to the rear of the building. The comments regarding the fence and additional details for the lighting will be provided. The deliveries will be in the rear. The roof drains will be shown. The pipe that connects will be in the Township right of way draining into the drainage system. The garbage containers will be collected by public works. The cans will be located in the paved area. Mr. Franklin stated no apron is shown. Mr. Flannery stated there would be roll out buckets and there would be no apron. Mr. Franklin stated they would collect them.

Mr. Penzer stated the applicant is creating no variances. It is an existing variance. The application creates no new variances. Mr. Flannery stated the balance of the comments from the professionals would be complied with. The lighting would be changed in accordance with the professionals' reports.

Mr. Dolobowsky asked about the lighting and having it a little lower. Mr. Banas stated that are shades in the lights. Mr. Slachetka stated a little lower and less intense would be sufficient.

Mr. Banas opened the application to the public. Seeing no person wishing to speak for or against the application, Mr. Banas closed the public hearing.

On motion by Mr. Dolobowsky and seconded by Mr. Herzl, the application was hereby approved with the existing variance.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Herzl, yes; Mr. Franklin, yes; Mr. Long, yes; Mr. Banas, yes;
Mrs. Wise, yes; Mr. Dolobowsky, yes; and Mr. Ackerman, yes.

5. **SD #1472** (Variance requested)
Applicant: Yosef Lipschitz
Location: corner of Vine Avenue & Elm Street
Block 764 Lots 12 & 13
Minor subdivision to re-align two existing lots

Mr. Banas felt that the engineer should be present to hear the application. Mr. Kielt stated there is a representative present from the engineer's office but he is not licensed who prepared the plans. Mr. Jackson stated that it was an issue for the engineer. He did not think it was a problem to provide testimony. He has the degree and operates under the seal of an engineer. He did not see it was a problem if the board accepted it. The representative did not have a problem.

Mr. Banas asked if there was a reason why the engineer was not hear. The representative stated he was on Route 9 when he talked to him and he should be hear any second. Mr. Banas stated that the applicants have to be ready at 6:00 p.m.

Mr. Jackson stated he had a conversation today with Mr. Peters and other people. It was brought to his attention that in granting the approvals, the board has adopted certain boiler plate language that says the applicant shall obtain all outside agency approvals before it can be deemed complete and the mylar signed to get the building permit. One of the outside agency approvals is treatment works approval from the NJDEP. This is a six to eight month process. He understood that in Lakewood there were no allocation problems. The issue is that Mr. Peters is uncomfortable with signing off on the application and deeming it complete and signing the mylar because in that process he makes a representation that he has reviewed everything and that they complied with everything in the resolution. One of the things that is not complied with is the TWA application and approval. This is causing problems for the applicants because they could be building while waiting for the permit. If this were a town like Manchester where there are water allocation problems it would make sense. In Lakewood it is not a problem. He was advised that former engineers did not have problems signing off on resolution completeness with the outside agency approvals. If the board allowed an applicant to be deemed complete Lakewood would be protected because you cannot get final building approvals without water and sewer connections. He did not see the need for a safeguard of the issue. He felt the board could administratively correct this by adopting a resolution to enable all former resolutions that reference the need for outside agency approvals to amend it for the application to the NJDEP that it would be sufficient that the applicant has made that application and also that the applicant build at their own peril and that it is ultimately that they must still get all CO's. He drafted a resolution. The matter was discussed by the board. Mr. Dolobowsky stated that some applications have been denied. Mr. Banas stated that it was nothing in the future, it was for past approvals. Mr. Franklin stated it worked and he did not see why they should change it. Mr. Jackson stated that the permits would be issued without the application for the permit. The engineer is concerned with this. Mr. Dolobowsky suggested different scenarios that they could do to satisfy the engineer. Mr. Jackson stated that he could indicate that he brought it up to the board and the board denied the request.

5. **SD #1472** (Variance requested)
Applicant: Yosef Lipschitz
Location: corner of Vine Avenue & Elm Street
Block 764 Lots 12 & 13
Minor subdivision to re-align two existing lots

Mr. Peters stated the applicant is seeking minor subdivision approval to convey 4,067 square feet of land from existing lot 12 to existing lot 13 along Elm Street within Block 764 in the R-7.5 zone. A variance is required for minimum front yard setback for lot 13.01. A front yard to Vine Avenue of 25 feet is required, 13.36 feet has been proposed. The front yard to the unimproved Vine Avenue is an existing condition. The applicant will be required to obtain approval from Ocean County Planning Board. No other outside agency approvals will be required. The surveyor's certification has been added to the plans.

Mr. Slachetka stated the applicant should indicate the reason for the subdivision. Is a further subdivision of proposed lot 13.01 contemplated? If so, the applicant should be aware of the Township's policy regarding a "creeping" major subdivision. In accordance with chapter 17-4, further subdivision of a tract which was previously subdivided is considered a major subdivision. There were several minor technical comments.

Charles Surmonte, P.E., was sworn in and his credentials were accepted. He stated the applicant, at this time, has no intentions of further subdividing the lot. He may decide to put the lot up for sale. In doing so, he may want to reserve the right to subdivide if the street is improved. The subdivision is really a property line adjustment. Mr. Banas stated there is a waiting period for further subdivision. Mr. Kielt stated that if the new ordinances are passed, the definition of a minor subdivision will change and this would remain a minor. Mr. Slachetka stated he did not review it based on the new ordinances. The applicant should be aware of the fact. Mr. Surmonte stated they accepted the recommendations of the board's professionals.

Mr. Banas opened the application to the public. Seeing no person wishing to speak for or against the application, Mr. Banas closed the public hearing.

On motion by Mr. Dolobowsky and seconded by Mr. Long, the application was hereby approved.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Herzl, yes; Mr. Franklin, yes; Mr. Long, yes; Mr. Banas, yes;
Mrs. Wise, yes; Mr. Dolobowsky, yes; and Mr. Ackerman, yes.

V. CORRESPONDENCE

None at this time. Mr. Kielt stated he received a request from an engineer who wants to do a presentation on behalf of DOT regarding the road widening of Route 9. They would like to do the same at the public hearing in July. It was a twenty minute presentation. Mr. Banas suggested the technical meeting in July. Mr. Kielt stated he would see what he could do. Mr. Banas stated that if he could not reschedule it to keep it where it was. It should be listed first on the agenda.

VI. PUBLIC PORTION

None at this time.

Mr. Banas stated Mr. Kiert provided each member with a copy of the unified ordinance which appeared before the Committee for first reading. The board had to review the same and make recommendation at the June 21, 2005 meeting. The committee wants to adopt the same at their meeting of June 30th. Mr. Banas asked Mr. Slachetka to review the same for the board as he did with the Committee. Mr. Slachetka replied that he would. The members discussed a possible meeting date to review the ordinances. Mr. Slachetka stated it would take at the most two hours.

The meeting would be May 31, 2005 at 6:00 p.m.

Mr. Banas asked what the board should not review prior to the meeting and what they should. Mr. Slachetka stated that the board could review any section they wanted. The sections they may be most interested in are the definition sections, article eight, article nine, article ten, and some provisions of article eleven. Article seven is administrative procedures. Articles three through seven are governed by the MLUL. Mr. Jackson stated the board has to review the ordinance to determine its consistency with the master plan.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was hereby adjourned. All were in favor.

Respectfully submitted,
Elaine Anderson
Planning Board Recording Secretary