

# PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING

Meeting Minutes

August 5, 2021

## MEMBERS PRESENT:

William Barker, Chair  
Robert Musgnug  
Chris Chesner  
Henry Balikov  
Jeff Dey  
Lisa Petriello  
Elyse Brown  
Naoji Moriuchi  
Melissa Acaro Burns

## STAFF PRESENT:

Patty Muscella, Planning Board Secretary  
Matthew Wieliczko, Board Attorney  
Mackenzi Kelly, Recording Secretary

**ABSENT:** Kevin Aberant and David Zipin

Mr. Barker called the meeting to order at 7:03 PM in the Council Chambers of Town Hall, 111 West Second Street by reading the Open Public Meeting Act statement. The Pledge of Allegiance followed a moment of silence. Roll call was listed as above.

Mr. Barker welcomed the new board members; Elyse Brown and Naomi Moriuchi. Mr. Wieliczko stated they would be voting tonight as alternates.

## Minutes

June 3, 2021

Mr. Musgnug made a motion, seconded by Mr. Chesner to approve June 3, 2021. The roll call vote of the Board was unanimous in favor with those eligible to vote.

## Adoption of Resolutions

**Resolution #2021-16**, Resolution No. 2021-16 Reconstructive Orthopedics, 300 Route 38, Block 3201 Lot 7, Minor Site Plan with Variances.

Mr. Chesner made a motion, seconded by Mr. Musgnug to adopt the Resolution 2021-16 with changes and the additional condition of approval suggested by Mrs. Petriello. The roll call vote of the Board was unanimous in favor with those eligible to vote.

## New Business

**PB#2021-32:** Presentation by Dave Hess from Sustainable Moorestown Green Team- If acceptable Resolution Articulating Moorestown Planning Board Support for the "Moorestown Creates" Subcommittee of the Sustainable Moorestown Green Team in its Efforts to Advance the Arts.

David Hess was sworn in; he resides at 834 N Lenola Rd in Moorestown. He is the Vice Chair of Sustainable Moorestown as well as a resident of the town.

He discussed three features to make the town sustainable:

1. Make sure the Municipality is fiscally sound
2. Promote diversity in the township

# PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING

Meeting Minutes

August 5, 2021

3. Their concern for natural resources.

He stated the artist coming into Moorestown would bring commerce into the community. In 2014 they approached the board and council and created this committee. They have surveyed over 100 artists in town and put together a road map of things to go forward. There was a resolution passed by both the board and council. He hopes this becomes more of an ongoing dialogue and engages more with someone on the board to channel thoughts and ideas. . He requested someone on the board to be a liaison to their group.

Carol Buss, from 708 Covington Terrace

Carol discussed how she wants the arts to be an economic driver for the township, and to improve the community. She agrees with David Hess on having a liaison from the Planning Board.

Mr. Barker made a motion seconded by Mr. Musgnug to approve this resolution. The roll call vote of the Board was unanimous in favor with those eligible to vote.

Mr. Barker will poll members of the board for a liaison

**PB#2021-23:** Anthony Balboni, 180 Route 38, Block 4800 Lot 5, Minor Subdivision.

Damien Delduca from Delduca Lewis Law is the attorney for the applicant Anthony Balboni. He stated Joseph Mancini is the Professional Engineer and prepared the plans for the applicant. The two proposed lots front on Rt. 38 and Meadow Ln. It is located in the R2 zoning district. **They are proposing to sub-divide one 2 ½ acre lot into three individual tax lots.** The minor subdivision will create two new lots and will meet all the zoning requirements.

## **Exhibit A1**

This shows the sub-division plan. There is an existing house, which fronts on Rt. 38; they are proposing two new lots, which will front on Meadow Ln. This is a bi-rite minor subdivision.

## **Exhibit A2**

Aerial photograph of sub-division plan.

## **Exhibit A3**

A few photographs close to Rt. 38

They comply with all requirements.

They have 2 review letters from the Board's Professionals. One from Mrs. Taylor dated July 9<sup>th</sup> and Mr. Noll's letter dated July 23. They also have letters from the July 6 Tax Assessor dated 7/6/2021 and Public Works dated 7/26/2021. They have a few minor objections to some comments in the letters relating to the sidewalk and curb.

Joseph Mancini was sworn in; he is from Tri State Engineering, he is a Licensed Professional Engineer and Planner, he was accepted as an expert witness.

# PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING

Meeting Minutes

August 5, 2021

Mr. Balboni, Mrs. Taylor and Mr. Noll were all sworn in.

Mr. Mancini went over Exhibit A1 in detail. The proposed lots are 21780 square feet, the remaining 65000 square feet is the existing home, which will remain and be brought up to code. This plan shows sidewalk at the top. The proposed size of the lot facing Rt. 38 will be 65,340 square feet (lot 5.01). The two proposed new lots will be the same size 21780 square feet and meet minimum lot size requirements. All three lots meet all zoning requirements for the R2 zone. They will be lots 5.02 and 5.03.

Mr. Mancini agreed with Mr. Delduca there is an existing curb extending along Rt. 38 into a portion of lot 5.01. They are not proposing any curb or sidewalk along Rt. 38 because of a DOT improvement project coming up. It does not seem feasible since there is no sidewalk to connect to for a quite a distance. They will defer to DOT requirements; they have already filed an application for the subdivision. They are proposing sidewalk along the southwest frontage of Meadow Dr. There is already curb there. They are requesting a waiver for a sidewalk running north to south because there are mature trees running along the curb line as well as a substantial slope there. There is a sidewalk on the opposite side. Mr. Delduca stated Moorestown has an ordinance stating if you obtain a waiver for a sidewalk you can contribute to the sidewalk fund. Mr. Mancini agreed. They are seeking a waiver for the sidewalk on the west side of Meadow Dr. There are comments in the review letters (from Mrs. Taylor and Mr. Noll) regarding fencing existing on the opposite side.

## Exhibit A3

Photograph shows fence where it returns west along Rt. 38. It is a four-foot chain link fence. It is the neighbor's fence; they seek to leave it there. It encroaches slightly on the subject property about 1.5 foot. They agree to comply with all comments other than what they covered in Mrs. Taylor and Mr. Noll's letter. Other than the waivers, they requested relating to curbs and sidewalk they are not requesting any design exceptions, waivers or variances.

Mr. Noll stated in regards to the sidewalk; there are significant trees on the west side of Meadow Dr. He would like to meet with the applicant to make sure a sidewalk cannot be physically placed there without moving trees. If it cannot be placed there he would recommend a sidewalk contribution (158-17 f2b). Mr. Wieliczko in regards to the topographical concurrence waiver that was requested. Mr. Delduca stated that when they apply for the building permit they will provide a grading plan with those proposed contours on there. They have provided a survey with existing topographic information. The sidewalk they do install they would like to do that after construction before they get a CO. Mr. Noll stated they need proposed contours as a condition of approval before they apply for the building permit. Mr. Noll has no objection to having the sidewalk installed after construction.

Mr. Wieliczko stated the applicant agrees to meet with ERI to see if the sidewalk is not feasible then there will be a contribution to the sidewalk fund. Mr. Delduca stated it is not feasible without eliminating the trees, assuming they want them preserved. Per Mr. Noll, the main objective is to preserve the trees. Mrs. Taylor stated if a tree dies during

# PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING

Meeting Minutes

August 5, 2021

construction, they would be replaced with street trees. Mr. Delduca stated their expectation is due to the grade and root system damage that would occur we are not looking at sidewalk on that side of the street. Mr. Noll there is also submission waiver for proof of compliance in regards to soil testing which they recommend subject to testimony. Mr. Balboni stated there was a storage tank and they had it removed. There was no soil contamination. Mr. Noll asked for the report and the applicant agreed to provide it. Mr. Noll inquired about PVC cleanouts in the rear of the dwelling. Mr. Balboni stated a man came out and put covers on all three of them. They are cleanouts for the sewer line. Mr. Wieliczko stated to keep them capped in a manner acceptable to Mr. Noll. Mrs. Taylor had no further questions.

## **Board Questions:**

Mr. Chesner has concerns about the traffic coming off Rt. 38 and the families crossing the street from lot 5.01 to the east side of Meadow Dr. Mr. Chesner inquired if a crosswalk could be installed about 40 yards up on Meadow Dr. Mr. Noll stated typically, they do not install mid-block crosswalks. Mr. Noll stated they can look into the sidewalk adjacent to Lot 5.03. Mr. Balikov had concerns regarding drainage and topography. He stated there is drainage to the North. Mr. Mancini stated they have not observed any pooling on Meadow Drive during rain. There is a sewer grate at the northern corner of Route 38 and Meadow Dr. Mr. Noll stated they will be required to get a soil erosion permit approval and silt vents around any construction to reduce runoff and the amount of silt coming off site. Mrs. Petriello inquired about the fence around the property and if there were any approvals. Mr. Delduca does not know. The fence covers the property in the back as well. Mrs. Taylor stated there is a 3 foot height limitation for a fence in the front yard and they can check if there were any permits. Mr. Wieliczko stated with regard to the fence is in violation it becomes a code enforcement issue and the Board Secretary can refer it to code enforcement to research it and make a determination. If there is a violation, they will issue a citation. Mrs. Petriello inquired about the shed. Mr. Mancini stated there is a shed and a brick stove that are in disrepair and will be disposed of in accordance with applicable regulations and rules. She inquired about work being done on the house now. Mr. Balboni stated they are removing wallpaper, carpeting, cabinets, fascia, soffits and new gutters. She inquired about the parcel be subject to a deed restriction. Mr. Delduca stated there are no violation of the deed restriction to his knowledge. Mr. Balboni is not aware of any deed restrictions; his title company reviewed it carefully. Mr. Wieliczko stated a condition of approval could be they comply with all deed restrictions. Mr. Delduca stated they are happy to provide a copy of the title report. She stated the property is not well keep, is there anyway, work can be done on the trees. They spent \$8000 on landscaping on this property already. There was no maintenance was done in the back for about 10 years. There has been a substantial improvement from 60 days ago.

## **Public Comment:**

Daryl Tonia from 12 Meadow Dr.

She was concerned about the sidewalk not being on the opposite side. She stated Meadow Dr. is being used as a cut through. They drive quickly to make the light at Rt. 38. She feels

# PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING

Meeting Minutes

August 5, 2021

they need a sidewalk completely from Rt. 38. It is not safe. She inquired if the sidewalk was required would the lot acreage change. Mr. Noll said it will not change because of the sidewalk. When it is finished, it will be a half-acre lot. She wants to make sure the deed restriction is followed. Mr. Wieliczko stated the applicant has agreed to comply with all deed restrictions.

Carol Radomski from 6 Meadow Dr.

She has lived here for 30 years and is pleased something is being developed however feels there needs to be a sidewalk. When the new homes were, being built on the other side they were required to put in a sidewalk. She feels the trees are dead and should be removed and that side of the street should conform to the other side. She feels the deed restriction should be maintained; it should go with the new homes and remain with the rental property. She is concerned it will fit in with what is required on the R2 zoning and the restrictive covenant.

Patrick Lehan from 8 Meadow Dr.

He voiced the same concerns with the sidewalk. He feels it would be better for the neighborhood if they had as much sidewalk as possible.

Mrs. Taylor stated they should have an arborist come and look at the trees. She also stated if a sidewalk goes in, they would have to plant street trees. Lisa Petriello and Chris Chesner both want a sidewalk there. Mr. Delduca has no objection to a sidewalk. Mr. Noll stated he would walk the site to determine if a sidewalk can be installed. If the Board decides, a sidewalk is important they will provide one. If they cannot install one they will contribute to the side walk fund. He does not oppose their concerns.

## **Board Discussion:**

Mr. Wieliczko summarized the application. They have agreed to the callouts, recommendations and comments from the board professionals.

Conditions:

1. They have also agreed to cooperate with the DOT regarding the sidewalk and curbing.
2. They also agree to comply with all deed restrictions.
3. They have agreed to provide a copy of the recent title to the Director of Community Development and board professionals.
4. Removal of shed and brick oven
5. Secure the necessary soil erosion permit and installation of silt fencing
6. Cap pvc sewer cleanouts
7. Provide paperwork corresponding to the prior underground storage tank removal.
8. Provide proposed contours
9. Sidewalk specifically on Meadow Dr. They do not object installing a sidewalk but it would be at the cost of the trees.

He stated there are no variances needed, as this is a bi-rite subdivision.

# PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING

Meeting Minutes

August 5, 2021

Mr. Delduca stated the brick oven, there is a semicircular structure and has been removed. He would like to keep the balance like a fireplace situation.

Per Mrs. Taylor Lot 5.01 is subject to Ch. 160 for tree catalog and preservation. Mr. Musgnug would like someone to go out there to identify the dead trees and maintain some if possible. It may take work to keep them. They will have to catalog any trees they remove. They will have to determine what trees need to be removed and which can stay safely. She is talking about only lot 5.01. This ties in with landscaping comment on page 3 of 3, there is a distinction between 5.02 and 5.03. Mr. Delduca stated the trees are nice and would like to preserve them. He stated their expectation is they are not able to have both.

The more mature trees are towards Rt 38, a sidewalk could go along the eastside of Lot 5.03. They are trying to preserve trees. Deny waiver of the sidewalk on that section of Meadow Dr. with the recommendation that they preserve as many trees as possible. Mr. Delduca stated if the trees come out you would have a clear shot of Rt. 38.

## **Board Deliberations:**

Mrs. Brown wanted clarification of the sidewalk and trees. She wanted to know what happens to the back part of Meadow Dr. Mrs. Taylor stated street trees will be required on any new development. They would be recommended. The majority of the board wants a sidewalk. Mr. Wieliczko stated the motion could state: Approve the application for minor subdivision with conditions with expressed denial of waivers requesting:

1. Contours in the ERI review letter 7.23.21
2. Waiver of sidewalk requirement on Meadow Dr. on frontages of lots 5.01 and 5.03. A review and determination to preserve as many trees as they can if they cannot then new trees will be installed consistent with the township's ordinances. The board is allowing a waiver along Rt 38 with the condition they will cooperate with the DOT on curbing and sidewalk.

Mr. Chesner made a motion as enunciated by Mr. Wieliczko to approve the application with conditions, seconded by Mr. Musgnug. The roll call vote of the Board was unanimous in favor with those eligible to vote.

## **Referral from Township Council Ordinance No. 25-2021 Adopting the Moorestown Mall Redevelopment Plan for Block 3000, Lots 2, 3, 3.01, 3.02 and 5.**

It is a consistency vote for the master plan only

Mrs. Susan Gruel she is a Principal from Heyer Gruel & Associates in Red Bank, N.J.

Mrs. Taylor was sworn in again.

Mr. Wieliczko stated the board should have a copy of the plan and the review letter 8.2.2021 from Mrs. Taylor. The last page of the review letter has a chart, which has steps 1 through 11. In January 21, 2021 we were at step 3. We are currently on step 7. Council has referred this to the Board for consistency review.

Susan Gruel is a Community Planning License Professional Planner in N.J. she was accepted as an expert witness.

# PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING

Meeting Minutes

August 5, 2021

Mrs. Gruel stated one area of expertise is the statutory redevelopment process. She stated in front of the board is a Redevelopment plan of the Moorestown Mall dated July 26, 2021. They have multiple Phases, this document is a hybrid between a master plan and ordinance work. It has goals and objectives. It also has land use standards, regarding sustainability design and architectural standards. In her opinion, this plan meets the statutory requirements in terms of having all the components. In which she highlighted. She stated one requirement is to have electric charging stations. This plan and designation as a redevelopment area was triggered by the settlement agreement between the Township and Preit for the affordable housing obligation and addressing a portion of the unmet need.

Highlights:

1. Supersedes the existing SRC zoning and calls for the repeal of the overlay zone. Even though it supersedes it is still mentioned in here as one of the uses.
2. In many redevelopment plans if any consideration or proposal comes before the board triggers a use or 'D' variance it cannot be heard by the Zoning Board it must go back for a Plan Amendment by ordinance revision. The Zoning Board does not have any jurisdiction. This board can grant C variances, bulk variances or design exceptions as well.
3. There are a number of phases being proposed:
  - a. Phase 1A- 375 Unit Inclusionary multi-Family development- 20% set aside for affordable housing.
  - b. Phase 1B- Full service hotel
  - c. Phase 2- potential 2<sup>nd</sup> inclusionary multi-family-former Lord and Taylor
  - d. Phase 3- former Sears building, 3<sup>rd</sup> inclusionary multi-family. Preit made an agreement with Cooper to create a medical facility on that portion. That is moving forward.
  - e. The remaining part of the mall will be under the SRC standards.

\*Phase 2 is also inclusionary with a 20% set aside for Affordable housing.

She stated Phase 1A needs to be constructed; the remaining Phases; if considered there will need to be plan amendments. There are setback standards one in particular is along Rt. 38 100 feet, significant buffer there. There are coverage considerations as well as setback standards. She went over the need to consider storm water management and impervious coverage. The building height for the residential building is 65 feet and will be 4 stories. The requirement is they do structured parking, which could be six levels for parking. There is a need for standards and requirements for the parking to make sure there is sufficient parking. When they come to the board for site plan approval, they need to have a plan addressing parking and coverage.

She stated there is a circulation map for pedestrians included in the plan. There is also electric vehicle charging that is required as well as design standards and guidance for signage, landscaping and utilities. There are also sustainable green building standards and a menu of about 30 standards they identified for the residential. For residential they have to comply with 25 and nonresidential 20.

# PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING

Meeting Minutes

August 5, 2021

## Board Questions:

Mr. Chesner inquired about the multi-family inclusionary being 4 stories. She stated it supersedes the ordinance and can be four stories as well as the hotel and be 65 feet. The parking garage is for residential, to provide as much parking and at the same time deal with coverage and screening.

Mrs. Petriello with the medical office coming in what happens to the remaining 1065. Mrs. Gruel other users would come in and not be redeveloped as inclusionary. When addressing the unmet need it gives the option. They do not have to build it, there are no other places to build it. There was no prohibition that stopped the use of the Sears building for medical. Mrs. Petriello stated the six stories will make it the tallest building in town; she is concerned about the fire department. Mrs. Gruel stated when they come in for site plan approval the fire officials will have to review and approve that it complies all code requirements. Mrs. Petriello stated the calculation in exhibit B is wrong. Mrs. Gruel stated that came in the settlement agreement. She was not involved in that.

Mr. Balikov asked if the settlement agreement has had certain sustainable requirements drafted onto it. Mrs. Gruel stated that was not part of the settlement agreement, it is what was discussed with Preit. He asked for a definition of sustainability. She went over the sustainability plan on page 27. He asked for advice on how to achieve a certain level of sustainability. Mr. Wieliczko stated he does not want to prejudice any applicant that comes before the board in the future. He referred to the chart that Taylor Group put together they are on number 7, fast forward to number 11, which is when someone comes to the board with site plan. Then at that point, you can go over review letters from the professionals, which will include the sustainability plan. Mrs. Gruel stated when it comes to you, and then the Board can review the Professionals letters at that time. Mr. Wieliczko stated Mrs. Taylor's testimony would show this redevelopment plan is not inconsistent with the Master Plan.

Mr. Musnug inquired who approved the six level parking. Mrs. Gruel stated no one approved anything yet, it is a draft redevelopment plan formulated based on the settlement agreement and discussions with Preit. This draft was introduced by Council as it is, it has come to this board for referral and will go back to them for adoption. There are 375 units and you have to follow RSIS standards. They did not want to create a parking problem; if there were another level of parking, it could accommodate the RSIS standards. The applicant will have to come before the board to show what they plan on doing. Council approved this on first reading. Mr. Barker stated in Boscov's lease we cannot take away their parking, so it has to go somewhere else. Mrs. Gruel stated it is 6 levels, which is 10 feet above the 65 feet potentially being 75 feet. Mrs. Brown inquired about needing 2 ½% more impervious coverage. She does not see any green area or play areas. Mrs. Gruel stated the intent is to reduce impervious coverage by 2 ½%. Mr. Barker stated we need to get to the consistency vote now. Mrs. Gruel stated those concerns will be address during the site plan approval. Mr. Wieliczko stated our task this evening is to pass a resolution

# PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING

Meeting Minutes

August 5, 2021

consistent with the board's professional's opinions that the redevelopment plan as drafted is not inconsistent with the master plan.

Mrs. Taylor went over her memo dated 8.2.2021. Comments 1 through 4 she said were in respect to the housing plan. She said there are some economic plan elements that are relevant. Specifically, the local housing and redevelopment role, number 5, such as tax payment agreements. She said under B to monitor economic conditions one of the things the redevelopment plan does is when the planner did this they did it with Preit (Owner). She stated these improvements are intent to support, diversify and enhance what is the existing nonresidential development at the Mall. They are not inconsistent with the Master Plan. They did discuss the 6 floor last week with Mrs. Gruel and staff along with Mr. Noll. She stated they made comments: Keying in on the sixth floor. The redevelopment plan states these must be behind buildings. She is not sure how they are going to do that with a building in front of it. She stated the board could make a recommendation stating perhaps stating the residential building should be higher or the parking needs to be a different configuration. Mr. Wieliczko stated this could be a motion from the board confirming it is consistent with the master plan with the recommendations and comments that council give consideration to modify the garage or residential building.

**Public Comment:** None

Mrs. Petriello stated nothing in there relates to green space and wants to add this in their recommendation to council. Mr. Balikov inquired if she feels the current municipal services and infrastructure are adequate for the development they are proposing here. She said her opinion does not matter because the town is obligated as part of the settlement agreement to permit the construction of over 1000 units on this parcel. Now there are 375 units. The town will have to supply the appropriate infrastructure. Mr. Wieliczko stated this is a result of a negotiated settlement of a ligated case for years regarding affordable housing obligation and how the municipality is going to attempt to satisfy the obligation.

Mr. Noll stated in regards to water and sewer, there is a clause stating they will have to upgrade appropriately to make sure there is enough available. Mrs. Gruel stated, there are provisions for bike storage and other types of storage.

Mr. Musgnug made a motion approving the redevelopment plan being consistent with the Master Plan with the recommendations of the planning board to council that consideration is given regarding the addition of green space and the height of the parking garage, and to confer with their professionals as best they can, seconded by Mr. Chesner. The roll call vote of the Board was unanimous in favor with those eligible to vote.

**Referral from Township Council Ordinance No. 26-2021 Enacting Chapter 52 and Amending Chapter 180 of the Code of the Township of Moorestown Entitled "Zoning" to implement the New Jersey Cannabis Regulatory, Enforcement Assistance and Marketplace Modernization Act.**

Mrs. Taylor was sworn in again by Mr. Wieliczko. Mrs. Taylor went over her

# PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING

Meeting Minutes

August 5, 2021

correspondence dated 8.2.2021 regarding implementing Cannabis in the Municipality. In this correspondence they refer to the Municipal Land Use Law. The Master Plan in 2002 and 2018 did not address cannabis at all, so the information they can go on is the 2009 economic plan element. She stated going back to financial consideration, there are locally tax for cannabis and will be implemented by this ordinance. It is important and incumbent of the governing body to manage opportunities as they approach. They are responding to the Governor and changes to the law.

Things to look for are Location, conditional uses (being permitted conditionally), Master Plan is silent, understanding retail sales (pharmaceutical), and manufacturing of controlled substances would be permitted in the BP district. She stated the one issue she suggests is no retail sales to visibly intoxicated individuals. The zoning officers should not get that call, they are not the police. She stated the applicant should understand this is criteria under 52 (police power). She stated maybe testimony can be provided or signs can be visible on the building so everyone is on notice that no one can enter the facility intoxicated and be served. Mr. Mourchi inquired about setbacks; Mrs. Taylor stated Main Street would not be zoned for this use, it is not in the SRC or SRC 1. She stated extending Cinnaminson border and Maple Shade that is the BP1 District and this would be where manufacturing and processing would be permitted. She went over sites that would be included. She stated the setbacks for residential is 200, public and private schools 1000 and public parks is 500. Mrs. Acaro Burns inquired if it determined there is onsite consumption what happens if it is violated. She does not understand what happens if any of these is violated. Mr. Wieliczko stated they are here to determine if it is consistent with the master plan. He stated all these licenses have state regulations and must comply. Mrs. Taylor stated 52 requires a sign stating no onsite consumption. There should also be a sign somewhere stating no sales to visible intoxicated individuals.

Mr. Musgnug made a motion that they agree with Michelle Taylor's recommendation that it is not inconsistent with the master plan and also the applicant provide signage prohibiting on-site consumption as well as testimony by applicants regarding their understanding the restriction of sales to visibly intoxicated individuals and agreement for signage as a condition of approval, seconded by Mr. Dey. The roll call vote of the Board with those eligible to vote was unanimous in favor.

## **Public Comment:** None

- a. Staff to provide short update on meeting schedule  
Mrs. Muscella stated there would be a special meeting on 8/19/2021. She is not sure if it would be in person. Mr. Balikov stated he might be reluctant to attend in person. Mr. Wieliczko stated many municipalities have been affected on the way they are handling their public meetings. He stated the special meeting has been noticed in the paper for an in person meeting.  
Mr. Barker the ordinance committee will be starting in October. He appointed himself. He stated to email him if they are interested.
- b. EDAC Liaison Report- nothing new per Melissa Burns

**PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING**

Meeting Minutes

**August 5, 2021**

**Public Comment:**

None

**ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Barker stated the next meeting would be 8/19/2021. A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Chesner and seconded by Mrs. Burns. The meeting was adjourned at 9:44PM.

Next Meeting: 8/19/2021 at 7:00 pm