

**HAINESPORT TOWNSHIP JOINT LAND USE BOARD
MINUTES**

Time: 7:00 PM

August 5, 2020

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm by Mr. Krollfeifer.

2. Flag Salute

All participated in the Flag Salute

3. Sunshine Law

Notice of this meeting was published in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act By posting on the municipal bulletin board, publication in The Burlington County Times and Courier-Post Newspapers, and by filing a copy with the Municipal Clerk

4. Announcement of “No new business after 11:00 PM”

5. Roll Call

Present: Mayor MacLachlan, Ms. Schneider (7:15pm to 8:45pm), Mrs. Kelley, Mr. McKay, Mr. Wagner, Mrs. Baggio, Mrs. Tyndale, Ms. Kosko, Mr. Sylk, Mr. Krollfeifer

Absent: Mr. Levinson, Mr. Tricocci

Also Present: Robert Kingsbury, Esq., Board Attorney
Scott Taylor, Board Planner
Paula Tiver, Board Secretary

6. Items for Business

**A. Case 20-08: Jason Pirrotta
Block 100.06 Lot 10
9 Chaucer Circle
Bulk variance for inground pool**

Proper notice was given.

Mr. Krollfeifer stated there is a correspondence in your packet regarding this application.

Jason Pirrotta applicant was sworn in.

Mr. Pirrotta stated he was here to apply for a bulk variance for a swimming pool on his property. They have an issue with the impervious coverage and setback.

Mr. McKay asked the location of the home.

Mr. Pirrotta explained he is the first court coming into the development off Bancroft and Lenox.

Mr. Krollfeifer stated he was at the property and it is an irregular shaped lot. You are asking for 10' setback on the side where 15' is required.

Ms. Newcomb stated that he also is asking for impervious coverage.

Mr. Krollfeifer opened public comment. None. Closed public comment.

Mr. Krollfeifer stated the impervious coverage is 35.3%.

Mayor MacLachlan motioned to approve.

Second: Mrs. Tyndale

Roll call: Mayor MacLachlan, yes; Mrs. Tyndale, yes; Mrs. Kelley, yes;
Mr. McKay, yes; Mr. Wagner, yes; Mrs. Baggio, yes; Ms. Kosko, yes;
Mr. Sylk, yes; Mr. Krollfeifer, yes

Motion carries to approve.

Mr. Pirrotta asked for a waiver to proceed.

Mrs. Kelley motioned to approve.

Second: Mrs. Tyndale

Roll call: Mrs. Kelley, yes; Mrs. Tyndale, yes; Mayor MacLachlan, yes;
Mr. McKay, yes; Mr. Wagner, yes; Mrs. Baggio, yes; Ms. Kosko, yes;
Mr. Sylk, yes; Mr. Krollfeifer, yes

Motion carries to approve waiver.

**B. Case 20-05: Robert Shinn
Block 91 Lots 1, 1.01, 2
1810 Marne Highway
Use variance for apartment.**

Postponed until September 2, 2020 meeting.

**C. Case 18-04: Ravikio
Informal Review**

Mr. Krollfeifer explained that since last meeting there was a subcommittee meeting regarding the application. He stated who was present.

Doug Heinold stated that he represents Longbridge Farms, LLC. (Mr. Ravikio and Mr. Cassandra). Everyone meet for a couple hours talking about Muhlschlegel, their property, the redevelopment process, and the request that came out of that was to come forward with an informal presentation. This is where their heads are at and only conceptual. They have spent money on the site, engineering has been done on the site to find the location of wetlands and site limitations regarding development. There has been a lot of time spent with the township getting feedback on such things as possible setback requirements, what connections would be appreciated or frowned upon. That is what has brought them here tonight. He will give a simple overview.

Mr. Heinold presented a color coded concept of the area. He explained the different color areas. It is a logical layout to achieve the goals of the master plan. They want to take advantage of development and ratable for commercial development along the Route 38 corridor and be sensitive to the residential that it backs up to. They believe it is a good transition, commercial to the front to townhouses, and then to single family. They would have an interconnection between the Muhschlegel and Ravikio properties. There will be no connection between the commercial and residential.

Mr. Krollfeifer stated the proposed access for commercial from Route 38 and the proposed access for residential is from Hainesport-Mt. Laurel Road.

Mr. Heinold commented that they do not have any contracts with a developer at this time. They believe they will not until the zoning and redevelopment plan are in place. At this point this is just a concept. They are not asking for any determination from the Board tonight.

Mr. Krollfeifer explained that during the subcommittee meeting that this is very preliminary in terms of qualifying for the non-condemnation area in need of redevelopment or rehabilitation. All the Board is ask to do tonight is approve the preliminary investigation plan. It then goes back to the Township Committee which determine the rules.

Mr. Heinold agreed and they were here to present a sketch of their thoughts for the property.

Mr. McKay questioned what kind of communications you have had with the Muhschlegel group.

Mr. Heinold stated they are in communications with them but are not partners.

Mr. Taylor explained that even back in the 2004 and 2007 plan the town insisted there should be an interconnection between the two properties. We are trying to eliminate multiple and unnecessary driveways out to Route 38.

Mr. McKay commented that these are linked and without coordination between the two, you could end up with a messy site that does not work very well. He asked Mr. Ravikio when things stand with Muhschlegel.

Eric Ravikio explained that their conversations have been open dialog. He has his plan here and they submitted one for the informal review. They would be separate but would be linked together with a cross easement for access. He does not know where they stand in their property regards to users. They would like to continue on because they are further along with their engineering. If the opportunity presents itself, they will address the cross easement at that time. The communication line is open between the two of them.

Mr. McKay asked if they have expressed their position on the interconnection.

Mr. Ravikio stated they are agreeable.

Mr. McKay questioned their position regarding the tax abatement regarding the residential portion.

Mr. Heinold answered that is not on the table and they are not asking for it to be.

Mr. McKay asked about the commercial site.

Mr. Heinold answered yes, only for the commercial site. This would be up for negotiation at the time someone wants to come in and develop on the commercial site.

Mr. McKay referred to the map and pointed out the pink lots, which are single family houses. They would be covered under two of the designations just due to the age of the homes, and no other reason. What is your opinion on how the town should treat the pink lots?

Mr. Heinold stated he wants to make sure they deal with it in the redevelopment designation portion and not their conceptual discussion. They do not take a position on it and believe the town should do what they think is appropriate. The plan honors the residential by putting single family up against that section.

Mr. Taylor stated the proposed plan tonight does not show any of those single family residents' properties.

Mr. Heinold stated the only thing on the plan is what they have ownership of.

Mr. McKay questioned if the entire site would be developed at one time instead of sections.

Mr. Heinold explained they would like to but does not believe the market will allow it. They will not know until they get to that point.

Mr. McKay questioned if they were looking at this as a build out sight as opportunities arose verses to piece work with years between.

Mr. Heinold stated his goal would to come in with a preliminary site plan for the entire site. As commercial users come in, they normally need modifications. They would be able to market the site better and they get protection of any changes down the road.

Mr. McKay questioned if they are seeking any relief from the design parameters that the town has for the Route 38 corridor. Basically frontage setbacks.

Mr. Heinold stated not now but could be subject down the line. It is up to the town. If they want to keep the setbacks, they would have to adhere to the parameters. They are currently not asking for any relief tonight. They are presenting their ideas as requested.

Mrs. Baggio asked for clarification that they are only referring to A, Q, and D.

Mr. Heinold answered yes.

Mr. Taylor stated it is not uncommon when you have multiple sites such as these that there is a phasing plan and a master plan along with design standards. We don't want to see patch work with inconsistent architectural designs and roadways that don't align properly. If we get to a redevelopment plan phase, those things would be considered. The ideal thing would for everything would be built at once.

Mrs. Kelley questioned in moving forward if they thought about putting some form of pedestrian walk way between the residents and the commercial.

Mr. Ravikio answered yes.

Mrs. Kelley questioned if the wetlands that is shown include the wetland buffer.

Mr. Ravikio answered yes.

Mayor MacLachlan commented that he appreciated the presentation and the meeting. He is sorry for the interruption because he does not remember deeming an area in need of redevelopment without having an idea of what may go there. He understands that they currently do not have anyone for the commercial side of it yet. It gives the Board an understanding what you are trying to do there.

Mr. Krollfeifer opened for public comment.

Larry Bailey, 720 Mt. Laurel Road, stated that he purchased the Cain property on the corner of Mt. Laurel Road and Fostertown Road. He has concerns with the overall impact that it could have on the township. Is there any tax abatements but the taxpayers could be effected if not planned correctly.

Mayor MacLachlan commented that he did talk to the school superintendent, Mr. Corn because we have a lot of development going on now. He explained that we can take 100 to 150 more students. The town has never did a tax abatement on residential. Commercial we definitely would to help the impact of the business. He believes there would be any tax impact on something like this.

Mr. Bailey explained that he would like the public to have access to that analysis.

Mayor MacLachlan stated that they will when we get later in the project.

Mr. Bailey asked for confirmation that this development and the other development going on now will not impact the school with having to expand.

Mayor MacLachlan comment that it will not according to the superintendent.

Mrs. Tyndale explained she has lived here for 11 years and she currently has children at Hainesport School. The student count is down around 120 students from when she first moved in.

Mr. Krollfeifer stated that the public will have at least 4 more times to address this.

Mr. Taylor confirmed. It is a 10 step process and there are multiple public hearing.

Mrs. Baggio questioned what the possible time frame could be.

Mr. Taylor explained that the planning process could be easily done in a couple of months. The next step would depend on the market. We are currently in uncertain times.

Mrs. Boettcher questioned if the properties are combined.

Mr. Krollfeifer explained there would be a road to go between the two commercial properties. They are not combining but will be working together to try and develop that entire commercial area.

Mr. Taylor commented that it was stated that there would be no connection between the commercial and Hainesport-Mt. Laurel Road. Only the residential would come out onto Hainesport-Mt. Laurel Road.

Mr. Boettcher is against any 3 to 4 story buildings. The fire department is not equipped to fight anything more than 2 stories.

Mrs. Boettcher explained how the property was prior to August 4, 1971. Her lot is not square. She has concerns with a deep decline in property value and would be harder to sell, and the lighting pollution. What will become of the large drainage water pipe that runs from Route 38 to Mr. Ravikio's property? It is sinking on Ray Tucci's property. Mr. Tucci told her the county will not address it. The drainage is for Laurel Ridge and Chase. She would like her property and all the properties affected to stay flat behind them, no berm. It is a natural downhill drainage. There is one illegal berm on one of the properties that was reported to the township. Nothing was done about it. She currently gets debris from the trees currently on the property and want to know how close planting will be done to her property line. She believes that a small portion of the ground and was illegally filled in. It was reported to the township and nothing was done. When sheds were built by Jamie, they dumped the dirt behind her house. There is no way to anticipate every problem that could arise and what recourse does she have when there is one.

Mr. McKay questioned what Mrs. Boettcher's position is on whether her two properties should be considered in the development area or left as is for zoning purposes.

Mrs. Boettcher stated she can't answer that at this time because she doesn't understand it.

Pat Burns, 2515 Fostertown Road, there is a small underground creek between her and her neighbor. There is already a flooding problem, what is going to happen with the shifting of all the dirt. She explained how the water flows and what the county did.

Mr. Taylor explained that whenever a development comes in, they need to get approvals from the state and design a stormwater management system to meet the NJDEP stormwater management plan. One of the regulations does not allow them to dump additional water onto other properties.

Mrs. Kelley stated that she hasn't seen the mapping of that area. She believes that it runs to the creek. Some appear to be underground. There are a lot of underground streams. She has lived on Lumberton Road for 45 years. When they expanded Route 38, they were told that some of the underground streams would shift. They have shifted 3 times. They will shift and tend to shift with development, storms, and on their own.

Pat Macken, 116 Masons Woods Lane, why does she not see any low to moderate income on the site when there are discussion of putting in 72 units on Creek Road. Why isn't it being spread around?

Mayor MacLachlan explained that it is two different projects. The other developer had come in and that is what he wants to build. The property owners have a right to buy and

sell their property and somewhat build what they want. Now we are getting into the affordable housing that the township has to meet.

Mr. Ravikio explained that they are bound by the law for affordable housing.

Mr. Heinold explained that it would be units or money.

Mrs. Macken commented that we are 100% buildable for low to moderate income. It should be spread thru out the town and not centered.

Mayor MacLachlan asked Ms. Kosko what the percentage is.

Ms. Kosko stated it is 15%.

Mayor MacLachlan stated that we should move forward.

Mr. Krollfeifer closed public comment.

**D. Case 20-09: Haines Point Partners
Informal Review**

Mayor MacLachlan explained they had a meeting. The Muhlschlegel track is pretty cut and dry and do not have a customer. There was a concept plan of 4 buildings and there was an exit on to Route 38 and on Hainesport-Mt. Laurel Road. That would be up to the county, being a county road.

Mrs. Boettcher explained that was never a road. Bachman just was using it to get out on to Hainesport-Mt. Laurel Road.

Mr. Sylk stated that when they met with the developers, we are firmly against any commercial going onto Hainesport-Mt. Laurel Road.

**E. Case 20-02: BTC III Acquisitions, LLC
Block 42 Lot 1,
Discussion**

Mrs. Tiver stated no one is here.

Ms. Kosko commented that it can be removed from agenda.

**F. Preliminary Investigation, Non-Condemnation Area in Need of Redevelopment
or Rehabilitation Investigation
Block 103.01 Lots 1, 2, 2.01, 8, 9, 10, 10.01
Block 103.02 Lots 1, 1.01, 5.01, 7, 7.01, 8, 9, 10, 11
Block 113 Lot 4.05**

Mr. Krollfeifer explained that we are now moving forward with the step that the Township Committee has recommended that the Land Use Board do an investigation.

Mr. Taylor handed out the steps the town has to complete for a redevelopment and where we are currently on step 3. The governing body on November 12, 2019 asked the Land Use Board to do an investigation on these 17 parcels, approximately 42 acres, met the

statutory criteria to be consider a non-condemnation area or a rehabilitation area. They supplied the map to the township and a report dated June 29, 2020. We reviewed it at the July 2020 hearing which raised several questions. It was followed up with an informal meeting of the economic develop committee. The Board has the opportunity to comment and refer back their recommendation this evening to Township Committee regarding the study area. He handed out page 32 of his report which is the redevelopment area designation map.

Mr. Taylor explained that the yellow area, A, B, C, D, H, I, O, and P, meet the statutory criteria for a non-condemnation redevelopment area and recommend that they be designated as such. Parcel Q and J the do not meet the statutory criteria for a redevelopment area, however, the statue allows parcels to be included if the town feels it is necessary to be included for the effective redevelopment of the area. They recommend it be included because the owner both own the areas in yellow.

Mr. Krollfeifer commented that we would not be changing any zoning. They would remain as is.

Mr. Taylor agreed.

Mrs. Kelley stated that she thought it was decided at the last meeting to include J in the yellow area.

Mr. Taylor explained it doesn't meet the criteria but it is necessary to include J because it is necessary for the overall redevelopment of the area. We are also asking that Q be part of the redevelopment area to allow the rezoning of the residential component. It had single family homes on Hainesport-Mt. Laurel Road with townhomes behind.

Mrs. Kelley stated that parcel Q is zoned residential at this time.

Mr. Taylor said that is correct and would stay that way until we get to step 6, 7, or 8 that any changes would be considered.

Mr. McKay questioned if we need to make the distinction what is an area in need of non-condemnation redevelopment or rehabilitation or do we recommend to the town as a whole.

Mr. Kingsbury reads it as the governing body choose one of those options.

Mr. McKay read it the same way. He does not believe the statue intended us to choose, it is to recommend. The Township Committee is to deal with that.

Doug Heinold commented that the recommendation that comes back from the Board is, does it meet it or not. It is if a property needs redevelopment, it will also need rehabilitation. He would make the request that they meet the redevelopment criteria for their properties and likewise if you agree with your planner that they qualify for rehabilitation. Then when it goes back to the governing body they can decide what they want for the site, which is more of a policy decision. This is a planning determination.

Mr. McKay said there is evidence on the record that it would qualify for either.

Mr. Kingsbury commented that it was also his recommendation and wrote the resolution to convey that.

Mrs. Baggio commented that we have it listed in the three categories.

Mayor MacLachlan explained that most of the Ravikio property is vacant land. We are going through a process that it is in need of redevelopment. Yes it is, for him to attract a commercial customer and be competitive with other sites in surroundings areas. The Muhlschlegel property needs redevelopment. These developers want something to ease their pain in the development.

Mr. Krollfeifer stated if you look at the resolution. We are looking at all the yellow properties that are in need of redevelopment without condemnation. The second would be the green area. The third part addresses the residential properties on Hainesport-Mt. Laurel Road in pink. These are based on Mr. Taylor's recommendations.

Mr. Taylor explained that at least 83% of the residential properties are greater than 50 years old fall into the rehabilitation. Those pink properties do qualify, but are all in good condition and well maintained. They do not need redevelopment. They offered a third option if the Board wished to leave them undesignated and in their underlining zone.

Mr. Krollfeifer questioned if it could be changed at a later date.

Mr. Taylor answered that any of it could be changed, it is not uncommon for that to happen. When changes occur they have to go back through steps and start at 1.

Mr. Krollfeifer questioned if the pink properties were not included could we come back to this point and designate them.

Mr. Taylor stated he would have to leave that up to Mr. Gillespie and Mr. Kingsbury.

Mayor MacLachlan asked if he could explain the benefits for the homes in the pink to be included.

Mr. Taylor explained we know that the homes in the pink cannot meet the statutory criteria to be included for redevelopment. Because the majority of the homes are 50 years or older, they can be considered rehabilitation area. The benefits for the rehabilitation is that the Township Committee can offer up to a 5 year tax abatement on the improvements to the property. So if someone wanted to sell their home or double the size of the home, the tax bill would not double. A staggered rate of increase over 5 years under a rehabilitation designation, it can give the incentive to reinvest in their home. Knowing that they would not be spending additional money in taxes over the 5 years will allow them to put the money into the property. The benefit to the community is that the area has rehabilitated and at the end of 5 years there will be full taxation on the value of those improvements. It's a win. The property values have gone up and we have seen rehabilitation.

Mrs. Baggio questioned what improvements it includes, like a new kitchen or an addition.

Mr. Taylor stated that would be a question for the assessor, it would have to be assessable.

Mr. Krollfeifer questioned if they include the homes in the pink and the homeowner does absolutely nothing, there is no benefit or deterrent.

Mr. Taylor stated that is correct.

Mr. Krollfeifer stated that if we don't include them, they would have no benefit or deterrent.

Mr. Taylor answered correct.

Mayor MacLachlan stated that if you include the pink, if someone wanted to purchase a pink property to include in the yellow, could that be done.

Mr. Taylor explained that the pink area would stay as R1 and not be rezoned.

Mrs. Kelley questioned if we do not include Q now does it stay as residential.

Mr. Taylor stated both the green areas qualify as a rehab area. When you look at the housing stock, it qualifies the entire area for rehabilitation. The yellow properties meet the higher threshold for redevelopment. Because there was common ownership between the yellow and green properties, it is a more logical connection to include them as an overall effect of the redevelopment area. It is allowed under the law. There are a number of options. When we talk about rehabilitation, we talked about the 5 year tax abatement. Under the redevelopment law, up to a 30 tax abatement on the commercial could be offered under the statute, unless it was a 100% affordable housing project. I would not recommend any of the residential development be considered for tax exemption and abatement.

Mrs. Newcomb feels that the property should be done as one and believes it should be redevelopment.

Larry Bailey questioned how is the definition of the redevelopment area for parcel Q, how is that specific to the overall development of the project important to be included?

Mr. Taylor stated that there is a potential for the commercial area to be reduced A and the residential component that fronts Hainesport-Mt. Laurel Road. They are common ownership and because of the wetlands that the parcels be treated in the same way. The zoning would be different. The governing body would agree that Q would remain in a residential zone and part of parcel A. They get developed with a plan that is set forth. The steps for any changes would be 5, 6, 7, or 8.

Mr. Bailey without the Board including parcel Q, you would not be able to present the recommendation to the planning and zoning board specifically asking for rezoning of that lot into multi-unit.

Mr. Taylor stated they can. The local redevelopment and housing law actually allows the redevelopment plan to be developed for a rehabilitation area designation or redevelopment. The board felt the green should be just be rehab designation. A plan can be designed with those standards.

Mr. Bailey stated then it is not important for parcel Q to be included in the redevelopment area.

Mr. Taylor stated he did not say it wasn't important. Because those lands are in common ownership, they believe it makes more sense for an effective redevelopment of the area. Due to county approvals and necessary rezoning that all the parcels be considered redevelopment designation. That does not change what the zoning may be or become under steps 5-9. It allows us to treat the properties in a similar way. The Board could vote that parcel Q and J stay as rehabilitation and still can be incorporated into a redevelopment plan.

Mayor MacLachlan motioned to leave the green in. I didn't like the pink first, there is nothing bad that can come out of it. So he would like to include the entire map in the motion to approve.

Second: Mr. Krollfeifer

Mrs. Kelley fears that with the pink parcels and Q parcel, a developer could put pressure on those property owners or if someone has to sell are they going to be pressured to sell to a yellow. Will that remain residential?

Mr. Taylor explained that steps 5-9 dictates that the Township Committee decides what the zoning of those that remain. Neither of the plans include any of the pink parcels in their development. If they remain as R1 zoning, there will be no benefit for the yellow to put on any pressure. He's not saying it's not possible, but there would be no advantage.

Mrs. Kelley commented that the purpose of this meeting is just to set boundaries.

Mr. Taylor agreed, just to meet the one step of the statutory requirement of the law. The Board's action does not change any zoning, which are steps 5 – 9. It will also have to be sent back to the Board for review and master plan consistency.

Mr. McKay questioned if Mayor MacLachlan's motion is to adopt the resolution as written.

Mayor MacLachlan answered yes.

A discussion to change some verbiage in the resolution. The change be "redevelopment and/or rehabilitation non-condemnation"

Mayor MacLachlan and Mr. Krollfeifer agrees with the modification of the resolution.

Roll call: Mayor MacLachlan, yes; Mr. Krollfeifer, yes; Mrs. Kelly, no; Mr. McKay, yes; Mrs. Baggio, yes; Mrs. Tyndale, yes; Ms. Kosko, yes; Mr. Sylk, yes

Motion carries to approve.

7. Minutes

A. Special Meeting Minutes of June 22, 2020

Mayor MacLachlan motioned to approve.

Second: Mrs. Baggio

Roll call: Mayor MacLachlan, yes; Mrs. Baggio, yes; Mrs. Kelley, yes; Mr. McKay, yes; Mrs. Tyndale, yes; Ms. Kosko, yes; Mr. Sylk, yes; Mr. Krollfeifer, yes

Motion carries to approve.

8. Resolutions

- A. Resolution 2020-09: Adopting findings and recommendations to Hainesport Township Committee following review of preliminary investigation report of non-condemnation area in need of redevelopment or rehabilitation on Block 103 Lots 1, 2, 2.01, 8, 9, 10, 10.01; Block 103.02 Lots 1, 1.01, 5.01, 7, 7.01, 8, 9, 10, 11; Block 113 Lot 4.05**

Resolution was approved above.

- B. Resolution 2020-10: R & M
Granting preliminary major subdivision approval for 41 residential lots on Block 100 Lots 8.03 and 8.02**

Mayor MacLachlan motioned to approve.

Second: Mr. McKay

Roll call: Mayor MacLachlan, yes; Mr. McKay, yes; Mrs. Kelley, yes;
Mrs. Baggio, yes; Mrs. Tyndale, yes; Ms. Kosko, yes; Mr. Sylk, yes;
Mr. Krollfeifer, yes

Motion carries to approve.

9. Correspondence

- A. Letter dated July 10, 2020 from Taylor Design Group to Mrs. Newcomb
Re: Hirshland & Company, Block 96 Lots 1.01 & 1.04, Landscape Inspection #1
- B. Letter dated July 13, 2020 from Burlington Co. Planning Board to Mrs. Tiver
Re: Hainesport Commerce Center Case 9-15 Plan Distribution
- C. Certified for Continuance of Plan dated July 13, 2020 from Burlington County Soils to Mr. Blair
Re: Block 42 Lot 1 Clearing
- D. Letter dated July 22, 2020 from MUA to Joint Land Use Board
Re: 9 Chaucer Circle Block 100.06 Lot 10

Mrs. Kelley motioned to accept and file.

Second: Mrs. Tyndale

Roll call: Mrs. Kelley, yes; Mrs. Tyndale, yes; Mayor MacLachlan, yes;
Mr. McKay, yes; Mrs. Baggio, yes; Ms. Kosko, yes; Mr. Sylk, yes;
Mr. Krollfeifer, yes

Motion carries.

10. Professional Comments - None

11. Board Comments

Mr. Krollfeifer apologized to Mr. Kingsbury regarding Robert's Rules from last meeting.

Mayor MacLachlan thanked Mr. Taylor for doing a wonderful job on the plan.

Mrs. Kelley agreed.

12. Public Comments –

Mrs. Macken thanked Mr. Taylor for his presentation.

Mr. Murdy questioned if we voted to approve resolution 2020-10.

Mr. Krollfeifer explained that was for preliminary approval. The need to come back for final site plan approval.

13. Adjournment

Mr. Krollfeifer motioned to adjourn at 9:18pm

Second: Ms. Kosko

Roll call: All in favor

Paula L Tiver, Secretary