

MINUTES
DECEMBER 2ND, 2010
8:00 P.M. THE BYRAM TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Shivas called the meeting to order at 8:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
	Mr. Chozick	Mr. Kaufhold	Mr. McElroy	Ms. Raffay	Mr. Valentine	Ms. Segal	Mr. Walsh	Mayor Oscovitch	Mr. Gonzalez	Ms. Shimamoto	Mr. Shivas	/
Roll Call	H	H	H	E	H	H	H	E	H	H	H	/

Secretary	Cheryl White
Township Engineer	Lou Slaby
Township Attorney	Kurt Senesky
Township Planner	Paul Gleitz

STATEMENT BY CLERK

Adequate notice of this meeting has been published specifying the time and place in compliance with the provisions of the Open Public Meeting Act.

FLAG SALUTE led by Chairman Shivas.

MINUTES:

November 4th, 2010

A motion was made by Mr. Kaufhold and seconded by Ms. Segal to approve the minutes. The following vote was taken:

/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
Planning Board Member	Mr. Chozick	Mr. Kaufhold	Mr. McElroy	Ms. Raffay	Ms. Segal	Mr. Valentine	Mr. Walsh	Mayor Oscovitch	Mr. Gonzalez	Ms. Shimamoto	Mr. Shivas	/
Motion		X										
Second					X							
Aye	X	X	X		X	X	X		X		X	
Nay												
Abstain										X		
Absent				X				X				

Motion Carried

COMPLETENESS:

Lakeland Bank 80 Route 206 – Block 226 Lot15.01

Amended site plan – A motion was made by Mr. Walsh and seconded by Mr. Kaufhold to deem the application complete with a hearing date of January 20th, 2011. Lakeland Bank *must* provide a site plan showing more circulation details on the property and at the hearing Gordon Byram Associates has agreed to accompany Lakeland Bank. The following vote was taken:

/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
Planning Board Member	Mr. Chozick	Mr. Kaufhold	Mr. McElroy	Ms. Raffay	Ms. Segal	Mr. Valentine	Mr. Walsh	Mayor Oscovitch	Mr. Gonzalez	Ms. Shimamoto	Mr. Shivas	/
Motion						X						
Second		X										
Aye	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	
Nay												
Abstain												
Absent				X				X				

Motion Carried

SITE PLAN WAIVER

Gordon Byram Associates, LLC 90 Route 206 - L 226 L14 –

Site Plan Waiver Granted - A motion was made by Mr. McElroy and Seconded by Mr. Walsh to grant the waiver request. It was determined that an Amended Site Plan was not required but because of the site plan changes with Lakeland Bank they must appear at the Lakeland hearing on Jan. 20th, 2011 .

The following vote was taken:

Planning Board Member	Mr. Chozick	Mr. Kaufhold	Mr. McElroy	Ms. Raffay	Ms. Segal	Mr. Valentine	Mr. Walsh	Mayor Oscovitch	Mr. Gonzalez	Ms. Shimamoto	Mr. Shivas
Motion			X								
Second						X					
Aye	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X
Nay											
Abstain											
Absent				X			X				

Motion Carried

OLD BUSINESS

David Nufrio – Z01-07 – 138 Lackawanna Dr. Block 273 Lot 300 – Status on completion of addition to home.

Mr. Nufrio provided to the Board a letter from his Attorney Jeffrey Patti, 255 Woodport Road, Sparta outlining his intent to file law suit early 2011 against the General Contractor and various other parties that are in his opinion responsible for the delay in the completion of this project.

The Board discussed the length of time this lawsuit could take and because of this Mr. Nufrio must appear back before the Board on June 2nd.,2011 and until this issue is resolved Mr. Nufrio must return every 6 months with a status report.

A motion was made by Ms. Segal and seconded by Mr. Valentine to direct Mr. Senesky, Township Attorney to send a letter to Mr. Patti that the Board be provided a copy of all relevant information, i.e., any filed complaint, motions, or pleadings along with a status report on the case.

The following vote was taken:

Planning Board Member	Mr. Chozick	Mr. Kaufhold	Mr. McElroy	Ms. Raffay	Ms. Segal	Mr. Valentine	Mr. Walsh	Mayor Oscovitch	Mr. Gonzalez	Ms. Shimamoto	Mr. Shivas
Motion					X						
Second						X					
Aye	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X
Nay											
Abstain											
Absent				X			X				

Motion Carried

JTK Associates, LLC SP2-10 – 9 Lackawanna Dr., Block 226 Lot 16 –

Attorney for JTK Assoc, Mr. Larry Kron gave a brief update and presented the applicant’s engineer, Mr. Patrick McClellan whom reviewed a color version of the previously submitted plan dated 09/02/2010, named “Rendered site dimension plan/Signage Plan”, Exhibit A1-12/2/2010. This exhibit was used to show significant changes that were made to the plan. This plan shows the wetland line that the original plan did not show. As a result of the wetlands, a small modification had to be made to the access road so that there were no permits required to construct the access road because now it is fully outside of the wetlands buffer.

Mr. McClellan explained as previously testified that they are not qualified water resource engineers but they could present to the Board what a reasonable representation of the components of what that system would be. The plan depicts a water tank to the right of the access road just before it exits the property, specific design elements such as the height of the water tank are not provided, and Mr. McClellan is calling the Water design a conceptual design. Mr. McClellan indicated they would follow the standards allowed or a variance would be requested. Mr. McClellan discussed the various components, a water tank on a concrete pad, parking area off of the access road for maintenance purposes and a small pump house with a feeder pipe from all three wells on site, one existing well and two other conceptual wells and a proposed distribution system with pipe going to each proposed building. Three hydrants were also spotted on the plan. Township Attorney Kurt Senesky asked about the height of the water tank and Mr. McClellan said this is just conceptual and he can’t speculate. Planning Board member Frank Gonzalez asked what caused them to put the water tank in the area they

selected because it would require more tree removal. Mr. McClellan said because of the topography it's the best place. Planning Board member Andrew McElroy asked about the standards or codes for the height of the water tower. Mr. Shivas said it's a structure and would fall under that category. Mr. McClellan said if the tower exceeds the height and there is a volume of storage issue then they can make the diameter of the tank bigger and within the height limit. Mr. McClellan is confident that a tower can be built in conformance with the code. Mr. Senesky reiterated that the Board would want to see the design before approval. Township Planner Paul Gleitz said that the applicant may want to contact the developer for the Village Center, owner Cheyenne Corp. across the street from the applicant's parcel to see if they have identified a water source and they may want to partner with them.

Mr. McClellan discussed the other significant changes to the plan, such as the parking area and an access isle on the southerly side of the property, a new lighting plan; they doubled the number of fixtures and provided more lighting for the outdoor storage areas. In addition the plan offers a more enhanced landscaping, a vehicle wash area in the outdoor storage area, sidewalks and crosswalks were added out to Lackawanna Drive. A guardrail is depicted behind parking area A to run the entire length of the property to provide protection for the daycare center. Incorporated on sheet 2 of the plans there is a comprehensive traffic control, signage plan. Mr. McClellan said a supplemental report for Stormwater Management was provided and he will discuss that later.

Mr. McClellan discussed Mr. Slaby's letter dated December 2, 2010 to the Land Use Board beginning with Stormwater Management and identified a discrepancy between the area the applicant feels contributes to run off to the property so Mr. McClellan has agreed to have a representative from his office meet on site sometime next week with a representative from Mr. Slaby's office and hopefully come to agreement and they will make any necessary changes to the drainage design. Mr. Slaby will offer a comprehensive review of all the Stormwater Management issues.

Critical Areas – The applicant provided an exhibit labeled A2-12-2-2010, called "Slope Exhibit" which he reviewed with the Board. Mr. McClellan indicated that all of the critical disturbed areas that are 25% or greater are previously disturbed areas by the quarry activity. The exhibit depicts Critical slopes areas disturbed in two shades of green. All the green are the existing 25% or greater slopes, the light green, which are inside the disturbance line areas they are proposing to disturb as a result of this project and the dark green are existing 25% slopes which will not be disturb. Chairman Shivas asked about the red area depicted on the plan and Mr. McClellan indicated that is for proposed slope disturbance which has to do with the basins to be designed. The plan depicts the quantity of existing and proposed acreage to be disturbed; there was a brief discussion about this. Mr. Kron indicated that if it is decided that a variance is required due to critical slope disturbance they would seek a variance and in the newspaper notice they did provided verbage stating the applicant requests the application to be amended to include any additional approvals, variances, exceptions or waivers determined to be necessary, etc. Mr. Slaby asked how that was this calculated and Mr. McClellan said they used a surface mathematical model provided by the surveyor and utilizing software it can represent slopes that are 25% or greater and shade it accordingly. Planning Board member Caryn Segal asked if the soil on site is native to the site and Mr. McClellan answered yes.

Grading – Mr. Slaby requested some justification for creating the steeper slopes and Mr. McClellan indicated it was due to the detention basins. These basins will be professional maintained, there will be no pedestrian traffic in these areas, and the slopes are being used to generate more volume for the detention basins. Mr. Shivas asked if the basins will be dry and Mr. McClellan indicated yes. Mr. McClellan indicted the 3 to 1 slopes are permitted by the stormwater regulations and is consistent with the states rules for detention basins. There was an in depth discussion about the basins and the reduction of the amount they propose which is five (5). Mr. McClellan stated since the application must go before NJDEP there are regulations they must follow. Chairman Shivas said when the application is ready for approval the Board wants to see what they will look like. Mr. McClellan reviewed the basin elevations and sizes. Mr. Gleitz asked if the outdoor storage areas were reduced could that reduce the amount of basins required. Mr. McClellan indicated that it is not just the impervious coverage that is causing so many basins, there other contributing factors such as the grades of the property. Ms. Segal asked about rain gardens for the basins. Mr. McClellan indicated that his past experience with State permits that require flood hazard, the State does not want hardware in the ground; they want everything to be above ground, running thru vegetative strips and clean water.

Traffic and Parking – A 40' wide access road is depicted on the plan and this roadway is for primary traffic associated with the quarry. Mr. Slaby questioned the need for the 40' road and feels having such a wide road could encourage speeding trucks, trucks passing each other and in addition it adds to the amount of impervious coverage. Mr. Jacobson indicated they have large trucks sometimes pulling equipment and for turning motions and a combination of quarry traffic the road is needed. Due to some concerns the Board has Mr. Jacobson will talk to the property owner to re-analyze this to see if they could reduce a section and fan out the entrance way to Lackawanna Road. Mr. McClellan and the applicant felt there will be no problem obtaining a letter from the owner of the Quarry that they do not object to the construction of the proposed improvements.

Lighting - The applicant will provide a more detail of the foundation for the proposed site lighting on the plan as well as the proposed location of pole lighting which should be depicted on the dimension plan and grading plan to confirm there are no vulnerabilities to vehicular traffic, the applicant will comply. Mr. McClellan indicated poles are spotted 2' behind the roadway which was suggested by the Board previously. Mr. Slaby suggests while they have a lighting plan separate that they take the foundations from the lighting plan put them on to the site plan and grading plan so that they can better that there is no conflict, the applicant will do that.

Mr. Gleitz appreciates that the applicant listened to the Board and added more standards and more lighting across the site. Mr. Gleitz discussed page 12 of 18 on the new set of plans and some concerns he had, he talked about maximum light levels of over 10 (between 10 and 11) and the design standards for site plan and that no less than ½ foot candle shall be provided and he indicated the applicant will probably be seeking a waiver regarding lighting, he went on to discuss the lighting plan and said at an earlier meeting they were told they need to increase lighting near the outdoor storage areas, where there were some safety concerns. Mr. Gleitz also mentioned lighting in the parking and access roads and wants them to confirm that the lighting patterns were done correctly. Planning Board member Bob Chozick requested more lighting be added around Building B, the applicant said they would add that. Planning Board member Lisa Shimamoto asked about using more traditional lighting or old fashion type fixtures at least on the access road and along Lackawanna Drive. Mr. Jacobson said he is willing to use “preferred lighting” but since there is no standard available the applicant requests he be made aware of what the Board would like to see before he purchases the fixtures.

General - The applicant will provide details on the Allen block retaining walls and if over 4’ structural calculations will be provided to our Engineer to be reviewed to by the construction office if the application is approved. The applicant will provide detail of guiderail on the plans and also depict on “Wall Section A” which is provided on sheet 3 of the plans. The applicant indicated when an actually water distribution system is submitted it will provide all details requested. The applicant recognizes all the conditions # 4 – 9 they must comply with.

Mr. Slaby asked about the Highlands settling tank on sheet 13. Mr. McClellan indicated there is a settling tank chamber and it is to be worked in conjunction with the wash pad by the outdoor storage area which is best depicted on page 5 and is intended to be connected to the storm sewer that runs along the southerly side of the rear access road. Further discussion took place between Mr. Slaby and the applicant on how the tank is evacuated. Planning Board member Ken Kaufhold talked about a truck wash station and Mr. Jacobson said they could work on something like that on the site.

Ms. Segal asked the applicant when they plan on providing this information to the Board; the applicant indicated that details of the water distribution system would be provided after Board approval. Chairman Shivas indicated that it is not how the Board usually operates. The Board understands that there are conditions that cannot be satisfied prior to approval but he certainly can’t understand why a water distribution plan cannot be provided. The Board would also like to see more details on the outdoor storage area; they would like to see a plan depicting how this area will be organized and maximum height of storage area.

Mr. Kron requested a five minute break, the applicant’s Planner was late and they were waiting for his testimony. Mr. Kron reported they couldn’t get a hold of the Planner so they requested they be moved to the next meeting to hear his testimony. Mr. Kron reiterated that most of the outstanding items requesting be conditional, four (4) are with the DEP and one of the four involves the Sewer capacity. They will address the issues addressed with the Engineer, provide testimony from the Planner and subject to the Board being satisfied with their planning testimony the applicant’s hope is that they receive Board approval at the Dec. 16th meeting without going thru the “subject to’s” because they are of great costs to the applicant. The Board would like to see at the next meeting some type of plan showing the water resource design. Mr. Senesky asked if there is a general commercial schematic they can use. Mr. McClellan indicated it is not his expertise and Chairman Shivas indicated that they may have to hire an expert because this is something the Board wants to see sooner than later. Mr. Kron indicated this would be a great expense to the applicant and Mr. Senesky said it’s really a matter of appearance, design, height, and width. Mr. Kron said there are standards that they must follow or they will have to apply for a variance. Further discussion was made regarding the approval of the application before obtaining or providing information the Board would like to see. Mr. Jacobson said if all the Board needs are some general number s regarding volume size of the tank he’s sure he can come up with some numbers.

Mr. Kron indicated that he will provide a more detailed plan of the outdoor storage area and a site design of the height of the tank. Mr. Gleitz asked that when the applicant returns to talk about the width of the driveway, etc. they should talk to their planner prior to returning because Mr. Gleitz had some issues he spoke with the planner about regarding a sidewalk and a lighting plan, adding a landscape buffer around the outdoor storage area and maybe reduce some parking. There was more discussion about the height and arrangement of the outdoor storage area. Mr. Jacobson made it very clear that if the Board will limit the height of the outdoor storage less than 30’ then the applicant will remove his application. Mr. Jacobson said he made his intent very clear at the beginning of this process what he needed. Mr. Jacobson said he provided to the Board what he will be storing on the site and the maximum height will be no more than 30’. Mr. Gleitz said we can look at max height for vehicles, max height for bin material and max for mounted material. Mr. Gleitz said we can look at three separate standards. There was further discussion about the outdoor storage area and Mr. Senesky said if you think of it in terms of maximum height, volume and size and be able to present that to the Board that should give the Board a general visual of what the area will look like.

Mr. Shivas opened this application to the public. No one from the public came forward.

A motion was made by Mr. Valentine and seconded by Mr. Kaufhold to continue to Dec. 16th, 2011. All were in favor.

Variance Extension Granted - A motion was made by Mr. Chozick and seconded by Mr. Walsh to grant the extension. The following vote was taken:

Planning Board Member	Mr. Chozick	Mr. Kaufhold	Mr. McElroy	Ms. Raffay	Ms. Segal	Mr. Valentine	Mr. Walsh	Mayor Oscovitch	Mr. Gonzalez	Ms. Shimamoto	Mr. Shivas
Motion	X										
Second						X					
Aye	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Nay											
Abstain											
Absent				X			X				

Motion Carried

BILLS:

Heyer Gruel & Associates \$ 1,392.50
 Lou Slaby \$ 1,667.30
 Kurt Senesky \$ 2,922.50

A motion was made by Mr. Valentine and second by Mr. Kaufhold to approve Mr. Slaby's bills. All were in favor. Motion Carried

A motion was made by Ms. Segal and second by Mr. Chozick to approve Heyer Gruel's bills. All were in favor. Motion Carried

A motion was made by Ms Segal and second by Mr. Chozick to approve Mr. Senesky's bills. All were in favor. Motion Carried

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

Chairman Shivas opened the meeting to the public.

Jack Moran, 7 East Waterloo Road came forward regarding an issue with East Brookwood Park Trail Grant. Mr. Moran requested a courtesy review of the grant application and had a question regarding the lots involved; the Vetter parcel and the East Brookwood Pocket Park involving the use of the property and some NJDEP regulations. Mr. Moran explained how the "Pocket Park" has a well located in the center of the parcel and wanted to know how the parcel could be considered a park with the NJDEP well head regulations. Mr. Moran went on to explain that the well head regulations fall under the Protection Act which states that "Public community water systems require and control all land within 50' of any ground water source used for its water supply, major and minor pollutant sources and non water system related activities shall be prohibited within the specified area".

The Board discussed how the land went from the East Brookwood Property Owners Association to the Township, which occurred as a result of the land being deeded to the town so that the EBEPOA did not have to pay taxes on the land and part of the agreement was that the land was to be used as a "Park". Mr. Moran discussed some of the restrictions of the Deed and Mr. Shivas explained that the Planning Board had nothing to do with that agreement. Mr. Moran's question to the Board was in light of these regulations how can that parcel be used as a park and one of the grants proposed parking on the site. Mr. Shivas said that he would not be in favor of parking on the parcel and went on to say that the parking is not an issue, it was removed from the Grant and fencing with a lock for security was added. Mr. Moran felt that with the possibility of parking or public use on the property the well would be exposed. Planning Board member Ms. Shimamoto made comment how bikes, kids etc. are all over the well head now. Mr. Shivas said that with the 20 'X 20' area fenced and locked that would help secure the area. Mr. Moran asked how could the Association control and acquire the land if it is a public park. Mr. Senesky asked Mr. Moran what was their question to the Board and Mr. Moran asked how this could be considered a park area and could the parcel be "unmerged". Mr. Senesky said an application would have to be made by the property owner and this matter should go before the council. Mr. Moran said they came before the Board because he felt it should never have been co-merged and if there are provisions in the Deed that if the land was ever abandoned by the Town it would revert back to the ownership of EBEPOA and how could this take place if they are now all merged. Mr. Senesky said they should consult with an Attorney, he said they are really looking for advice and he thinks they should see an Attorney if they feel the terms of the deed were violated and they could file an action for the return of the property to the Association. Mr. Moran said they did seek legal advice from Dolan and Dolan. Mr. Shivas added that the reason the lots were joined was because the Vetter parcel previously purchased by the Town with Open Space funds was considered "landlocked" and since the Town owned the lot that had road access it was required to be merged. That is the job of the Planning Board, to eliminate any

landlocked lots. That was the only role the Planning Board had to do with the merging of these lots. Mr. Senesky stated the lot is subject to an easement which they still have. Mr. Moran went on to express concerns about future use of the parcel and had some concerns like people walking dogs near the well. Mr. Slaby stated that generally the well head is protected against any inflow of pollutants. Mr. Moran stated that this is an old well.

Mr. Senesky went on to say if they have an issue with the Township's intent on the parcel they should attend the Council meetings and express their concerns. Mr. Senesky remembers that when the Vetter piece was subdivided there was no one before the Board objecting. Mr. Gleitz read the Deed and the restriction and Mr. Senesky reiterated that if the Association feels that a condition of the Deed was violated that could start an action on behalf of the Association and ask a judge to give the property back. Mr. Senesky said he felt they would have a "tough road to hoe" and that he wouldn't give any advice beyond that and they really need to consult their own Attorney.

Mrs. Jeanne Moran, 7 East Waterloo Road, Vice-President of EBEP OA asked how much consideration was given at the time the properties were co-merged with regards to the Deed and restrictions in the Deed. Mr. Senesky again stated how the merger was done by the Municipality, not by the Planning Board and the only role the Planning Board played was regarding the minor subdivision. Ms. Moran asked what consideration was given to the deed contents from 1974 and Mr. Shivas and Mr. Senesky said probably none, they probably didn't know the Deed existed and there would be no reason they would have to have it. Mr. Shivas again stated how if two lots are non-conforming and under the same owner, they be merged. Mr. Senesky added that a deed was executed as a matter of record so that there only one deed merging the two parcels.

Ms. Moran went on to say that in 1974 Deeding the lot to the Township with the stipulation if it was used as a park/playground the Association never considered that it would put the Association in this situation. The DEP states the Association should acquire and control a 50' radius of the well head with no non-related water activities, since this was all grandfathered the Association doesn't have quite 50' and the Town has pretty much decided the Town can't have anything there, no playground or whatever", this is why the Town has offered a 20' fence. Ms. Moran added they would like to have a fence over the entire parcel and locked. Ms. Moran feels that the Water Board's responsibilities are sidelined to the Park issue. Mr. Senesky said the Township would probably not agree to lock the entire area because the Vetter parcel was purchased with Green Acres money and the parcel would have to be open to the public. Ms. Moran said they not going to agree to the 20' locked fence. Ms. Moran asked the Town already to Deed the property back to the Association with an unfavorable response. Ms. Moran said when the Town did the park grant they couldn't show a section that was not going to be used as a park and Ms. Moran believes the Town was looking to minimize the area and as a compromise give the Association a locked fence. Mrs. Moran said they are not in agreement with the Town and they will not allow any non water related activities and they do not encourage anything on that parcel and it should be fenced in. Ms. Moran's concern was that when the 2007 merger took place that no one really considered this issue of the other Deed. Mr. Senesky said "No", what he said was when the Board granted the subdivision the Board did not have the 1974 Deed to the adjoining lot. The merger was accomplished by the Municipality, not by the Planning Board. Mr. Gleitz stated that even if they had the Deed in their possession at the time it would not have mattered, it was "park use" and remained "park use" and there is no intention for development, so a trail or a parking spot for the trail would certainly fall within the guidelines of the DEP of "park use". Board member Andrew McElroy said in 2007 he recalls no discussion about the intention of the Township when the lots were merged and if the Deeds were there it wouldn't have made a difference.

Mr. Walsh also asked why they are more concerned about a walking trail thru the parcel than the pavement on top of it. Mr. Moran said since it's been there so long they felt by removing the pavement it would cause more of a safety issue. Mr. Moran wants to protect it, period. Mr. Gleitz said if you have a commitment for a 20' locked fence around the well head with no parking and only have pedestrian access in the area, does that get you closer to an agreement, if not, ask for a larger fenced area and no parking signs across the front of the lot. Mr. Moran said his concerns are also for any future regulations that the water association may need to abide by, example, the bio-terrorism act. They are afraid if they agree to something it may compromise the protection of the water.

Ms. Moran asked again if the Board was made aware of the Deed restriction would it have made a difference. Mr. Senesky said I'm sure they would have considered that but it is difficult to say how if it would have impacted the Board's decision. Mr. Senesky said the Resolution is over two years old and not subject to appeal. Mr. Senesky emphasized again that the Board is not giving any legal advice. Mr. Moran asked as far as DEP enforcement is that something that the Planning Board or Zoning Office enforces. Mr. Shivas said no, the DEP enforces that. Ms. Moran asked if the DEP rules were "Paper Tigers" and Mr. Shivas said you

have to go to the DEP to find out if the rule is a “Paper Tiger” or not. The Township plays by the DEP rules just like everyone else and they have to get a ruling from the DEP. The only way the Planning Board would have been involved if there were going to be Capitol Improvements on the site. Mr. Gleitz asked if there is something that can be done to make everyone happy, more vegetation, what type of improvements the Water Association can live with, etc. Ms. Moran doesn’t understand how this can be considered a park if there is a locked fence and Mr. Gleitz reiterated a park can just be open space; it doesn’t necessarily mean it has to have a “playground”. Mr. Shivas reiterated that the only role the Planning Board had was in the Vetter parcel subdivision. Mr. Gleitz reiterated if the Township wants to spend capitol funds for a public improvement then it comes before the Board for a courtesy review but for Grant money for trail work it doesn’t raise the level of a courtesy review by the Board. Ms. Moran said this park is supposed to be done in phases and this is phase one and who knows what phase two will bring.

Mr. Shivas closed the meeting to the public.

ADJOURNMENT:

At 11:20PM Mr. Valentine made a motion to adjourn; it was seconded by Mr. Kaufhold All were in favor. Motion Carried

Chairman Shivas adjourned the meeting.

Respectfully submitted;

Cheryl E White