

**AMENDED MINUTES**

**FEBRUARY 25, 2014**

**PLANNING BOARD**

**LONG HILL TOWNSHIP**

**CALL TO ORDER AND STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE**

Chairwoman Dapkins called the meeting to order at 7:35 P.M. She then read the following statement: Adequate notice of this meeting has been provided by posting a copy of the public meeting dates on the municipal bulletin board, by sending a copy to the Courier News and Echoes Sentinel and by filing a copy with the Municipal Clerk, all in January, 2012.

**MEETING CUT-OFF**

Chairwoman Dapkins read the following statement: Announcement is made that as a matter of procedure, it is the intention of the Planning Board not to continue any matter past 10:30 P.M. at any Regular or Special Meeting of the Board unless a motion is passed by the members present to extend the meeting to a later specified cut-off time.

**CELL PHONES AND PAGERS**

Chairwoman Dapkins read the following statement: All in attendance are requested to turn off cell phones and pagers as they interfere with the court room taping mechanism.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**ROLL CALL**

On a call of the roll, the following were present:

Suzanne Dapkins, Vice-Chairman  
Brendan Rae, Mayor’s Designee (arrived at 7:38 P.M.)  
Ashish Moholkar, Member  
Guy Roshto, Member (arrived at 7:38 P.M.)  
Gregory Aroneo, Member  
David Hands, 1<sup>st</sup> Alternate

Excused:

J. Alan Pfeil, Chairman  
Guy Piserchia, Mayor  
Timothy Wallisch, Member

Kevin O’Brien, Twp. Planner  
Thomas Lemanowicz, Bd. Engineer  
Daniel Bernstein, Bd. Attorney

Barry Hoffman, Bd. Attorney

Ms. Kiefer advised Chairwoman Dapkins that she had a quorum and could proceed.

X X X X X X X X X X X X

**EXECUTIVE SESSION** - It was determined that there was no need to hold an executive session.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of May 28, 2013 were approved as written on motion by Mr. Roshto and seconded by Chairwoman Dapkins. Chairwoman Dapkins noted that she had recused herself from that portion of the meeting which dealt with Application #12-06P, 1107 Valley Road LLC. Mr. Moholkar abstained since he was not present at the meeting. Mr. Hands abstained since he was not a member of the Board at that time.

The minutes of January 28, 2014 were approved as written on motion by Mr. Hands and seconded by Dr. Rae. Mr. Aroneo abstained since he was not present at the meeting.

The minutes of February were approved as amended on motion by Mr. Roshto and seconded by Mr. Moholkar.

**PUBLIC QUESTION OR COMMENT PERIOD**

Chairwoman Dapkins opened the meeting to the public for questions or comments on any item not on the agenda. Hearing none, she closed the meeting.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH**  
158 Central Avenue  
Block 13004, Lot 20

#13-01P  
Minor Site Plan  
Bulk Variances

Chairwoman Dapkins asked Ed Gerecht, jr., Esq., attorney for the applicant, to present the application.

Mr. Gerecht stated that the applicant would produce testimony and pictures pertaining to the present condition of the existing roof and downspouts. He explained that the applicant was seeking approval for Minor Site Plan for the roof. It is a flat roof and the application sought to make it a peaked roof on that section of the building. He outlined the reasons for the request. First, the flat roof has a constant leaking problem. Second, it would be more uniform with

the rest of the building which has a peaked roof. Mr. Gerecht referenced the photos distributed electronically which showed the existing building.

Mr. O'Brien and Mr. Lemanowicz were sworn in by the court reporter.

Mr. Gerecht then introduced the engineer, William G. Hollows, **Murphy & Hollows Associates**, Stirling, New Jersey.

Chairwoman Dapkins accepted Mr. Hollows as an expert witness.

Mr. Gerecht stated that Mr. Hollows was hired by the First Presbyterian Church to do the site plan for the new roof construction.

Mr. Hollows affirmed that the statement was correct. He had taken the height elevations and different site measurements of the property. He updated the site survey and did a topographical survey at the same time.

Mr. Gerecht asked Mr. Hollows to explain the application to the Board using the colorized plans. Mr. Hollows stated that the Board had the same plans without the colored area. Sheet 2 of 3 was marked **Exhibit A-01** and Sheet 3 of 3 was marked **Exhibit A-02**.

Mr. Hollows stated that the subject property is located on Central Avenue, Chestnut Street, and the parking lot areas touch on Elm Street. The colored in area on **Exhibit A-01** represented the existing church: the sanctuary in the front, the area to the rear, and the church building to the south. He noted that the parking lot is located along the south going out to Elm Street. In the front, there is a single family residence which was not colored in.

Mr. Hollows referred to **Exhibit A-02** and stated that the applicant wanted to construct a new roof on the rear portion of the building, behind the sanctuary. It was represented with a different color. He said that this was the only area of construction. There would be no land disturbance as part of the application. It was 2,340+ square feet of roof.

Mr. Hollows noted that the new roof would be 7'-6" above the existing flat roof. The height of the building would go from elevation 284.01 to elevation 291.51. That would be approximately twenty-one (21) feet above grade at the lowest point which is the southwesterly corner of that flat roof building. Mr. Hollows' drawing had different numbers than the architect's drawing but in discussing this with the architect, he was confident that the numbers he just gave the Board were correct.

Mr. Gerecht asked how the new roof would compare to the height of the peaked roof on the church.

Mr. Hollows answered that the sanctuary is at elevation 302.84 and it is the highest point of the complex of buildings. The church building to the south is at elevation 293.26 which is approximately two (2) feet higher than the proposed new roof.

Mr. Gerecht asked Mr. Hollows to explain to the board members whether there would be overhangs.

Mr. Hollows referred to the architect's plan and stated that there would be a slight overhang but that it would not be substantial.

Mr. Gerecht asked if the height of the proposed new roof would be anywhere near the maximum height permitted by the ordinance.

Mr. Hollows answered that the ordinance height was thirty-five (35) feet and that the height of the proposed new roof would be no where near that.

Mr. Hollows noted that there was a setback variance.

Mr. Gerecht stated that this application would not increase the setback.

Mr. Hollows agreed. He noted that there was a setback variance from Chestnut Street. The proposed roof would be constructed on top of the existing structure. The setback requirement is fifty (50) feet and that portion of the building is set back about thirty-four (34) feet. He noted that the sanctuary is closer to Chestnut Street than that addition.

Chairwoman Dapkins asked how the water would be collected from the roof.

Mr. Hollows answered that there are gutters on the building.

Mr. Gerecht had photographs that he wanted marked and entered into evidence. These photos would show the Board that there are existing gutters and that the new gutters would be in the same positions as the existing. The water would be drained in the same method as before.

Chairwoman Dapkins asked where the water would go.

Mr. Hollows answered that there are three (3) leader drains on the north side and two (2) on the south side. They all went underground and he did not know where they exited.

Mr. Gerecht interjected that he would present testimony to answer that question.

Mr. Bernstein suggested they mark the packet of pictures **Exhibit A-03**. Each of the eighteen (18) photos was given a letter designation, (a) through (r).

Mr. Bernstein asked if a notation to the effect that detention would be subject to approval from the Board engineer would be acceptable.

Mr. Gerecht stated that he still had not presented testimony pertaining to the water.

Mr. Bernstein also noted Mr. Lemanowicz's Comment #4 in his report dated February 17, 2014 in reference to the lack of striping in the parking lot.

Mr. Gerecht stated that he would present testimony to address that comment.

Mr. Gerecht distributed the photo packets to the board members and explained that they showed what the section of the building with the flat roof looks like and also showed the gutters and leaders which collect the water from the flat roof.

Mr. Gerecht asked Mr. Hollows if any more or less water would come off of a flat roof than a peaked roof.

Mr. Hollows answered that water would still run off a "flat" roof since it does have some pitch. There is a gutter on each side of the building to collect water which then goes down the downspout and underground. A flat roof does have pitch so the water would not pool. He felt the controlling issue would be the drop. When the water got to the drop, the leader drain would collect it and feed it to the downspout.

Mr. Gerecht asked if there was going to be any increase to the area of water.

Mr. Hollows said there would be no increase. There was no new construction or footprint change. The new roof would be placed on the existing structure. The amount of impervious coverage would not change at all.

Mr. Hands asked if the gutters on the proposed new roof would be tied into the existing.

Mr. Hollows answered that they would.

Mr. Hands asked if there would be more water coming down.

Mr. Hollows answered it was the same amount of impervious coverage and he could not see where there would be an increase.

Mr. Hands referred to **Exhibit -03(f)** and asked if there would be more water coming down that valley.

Mr. Hollows answered that the valley shown in the picture comes down on to the flat roof and the new roof would tie into that same roof so he did not see any increase.

Mr. Hands asked if it was then a fair statement to say that there would be no increase in water captured.

Mr. Gerecht said that with the new roof configuration, the water would drain naturally into the gutters.

Mr. Hollows affirmed that statement.

Chairwoman Dapkins asked Mr. Gerecht to address the concerns stated in the letter from the Environmental Commission.

Mr. Gerecht asked Mr. Hollows to comment on the following statement from the Environmental Commission. "The applicant suggests that the proposed variance will not have a negative effect on the property. We disagree. Sloped roofs do create more water runoff than flat roofs do. In addition, they increase the speed at which water runs off." He asked if that was true.

Mr. Hollows stated that, after discussion with his partner, Mr. Murphy, they felt that the controlling factor was the drop. When the water comes off the roof, it would go into the leader drain straight down. That would be the speed. He felt that the increase would be miniscule.

Mr. Hollows also stated that it would be the same amount of water whether it was flat or peaked.

Mr. Gerecht stated that there would be no change in the amount of water or effect on where it went.

Dr. Rae asked about the speed of the water as it went through the gutters. He asked, if the water gathered momentum as it ran through the gutters, would it cause erosion.

Mr. Hollows answered that the water would get to the drop quicker however once it was there, it would be the same amount dropping and at the same speed.

Mr. Aroneo asked if there was anything available on this either statistically or quantitatively. He felt that this discussion was anecdotal and he noted that there should be some studies on this situation.

Mr. Lemanowicz said that there were two (2) statements or inferences in the letter. The first inference was that there would be more water coming off the sloped roof. More water is volume. In the case of a sloped roof versus a flat roof, the volume would not change. If the roof was expanded, there might be a change in volume. In this application, there was no issue with volume.

Mr. Lemanowicz said that the other statement pertained to the speed of the water. If the water came off the roof faster, the rate would increase. An increase in rate could be an issue because of erosion, although in this case the water would be piped underground. He said that the rate increase may be there but it would be controlled by the amount of water that could fit down the downspout. In a large storm, it would be the same because the water would pile up in the gutter trying to get down the downspout hole. A residential site improvement standard says that when a stormwater design is created, the calculation for time of concentration, which is the amount of time it would take the water to get from the farthest point in the watershed to the point being examined, starts at a minimum of ten (10) minutes. For the proposed roof, it might be thirty (30) seconds. It would not even be measurable.

Mr. Hands asked if the five (5) downspouts would be sufficient.

Mr. Hollows answered that he was surprised that there were that many and he felt it was a good thing.

Mr. Hands asked if there were any flooding concerns on the property.

Mr. Hollows answered that his office was located downhill and across the street from the subject property. He stated that he had never seen any issues with flooding.

Chairwoman Dapkins asked Mr. Gerecht to comment on the Environmental Commission's suggestion that a rain garden be used.

Mr. Hollows did not know where a rain garden could be placed on the property because of the distance requirements.

Mr. O'Brien asked if all the water was being piped somewhere, what would supply the rain garden.

Mr. Hollows said that the rain garden couldn't collect water from another portion of the site. The sanctuary, being an older building, does not have gutters on it and therefore, water can not be collected from there.

Mr. Lemanowicz asked to go over the heights again. He said that according to Mr. Hollows, it would peak at 291.5 and it would be twenty-one (21) feet high.

Mr. Hollows affirmed that.

Mr. Lemanowicz stated that the lowest point adjacent to the building which is how the township measures height is 269.4.

Mr. Hollows stated that he took the measurement from a point adjacent to where the new roof would be (he pointed to a spot on **Exhibit A-02**).

Mr. Lemanowicz said the ordinance states that it should be measured from the lowest grade touching the building.

Mr. Hollows said based on that location, it would be twenty-two (22) feet instead of twenty-one (21).

Mr. Gerecht stated, for the record, that that measurement was taken from the lowest corner which is in another section of the building.

Mr. Hollows stated that his drawing needed to be revised.

Mr. Gerecht asked if there were any questions from the Board. There were none.

Mr. Gerecht asked that Thomas Parziale be sworn in to testify about the present condition of the building, the surrounding land, and what is occurring there.

Mr. Parziale was sworn in by the court reporter and stated that he was Chairperson of the Building and Grounds Department for the First Presbyterian Church of Stirling. His responsibilities included keeping the building in good condition and maintaining items as needed.

Mr. Gerecht asked if he had working knowledge of the conditions of the grounds and the roofing of the church.

Mr. Parziale affirmed that he did.

Mr. Gerecht asked if Mr. Parziale had seen any erosion or problems with drainage on the property.

Mr. Parziale answered no.

Mr. Gerecht asked where the water from the downspouts exited.

Mr. Parziale answered that the water was funneled out to Chestnut Street. To his knowledge, that had been in existence since the last renovation of that roof and even before then. He estimated that it was since the late 1990's and probably well before that.

Mr. Gerecht asked if there had been any erosion in the surrounding areas around Chestnut Street or around the perimeter of the church because of any water coming off the roof.

Mr. Parziale answered no.

Mr. Gerecht asked what the uses nearest to the church are.

Mr. Parziale answered that the Memorial Garden is on the Chestnut Street side. On the Elm Street side, they are on the edge of the playground for the nursery school. On the third side that faced the neighbor's property there is an exit from the child care room with a set of stairs.

Mr. Gerecht asked what is contained in the Memorial Garden.

Mr. Parziale answered that it contains the ashes of individuals who have passed away.

Mr. Gerecht asked if any of those areas have shown signs of erosion.

Mr. Parziale answered no.

Mr. Gerecht asked if there had been any complaints from surrounding neighbors concerning any water runoff from the church.

Mr. Parziale answered no. If any complaints had been made, they would have been made either directly to him or to the church however, either way he would know about it.

Mr. Gerecht asked if there were any questions.

Mr. O'Brien asked how the water gets to Chestnut Street.

Mr. Parziale answered that it goes down the gutters and downspouts, and then underground.

Mr. O'Brien asked if it comes above ground at Chestnut Street.

Mr. Parziale answered that it comes out onto Chestnut Street a handful of inches above ground. There is one (1) opening.

Mr. Lemanowicz referred to the parking lot.

Mr. Gerecht stated that the parking lot is on the southern part of the building exiting onto Elm Street. He asked Mr. Parziale what the current condition of the parking lot is.

Mr. Parziale answered that it is in poor condition.

Mr. Gerecht asked if it had been striped in the past.

Mr. Parziale answered that it was striped approximately fifteen (15) years ago.

Mr. Gerecht asked what the church planned to do with the parking lot.

Mr. Parziale answered that after the roof project, the next major project would be the reconstruction of the parking lot and driveway and ultimately, restriping. Striping at this point would not be wise. He also added that there would be no increase in parking, or change in property use, or change in the number of people on the property if the application for the new roof was granted.

Mr. Gerecht asked if the lack of striping inhibited the parking.

Mr. Parziale answered no.

Mr. Gerecht noted that there are two (2) handicapped spots. He asked M. Parziale where they are located.

Mr. Parziale answered that they are located along side the sanctuary facing west which would be repaved also. He stated that the driveway, the entrance, the landing area, and the parking lot area would all be reconstructed and repaved.

Mr. Moholkar asked how soon that would be scheduled.

Mr. Parziale answered that it would be started within one (1) year.

Mr. Lemanowicz said that the only remaining issue was the stop sign at Elm Street which would not be in the paved area.

Mr. Gerecht stated that it could be installed at the exit at Elm Street.

Mr. Parziale offered that there was a grassy area at the end of the parking lot where the stop sign could be installed.

Mr. Gerecht then addressed the requested waiver items as outlined in Mr. O'Brien's report dated February 19, 2014.

Mr. O'Brien said that staff had no concerns about the completeness of the checklist waiver items requested by the applicant and no objection to the Board allowing those waiver items to be granted.

Mr. Gerecht asked Mr. Parziale about the current use of the rooms underneath the flat roof.

Mr. Parziale answered there is a choir or meeting room, a childcare room, the minister's office, a kitchen, the main office, two (2) restrooms, and that the edge of the roof covers one closet. Below those first floor uses is a good portion of the Montessori School.

Mr. Gerecht summarized that the flat roof covers the administrative uses. He asked about the condition of the flat roof.

Mr. Parziale answered that it is in poor condition, causing leakage due to the amount of snow and ice on the roof.

Mr. Gerecht asked if Mr. Parziale was familiar with the surrounding areas.

Mr. Parziale said that he was. He stated that to his knowledge there were no other flat roofs in the surrounding area.

Mr. Gerecht stated it was the only nonconforming flat roof in the area. The rest were all peaked.

Mr. Parziale affirmed that statement.

Mr. Gerecht said that by putting a peak on the roof, it would conform to the surrounding structures.

Mr. Parziale agreed.

Mr. Gerecht asked if there were any questions from the board members.

Mr. Hands asked if it would be a vaulted ceiling or would there be storage.

Mr. Parziale said there would not be an attic or storage.

Mr. Gerecht added that trusses would be used.

Mr. Hands asked if the ceiling height would remain the same.

Mr. Parziale said that to his knowledge, everything would remain the same.

Mr. Gerecht asked if the setback would change.

Mr. Parziale answered that there would be no change to the footprint.

Mr. Gerecht asked if there would be any lot coverage change.

Mr. Parziale answered that there would be no change.

Mr. Gerecht stated that he had no further testimony.

Chairwoman Dapkins asked if the professionals had any further questions. There were none.

Chairwoman Dapkins asked if the public had any questions. There were none.

Mr. Gerecht summed up by stating it was a simple application requesting approval to install a conforming peaked roof on a flat roof area. He pointed out that that portion of the structure was built in the 1960's and at that time, mistakenly, a flat roof was installed. As stated during testimony, the flat roof had deteriorated and could no longer be maintained. It does not conform to the surrounding structures which all have peaked roofs.

Mr. Gerecht referred to the testimony of Mr. Hollows and Mr. Lemanowicz which stated that water runoff would not be affected adversely and would be handled in the same manner as it is currently being managed with no apparent detriment or erosion to the area around it currently and in the future.

Mr. Gerecht said that the numbers for the heights would be corrected on the plans.

Mr. Gerecht added that the stop sign would not be a problem.

Mr. Gerecht also said that the striping in the parking lot would be dealt with in the near future by the church as soon as this project was completed.

Mr. Gerecht felt that having the building conform to the surrounding structures would be a benefit to the residential look of the neighborhood.

Mr. Gerecht stated that the negative criteria had been addressed.

Chairwoman Dapkins opened the meeting to the public for comments.

Judy O'Donnell, a neighbor, was sworn in by the court reporter. She spoke in favor of the application.

Chairwoman Dapkins asked if there were any further comments. Seeing none, she closed the meeting to the public.

Mr. O'Brien advised the Board that there were two (2) items to consider. First, it was a site plan application. Second, there were "C" variances involved.

Mr. O'Brien reminded the board members that, regarding the site plan application, their authority in reviewing this type of application was limited to determining whether the development plan conformed to the zoning ordinance and the applicable provisions of the site plan ordinance.

Mr. O'Brien then told the Board that in this application, there was a "C" variance for the setback from Chestnut Street. The applicant had one (1) of two (2) proofs to meet. The first was Hardship based upon the size or shape of the land itself. The second was that the benefits of going against the ordinance outweighed the detriments thereof. Since this application was one of inherently beneficial use, a church, he said the argument would be that the benefits of a peaked roof over an existing frame that would cause no further lot coverage or building coverage issues and would not exacerbate the existing setback would outweigh any detriments. In fact, no detriments had been identified to the Board during any testimony.

Mr. Bernstein stated that it was a "C-2" variance where two (2) purposes were being promoted. One was 2(a) which discussed the general welfare, health, and safety. He felt it was a safer situation with the peaked roof since there would no longer be any leaks. The second was 2(i), which discussed aesthetic improvement. He felt that most would agree a peaked roof was visually preferable to a flat roof. Mr. Bernstein also noted that a peaked roof would be consistent with the neighborhood. With that in mind, he felt that the applicant had proved the C-2 criteria especially since they would not be exacerbating any existing non-conformity. He advised the board members that this was a simple application deserving approval.

Mr. O'Brien advised Chairwoman Dapkins that, should the Board decide favorably on the application, two (2) conditions should be attached. First, there should be revised drawings provided with updated height figures and other engineering figures per Mr. Lemanowicz. Second, the stop sign should be installed at the Elm Street exit.

Mr. Bernstein asked if having the gutters tie into the existing leaders should be listed as an additional condition.

Mr. O'Brien stated that there had been testimony to that effect.

Mr. Roshto asked if there would be a cost to applicant for revising the drawings, and if so, were the changes that significant that the township would need those drawings revised.

Mr. Hollows stated there would be no additional cost for those changes.

Mr. Bernstein asked if the architect would have to submit revised drawings.

Mr. Hollows stated that the architect would remove anything referring to height and submit strictly architectural plans.

Mr. O'Brien advised Mr. Roshto that those drawings must be submitted for signature by the Board.

Chairwoman Dapkins asked Mr. Moholkar to begin the discussion.

Mr. Moholkar stated that he did not see anything negative in the application. He felt that this was an existing structure that was simply being augmented. He also felt that considering the past winter, a peaked roof would be preferable.

Mr. Aroneo said that he had nothing to add and agreed with the opinions of the professionals.

Dr. Rae concurred with the recommendation.

Mr. Roshto agreed also.

Mr. Hands agreed also.

Chairwoman Dapkins was also in agreement with the testimony. She asked for a motion. Mr. Roshto motioned to approve the application subject to the three (3) conditions outlined earlier and to agree on the waivers and minor site plan variances. Mr. Moholkar seconded. A Roll Call Vote was taken. Those in favor: Mr. Aroneo, Mr. Moholkar, Dr. Rae, Mr. Roshto, Mr. Hands, Chairwoman Dapkins. Those opposed: None. Motion passed unanimously.

Chairwoman Dapkins requested a recess at 8:39 P.M.

X X X X R E C E S S X X X X

Chairwoman Dapkins called the meeting back in session at 8:50 P.M.

Chairwoman Dapkins told Mr. O'Brien that the Board was looking for 2014 Status Report Nos. 1 & 2.

Mr. O'Brien thanked the Chair and stated that Status Report No. 1 dated January 12, 2014 basically recapped the Status Reports from 2013 and was in the same format as those reports of 2013. Several board members felt that report format was long, rather repetitive, and because paragraphs were added onto paragraphs in order to recap where the Board was, it had become a rather unwieldy document.

Mr. O'Brien said that on February 13, 2014, he issued Status Report No. 2 which was a complete change in the document format. The recap was located in the very beginning and showed the various initiatives of the Board. It then gave the Board the current status of each of those items. That summarized the difference between the documents. From this point on, any changes to Status Report No. 2 would be highlighted in a track changes document.

Mr. O'Brien added that the Ordinance Subcommittee had met last month and they had undertaken a number of initiatives which would be moved along.

Chairwoman Dapkins asked if there was a list of items that was carried over from the past year.

Mr. O'Brien said that those items would be listed on pages 1 and 2. Millington TDR is a separate committee which was reorganized in January. They would report their progress to the Board. He noted that the Planning Board has Morristown Road Rezoning in front of it.

Chairwoman Dapkins asked how these items would be advertised since there were no applications currently pending before the Board for March 11, 2014.

Ms. Kiefer affirmed that there were none for that date.

Mr. O'Brien answered that because they are agenda items, they would be placed on the agenda at a regular meeting.

Chairwoman Dapkins asked if they could be reviewed at the March 11<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Mr. O'Brien answered that none of those items would be ready for the Board's review by March 11<sup>th</sup>. He then said that he would confer with the Ordinance Subcommittee to see if they could have some items ready for Board review.

Mr. Roshto noted that the Recreation Element had been provided to the Township Committee for discussion and he wondered if the Planning Board could at least have a conversation about it on the 11<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. O'Brien had not read that element so he could not advise the Board as to whether or not he could be prepared by the 11<sup>th</sup>. He noted that even though the Township Committee had read it, it is a Planning Board document and only the Planning Board could pass it.

Mr. Roshto said that the Recreation Commission felt its draft was solid enough and presented it to the Township Committee. He felt it was worthy of discussion by the Planning Board and that there would be no tremendous changes.

Mr. O'Brien felt that he would be more comfortable if he were to look at it and then work with the Recreation Commission to make any changes that needed to be made. He stated that he would get to it within the next week and if he found that there were very few substantive changes to be made, he would be happy to have the Board look at it.

Chairwoman Dapkins advised the board members that the next meeting might be cancelled.

Chairwoman Dapkins asked for a motion to adjourn. Dr. Rae motioned, Mr. Moholkar seconded the motion. A Voice Vote was taken and the motion passed. The meeting was adjourned at 9:01 P.M.

---

CYNTHIA KIEFER  
Planning and Zoning Secretary