

**BOROUGH OF WEST CAPE MAY
PLANNING-ZONING BOARD
MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING - October 10, 2017**

The Regular Meeting of the Borough of West Cape May Planning-Zoning Board, held at the Municipal Building, 732 Broadway, was called to order by Chairman O'Neill at 7:00 PM. After reading the Open Public Meetings Act of 1975 he led all present in the flag salute.

ROLL CALL:

Members:

TJ Belasco	present	Kevin O'Neill	present
Doris Jacobsen	present	Lisa Roselli	absent
Art Joblin	present	Carol Sabo	present
Pam Kaithern	present	<u>Alternates:</u>	
Barbara Lamb	present	Lindsay Casale	present
Paul Mulligan	present	Janet Payne	present

Also Present: Brock Russell, Esq., Board Solicitor
Raymond M. Roberts, Board Engineer
Theresa Enteado, Board Secretary

MINUTES:

September 12, 2017 Regular Meeting

On motion of Paul Mulligan, seconded by TJ Belasco, the minutes of September 12, 2017 Regular Meeting were approved, on roll call vote as follows: TJ Belasco, Pam Kaithern, Paul Mulligan, Carol Sabo, Lindsay Casale, Janet Payne and Kevin O'Neill voting in the affirmative.

RESOLUTIONS:

Resolution #0014-17 Adopting Certain Board Standard Operating Procedures

On motion of Paul Mulligan, seconded by Art Joblin, the aforementioned resolution was approved, on roll call vote as follows: everyone present voting in the affirmative.

APPLICATIONS:

Application 005-17, Scott Peter, 512 Myrtle Ave., Block 2, Lot 1.01, Continuation, Preliminary & Final Site Plan/Use Variance/Variance Relief – Hardship

Pam Kaithern and Carol Sabo recused themselves due to the Use Variance. Since there were not enough members from the May 9th meeting present, the hearing could not be continued and testimony would have to start at the beginning. Solicitor Brock Russell instructed the Board's alternate II member that she could not vote and Board Member Paul Mulligan clarified that she could participate and ask questions, but just couldn't vote.

Ron Gelzunas introduced himself as attorney for Scott Peter, the contract purchaser for 512 Myrtle Avenue, and said the owner is Cape May Lumber. Mr. Gelzunas said this is an application for a current vacant lot, he said they obtained the LOI from the DEP indicating that

there are no wetlands or wetlands buffers on the property within the proposed building area. Mr. Gelzunas said the property is in the C-2 Zone however the current situation is that it is 100% surrounded by residential homes. He said the proposal is to construct a duplex or side by side twin that will conform to the adjoining R-1 standards. He said they realize those standards do not apply because the property is in the C-2 not R-1 but they wanted to show that the proposal would meet all the R-1 standards except for lot frontage.

Mr. Scott Peter of 745 W. Montgomery Avenue, Wildwood and Mr. Harold Noon Jr. NJLPLS were both sworn in by Solicitor Russell. Mr. Noon testified that Myrtle Avenue is currently a one way street for most of the street, and that the property is surrounded by a single family residential, a multi-family townhouse association, three residential properties and another multi-family condo association, with one commercial property on the corner of Perry and Myrtle. Mr. Noon testified that the C-2 district permitted residential use but along with commercial use, not alone. After researching the area Mr. Noon concluded that residential would be the best fit and commercial didn't make sense now that the area has become surrounded by residential properties. He said there is very low traffic visibility, part of the street is one way only, and parking is already problematic so it wouldn't be effective to put a commercial property in this area. Mr. Noon testified that when he lived very near to this site he wouldn't have wanted a commercial use in the area and felt that most of the other residential property owners would feel the same way. Mr. Noon testified that the proposed building would satisfy the R-1 requirements with the exception of lot coverage but that this is compensated for with extra lot depth and the fact that it would pose no detriment to the current ordinance. Mr. Noon added that to comply with the C-2 standards could mean a much more intense proposal as far as Use and Density requirements. Mr. Noon testified that he would be agreeable to downward facing lighting on the exterior and to moving the HVAC system to the rear of the property.

Chairman O'Neill asked Mr. Noon the width of the lot. Mr. Noon testified that it is 65 feet across and 124 deep therefore short on frontage but excess depth.

Board Member Belasco asked for clarity because Mr. Gelzunas indicated that they would not exceed the required FAR but the numbers indicate otherwise. Mr. Gelzunas addressed this concern by saying they agree to amend that and conform. Mr. Gelzunas also pointed out that this proposal is for a Use change and they are simply using the R-1 as a standard even though it does not apply here.

Board Member Payne wanted to address the fact that there are some commercial uses in the area that do not create a negative impact on traffic flow or to the surrounding lots. Mr. Gelzunas replied that they did not intend to speak ill of commercial businesses, they just feel that for this particular lot, with its surroundings and low visibility, the best fit would be residential.

Mr. Peter testified that he feels this proposal would be the best plan for the community, the neighborhood, and the Board. He said it is not overdeveloping and is something that adds to the neighborhood.

Board Member Belasco asked about rainwater run-off. Mr. Peter testified that the Borough's new ordinance requires an extensive site plan for grading that would prohibit runoff to neighboring properties.

Board Engineer Raymond Roberts was sworn in. He advised the Board that they must be clear on what bulk requirements should be made conditions if they approve. Mr. Roberts said if this was just commercial there would be no need for any variances. Since they are proposing a residential use he asked that the applicant be specific about which bulk requirements they are agreeing to meet. Mr. Gelzunas said they are asking for a change in Use, to be allowed to

construct residential only and omit the commercial. Solicitor Russell suggested they look at subsection C of Mr. Roberts report. It was agreed to by the applicant, that lot frontage would be 65 feet and lot width 64.85 feet, all other dimensions would remain the same except for maximum gross floor area which will be 1,688 square feet and the floor area ratio would not be 50% but instead would be 45%. Mr. Roberts said he was satisfied with this statement. Mr. Roberts also asked if the applicant would agree to meet the site plan requirements as well as the curbing recommendation. The applicant agreed.

Solicitor Russell advised the Board that some of the confusion is because with the Use variance there really are no standards that apply to the proposed project. He said the C-2 standards were never intended for a residence so that is why R-1 was used as a guide. He advised the Board to remember that the project meets all C-2 requirements but they are just asking to omit the commercial unit.

Board member Lamb asked about the lot coverage, it was off by 1.25% and she asked if that would be brought into conformity as well. The applicant agreed.

The floor was opened to residents within 200 feet of the property and beyond. Pam Kaithern of 207 Stevens Street was sworn in and asked for clarity on the LOI for the record. She asked Mr. Gelzunas to confirm that there are wetlands on the property but they will not be effected by the development that is being proposed. Mr. Gelzunas said yes, no construction will take place in the wetlands or wetland buffers. Ms. Kaithern also asked the applicant if all the storm water was going to stay on the property and not runoff onto neighboring properties. Mr. Peter agreed.

When no one else wished to speak, the public portion was closed and Solicitor Russell advised the Board that they should first consider whether or not to grant the Use variance. He suggested that there be a motion to approve a Use variance that would allow the applicant to construct two stand-alone residential units on a lot that is located in the C-2 zone. He said the minor site plan, subject to all conditions, should be a separate motion.

On motion of Art Joblin, seconded by Paul Mulligan, the motion to approve the Use variance was approved on roll call vote as follows: TJ Belasco, Doris Jacobsen, Art Joblin, Barbara Lamb, Paul Mulligan, Lindsay Casale, and Kevin O'Neill voting in the affirmative.

On motion of TJ Belasco, seconded by Art Joblin, the motion to approve minor site plan subject to all conditions was approved on roll call vote as follows: TJ Belasco, Doris Jacobsen, Art Joblin, Barbara Lamb, Paul Mulligan, Lindsay Casale, and Kevin O'Neill voting in the affirmative.

Application 012-17, Mark Lukas & Edward Celata, 119 Myrtle Ave., Block 4, Lot 4, New Application – Preliminary & Final Site Plan with Variance Relief

After a 10 minute recess from 8:04 to 8:14 PM the Board Chairman invited the second applicant to the table. Dorothy Bolinsky from Drinker Biddle & Reath announced that she was appearing on behalf of the co-applicants Mark Lukas and Edward Celata who have applied for preliminary and final site plan approval for the properties 119 Myrtle and 123 Broadway. Ms. Bolinsky said the application was initially for a boutique hotel that would take the existing residence on Myrtle and convert it into six hotel units while doing an expansion for 24 total units with an interior restaurant accessory use of 80 seats. In addition to that there would be other amenities in the hotel including a small gym, spa and pool with parking in either infrastructure on the lot. After some discussion with the applicants and the professional team, she said they decided to amend the application to reduce the restaurant count from 80 to 50 seats so that it

complies with the accessory use standard in the Borough code and would eliminate the need for variance relief. Solicitor Russell asked if they were no longer seeking a Use variance and Ms. Bolinsky confirmed that that was correct. Solicitor Russell advised the Board that Members Kaithern and Sabo would not have to be recused considering these changes. There was some discussion as to the proper procedural process. Ms. Bolinsky said it was because there was a question raised that the parking lot was a separate lot. However, she said the application is being proposed by the co-applicants who are general partners, the properties are contiguous and are going to be used and have been noticed as an integrated complete project where parking is onsite for the purpose of serving the hotel. She added that as a condition to this application the applicants would have no objection to doing a consolidation deed to confirm that at the end of the day this would be one integrated project where the parking is used to support the hotel. Ms. Bolinsky said as the project is presented it would be easy to see that is clearly the purpose and the intent.

Solicitor Russell expressed that if the applicants are agreeable to a condition of a deed of consolidation that they do not require any D Variance relief and therefore the hearing could proceed before the Planning Board configuration.

The following experts were sworn in by Solicitor Russell: Matt Hender, Licensed Professional Planner and Licensed Landscape Architect with Engineering Design Associates. Pamela Fine, owner of Fine Architect, Licensed New Jersey Architect designing in this area for over 19 years. Vincent Orlando, General Partner for firm EDA, Licensed Professional Engineer, Licensed Professional Planner, Licensed Landscape Architect and Certified Municipal Engineer. Mark Lukas, owner and applicant.

Mr. Lukas gave a brief history of the property. He testified that he and his partner Mr. Celeta have been together for 21 years and they purchased the property at 119 Myrtle 15 years ago. He mentioned that back then, it was very overgrown and not maintained at all and they spent considerable resources and effort to make it what he considers one of the most beautiful homes in West Cape May. Mr. Lukas testified that the home was once owned by Captain Samuel Ewing who was mayor, sheriff, a sea captain and also a contractor in the area and he bought this house, picked it up from Cove Beach and moved it to its current location in 1904. He said the home was originally gothic revival but was converted into colonial revival which is important to the proposed project because they are focusing on all those elements in their design. Mr. Lukas testified that this project is a labor of love for him in terms of restoration and when the community re-evaluated the master plan and created a downtown area and changed the zoning on the property he decided to take a look at commercial uses, mostly because it is a 6,800 square foot house and expensive to maintain. He mentioned that there are 78 windows in the home and 51 were hand restored. He said they are committed to maintaining the home and they are interested in becoming part of the new master plan by converting the house into a boutique hotel. Mr. Lukas wished to express this will not be a motel it will be a boutique hotel and it will have luxurious rooms with amenities that will cater to couples with more disposable income and it will be a premier property. He said it was important to them to create something new that isn't currently in Cape May, a quiet restful place.

Ms. Fine mentioned that she was familiar with the house as she did earlier work on the renovation about 10 years ago. She said Mr. Lukas provided her with plans from EDA and said he wanted to do a boutique hotel with 24 rooms, a spa, a gym, a small restaurant and a lobby. Ms. Fine said on the right side from the parking lot is the hotel lobby entrance with a glass enclosed vestibule a hotel lobby office, from there is a corridor that gives access to hotel rooms,

and also stairs up to the second and third floors. She said as you get into the actual existing part of the house would be the restaurant/kitchen and general lobby for the restaurant, and the front porch will remain. Upstairs will be additional rooms across the entire plan, elevators and stairs and then finally on the top floor of the existing house will be another guest room and owners quarters, the spa, and the gym with the pool buffered in between. Ms. Fine said she took bits and pieces of the existing house with a lot of detail and carried those over into the addition with much attention to detail. She said she attempted to create a seamless flow. Ms. Fine said the pool area will have a buffer to provide privacy for the people using the pool as well as for the surrounding neighbors. She testified that the landscape buffer is about 4 & ½ feet with taller plantings to create the feeling of a secluded oasis. Ms. Fine said the HVAC units are located at the top floor set in a nook and out of the way with a vegetation buffer and a wall to further buffer the noise. There will be 2 other HVAC units on the grade next to the trash enclosure with a wall and vegetation buffer there as well.

Board Member Jacobsen asked if the applicant was aware the property was in the historic district and asked if they had applied to the HPC. Mr. Orlando testified that yes they have already applied. Mr. Orlando went on to testify that the historic value and history was a significant factor in the design.

Mr. Orlando testified that the lot was somewhat irregular in shape with frontage on Myrtle where the existing home sits and then it goes back to the L-shaped portion on Broadway. He said the lot, which will be successfully consolidated through deed, is within the C-1 zoning district. He said to the right is the Albert Stevens Inn which is a 10 unit bed and breakfast, the Wilbraham Mansion which is a 26 unit hotel, the CVS, and the Highland House and then the Buttonwood Manor. Mr. Orlando continued saying on Yorke Avenue there is single family development. Mr. Orlando testified that the applicants studied the 2015 master plan update and the ordinances. He spoke of the master plan re-evaluation, specifically how it stated the desire to create a commercial district on Broadway that would support the tourist economy and provide employment and business opportunities. He said it goes on to say the lack of the significant commercial base has resulted in the over reliance on residential property taxes to fund municipal services and educations. Mr. Orlando said this created two critical changes to the Borough Ordinance, one was to create a walkable community and the other was to create a vibrant mixed use commercial district where residents could live, shop, work, and dine. He testified that the ordinance also stated the purpose was to create a thriving commercial district promoting diversity and the use of viable historic buildings to expand commercial uses.

Mr. Orlando testified that after much discussion the decision to go from an 80 seat restaurant to a 50 seat makes both uses that are being sought, the boutique hotel and the restaurant, permitted principal and accessory uses. Mr. Orlando said the proposed restaurant is less than 10% of the total building area, the front of the building will stay the same, the existing drive that will remain but will be upgraded to a patio with a paver surface to be used for deliveries and trash pickup. He testified that the parking area will come off Broadway and the reverse L shape will provide access which will be off Broadway and will be made up of a decorative paver. He said the parking lot will provide 90 degree parking and will lead to another paver area which drops off and is the entrance to the hotel. The paver areas are meant to guide the guest and to create a sense of entry and arrival. Mr. Orlando said they intend to use a porous surface for the parking lot to allow for infiltration of storm water and prevent runoff, in addition the design accepts water from the adjacent properties and directs the water so that no water will ever leave the site.

Mr. Orlando testified that they understood how important lighting and landscaping is to the Borough and in order to compliment the architecture of the proposed project the landscaping had to be a certain way and they created what is similar to an English garden with many plants and buffers consisting of evergreen shrubs and various trees. He said a six foot fence would run along the property as well as the parking area and would be aligned with landscaping on both sides. Mr. Orlando said it is a diverse landscaping plan that allows for enhanced buffering.

Mr. Orlando testified that in recognizing that the property is adjacent to residential properties they decided on 8 foot high LED lighting with downward shields to prevent light spilling onto the neighboring properties. The light will stop at the property line.

Mr. Orlando said he presented a concept plan to the WCM VFC that should address the ingress and egress for emergency vehicles and he understands they need time to review and discuss it. He also testified that they would not need to use Myrtle Avenue for any of the service connections. Mr. Orlando feels that reducing the number of seats in the restaurant eliminates the need for parking variance because 33 would be required and 33 will be provided and this would be positive for traffic. He said this location would be a very walkable site as the ordinance discusses, guests can park and keep their car parked for most of their stay and walk to restaurants, the beach, shopping. He also discussed providing golf cart rentals to guests.

Mr. Orlando discussed the proposed sign on Broadway that would be 5 & ½ feet high and 6 feet to the top of the pillar. He said variance relief is needed because the code requirement is 4 feet. He said the sign would identify the location of the entry to the hotel and it would be designed and displayed in such a manner as to compliment the architecture of the hotel.

Mr. Orlando said he is concurrence with the waivers and variances that were highlighted in the Borough Engineer's report, with the exception of the parking variance and the accessory use variance because with the changes they have made these are eliminated. He said there are three pre-existing non-conforming conditions; lot frontage lot width and front yard setback. He said no variance is needed since they are not being exacerbated by the application. Mr. Orlando said he agreed that variances are needed for, lot area, fence height, parking in the front yard, sign height, and landscaping and vegetation. He said all of the required variances can be viewed under the C-1 and C-2 criteria and discussed those.

Mr. Orlando testified that the project promotes the general welfare of the community and that it fits perfectly into the mold or example outlined in the master plan re-evaluation. He said this project would preserve the historic value and provide ample positive criteria for the community. He did acknowledge the substantial detriment saying the key term is substantial and that anytime a commercial project is introduced there is some detriment but in this case it is very minimal due to the variances required. Mr. Orlando testified that the applicants intend to live here for many years and run the property with an open door policy and to be mindful of the neighborhood and community.

Board Member Sabo asked if all 24 rooms were booked and presumably 24 parking spots used, would that leave only 8 spots for a 50 seat restaurant? Mr. Orlando replied yes and said that is what the ordinance requires. He went on to explain that there is a shared component of the parking because the guests at the hotel will be eating at the restaurant.

Ms. Sabo also expressed her concern over the ability of a fire truck to enter the property. Mr. Orlando said it could absolutely enter but his conversation with the fire chief was brief and they would need to have a sit down to discuss the matter further. Ms. Sabo also expressed her belief that the roof plantings would not be enough to offset the landscape and vegetation ordinance. Mr. Orlando testified that it would indeed offset rainwater runoff.

Chairman O'Neill asked what the hours of operation would be for the restaurant. Mr. Lukas said the restaurant would serve breakfast lunch and dinner and would stop at 10:00 PM.

Board Member Lamb asked if they were requesting a variance for lot coverage because of the size of the building and parking lot. Ms. Bolinsky advised that they did initially request variance for lot coverage but because they changed the parking lot surface to a pervious coverage it brought the ratio down to conform. Board Member Kaithern brought up lot area and suggested they reduce the number of rooms down by two so they would conform there as well. She wondered if they considered that at all since they seemed to bringing everything they could into conformance. The applicants asked that an answer to that question be tabled for the moment.

Ray Roberts Board Engineer, was sworn in and testified that he has completed three reports to date in response to revisions by the applicant. Mr. Roberts said the applicant has clearly identified the variances that are necessary and has addressed the majority of the issues but one of the issues they are asking for is a variance for the front yard parking off of Broadway. He said there are two parking spaces that are proposed now that would be impacted by that. And the driveway in the back would impact three spaces so if those two variances were not granted they would only have 28 spaces. So for them to have their 33 spaces those variances would have to be granted. Mr. Roberts also asked if the emergency vehicle access turning radius would impact the proposed parking spaces. Mr. Orlando testified that it would not impact them and the vehicle would clear. Mr. Roberts said the applicant has addressed the concerns about buffering the HVAC systems and as for a tree survey, the landscape plan they have submitted covers the replacement requirements by a long shot. Mr. Roberts said overall the applicant has done an excellent job addressing all the issues on his report and asked the Board if they had any other specific questions for him.

Chairman O'Neill asked Mr. Roberts for his professional opinion about access from Broadway because he sees it as a safety issue. Mr. Roberts said the applicant filled the obligation about safety by using the county standards on safe site distances and they meet the minimum requirements. Solicitor Russell advised the Board that it should be made a condition to acquire County Planning Board approval since Broadway is a county road.

Chairman O'Neill asked Mr. Roberts if he felt the applicant did a satisfactory job with the drainage plan. Mr. Roberts replied that the combination of the porous concrete and the drainage recharge pipes along with rock in the ground that run along both sides of the property and tie into the roof drains is more than adequate, he felt it was an excellent job. Mr. Roberts also wanted to clarify a point from earlier testimony and said all utility services are already in place on Myrtle.

Chairman O'Neill announced that due to the late hour he would open the floor to the public and give them a chance to be heard since there were many people in attendance.

William Kaufmann introduced himself as attorney representing two of the objectors, Patricia Pierce and Christine Mueller. Mr. Kaufmann said the board solicitor indicated that there was a jurisdictional issue and in his mind it has been resolved but he wanted to expand on that a bit. He said the issue with the parking lot is because that property is going to be only a parking lot and as such an accessory to the hotel, yet the ordinance indicates that an accessory use must be on the same lot as the principal use. He went on to say another section of the ordinance makes an exception for parking lots but they must be in common ownership. Mr. Kaufmann said that council announced at the start of the hearing that the owners were willing to consolidate the lots and that he felt it needs to be made clear. He said Mr. Lukas would have to convey his lot from himself to himself and Mr. Celata and Mr. Celata would have to do the same thing on the Broadway property and additionally they would have to agree to a deed restriction on the

Broadway property stating that it could only ever be used for parking for the adjacent hotel. And if that is what they mean by consolidating the lots then he would suggest that the issue is resolved. Ms. Bolinsky said the applicants intend to convey the properties to an LLC that will be jointly owned by Mr. Lukas and Mr. Celata and the consolidation deed turning this into one tax lot would be sufficient. Solicitor Russell just added that this would be a condition of approval to be reviewed and approved by Board Engineer and Board Solicitor. Mr. Kauffman was satisfied with the outcome.

Elise Kelly, 124 Yorke Avenue, was sworn in and said she is directly behind the property being discussed. She asked what happened with the extra room there would be when downsizing from an 80 seat restaurant to a 50 seat one. She wanted to know if they made the kitchen bigger. Ms. Bolinsky replied that the dimensions were not changed, the restaurant would just have more space. Ms. Kelly then asked where the buffer of a foot and a half would be because she could not see the picture. Mr. Orlando indicated where the buffer would be. Ms. Kelly was satisfied.

Jim McPartlin, 124 Yorke Avenue, was sworn in and testified that he has experience in the hotel/motel industry and he does not believe that 33 parking spaces will allow for adequate room. He also expressed his concern about employment and staff considerations.

Glenn Fala, 123 Yorke, was sworn in and testified that he is very concerned about parking. He understands that though criteria may have been met the project will definitely negatively impact parking on Yorke which is already problematic. He testified that he is also very concerned about noise saying the applicant can advertise a quiet retreat but they can't control how guests may or may not behave by the pool. Mr. Fala also did not feel good about Broadway being the entrance to the front door of the hotel, he said safety is a huge concern. Lastly, he wanted to stress that if the variance isn't granted cars would be parked directly next to the fences of neighboring homes so it is very important to consider.

Paul Niemczura, 121 Broadway, was sworn in and expressed much concern for the environment and community. He testified that the applicant was playing with the numbers to satisfy certain criteria but he is not impressed with pervious asphalt and pavers being passed off as green space. Mr. Niemczura stressed his opinion that no matter what they reduce they are still essentially paving over both lots. He wanted to say the variance on the parking may seem like it's only a couple feet but if you look at the layout of his property, the distance from his house and the property line is less than 5 feet. He said he would have vehicles pulling in and out from 5 feet away along the entire length of his property. He also said it is a hotel so it is a 24 hour operation and people will not leave their cars parked the entire length of their stay. He said this will create a hardship on his property and others and it will not enhance the overall appearance or quality of the community it only enhances the commercial aspect noted in the master plan. Mr. Niemczura finally commented on the lighting and said it would not stay on site only.

Christy Seymour, 114 Yorke Avenue, was sworn in and testified that she grew up in the area and was lucky enough to buy a home in West Cape May and she has always supported local businesses. She said when she and other neighbors heard about the project they wanted to know how it would impact them and they wanted to support it but the main feeling was that it be done within the requirements, do what is permitted to do. She said many people don't have driveways and parking is a concern. She said she would like the applicant to be successful but don't request variances, do it within the ordinance requirements because there is a reason they are there. Ms. Seymour also wanted to mention that the applicants would not meet with any of the neighbors and they she feels they should have reached out.

Patrice Callahan, 125 Yorke, was sworn in and testified she is concerned about lighting

on the rooftop pool and commercial deliveries. Mr. Orlando replied that all deliveries would come off of the driveway off of Myrtle Avenue. Mr. Orlando said there would be pool lights but no overhead lighting.

Solicitor Russell suggested wrapping up the meeting and Chairman O'Neill announced that open floor would be closed at this time. The Board discussed the next meeting availability and it was decided it could only be December 12th. Solicitor Russell advised the Board that a motion should be heard to continue the hearing to December 12th at 7:00 PM to be first on the agenda with no re-notice or re-publication required.

On motion of TJ Belasco, seconded by Paul Mulligan, the postponement of the hearing to December 12, 2017 was approved on roll call vote as follows: TJ Belasco, Doris Jacobsen, Art Joblin, Pam Kaithern, Barbara Lamb, Paul Mulligan, Carol Sabo, Lindsay Casale, and Kevin O'Neill voting in the affirmative.

Once again Solicitor Russell advised the members of the public that no re-notice was required and they would need to attend the December 12, 2017 meeting at 7:00PM if they were interested in being heard.

Privilege of the Floor:

When no one else wished to speak, the meeting was adjourned at 10:20 PM on motion of Pam Kaithern and carried by unanimous voice vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Theresa Entead
Board Secretary