The meeting was called to order at 7:30 PM by the Chairman, Mr. Wes Suckey, who then led the assembly in the flag salute.

Mr. Suckey read the Statement of Compliance pursuant to the "Open Public Meetings Act, Chapter 231, PL 1975."

ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS: Mr. Wes Suckey, Chairman (Present)

Mr. John Christiano, Vice – Chairman (Present)

Mr. Nick Giordano, Mayor (Present)

Mr. Stephen Skellenger, Councilman (Present)

Mr. Floy Estes (Present)
Mr. Jim Nidelko, (Present)
Mr. Jim Williams (Present)
Mr. John Friend (Present)

Mr. Richard Knop, Alternate #1(Present)
Mr. Ted Bayles, Alternate #2 (Present)
Mr. Michael Raperto, Alternate #3(Present)
Mr. Stephen DeFinis, Alternate # 4 (Present)

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. Dave Brady, Board Attorney

Mr. Tom Knutelsky, Board Engineer Mr. Ken Neslon, Board Planner

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

There were no minutes for approval

Other Business

Final draft of recording policy for Franklin Planning Board was presented to the members. Mr. Brady briefly explained the revisions he made to the draft and explained how he shrunk it down after speaking to Mr. Suckey after the last meeting. Mr. Suckey was pleased with the items going from ten different areas to four. The board agreed and did not have any questions or concerns about the finalized recording policy. Mr. Suckey asked for a motion to accept the final draft of the recording policy for the Franklin planning board. Mr. Estes made the motion to accept the recording policy. Seconded by Mr. Williams.

Upon Roll Call Vote:

AYES: Suckey, Christiano, Williams, Skellenger, Giordano, Estes, Bayles, Nidelko, Friend, Knop, Raperto, DeFinis

NAYS: None ABSTENTIONS:

EXECUTIVE SESSION - TO DISCUSS LITIGATION THE OPEN PUBLIC MEETINGS ACT ALLOWS THE PLANNING BOARD TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC FROM A PORTION OF A MEETING IN CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE BOROUGH OF FRANKLIN, THAT THE PUBLIC SHALL BE EXCLUDED FROM DISCUSSION OF MATTERS ALLOWED BY NEW JERSEY LAW.

THE EXECUTIVE SESSION MINUTES WILL BE PLACED ON FILE IN THE PLANNING BOARD OFFICE, AND WILL BE AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC AS PROVIDED FOR BY NEW JERSEY LAW. MINUTES OF THE SAME MAY BECOME AVAILBLE AFTER THE NEED OR ATTORNEY CLIENT PRIVILEGE NO LONGER EXSITS.

Be further advised this Resolution shall take effect immediately.

Chairman Suckey requested a motion to adopt a resolution to adjourn into Executive Session to discuss certain items that relate to litigation

Mr. Skellenger made the motion to adopt the resolution to adjourn into Executive session. Seconded by **Mr. Nidelko**.

Upon Roll Call Vote:

AYES: Suckey, Christiano, Williams, Skellenger, Giordano, Estes, Nidelko, Friend,

Knop, Bayles, Raperto, DeFinis

NAYS: None ABSTENTIONS:

CORRESPONDENCE:

Memo from Darlene Tremont, Acting Municipal Clerk

Re: Ordinance 08-2018 This Ordinance was introduced at the Mayor and Council Meeting on June 12, 2018; passed introduction and was adopted by the Mayor and Council at their July 10, 2018, Meeting.

APPROVAL OF RESOLUTIONS:

There were no resolutions for approval.

APPLICATIONS FOR COMPLETENESS:

-JP Morgan/Chase Bank PB 06-18-03 Block 1101, Lot 7 (300 Route 23) Minor Site Plan in zone HC-1

There were no representatives present at the meeting representing Chase Bank.

Mr. Knutelsky suggested we that we proceed with the application for completeness. Both Mr. Knutelsky and Mr. Brady agreed that they could move forward with the completeness report without the applicant being present. The board was in agreement and Mr. Knutelsky proceeded with his report. Mr. Knutelsky read from his July 12, 2018 report for PB # 06-18-03

Mr. Knutelsky suggested that the board deem the application complete. Mr. Knutelsky amended his report to remove his recommendation to have this application proceed into a hearing following completeness.

Mr. Suckey asked the board for any questions or concerns. With no questions or concerns by the board. Mr. Suckey asked for a motion to deem the application complete.

Mr. Giordano made the motion to deem the application complete. Seconded by Mr. Nidelko.

Upon Roll Call Vote:

AYES: Suckey, Williams, Skellenger, Giordano, Estes, Bayles, Nidelko, Friend,

Knop

NAYS: None ABSTENTIONS:

Motion passed and application deemed complete. The hearing will be carried over to the August 20, 2018 planning board meeting.

The next application is F&R Associates, LLC PB 06-18-01, Block 1302, Lot 16 for a Minor Subdivision in zone OS/GU (RS Phillips/Buckwheat Quarry)

Mr. Christiano recused himself from this application. Ms. Schultz also recused herself from this application. Mr. Williams, Mr. Nidelko and Mr. Suckey recused themselves due to being officers and members of the Franklin Fire Dept. Mr. Suckey announced Mr. Friend would be chairing this application.

Mr. Friend brought the meeting back to order, asking Mr. Knutelsky to bring the board up to speed with this application. Mr. Knutelsky read his July 12, 2018 report for PB 06-18-01 Block 1302, Lot 16 for a Minor Subdivision in zone OS/GU. Reading specifically from section B in his report. Mr. Knutelsky explained the following items are incomplete and will need waivers. Checklist item #16, Checklist Item #20 Checklist Item #22, Checklist Item #23 These four items do not impact the application. The nature of the application is a minor subdivision dedicating two simple lots to another agency.

Mr. Brady suggested Mr. Friend ask for a motion to have the waivers granted before hearing from the applicant.

Mr. Friend asked the board if they had any questions or concerns in regards to the waivers being granted. The members did not have any questions or concerns.

Mr. Friend asked for a motion to grant the waivers recommend by Mr. Knutelsky. Mr. Estes made the motion. Seconded by Mr. Knop.

Upon Roll Call Vote:

AYES: Skellenger, Giordano, Estes, Friend, Bayles, Knop, DeFinis

NAYS: None ABSTENTIONS:

Mr. Brady explained waivers had been granted and we can proceed to the hearing. Mr. Brady noted that Mr. McGee forwarded proof of service and publication and find it to be in order and the board has jurisdiction.

Mr. Steven McGee who is the attorney representing the applicant F& R Associates appeared along with Stephen Phillips managing member of F& R associates. A request was made to carry the public hearing portion of this application to August 1, 2018. Mr.

Brady stated that the public hearing for F& R Associates would be carried to August 1, 2018 at 7:30 with no other notices being provided. All parties agreed.

At 8:28PM Mr. Suckey, Mr. Williams, Mr. Nidelko, Mr. Christiano, and Ms. Schultz returned to the meeting.

Mr. Suckey brought the meeting back to order at 8:33PM

ADJOURNED CASES:

There were no adjourned cases.

APPLICATIONS TO BE HEARD:

Mr. Suckey introduced - JCM Investors, 1012, LLC, PB # 04-18-02, Block 2701, Lot 2-110 Munsonhurst Road, Preliminary & Final Site Plan in MPR Zone (Continued from June 18, 2018)

Mr. Brady asked the chairman and Mr. Kelly if he could fill the board in with the issues that arose from the last meeting, Mr. Brady proceeded to explaining that at the last meeting or the meeting before, the issue of what the slope disturbance restrictions applied The applicant indicated that the slope disturbance restrictions had 30/20/20 limit. The public questioned whether or not that was the correct slope disturbance criteria. Since that meeting Mr. Brady had the opportunity to go back and look at what occurred regarding this zone at the council level.

Mr. Brady explained in summary, this site was in the MAAH zone which allowed for 250 units of all senior citizen housing, It had slope restriction criteria of 10/5/2. Last fall the council proposed a new ordinance that would lift the age restrictions an, allow 300 units and have the new slope disturbance criteria be 30/20/20. It came to the planning board for comments and/or recommendations. The planning board had two concerns. It directed Mr. Brady to write a letter to the council regarding the terms and draft a resolution to be memorialized showing the two concerns the planning board had. The language to the age restrictions it was just that a concern. The second concern being the slope disturbance. The planning board recommended 10/5/2. Mr. Brady explained that he has gone back to listen to the November council meeting and has read the minutes from that meeting and explained, that after much discussion on the council level and a series of motions.

The first motion at the council meeting was to reject the planning board's recommendations that the slopes be disturbance limits at 10/5/2. This motion resulted in a tie. When there is a tie on a motion the motion fails. The second motion was to reject the planning boards concern about the language. The language on the age restrictions. That motion passed.

The third motion was to accept the planning board's recommendation to accept the recommended slope disturbance at 10/5/2. The final motion of the night was that the council adopt the ordinance with the amended slope disturbance limits. This motion passed. The question presented in their application is what restrictions apply per the

ordinance. The applicant appears to have prepared an application applying the 30/20/20 slope standards. The E code the on-line version of our ordinance shows 30/20/20 this was a clerical error. Mr. Brady continued by saying in his opinion and his direction to the board is that legislation can only be adopted in accordance to the applicable statues and procedures that are placed in the hands of elected officials on the council. The council passed a motion to adopt the ordinance with slope disturbance restrictions of 10/5/2. Therefore the ordinance that should be applied should be the ordinance that was passed by the council meeting on November 20, 2017 with the slope disturbance restrictions of 10/5/2.

Mr. Kelly voiced his concerns in regards to Mr. Brady's statement he then asked to admend the application and ask for a C variance relief as to slope disturbance with respect to steep slopes. We would continue our testimony with the planners and professionals we have with us tonight. Mr. Brady board members that this not uncommon. Mr. Brady explained the notice has what we often call notices such as Mr. Kelly's notice as catch all language whether or not steep slopes was specified or not on the notice. The standard for notice is weather the notice has sufficient information for Snyder to decide whether to appear. Mr. Brady stated he finds the notice is effective and we can proceed with the hearing.

Mr. Kelly thanked Mr. Brady and proceeded by addressing the board and introducing Mr. Eric Snyder and Eric Keller of whom will testify as planners. Both to testify as planners. Mr. Kelly would like both professionals to discuss the proposed C variance. Mr. Brady stated that the last meeting Mr. Keller was sworn in and gave his credentials for being a professional engineer. Mr. Brady reminded Mr. Keller that he was still under oath from the last meeting. Mr. Keller agreed and listed his credentials as a planner which the board accepted Mr. Keller as a professional planner.

Mr. Keller proceeded with his testimony. Mr. Keller explained in detail what exactly a C1 and C2 variance would be and what why they are asking for the planning board members to approve their request for such variances. Mr. Keller explained in length that the MPR ordinance talks about the different slope categories in this particular area is 5.29 acres with slopes between 15%- 20%. The allowed disturbance is 10% or little over half an acre. 20% - 25% slope category a 5% disturbance or 3.34 acres. On slopes over 25. Disturbance 2% and 6.33 acres disturbance of .12 acres.

The prior ordinance MAAH zone also had the 10/5/2 this criteria but was based on a different formula. The new ordinance is not the same or even similar. They are different in that the slope criteria and what is allowed to be disturbed in percentage. In this ordinance it doesn't matter if you disturb 5 acres or 70 acres the slope categories are the slope categories and the allowing disturbance is the allowable disturbances. Under that ordinance if you disturb more of the sight you disturb more of the steep slopes. That's not the case anymore in the new ordinance that the town adopted.

Mr. Keller went on to explain what it is that they will be disturbing under the new ordinance. Of the 15-20% would disturb 22.9 % of the slopes which exceeds the allowed 10% for the 20-25% allowed to disturb 5% and we would disturb 19.5 % and for the over 25% allowed disturbance is 2% and we would disturb 16.4 %. Mr. Keller then explained what a steep slope is. A slope is a vertical change over a horizontal change. The town ordinance defines a steep slope as being over 15%. Mr. Keller explained that they create slopes steeper then what the town ordinance is controlling. The design that we submitted at the June 6th meeting explaining that we would be disturbing 15.6 acres less than 25% of the track 2.9 acres are considered steep slopes a little over 4% of the entire track. Steep Slopes are 20% of the track which means 80% of the track is not considered steep slopes.

Mr. Keller entered an exhibit A8 – Milly's court July 16, 2018 project foot print/ steep slope plan. Mr. Keller went on to explain what the different colors and lines represented on the exhibit. The darker blue line being the Mr. Keller explained and showed the area of steep slopes and what slopes were man made slopes which were man made. Due to building the access road for the town wells. Manmade slopes are exempt from the ordinance.

Mr. Keller went on to explain in length the five basic criteria when dealing with steep slopes. Touching and explaining the impact on each. Mr. Keller explained that they would be working closely with the DEP and all other agencies that would need to be regulating the project. Mr. Keller in closing stated that in his opinion that he believes that the project design meets the regulations and standards of the DEP in respect to the wet lands, flood hazards along with the five basic criteria areas discussed when dealing with steep slopes. Mr. Keller explained that for the C2 variance this project does not have a negative impact on the zoning ordinance. The project has been condensed and shrunk to the point where there is no way it can be any smaller.

Mr. Keller went on to state that he believes that this plan complies with all the requirements. Mr. Keller explained as far as the steep slopes related to this project they have no material impact to the environment although. The steep slopes are only 4.2% of the entire track. It does exceed the 10/5/2 limits of the town's ordinance.

Mr. Suckey **opened the meeting to the public** asking if anyone had any questions for Mr. Keller.

Julia Somers – 578 Newton, New Jersey Ms. Somers asked Mr. Keller to explain what the colors on his exhibit represented as far as steep slopes. Mr. Keller explained each color and what each color represented. Ms. Somers went on to ask Mr. Keller for his exact percentages when it came to the slope disturbance and exactly what percentages he was looking to disturb and what those percentages equaled in acres. Mr. Keller explained his calculations and answered all of Ms. Somers questions. Ms. Somers also asked Mr. Keller if this project has a wetlands permit. Mr. Keller explained that at this time they did not have a wet lands permit and, being they are in the beginning stages of the project.

Dawne Rowe – 140 Munsonhurst Road Ms. Rowe walked over to the exhibit and asked if she could get some clarity. She asked where the buildings would go. Mr. Keller explained that the buildings would be built on the ridge line would be flattened and graded. Mr. Rowe then asked if that was part of the calculations with everything else. Mr. Keller assured her it was all part of the calculations and percentages.

Cherly Krause - 160 Munsonhurst Road

Ms. Krause asked a question about two criteria's for C2 variance. Ms. Krause wanted reassurance on what exactly the variances were requested. Mr. Keller answered by stating he would have Mr. Snyder answer that question.

Ian Sherwood – 189-193 Corkhill Road

Stated that on the 4th of July it down poured for an hour straight and that his farm flooded.

He asked the applicant's catch basins would be able to handle those kind of conditions. Mr. Suckey interrupted and stated that this question was not what was discussed in Mr. Keller's testimony. He reassured Mr. Sherwood that he would have an opportunity to ask that question at a later time.

Mr. Sherwood also asked how flattening the slopes would help with erosion.

Mr. Keller explained what the applicant intended to help reduce the erosion and the procedures they would take to make sure the erosion was limited in the case of heavy rainfall. Mr. Sherwood agreed he would hold any other statements he had for a later time.

Mr. Suckey stated without anyone else coming to the microphone. He would close the meeting to the public at this time.

Mr. Suckey asked the board members if they had any questions at this time. The board members did not have any questions at this time. Mr. Suckey addressed Mr. Nelson asking Mr. Nelson if he had any questions.

Mr. Nelson stated he needed a few clarifications. What is the difference between the MAAH zone and the MPR zone regarding slope disturbance. Mr. Keller explained that the MAAH zone was total disturbance. The current ordinance is 10% of steep slopes.

Mr. Nelson asked Mr. Keller whether there is no mention of steep slopes in the master plan. Mr. Nelson asked Mr. Keller to restate his calculations in regards to the percentages and what they would be equivalent in disturbance of acres. Mr. Keller restated the calculations and referred to the exhibit in regards to where the slopes are on the site. Mr. Nelson asked if fewer units on the site would help preserve more of the steep slopes that that are on the site. Mr. Keller stated that the application is for 300 units and there are a list of reasons why it is 300 units.

Mr. Brady asked to Mr. Keller is there way to redesign the plan which would help with the disturbance of the slopes.

Mr. Suckey asked for clarification on his notes on percentages.

Mr. Keller restated the calculations and percentages for Mr. Suckey.

Mr. Knutelsky questioned Mr. Keller. Would there be any way you could redesign the plan and move the units around to help with saving any of the steep slopes. Mr. Keller explained that there was not.

Mr. Giordano asked whether the ridge line we mention if it is a steep ridge line is a steep ridge or is it a flat ridge.

Mr. Keller explained that the ridge has steep areas and it also has flat areas along the ridge.

Mr. Knutelsky explained that the area near the Borough's wells is it flat and goes grades up to a slope.

Mr. Skellenger asked Mr. Nelson if he believes that the master plan that has no mention of steep slopes in it as Mr. Keller states. Mr. Nelson answered by stating he would be looking into that and would have a better answer on that question for the next meeting. There being no other questions from the board members and the professionals that Mr. Kelly introduced his next witness.

Mr. Kelly introduced Mr. Eric Snyder, professional planner. Mr. Brady swore in Mr. Eric Snyder.

Mr. Snyder listed his education and qualifications. Mr. Suckey accepted Mr. Snyder's qualifications and asked him to proceed. Mr. Kelly started by asking Mr. Snyder to give his professional opinion on why he feels that disturbance in slopes is not terribly concerning. Mr. Snyder went on to say why slope disturbance is not necessarily a negative. Mr. Snyder stated. There is no way that this development would be able to be built without slope variances. Not granting the variance would kill the project. Of the 70 acres only 15 is actually useable. We have reduced this footprint as much as possible. Far beyond what was originally approved in the 1980's. Mr. Snyder states nothing you have heard suggests that disturbing these steep slopes would have substantial negative impact on the neighbors. There would be no negative impact on the neighbors or the zone plan. Everything you've heard tonight in regards to the standards suggests that we meet those standards. Nothing suggests that disturbing these slopes would cause any problems for the neighbors or the zone plan. The slope disturbances does not have any substantial impact.

Mr. Snyder then explained the C2 variance. Mr. Snyder spoke at length about what he believes the C2 variance covers. The applicant provided adequate light. Open space. The applicant is working with DEP working with regard to the natural habitat.

Mr. Kelly asked Mr. Snyder what is the purpose of having a steep slope ordinance. Mr. Snyder answered his question by explaining that if you try to avoid disturbing steep slopes. It's easier if you did not have steep slopes. When you don't have steep slope being disturbed it makes the plan that much easier. However in this particular project that is not the case.

Mr. Suckey **opened the meeting to the public** at this time to ask Mr. Snyder questions on his testimony only.

Corey Hennings Taylor Road- My question is that when you applied for this application you were under the impression that the slope restrictions were less restrictive than they are now. With that being said, why don't you just build fewer buildings? I would like to know that 300 units fit today with the 10/5/2 restrictions. Why would you not go back and try to build less units? Mr. Snyder said it would not work. Mr. Hennings stated I don't understand why its 300 or 0. Mr. Suckey interrupted and explained that we are getting away from Mr. Snyder's testimony now and Mr. Hennings could address this again at a later time.

Robert Mose, Bloomfield NJ asked Mr. Snyder you mentioned that the municipality decided that 300 units is proper destiny for this particular area. Mr. Snyder replied by stating it's in the code. Mr. Moose said it's in the code, yes, thank you.

Dawne Rowe 140 Munsonhurst Road

Ms. Rowe asked Mr. Snyder stating that if his statement, that the neighborhood would not be impacted negatively, is your opinion or is it facts. Mr. Snyder stated that this project does not have any negative impacted. Mr. Brady interrupted and stated that he was sworn in this evening to give his professional opinion.

Julia Somers - New Jersey Highland Coalition, asked Mr. Snyder if that the state was ok with you building this project? Mr. Snyder explained that he did not say that in those exact words. Mr. Keller however explained in his testimony that we do not have any of the permits. Mr. Snyder went on to explain to that they would comply with all wet land standards.

Cheryl Krause 160 Munsonhurst Road

Ms. Krause asked Mr. Snyder what facts can you give to show that the negative criteria would not be detrimental to the neighbors. Mr. Snyder explained that in his testimony he explains that he believes that there would be no detrimental impact on the neighbors and being a licensed planner that is what I believe. It is up to the board's discursion to decide if they would grant the appropriate approvals.

Mr. Suckey stated at this time with no one else coming up to the microphone. The meeting is closed to the public at this time. Mr. Suckey asked the board members if they had any questions for Mr. Snyder at this time. Mr. Giordano asked if you were to move the buildings by angling them in different areas of the property, would that help eliminate some of the disturbance of the slopes whether, you would have to alter the height of the buildings. Mr. Snyder stated that was a question that Mr. Keller was better fitted to answer.

Mr. Brady stated that often he hears planners testify on the C2 purposes of zoning that are advanced and asked Mr. Snyder to list yours for the board. Mr. Snyder went on to list and give brief description of them being letters C, E, G and I.

Mr. Nelson addressed his concerns to Mr. Snyder about losing a significant amount of trees. He asked Mr. Snyder if there has not been an accurate inventory on the trees that would be removed during construction of the development. Mr. Snyder explained to Mr. Nelson that there has been a precise count on trees that would be removed. However they would be replaced with heavy landscaping.

Mr. Suckey asked if there were any other questions from the professionals or board members. There not being any more questions. Mr. Kelly asked if he could have Mr. Keller return to answer any more questions. Mr. Suckey stated that it was already after 10:30. Mr. Suckey made it clear that he did however want Mr. Keller to return but it would have to be at the next meeting. The next meeting being August 1, 2018.

Mr. Knutelsky requested of the applicant to provide himself and the board members a copy of that map pointing to the exhibit with the development superimposed on the slopes. Mr. Brady asked Mr. Keller if that was something that could be done within 10 days prior to the August 1, 2018 Meeting. Mr. Keller answered yes, that can be done.

Mr. Giordano also asked if the board could have some pictures of the property. Mr. Knutelsky suggested that every member go to the site for themselves to get a look at the site and become more familiar with the site. Mr. Brady mentioned that all are welcome to visit that property, however do not go all at the same time, to be sure not to have a quorum. Mr. Suckey suggested emailing him to set up time and dates to arrange everyone going to the property to be sure there is not a quorum at any time.

The application was carried to the August 1st meeting with no further notice.

PAYMENT OF BILLS:

Mr. Nidelko made a motion to approve the **Franklin Borough Planning Board Escrow Report for** September 15, 2014. Seconded by Mr. Friend.

Upon Roll Call Vote:

AYES: NAYS: None ABSTENTIONS: Giordano, Skellenger

CORRESPONDENCE:

Memo from Darlene Tremont, Acting Municipal Clerk

Re: Ordinance 08-2018 This Ordinance was introduced at the Mayor and Council Meeting On June 12, 2018; passed introduction and adopted by the Mayor and Council at their July 10, 2018, Meeting.

OPEN PUBLIC SESSION: Non Agenda Items

Mr. Friend made a motion to **Open to the Public**. Seconded by Mr. Giordano. All were in favor.

Joanne Tatka – 151 Maple Road stated that usually when there is a proposal like this there is a set of plans made available for the public on the back table. Mr. Suckey

stated that this something that we could do. Mrs. Tatka thanked the board returned to her seat.

Erin Foulton -Evans Street – I have a question in regards to whether or not the F& R application would be further discussed this evening or if it would be carried to the August 1, 2018 Meeting. Mr. Suckey explained to him that the hearing for that application would be carried over to the August 1, 2018 at 7:30. There will be no further notice given.

lan Sherwood 189-193 Corkhill Road addressed the board stating he would be on away at the next planning board. Could he email or give any last statements to the board for the next meeting to be read or is it he is away and he is just out of luck as far as being able to get any last words in. Mr. Brady explained there would be no way we would be able to read any of your statements. You would not be sworn under oath or be able to be crossed examined as you would if you were physically here for the meeting.

Mr. Sherwood understood and thanked the board members for taking the time to go visit the site before the next meeting. He also welcomed anyone who wants to visit his property.

Mr. Giordano asked Mr. Brady if there was any way to make any accommodations for the Sherwood's by changing the hearing date. Mr. Brady said that it was announced and the applicants are no longer here so we cannot change the meeting date at this time. What he Mr. Brady suggested not making any decision dealing with it tonight, but maybe at the next meeting. Mr. Brady suggested to Mr. Sherwood write a letter to the board requesting the board not conclude the meeting that night allowing Mr. Sherwood to speak at the following meeting.

Julia Summers – I questioned if members of the public would like to bring their own witnesses to the stand this would be the time to do this?

Mr. Brady response was yes once applicant states he has rested.

Mr. Suckey asked the public if there was anyone else who would like to address the board. With no one else coming forward. I would like to ask for a motion to close the meeting to the public at this time.

Mr. Skellenger made a motion to **Close to the Public**. Seconded by Mr. Williams All were in favor.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business to come before the board, the meeting was adjourned at 10:45 PM on a motion by Mr. Nidelko, seconded by Mr. Friend All were in favor.

Respectfully submitted, Michelle Babcock Planning Board Secretary