

Ms. Williams moves to approve, seconded by Mrs. Sims.

Yes: Mayor Tagliarini, Mr. Brady, Mr. Awofolaju, Mr. Hirsch, Mrs. Sims, Mr. Shenton, Ms. Williams

No: None

Abstain: None

Resolution No. 8: Mr. Shenton asks for approval of the continuity in attendance resolution; Mr. Awofolaju moves to approve, seconded by Ms. Williams.

Yes: Mayor Tagliarini, Mr. Brady, Mr. Awofolaju, Mr. Hirsch, Mrs. Sims, Mr. Shenton, Ms. Williams

No: None

Abstain: None

The Reorganization Meeting is adjourned, to be followed by a Public Meeting.

Minutes of the Planning Board Public Meeting of February 19, 2014

Present are Mayor Tagliarini, Mr. Brady, Mr. Awofolaju, Mr. Hirsch, Mrs. Sims, Mr. Shenton, Ms. Williams.

Also present are Marc Leckstein, Esq., Leckstein & Leckstein, Tim Gillen and Anthony Abbonizio, CME Associates, and Anthony Rodriguez, T&M Associates.

Absent are Mr. Mirabal due to a death in the family, and Deputy Mayor Montone, Mr. Vena and Mr. Vinci for personal reasons. .

Mr. Hirsch moves to accept the minutes of the June 19, 2013 Public Meeting and the December 4, 2013 Executive Session minutes, seconded by Mr. Awofolaju, and on voice vote all members agree.

Continued Business, **Addison Park (formerly Garden Manor), 150 Highway 35, Block 230, Lots 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, Administrative change** to amend Condition No. 16 of a 1987 Resolution to remove U Turn

Anthony Locascio, Esq., of the firm Gold, Albanese & Barletti, LLC, attorney for Addison Park, formerly known as the Garden Manor, speaks of his October 19, 2013 letter to Mayor Tagliarini, and refers to the Planning Board's November 18, 1987 Resolution, Condition No. 16, ...that the *applicant shall continue to permit turn around on the property for cars, but may post a sign barring truck or trailer use of the property for turn around use.*

He has had several certifications and reports from traffic engineers advising that the use of that turn causes back ups onto Route 35 and is a safety hazard for the Addison Park property. He also received a letter from David J. Martin, Supervising Engineer Bureau of Traffic Engineering, State of New Jersey Department of Transportation, dated January 9, 2014, that the turn around is not recognized nor permitted by the State.

Mr. Locascio reads into the record the letter from Mr. Martin in response to Mr. Locascio's letter of *November 19, 2013...your November 19, 2013 letter concerning the alleged illegal U-Turns being made on the Addison Park Banquet Hall property located at 150 Route 35, Aberdeen, NJ 07735 has been referred to me for response.*

At this time the..... NJDOT cannot comment on its need for a future right of way nor can it accept a traffic report as evidence of a safety concern without conducting its own traffic study. Nonetheless, the NJDOT- approved traffic signal plan at the Addison Park property location shows a NO U-TURN sign on the property approach, and therefore any U turn on the Addison Park property within the vicinity of this NO U-TURN sign is not authorized by the NJDOT. Under N.J.A.C. 16:27-5.1, you may submit a 25 fee to the Bureau of Traffic Engineering (check or money order made payable to the NJDOT) and the NJDOT will provide a certification that the traffic signal encompassing the location of the Addison Park property, along with the signing encompassed by this plan, are approved by the Commissioner of Transportation. This certification will serve as evidence of the U-Turn prohibition.

A search of our files reveals that the Commissioner of Transportation did not approve any local resolution or ordinance allowing for U-Turns at the location of the Addison Park property. Consequentially, as per N.J.S.A. 39:4-8, any such resolution or ordinance lacks force or effect.

I hope this information is helpful. Please feel free to call me at 609-530-3717 with any additional questions. (Signed: David J. Martin).

Mr. Locascio says, based on the letter, the NJDOT does not recognize the U turn, but he says that any use or requirement of the U turn by emergency vehicles would be permitted.

Mr. Leckstein says basically the NJDOT is saying this is not a legal U turn and any resolution requiring same is not in effect. This Board cannot require them to do something that the NJDOT will not approve.

Mr. Shenton, who states he sat on the Board at the time of the Resolution in 1987, says Lt. Powers was adamant about County Road residents being able to use the U turn to go across the Highway because there was no other way to make a left turn to County Road.

Mayor Tagliarini asks if there is a line in the letter saying because it is not filed properly or not requested properly or not allowed because of the signals.

Mr. Locascio says it does not say it appears to be a misfiling nor did the Commissioner did not approve allowing local residents....

Mayor Tagliarini states his point is it seems this municipality did not file with the State DOT requesting.....so what does that mean.

Mr. Leckstein says 1987 was a different world; he was not the attorney at the time, and no one here would know what was done.

Mrs. Sims asks where the back up of traffic is; it was originally Garden Manor in 1987. Coming southbound you can't make a left turn into Addison Park from the Highway, and she has not seen a back up going north bound, even turning around in the lot.

Mr. Locascio says there is a good amount of traffic; looking at the first report in 1996 there were close to 150 people going into the property, going partially to where the entrance is, turning around, going back to the traffic light and go straight thru or make a left turn. The issue was making a U turn onto the property and going back onto Highway 35. One day there were 100 people using it.

Answering Mr. Brady, Mr. Locascio states traffic studies were done on four date, July 5, 2012, October 10, 2012, October 17, 2012, March 11, 2013. In that analysis there were upward of 249 illegal U turns made on Addison's property, which not only contributed to the queuing of vehicles on north bound Route 35, but complicated internal site circulation as they need to travel almost to the entrance to execute the U turn around the median separating inbound and outbound traffic flow, and increased stacking at the entrance of Addison Park, resulting in back ups along Route 35.

Mrs. Sims asks if he is saying there were actually 249 cars going thru the property and down County Road in one day? Mr. Locascio says cars come into the property as far as where patrons park their cars, turn around, and go back out and make a left turn or go down County Road, but many were using it for a U turn to go south on Highway 35. Mrs. Sims finds this hard to believe and that perhaps some of those people were visiting Addison Park, which Mr. Locascio says they

were not. These four days were a safety concern, and there was a person there doing these counts and seeing what was happening.

Mr. Leckstein informs the Board, who do not have a copy of the letter from John Rea, P.E., of McDonough and Rea Associates, who did the traffic study, and states..... *that on Thursday, July 5, 2012, an evening affair was being held at Addison Park. MRA recorded 78 illegal U turns being made on northbound Route 35 at the Addison Park driveway between 5 and 7:30 p.m. A total of 34 illegal U turns were made between 5 and 6 p.m., the highest peak hour. It was noted during these counts that both illegal U turns and traffic entering Addison Park backed up onto northbound Route 35. Illegal U turn activity contributed to the back ups on the northbound shoulder of Route 35.*

Mr. Locascio says studies were done on other days closer to the Christmas holidays.

Mr. Leckstein says Mr. Rea makes comments in his letter about other days that they did traffic studies in 2012 and 2008, on Wednesdays.

Mr. Leckstein says the DOT is saying you cannot have it; the Board cannot require something the Dot says you cannot have.

Mayor Tagliarini, going back to the letter read originally by Mr. Locasio from the DOT, says he is interpreting why they did not find anything in the file is because this Board did not send anything to the State DOT. He does not believe there is a formal request to be seen that this Board did not file with the DOT its intentions of having a U turn there. Due diligence would be for us to say that whenever it was this Board made the condition, this Board failed to take action, and we are now formally requesting you to review and take action. If they come back and say whatever, we have done due diligence. This may be one of the reasons this never came up in any of the searches, because we never filed it.

Mr. Shenton asks Mayor Tagliarini if he is suggesting we should make a request now, and the Mayor says we should, absolutely, because we don't have a formal answer.

Mr. Leckstein says filing any paper work even back when this happened would be the applicant's responsibility, not this Board's responsibility. But the Board could submit an application to the DOT and let them come back and say we are denied.

Mayor Tagliarini says the only investigation he knows is from personal conversations that when they purchased this property, nothing was attached from the town, the county or the DOT, and he inherited a U turn. He is not saying right, wrong or indifferent, he is just saying he does not think this Board did the proper thing back then.

Owen Drapkin is sworn in by Mr. Leckstein states that a U turn was agreed upon and put in a developer's agreement that included the resolution with conditions. The applicant, Garden Manor, came before the Council one day, the U turn could be used for the residents of County Road, and Mark Coren was the manager.

Mayor Tagliarini says whether it was written into the agreement or not, someone did not follow thru when someone granted something.

Mr. Drapkin says now with the road work going on on Highway 35 everything is a mess and you can't go by the traffic studies.

Pastor Amelda Lee, of Providence Baptist Church, County Road, Cliffwood, is sworn in by Mr. Leckstein, asks who put the sign up that there is no U turn into the property.

Anthony Campitiello, an owner of Addison Park, is sworn in by Mr. Leckstein, and states that he has spoken to the State and the State said to him there is no way they would allow a turn lane.

Pastor Lee says she has never seen a backup in Addison Park in all her years in the Township. The only other way the residents could get across to County Road would be to make the jughandle at Cliffwood Avenue light where there is a back up, so County Road residents chose to make the turn at Addison Park rather than on Cliffwood Avenue where everyone makes a turn and it is difficult to get across the Highway.

If that turn is going to be eliminated, Pastor Lee wants to know the Township's plan.

Mr. Leckstein says this is a State highway and the DOT has jurisdiction. The Township cannot go in there and make a change without the DOT approval.

Pastor Lee wants to know, if there are complaints as there have been over the years with traffic and flooding on the Highway 35 southbound, and the residents can't get out of their driveways on County Road because of all the traffic coming off the flooded highway, traffic from the Parkway and Highway 35, who is responsible. She asks if a petition can be made with the DOT to get them into their homes off Highway 35 if the area is blocked off.

Mr. Leckstein says the Planning Board would have no jurisdiction or input in this matter; Mayor Tagliarini agrees with Mr. Leckstein, and says they hope the construction on Highway 35 is suppose to take about 18 months, as verified by Mr. Gillen, should help the flooding on the Highway.

Mayor Tagliarini feels that something was not done by the Township, and maybe one more letter from this Board to the DOT would help the situation.

Mr. Shenton asks if the applicant would be willing to request the DOT to work with the residents.

Mr. Leckstein says there was a resolution from this Board in 1987 that needed DOT approval. no one knows if the DOT accepted it, if it is lost or what happened after the Board resolution.

Mr. Locascio says he thought the letter was rather specific, any resolution would be trumped by the State letter; if the Board is looking for something more specific, he likes what the Mayor is suggesting, go to the DOT with a letter from the Board and see what they say. He can submit a letter as well. That way you get a specific answer.

Mr. Leckstein says the Board can send that letter.

Mr. Shenton asks if the applicant can cosign the letter.

Mr. Leckstein says he will draft a letter that both the Board and the applicant can sign and present it at the next meeting in March for approval. It can then be sent to the DOT and we will wait and see what they say.

Mr. Shenton wants to sign the letter.

Mayor Tagliarini says he wants clarification from the State on the issue of the U turn.

Mr. Hirsch says his concern is two sided, namely getting to the homes. He knows at one time there was a facility on the other side of County Road, and their customers were allowed to use the U turn to access the gym, although the facility is gone now, and they met with Addison Park to gain that approval. If people were pulled over the explanation was to the Police Department they were permitted to use the U turn. What would all of the residents that live on that side of County Road do? His other concern is the safety issue; he thinks the Board would be remiss in not approaching the DOT and have the residents approach the DOT, and ask what can be done.

Mrs. Sims asks why now, when the facilities across the street are gone, and there is now less traffic and no back up on Route 35 going into Addison Park. She has never seen a back up on Route 35 going into Addison Park. Why is this statement being made; she has seen maybe up to five cars waiting to come thru, but they are inside the U turn area. There is less traffic now.

Mr. Leckstein says, although the Board's concerns are accurate, he does not want the Board to get bogged down. The only issue is whether or not the DOT will permit the U Turn. If the DOT says you can't have it there, the issues are irrelevant. The Board can take a vote to determine if the Board attorney should draft a letter, share it with the applicant's attorney, bring it to the next meeting and the Board can vote upon it.

Pastor Lee understands what Mr. Leckstein is saying, but says that the traffic will only get backed up at the next U turn in Laurence Harbor because everyone will now go down there. She says she can't tell us how many lights people sit thru to try to make the turn back onto the Highway. A solution is needed in our community.

Mayor Tagliarini tells Mr. Leckstein to include those comments in his letter to the DOT from the Board. Mr. Leckstein will also put in the letter the comments of residents that were made known at this public meeting.

Another Aberdeen resident is sworn in by Mr. Leckstein and requests during construction of Highway 35 a left turn signal be put in; Mayor Tagliarini responds that he has had conversations with the DOT and owners of Addison Park to acquire property to make a turn lane, and the DOT will not consider it. Mr. Brady says they tried for a left hand turn signal or a U Turn into the Addison Park property during the construction phase, but they were rejected.

Wilhemina Gumbs is sworn in by Mr. Leckstein, and asks if this is a hardship for Addison Park, why, since it has been there since 1987. She thinks it will be ok, and it has helped the residents of County Road for so many years, why is it a problem now.

Mr. Locasio says his client would like to work this out for the best for everyone; he is willing to cooperate with the Board in drafting a letter ; if that doesn't work he will have to do something to protect his client's property.

Mayor Tagliarini asks if something could be done to prohibit turns during the hours of operation of Addison Park. If there is a Friday night wedding, and the bride is taking pictures, the bridal party is walking around, and the valets are parking cars, maybe we could say no U-Turns such and such an hour, and work together somehow.

Mr. Locasio is concerned this may work for a certain period of time, but what happens when there are people that don't stay to the designated hour. He would be happy to look at something along this suggestion.

Mr. Shenton asks if the traffic studies differentiate between residents' cars and commercial traffic; Mr. Locasio says he would have to review the studies.

Mr. Campitiello talks about his concerns in maintaining the parking lot; he has put down speed bumps and gotten yelled at by drivers, he has blacktopped the parking and people ride right thru. People complain about him plowing, people beeping and honking at him, asking what he is doing. Everyone feels it is their right and their parking.

Mr. Locasio says it is understanding that in the letter to the DOT we are seeking clarification from the DOT whether or not they would permit a U Turn. But he heard from the Board that they want him to emphasize the need for this U Turn, but that may not be what his client wants.

Mr. Leckstein says there are two things here: if the DOT comes back and says this U Turn cannot be there, then this Board has to remove that condition of approval in the resolution, because it is unenforceable. Or, although the applicant doesn't want it but the DOT comes back and says it is fine with them, providing the applicant file an application. Then the applicant would have to file for an amended site plan, with all the proofs stated, to remove the condition.

If the Board so authorizes, we are going to send a letter to the DOT to see if they will approve the U Turn based on the 1987 approval, but the applicant wants the DOT to turn the U Turn down.

Mr. Hirsch asks if in the letter we can request a no U-Turn at specific times, which Mrs. Gumbs objects to.

Mayor Tagliarini says we should just file to the DOT without hours.

Mrs. Sims moves to authorize Mr. Leckstein to prepare a letter to the DOT, seconded by Ms. Williams.

Yes: Mayor Tagliarini, Mr. Brady, Mr. Awofolaju, Mr. Hirsch, Mrs. Sims, Mr. Shenton, Ms. Williams

No: None

Abstain: None

It is suggested the draft letter be emailed to the Board Secretary, who will email Board members for comments in advance of the March 19 meeting date..

New Business, **SP14-500/Columbia Bank, Applicant and Property Owner: Columbia Bank, 1154 Highway 34 (at Lloyd Road), Block 89, Lot 11, Concept plan** to replace existing four (4) parallel parking spaces along Route 34 with eight (8) parking spaces to be placed on a diagonal. Variances required for 20 ft. parking setback to street line required, 19 ft. exists and 4 ft. proposed; no parking permitted in front yard, but variance previously granted which will now be increased, and 35% lot coverage for parking and loading permitted where 36% exists and 39% proposed. Parking changes requested to provide parking spaces in closer proximity to building entrance to better serve less mobile customers.

Thomas Warren, Esq., attorney for the applicant, states this is a concept plan to realign parking in front of the bank due to comments from senior citizens trying to gain access to the bank. This application will acerbate site plan and variances granted over ten years ago to develop the property for the bank, which is located at the intersection of Route 34 and Lloyd Road.

Referring to the concept plan, Mr. Warren says they are proposing to modify four existing parking spaces along Route 34, proposing to construct eight parallel parking spaces. The modification will increase the number of available parking spaces to 22 from 18. The Ordinance requires ten spaces. The Ordinance does not permit parking in a front yard, however, variances were granted in the original application for front yard parking; according to Mr. Gillen the impact of this front yard parking will be increased. Also to be increased will be front yard set back to parking and lot coverage.

Mr. Warren says he has contacted the attorney for the Monmouth County Planning Board, who verbally has said there would be no objection to the application.

Mr. Warren says there is no other way to access the parking in the front. They will maintain their side and rear parking, but they cannot do anything else in the rear as there is a big drop off and it would defeat the purpose of trying to get customers closer to the front door. They cannot move the building to redo the parking. They are trying to change four parking spaces into eight right angled parking spaces.

Mr. Gillen says issues that will need to be addressed include screening/landscaping for the angle parking, nonstandard aisle width immediately proximate to the building, increased drainage quantities associated with increased impervious areas, necessity for increasing the parking spaces.

Mr. Shenton is concerned with the variances being requested and the need for hardship. Mr. Warren again says they can't relocate the building, and they are defeating their purpose to utilize the rear for parking spaces. The variances exist at the present time, granted by this Board years ago.

Mr. Gillen says if they were to eliminate some of the parking spaces in the rear that would eliminate some of the impervious coverage.

Mr. Shenton says that would help a lot, especially since he has never seen the back full, only the front, which is what Mr. Warren is talking about.

Mayor Tagliarini is concerned about coming from Lloyd Road entrance to the front of the building, it is narrow, and backing out of a proposed new space would present an issue for cars

coming thru. Mr. Gillen says the Lloyd Road entrance would have to be modified, the aisle parallel to Lloyd Road would have to be modified for better direction.

Mr. Hirsch is concerned as well backing out on the angle and a senior crossing the roadway or juggle backing out.

Contrary to Mr. Shenton's request for further review, Mr. Gillen says this is a concept plan to find out whether or not this would be an acceptable change to their site plan, subject to them ironing out all the engineering details as discussed, and then review by the police and fire boys, among others.

Mr. Gillen, answering Mr. Hirsch, says the parallel parking presents a potential problem with car headlights spilling over to Highway 34 southbound. This would have to be mitigated with landscaping in any final presentation to the Board. The issue to address would be cars coming in the lot, cars coming down the highway, lights shining at each other.

Mr. Warren will speak with his client about submitting a formal application.

New Business, **Township Ordinance 2-2014/Amendment to Land Development Ordinance Ordinance** adopting the Redevelopment Plan relating to property at 1337-1341-1343 and 1355 Route 34, commonly known as Block 114, Lots 6, 7.01, 13 and 13 Q-Farm.

Anthony Rodriguez, T&M Associates, planner for the Planning Board, says in July there was a hearing recommending to the Township Council that this site be an area in need of redevelopment. The Council acted on the Planning Board's resolution in November, and authorized him to prepare a redevelopment plan. The Ordinance was given to the Council, who referred it to the Planning Board for review, comments and/or recommendations. If the Planning Board so chooses, tonight they can recommend this back to the Council that they take action to adopt the Ordinance.

The objectives start with transition the use of an existing tract of land dedicated to heavy commercial or industrial uses into land uses that are compatible with surrounding land uses. Redevelop the Redevelopment Area with land uses that are consistent with prevailing land use patterns and land use types in the Township. Redevelop the Redevelopment Area in a manner that respects and preserves environmentally sensitive features including steep slopes, wetlands, and mature wooded areas. Incorporate principles of sustainability that promote energy efficiency, enhancing indoor air quality, and the conservation of natural resources. Improve the aesthetic image of the Township and the Route 34 gateway into Aberdeen from Marlboro Township. Redevelop the Redevelopment Area in a manner consistent with the objectives of the Township's Master Plan.

The Redevelopment Plan concept includes multifamily residential development including garden apartments and townhouses. The Plan supersedes underlying HC (Highway Commercial) zoning.

Consistency with Master Plan: Master Plan Objectives: Residential includes smaller, moderately priced housing units should be encouraged. Senior citizen housing/adult communities should be encouraged. Commercial should have scattered commercial uses should continuing to be phased out. Industrial visual incompatibilities between industrial development and adjoining residential areas should be minimized by adequate buffering and other design techniques. Conservation of tidal and inland wetlands, as well as stream banks, should be conserved.

Permitted Uses include multifamily residential development, including garden apartments and townhouses. Permitted accessory uses should include resident amenities, fences/walls subject to Land Development Ordinance, signs, maintenance buildings, and refuse/recycling storage areas to service the site.

Lot and Building Requirements: the tract size is 28 acres, tract frontage is 1,000 ft., and tract boundary setbacks to Highway 34 is 50 ft., existing adjacent single family parcels 50 ft., and all other tract boundaries 25 ft. Building Setbacks side to side is 20 ft., side to rear is 35 ft., rear to rear is 40 ft. and front to front is 60 ft. The maximum requirements for density are 200 units, number of units per building 14, building coverage is 20%, lot coverage is 45% and building height is 2.5 stories/35 ft.

Parking Requirements: General parking to be provided in accordance with RSIS, 24 ft. driveway aisles, and total parking area divided into smaller lots of no more than 50 spaces. Parking setbacks must comply with all building setbacks and may not be located within 10 ft. of any building façade. Lighting limited impact on adjacent properties/light pollution, and maximum mounting height of 25 ft. or nearest building height. Landscaping will have one shade tree per 20 parking spaces, and additional landscaping as required by Ordinance.

Refuse/Recyclables: the refuse areas will be well lit and easily accessible, not visible from any public street, and enclosures are required. The recycling areas may be in or outdoors, might be sized to accommodate the number/size of bins/containers, signage identifying area and materials accepted, shall be enclosed if outdoors, separation/collection/storage/recovery in accordance with Township Ordinances.

Signage and Landscaping: Permitted signs to include monument signs at each public street access; Directional signage design and placement subject to Board approval; informational signage design and placement subject to Board approval.

Green Design Standards: promote energy efficiency, conservation of natural resources and indoor air quality. Required practices: building orientation, high efficiency appliances, heating and HVAC equipment, minimize disturbance of steep slope areas, use of sustainable building materials, utilize landscaping to mitigate effects of climate that impact energy consumption. Option practices include utilization of high efficiency hot water sources, minimizing impervious coverage, utilizing native plant species, hybrid street lighting systems to establish an “off the grid” system.

A conceptual plan is presented by Mr. Rodriguez showing the layout of the 200 unit luxury apartment concept plan.

Architectural Design Standards: Overall architectural scheme shall provide overall compatibility with appropriate variation. Variations may include landscaping, building orientation, and architectural elements. Architectural elevations subject to Board review and approval, and each building shall have adequate access for firefighting purposes.

Mr. Hirsch is concerned about the plan and its effect on a possible 200 homes with school aged children to occupy the proposed units and its burden on the schools and the taxpayers.

Mr. Shenton is concerned about environmental issues on the property and businesses and equipment that might be there. Mr. Rodriguez says he has identified several potential areas that could be a concern. The redevelopment Plan requires a developer enter into a Redevelopment Agreement with the Township and any environmental issues would have to be presented to the Township.

Mayor Tagliarini says the builder of the townhomes on Highway 34 and off County Road have told him there are only a couple of school aged children living in the developments. This was in response to his question to the developer when Somerset Anchor was before the Planning Board. Many of the buyers in the developments tell the developer they are downsizing. These issues can be discussed when a developer is selected.

Mr. Hirsch would like to recommend that only 55 and over development be considered for this area. There is also talk about COAH units, though Mr. Shenton says at this time we do not know where COAH is going.

Mr. Brady moves to recommend adoption of the Ordinance to the Township Council with concerns about minimizing the impact on the schools, environmental issues and traffic, seconded by Mr. Awofolaju.

Yes: Mayor Tagliarini, Mr. Brady, Mr. Awofolaju, Mrs. Sims, Mr. Shenton, Ms. Williams

No: Mr. Hirsch

Abstain: None

New Business **SD10-301/Jackiewicz 9 Harrison Avenue, Applicant and Property Owner: Chester Jackiewicz, 9 Harrison Avenue, Block 258, Lot 5**, Request for **extension** of subdivision approvals granted November, 2010 and first extension granted May, 2013.

The applicant's attorney has written a letter to the Board requesting an extension of prior subdivision approval. Mr. Hirsch moves to grant the extension, seconded by Mrs. Sims.

Yes: Mayor Tagliarini, Mr. Brady, Mr. Awofolaju, Mr. Hirsch, Mrs. Sims, Mr. Shenton, Ms. Williams

No: None

Abstain: None

New Business, 34 Partners, LLC vs. Planning Board litigation. Mr. Awofolaju moves to permit Michael Leckstein, Esq. to represent the Board in this litigation, seconded by Mr. Hirsch.

Yes: Mayor Tagliarini, Mr. Brady, Mr. Awofolaju, Mr. Hirsch, Mrs. Sims, Mr. Shenton, Ms. Williams

No: None

Abstain: None

The Public Meeting is adjourned.

