

**TOWNSHIP OF FRANKLIN
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
COUNTY OF SOMERSET, NEW JERSEY**

**VIRTUAL MEETING
October 15, 2020**

This Regular Meeting of the Township of Franklin Zoning Board of Adjustment was held virtually at 475 DeMott Lane, Somerset, New Jersey and was called to order by Chairman Thomas at 7:30 p.m. The Sunshine Law was read, and the roll was called as follows:

PRESENT: Anthony Caldwell, Laura Graumann, Bruce McCracken, Alan Rich, Gary Rosenthal, Robert Shepherd, Joel Reiss, Richard Procanik, Kunal Lakhia, and Chairman Thomas

ABSENT: Cheryl Bethea

ALSO PRESENT: Daniel Lagana, Board Attorney, Mark Healey, Planning Director, and Christine Woodbury, Planning & Zoning Secretary

MINUTES:

- **Regular Meeting – August 6, 2020**

Mr. Reiss made a motion to approve the Minutes, as submitted. Mr. McCracken seconded the motion, and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Mr. Caldwell, Vice Chair Graumann, Mr. McCracken, Mr. Rich, Mr. Rosenthal, Mr. Shepherd, Mr. Reiss, Mr. Procanik, Mr. Lakhia, and Chairman Thomas

AGAINST: None

RESOLUTIONS:

- **Joseph McGuire / ZBA-20-00014**

Mr. Reiss made a motion to approve the Resolution, as submitted. Mr. Rosenthal seconded the motion, and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Mr. Caldwell, Mr. McCracken, Mr. Rich, Mr. Rosenthal, Mr. Shepherd, Mr. Reiss, and Chairman Thomas

AGAINST: None

- **Ananda Mandir, Inc. / ZBA-20-00015**

Applicant was asking for a temporary use permit to conduct events partially outdoors for specific dates at 269 Cedar Grove Lane, Somerset; Block 508.02 Lot 5.03 in an R-40 Zone – Application was approved at the 9/17/2020 hearing, but afterwards withdrawn, and would not be memorialized in a Resolution as a result.

DISCUSSION:

Extension of Time:

- **Franklin II Associates, Ltd. – Appeal of Zoning Decision – CARRIED TO A DATE TO BE DETERMINED – further notification required.**

HEARINGS:

- **PILLAR OF FIRE INTERNATIONAL / ZBA-19-00045**

Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan w/C & D Variances in which the Applicant sought to expand the existing parking lot and add a freestanding sign at 2 Ministry Center Drive, Zarephath; Block 516.01, Lot 1.01, in the Agricultural (A) Zone - **CARRIED TO DECEMBER 3, 2020 – no further notification required.**

Mr. Healey then read the link for the next hearing, through Webex, was read into the record for the Board, the witnesses, and the public's benefit.

- **DADA BHAGWAN VIGNAN INSTITUTE / ZBA-19-00040**

Mr. Peter U. Lanfrit, Esq., Attorney, appeared before the Board on behalf of the Applicant, Dada Bhagwan Vignan Institute. D(3) Conditional Use Variance, "C" Variance and Site Plan in which the Applicant was asking to construct a 21,083 sq. ft. place of worship with parking lot and 5' monument sign at 60 South Middlebush Road, Somerset; Block 37.02, Lot 46.03, in the Agricultural (A) Zone – **CARRIED FROM OCTOBER 1, 2020 – with no further notification required.**

Mr. Lanfrit indicated that the night's hearing was the third hearing in the matter before the Board. He reminded the Board that they were first before them in September, in which time they spent time going over jurisdictional issues. He went on to state that they carried the matter then to the hearing on October 1, 2020, at which time they presented the testimony of Mr. Mistry, the Applicant's architect, and started the testimony of the Applicant's civil engineer, Mr. Ardman. Mr. Lanfrit did explain, however, that due to technical difficulties, the audio on Mr. Ardman's end was not very clear and they decided to carry the hearing to that night's meeting.

Mr. F. Mitchell Ardman, Engineer, employed with the Reynolds Group, 575 Rte. 28, Suite 110, Raritan, NJ, came forward and continued to be sworn in from the last hearing. Mr. Ardman

then put up the exhibits on the screen that he would be relying upon that evening. Mr. Ardman then described the subject property, what it currently consists of and described the surrounding land uses. Mr. Ardman then entered into the record as Exhibit A-1, which was an aerial view of the property with the Site Plan superimposed upon it. He then outlined with his cursor the 15.96-acre parcel that was located on the easterly side of South Middlebush Rd., which was several hundred feet south of its intersection with Cortelyous Lane. Mr. Ardman then indicated that they had approximately 400 ft. of frontage on South Middlebush Rd. He described the driveway as being located at the southern end of the property, which was primarily wooded, and noted the location of the existing residential structure on the property in the center of the wooded portion of the site. Mr. Ardman then discussed the wetlands area at the rear of the property, which he indicated they had a current Letter of Interpretation (LOI) from NJDEP. He then discussed the drainage patterns on the property. Mr. Ardman then told the Board that surrounding land uses included preserved farmland to the north and east, single-family homes to the west and fronting on South Middlebush Rd. as well as Township Open Space to the south.

Mr. Ardman then discussed his review of the Conditional Use Standards for houses of worship as well as the requirements for the Scenic Corridor ordinance that applied to properties along South Middlebush Rd. He then discussed the original concept that was provided to the Township from the Applicant. He noted that the first concept was for the building to be placed, generally, in the center of the site, in the open field portion of the property and about 300-400 ft. back from South Middlebush Road. When presented to Township staff, the proposal was deemed that the building would be too visible from South Middlebush Rd., especially due to it being designated a Scenic Corridor, despite the proposed buffer in the front of the property and on the northern property line. He told the Board that the suggestion by staff was to move the building back further onto the property. Mr. Ardman indicated that they took into consideration the surrounding neighbors, with Franklin Township Open Space to the south. He added that they were most concerned with the two (2) residential neighbors along South Middlebush Rd. and the Scenic Corridor that they were trying to provide buffer from. In siting the building on the property, Mr. Ardman stated that they also took into consideration the wetland pocket in the southern corner of the property, the existing building on the site and the two residential properties in front of the subject property. He testified that they felt that the wooded area would provide a natural buffer and that the rear area would be the most appropriate location on the property because it was furthest from South Middlebush Rd. and from the residential neighbors. Mr. Ardman then stated that deviations from the Conditional Use Standards and Zoning Ordinance included a rear yard setback and a side yard setback situation.

Taking information from Mr. Healey's Planning report and the testimony of Mr. Ardman, the proposal required the following approvals:

- Site Plan approval
- D(3) Conditional Use Variances:
 - Off-Street Parking (112-37.D(1)): 457 parking spaces required – 157 spaces proposed.
 - Parking Location (112-37.E) – The majority of the parking shall be located to the rear of the main structure, with no more than 10% of the total parking located at the front entrance for handicapped accessibility, weddings, and funeral services – parking located in front of the building proposed.

- Building Setback – Side (112-37.G): 75 ft. required – 67.9 ft. proposed.
- Building Setback – Rear (112-37.G): 200 ft. required – 50 ft. proposed.
- Buffer (112-37.K(1) and (2)): Required 15-ft. buffer consisting of double, staggered row of evergreen trees planted at a maximum of 10 ft. on center with a minimum planting height of six (6) to eight (8) feet, or approved equivalent; a mix of evergreen and deciduous shrubs; and a six (6)-ft. high, solid, board-on-board fence OR 25 ft. wide heavily landscaped buffer with triple, staggered row of evergreen trees planted at a maximum of 10 ft. on center with a minimum planting height of six (6) to eight (8) feet, or approved equivalent; and a mix of evergreen and deciduous shrubs – Buffer requirements not fully satisfied in certain areas (e.g., along rear property line).
- Lighting (112-37.K (3)): Maximum mounting height of 15 ft. – 17.5 ft. mounting height proposed.
- “C” Variances
 - Freestanding Sign – Area: 25 sq. ft. permitted – 67.5 sq. ft. proposed.

Mr. Ardman testified that where there was a rear yard deviation, there were open farm fields located there. He also noted that there were only portions of the proposed building that were less than the required 75 ft. side yard setback.

Mr. Ardman then described for the Board how the site would function, utilizing the Dimension Plan, Sheet 4 in the Site Plan, entered into the record as Exhibit A-2. He showed on the screen the location of the entrance driveway that already existing on the property, stating that it would be widened appropriately for two (2)-way traffic and fire service coming into the property. He then noted that the driveway lead into the site, approaching the house of worship and the parking lot located in the front of the building. He continued by saying that circulation on the site would take travelers through a 37-space parking lot to loop around in front of the building under a portico drop-off area, in a counter-clockwise direction leading out of the site. Mr. Ardman then explained that the other driveways shown on the site were to the existing house, noting that the existing driveway to the house was slightly realigned and then connected to the main drive. Mr. Ardman then described the secondary parking lot (120 parking spaces) to the rear of the building and would serve the larger events. He told the Board that the larger parking area was a minimum of 111 ft. from the property line to the north of that area. Mr. Ardman added that the distance to the residence off South Middlebush Rd. was 270 ft. and to the house to the north would be 350 ft. away (Lot 42.05). He then told the Board that there was a wooded area between the house of worship and the rear property line of the subject property that would remain and that they have made every effort to preserve all the existing wooded areas on the property where possible. Similarly, he testified that they were limiting tree removal along the driveway that came into the site to preserve as much buffering as possible to the residence to the south of the property. Mr. Ardman then pointed out the wetlands pocket on the property and noted that they added the fire lane as Mr. Hauss, Fire Prevention Direction, requested. He then showed the Board an area of patios near the drop-off area in front of the building to provide a gathering space before entering the house of worship. He added that at the rear side of the building, there was a secondary patio area for another gathering space and also mentioned the location of the proposed detention basin.

Mr. Ardman then started giving testimony in more detail, starting with the width of the existing driveway was of varying width, but about 12 ft. in width on average. He added that they would be widening that driveway to 22 ft. wide and that it was a technical deviation because the

zone contemplated a residential property here. He noted that they first suggested a 26 ft. wide driveway, but they balanced the width of the proposed driveway between site circulation and emergency access to come up with the 22 ft. width proposal. He testified that the widening of the existing driveway from 12 ft. to 22 ft. took place as much to the north as possible. He also indicated that the driveway was consistently 22 ft. wide throughout the site, and 26 ft. wide in the parking areas. Currently, Mr. Ardman stated that the driveway was graveled and that the proposed driveway would be paved. He then discussed the type of vegetation that was growing between the proposed driveway and the property line, stating that there were some mature trees that would be remaining there. Mr. Ardman then drew the Board's attention to the proposed lighting along the driveway and in the parking areas. He stated that there would be LED type lighting throughout the property, which gives good directional control with good lighting. Based on comments from the Township staff, they reduced the height of the lighting to 15 ft., which was the required standard in the zone and the mounting height. Next, Mr. Ardman indicated that the light poles would be located in the center of the northerly parking lot, at the edge and in the center of the smaller, front parking lot as well as along the northerly edge of the driveway heading out to South Middlebush Rd. He informed the Board that the benefit of having split parking lots was that the lights would only be turned on as needed and the two parking area lights would be on separate systems and they would be turned out when services or other festivities were over. He then added that only emergency, architectural lights would be left on for security purposes.

Mr. Ardman then explained how members would navigate their way from the rear parking lot to the house of worship. He indicated that there would be a sidewalk along the eastern edge of that rear parking lot which connected to a sidewalk that would take them around the easterly parking lot and right onto the patio area and into the building. He also noted that they had a full complement of ADA parking spaces, ramps, and walking path from the parking area in the front of the building. Mr. Ardman then stated that there was about 230 ft. from the front parking lot to the house of worship.

Mr. Ardman then explained how stormwater management would be handled on-site. He testified that they would be able to capture all storm water runoff from the site and pipe it to the detention basin. He also stated that the larger, rear parking lot would have a series of inlets in the parking lot to capture the runoff from the full pavement and pipe it to the stormwater detention basin. Mr. Ardman told the Board that the same would happen with the smaller parking lot and the roof drains would be connected and tied into the stormwater management system. He then explained the three (3) main criteria that they needed to follow to satisfy the NJDEP storm water management standards, i.e., peak run-off rates, water quality and ground water recharge. Since the original submission, he believed that they had been able to address all the stormwater management comments in the CME Engineering review letter as well as comply with the Township and State stormwater regulations. Mr. Ardman noted that the stormwater basin would be a dry basin and not permanently hold water. He then indicated that they had received a review letter from the Delaware & Raritan Canal Commission (DRCC) stating that the Applicant had met the criteria for stormwater regulations.

Mr. Ardman then discussed the fact that the existing home on the property would remain, along with its graveled driveway. He added that about the first 10-15 ft. of it would be paved and the rest would remain graveled. He then explained that refuse would be held in a container inside a trash enclosure that would be placed outside of the parking area. Mr.

Ardman then mentioned that trash pickup would be handled by a hauler who would be able to navigate the site, as designed. He told the Board that the site would be serviced by a well and a septic system, which would be placed on the site with the best permeability. Furthermore, he then told the Board that the plans for the septic system were submitted to the Board of Health. He then pointed out the location of the well to service the house of worship and then told the Board that they would also have a water storage tank for the emergency fire services to use, and that there would be a hookup available to them. He noted that the water storage tank was an underground tank just off the northerly corner of the house of worship.

Mr. Ardman then spoke about the Landscape Plan shown on the screen, which was Sheet 6 of the Site Plans submitted to the Township and entered into the record as Exhibit A-3. He showed the existing vegetation that was along the entrance drive, noting that they had also supplemented, underplanted and back planted along the full length of the driveway as it comes into the sight and recognizing that the closest neighbor was near that area. He told the Board that they would include a variety of evergreen trees to include cedars and other evergreens and wrapped that buffer around the western side of the property line that was close to the residential properties. He then showed shade trees around the parking areas as well as along the length of the driveway and ornamental trees around the building. Mr. Ardman indicated that they would be planting street trees along the frontage on South Middlebush Rd. He then detailed some of the deviations from the required Conditional Use Standards in the zone, including some of the parking located in front of the proposed building. Mr. Ardman stated that in Mr. Healey's Planning report, he indicated that it was his opinion that the proposed site layout did not violate the intent of the requirement because they placed the parking area several hundred feet from the road and within the forested area of the site and a travelling motorist would not be able to see the parking area from South Middlebush Rd. He also added that the original plan had the house of worship closer to the roadway, and the parking was placed behind the building, which would have complied with the ordinance. Next, Mr. Ardman spoke about the buffer requirement and that he felt the intent of that ordinance was met by providing solid screening utilizing the wooded area as well as the distance away from South Middlebush Rd., which was over 800 ft. He then also mentioned that the closest parking lot was over 550 ft. away from the roadway and the parking area closest to the house of worship was over 750 ft. away. To comply with the buffering requirements around the two (2) nearby residential dwellings, some of the existing mature trees would need to be removed and felt that their proposed plans were a better design. He did testify that they were not planning to provide buffering along the northerly and easterly property line as it abuts large open preserved farm fields and will preserve whatever trees that exist along the property line.

Mr. Ardman then spoke about the parking variance for the number of parking spaces that the Applicant would be providing. He again reiterated his testimony regarding the way they broke up the size of the parking lots to accommodate the more frequent events and the larger events with the second lot. He noted that the ordinance required 457 parking spaces, which was based upon 1 parking space for every 15 sq. ft. of open area within the main room of the building. Mr. Ardman explained that they were providing 157 parking spaces within the two parking areas on-site and added that there was ample room on the property to add more parking area if they needed to park more cars on the lot. He indicated that he saw no reason for more tree removal, impervious coverage and visibility and provided what they felt to be appropriate for the uses on the property. Mr. Ardman then detailed the lot coverage requirements and the building coverage requirements of the zone compared to what was

being provided. He indicated that they were allowed 10% building coverage and they were at 3.68%. He added that maximum impervious coverage in the zone was 40% and they were at 18.6%. Mr. Ardman then addressed the restriction by the State concerning the gallonage or usage on the site. He indicated that the standard usage on the site for the septic system would be below 2,000 gallons/day for maximum use for the full occupancy of the building.

Mr. Ardman then drew the Board's attention to Exhibit A-1, noting the various photo locations where pictures were taken on the site. The seven (7) photos were entered into the record as Exhibit A-4, colorized photographs of surrounding neighborhood and taken in early April of 2020. Mr. Ardman explained that the first two (2) photos were taken from the roadway onto the site and would be considered the worst-case scenario with the trees absent any leaves at that time. He spoke about the first two photos showing open fields with a large tree line, which would remain on-site. The next two (2) photos showed the existing driveway with mature trees growing on either side. He also added that the area to the right of the driveway was the location that they would be including all the evergreen plantings. Mr. Ardman noted that photograph #5 was taken from South Middlebush Rd. looking straight back to the wooded area of Lot 45.01 and photograph #6 and #7 were taken showing the mature wooded rear yards of the two residential properties and into the subject property where the house of worship would be placed.

Mr. Ardman then addressed the signage that was proposed on the property. He then drew the Board's attention to the aerial view, Exhibit A-1. He stated that the sign would be placed just north of their existing driveway on South Middlebush Rd. He referred back to the testimony given by the architect at the previous hearing and noted that it would have landscaping at its base. He then told the Board that the total area that they were proposing for the sign was 67.5 sq. ft., including the posts and pillars and frame of the sign, with the sign face at just over 22 sq. ft. Mr. Ardman, working with the architect, felt that the sign was appropriate in size and scale, and the driveway went into the wooded area so they wanted to make sure that it could be seen by members. He then told the Board that the sign would be placed 25 ft. back from the property line and was shown on the dimension plan. Mr. Ardman explained that it met the requirements of the ordinance and did not require a variance. He then stated that it would have LED up lights facing directly on the sign and not be internally lit.

Mr. Ardman then discussed how the utilities would service the house of worship, noting that all other utilities besides septic and well water would be placed underground along the driveway. He then spoke about originally submitting the plans last Fall, 2019, and the hearing being delayed due to the pandemic. He indicated that the Township staff reports had been received and reviewed within that time, and they revised the plans in the meantime to address most of the issues raised in the original staff reports. In discussing the CME report, dated January 9, 2020, Mr. Ardman stated that they had an 8-page report with Engineering comments. After the Applicant sent in a new submission, CME issued a new report, dated May 19, 2020, consisting of about 5 pages. Mr. Ardman then told the Board that after reviewing CME's latest report and going through all their comments, he testified that they would be able to comply with all the remaining items. He added that they had applied and would be obtaining all the outside agency approvals. He also testified that by complying with the remaining comments, they would not be significantly altering what the Board was reviewing that evening.

Mr. Arman then addressed Mr. Healey's Planning report, dated January 8, 2020, with the first four (4) pages dealing with the variances. With respect to the Site Plan comments, Mr. Ardman testified that they would be able to comply with most of the comments in that report. He then indicated that they would be able to comply with all the remaining comments in Mr. Healey's revised Planning report, dated May 21, 2020. He also testified that by complying with the remaining comments, they would not be significantly altering what the Board was reviewing that evening.

Mr. Ardman then addressed a report from the Somerset County Dept. of Health, which indicated that they had no objection to the Application. He then drew the Board's attention to Mr. Hauss' Fire Prevention report and indicated that they had satisfactorily addressed all of his concerns.

Chairman Thomas then asked how many people, according to the State, would the proposed septic system be able to accommodate at one time. Mr. Ardman stated that they would be connecting the house of worship as well as the existing house on the property and that the septic system could handle from 400-450 people at one time, which was calculated by the number of people that could occupy both buildings. Mr. Ardman indicated that in no way did that indicate that they were expecting that number of people on the property at any one time. Mr. Caldwell then asked to be shown the proposed location of the septic system on the property and Mr. Ardman complied utilizing Exhibit A-1. He added that there would be no disturbance to any trees when constructing the septic field which he stated would be 250 ft. from St. Middlebush Rd. Mr. Caldwell then asked how far away from the proposed septic system was the neighbor's well, and Mr. Ardman testified that it would be over the 150 ft. minimum amount of space required. He then calculated that the septic system would be at least 200 ft. to the property line and over 200 ft. to the neighbor's well.

Mr. Procanik referenced the variance that they were seeking to the side yard setback, he asked what was preventing the Applicant from shifting the building to comply with the ordinance. Mr. Ardman explained that there was a little bit more of a clearing in the proposed area they were planning to construct the temple and by moving it the required distance to comply, it would shift the parking, and he indicated they had a bit of a restriction due to the existing home on the property. He then stated that to offset the deficiency in that one area, some additional buffering was requested. A discussion then ensued regarding how shifting the building would also cause it to be closer to the fire lane, which the Fire Prevention Director indicated would be an issue for their ladders. He added that Mr. Hauss preferred to have at least 33 ft. between the fire lane and the building for safety reasons.

Mr. Procanik then asked if they were asking for relief for a deficit of trees being placed on the property. Mr. Ardman stated that they were not able to plant the total amount of trees necessary on the site, but that they were going to be contributing to the Township's tree fund for the remaining 380+ trees. They discussed areas on the property where they could supplement the buffering by planting new trees, but that they did not want to disturb the existing tree line on the property to plant the required number of trees. Mr. Procanik suggested that there were many areas for them to plant trees, specifically around the parking lot and between the parking lot and the basin as well as along the property lines to the north and to the east. Mr. Ardman agreed to look at the plan again to see if there were more opportunities to plant the required number of deficient trees on the property before contributing to the Township's tree fund.

Mr. Procanik then asked if they had committed to adding additional buffering along the neighboring property lines. He said he was specifically asking about additional buffering to the property with the active farm. Mr. Ardman indicated that he did commit to providing additional buffering to the active farm property because he felt it would help to justify the variance being requested for the side yard setback. He indicated that they would be providing the minimum tree size by height for evergreen trees or by caliper for deciduous trees. He also added that they would be speaking to the Applicant going forward to providing more than just that. Mr. Ardman also indicated that they would be including a wildflower/pollinator mix of vegetation in the easterly section of the property near the farm and in the front of the site as well as viburnum, chokeberry, and native species of shrubs/trees.

Mr. Procanik then asked if there was curbing proposed for the center landscaped island in the parking lots. Mr. Ardman stated that there was no curbing proposed and spoke to the concept of "low impact" development as part of the State design standards for storm water management systems. He added that thought in the Agricultural (A) Zone was to allow flow-through in a planted grass strip in places to help drop off and water quality improvements. Mr. Procanik then asked if he considered the use of a rain garden in that area. Mr. Ardman said that they did not consider a rain garden design in that area and that the single infiltration detention basin made the most sense for the design. Mr. Ardman also testified that it would require more tree clearing to accommodate the rain garden design.

Being that the detention basin was in such close proximity to the wetlands on the property, Mr. Procanik asked if an infiltration basin was a better option than a man-made wetland. Mr. Ardman indicated that he felt that the infiltration basin was a better option. A discussion ensued as to the reasoning behind his opinion, and he explained that there had been trouble keeping wetlands basins and even wetlands mitigation maintained based on the natural weather patterns in the area.

Mr. Procanik then asked about what the intended use for the existing residential structure was, and Mr. Ardman stated that it was going to continue to be for a residential use. A discussion ensued regarding parking requirements for that structure, with Mr. Ardman noting that there was a garage and a paver area in front of the garage to allow for four (4) parking spaces, which he indicated was more than what was required. He stated that it did follow Residential Site Improvement Standards (RSIS) in the zone. Mr. Procanik asked about the use of the existing residential structure and if it would act as an accessory use or a principal building. Mr. Ardman indicated that he would defer that response to the Planner for that classification. Mr. Procanik then inquired about whether the parking lot that would allow for headlights to point towards the residential properties have a negative impact on those properties. Mr. Ardman answered that with the distance from the properties and the buffering plantings (evergreen and under plantings), he indicated that it would not negatively affect those residents. He added that the Applicant was permitted to have the parking lot, especially with having more distance than what was required from the property line (75 ft. required/110 ft. provided). Mr. Procanik then suggested Mr. Ardman check the guidelines as he believed that each of the parking lots needed to comply with the ADA guidelines for ADA parking spaces and ADA paths to the house of worship. Mr. Ardman indicated that he would check into the requirements.

Mr. Procanik then asked Mr. Lanfrit if the hearing that evening was appropriately noticed and if it were covered in the Application as possibly having two principal uses. Mr. Lanfrit testified

that the existing residential building was considered an accessory use to be occupied by a clergy member when that person was in town. He then stated that they had already gone through the notification process and that he believed the hearing was properly noticed.

Mr. Procanik then just reminded the Applicant/Board that he would like to see the house of worship shifted to the south, if the location were not dictated by the fire official, and the 385-tree deficit, to be consistent with the ordinance, a more reasonable attempt to put more trees on-site should be made.

Mr. Daniel Lagana, Board Attorney, reiterated Mr. Procanik's observation regarding the location of the building and the side yard setback requirement. He indicated that he believed that Mr. Ardman appropriately described why the building could not be shifted. Mr. Lagana stated that he felt it was more an architectural plan issue rather than an engineering plan issue with the inclusion and location of the vestibule and the portico. Mr. Lagana suggested that perhaps the architect could revise the location of the vestibule, because it was now spilling into the atrium area, they could avoid the possible removable of an ADA parking space. If they eliminated the small bump-out, Mr. Lagana stated that they could then eliminate the one (1) side yard variance.

Mr. Lagana then asked Mr. Ardman if he considered any other location for the ingress/egress driveway on the site. Mr. Ardman stated that they generally did consider other locations but decided to keep it in its current location to eliminate tree disturbance. He added that they considered moving it further north along South Middlebush Rd., which would be a positive for site visibility, but would have an impact on the Scenic Corridor. Mr. Ardman used his cursor to show the Board how they could follow the line of the open field but would have to at some point curve the driveway back into the wooded area, which would cause the need to eliminate more trees. He also stated that it might be construed as a negative impact on the Scenic Corridor as the driveway would be more visible for a longer distance. They then discussed the size of the monument sign, with Mr. Ardman indicating that he felt that the size of the sign was adequately sized regardless of the location of the entrance drive. Mr. Lagana then brought up the fact that the entrance driveway, as it was presented to the Board that evening, was close enough to the residents' driveway that there may be the possibility of an error being made by patrons of the house of worship.

Mr. Lagana then asked if the buffer to the rear of the residential homes would be irrigated. Mr. Ardman stated that they would have the temporary bond in place for the first year or two and that once established, he indicated that they would not get burned out as they were within the woods. Mr. Lagana then asked what the date was for the letter from the Delaware & Raritan Canal Commission, and Mr. Ardman indicated that it was from October 22, 2019. He then explained that the DRCC signed off on all the technical aspects of the plan, with the Township Planning Board copied, but have not been recommended for approval yet as they required Township approval first. Mr. Ardman testified that he could submit any subsequent letter, once received from the DRCC, as well.

Mr. Lagana then opened a discussion regarding the mention about possible banked parking and asked Mr. Ardman to speak to and show the Board the possible location (2) for that parking. Mr. Ardman then indicated that they could bank an extension of their western parking area, possibly another row of parking, but that it would be closer to the residences. He added that they could also bank a portion that was north of the current location of the

entrance driveway. Mr. Lagana then stated that should a future parking area be contemplated north of the current entrance driveway, that would support the notion of perhaps moving the entrance driveway more into the open field to accommodate that possibility. Mr. Ardman testified that he felt that the current location of the entrance driveway could still work should they need to add additional parking on the site.

Mr. Lagana then opened a discussion regarding the current 3 ft. chain link fence that bordered the residential properties and the subject property. He asked if there was any thought to replacing that fence and providing a more substantial fence in that area. Mr. Lagana indicated that it would eliminate sound and any spillage of light coming from the subject property and onto the residential properties. Mr. Ardman indicated that they were not planning on replacing the fence in that area as they were adding substantial vegetative buffering in that area and he also testified that he was fairly certain that the existing chain link fence was not their fence. Mr. Ardman then told Mr. Lagana and the Board that on Lot 45.02, the fence there wrapped around and actually turned back towards the existing dwelling. He also stated that he was not sure if the fence on Lot 45.01 was the same fence, but that it was the neighbor's fence, in any case.

Mr. Lagana then asked Mr. Ardman if they were proposing any way-finding signs on the site, considering the depth of the site. Mr. Ardman stated that they were not proposing any way-finding signs because it was a straight shot back to the house of worship. Mr. Lagana asked if Mr. Ardman saw any concern for patrons going down the driveway leading to the residential home on the property instead of following the road to the parking lots for the house of worship. Mr. Ardman stated that he did not have any concerns regarding that issue, but if the Board thought it would be a problem, he did not see any reason why they could not put a sign indicating that it was a private residential driveway.

Chairman Thomas then reiterated the concerns brought up by Mr. Lagana regarding the possibility of needing additional parking in the future and how the relocation of the current driveway to the open field area would help that situation. The Chairman brought up issues related to the need for more parking to include more people, more cars, and more impact on the neighbors. Secondly, Chairman Thomas stated that they could make a driveway through the open field that enhanced the Scenic Corridor ordinance by utilizing some of the over 350+ tree deficit and line the driveway with trees to enhance the entrance to the house of worship. He added that the driveway could be swung from the open field back to the parking lot and there would be virtually no impact on anyone else should they have the need to add additional parking. Chairman Thomas then said that he liked the idea of the enhanced fence being placed along the property line with the residences to help shield car lights from shining onto their properties.

Mr. Shepherd asked for clarification regarding the distance of the secondary parking lot from South Middlebush Rd. Mr. Ardman indicated that it was approximately 550 ft. Mr. Shepherd then asked about the tree line in the front of the open field on Exhibit A-1 shown on the screen, and Mr. Ardman indicated that that was where they proposed a mix of native pollinators including trees and bushes. Mr. Shepherd then asked about whether the secondary parking lot was going to have shoebox style lighting where the lights illuminated downward, and Mr. Ardman answered in the affirmative stating that the current LED lighting was even more effective and less intrusive, per the ordinance. Mr. Shepherd then inquired about the emergency/security lights on the building and what type of shielding did they have.

Mr. Ardman indicated that they would be downward pointing as well and there would be no spillage off the site. He also noted that the front door was facing inward toward the property and that there was a quite a distance as far as those small lights go, with a minimum of 60 ft., so there would not be any spillage off-site from those lights either. Mr. Shepherd then asked for clarification about what kind of basin they were creating on-site. Mr. Ardman indicated that it was an infiltration detention basin and that it would discharge just outside of the wetlands buffer. Mr. Shepherd then wanted to confirm that the only person(s) staying in the existing house on the property was a member of the clergy who was conducted a service or visiting. Mr. Lanfrit indicated that clergy would only be staying at the house twice a year during high holy days celebrations. Mr. Shepherd then asked about when the lighting for the monument sign would be illuminated. Mr. Lanfrit indicated that it was their intention to only have the sign illuminated when they were having people come to the site.

Mr. Healey then asked why they did not put the proposed building in a more compliant setback situation related to both the side and the rear yard setback variance they were requesting. Mr. Ardman explained that they had to place the building forward away from the wetlands at the rear of the property and away from the existing residential structure and they were also trying to balance the location of the house of worship with the least amount of impact to the neighbors and they would have had some drainage issues with the rear parking lot.

Mr. Healey then opened a discussion with Mr. Ardman regarding the possibility of demolishing the existing home to move the house of worship up in between the two parking areas. Mr. Ardman indicated that it was possible, but that the home was in good condition and could be seen as a resource, even though the clergy would only be using it a few times per year.

Mr. Healey then brought up the fact that one of the professionals for the Applicant should go through the different sections cited in his Planning report regarding the Scenic Corridor ordinance and provide direct testimony. Mr. Ardman then addressed the signage and indicated that he felt it was an aesthetically designed sign with decorative pillars surrounding it as well as landscaping at the base of it. He also added that the ordinance asks for the use of earth tone materials, and they were complying with that in the choice of stone they were using and that they were agreeing to only indirectly illuminating the monument sign. Related to storm water detention, Mr. Ardman mentioned that the detention basin would not be visible at the front of the site and that the ordinance spoke to the balance to achieve between aesthetic value, the Scenic Corridor, storm water management and enhanced water quality, which he felt they achieved, as well as the view to create wildlife habitat. Mr. Ardman indicated that they were achieving the creation of wildlife habitat with the inclusion of the inclusion, in the front and in the rear, of naturalized plantings. He then noted that there were several components of the landscape design that included the preservation of hedgerows, and in this case, the preservation of trees that flank the driveway coming into the site. The Scenic Corridor also speaks to the use of native grasses and wildflower patterns, Mr. Ardman stated that they were including those in the front landscaped area, which they feel met the intent of the ordinance. According to Mr. Ardman, another aspect of the Scenic Corridor ordinance was keeping the entrance drive screened with existing trees so that it could not be seen from the roadway, along with the in-fill of evergreens he spoke about earlier. He then explained that utilities would all be underground, with little disturbance for those on-site, and that they were not proposing no new street lighting along South Middlebush Rd. and just some on their internal entrance drive, but that meet the ordinance intent. Relating to the

building plans, Mr. Ardman indicated that the Architect did speak to the components of the Scenic Corridor ordinance. Mr. Ardman also added that with the photos that he showed that were views from South Middlebush Rd., the distance the trees that were to remain, he did not believe there would be any visual impact from the building to the road.

Chairman Thomas brought up the 200 ft. sidewalk connection between the secondary parking lot to the house of worship and asking if they could cut that distance in half by moving the house of worship 100 ft. closer to it and drastically cutting down on the rear yard variance. He stated that the existing home was only going to be used 4 or 5 days a year, yet it was dictating variances and site plans when they could be lessened or eliminated. Mr. Ardman indicated that they could speak with the Applicant and weigh the options. He did want to remind the Board that by doing the adjustments suggested, it would bring the entire site plan 100 ft. closer to the existing neighbors. A discussion ensued.

Mr. Gregory Asadorian, Esq., Attorney, on behalf of the interested parties, John Warwick III, and Mary Ellen Warwick, property owners of 646 South Middlebush Rd. Mr. Asadorian asked Mr. Ardman various questions regarding the size of the property and whether anyone currently lived in the existing residential dwelling on the property. He also wanted to know how far away from South Middlebush Rd. the existing house was, and Mr. Ardman stated that it was 380 ft. to the rear property lines of the lots fronting on South Middlebush Rd. and approximately 760 ft. from the roadway. He then asked about the distance from the proposed house of worship to South Middlebush Rd., and Mr. Ardman indicated it was approximately 890 ft. away. Mr. Asadorian asked what led to the site plan that was being presented that evening, and Mr. Ardman indicated that they met with the Technical Review Committee (TRC) over the past few years to get the plan to where it was today. They then discussed who was present at those meetings, and Mr. Ardman included members of Police, Fire Prevention, Planning, Engineering, etc. Mr. Asadorian asked what discussions occurred that brought the proposed site plan to the Board, and Mr. Ardman indicated that it was a combination of issues that guided the plans as they were presented that evening. He told Mr. Asadorian that placing the house of worship in the middle of the open field impacted the Scenic Corridor too much. A discussion ensued regarding the tree removal numbers that would occur in moving the temple to its present location on the plans. They then spoke about the topography of the land and whether there was a significant change in slope from the proposed locations for the house of worship. Mr. Ardman testified that there would be no change in the wetlands or wetlands buffer area, but that they would have to excavate for the detention basin and level out the area for the parking lots that would have minimal grade changes. They spoke about the exact grade changes and indicated that they would not be changing the grade by more than 1.5 ft.

Mr. Asadorian then asked Mr. Ardman for the height of the temple building at the different locations and how it was measured. Mr. Ardman stated that the height measurement was the average grade in the front of the building and up to the roofline, but not the parapet. With utilizing the average grade in the front of the building, which was the height definition in the ordinance, the height there was less than 30 ft., as testified to by Mr. Ardman. Mr. Ardman then indicated that the height on the north side would be the same measurement, with the measurement for the south elevation where the property sloped off and where there was a partial basement, the measurement would be higher by about 5 ft. from grade to the roof line. Mr. Asadorian then asked Mr. Ardman for the height of the existing home on the property, and Mr. Ardman stated he did not have an exact measurement. He did testify, however, that the

home was a 2.5 story home, but could not say for sure if the temple was taller or shorter than the existing home.

Mr. Asadorian then drew Mr. Ardman's attention to the fact that there was no parking in front of the temple. Mr. Ardman indicated that they used the area in front of the temple as a drop-off area, ADA parking and a circulation area on-site. They then discussed the provision of 157 parking spaces on-site, with Mr. Asadorian asking for the dimension of the parking spaces. Mr. Ardman indicated that all the parking spaces were going to be sized at 9 ft. x 18 ft., with the ADA parking spaces meeting the criteria for those parking spaces. Mr. Ardman then indicated that six (6) spaces would be designated as ADA parking spaces on-site. Mr. Asadorian then asked how the total number of required parking spaces was calculated, and Mr. Ardman indicated that there were two (2) provisions in the ordinance, including one (1) space per 15 sq. ft. of worship area and another section that described net of no seating as well as a section that was the occupancy total permitted divided – one (1) space per three (3) people, whichever was greater. Mr. Ardman indicated that in this case, the one (1) parking space per 15 sq. ft. of worship spaces came out higher to the 457 spaces as opposed to the occupancy limit, which was calculated at 153 required spaces. Mr. Ardman indicated that the occupancy limit method was much closer to reality, but that the ordinance required 457. They then discussed the distance from the ADA parking spaces to the building, with Mr. Ardman indicating that they were 35-40 ft. from the side entrance and 75-90 ft. from the front entrance.

Mr. Asadorian then inquired about a concrete island, and Mr. Ardman indicated that it would be in front of the building in the drop-off area and where the columns supporting the porte-cochère would be located. Mr. Ardman then gave the dimensions for the concrete island as an 8 ft. x 60 ft. long island. Mr. Asadorian then wanted to know the distance from the island to the curb, and Mr. Ardman stated it was 20 ft. They then spoke about a turning template for emergency vehicles, and Mr. Ardman indicated that he did not have one in front of him, but that they did submit that with the plans. A discussion ensued regarding the sizes of the emergency vehicles in the Township, and Mr. Ardman indicated that the turning template was discussed and reviewed with Mr. Hauss, the Fire Prevention Director, and that he was satisfied. Mr. Asadorian then asked for the location of the fire lane on the plans, and Mr. Ardman indicated that it was on the south side of the building. They then discussed the reason why the fire lane did not wrap around the entire building, with Mr. Ardman explaining that due to the size of the building, and the accessibility from the front and side, the fire official was satisfied that that was sufficient.

Mr. Asadorian then opened a discussion regarding whether a survey was done on the property, and Mr. Ardman answered in the affirmative. Mr. Asadorian asked whether the survey showed a fence at the property line of the Warwicks. Mr. Ardman indicated that there was a 3 ft. high chain link fence at the property line there and that his testimony assumed that that was the Warwicks' fence. Mr. Asadorian testified that the Warwicks' property extended 3 ft. beyond the chain link fence into the site area. Mr. Ardman indicated that he could concur with Mr. Asadorian's statement. Mr. Ardman then stated that they calculated the setbacks from the property line, and not to the Warwicks' fence.

Mr. Asadorian then asked whether there were any covenances, easements or deed restrictions associated with the subject property. Mr. Ardman testified that there were none that they found with the survey that was done.

Mr. Asadorian then asked for the dimensions for the current and the proposed drive aisle into the site. Mr. Ardman reiterated his previous testimony, indicating that the drive aisle width varies now, with the dimensions at the entrance on South Middlebush calculating to 15-18 ft. wide, and about 12 ft. wide for a good stretch of the driveway. A discussion ensued regarding the ordinance requirements for the zone and for other requirements. Mr. Asadorian then asked when the driveway was converted from gravel to pavement whether they were planning to post a speed limit sign along the driveway, and Mr. Ardman stated that he felt that that was a good idea. Mr. Asadorian then asked if there would be any speed bumps on the driveway, and Mr. Ardman indicated that there would not be any included.

Mr. Asadorian asked whether Title 39 would apply, and Mr. Lanfrit indicated that Title 39 did not apply to private property. Mr. Asadorian stated that it can apply and that it can also be petitioned for by the Board as well. Mr. Lanfrit stated that it can apply to shopping center or other higher-trafficked areas, but that he had never seen a Board impose Title 39 restrictions on a house of worship.

Mr. Asadorian then drew the conversation to the increase in impervious coverage on the site, and Mr. Ardman testified that there would be an increase in impervious coverage from existing conditions, approximately a 16% increase, but that it would be less than half of the permitted coverage in the zone.

Mr. Asadorian then asked if Mr. Ardman prepared a sight triangle to the driveway. Mr. Ardman stated that, as part of their review with the County, and was shown on the overall site plan going in both directions (15 ft. x 450 ft. to the north) and a notation to the south as well. A discussion ensued regarding County standards for sight triangles and it may traverse a portion of a neighboring property. Mr. Ardman then testified that they were not proposing an easement or condition on that, however. A discussion ensued regarding the Warwicks' right to plant a tree even if it were within the edge of the sight triangle for the subject property, and Mr. Ardman brought up the topic of plantings within the County right-of-way but could not opine whether or not they would be allowed to plant there.

Seeing the late hour, Mr. Asadorian asked the preference of the Chairman as to whether they wanted to continue with his questioning or save it for the next hearing. He did mention that he had about 20-30 minutes more of questioning. The Chairman as well as Mr. Lakhia agreed that they could hear the rest of Mr. Asadorian's questioning, but that some of the questioning was related to regulatory processes that had already been approved and that counsel was urged to not spend any more time on items that had already been approved by a Township official or on testimony that had already been given by the witness.

Mr. Lanfrit then stated that Mr. Asadorian had spent a great deal of time on the fire issue, he wanted the Board to know that there was a report, dated February 3, 2020, from Mr. Hauss, the Fire Prevention Director, with five (5) comments on it. Mr. Lanfrit indicated that they then revised the plans and incorporated the comments into the changes so that when Mr. Hauss issued another report on May 26, 2020, which should be in the Board's packet, it stated that the revised plans satisfactorily addressed his previous comments from his February 3, 2020 memo to the Board.

Mr. Asadorian then asked questions about the proposed monument sign, asking if it was supposed to be a double-sided sign. Mr. Ardman then answered in the affirmative. Mr.

Asadorian then opened a discussion on the number of colors to be included on the sign, and Mr. Ardman stated that he believed the architect discussed the details of the sign. Mr. Asadorian then asked if any review had been done to ensure that the signage would not block the view when the Warwicks' exited their driveway. Mr. Ardman stated that now that they had the sign set back 25 ft. from the right-of-way, not from the pavement, the sign would not block the Warwicks' view leaving their driveway. Mr. Asadorian then wanted to know if, at the speed limit of 45 mph, would a vehicle be able to see the sign at 25 ft. back from the right-of-way. Mr. Ardman then answered in the affirmative.

Mr. Asadorian then opened a discussion regarding a proposed conservation easement he believed was discussed at the last hearing. Mr. Ardman indicated that they did discuss a conservation easement around the wetlands area on the property at the last hearing. Mr. Asadorian wanted to make sure that the conservation easement was just going to be in place for the subject lot and not for the neighboring lots, and Mr. Ardman concurred. Mr. Asadorian then explained that he thought that the plans showed the conservation easement on the two neighboring properties as well. Mr. Ardman testified that the conservation easement was not shown on the neighboring properties, but just show the wetlands and the wetlands buffer line which was required by NJDEP to show on the plans. Mr. Asadorian then asked for clarification regarding the total disturbance on the property, and Mr. Ardman testified that it would be 5 acres. Mr. Ardman then indicated that they did get Soil Conservation comments, and that the approval was pending until they finalized with them pending comments from the Board.

Mr. Asadorian then drew Mr. Ardman's attention to the Landscaping Plan, and Mr. Ardman indicated that a landscape architect from his firm prepared the landscape plan for the Application. They then discussed that 88 trees would be removed from the property to construct the house of worship, and Mr. Ardman corrected Mr. Asadorian by stated that 95 trees would be removed. Mr. Asadorian also discussed the 385-tree replacement deficit on the property as it related to the affect on wildlife in the area. Mr. Ardman indicated that there was always an affect on wildlife with any development, but that they were within the regulations and were supplementing the trees where possible on the site. Mr. Asadorian brought up the Board suggestion that if the temple was relocated to the center of the two (2) parking lots, then less trees would have to be removed. Mr. Ardman agreed that there was some potential for less trees having to be removed and replaced. Mr. Asadorian suggested that it would lessen the variance related to the tree replacement deficit on the site, and Mr. Lanfrit objected because there was no variance associated with tree replacement. He explained that the Township calculated the number of trees to be replaced on the site, and the Applicant was then able to replace as many as possible on the site and then provide a contribution to the Tree Replacement fund.

Mr. Asadorian then discussed the proposed buffer on the site, and then asked how many feet away from the neighboring property the buffer was going to be. Mr. Ardman indicated that the buffer at the rear of the neighboring properties would start at 10 ft. off the property line and go to about 30 ft. off the property line. He added that they were going to plant around existing trees, supplementing them with evergreen under-plantings, etc. Mr. Ardman also stated that the buffer wrapped around the neighboring properties. He further detailed the plantings by stating that the evergreens would be 6-8 ft. at planting and vary related to the other species that would be included there.

Mr. Asadorian then opened a discussion regarding the Lighting Plan. Mr. Ardman indicated that some of the building wall sconces would be part of the security lighting for the temple, and Mr. Asadorian asked what the foot candles were for those light fixtures. Mr. Ardman explained that they did a grid on the site with all the lighting for the parking lots and some of the building mounted lights, which was shown on Sheet 7 of the Site Plan. Mr. Ardman then testified that all the lighting on the site would have zero (0) foot candles when you reach the property line and no light spillage whatsoever. Mr. Asadorian asked whether the Lighting Plan would comply with the height requirement, and Mr. Ardman answered in the affirmative. Mr. Ardman also reiterated his earlier testimony that the lighting would be turned off when there was no activity on the site, except for the security lights on the building. They then discussed light spillage from automobiles onto the neighboring properties, and Mr. Ardman indicated that the landscape buffer that was described was put in place and supplemented for just that reason.

Mr. Asadorian then asked about noise on the property during construction, and he asked Mr. Ardman how long he anticipated the construction to last. Mr. Ardman indicated that the Applicant would be contracting the construction of the building, but that it could be more than six (6) months total. Mr. Lanfrit then objected to the questioning, as he indicated it was obvious that if the project were approved, it would need to be constructed. Mr. Asadorian was concerned with the noise level, indicating that there was a noise level ordinance. Mr. Lanfrit stated that those issues were beyond the purview of the Zoning Board and that the municipality had ordinances in place involving noise levels if a contractor or worker on the property created noise that was in violation of the ordinances that they would be cited for a violation. Mr. Lagana, Board Attorney, agreed with Mr. Lanfrit that the questioning had to do with the noise ordinance. He stated that they would comply with the hours of operation and they would comply with the noise requirements.

Mr. Asadorian then asked if a Letter of Interpretation (LOI) from NJDEP was obtained, and Mr. Ardman stated that a current one was in place. Mr. Asadorian then asked if the soil removal would affect the wetlands, and Mr. Ardman testified that they were outside of the wetlands. Mr. Asadorian then asked if the change in impervious coverage affect ground water recharge. Mr. Ardman then stated that they had complied with the requirements for ground water recharge by the design of their detention and infiltration basin. Mr. Asadorian then spoke about the fact that the property was serviced by well water, and he asked if the well would be sufficient to serve the development on the property. Mr. Ardman indicated that they would be constructing a new well for the temple building and agreed with Mr. Asadorian that they would have a septic system for the temple. Mr. Asadorian then asked whether there would be a storm water control on the south side of the building. Mr. Ardman answered in the affirmative and stated that the roof drains would be connected to the detention basin system. Mr. Asadorian then asked if there would be a drainage facility to capture the runoff along the perimeter walkway on the south side of the building and on the patio on the northeast side of the building.

The Chairman interjected at this time because the questioning was just a reiteration of testimony that the engineer, Mr. Ardman, had already given and discussed during the earlier part of the hearing. Mr. Lagana, Board Attorney, asked Mr. Asadorian to please limit his further questioning to those that had not already been asked and discussed.

Mr. Asadorian then asked which side of the driveway the underground utility would be on. Mr. Ardman indicated that it would be placed on the northerly side of the driveway, away from Lot 45.02 so as not to interfere with the new plantings they were including.

Mr. Asadorian then asked about the banked parking that Mr. Ardman spoke of earlier. Mr. Lanfrit indicated that there was no banked parking shown on the Site Plan because they were not proposing any banked parking.

Mr. Asadorian then asked if metes and bounds were prepared for the preservation/conservation easement. Mr. Ardman stated that they had not yet done that and that they would typically do that upon Board approval.

Ms. Bailey, Esq., asked for confirmation that she would have an opportunity at the next hearing to question Mr. Ardman regarding his testimony. Chairman Thomas agreed that she would have an opportunity to do so at the next hearing as that was how they typically operated.

Mr. Lagana, Board Attorney, then interjected that after Ms. Bailey has had an opportunity to question the witness who gave testimony this evening, the public will also have any opportunity to do the same at the next hearing.

The Board and Applicant discussed the date for the next hearing, and all agreed - **CARRIED TO NOVEMBER 5, 2020 – with no further notification required.**

DL – 11/20/20

Mr. Healey then explained to the listening public how to connect to the next hearing via Webex and by phone. He also read into the record the direct link to participate in the next hearing.

WORK SESSION/NEW BUSINESS:

There was no work session or new business discussed.

MEETING ADJOURNED:

A motion was made to adjourn the meeting at 10:30 p.m. The motion was seconded, and all were in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathleen Murphy, Recording Secretary
December 5, 2020