

**Township of Lumberton
Land Development Board
Regular Meeting
June 18, 2009**

The regular meeting of the Lumberton Township Land Development Board was called to order by Chairman Bennett on Thursday, June 18, 2009 at 7:02p.m.

Chairman Bennett read the following statement:

In compliance with the Open Public Meetings Act, this is to announce that adequate notice of this meeting was provided in the following manner:

On January 2, 2009 advance written notice of this meeting was posted on the bulletin board in the main lobby in the Town Hall; was mailed to the Burlington County Times and the Courier Post; was filed with the Clerk of Lumberton Township and was mailed to all persons who requested and paid for such notice.

Please note that unless otherwise modified by Resolution of the Land Development Board, all meetings shall begin at 7:30 p.m. and no new matter shall be initiated after 11:00 p.m., except where the Land Development Board, by majority vote of those present, shall specifically authorize the extension of the meeting beyond 11:00 p.m.

Those testifying before the Board on any application are required to be sworn in. The Board's Engineer and Planning Consultant have taken an oath upon their agreement and their testimony on an application is under oath on a continuing basis.

Roll Call

Ammerman	Citizen	Member	Thomas
		Robert Bennett, Chairman Thomas Bintliff Sheldon Evans	
Marinelli			Beverly
Morton			Robert
(Absent)		John Pagenkopf	

Representatives of Governing Body James Conway, Jr.
Lewis Jackson

Alternate #1	Nancy Bleznak	
Alternate #2	Craig Potter	
Alternate #3	Doug Alba	
(Absent)		
Alternate #4	Ed Borm	
Solicitor		Peter Emmons,
Esq., Gibbs, Gregory & Emmons		
Consulting Engineer & Planner	Gregory J. Sullivan, P.E., P.P.,	Remington, Vernick & Arango
Board Secretary	Catherine	
Borstad		

Mr. Joseph M. Petrongolo, Remington & Vernick Engineers was present representing Board Engineer/Planner until Mr. Sullivan arrived at 7:22 p.m.
Guest Speaker-Right-To-Farm-Act

Mr. David Frank, Esq. & Mr. Daniel Kennedy, Burlington County Farmland Preservation Program Coordinator.

Mr. Frank discussed with the Board the Right- to- Farm Act. He explained to the Board that farmers are governed under the CADB Board.

Mr. Frank stated that farmers have to actively seek the protection of the act. He stated that there are criteria that the farms need to meet; such as income standards to qualify as a commercial farm, and whatever it is that the farmer is doing has to be found to be generally accepted agricultural management practice, which is protected under the Act.

Mr. Frank stated that if a farmer is protected by the Right-to-Farm Act, then the local Township ordinances and Boards are preempted.

Mr. Frank stated that an individual landowner can go to the County Agricultural Development Board (CADB) to seek the Right-to-Farm protection. Mr. Frank stated that Mr. Kennedy is the Administrator of the CADB.

Mr. Frank stated that farmers have protection over certain ordinances if it is a generally accepted practice.

Mr. Frank stated that if there is a conflict between a farmer and the township, instead of it being heard at the local level, it goes to the state level State Agriculture Development Board (SADC). He stated that there is a hearing

before a hearing officer who then presents the finding report to the SADC, and then the SADC Board issues their findings which are sent back to the CADB.

Mr. Frank stated that a farmer has to formally seek the protections of the Act, they are not just protected automatically.

Mr. Kennedy discussed the process of how a township or farmer can go through the CADB Board.

Mr. Kennedy stated that part of the County's goals is to protect the right to farm. He stated that the County would rather the town and the farmer work it out rather than go to the state level.

Mr. Kennedy stated that if a municipality believes a farmer is in violation of an ordinance the process would be that the municipality would file a complaint with the CADB before a summons is issued. He stated that often a summons is issued, the case is heard locally, and then the court remands it to the CADB.

Ms. Marinelli asked that if a farmer is in violation, before they are given a summons, the farmer is supposed to go through the CADB.

Mr. Kennedy stated that there are two ways that the CADB can hear cases. One is through the conflict resolution process or the farmer can ask for a site specific determination. He stated if a municipal official wants to claim that a farmer is in violation of one of the ordinances, a complaint would be filed with the CADB rather than filed in the local court.

Mr. Kennedy stated that if a farmer feels that they are being treated improperly by a zoning official, they have the right to come before the CABD for a Site Specific Management Practice Determination. He stated that if the farmer meets the criteria of the Right-to-Farm the CABD will hear the case. He stated that if a particular farmer does not meet those requirements than the Right-to-Farm protection will not be afforded to that particular landowner. He stated that if that is the case a summons would be issued and would go through the typical local process.

Mr. Kennedy stated that a farmer has to prove that there is a good agricultural reason before the CADB would trump local zoning to allow his activity to take place. He stated that the burden is on the farmer to testify.

Mr. Conway stated that they are looking to streamline their process. He stated that they are looking for a determination of whether or not a particular use is a farm use.

Mr. Kennedy stated that a more efficient process would be to have the farmer come directly to the CADB.

Mr. Frank stated that the township board has no jurisdiction to make any determinations about eligibility for farms or the Right-to-Farm Act. He stated that it is entirely the jurisdiction of the CADB and SADC.

Mr. Conway asked how the township would know if a farmer is protected under the Right-to-Farm Act. He asked if the township were to find a farmer is in violation of zoning, would the farmer tell the township that they are under the Right-to-Farm Act and show some proof. Mr. Frank stated yes.

Mr. Emmons asked whose obligation is it to go the CADB, the farmer or the town. Mr. Frank stated that it is the farmer's responsibility to go to the CADB for determination.

Ms. Bleznak asked if the CADB preferred that the town make the complaint rather than the farmer. Mr. Kennedy stated that there is no preference as how it gets to the CADB. He stated that his preference is for a farmer to understand the Right to Farm Act and the town and the farmer and town work it out between themselves. Ms. Bleznak stated that she had an issue several years ago and she repeatedly tried to go the County to resolve. She stated that at that time the County repeatedly told her that she needed to have the town file a complaint against her. She stated that she could not get the county to put the process in place. Mr. Kennedy stated that the process has changed since that time and all someone would have to do is fill out the form and the County is obligated to respond.

Mr. Kennedy stated that once a resident fills out and submits the forms for the CADB, the CADB has to respond.

Chairman Bennett asked how it would be handled if the town felt that somebody once qualified for a farm market, but not longer does. Mr. Kennedy stated that if the person does not comply with the agricultural management practices that they were given protection for, the municipality would re-file to start the process over for the CADB to re-evaluate. The CADB does not monitor farms in a way that a zoning officer would.

Mr. Emmons asked how long does it take after the form is filled out. Mr. Kennedy stated that at the first meeting after the request is received, the staff will determine eligibility. The second meeting a public hearing takes place, then the third CADB meeting the resolution is memorialized. Mr. Kennedy stated that if a farmer does not qualify it is approximately one month process.

Mr. Emmons asked how long would it take for the township staff to know if someone is protected under the Right-to-Farm Act. He asked if there is a certification or license that is issued. Mr. Kennedy stated that there would be a resolution.

Mr. Jackson asked if the resolution is site specific listing what can and cannot be done on the farm. Mr. Frank stated yes.

Mr. Conway asked if a farmer has approval to grow corn and now and then wants to put up a stand to sell the corn, is that farmer exempt from coming to the township board. Mr. Frank stated that if a particular activity is a direct threat to public health and safety, then the Right-to-Farm Act cannot protect the farmer. Mr. Frank stated that just because the Right-to-Farm Act exists, doesn't mean that the farmer is automatically protected. He stated that it is the farmer's obligation to get the protection. Mr. Kennedy stated that a farmer has to show the CADB legitimate reasons for not complying with the township regulations.

Mr. Kennedy had copies made for each board member the CADB process and a copy of the application that a farmer would fill out.

A second roll call was taken to witness the presence of Mr. Sullivan.

Minutes

A. Regular Minutes for May 21, 2009 meeting

Motion was made by Ms. Marinelli, seconded by Mr. Potter to approve the meeting minutes of May 21, 2009. The vote was affirmative with the exception of Mr. Ammerman, who abstained, and the motion carried.

Correspondence

There was none.

Ordinance

Maintenance Code - Table until July's agenda.

Resolutions

- a. 2009-09 Jambor, James, 719 Henderson Road, Block 19.44, Lot 42. Bulk Variance for rear addition. Approved.

Motion was made by Mr. Evans, seconded by Mr. Potter to approve Resolution 2009-09. The vote was affirmative with the exception of Mr. Ammerman, who abstained, and the motion carried.

- b. 2009-10 Peak, Jason, 18 Canterbury Court, Block 19.23, Lot 133. Bulk Variance for rear addition. Approved.

Motion was made by Mr. Evans, seconded by Mr. Conway to approve Resolution 2009-10. The vote was affirmative with the exception of Mr. Ammerman, who abstained, and the motion carried.

Items for Action

- a. Adams, Jane and Murphy, David**
Block 38, Lots 5 & 8.01
Stacy Haines Road
Preliminary Major Subdivision (8:03-8:25)

Michael Ridgway, Esq., present representing applicant

Mr. Ridgway stated that the applicant is requesting approval for a four lot major subdivision. He stated that the owners have owned the land for the past 20-25 years.

Chairman Bennett asked Mr. Sullivan if the application is complete. Mr. Sullivan stated that the only issue is that the Environmental Impact Study (EIS) was not submitted. Mr. Sullivan stated that he suggests that a condition of the application be that a Historic Pesticide test be done on the property. Mr. Ridgway stated that they agree.

Exhibits marked - A-1 - Site Exhibit dated 6/18/09.

Mr. Kevin Kammerer, CMX Engineer, Professional Engineer and Land Surveyor. Chairman Bennett stated that the Board accepts Mr. Kammerer as a Professional Engineer and expert witness.

Mr. Kammerer stated that the total tract is 56.4 acres located on the north side of Stacy Haines Road. He stated that the proposal is for a four lot subdivision. He stated that no bulk variances are requested. Mr. Kammerer stated that the lots would be accessed using the two existing drives on the farm. He stated that two lots of the lots would share one drive and the other two lots would share the other drive. He stated that there will be a shared access easement to the property line. Mr. Kammerer stated that there are wetlands on the property.

Mr. Kammerer stated that 51.4 acres of the 56.4 acres is in the RAS zone which is where the residential structures will be located. He stated that lot 5, located in the I-3 industrial zone is wet and could not be developed. Mr. Emmons asked which parcel lot 5 would be a part of. Mr. Kammerer stated that lot 5 is proposed to be part of the second lot shown on the plan.

Mr. Emmons stated that they will be treating this application as a Use Variance.

Mr. Emmons stated that Mr. Conway and Mr. Jackson would be stepping down.

Mr. Emmons asked if the lots could have been arranged differently so that they are not so strangely shaped. Mr. Kammerer stated these lot lines were as practical as they could get due to the shape of the property.

Mr. Kammerer stated that the Use Variance is for Lot 5. He stated that they are not proposing any residential structures on that lot. He stated that the lot is landlocked and is entirely wet. He stated that NJDOT owns the land that surrounds lot 5.

Mr. Emmons asked if they tried to sell lot 5 to New Jersey Department of Transportation. Mr. Kammerer stated no. Mr. Emmons stated that the lot would be useless to any industrial company. Mr. Kammerer stated that was correct.

Ms. Marinelli asked if two houses would be located back in the woods and the other two would be located in the current open farm area as shown on the plan. Mr. Kammerer stated that was correct. Mr. Ridgeway stated that these locations are represented as the best location based on the percs. He stated that a potential buyer could locate the house in or around the location in accordance with Township Ordinance.

Mr. Evans stated that lot 8.04, 8.05, and 8.06 are in the New Jersey Air Safety Zone. He asked if they would be including that in the deed. Mr. Kammerer stated that there will be a discloser statement on those lots.

Ms. Marinelli asked if there was a way that they could notify potential buyers before the sale. Mr. Ridgeway stated that it would be included in the contract for sale. Ms. Marinelli stated that it should be made aware before the potential buyers get that far. Mr. Emmons stated that there is certain aspects of buyer beware in real estate. He stated that the burden is put on the purchaser. Mr. Sullivan suggested that the developer inform potential buyers ahead of the contract for sale. Mr. Ridgeway stated that they would agree to that.

Mr. Emmons asked if there were any COAH obligations. Mr. Sullivan stated that the COAH obligation is consistent with the Ordinance. Mr. Emmons stated that if there is a COAH obligation the applicant will have to comply. Mr. Ridgeway stated that they will comply.

Mr. Sullivan stated that the applicant is requesting a waiver of the Environmental Impact Study. Mr. Sullivan suggested that the Board make a

condition of approval that the applicant does a historic pesticide test. Mr. Ridgeway stated that they have no problem complying. Chairman Bennett asked how long it takes to have the testing done. Mr. Kammerer stated that they could have it done in three weeks.

Ms. Marinelli asked if the lots are being sold as lots or with houses already on them. Mr. Ridgeway stated that they are being sold as lots.

Mr. Evans asked if anything has to be done for the driveways. Mr. Sullivan stated that it is county jurisdiction.

Ms. Marinelli asked if there will be one driveway for each two houses. Mr. Ridgeway stated that was correct. She asked if that would be on the deed. Mr. Ridgeway stated that there will be cross access easement which will be included in the deeds or a separate recorded document.

Mr. Emmons asked if the applicant was seeking final approval as well. Mr. Ridgeway stated yes.

Chairman Bennett opened the meeting up for public comment. There being none, this portion of the meeting was closed.

Mr. Emmons stated that this application is for approval of preliminary and final major subdivision. He stated that the applicant has asked for a waiver of the Environmental Impact Study. He stated that the applicant has agreed to any COAH Requirements. Mr. Emmons stated that the application requires a Use Variance, since the property is landlocked and useless for development. He stated that the applicant will provide the Air Safety Zone disclosure in the deeds and also to potential buyers. He stated that the applicant will do a historic pesticide testing consistent with residential standards and send results to the Township Engineer.

Motion was made by Ms. Marinelli, seconded by Mr. Bintliff to approve the Preliminary and Final Major Subdivisions with conditions as stated. The vote was unanimous and the motion carried.

b. Sta Seal

Block 14, Lot 2.01

13 Maple Avenue

I-1 Zone

Minor Site Plan for placement of Scale House and 2 Scales with variances.(8:27-9:45)

Exhibits Marked.

Mr. Bruce Lubitz, Esq., present representing applicant.

Mr. Lubitz stated that certain matters that were before the Board over a year ago have been resolved. Mr. Lubitz stated that the Class B Recycling Permit has been renewed. Mr. Lubitz stated that the plan has been approved by the County Planning Board. He stated that the lot in question has been included with County Solid Waste Management Plan, and the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) has included the lot in this facility with the Recycling Permit. He stated that these documents have been submitted to the Board. He stated that it is his understanding that they are before this Board for informational purposes only. Mr. Lubitz stated that it is his understanding that the Board is preempted by Solid Waste Management based on the approvals they have received from DEP. Mr. Lubitz stated that it is their understanding that there is no use variance required.

Mr. Emmons agreed that a use variance is not required, however he said a variance for impervious coverage may be needed.

Chairman Bennett asked Mr. Sullivan if the application can be deemed completed. Mr. Sullivan stated that he did not receive a complete set of documents until Tuesday of this week. He stated that the initial documents supplied raised more questions than answers. Mr. Lubitz stated that Mr. Nicholson testimony will clarify any concerns that Mr. Sullivan may have.

Chairman Bennett stated that the applicant will go through the testimony and the Board will reserve on the preemption if necessary.

Mr. William H. Nicholson, Professional Engineer, sworn to provide testimony.

- Exhibit marked - A-1 - Site Plan Sheet 1 of 2
- A-2 - Burlington County Approval letter
- A-3 - Class B Permit
- A-4 - Freeholder Resolution Solid Waste
- A-5 - Site Plan Submission/ Approved by DEP (3 sheets)
- A-6 - DEP Sight Distance Plan

Mr. Nicholson went over the site plan with the Board with the new location of the scale. He stated that Burlington County has approved the application. Mr. Nicholson stated that the County required them to widen the driveway to facilitate better circulation in and out of the site. He stated there were some changes to some of the landscaping.

Mr. Nicholson discussed the circulation of trucks on site. Mr. Emmons asked how wide the driveway is. Mr. Nicholson stated that the driveway is 74' wide. Mr. Nicholson stated that this driveway will allow for trucks to enter and exit the site.

Mr. Emmons asked how many trucks could be stacked on the lot before they start to encroach out onto Maple Avenue. Mr. Nicholson stated an estimate of 6-8 trucks could be stacked on the lot.

Ms. Marinelli asked when is the busiest time that trucks are queuing?

Mr. Lubitz stated that the Class B Recycling Permit that DEP issued states that material deliveries to the recycling center shall be scheduled in such a manner to minimize truck queuing on the recycling center property. Under no circumstance shall delivery trucks be permitted to back up or queue onto public roads.

Ms. Marinelli stated that the police should not have to monitor the queuing of trucks.

Mr. Tim Curnan, sworn to provide expert testimony. Chairman Bennett stated that the Board accepts Mr. Curnan's credentials as an expert witness.

Mr. Lubitz asked Mr. Curnan to explain the application and obtaining of permit process. Mr. Curnan stated that in July 2007 Sta-Seal requested a renewal of Class B Recycling Permit from DEP. They received a response in February of 2008 requesting additional information. February of 2008 at the time the applicant was before this Board Sta-Seal submitted the information DEP had requested. Since that time additional information was prepared by Mr. Curnan's office and submitted to DEP. Mr. Curnan stated that in September of 2008 the Burlington County Freeholders granted administrative approval to the County Solid Waste Management. Mr. Curnan stated in December of 2008 DEP granted renewal of the Class B Recycling Permit.

Mr. Curnan stated that he submitted a site plan to DEP with the renewal application. He showed the Board the site plan that he submitted to DEP.

Mr. Emmons stated that a year and half ago, the site had 100% impervious coverage. Mr. Curnan stated that it is 95% impervious. Mr. Emmons stated that even at 95% it is 25% over the code. Mr. Emmons asked how DEP felt about the impervious coverage. Mr. Curnan stated that DEP has approved the plan. Mr. Emmons asked if DEP required 25' buffers all around the site. Mr. Curnan stated yes. Mr. Emmons asked if the impervious coverage has changed. Mr. Curnan stated no, nor will it.

Mr. Sullivan stated that this is the first time he is seeing these drawings.

Mr. George Conway, Corporate Officer of Sta-Seal, sworn to provide testimony.

Mr. Conway stated that they have rectified the issues from the previous meeting. He stated that they have handed out flyers to the drivers asking them not to queue up on Maple Avenue and they had to be on site or come when the gates were open. He also stated that they have monitored the area from their control tower which is located close to the asphalt plant. He stated that there is a small area on the north side of the property where there is an indentation where trucks were backing up and waiting. He stated that they have stopped this completely and are monitoring the site carefully.

Mr. Emmons asked what the hours of operation are. Mr. Conway stated 7a.m. to 4 p.m. Mr. Emmons asked if the gates open at 7 a.m. Mr. Conway stated that they are normally open before 7 a.m.

Mr. Conway stated that they have not received any complaints that he is aware of.

Chairman Bennett asked Ms. Borstad if she was aware of any complaints. Ms. Borstad stated that Mr. Regn has been receiving calls regarding the queuing on Maple Avenue.

Mr. Conway stated that he is not aware of any queuing. He stated that there have been other trucks in the area that are not for his site.

Mr. Emmons asked if the monitoring taking place on site is a 24 hour operation. Mr. Conway stated that it is controlled during the hours of operation, but that it does not run at all times.

Ms. Marinelli asked if the shrubs out front were a requirement of DEP. Mr. Conway stated that they already exist. Ms. Marinelli asked if there was any landscaping required. Mr. Sullivan stated that it is up to the Board's decision.

Chairman Bennett asked if the applicant has received any DEP violations. Mr. Conway stated no.

Mr. Emmons asked who monitors if they are in violation of the square footage of waste. Mr. Conway stated that Solid Waste monitors that. Chairman Bennett asked if there was a particular name of an inspector that monitors the site. Mr. Conway stated Frank Spino.

Mr. Sullivan stated as part of the DEP permit, required sight distance boundaries apply on site. Mr. Sullivan stated that the Township may wish to have a copy of this plan for files for future reference. Chairman Bennett asked if the applicant would submit. Mr. Curnan stated yes.

At this time Chairman Bennett opened the meeting up for public comment.

Cary Williams - Allan Transfer & Storage

Mr. Williams stated that his property is directly across the street. Mr. Williams stated that the applicant has moved the scales before seeking approval. Mr. Williams expressed his concerns regarding the queuing of trucks and creating a sight distance problem.

Mr. Williams asked about a building that was demolished on the site. Chairman Bennett asked if the applicant has a building demolished. Mr. Conway stated that they came to the Township for a demolition permit to demolish the building.

Mr. Williams had concerns about the turning movement of the trucks in and out. Mr. Nicholson stated that the County has approved the driveway for turning movements in and out.

Mr. Williams submitted photos to the Board that were taken on the 17th of June. He stated that the photos are of trucks entering the facility. He stated that the drivers do not stop or use turn signals. Chairman Bennett stated that the pictures can not tell show the Board that.

Mr. Emmons asked if there was a stop sign at the gate. Mr. Conway stated no. Mr. Emmons asked if a stop sign could be placed at the gate. Mr. Conway stated yes.

Mr. Emmons asked if a traffic study was done. Mr. Nicholson stated no that it was not a requirement of County approval.

Ms. Marinelli asked Mr. Williams to address exactly what the problem is. Mr. Williams referred to Ms. Shontz.

Sally Shontz - General Manager, Allan Transfer

Ms. Shontz stated that she was present two years ago when Sta-Seal came before the Board. Ms. Shontz stated that Sta-Seal has changed their entrance from Hainesport Township to Lumberton Township which is now directly across from their entrance. She stated that the County was very stringent on Allan Transfer when they went for approval. She stated at the time of their approval there was no use at the gate across from theirs. She stated that now it causes a great deal of traffic jams, jake braking at 6:15 AM, rattling the windows in their building, and 5-6 dump trucks are lined up in front of her property preventing them from getting in and out of the driveway. Ms. Shontz stated that it is difficult to see if there is anything coming down Maple Avenue before entering. She stated that one of her employees almost got hit by a dump truck. She stated that the trucks do not even look; they just zoom into

the driveway. Ms. Shontz asked if there was a way to control the in and out of the driveway.

Mr. Emmons stated that the County had required Allan Transfer to have the driveway in the existing location. Ms. Shontz asked if Sta-Seal has County approval. Mr. Emmons stated yes.

Mr. Emmons stated that the approval from the County states that the ingress and egress of the facility should be restricted to Maple Avenue only. Ms. Shontz asked if there was going to be curbing at the site. Mr. Emmons stated that it is a county road and that this Board does not have any jurisdiction over it.

Mr. Emmons stated that the County has approved only one entrance in and out. Mr. Emmons asked about the other gate on the site. Mr. Conway stated that it is locked and not in use. Mr. Emmons stated that there is nothing this Board can do since it is a county road.

Mr. Emmons suggested Ms. Shontz bring her concerns to the County's attention.

Ms. Shontz complained about the debris that is coming out onto Maple Avenue. Mr. Emmons stated that it is covered under the DEP permit. Chairman Bennett stated that if Ms. Shontz feels that Sta-Seal is in violation that she can contact DEP. Mr. Emmons gave Ms. Shontz the appropriate information for her to contact DEP.

Mr. Emmons asked if the County is requiring the applicant to place no parking signs along the property. Mr. Nicholson stated no. Mr. Emmons asked if the applicant would be willing to place no parking signs on the property per DEP permit which will include the regulation. Mr. Conway stated yes.

Mr. Conway stated that they would hang them on the fence. Mr. Emmons stated that the Board Engineer will visit the site and advise of the height of the signs.

Ms. Shontz stated that if a patrolman was located on Maple Avenue, they could probably write a lot of tickets. Mr. Emmons suggested that Ms. Shontz consult with the Chief of Police about that issue.

Public portion of the meeting was closed.

Mr. Emmons stated that after the testimony, this Board is preempted. He stated that the Board is here only for site plan review. He stated that the applicant has testified that there will be no more queuing on Maple Avenue, the hours of operation are 7 a.m. until 4 p.m., the gates open a little before 7 a.m.

The applicant has testified that they do monitor from a control tower. He stated that the applicant has agreed to place no parking signs as per our Board Engineer and to install a stop sign at the gate.

Mr. Sullivan suggested placing arrows under the stop sign to remind drivers to use their turn signals.

Motion was made by Mr. Jackson, seconded by Ms. Marinelli to approve the site plan application as stated. The vote was unanimous and the motion carried.

Old Business

- a. 20 Maple Ave, LLC., (Cave Holdings)

Public Comment

There were none.

Comments from Professionals

Mr. Sullivan stated that the comments from the last meeting have been incorporated into the Master Plan. He stated that they are waiting on a few road names.

Comments from the Board

A. Bill List

Ms. Marinelli questioned bill #049593 - Meadow Glen

Motion was made by Mr. Jackson, seconded by Mr. Conway to approve the bill list. The vote was unanimous and the motion carried.

Adjournment

Motion was made by Ms. Bleznak, seconded by Mr. Conway to adjourn at 9:50p.m. The vote was unanimous and the motion carried.

Respectfully Submitted,

Caryn L.

Cutts

Land Development Board Secretary