

**TOWNSHIP OF FRANKLIN  
PLANNING BOARD  
COUNTY OF SOMERSET, NEW JERSEY**

**REGULAR MEETING  
January 18, 2017**

The regular meeting of the Township of Franklin Planning Board was held at 475 DeMott Lane, Somerset, New Jersey and was called to order by Chairman Orsini at 7:30 p.m. The Sunshine Law was read, the Pledge of Allegiance said and the roll was taken as follows:

---

**PRESENT:** Councilman Chase, Carl Hauck, Alex Kharazi, Cecile Maclvor, Robert Mettler, Robert Thomas, Jennifer Rangnow, Godwin Omolola and Chairman Orsini

**ABSENT:** None

**ALSO PRESENT:** Mr. James Clarkin, Board Attorney, and Vincent Dominach, Senior Zoning Officer

---

**OATH OF OFFICE:**

Mr. James Clarkin, Board Attorney administered the Oath of Office, to the following Board members:

- Alex Kharazi
- Carl Hauck
- Theodore Chase
- Cecile Maclvor
- Robert Mettler

*To be carried to next hearing:*

- Charles Brown
- Godwin Omolola

## **REORGANIZATION:**

- **Nomination/selection of Chairperson**

Ms. Cecile Maclvor made a motion to nominate Dr. Michael Orsini as Chairperson for the Planning Board. Mr. Mettler seconded the motion and, hearing no other nominations put forth, the Board was all in favor of nominating Dr. Orsini.

- **Nomination/selection of Vice Chairperson**

Chairman Orsini made a motion to nominate Ms. Cecile Maclvor as Vice Chairperson for the Planning Board. Mr. Mettler seconded the motion and, hearing no other nominations put forth, the Board was all in favor of nominating Ms. Maclvor.

- **Appointment of Board Attorney**

Mr. Dominach explained that they hold a fair and open nomination period for the position of Planning Board Attorney. He stated that they had received two resumes and the Board had asked that they interview the current attorney, Mr. Clarkin. Chairman Orsini asked the Board if there were any questions they wanted to ask of Mr. Clarkin and, seeing none, the Chairman made a motion to appoint the firm of Clarkin & Vignuolo as Planning Board Attorney. Vice Chair Maclvor seconded the motion and all were in favor.

- **Resolution Appointing Board Attorney**

Chairman Orsini made a motion to approve the Resolution appointing the firm of Clarkin & Vignuolo as Planning Board Attorney. Vice Chair Maclvor seconded the motion and all were in favor.

- **Witness Oath – Director of Planning, Mark Healey, Zoning Officer, Vincent Dominach**

Board Attorney, Mr. Clarkin, then administered the Witness Oath, which would carry forward for the rest of calendar year 2017.

**MINUTES:**

- **Regular Meeting – November 9, 2016**

Vice Chair Maclvor made a motion to approve the Minutes as submitted. Mr. Kharazi seconded the motion and all were in favor.

**RESOLUTIONS:**

- **E & J Equities, LLC / PLN-16-00006**

Vice Chair Maclvor made a motion to approve the Resolution as submitted. Councilman Chase seconded the motion and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Councilman Chase, Mr. Hauck, Mr. Kharazi, Vice Chair Maclvor, Ms. Rangnow and Chairman Orsini

AGAINST: None

- **L’Oreal USA Products, Inc. / PLN-16-00007**

Vice Chair Maclvor made a motion to approve the Resolution as submitted. Chairman Orsini seconded the motion and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Councilman Chase, Mr. Hauck, Mr. Kharazi, Vice Chair Maclvor, Ms. Rangnow and Chairman Orsini

AGAINST: None

- **Canal Walk Associates, LLC / PLN-14-00013**

Chairman Orsini made a motion to approve the Resolution as submitted, and the motion was seconded. The roll was called as follows:

FOR: Councilman Chase, Mr. Hauck, Mr. Kharazi, Mr. Mettler, Mr. Thomas, Ms. Rangnow and Chairman Orsini

AGAINST: None

- **2017 Calendar**

Chairman Orsini made a motion to adopt the 2017 Calendar. Vice Chair MacIvor seconded the motion and all were in favor.

**DISCUSSION:**

***Vouchers:***

- **Clarkin & Vignuolo, P.C. – December Retainer - \$833.33**

Chairman Orsini made a motion to approve the Vouchers as submitted. Vice Chair MacIvor seconded the motion and all were in favor.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

Chairman Orsini then opened the meeting to the public for discussion of anything related to Planning that was not the subject of a hearing that evening. Mr. Mettler seconded the motion and all were in favor. Seeing no one coming forward, Mr. Mettler made a motion to close the public portion of the meeting that evening and Vice Chair MacIvor seconded the motion. All were in favor.

**HEARINGS:**

- **FRANKLIN JULIETTE, LLC. / PLN-16-00010**

Catherine Copp, Esq., Attorney with the law offices of Peter U. Lanfrit, appeared before the Board on behalf of the Applicant, Franklin Juliette, LLC. Sign Variance which Applicant was proposing placement of a monument sign at 607 Somerset Street, Somerset; Block 164, Lot 1.01, in the RC Zone.

Mr. Dominach's Zoning information identified the need for the following variances:

- Sign area: 60 sq. ft. maximum permitted – 127 sq. ft. proposed
- Sign setback: 20 ft. required – 5 ft. proposed
- Sign Height: 10 ft. maximum permitted – 12.5 ft. proposed

Mr. Healey explained that the hearing that evening was the Franklin Juliette Wawa Application that was approved some time in 2016. He indicated that, as part of that application, the Applicant had proposed a sign of 20 ft. in height, which required some variances and were not approved by the Board. He stated that the Applicant did not prove that the sign they were proposing at that time needed to be higher due to sight line issues. He then stated that during that hearing, he had made a recommendation of placing a smaller monument sign, lower than 20 ft. and placed closer to the roadway.

Mr. Healey told the Board that he believed that the Applicant had now taken that advice to heart because the Application before them that evening was just like the example given in his memo – a monument sign that was 12-1/2 ft. in height. Mr. Healey did add that it still required some variances because the ordinance in that district limited the sign area to 60 sq. ft. and the Township included the entire sign structure when taking the measurements. He then noted that the entire sign area proposed was just under 50 sq. ft. He then discussed the sign setback variance that was required as well as the sign height in the RC Zone. Despite the need for variances, Mr. Healey stated that the proposed sign before the Board that night was consistent with what staff had recommended. He also added that the Technical Review Committee (TRC) had issued a report and had no concerns. He explained that they did look at sight distances because the sign was closer to the roadway, but found no issues with the sight distances into or out of the driveway.

Mr. Matthew Sharo, Engineer employed with Dynamic Engineering Consultants, came forward and was sworn in. The Board accepted his qualifications. Mr. Sharo was provided with the report provided by Mr. Healey and agreed with all statements made by him during the hearing. Mr. Sharo indicated that he performed a sight line test that included both the visibility of the sight and safety of motorists driving down the street with the sign at the proposed height. He then testified that if the sign were any smaller or any further away from the roadway than presently proposed, it would be blocked by vehicles exiting the property as well as vehicles driving down the roadway. Mr. Sharo then testified that the proposed sign at the proposed distance from the roadway was the most appropriate sign.

After Chairman Orsini asked for justification of the three (3) variances, Board Attorney, James Clarkin stated that since they did not have a professional Planner present to testify, they often allow the Applicant's attorney to present what was called a "proffer", which was the justification for the variances if that would be agreeable to the Chairman and the Board. Mr. Clarkin stated that it was his understanding that the justification would be under the "C-2" analysis, a weighing of the benefits and the detriments. Ms. Copp agreed with that statement and Chairman Orsini agreed to the "proffer" statement.

Ms. Copp indicated that it was their position that there were no detriments to the proposed sign, both in size and location, and that it was testified to by Mr. Sharo that it would be a safer option than a sign that complied with the ordinance. Ms. Copp added that they do not see any negative impact from the sign as proposed and believe that it did comply with the Township's Master Plan and the intent of the zoning ordinance. She concluded by saying that it was a better zoning alternative and that the benefits substantially outweigh any detriments because they don't believe any detriments exist.

Vice Chair MacIvor made a motion to approve the Application. Mr. Kharazi seconded the motion and the roll was called as follows:

Mr. Kharazi asked whether they knew if any other signs in the area were going to be completely different than what was being proposed that evening. Mr. Sharo indicated

that they didn't look at any other signs and don't know what was being proposed elsewhere in the area. A discussion ensued among the Board and Mr. Healey regarding the compatibility of the monument sign to the materials used on the main building.

Mr. Clarkin then asked if the Applicant would abide by all the other conditions of the prior approval should the sign variances be approved that evening. Ms. Copp indicated that they would abide with all conditions from the previous approval.

Chairman Orsini made a motion to open the meeting to the public and Mr. Thomas seconded the motion. All were in favor. Seeing no one coming forward, Mr. Thomas made a motion to close the meeting to the public. Vice Chair MacIvor seconded the motion and all were in favor.

Chairman Orsini made a motion to approve the Sign Variances as well as the Applicant's agreement to abide by all the previous conditions of the prior application. Vice Chair MacIvor seconded the motion and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Councilman Chase, Mr. Hauck, Mr. Kharazi, Vice Chair MacIvor, Mr. Mettler, Mr. Thomas, Ms. Rangnow and Chairman Orsini

AGAINST: None

- **S4 Estates, LLC / PLN-16-00006**

Mr. James Mitchell, Esq., Attorney, appeared before the Board on behalf of the Applicant, S4 Estates, LLC. He explained that they were there that evening seeking Site Plan approval in which the Applicant was proposing to construct a 14,989 sq. ft. 1-story retail building with freestanding sign at 3059 Route #27, Somerset; Block 34.01, Lots 32.01 & 33.01, in the NB Zone.

Mr. Mitchell also stated that they were there before the Board for Sign Variance approval as well, to permit total sign area in excess of 100 sq. ft. and less than 20 ft. from the roadway. Additionally, Mr. Mitchell indicated that they were also seeking sign variance approval to permit frontage on the south side, i.e., the Rte. 27 frontage that did not have any entrances. He also then asked for any approvals necessary for the consolidation of the two lots.

Mr. Bill Doran, Architect, came forward and was sworn in. The Board accepted his qualifications. Mr. Duran described the proposed project of a retail center with four (4) units. He went on to explain the types of materials that were proposed to be used as well as the access points to the building. He then testified that they were within the Township's height restrictions in the zone. He then noted that the project had received approval from the Historic Commission. Mr. Duran then moved on to discuss the proposed building lighting, including gooseneck lighting and lighting under canopies on

the back of the building. He then testified that any of the building signs would meet the requirements of the ordinance.

Mr. Healey asked for clarification as to which sign they were seeking variance approval for, and Mr. Mitchell indicated that they were seeking sign variance approval for the building mounted signs on the Rte. 27 side of the building because there were no entrances on that side to meet the design standards that included parking in the rear of the building. A discussion ensued among the Board. Mr. Healey explained that because the entrances to the storefronts were in the rear of the building near the parking lot, a sign variance was required. He also stated that he felt that the signs on the Rte. 27 side of the building help "finish" that side of the building.

Chairman Orsini asked whether they knew what kind of businesses would be occupying the four (4) units. Mr. Mitchell stated that they know that approximately 1/3 of the building would be occupied by a restaurant, but that they did not yet know what type of businesses would be leasing the remainder. He did state, however, that whatever use (retail/restaurant) would occupy the space would be compliant in terms of zoning and the restrictions related to the NJDOT Access Permit. A discussion ensued among the Board.

Mr. Daniel Doran, Engineer/Land Surveyor/Planner with the firm of William Doran and Sons, came forward and was sworn in. The Board accepted his qualifications. Mr. Doran then entered into the record as Exhibit A-1, which was an enlarged, highlighted version of the Site Plan that was submitted with the Application, dated 1/18/2017. He then described the subject property, noting that it met all of the Zone's bulk requirements. He noted that they were going to place the A/C units on the roof of the structure and would be visibly obstructed from view by the façade of the building. He then spoke about the one (25 ft. wide), two-way driveway that was located on the east side of the building and the site, noting that the driveway would have left and right turns allowed into the site and would only have right turns allowed out of the site. He discussed how the driveway would lead back to the parking area, both of which would be covered with asphalt, and include curbing and striping of parking spaces. Mr. Doran then indicated that they would be supplying the required amount of 9 ft. x 18 ft. parking spaces (75), with a drive aisle of 26 ft. wide. He then discussed the sidewalks proposed around the building on the east, north and west side as well as a sidewalk along the entire frontage of the property. He then indicated that the new sidewalks would connect to the existing walkways on the east and west side of the property. Mr. Doran then added that there would be sidewalk along the west side of the entrance driveway that would connect the walkway along Rte. 27 to the walkways around the perimeter of the building. Mr. Doran then spoke about the proposed monument sign that was located at the center of the building and approximately 17 ft. from the curb line and 8 ft. from the property line. He added that the monument sign would have a 3 ft. base, with the message area of the sign at 100 sq. ft. he then stated that the entire sign would be approximately 156 sq. ft. Mr. Doran then indicated that they were seeking a C-2 variance for the size and location of the sign. Even though the sign would be set back at 8 ft. instead of the required 20 ft., Mr. Doran indicated that the sign would not be in

any sight lines of the driveway. He then spoke to the Planning proofs, noting that purpose "M" of the zoning ordinance speaks of the aesthetic value of the proposed sign, which he believed would be a much more attractive sign than what was permitted in that zone. He stated that he didn't believe there would be any detriments to approving the variances. Mr. Doran then drew the Board's attention to the request for wall mounted signs on the side of the building along Rte. 27 because there were no entrances along that side of the building. He also noted that the wall mounted signs would be of a conforming size. He then discussed how they would enhance the look of that side of the building and provide the motorists on Rte. 27 the ability to know what establishments were located there. Mr. Doran then testified that a 10 x 15 ft. trash enclosure was proposed in the northwest corner of the parking lot, with a 6 ft. high stockade fence to be erected along the northerly as well as easterly property line, bordering the residents that abut the site. He then discussed the drainage on the property, noting that the improvements on the property would not alter the drainage patterns presently on the site. He then noted that the storm water system was designed to meet or exceed the requirements for the site. Mr. Doran then discussed the Landscape plan, with a mix of evergreens and shade trees on the site. He noted that the plan would meet or exceed the tree removal requirement and the buffering requirement of the ordinance. An exception to the plan proposed was removing the flowering evergreens in the front of the building and replace them with shade trees in accordance with the ordinance; therefore, a waiver for street trees was no longer necessary. Additionally, Mr. Doran wanted to remove the proposed shade trees along the driveway since the area there abutted a planter wall on the adjoining property that already had evergreens which would dominate the space. Mr. Doran then discussed the Lighting Plan, speaking about a number of 14 ft. high LED fixtures along the driveway and parking area. Finally, Mr. Doran indicated that they would be able to comply with all items on the various staff reports.

Vice Chair MacIvor opened a discussion regarding an area on Exhibit A-1 that Mr. Doran explained would be a detention basin that included a grass bottom with a 4 ft. high post and rail fence around it.

Mr. Hauck asked for an explanation of where trucks would go to make deliveries on the site. Mr. Doran explained that the deliveries would be scheduled early in the morning in a truck no larger than 30 ft. and would park along the curb line in the parking lot. He stated that the parking area was designed for these sized trucks to easily maneuver through the drive aisles.

Councilman Chase opened a discussion regarding the ability to save an existing tree on the site. Mr. Doran indicated that they would do all they could to save the tree. A discussion ensued regarding that issue as well as the storm water management system.

Mr. Kharazi opened a discussion regarding the safety aspects associated with the detention basin that was going to be placed close to a residential property. Mr. Doran reiterated that there would be a six (6) ft. high stockade fence along the property line



and a dense row of evergreens. Additionally, he stated that there was also going to be a four (4) ft. high fence around the entire basin.

Mr. Clarkin, Board Attorney, asked for clarification regarding Mr. Doran's testimony related to the sign variances with respect to promoting motorist safety. Mr. Doran answered in the affirmative. Mr. Clarkin then asked Mr. Doran if purpose "A" of the Master Plan (promoting the general welfare) would also be a goal and objective of the Municipal Land use Law (MLUL). Mr. Doran stated that he was in agreement with that statement. He added that the benefits outweigh any detriments. In answer to Mr. Clarkin's question about consolidating the lots, Mr. Doran answered in the affirmative.

Mr. Mettler opened a discussion regarding the Lighting Plan, asking if the fixtures would be designed to avoid light spillage onto the adjoining properties. Mr. Doran explained how they were designed to avoid light spillage and that they would be on a timer and shut off an hour after closing. A discussion ensued among the Board.

Mr. Healey suggested that the Applicant increase deciduous trees along the rear of the site to increase the buffer. Mr. Healey also suggested some foundation plantings/shrubs along the westerly side of the building that was not as decorative as the other sides of the building. Mr. Doran agreed that they could accomplish those objectives.

Mr. Scott Kennel, Traffic Engineer employed with McDonough and Rey Associates, came forward and was sworn in. The Board accepted his qualifications. Mr. Kennel testified that his office completed a Traffic Study, dated October 3, 2016, which included a collection of traffic counts in September of 2016 on Rte. 27 on a weekday (September 13, 2016 from 4p-6p) as well as on a Saturday (11a-2p). Mr. Kennel went on to explain how they collected and recorded their data to determine the additional traffic counts that would be generated from the proposed site. He indicated that it was determined to be "specialty" retail and would not be a high generator of traffic like a fast food restaurant or drive-thru bank might incur. He then discussed how they determined how the site access driveway would operate, with the conclusion being a level of service "D" for both the weekday p.m. and Saturday peak hours and was in the acceptable range by the NJDOT. He noted a level of service "B" for the left turn into the site. He reminded the Board that the levels of service recorded at the site were consistent with the number of other commercial uses in the area such as the day care center and the IHOP. Mr. Kennel told the Board that the Application to the NJDOT was deemed complete on October 31, 2016, and that they expected their favorable completed review within the next two weeks. Mr. Kennel then discussed the proposal of 75 parking spaces, which meets the requirements of the ordinance, and the on-site circulation that was designed to provide positive on-site circulation to accommodate both larger trucks and passenger vehicles. He then noted that the site driveway was placed in an area that optimized sight distances, and that his opinion was that it could operate safely and efficiently when the development was completed.

Mr. Healey asked for clarifications of the testimony that Mr. Kennel gave regarding NJDOT restricting the types of businesses that would be approved for that location. Mr. Kennel indicated that since it was considered a “specialty” retail use, there has to be at least two (2) tenants in a building of less than 20,000 sq. ft. and would also require a deed restriction as part of the access approval. Mr. Kennel reiterated that there could be no fast food restaurants or drive-thru banks as well as a delicatessen or post office facilities. He added that the restrictions were put in place to avoid having high volume, high turnover retail type establishments. Mr. Kennel indicated that they could provide copies to the Board of the NJDOT access permits upon receipt.

Mr. Clarkin then inquired as to whether all drive-thru uses were restricted under the permits. He asked about a drive-thru Starbucks, and Mr. Kennel indicated that coffee shops would also be considered a high-volume use and would be included in the restrictions. A discussion ensued among the Board. Mr. Healey added that they would have to redesign the site since it was not set up to accommodate that kind of traffic. Despite what the NJDOT grants in permits for “specialty” retail only, Mr. Clarkin wondered if the Applicant would agree to a condition of approval that only “specialty” retail businesses be allowed on site. Since it was the basis of the NJDOT application, Mr. Kennel agreed to that condition as well as affording Title 39 jurisdiction, allowing the Police Dept. to enforce the right turn out only from the driveway.

Councilman Chase indicated that his opinion of the site would be that he would never turn left into the site, which was why it was forbidden to turn left out of the site.

Mr. Healey then asked about whether sit-down restaurants were included in the definition of a “specialty” use on the site. Mr. Kennel indicated that he was of the opinion that sit down restaurants were included because there was typically a lower turnover and would be permitted because that was its primary use. He noted that a sit-down restaurant also might offer take-out, but would have to be considered an ancillary use. He also added that sit-down restaurants also do a higher volume outside of the peak traffic times on Rte. 27. A discussion ensued among the Board.

Vice Chair Maclvor made a motion to open the meeting to the public. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion and all were in favor.

Keith Stensland, 23 Pleasant Plains Rd., Franklin Park, NJ, came forward and was sworn in. He indicated that he lived right next to the detention basin and was concerned about drainage and runoff. He was appreciative of the 6 ft. fence, but asked that it be of the cedar shadow box type variety since he hasn't seen a white vinyl fence that doesn't get dirty and/or broken beyond a year's use. Mr. Bill Doran, Engineer, described how the detention basin would be constructed to address his concerns. He also indicated that the water would now be collected in the detention basin and not allowed to flow onto his property. Mr. Stensland indicated that it was a large dumping ground on the property and wanted the Applicant and the Board to know that there might be some chemicals there that should be removed. Mr. Mitchell stated that after speaking with the

Applicant's Principal that a wooden fence would decay over time and that a vinyl fence would hold up better in the long run.

Chairman Orsini asked whether they could provide fencing that would result in "net" six (6) foot coverage. Mr. Healey indicated that if the fencing itself exceeded 6 ft., they would just need to obtain a construction permit and Mr. Mitchell was agreeable.

Mr. Stensland also indicated that he didn't feel that the left turn lane coming out of the property would just add to problems on Rte. 27. Mr. Mitchell clarified that the existing approvals do permit right and left turns out of the site.

Councilman Chase then drew the Board and public's attention to the Assistant Township Engineer's comment #59 related to the detention basin to avoid any water going onto Mr. Stensland's property. Mr. Healey indicated that that would be a condition of any approval and the Applicant would have to satisfy Mr. Vega, the Assistant Township Engineer.

Ms. Claire Lowry, 7 Pleasant Plains Rd., Franklin Park, NJ, came forward and was sworn in. She expressed her concerns for left hand turns out of the site and wanted to make sure that the site was shielded from view with trees, fencing and making sure that the lighting did not spill onto neighboring properties. She asked if the lights could be capped on the east side so that the lighting did not project into her backyard. She also didn't want overflow parking to go into the doctor's parking lot which would increase the likelihood that car headlights would shine into her backyard.

Mr. James White, 3073 Rte. 27, Franklin Park, NJ, came forward and was sworn in. He asked that trash removal and deliveries not take place before 7:00 a.m. in the morning. Mr. White also wanted to make sure that there be a strict right turn out only from the property.

Ms. Holly Hardaway, 7 Pleasant Plains Rd., Franklin Park, NJ, came forward and was sworn in. Ms. Hardaway indicated that she echoed what was already stated by her neighbors and ask that additional no left turn signage be placed at Pleasant Plains Rd. to avoid it being used as a turnaround. Mr. Healey suggested that it was an enforcement issue that could be brought up with the Township Manager and Police Dept. to ask for more patrols in that area.

Seeing no one further coming forward from the public, Vice Chair MacIvor made a motion to close the meeting to the public. The motion was seconded and all were in favor.

Chairman Orsini asked the Applicant to restrict trash removal and deliveries to after 7:00 a.m. He then asked Mr. Doran, to explain again where the deliveries would be made, noting they would come into the site and deliver from curbside in the parking lot to the individual establishments' entrances. Mr. Doran then addressed concerns about lighting, stating that the lighting would be shoebox-type lights facing downward and

would be shutoff one hour after the latest closing time in the center. The Chairman felt it was reasonable for the Board to ask the Applicant to provide a wood fence that was pressure treated. Mr. Kharazi concurred with Chairman Orsini regarding the provision of a wooden, pressure treated fence.

Mr. Thomas asked if there was any construction technique that could make the blocking island more prohibitive of making a left turn out of the site. Mr. Dominach suggested that the Site Engineer and Township Engineer discuss the situation and try to work something out. He did add that it would depend upon what NJDOT would allow. A discussion ensued among the Board. Councilman Chase also discussed the sidewalk that would be continued over the blocking island.

Vice Chair Maclvor made a motion to approve the Application and variances, with all the limitations and conditions discussed. Chairman Orsini seconded the motion and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Councilman Chase, Mr. Hauck, Mr. Kharazi, Vice Chair Maclvor, Mr. Mettler, Mr. Thomas, Ms. Rangnow and Chairman Orsini

AGAINST: None

## **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

No reports were discussed.

## **WORKSESSION/NEW BUSINESS:**

Mr. Healey gave a quick update on the Master Plan. He reminded the Board that the first half of 2016, the Board worked on the Re-examination and told them at that time that he would then be working on the Farmland Preservation Plan, Environmental Resource Inventory and Historic element. Mr. Healey noted that he worked with the various committees (Agricultural Advisory Committee, Environmental Commission and Historic Commission) and provided numerous drafts to each. He told the Board that he recently got approval from the Historic Commission regarding the Historic element of the Master Plan and that he would present at work sessions over the next few months the work that had been done. Mr. Healey then explained that they would be getting busy working on the Land Use element of the Master Plan.

## **EXECUTIVE SESSION:**

The Board did not enter into an Executive Session that evening.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Vice Chair Maclvor made a motion to adjourn the regular meeting at 9:15p.m. The motion was seconded the motion and all were in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Kathleen Murphy, Recording Secretary  
February 15, 2017