

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

**REGULAR MEETING  
May 17, 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 Robert Mettler 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, Robert Mettler, Jennifer Rangnow and Godwin Omolola

**ABSENT:** Cecile Maclvor, Alex Mansaray, Charles Brown, Robert Thomas and Chairman Orsini

**ALSO PRESENT:** Mr. Peter Vignuolo, Board Attorney, Mark Healey, Planning Director, and Christine Woodbury, Planning and Zoning Secretary

---

**MINUTES:**

- **Regular Meeting –April 5, 2017**

Mr. Omolola made a motion to approve the Minutes as submitted. Mr. Kharazi seconded the motion and the roll was called as follows:

**FOR:** Councilman Chase, Mr. Hauck, Mr. Kharazi, Mr. Mettler, Ms. Rangnow, and Mr. Omolola

**AGAINST:** None

## **DISCUSSION:**

### ***Vouchers:***

- **Clarkin & Vignuolo, P.C. – May Retainer - \$833.33  
Celik - \$70.00**

Mr. Hauck made a motion to approve the Vouchers as submitted. Councilman Chase seconded the motion and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Councilman Chase, Mr. Hauck, Mr. Kharazi, Mr. Mettler, Ms. Rangnow and Mr. Omolola

AGAINST: None

- **Catalpa Park Plans**

Mr. Rob Russo, CME Associates, appeared before the Board, along with Darrin Mazzey. He explained that CME was retained by the Township back in 2013 to prepare concept plans for Catalpa Park improvements and subsequently prepared a three-phase plan that was presented to the Council in 2014. Mr. Russo went on to state that after that presentation, they modified the plan by reducing the size and eliminating Phase III and presented that plan to the Council in 2015. He indicated that since that time, they had made some minor modifications and were there that evening to present those modifications.

Mr. Russo then described the location of the proposed park, located in the southwest corner of South Middlebush Road and Vliet Rd. He also noted that the park was approximately 108 acres in size and surrounded by residential properties and the Bunker Hill Golf Course. Mr. Russo described the park by stating that the southern portion and northeast portion of the park was comprised basically of fields, and the western portion was more wooded. He then indicated that the farmhouse that was presently on the property was going to remain, with an existing driveway coming off of Old Vliet Rd. Mr. Russo then went on to describe the plans for the park, noting the entrance driveway would basically follow the same farm field driveway (24 ft. wide paved road, constructed of porous pavement). He added that there would be a parking area on the right side as you enter the site, generally for the cricket fields and would have enough room for 67 parking spaces. To the left of the driveway, Mr. Russo indicated, would be two cricket fields located in the existing open field. He testified that they located the cricket fields as far to the northwest as they could to stay away from the residences that were bordering the park. He then noted a pavilion that was across from the parking area for the people using the cricket fields and there would also be a heavily landscaped buffer to supplement the existing buffer. Mr. Russo then stated that per a request by the Planning Board, they were going to have a community garden. He noted that they have two proposed locations, one by South Middlebush Rd. and the other just

to the west of the parking area. By continuing up the roadway, Mr. Russo indicated that you would cross a new culvert which would cross at the same location of the existing culvert. After passing that area, Mr. Russo indicated that there would be a new driveway constructed to the farmhouse, with decorative fencing around the house. Going further down the driveway, Mr. Russo indicated there would be the main parking area, containing 85 parking spaces, with a loop at the end for a drop-off and pick-up area. He added that in that area of the park, there would be four (4) tennis courts, two (2) basketball courts, a very large tot lot area with equipment for ages 2-5 and 5-12 and swing sets, with a large ADA compliant equipment area. He added that there would also be a restroom area with a stamped concrete area in the center of the play area. Mr. Russo then explained that there would also be a large pavilion in the area that could be used for picnics for families that could be rented out and would include picnic tables with barbeque equipment behind it, a bocce ball court, bean bag toss and horseshoes. Mr. Russo described a 10 ft. wide walkway that would go around all the equipment and connects to the existing trail and also connects to the existing grassed trail that connected to South Middlebush Rd. Mr. Russo then indicated that there would also be various benches, tables, and solar powered compacting garbage cans on the site. He then drew the board's attention to the utilities for the site, noting the proposal of a few wells to provide for non-potable water for the restrooms. He added that there would be a second bathroom area near the cricket fields. Mr. Russo indicated that the proposal for the sanitary sewer system was to use holding tanks. He then testified that there would be no site lighting anywhere in the park. He then discussed the improvement of Old Vliet Rd., which would be totally reconstructed and 24 ft. wide and would extend just past the entrance to the park.

Mr. Healey told the Board that the Council asked the Planning Board, Open Space Committee and other committees in the Township to review the concept plans. He told the Board that it was his understanding that the plans before the board that evening incorporated all the comments garnered from the different committees, Planning Board and Council. He indicated that the plans presented that evening had already been reviewed by the Open Space Committee and Rec. Advisory Committee, as confirmed by Councilman Chase, and now it was the Planning Board's opportunity to review the updated plans as well. He indicated that in the next few months, there would be a review by the Council where the public would be able to come to see the newly proposed plans.

Councilman Chase wanted everyone to know that there was existing shrubbery along the border of the park to the east, so the additional plantings should be inside that area toward the cricket fields so that the existing buffer would be maintained. The Councilman had gotten some feedback from the residents in the area, stating they would prefer the community garden be placed by the parking lot for the cricket field. He then discussed the driveway that crosses the stream, noting that there had been some discussion about having it a little further west to keep it a little further away from the farmhouse to minimize the number of public walking up to their door. He did add that it would require receiving a more extensive permit from the NJDEP than just replacing the existing culvert at the current point, but CME was still exploring the possibilities. The

Councilman indicated that they would be saving about \$250,000 by not running the sewer lines to the bathrooms, but by using the proposed tanks. He then stated that the bathrooms, according to the manager, would normally be locked, but a key would be available for the main bathrooms to anyone who rented the pavilion and presumably, the cricketers would have a key to the bathrooms near the cricket parking lot. He noted that the pavilion by the cricket fields was much reduced since it was not determined that they needed the larger version.

Mr. Kharazi opened a discussion regarding the cricket parking lot and the ability to provide enough parking for championship games. Mr. Russo indicated that the amount of parking was based upon other cricket fields and that a traffic study was done for the cricket field at Weston Rd. It was determined that the maximum would be 37 parking spaces required, according to Mr. Russo. He added that they accommodated for family coming to the games and for those who were coming to the community garden and those who wanted to use the walking paths to come to the 67 parking spaces that they were providing. He did note that there were also the 85 parking spaces in the main area of the park that was connected to a walking path that lead to the cricket fields as well. A discussion ensued among the Board.

Mr. Healey then opened a discussion regarding Councilman Chase's suggestion regarding the placement of the community garden. Councilman Chase indicated that all of the suggested locations for the different components stayed away from the existing mature second growth deciduous red cedar areas. Mr. Healey then reiterated the Councilman's suggested to move the additional landscape screening to the west or to the east so as not to be over the shrubbery that was existing. Councilman Chase also added that there was a discussion of having a 3 ft. fence there to deter people from walking through from the residences to the park. He added that the lower fence height would still allow the deer to come across.

Mr. Mettler asked whether there was a fence proposed around the community garden in order to keep the deer away. Mr. Russo answered in the affirmative.

Councilman Chase added that there was a proposal to add fitness equipment along the trails, but residents didn't want trails near their properties, so Councilman Chase suggested to have that type of equipment along the trail near the west end around the large pavilion. The Councilman also said that suggestions were to keep a lot of the existing trees near the trail.

Mr. Mettler made a motion to forward the recommendations made during the meeting to Council for their consideration. Mr. Kharazi seconded the motion and all were in favor.

- **413 Somerset Street Associates, LLC – Extension Request**

Mr. Jeffrey Chang, Esq., Attorney employed with the law offices of Heilbrunn Pape. Mr. Chang explained that they had received an Extension of Time last year for the

Preliminary and Final Site Plan approval which was originally granted in 2010. He noted that since that time, they had secured the sewer system approval, but had to post the final monies. He added that there had also been a pipe company that had been renting the property that had been doing work for the municipality and recently signed an additional 90-day lease, so he explained that they were in the process of removing them from the property. He testified that he believed the work they were doing for the municipality would be completed shortly. Mr. Chang also stated that their engineer was doing some additional work for resolution compliance and working with the Township Engineer. For those reasons stated, he asked for an Extension of Time for the period of one year.

Mr. Kharazi made a motion to grant the Extension of Time. Councilman Chase seconded the motion and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Councilman Chase, Mr. Hauck, Mr. Kharazi, Mr. Mettler, Ms. Rangnow and Mr. Omolola

AGAINST: None

#### **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

Mr. Mettler then opened the meeting to the public for discussion of anything related to Planning that was not the subject of a hearing that evening. Councilman Chase made a motion to open the meeting to the public and Mr. Kharazi seconded the motion. All were in favor. Seeing no one coming forward, Mr. Kharazi made a motion to close the public portion of the meeting that evening and Councilman Chase seconded the motion. All were in favor.

#### **HEARINGS:**

- **SOMERSET ATRIUM / PLN-17-00007**

Site Plan w/Minor Subdivision in which the Applicant was proposing to subdivide the property into two lots and proposing a hotel at 600 Atrium Drive, Somerset; Block 468.01, Lot 21.10, in the CB Zone - **CARRIED TO JUNE 07, 2017 – with no further notice required.**

**DL 06/30/2017**

- **RPM DEVELOPMENT, LLC / PLN-17-00009**

Mr. Peter U. Lanfrit, Esq., Attorney, appeared before the Board on behalf of the Applicant, RPM Development, LLC. Mr. Lanfrit explained that they were before the

Board that evening in which the Applicant was proposing an apartment development at 41 Berry Street, 24, 34 & 36 Voorhees Avenue & 19 School Avenue, Somerset; Blocks 112/117, Lots 1-8, 9.01, 16.01, 25.01 & 42-49/20, in the CMR Zone. He indicated that the Application was to construct six (6) buildings, consisting of 151 residential units in the Redevelopment area within the Churchill Millstone Residential zoning district. He noted that the Application was conforming, except for the need for a variance for the signs that were being proposed to identify the project. Mr. Lanfrit added that the Application met all the density and setback requirements and was well under the allowable height for the buildings, and well under the density requirements of the zone. He testified that the plan that was being presented that evening had been reviewed by the Redevelopment Agency and Township staff on numerous occasions. He added that there was a meeting just the day before with the Township Engineer, Township Planner and other staff where some minor changes were made and now being proposed in conjunction with the plan before the Board.

Mr. Robert Cogan, Architect and Principal of Barton Partners Architects & Planners, came forward and was sworn in. The Board accepted his qualifications. Mr. Cogan then gave the Board some handouts for each of the exhibits he plans to introduce during the hearing. Mr. Cogan then described for the Board the way the site appears today prior to redevelopment. He marked the exhibit into evidence as Exhibit A-1, showing four (4) photographs showing the existing site conditions taken from various locations on the site. Mr. Cogan indicated that the pictures showed that there was a previous construction company that stored various types of materials on the site and left most of it there. He indicated that his firm started the conceptual site plan and then moved on to develop the architectural design of the site. Mr. Cogan indicated that Dynamic Engineering took what they had developed and then worked on the engineering for the Site Plan. He referred to another exhibit, a Site Plan exhibit that would be utilized by the Engineer, and marked it as Exhibit A-2. Mr. Cogan described the five (5) buildings that would be incorporated into the site, along with a "green" park space that the entire site was designed around. He indicated that the park space was not supposed to be limited for use of the development residents, but also for the surrounding neighborhood. He reiterated Mr. Lanfrit's testimony that the density of the development was much less than it could have been, by proposing only 3-story buildings as opposed to 4-story buildings and to introduce more market rate units into the project. At that point, the breakdown was 45% market rate and 55% affordable units. Mr. Cogan then entered into the record as Exhibit A-3, a perspective rendering of the project. He noted that the perspective was centered on the green park space that included street trees, benches and street furniture. He then described the location of the buildings, noting that they make an effort to bring the buildings closer to the street. They also incorporated two-story townhouse type buildings, with their own front doors facing the street to encourage street activities, walkability, etc. Mr. Cogan then entered into the record another perspective rendering that he labeled Exhibit A-4, showing the increased lawn area for active recreation by removing the rain garden. He described using certain elements of the Redevelopment Plan in terms of the materials used and discussed those that were proposed for the exterior of the buildings to bridge the gap between the traditional style of Berry Street and the more modern look for the proposed

project. Mr. Cogan then entered into the record as Exhibit A-5, showed Building A's elevations with the color palette of grays, browns and whites as well as the use of the stone and panels of the lap siding. He further discussed the different architectural elements used on the building.

Mr. Cogan then drew the Board's attention to the breakout of one, two and three bedroom units. He stated that the one bedroom units represented 32%, the two bedroom units comprised 53% and the three bedrooms were just shy of 15%. Mr. Cogan noted that the floor plans were made part of the Application and were included in the Board members' packets. In accordance with Mr. Healey's Planning report, Mr. Cogan indicated that he incorporated the Churchill Millstone Design Standards into the design of the project, which were reviewed and supported by the Redevelopment Agency.

Board Attorney, Peter Vignuolo, then indicated that there was a 16-page packet that included perspective renderings; floor plans of Buildings A, C and D/E; elevations of Buildings A, C and D/E; and photographs of the existing site. He entered this packet into the record as Exhibit A-6. [Included in the A-6 packet are copies of Exhibits A-1; A-3, A-4 and A-5]

Mr. John Palus, Engineer/Planner and Principal of Dynamic Engineering, came forward and was sworn in. The Board accepted his qualifications. Mr. Palus utilized Exhibit A-2, the colorized Site Plan exhibit, as well as introduced Exhibit A-7, which was a colorized aerial view of the site, to frame the discussion. He then spoke about the location of the site and the surrounding area as well as the existing conditions, noting two wetlands areas on the property. Mr. Palus indicated that they currently had approvals to handle the wetlands areas on the property. He then told the Board that there were several access driveways to the site currently and that portions of the site were overgrown with vegetation. He then drew the Board's attention to Exhibit A-2, the colorized Site Plan, and indicated that they were proposing 151 residential apartment units and stated that the lots involved would ultimately be consolidated into one lot. Mr. Palus indicated that they would be able to comply with all the items in the Planner's and Engineering Dept.'s reports, with the exception of a few that he would directly address. He delineated the number of units in each building proposed for the property, as follows:

1. Building A – 43 units
2. Building B – 43 units
3. Building C – 53 units
4. Building D - 6 units
5. Building E - 6 units

According to Mr. Palus, modifications that were being made was that they were providing parking on the interior portions of the building in Buildings A, B and C, internal to the "L" of the buildings. Where there was parking up against the buildings, he indicated that they extend the sidewalks to 6 ft. to address one of the code requirements, with no modifications to the parking area itself. He discussed the

requirements for parking in the Redevelopment area as well as the Residential Site Improvement Standards (RSIS). He stated that they currently were proposing 218 parking spaces on-site and 22 on the street, for a total of 240 spaces. He indicated that they would be losing approximately seven (7) parking spaces along School Avenue due to the utility poles there, but still complying with the Redevelopment Ordinance. He indicated that they would be able to pick up an additional four (4) parking spaces along Berry Street by relocating some utility poles there. Mr. Palus then discussed not striping the internal parallel parking spaces to a 23 ft. length and assume a 20 ft. long space to accommodate for the various types and sizes of vehicles, and thereby gaining an additional five (5) parking spaces overall, for a total of 245 parking spaces (a ratio of 1.62 spaces per unit). He then discussed the Applicant's experience with parking demands of other developments they have constructed, and testified that the provision for parking for the subject site was adequate. With that, Mr. Palus indicated that the Applicant was asking the Board to grant the de minimus deviation from the RSIS requirements. A discussion ensued among the Board. Mr. Palus testified that since the project was a permitted use within the Redevelopment Area and the density was under what was allowed, so the traffic counts were not required. He did state that a traffic analysis was done and submitted as part of the Application. He then discussed the access drives, with the main entrance located off of School Avenue, and two driveways for Building A to the southwest and Building B to the southeast and two driveways on the Berry St. side of the project. He then discussed decreasing the turning radiuses recommended by the Township Engineer as well as the circulation on the site, with the inclusion of 24 ft. wide drive aisles to accommodate emergency vehicles. Also noted was the inclusion of walkways interior to the site as well as along the exterior of the property, as recommended by the Township professionals. Mr. Palus then discussed the locations for exterior masonry enclosed refuse and recycling on the site. He added that Buildings A, B, and C would use internal trash and recycling receptacles and discussed where it would be brought outside the building for pickup.

Mr. Palus indicated that they complied with all of the bulk requirements, were well below the impervious coverage limits, where the Redevelopment Ordinance allows for 100% and they were at 77%, and they were eliminating an existing condition of a front yard setback. Even though they had originally planned for a rain garden concept in the green space between Building A and B that municipalities have been pushing for, the Township was looking for more useable space in that area even with the lower density use. He added that the rain garden wasn't really going to be functioning for ground water recharge, which was going to be handled by the basin further to the east. Mr. Palus then indicated that they have 0.45 acres of green space, primarily open space, so they were planning to enhance that area with some shade areas and seating off to the side. He indicated that the basin would just become a bit larger, but would not have any negative impact. He then drew the Board's attention to the utilities that were available to service the area between Buildings C, D, and E in a north/south direction and have worked with the Township Engineer to create an easement for any future maintenance. Mr. Palus then discussed the lighting for the site, noting that it was not going to be the more intensive lighting that would have been needed for a retail site since it was all residential. He stated that they would be using 33 decorative gooseneck area lights at a



15 ft. height throughout the site. He then spoke about a few building mounted lights located throughout the site. Mr. Palus then drew the Board's attention to the Landscaping plan, noting that they were planning for 90 deciduous trees on the site, 3 ornamental trees, 7 evergreen trees, 510 shrubs, 459 ground covers and perennials and about 3,400 different plantings located throughout the rain garden II area. He indicated that all landscaped areas would be irrigated. Mr. Palus then discussed the storm water management system, which included three (3) basins, two of which would be underground and the other an open basin on the southeast side adjacent to Building B.

Mr. Palus then discussed the proposed signs for the project, noting that they located three (3) signs at the major entrances along each street, and the only variance associated with the Application. He indicated that the signs identify the location, with the street address shown and sat on a stone base. Mr. Palus indicated that they have a sign comprised of 24 sq. ft., including the base, where 20 sq. ft. was allowed. He marked the sign exhibit into the record as Exhibit A-8.

Mr. Healey explained that the sign message was well below the standard, but exceeded the allowable square footage when including the decorative base. He noted that the sign was 3.4 ft. in height, with the base only 2 ft. in height. He passed around the exhibit to the Board for their edification, but stated that it was extremely modest in size and quite attractive.

Mr. Palus stated that there was already a utility easement that currently ran through the property. He noted that the staff reports included some curbing in that area that was proposed and that there would be included a developer's agreement should the curbing need to be disturbed to access the utilities below ground so that the Township would not be responsible for replacing the curbing. Mr. Healey added that should there be any disturbance in the area, it would be RPM's responsibility to replace it.

Mr. Palus also delineated the rain garden area that would be removed and approximately 65-70% would be changed over to green space, with the rest of that area remaining as plantings and have other amenities that they would work out with the Township Planner.

Mr. Mettler then opened a discussion about parking on the interior roadways and asked whether the roads would still be sufficient for fire/emergency vehicles. Mr. Palus answered in the affirmative. Mr. Healey indicated that the Fire Prevention Dept. had reviewed the plans, but did mention that some of the turning radii would have to be evaluated and adjusted to allow for the turning radius of a ladder truck. Mr. Lanfrit indicated that they would agree to work that out with Mr. Hauss, the Fire Prevention Director.

Mr. Mettler then made a comment as a member of the Redevelopment Agency, noting that the agency had been asking the developer for some kind of overall concept that they could see and what was being presented did speak to that request.

Mr. Healey then gave some clarification on some issues already discussed. Regarding the internal roads, he stated that they were really considered private roads and owned and maintained by the Applicant and not the Township. He added that there were certain elements that aide in the design of the site, but that the Applicant would be responsible for maintaining those areas. Similarly, he noted that the park would be open to the public per the testimony of the Applicant, but would also be owned and maintained by the Applicant.

Councilman Chase then opened a discussion regarding the eliminated rain garden area, and Mr. Palus stated that they still had another rain garden in the southeast corner of the site near the basin there that would be used for infiltration ground water recharge on the site. He stated that the proposed rain garden function in the park area was not actually going to function as a true rain garden. He added that the one in the southeast corner was away from the public use and would be able to grow better. A discussion ensued.

Mr. Hauck opened a discussion regarding the street widths of Voorhees, School and Berry streets, not counting the space for parking. Mr. Palus stated that all have at least 24 ft. widths, with Voorhees at 24.5 ft. He added that Berry Street also had an additional 7 ft. shoulder on the other side.

Mr. Healey asked for clarification for the curbing detail on the Township roads, with School Rd. having a straight curb, Berry Street having a consistent curb line with parking spaces along it and Voorhees Street having 9 spaces and remaining as proposed since there were no utility poles there. Mr. Palus concurred with Mr. Healey's statements. Mr. Healey mentioned that there were many connecting sidewalks within the site, but that the Township was trying to encourage sidewalk connections outside of the developments. He suggested that there be drop curbs and crosswalks across Berry Street to connect to the sidewalk in front of Berry Street Commons. Mr. Healey then stated that the Township recently constructed a sidewalk on the easterly side of Berry Street between Blair and Voorhees and asked the Applicant if they would agree to make those sidewalk connections with handicapped curbs and crosswalks. Mr. Palus answered in the affirmative.

Mr. Omolola made a motion to open the meeting to the public. Councilman Chase seconded the motion and all were in favor. Seeing no one coming forward from the public, Councilman Chase made a motion to close the public portion of the meeting. Mr. Omolola seconded the motion and all were in favor.

Councilman Chase asked whether the Applicant had ownership of the various properties involved in the site since he saw many owners' names on the paperwork.

Mr. Brendan McBride, Representative of RPM Development, came forward and was sworn in. Mr. McBride updated the Board on the status of the land acquisitions for the project, noting that it was made up of two assemblages of lots. He testified that they

were currently the owners of 19 School Rd. He noted that the other property, also known as the previous Buist site, an HVAC contractor, was acquired by the Redevelopment Agency through eminent domain in early 2017 and would be conveyed in the next week to RPM Development's project entity.

Mr. Omolola asked whether there was a study that would show that there were no hazardous materials left on the site from the previous use. Mr. McBride testified that the prior owner had done some remediation work, and that they had Phase I environmental assessments for both sites. He noted that there were very limited remaining issues on the site, mostly focusing on oil stains and the like from vehicles that had been parked there. He indicated that there had been extensive remediation done on the Buist site and the owner of that site had all of the issues taken care of and passed inspection by the NJDEP. Mr. McBride stated that they looked very deeply into the reports regarding the remediation prepared by a licensed site remediation professional to understand what had been done. In an abundance of caution, he indicated that they had their consultant go back and do further ground water testing just for assurances that everything was fine.

Mr. Mettler made a motion to reopen the public hearing on the Application for questions of Mr. McBride. Councilman Chase seconded the motion and all were in favor. Seeing no one coming forward, Councilman Chase made a motion to close the meeting to the public. Mr. Mettler seconded the motion and all were in favor.

Mr. Lanfrit gave his summation regarding the work involved to bring the plan to the Board that evening.

Councilman Chase brought up an annex packet attached to the plan submitted to the Township that indicated there were some additional variances requested by the Applicant. Mr. Lanfrit explained that they were design waiver requests that had been discussed with the Township staff. Mr. Healey concurred that there was only a variance for the sign and that the testimony of the architect and engineer demonstrated that they would comply with the design standards set. Mr. Lanfrit then stated that they would agree to comply with all staff reports, other than those represented during the hearing, i.e., the waiver from completing a traffic study that was agreed to with the Assistant Township Engineer.

Councilman Chase made a motion to approve the Site Plan with Sign Variance. Mr. Mettler seconded the motion and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Councilman Chase, Mr. Hauck, Mr. Mettler, Ms. Rangnow, Mr. Omolola

AGAINST: None

## **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

There were no Committee Reports presented.

## **WORKSESSION/NEW BUSINESS:**

There was no work session or new business items to discuss.

## **EXECUTIVE SESSION:**

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

## **ADJOURNMENT:**

Councilman Chase made a motion to adjourn the regular meeting at 9:07 p.m. Mr. Omolola seconded the motion and all were in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Kathleen Murphy, Recording Secretary  
June 6, 2017