

**MEETING MINTUES
BYRAM TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD
MEETING, April 1, 2021**

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Shivas called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL

	Mr. Chozick	Ms. Franco	Mr. McElroy	Mr. Morytko	Ms. Raffay	Mayor Rubenstein	Mr. Serrilli	Ms. Shimamoto	Mr. Smith	Mr. Walsh	Chairman Shivas
HERE		H	H	H		H	H	H	H	H	H
ABSENT	A				A						
EXCUSED											
LATE											

Also present: Attorney Alyse Hubbard, Esq.
 Engineer Cory Stoner, P.E. C.M.E.
 Secretary Caitlin Phillips

STATEMENT BY CLERK

Both the Federal and State governments have declared a state of emergency in response to the outbreak of the Covid-19 Virus, that limits the number of people allowed to gather, and requires social distancing. To continue Planning Board business, this special meeting for April 1, 2021 is being held by remote video or audio connection only. This service allows the Board, its professionals, applicants, and members of the public to participate.

Adequate notice of this meeting has been published specifying the time and access information in compliance with the provisions of the Open Public Meetings Act. Notice of this meeting is on file in the office of the Planning Board Secretary, posted on the main door, and on the bulletin board in the Municipal Building, and on the Township website at:

https://www.byramtwp.org/index.php/meetings/committees/planning_board

and has been forwarded to those persons requesting notice.

FLAG SALUTE led by Chairman Shivas

MINUTES

Mr. McElroy motioned to approve the March 18 minutes, seconded by Mayor Rubenstein.

The following vote was taken:

	Mr. Chozick	Ms. Franco	Ms. Raffay	Mr. McElroy	Mr. Morytko	Mayor Rubenstein	Mr. Serrilli	Ms. Shimamoto	Mr. Smith	Mr. Walsh	Chairman Shivas
MOTION				√							
SECONDED						√					
AYE		√		√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
NAY											
ABSTAIN											
ABSENT	√		√								

Motion carried.

Mr. Serrilli motioned to approve the March 25 minutes, seconded by Mr. Morytko. The following vote was taken:

	Mr. Chozick	Ms. Franco	Ms. Raffay	Mr. McElroy	Mr. Morytko	Mayor Rubenstein	Mr. Serrilli	Ms. Shimamoto	Mr. Smith	Mr. Walsh	Chairman Shivas
MOTION							√				
SECONDED					√						
AYE				√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
NAY											
ABSTAIN		√									
ABSENT	√		√								

Motion carried.

SCHEDULING UPDATE

Z09-2020, Barbara Bolen, 89 Glenside Trail, Block 312 Lot 2050, R-5 Zone

The applicant requested to be moved from tonight’s meeting to 05/20.

Mr. Walsh motioned to approve this move, seconded by Mr. McElroy. The following vote was taken:

	Mr. Chozick	Ms. Franco	Ms. Raffay	Mr. McElroy	Mr. Morytko	Mayor Rubenstein	Mr. Serrilli	Ms. Shimamoto	Mr. Smith	Mr. Walsh	Chairman Shivas
MOTION										√	
SECONDED				√							
AYE		√		√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
NAY											
ABSTAIN											
ABSENT	√		√								

Motion carried.

COMPLETENESS REVIEW

Z04-2021. Robert Lovenberg, Block 344 Lot 33.05, R-1 Zone

Mr. Walsh said that the subcommittee met prior to this meeting. There’s a lot of history at this site, and this application seeks to clean up a lot of the issues that have existed to help with their future operations. There are some items that are required before the application is heard. The subcommittee will not ask for full details on structures, but will ask for photos on existing structures. They feel an Environmental Impact Statement is needed, and this application can be deemed complete if there is an EIS provided twenty days prior to the hearing date established tonight. There are a few waivers needed: soil erosion, fire protection, etc.

Mr. Walsh motioned to deem this application complete with a hearing date of June 3rd. This approval is subject to the EIS being provided at least 20 days prior to the date. This was seconded by Ms. Shimamoto. The following vote was taken:

	Mr. Chozick	Ms. Franco	Ms. Raffay	Mr. McElroy	Mr. Morytko	Mayor Rubenstein	Mr. Serrilli	Ms. Shimamoto	Mr. Smith	Mr. Walsh	Chairman Shivas
MOTION										√	
SECONDED								√			
AYE		√		√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
NAY											
ABSTAIN											
ABSENT	√		√								

Motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS

Z14-2020, Safa LLC, (Joe Ahmad), 16 Weaver House Cove Road, Block 109 Lot 2, R-5 (Carried from 12/03/2021 and 02/04/2021)

Cory Vandervalk from MAP Engineering (170 Kinnelon Road, Kinnelon NJ) appeared along with the attorney Alan Mariconda, the architect Michael Romanik (291 Crooks Avenue, Paterson NJ), and the applicant Joe Ahmad (15 Lilro Court, Wayne NJ). They were all sworn in. Mr. Romanik has been a registered architect and licensed planner for over 35 years. He has an MA in Architecture, and was the city planning director in Paterson as well as the director of the planning and zoning division. Chairman Shivas asked what towns he’s worked in, perhaps some in Sussex County. Mr. Romanik said he’s worked in probably over 100 towns in New Jersey, including Kinnelon and Clifton. He was deemed an expert. Mr. Vandervalk graduated from the NJ Institute of Technology with a BA in mechanical engineering and has worked with MAP Engineering for the past 9 years doing site plan subdivisions and zoning plans across Morris, Bergen, Passaic, and Sussex County. He passed his Civil Engineering exam last year and obtained his PE license in February 2021. He was also deemed an expert.

Mr. Vandervalk provided an overview of the site. The purpose of the project is to renovate the existing dwelling. The size of the property has a few existing nonconformities that affect the application, including the setback and steep slopes. The main cause of the variances is adjustments to the roof. The existing setbacks are measured off the exterior walls, and the proposed setbacks are measured off of the roof overhangs proposed. The dwelling size is being increased by 50 sq. feet, driven by the cantilever at the right rear of the dwelling. There is a shed roof on the dwelling now, and the proposed is a gable roof. Mr. Mariconda confirmed that this is an existing single-family dwelling. Mr. Vandervalk noted that the setback variances are increasing only because they’re measuring off of the overhangs now; there’s no change in the foundation of the dwelling.

Mayor Rubenstein asked how the right-side setback is getting better. Mr. Vandervalk responded that based on a conversation with Zoning Officer Tom Dixon, he wanted Mr. Vandervalk to measure the existing right setback at the steps leading into the house. Those are to be removed, so that setback is changing. Mr. McElroy asked about the septic system, as the current one didn’t meet the Sussex Board of Health standards. Mr. Vandervalk said

the existing system is in the right rear corner, and they are designing a new system as part of this project.

Chairman Shivas opened to the public regarding the engineering of this application.

Elizabeth Durkin from the Durkin Firm joined on behalf of the adjoining property owner Kathryn Rosa (3 Hickory Trail). Ms. Durkin asked about how exhibits are handled, requesting that exhibits are marked in. Ms. Hubbard explained that what's online is submitted by the applicant and that we don't mark them unless there are new exhibits at the time of the meeting.

Ms. Durkin asked Mr. Vandervalk if he had an opportunity to review the documents pertaining to this application, and if he was familiar with the document "Minutes of the Byram Board of Adjustment" from 1969. He said he briefly reviewed them. Ms. Durkin asked how many times he'd been to the site; he responded three times. She then pointed to the 1969 minutes, to the portions that mentioned expanding an existing porch and the property's setbacks. She then pointed to the sketch that's part of the document and the approval from the Board. She noted that she performed an OPRA search for land use approvals and this was the only document that came up. Mr. Vandervalk confirmed that he was not aware of any other approvals, and that he did an OPRA search for septic components. Ms. Durkin asked him to show on his plans where there is a rear porch, and he responded that it's all part of the house, and he can't speak to anything before this property was surveyed regarding when the porch became part of the house. She confirmed that he did not see a porch when visiting the property. Ms. Durkin went over the setbacks for the house, as well as what they'd be if there was a porch. She also asked about the septic design. Mr. Vandervalk doesn't anticipate the new design not being approved.

Mayor Rubenstein asked regarding the setbacks, on the 1969 approval, the 10' measurement seems to be not at an angle that's perpendicular to the rear setback, whereas on the new survey the 8.6' is perpendicular; would that have an effect on the proposal? Mr. Vandervalk said their survey shows a steeper angle. Mayor Rubenstein noted that the setback discrepancies between the hand-drawn survey and the one Mr. Vandervalk prepared shouldn't be compared since the 1969 isn't really a survey. Chairman Shivas noted that maybe in past surveys they weren't measuring to the overhangs like Mr. Vandervalk is doing. Ms. Durkin confirmed with Mr. Vandervalk that there would be no increase in the footprint of the building. He confirmed that the only increase is a cantilever, which is a raised portion of the dwelling. She asked that if there was a porch there, would there be an increase in the variances for the building. Mr. Vandervalk noted that "porch" is a vague term—it could be enclosed, covered, open, etc. An open porch wouldn't be considered building coverage but an enclosed one would. Mayor Rubenstein said that doesn't change the footprint either way, covered or not. Mr. Vandervalk noted that he can't speak to what happened between 1969 and 2021.

No one else from the public came forward. Chairman Shivas closed to the public.

Mr. Smith asked if Ms. Durkin is representing the lot in the rear. Mayor Rubenstein showed the property on the Highlands Council Interactive Map (**Exhibit B1**).

Mr. Mariconda turned to Mr. Romanik to go over the architectural components. Mr. Romanik showed sheet number 1 of 4 of the architectural drawings to explain the existing conditions. He showed the functions of the rooms and swinging doors on the ground level, 3 of which will be removed and there will be one entrance. On the upper level they're looking to raise the ceiling height to 8 feet. The kitchen and bathroom will stay in the same spot. They're looking to widen the bedroom and adjoin it to the dining room. He reiterated that no change in the footprint will occur. He then turned to sheet 2 of the architectural drawings. They will put a new roof on the structure to make it aesthetically pleasing and the height will be 25', no higher than what is there now. He turned to sheet 3 to show the cantilever, used to widen the space in the rear. The bathroom will be upgraded, and they're providing stairs to the lower level.

Mr. Mariconda asked Mr. Romanik to explain why this proposal should be granted approval. Mr. Romanik noted that a lot of what's shown is pre-existing and feels that they fall under the parameters of the C1 variance; the configuration of the lot is irregular. They are making internal arrangement improvements, their setback request is minor, and there is no major detriment to the public.

Chairman Shivas asked regarding the photos, that there seems to be an overhang already. Mr. Romanik noted that it is indeed already there; Mr. Vandervalk has said that the Zoning

Officer wanted the measurements to be shown including the overhangs. There would only be about a 12'' overhang, which provides ventilation. Mayor Rubenstein noted that they had already said that this overhang is pre-existing. Mr. Vandervalk said the surveyor doesn't locate existing overhangs, so it looks like on the plans they are proposing an overhang, but they are already there. Mayor Rubenstein asked if there will be change between the overhang now and in the proposed changes. Mr. Vandervalk said he can't speak to how long the overhangs are now. Mr. Romanik certified that the overhang would be no more than 12''. Mr. Serrilli asked if that excludes the gutter; Mr. Romanik said if there's a specific request for the measurements they'd work with that.

Mayor Rubenstein asked if the tree close to the house is staying. Mr. Romanik said it would need to be removed; Mr. Ahmad wants to preserve as many trees as possible.

Chairman Shivas opened to the public regarding the Planner.

Ms. Durkin asked how Mr. Romanik concluded that the room identified as such is a bedroom. He responded based on his experience of about 40 years. There was a discussion about what qualifies as a bedroom, because Ms. Durkin thinks it could have been the porch. Mr. Romanik added that this makes sense to be a bedroom because you can't, by code, go through a bedroom to get to another room. He added that the variance was about a porch 50 years ago, so they don't know what happened since then and there's no way to show it. He said he's not sure how relevant it is to locate where the porch was because the application is before the Board now with the existing conditions. Ms. Durkin feels that the burden of proof is on the applicant, and that the municipal land use law regarding pre-existing nonconformities would say that the nonconformity had to exist legally at the time it was put there. Mr. Romanik reiterated that he's not giving the applicant burden of proof for something that happened 50 years ago.

Ms. Hubbard asked Ms. Durkin if her OPRA search showed anything different than what was submitted by the applicant, and how we received the 1969 minutes. It was surmised that Mr. Dixon found the 1969 minutes, and it was uploaded online by the previous Board Secretary Cheryl White so there's no way to confirm at this time how it was received. Ms. Durkin confirmed that the 1969 approval was the only document from the OPRA search. Mr. Mariconda added that they're not disputing the public record. Ms. Hubbard agreed, saying that not knowing the basis of objection, they've discussed this at length. Chairman Shivas said there's nothing that says the porch wasn't covered from the beginning. There's no description of the porch, so the room could be labeled a bedroom or anything else and it would still be enclosed. Mr. Walsh said that he's prepared to acknowledge that what was there in 1969 was a porch and what is proposed is not a porch. Ms. Durkin said that the issue is that the variances change based on that classification.

Mayor Rubenstein asked why this is suddenly a problem for the neighbor. Ms. Durkin noted that the property hasn't been occupied for a while, and that it was built as a summer bungalow. In 2000, the owner was looking to winterize it. Ms. Hubbard asked what documents she has regarding winterizing the property. Ms. Durkin said it was in the OPRA in 2000; there was a letter to the owner from the Township Manager regarding the winterization. It showed 2 buildings permit issued.

Mr. Walsh asked should the existing plans show what is there now or show what was last approved. Mr. Mariconda added that they have no idea what administrative approvals were granted in the past. Mr. Walsh said that what he thinks Ms. Durkin is saying is that the existing plans should reflect that it was approved as a porch. Mr. Morytko asked if she's saying there are variances that are not being requested. She said the variances regard the rear yard setback, which should start with what was approved. Ms. Hubbard said that has to do with how it was measured, and the property line is on an angle. Ms. Durkin said the applicant doesn't get the benefit of closing a porch and labeling it as a bedroom. Ms. Hubbard added that on the current survey, the measurement is on an angle and the survey has it straight back. If it's on an angle, that impacts the measurement. Mr. Walsh agreed, saying the measurement is different from the hand-drawn one and the current survey; Mr. Serrilli added that it's not even an official survey. Mayor Rubenstein followed up, asking what additional variances she thinks are needed. Ms. Durkin said it's the rear-yard setback, and that the porch has to be a porch, not a bedroom. Mayor Rubenstein asked Ms. Hubbard that if in 1969 they wanted a porch, and then later changed it without altering the dimensions, do they need another variance. Ms. Hubbard said the minutes are too vague on what kind of porch it was (i.e. enclosed). She said if the use is permitted, there's no need for a variance. Chairman Shivas said he thinks they'd just need a building permit.

Mr. Walsh added that this is different because it's an intensification. A variance was granted

for a porch; the fact that it's not a porch means the intensification of the nonconformity has increased. He thinks this would've needed a new variance, but he's not sure of the relevance because the Board is mindful that it was approved as a porch and will review the plans as submitted. He doesn't think the setbacks have changed and the structure hasn't been relocated, so they're just approving what's proposed, recognizing that it's different than what was previously approved.

Chairman Shivas closed to the public.

Mayor Rubenstein asked why Ms. Durkin is here. She responded that the issue is mainly the rear renovations, because they're close to her client's property. Mayor Rubenstein said he doesn't see the issue because the footprint isn't moving. Mr. Walsh agreed with this, saying that they're interested in hearing neighbor testimonies to help consider each application. He wants to hear how this will impact Ms. Durkin's client.

Kathryn Rosa (3 Hickory Trail, Andover) appeared at the meeting and was sworn in. She stated that her parents bought the house in 1979 and has heard all the testimony tonight and reviewed the plans. She said she thought the porch was always unusually close to the house and didn't have a reason until the notice to dig more into the details. She said she's seen 2 fires on her street, and her concern is that the house is so close that if it caught fire, hers would too, especially coming closer. Mayor Rubenstein asked how they're getting closer since the footprint isn't moving. She responded that even if it's just the roof that catches fire it would still affect her. Mr. Romanik confirmed that nothing is getting any closer than it is now; the height of the roof will decrease by about 1 foot. Ms. Rosa looked at the memo, saying it looks like it's getting closer. Mayor Rubenstein added that that's because they're measuring from the overhang. Mr. Romanik confirmed they are not changing the façade in any way that it will be closer to Ms. Rosa.

Mr. Smith asked if Ms. Rosa recalls if there was a porch. She responded that the previous tenant was using it as a bedroom; she remembers seeing the bed because it's close to her house. Mr. Smith said whatever happened with the porch would have then occurred before she remembers it. She responded that it could have happened before her parents bought the house. He also asked if this was an application to make it look like it does today rather than what's proposed, would she be opposed. Ms. Rosa said her other issue is that they're extending into the right side that's closest to her property, impacting marketability.

Mr. Romanik stated that the oil tank will be removed, and the cantilever affects the right side, not the rear. Ms. Rosa brought back Mr. Smith's original question, and said there has always been a door in that area, so it must have been a porch because people don't have a door to their bedroom. She added this was originally used as a summer cabin, so this is a significant addition, and they should work with what's there.

Ms. Shimamoto asked what the septic system was approved for regarding the bedroom allotment. Mr. Vandervalk said you cannot design a system for anything less than a two-bedroom. Mr. Morytko said he's not sure how the bedroom number is relevant, and that Cranberry Lake has a lot that's not typical so having a bedroom with a door is possible. Mr. Walsh said he'd be comfortable if he saw tax records confirming this is a two-bedroom. Mayor Rubenstein found a property record from the septic system from July 28th, 1995 (**Exhibit B2**) on the Sussex County record system. It shows the bedroom count is 3.

Chairman Shivas closed to the public.

Mr. Walsh said that this is a tiny property being expand, which gives him a little pause. Mayor Rubenstein said it's .08 of an acre. Mr. Morytko said it being a small lot does get his attention, but the placement of the rear portion mitigates the size change. Mr. Walsh asked about having one entrance/exit. Mr. Romanik said it's not a problem, it meets the code, and he thinks it's appropriate for the structure.

Ms. Shimamoto motioned to approve this application, seconded by Mr. McElroy. The following vote was taken:

	Mr. Chozick	Ms. Franco	Ms. Raffay	Mr. McElroy	Mr. Morytko	Mayor Rubenstein	Mr. Serrilli	Ms. Shimamoto	Mr. Smith	Mr. Walsh	Chairman Shivas
MOTION								√			
SECONDED				√							
AYE		√		√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
NAY											
ABSTAIN											
ABSENT	√		√								

Motion carried.

Ms. Shimamoto requested that in the resolution it be stated that the way the setback was measured previously is the same measurement, just measured in a different way, that way we know there's not an additional setback. Mayor Rubenstein added to note that the previous survey was not professional in any way.

Z19-2020, Craig Humphrey, 18 Broad Street, Block 223 Lot 3, R-4 Zone

Craig Humphrey (18 Broad Avenue, Stanhope) was sworn in. He explained that he will take down the old house to the foundation and put in a bigger foundation for a 3-bedroom ranch house with a covered porch. He will also add a garage and move the driveway to the other side of the house because there's more room and he didn't want to encroach on his neighbors. He will bring the old driveway back to grass, confirmed by Chairman Shivas. He will also take down the existing shed, which is rotten, and put a new shed up. He has a 3-bedroom septic that was put in last year, and has a community well. Chairman Shivas confirmed this would be considered a new house.

Mayor Rubenstein said the only variance is principal building coverage. He confirmed the footprint would change from 1,400 to 3,100 square feet, more than doubling but still complying with all the setbacks.

Ms. Hubbard asked what the benefits are or if there are any hardships. Mr. Humphrey said the house is old, some of the beams are rotting, the bedrooms are very small, the walls are just wood slat, and the pipes are outdated. Ms. Hubbard confirmed with Mr. Humphrey that in order to improve the home it's easier to tear it down and rebuild than to renovate.

Mr. Stoner asked about the square footage. Mr. Humphrey said he added on the overhang with the gutter; he may be 50 square feet too much but wanted to give himself more if needed. Mr. Stoner said it should be a condition that the shed be properly positioned away from the building. He confirmed Mr. Humphrey will pave the new driveway, and said the size is increasing a lot but it's a small house as it is. He asked what the size is compared to other houses in the area. Mr. Humphrey said the house to the right is about the same size, there's a bi-level next to him that's bigger, two houses down is a lot bigger, and across the street there a house that's about the size that he's proposing. Mr. Stoner confirmed that the size would then be appropriate for the neighborhood.

Chairman Shivas opened to the public.

Roy McDonald appeared but is the next applicant and left.

Chairman Shivas closed to the public.

Ms. Shimamoto asked that when Mr. Humphrey removes the driveway he puts topsoil and grass there. She also asked how he will handle the runoff. Mr. Humphrey said the front of the house will drain to the street and the back will drain where the existing gutters are; the lot pitches towards the street. He will have landscaping and mulch around the house.

Ms. Shimamoto motioned to approve this application, seconded by Mayor Rubenstein. The following vote was taken:

	Mr. Chozick	Ms. Franco	Ms. Raffay	Mr. McElroy	Mr. Morytko	Mayor Rubenstein	Mr. Serrilli	Ms. Shimamoto	Mr. Smith	Mr. Walsh	Chairman Shivas
MOTION								√			
SECONDED						√					
AYE		√		√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
NAY											
ABSTAIN											
ABSENT	√		√								

Motion carried.

John MacDougall of JMC Development (12 Ludlow Road, Parsippany), the home improvement contractor, was sworn in. He explained that this is a proposed covered porch. The roof will have a gable effect to the left of the house, and under it will be bushes and a standard railing. The siding and roofing will match what’s there. It will be 2.5 feet off the ground in the front with 3 steps and 4-5 steps in the back because of the slope. They’re looking to bring the steps down to touch into the existing patio so it’s more natural.

Roy and Karen McDonald (4 Roger Drive, Byram), the applicants, were having technical difficulties joining the call and joined at this point, and were sworn in. They’re looking to put a porch on the left side of the house, because from the front to the street is too small. The porch will be covered but not enclosed.

Mr. Stoner said they’re asking for a variance on 29’ but thinks they should ask for 22’. The building is 22’ from the right-of-way, which means it’s an existing non-conforming structure. The setback is further back from the rest of the building. **Exhibit B1** of their property was shown to get a better idea of the setbacks. There was discussion on the measurements and what requires a variance.

Mr. Stoner asked regarding the sketch for the septic system, will this proposed change impact the system in any way. Mr. McDonald said the septic is to the right and below so there’s a clear access point. Mr. Stoner added that an approval should be conditioned upon meeting any septic requirements.

Ms. Shimamoto asked how they’ll handle the runoff. Mr. MacDougall responded that the water will be placed in the same area it’s in now. The only difference is that the roof will be 12’ deeper that would slope towards the stream, so there will be no impact. Ms. Shimamoto confirmed that they’ll provide plantings as well.

Chairman Shivas opened to the public. No one came forward. Chairman Shivas closed to the public.

Mayor Rubenstein motioned to approve this application, seconded by Mr. Walsh. Mr. Walsh said they’d need to change the zoning table for the proposed (from 29 to 22, and the variance should say 16.5). The following vote was taken:

	Mr. Chozick	Ms. Franco	Ms. Raffay	Mr. McElroy	Mr. Morytko	Mayor Rubenstein	Mr. Serrilli	Ms. Shimamoto	Mr. Smith	Mr. Walsh	Chairman Shivas
MOTION						√					
SECONDED										√	
AYE		√		√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
NAY											
ABSTAIN											
ABSENT	√		√								

Motion carried.

REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

Architectural Review Committee: Mr. Morytko said there was no meeting.
 Building Committee: Mr. Morytko said there was no meeting.
 Environmental Commission: Ms. Shimamoto said they met last week and went over applications and the Board will see them soon.
 Open Space: Mr. Morytko said there’s a meeting 04/12.
 Township Council: Mayor Rubenstein said there’s a meeting next Tuesday. He noted that there’s a government energy aggregation program. The second information session was tonight, so he offered to answer any questions for the Board who missed the meeting.

BILLS

Law Office of Larry Wiener (3 Bills)- \$1,155.00
 A motion to approve the bills was made by Mr. Walsh. The motion was seconded by Mr. Morytko. All were in favor. Motion carried.

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

Chairman Shivas opened to the public. No one expressed an interest to speak. Chairman Shivas closed to the public.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made at 10:35 by Mr. Morytko. The motion was seconded by Mr. Serrilli. All were in favor. Motion carried. The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,
 Caitlin Phillips
 Page 7