

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

**REGULAR MEETING
July 19, 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, Cecile MacIvor, Robert Mettler, Mustapha Mansaray, Charles Brown and Chairman Orsini

ABSENT: Alex Kharazi, Robert Thomas, Jennifer Rangnow and Godwin Omolola

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

RESOLUTIONS:

- **Somerset Atrium Sub-Division/Site Plan**

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

FOR: Mr. Hauck, Vice Chair MacIvor, Mr. Mettler, Mr. Mansaray, Mr. Brown and Chairman Orsini

AGAINST: None

DISCUSSION:

Vouchers:

- **Clarkin & Vignuolo, P.C. (Peter Vignuolo) – July Retainer - \$833.33**

Vice Chair Maclvor made a motion to approve the Vouchers as submitted. Mr. Mettler seconded the motion and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Councilman Chase, Mr. Hauck, Vice Chair Maclvor, Mr. Mettler, Mr. Mansaray, Mr. Brown and Chairman Orsini

AGAINST: None

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Mettler made a motion to open the meeting to the public for any planning comment other than what was being discussed in the hearing that evening. Vice Chair Maclvor 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. Vice Chair Maclvor seconded the motion and all were in favor.

HEARINGS:

- **ASHA ABRAHAM / PLN-17-00001**

Flag Lot Subdivision in which the Applicant wants to subdivide the property into two lots at 199 Wilson Road, Somerset; Block 417.1, Lots 24 & 25, in the R-40 Zone – **CARRIED TO SEPTEMBER 6, 2017 – with no further notification required.**

DL 07/31/2017

- **72-76 MADISON AVENUE, LLC / PLN-17-00006**

Mr. Peter U. Lanfrit, Esq., Attorney, appeared before the Board on behalf of the Applicant, 72-76 Madison Avenue, LLC. Mr. Lanfrit explained that they were before the Board that evening for Preliminary & Final Major Subdivision approval w/Variance in which the Applicant was proposing to re-subdivide the site into six lots at 72-76 Madison Avenue, Somerset; Blocks 540/543, Lots; 1.01 & 4.01/1.01, in the R-10 Zone. He explained that they had been before the Board a few years ago and were granted minor sub-division approval at that time. He noted that the property was then since sold to the Applicant, who now was interested in a major subdivision.

Mr. Michael Ford, Engineer/Planner, employed with Van Cleef Engineering, came forward and was sworn in. The Board accepted his qualifications. Mr. Ford first described the property and showed a colorized version of the Existing Condition Plan, Sheet 2, which was part of the subdivision that was submitted with the Application. He described one large parcel with a paper street between that and another smaller parcel. Mr. Ford indicated that the previous subdivision created three conforming lots. He then told the Board that part of that subdivision included the extension of Madison Street by about 250 ft. to provide for the frontage of the two smaller lots. Mr. Ford then stated that Ruth Street was to remain a paper street, but that it did have a public sanitary sewer within it. The next slide showed a colorized version of Sheet 3 of the Preliminary Plat, which was also submitted as part of the subdivision Application. Mr. Ford stated that what was being proposed was to improve that section of Ruth Street that was an unimproved public right of way with a 20 ft. wide cart way and an intersection at Elizabeth Avenue. He noted that there were six (6) lots proposed, three (3) on each side of Ruth Street that would all have access to public sewer and all would have access to on-site private wells. Since the property was located within the R-10 Zone, there was the availability of 10,000 sq. ft. lots, but were increased to 20,000 sq. ft. lots because there was not both public sewer and water available and that complied with all required bulk standards. He did indicate that there was one technical corner lot that fronted on both Madison St. as well as Ruth Street and did not comply with the requirement for corner lots of 105 ft. frontage, but had a de minimus shortfall of 5 ft. He added that there was also another technical variance because three of the lots back up to Halsey Street, which was another paper street and were considered "through lots" and had frontage on two roads. Mr. Ford testified that they would agree to never have access to Halsey Street, even it became developed in the future. Chairman Orsini then opened a discussion regarding whether there would be access to Madison Street and Mr. Ford used the first exhibit to explain the access that the residents would have out to Elizabeth Avenue..

Mr. Ford then indicated that they had received approvals from Somerset County (with some minor improvements) and the D&R Canal Commission. He then drew the Board's attention to how the storm water management was going to be handled. Mr. Ford stated that storm water management was going to be handled by a number of subtle and important aspects, one being the change of land use of the property. He indicated that a large portion was going to be changed from lawn back over to vegetation in terms of turning it back into woods again, which helps with the storm water run-off situation as well as provides a nice buffer between the rear of the lots there and Rte. 287. Additionally, Mr. Ford spoke about providing for an individual dry well for each single family lot and, in the absence of providing curbing, roadside, water quality grass swales would be included. Lastly, the run-off from the roadside swales would be directed into catch basins and collected and then filtered through mechanical treatment devices, which would help to treat the water run-off to a higher standard since it was within the Delaware & Raritan Canal Commission review area. Mr. Ford reiterated that they had received a review memo from the D&R Canal commission in April of 2017 that they approved the proposed storm water management system and that it complied with their heightened standards, which were also the State standards. Mr. Ford indicated that

they did have some conflict with where some of the treatment devices of the storm water management system were located, but said he spoke to the Township Engineer that afternoon to deal with those issues. He discussed the issue of maintenance of the treatment devices that he had with the Township Engineer, noting that they agreed not to place them in any Township right-of-way so as not to give the Township the responsibility for the maintenance of the same. A discussion ensued regarding their conversation and a solution. Chairman Orsini showed some concern that a private homeowner would have responsibility for maintenance of the treatment devices. A discussion ensued among the Board. Mr. Ford indicated that there was a deed restriction recording required as well as a maintenance agreement signed for the D&R Canal Commission. Mr. Ford indicated that it was part of the Township's ordinance that the homeowner has a professional inspector report the findings to the Township, along with paying a registration fee. He then discussed the alternatives that would include not buildings one of the homes, but instead put in an above ground detention basin. He included many of the reasons why that would not work on the subject property. Chairman Orsini as well as Mr. Mettler expressed concern for burdening an individual homeowner with such a responsibility and expense. Mr. Lanfrit stated that the storm water management system had been reviewed and approved from the D&R Canal Commission as well as the NJDEP and does comply. Chairman Orsini asked whether the maintenance of the system be done through a Homeowner's Association, and Mr. Lanfrit indicated that it was also a possibility. A discussion ensued among the Board.

Mr. Brown noted that the NJDEP had not approved the storm water management system with the treatment devices located outside of the Township Right of Way, and Mr. Lanfrit indicated that they would have to resubmit the revised plans for approval. They then discussed locating the treatment devices on the public right-of-way with a contribution to the Township for ongoing maintenance that he said he discussed with the Township Engineer, but was not agreed to.

Mr. Lanfrit then discussed Mr. Hauss' Fire Prevention report, noting that the right of way was set at 20 ft., which complied with RSIS (Residential Site Improvement Standards), but that Mr. Hauss wanted set at 24 ft. Mr. Ford indicated that they could increase it to 24 ft. and suggested that the treatment devices be placed within that wider right-of-way

Mr. Ford addressed Mr. Healey's comment on his Planning report regarding the proposed Landscaping and buffering plan. He indicated that he would sit down with Mr. Healey to reach agreement on the plan and type of species used. Chairman Orsini then brought up a discussion regarding the need for street lighting and the Board discussed the need for one fixture at the intersection of Ruth Street and Madison Street as well as Ruth and Elizabeth Avenue. They also opened a discussion regarding adding a third street light in the middle of the roadway. Mr. Ford then asked for a waiver for curbs and sidewalks and the Board discussed the inclusion of sidewalks.

Councilman Chase then opened a discussion regarding increasing the cart way to 30 ft. and including a bike lane with no parking allowed on that side of the street.

Chairman Orsini agreed that there should be a sidewalk at least on one side of the road, preferably the northerly side to get it closer to Elizabeth Avenue. Mr. Ford discussed the feasibility, noting that there were some wetlands on the corner lot to consider.

Councilman Chase then discussed the choice of trees planned for the buffer area as well as some suggestions for some undergrowth plantings. Mr. Lanfrit indicated that they would work out the plan with Mr. Healey.

Mr. Lanfrit indicated that there was a requirement in the Engineering report to submit an Environmental Impact Statement, which he stated was included with the Application.

Mr. Lanfrit brought up the suggestion of the possibility to bring public water to the property, but indicated that there was no public water immediately available. He did say that they were in discussions with American Water and would bring it into the development if it were at all feasible. He then added that if they were able to bring in public water, they would be allowed to build homes on 10,000 sq. ft. lots.

Mr. Ford then stated that they would be able to comply with all other comments in the staff reports.

Mr. Healey then reiterated the testimony given for all of the components discussed for the storm water management system, including grassy swales, treatment devices and re-forestation of grass areas into wooded areas as well as pervious driveways. Mr. Lanfrit added that the re-forestation of grassy areas to wooded areas as well as the pervious driveways would be deed restricted so that it would be required to be kept that way.

Vice Chair Maclvor made a motion to open the meeting to the public. Mr. Mettler seconded the motion and all were in favor. Seeing no one coming forward, Vice Chair Maclvor made a motion to close the meeting to the public. Mr. Mettler seconded the motion and all were in favor.

Vice Chair Maclvor made a motion to approve the Application, including an easement outside of the right-of-way for the treatment devices for the storm water management system, 24 year payment required to the Township for maintenance of such devices, sidewalks constructed on the southerly side of Ruth Street (24 ft. cart way) with no street parking, as well as the three LED street lights discussed. Chairman Orsini seconded the motion and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Councilman Chase, Mr. Hauck, Vice Chair Maclvor, Mr. Mettler, Mr. Mansaray and Chairman Orsini

AGAINST: None

ABSTAIN: Mr. Brown

- **DAVANNE REALTY / PLN-17-00010**

Mr. Peter U. Lanfrit, Esq., Attorney, appeared before the Board on behalf of the Applicant, Davanne Realty. Mr. Lanfrit explained that they were there before the Board with a Site Plan in which the Applicant was proposing to construct an additional 55,900 sq. ft. warehouse at 60 Clyde Road, Somerset; Block 86.02, Lot 1.03, in an M-2 Zone. He went on to explain that the Application had been before the Planning Board in 2013, under docket # PLN-13-00011, to construct a parking lot for truck, tractors and trailers on the property. He indicated that the Application had been approved in 2013, and site clearing had been done on the property as a result. After the property had been cleared, Mr. Lanfrit stated that the Applicant had decided to construct a warehouse, which was what they were before the Board that evening to discuss.

Mr. Thomas Muller, Engineer employed with Dynamic Engineering Consultants, P.E., came forward and was sworn in. The Board accepted his qualifications. Mr. Muller drew the Board's attention to an enlarged version of the survey for the property that was part of the submission with the Application. Mr. Muller then entered into the record as Exhibit A-1, showing an aerial, colorized rendering of the property and surrounding area, dated July 19, 2017. He then entered into the record as Exhibit A-2, which was a colorized version of the Site Plan rendering. Next, Mr. Muller entered into the record as Exhibit A-3, the colorized architectural elevations prepared by Cerminara Architects, dated July 19, 2017. Mr. Muller went on to describe the subject property, noting that it was within the M-2 zoning district and surrounded by other light manufacturing uses. He then noted that they had two frontages; one on Clyde Road and one on Jiffy Rd.. Mr. Muller went on to testify that the actual Jiffy Road right-of-way was a dead end along the western property line and, as it continued through the site, it was a private right-of-way easement (50 ft. wide) that the Applicant had control over. He then noted that there was a structure presently situated on the property comprised of 100,800 sq. ft., of which 2,600 sq. ft. was office space and the remainder as warehouse space. Mr. Muller then drew the Board's attention to the wooded area on the site, which was the space they intended to develop and had already been cleared with a tree removal fee already paid to the Township to do so. Mr. Muller then referred to Exhibit A-2, the Site Plan rendering, and handed out reduced sized renderings for the Board's review. He indicated that they were proposing a new warehouse structure comprised of 55,900 sq. ft. to be located on the westerly portion of the site where the previous approval was granted. He added that, inclusive of the 55,900 sq. ft. proposed structure, was 3,000 sq. ft. of office and the remainder comprised of warehouse space. Mr. Muller noted that the proposal complies with all setback requirements, building coverage requirements, floor area ratio, etc. In his testimony, he indicated that they would be seeking one variance for the total impervious coverage on site. He then added that there was an existing parking variance due to the existing size of the parking stalls, which would be eliminated as part of the subject application. Additionally, he stated that there was an existing, non-conforming condition for the existing building with respect to the front yard setback to Clyde Rd. Mr. Muller then explained that the non-conformity would remain post-development; however, it was not exacerbated as part of the proposed

development. Mr. Muller then drew the Board's attention to Exhibit A-3, the architectural renderings, noting the building height of 44 ft., with a maximum of 50 ft. allowed by ordinance. He then described the colors planned for the building and that it would be constructed of pre-cast slab. Additionally, he described the two isolated entrances planned for the structure on the easterly side of the building to provide for the chance there might be two tenants occupying the building. Also provided were four (4) current loading docks as well as two (2) drive-in ramps and a provision for the potential for four knock-out walls to provide an additional four (4) loading docks, depending on the tenants' needs in the future. Mr. Muller then stated that conforming signage would be provided as well. He then drew the Board's attention back to Exhibit A-2, the Site Plan rendering, and noted that the ordinance required 90 parking stalls for the proposed building where they would be providing 98 parking stalls. Mr. Muller added that they were also providing 9 ft. x 18 ft. parking stalls as well as ADA parking stalls to bring the site into ADA compliance. He stated that the parking areas were located strategically around the site and were reorganizing the parking area for the existing building on the northeast corner and providing another isolated parking area in the northwest corner of the existing building as well. Additionally, they were providing two (2) independent parking areas centered on the two (2) entrances for the newly proposed building. A discussion ensued regarding the Chairman's suggestion of the possibility of banking some parking spaces due to the slight overage in impervious coverage. Mr. Lanfrit indicated that they could provide the required 90 parking spaces and bank the others, but he testified that he didn't want to go below the required 90 spaces because they did not as yet know who the tenants would be.

Mr. Healey stated that there was a condition in the ordinance for them to bank up to 50% of the required parking stalls and suggested that they could adjust the amount of required parking when they know who the tenant will be. A discussion ensued among the Board. Mr. Lanfrit agreed to take out eight (8) parking spaces as well as notify the Township if they did not need additional proposed parking spaces when they find out how much parking was needed for the tenant(s).

Mr. Muller then stated that they were planning to mill and overlay the loading area of the existing building to clean up the area. Councilman Chase then inquired as to whether they would be improving Jiffy Rd. since it was in terrible condition. Mr. Muller indicated that the roadway would remain the same since there was no requirement in the 2013 approval to do any improvements there since it was a private easement. Mr. Lanfrit agreed to patch or repair Jiffy Rd., as needed, and would put a note on the plan. He also added that they would be agreeable to have the "private road" sign removed if that was what the Board desired.

Mr. Muller then touched upon access and circulation, stating that they were not doing anything with the access points onto the easement from Clyde Rd. or Jiffy Rd., however, he indicated that they would be cleaning up the access from the proposed parking areas onto the easement area. Mr. Muller then brought up the request from the Fire Prevention Dept. to provide a paved access road around the entirety of the proposed building, so they included a 360 degree circulation throughout the entire site

and will work with the department to satisfy their request for a 24 ft. roadway. He did state, however, that doing so would increase the impervious coverage on the site.

Mr. Muller then drew the Board's attention to the storm water management system designed for the site, noting that it was planned to satisfy all State, County and local requirements, including the Delaware & Raritan Canal Commission. He then indicated that the site would have two independent storm water systems, one with an above ground basin to the rear of the site to the south and the other an underground system to the north of the site. Mr. Muller then noted that all public utilities were available and stated that all electrical and communication lines would be placed underground. He then discussed the Lighting Plan, noting that they would provide all LED lighting fixtures per the request of the Township Planner. He indicated that they would revise the plans to show LED lighting and to bring the uniformity lighting ratios down to meet the requirements.

Mr. Muller then addressed the wetlands on the westerly portion of the property. He indicated that they had NJDEP approval to fill the small pockets of wetlands. He moved on to discuss how trash removal would be handled within the new building. He discussed the locations of the two (2) proposed trash enclosures that were planned to be hidden in the rear notch of the proposed building; however, the Fire Prevention Dept. required them to be set 10 ft. away from the building so that they would be relocated so that refuse trucks would still be able to access them.

Mr. Muller then addressed Mr. Healey's Planning report, speaking in regards to the proposed curbing for the project. He pointed out on Exhibit A-2 the areas where they would not be providing curbing, i.e., in the rear of the building to allow for sheet flow into the detention basin and the easterly portion of the parking area in front of the existing building. He added that they would be maintaining the existing curbing patterns on Jiffy Rd. and proposing some curbing where it was needed to create the driveways.

Mr. Muller then addressed the Township Engineer's report, indicating that they could comply with all items in the report, with the exception of items #18 and #22. In relation to item #18, he asked the Board for a condition of approval to keep the underground detention basin in the loading dock area since the basin was designed to be located in that area and they were planning for significantly thicker pavement section over that area for additional protection. He agreed to work with the Township Engineer on that point. In regards to item #22, Mr. Muller indicated that the above ground basin would be dry most of the year and was designed to drain in much less than three (3) days and was only about 3-4 ft. deep with no pedestrian traffic in that area, so he didn't feel it necessary to provide a 4 ft. fence with maintenance gate there. He also indicated that there were no residential dwellings nearby where children might wander there.

Mr. Muller then testified that they could and would comply with all other comments in the staff reports.

Mr. Hauck stated that he agreed with the Township Engineer that underground detention basins should be in parking areas for maintenance reasons and asked whether the underground basin could be split to be placed under the two front parking areas. A discussion ensued. Mr. Muller stated that all the maintenance manholes for the underground basin were located outside the loading area in the parking areas. Mr. Hauck then inquired about item #20 in the Township Engineer's report regarding a "watertight" basin. Mr. Muller agreed to provide the specifications on the materials used there.

Mr. Healey then noted that the Site Plan had one feature that would not ordinarily be permitted since both buildings have loading docks facing the road and the trucks would be maneuvering in the road to access the buildings. He added that since Jiffy Rd. was a private road on private property with an easement it would be allowed and would not be setting a precedent for future light industrial developments.

Mr. Kevin O'Brien, Planner, came forward and was sworn in. The Board accepted his qualifications. Mr. O'Brien discussed the impervious coverage variance that was required due to the coverage being at 68.8%, where 65% was allowed. Mr. Lanfrit indicated that the impervious coverage percent was lowered due to the giving up of some parking stalls, but might be increased again if they widen the fire lane as requested by the Fire Marshall of the Township. Mr. O'Brien stated that the prior approval in 2013 allowed for 63.9% impervious coverage for outside tractor trailer parking. He then gave planning testimony that supported industrial uses in the zone and noted that the subject property was not near any residential areas. Mr. O'Brien then handed out copies of the aerial shown in Exhibit A- 1. He asked for approval of the impervious coverage variance on the basis of a C-2 argument, that the benefits outweigh any detriments. He added that the impervious coverage coverage was as a result of the request from the Fire Prevention Dept. for a full emergency access roadway, but was slightly mitigated by the removal of some parking areas.

Councilman Chase opened a discussion regarding some impervious coverage in the rear of the proposed building. Mr. Muller indicated that they would not have to include that impervious coverage now that they were moving the trash enclosures.

Mr. Healey asked that the existing, non-conforming setback (48.8 ft.) be included as a requested variance should the Board be inclined to approve the Application.

Vice Chair Maclvor made a motion to open the meeting to the public. Mr. Mettler seconded the motion and all were in favor. Seeing no one coming forward, Mr. Mettler made a motion to close the meeting to the public. Vice Chair Maclvor seconded the motion and all were in favor.

Vice Chair Maclvor made a motion to approve the Application with variances and conditions and limitations discussed during the hearing, including no fence around the detention basin. Board Attorney, Mr. Vignuolo, asked for a percent for impervious

coverage. Mr. Lanfrit felt it might be under 70%, but that they would ask for a variance for 70% coverage. Chairman Orsini seconded the motion and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Councilman Chase, Mr. Hauck, Vice Chair MacIvor, Mr. Mettler, Mr. Mansaray, Mr. Brown and Chairman Orsini

AGAINST: None

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

There were no Committee Reports discussed.

WORKSESSION/NEW BUSINESS:

- **Ordinance – Garden Shed Set Backs**

Mr. Healey explained that this was also a draft ordinance. He went on to explain that currently garden sheds were regulated in two ways; the first, within the zoning ordinance, where if a shed is 100 sq. ft. or less the setbacks were relatively small, ranging from 3ft. to 5 ft., and up to 25 ft. setbacks if the shed was larger than 100 sq. ft. He added that in some instances, the setbacks were 75 ft. to 100 ft. in some zones, and that residents complain that the shed would need to be placed in the center of their property to be conforming. Mr. Healey then stated that the second way they are regulated is through the construction code. He added that if a garden shed is larger than 100 sq. ft. in this instance, a zoning permit was required as well as a construction permit. Mr. Healey then indicated that the State was more than likely going to change the construction code so that only structures over 200 sq. ft. would require a construction permit. He noted that the idea was to move with the State's change to the construction code and do the same for the zoning ordinance. Mr. Healey stated that he felt it was a reasonable change and long overdue. He did state, however, that there were some provisions and safeguards in the draft ordinance. Currently, he stated, the ordinance also limited the height of garden sheds that could be subject to the smaller setbacks to 10 ft. high. He suggested that they go up to 12 ft. high just because of the heights of some of the sheds he had seen at Lowes and Home Depot stores. Mr. Healey then discussed the fact that building coverage and impervious coverage remain unchanged. He indicated that the matter did not require a motion, but that it would be referred to the township Council for review unless any of the Planning Board members had any objections to anything in the draft ordinance.

- **Ordinance -- Leewood RP Amendment**

Mr. Healey explained that this was a draft ordinance and something that the Redevelopment Agency had been working on for some time. He referred to the property in the Leewood Redevelopment Area (200 or so unit build-out for townhomes and condos with a 50% affordable component). He added that there had been some talk with the developer to eliminate one small portion of their redevelopment area, the only area that fronts on Rte. 27, allowing the property owner to develop it for a small commercial site. He described a small convenience store up the road from that area where they did the same thing, locating parking for that commercial business in the rear. Mr. Healey summarized the ordinance amendment by saying that it would keep the site in the multi-family residential zone, but it would extend the Neighborhood Business Overlay Zone (NBO) down to encompass the site that fronted on Rte. 27. He went on to explain that the developer was in discussion with the property owner and the Redevelopment Agency, and if the talks fall through, then the property in question would remain in the multi-family residential zone within the Redevelopment area.

Chairman Orsini asked Mr. Healey to give the Board a better idea of where the property along Rte. 27 actually is located. A discussion ensued among the Board.

Chairman Orsini then asked Mr. Healey where they stood with the Master Plan, and Mr. Healey gave the Board an update of updates they had received from the State regarding the Farmland Plan. He noted that they were not significant, but they were numerous and that he would have to go through all of them. He added that the plan was to present those comments as well as the ERI and the Historic element all at once instead of individually. Mr. Healey then indicated that he would have to work on the Land Use element, and the goal was to get it done by the end of the year. Mr. Healey then discussed the Transportation element, reminding the Board that they had approved an outline for that portion and it now they just needed to go out for an RFP.

Mr. Mettler then inquired of Mr. Healey as to whether the Township had heard anything further on Mt. Laurel. Mr. Healey stated that it was out of the Township's hands and that it was still in the courts and they were waiting for their opportunity to go before the judge in that matter.

EXECUTIVE SESSION:

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

ADJOURNMENT:

Vice Chair MacIvor made a motion to adjourn the regular meeting at 10:00 p.m. Mr. Mettler seconded the motion and all were in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathleen Murphy, Recording Secretary
August 22, 2017