

**DRAFT**

**MINUTES OF THE JUNE 18, 2019 PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
BOROUGH HALL, BOROUGH OF HILLSDALE**

MEMBERS PRESENT: E. Lichstein, E. Alter, Councilman Z. Horvath, F. Franco,  
Mayor J. Ruocco, M. Kates, S. Riordan, S. Raymond,  
Chairman M. Giancarlo

MEMBERS ABSENT: Vice Chairwoman J. Miano, D. Burleson

EMPLOYEES PRESENT: N. Nabbie, Esq. Board Attorney  
C. Statile, P.E., Board Engineer  
M. Haag, Acting Deputy Secretary

Chairman Giancarlo called the meeting to order with a reading of the Open Public Meetings Statement at approximately 7:30pm.

OPEN TO PUBLIC (for matters not on the Agenda):

As no one wished to speak, the meeting was closed to the public.

MINUTES:

The *May 9, 2019 Meeting Minutes* were approved by the Board.

BILLS:

*Invoices from C.P. Statile, P.A.* were approved for payment by the Board.

*Invoices from Cleary Jacobbe Alfieri Jacobs, LLC* were approved for payment by the Board.

COMPLETENESS REVIEW:

***PZ-06-18; Block 1308, Lots 15 & 16: RJN 333, LLC; 333 Washington Ave.***

***Major Site Plan with Variances application***

Board Engineer C. Statile explained that the applicant previously proposed a multi-family application and has revised the application to a four individual lot subdivision. The application is complete. The hearing for this application will take place on July 17, 2019. The applicant will still need to submit a landscape plan as that has not yet been submitted.

M. Kates asked about the completeness of the Orchard Street application. Mr. Statile responded that the application is still in the process of being reviewed.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

**REDEVELOPMENT:** The Hillsdale Planning Board will undertake a preliminary investigation to determine whether the following properties qualify as an Area in Need of Redevelopment (without condemnation) pursuant to the New Jersey Local Redevelopment and Housing Law:

***Block 1207, Lots 8, 9, 10 and 11; Block 1208, Lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5; Block 1209, Lots 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6; Block 1210, Lots 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11; Block 1211, Lots 1 and 2; and Block 1212, Lot 13.***

***DMR Architects prepared a report dated February 2019, as amended in May 2019, titled Preliminary Investigation for Determination of an Area in Need of Redevelopment without Condemnation (the "DMR Report") and will present testimony to the Board in connection with said report.***

Board Attorney N. Nabbie, Esq. swears in professionals.

## DRAFT

**Francis Reiner, PP, LLA from DMR Architects** presenting final four remaining properties as identified in May 2019 report. The presentation is a continuation from the March 26, 2019 and April 16, 2019 planning board meetings. A slide presentation has been prepared.

*Block 1209 Lot 5 - 107 Prospect Place* - Commercial property with single building. Refers to page 88 of May document. Criteria D - Roof leaders drag water across egress driveway create dangerous conditions which is detrimental to health, safety and welfare of the community. Also, regarding the front of property, asphalt property is located at the back of curb which is in violation of ordinance in section 310-58 which requires a 10 foot area between curb and parking. Instead of public sidewalks there are parking stalls. In addition, there is a general lack of adequate lighting and a significant amount of impervious area which drains into the water area in the rear of the property.

Chairman M. Giancarlo asks if this is a re-evaluation of this property and Mr. Reiner confirms that it is.

E. Alter asks if these matters were an issue before the re-evaluation. Mr. Reiner responds that they were not identified before, however after Mr. Statile and the Board pointed a number of these things out he has re-evaluated the property and come back with recommendations.

*Block 1210 Lot 8 - 544 Piermont Ave.* - Refers to page 106 of May report. Commercial building with frontage on two streets. Meets criteria D. Refers to photos from Brookside place. Parking condition is in violation of ordinance section 310-58, requires 10 foot area between parking and street line. No sidewalks or street lights creating a dangerous condition. As per ordinance section 310-113, parking area is not illuminated accurately.

E. Lichstein asks if all properties are dangerous. Mr. Reiner states that because there is no curb cut on properties, vehicles are going in and out of the entire length of the property which creates a dangerous condition.

*Block 1210 Lot 9 - 550 Piermont Ave.* - Refers to page 110 of May report. Single commercial building. Rear portion of building has single driveway. No access into commercial space from the back side. Access point into commercial space is off of the stairs from the street, no sidewalk. Stairs are within the right of way and does not have ADA accessibility. Also, roof leader lines pour out onto the asphalt causing water to run across egress and ingress drive representing a dangerous condition.

M. Kates asks if there are parking issues or are the issues just the leaders and the stairs. Mr. Reiner confirms that the leaders and the stairs are the issues with this property.

E. Alter asks if the stairs are preventing the lack of sidewalks. Mr. Reiner states that the sidewalks would allow pedestrians to be able to access the building without walking on the public street. There is a platform due to a grade change on the property resulting in the stairs being put in and not allowing room for a sidewalk.

*Block 1210 Lot 11 - 77 Brookside Place* - Refers to page 122 of May report. Two story predominantly vacant commercial building with heat and electric. In violation of zoning ordinance 310-58, due to lack of space between the building and public street. Vehicles have to pull out into the street to back out. Parking area is closer than ten feet of the street line, no sidewalks. Roof leader drains across parking lot. In addition, egress doors are above grade of asphalt. There is insufficient lighting and no railing or landing.

Chairman M. Giancarlo asks hypothetically, what would the overview of a compliant area look like. Would that include sidewalks and would the buildings be re-situated? Mr. Reiner replied yes, there would be curb cuts, better lighting, and designed in a way that would meet the criteria of the zoning ordinance and geared more towards safety.

## DRAFT

Mr. Reiner concludes and summarizes his slide presentation. With this recommendation this process would not change zoning and permitted uses, would allow businesses to continue to operate, and does not permit condemnation. Process would need to start all over if the board wanted to permit condemnation. This is not a stepping stone toward future condemnation. An entirely new process would need to begin. This is identifying current issues that need to be addressed. Finally, this designation would give the municipality greater design and development control as they move to the next step of the process which would be a redevelopment plan.

Chairman M. Giancarlo asked which properties are not included in the redevelopment plan. Mr. Reiner replied those properties are B1212 L13 and B 1207 L11.

E. Alter asked Mr. Reiner to repeat exactly what happens with owners of properties if this happens. Mr. Reiner states that if the properties are designated, there would be no zoning change, businesses would continue to operate, no use change and no condemnation.

M. Kates asks if the owners will be required to address issues. Mr. Reiner answered not as part of this report. The DPW and Building Department would determine whether issues need to be addressed in regards to health, safety, and welfare.

E. Lichstein asks if there was a change in ownership would the use stay the same. Mr. Reiner replies that the zoning would not change. They would be allowed to operate a business with a permitted use.

Matter is opened to the public for questions.

**Daniel Steinhagen from Beattie Padovano, LLC** representing CROR. N. Nabbie asks Mr. Steinhagen who his clients are. Mr. Steinhagen states that his clients are TCM and Pana Inc.

Mr. Steinhagen asks if the board has received any written comments from other parties. The board answered no. Mr. Steinhagen questions Mr. Reiner about when he was hired and who hired his firm. Mr. Reiner states that he works for DMR who was hired by the Borough of Hillsdale. Mr. Steinhagen proceeds to question Mr. Reiner about the list of properties discussed at tonight's meetings. Mr. Steinhagen questions if properties previously observed had significantly changed since the last time they were observed or had factors been overlooked. Mr. Reiner states that the board had pointed out issues that had not previously been observed.

Mr. Steinhagen continues to question Mr. Reiner about his testimony and his view regarding the differences between condemnation and non condemnation of properties. Mr. Steinhagen asks Mr. Reiner for his credentials, which are then provided by Mr. Reiner. Mr. Reiner states that he does not have an engineering or architecture degree. He is acting as a Landscape Architect and Professional Planner. Mr. Steinhagen asks if a Landscape Architect or Planner is able to prepare a drainage report, site plan, and stormwater management. Mr. Reiner states not to his knowledge. Mr. Steinhagen questions the appendix included in Mr. Reiner's report and if incidents including accidents were included. Mr. Reiner states that he referred to police department records and building department files going back to 1996 for all of the properties. Mr. Steinhagen asks if a template was used for each property. Mr. Reiner states that each property report is written by scratch for the study and there are similar issues for multiple properties. Mr. Steinhagen continues to question Mr. Reiner about the issues that were observed at the properties.

Mr. Steinhagen refers to page 37 of the report, images 3 and 4, and questions Mr. Reiner about position and size of tractor trailer, as well as other vehicles. Mr. Reiner states that the property has access all around the building. Mr. Steinhagen continues to question Mr. Reiner about what he witnessed at the property.

Mr. Steinhagen asks Mr. Reiner about his testimony regarding businesses being able to continue to operate and if his testimony was hypothetical. Mr. Reiner states that the designation of an area needing redevelopment without condemnation would not change zoning of existing properties. Mr. Steinhagen asks if the plan is to stop redeveloping plan. Mr. Reiner states that he has not been asked to draft a redevelopment plan.

## DRAFT

Mr. Steinhagen questions Mr. Reiner about runoff from the properties into Pascack Brook and concerns with sediments and discharge. Mr. Reiner comments on his findings and that visually certain properties indicate runoff issues. Mr. Steinhagen refers to page 30 in the May report. Mr. Reiner comments that this page states that it is for informational purposes only. Mr. Steinhagen continues to question Mr. Reiner on various sections of the report and wording referring to controls or lack of controls. Mr. Reiner comments on specific properties that he observed to have a lack of control for stormwater runoff management. Mr. Steinhagen asks if the Local Housing Law indicates that lack of stormwater management is a reason for redevelopment. Mr. Reiner answers no.

Mr. Steinhagen asks Mr. Reiner if he has ever testified in support of variance applications as a planner. Mr. Reiner answers no. Mr. Steinhagen asks if Mr. Reiner knows the legal criteria for a C variance and D variance. Mr. Reiner states positive and negative criteria. Mr. Steinhagen asks Mr. Reiner if he is familiar with the concept of special reasons for a use variance.

Board Attorney Nabbie asks Mr. Steinhagen for relevance. Mr. Steinhagen said because Mr. Statile stated that one of the properties in the study area recently got a use variance. Mr. Steinhagen is contending that it advances the general welfare because of the location of the site. Ms. Nabbie states that she doesn't understand how this line of questioning is relevant to what Mr. Reiner is testifying. Ms. Nabbie asks Mr. Steinhagen to move on.

Mr. Steinhagen asks Mr. Reiner about property on Prospect with insufficient lighting. He refers to page 98, property owned by TCM realty. He also refers to page 95, 109 Prospect, TCM property. Mr. Steinhagen also continues to question Mr. Reiner about when the pictures were taken. Mr. Reiner states that he cannot recall.

E. Lichstein comments about a lawn mower in the image.

Mr. Steinhagen asks Mr. Reiner about the location of the utility poles on page 96, image. 3. Mr. Reiner says that the image shows where the driveways are in relation to the street and telephone poles. Mr. Steinhagen asks if the loading dock extends beyond the telephone pole and also refers to image number 6. Mr. Reiner responds that the answer to his question is yes although he would not characterize it as that. Mr. Steinhagen continues to question Mr. Reiner about trucks in loading dock and pictures that were taken.

Mr. Steinhagen asks Mr. Reiner about his comments on the buffer ordinance 310-58. Property located at 115 Paterson Block 1208 Lot 4, pg 59. He asks Mr. Reiner about the handrail and if the property was there before the international building code was in effect before or after the steps were built. Mr. Reiner responds and states that he is testifying that the existing lack of handrail is detrimental to health, safety and welfare to the community. Mr. Steinhagen states that the municipal land use law protects nonconformities and allows them to continue and asks if Mr. Reiner is aware of any evidence of incidences resulting in injury to the member of the public. Mr. Reiner states that he is not aware of any. Mr. Steinhagen has no further questions.

Scott Raymond - 55 Prospect Place - Comments that the report indicates that his building has no lighting and he has 14 lights on his two buildings in the front, back and side. He states that he has a 25 ft. turnaround and he is concerned that this is not accurate in the report.

Attorney representing 105 Pascack Road expresses concerns about timing of meeting and if the board will be getting to his client's application tonight. Board Attorney Nabbie explains how much time may be needed to complete the first application on the agenda. The board is attempting to hear both applications depending on how much time is available.

Mr. Steinhagen calls witnesses. Nick Markantes is sworn in. He is the owner of Westwood Banana Company (TCM) 100 and 109 Prospect. Mr. Markantes comments on the lighting at his property and states that his parking lot is well lit. He submits photographs to the board. Board Attorney Nabbie marks the photographs as exhibit C1. Mr. Markantes states that his trucks never park in the street. They park in the parking lot and they park along and behind the building. He hasn't received any complaints in the past ten years.

## DRAFT

S. Riordan asks if Mr. Markantes trucks unload and leave immediately and if he uses Prospect as an active area between his lots. Mr. Markantes says yes.

E. Lichstein refers to pg 96, image 2 and asks how Mr. Markantes knows that the flashers are on and the truck is moving. Mr. Markantes says there is no proof but there is no reason to park there, they never do.

M. Kates asks the property owner why he is opposed to a designated redevelopment at his site. Mr. Steinhagen states he doesn't think that's an appropriate question. Board Attorney Nabbie states that his client can reveal this if he chooses to. For this proceeding it is relative to the statutory criteria. Ms. Kates states that it would help her to know how the owners are feeling. Mr. Markantes states that he is uncomfortable with what designating the property leads to. Mr. Steinhagen states that this is the time for residents to voice their concerns. His client understands that there is a developer that is trying to acquire sites in the area. This is the time to present the case otherwise there won't be another chance. Board Attorney Nabbie asks Mr. Steinhagen about the possibility of selling properties in an industrial area and possible changes that could take place. Mr. Steinhagen speaks about devaluing properties and grievances. E. Alter states that this board is not responsible for wealth management and is only interested in the common good of the community. Mr. Steinhagen agrees, the board's consideration is limited solely to whether or not it meets the statutory criteria. Board Attorney Nabbie agrees with Mr. Steinhagen on that point.

F. Franco asks Mr. Markantes if he has a policy that trucks are not left out in the street and how many trucks pull in and out each day. Mr. Markantes states that it is his policy and 5-20 trucks will go in and out each day.

Mayor J. Ruocco asks Mr. Steinhagen which statement for Block 1209 Lot 6 on page is not proven. Mr. Steinhagen states neither paragraph one or two meet the criteria. Mayor Ruocco states that the report reads that trucks are backing into traffic. Mr. Reiner refers to section 210-60, it's an unsafe condition. Mr. Steinhagen states there is no evidence this creates an unsafe condition. Mr. Reiner states the faulty arrangement of the loading docks force the trucks to back into the right of way. The design of the building is faulty. Board Engineer Statile comments that there was a time that the town wanted to use the right of way. However, modern day warehousing doesn't use the public right of way. These sites are not modern day sites and predate modern zoning ordinances.

Mr. Reiner clarifies that the report states that there is lighting on the building facade on page 93. Mr. Steinhagen asks if the report says there is lighting for the property across the street, 100 Prospect place. Mr. Reiner says, there is not lighting at that property.

E. Alter asks what addresses do the photographs refer to. Mr. Markantes replies 109 Prospect and 100 Prospect. Board Attorney Nabbie asks for identification of properties in the photos. Mr. Steinhagen replies page 1 is 100 Prospect and 560 Piermont and pages 2 through 6 are of 109 Prospect.

Councilman Z. Horvath asks Mr. Markantes how he accommodates vehicles arriving at the same time each day. Mr. Markantes states there is no specific schedule. There are never 18 vehicles arriving at the same time, but the vehicles use the parking lot across the street as seen in pages 100 and 101.

S. Riordan asks how long it takes to load and unload the trucks. Mr. Markantes states it takes five to ten minutes. Mr. Riordan asks how long the trucks are in the street. Mr. Markantes states for 60 seconds.

Next Witness called is Peter Steck, Professional Planner - 80 Maplewood Ave, Maplewood, NJ. He is sworn in and his credentials as a professional planner are accepted. Mr. Steck reviewed the studies, zoning ordinance and master plan, toured the properties four times day and night, has been present for two prior hearing and listened to meeting recordings. Mr. Steck explains the difference between condemnation and non condemnation. The only difference is public notice. According to local redevelopment housing law, detrimental issues must be proven. Something isn't blighted just because it doesn't meet certain standards. Mr. Steck believes there is a lot of data in the study with no validity. There have been no physical change

## DRAFT

before and after, which means it's an arbitrary study. Mr. Steck goes through each property discussed and explains why they are not to be considered blighted. Once a property is considered blighted, the Planning Board can spot zone a redevelopment plan. There is also no D variance allowed in rezoning. At that point, the redevelopment plan would have to be amended legislatively. Mr. Steinhagen asked if the physical expansion of a structure that's not permitted require a use variance. Mr. Steck replied yes, it would need a D variance.

Mr. Steck comments on parking, drainage, backing into traffic, and low volume of traffic in the area. Mr. Steinhagen asks Mr. Steck to describe a photograph of Park Avenue with angled parking and along Broadway with parallel parking. He also discussed the municipal parking lot and states that there is not a ten foot setback with side street, Central Avenue. This is not unusual in an urbanized area. There are inconsistencies in the properties being considered blighted. Mr. Steck states there is no credible evidence that these properties are blighted.

Mr. Statile asks if Mr. Steck he is referring to properties in the redevelopment plan. Mr. Steck said he is referring to properties in the redevelopment plan.

E. Lichstein asked if the board should use this to decide if a property is blighted. Mr. Steck states that if he was a property owner, this is why he would be concerned of a blight designation even though its non condemnation. Mr. Steinhagen asks Mr. Steck about the evidence being credible. Mr. Steck states just because a newer standard isn't met, doesn't mean it's detrimental to the health, safety and welfare of the public.

S. Riordan states that it seems that Mr. Steck's main concern is questioning why the other two properties aren't considered blighted. Mr. Steck states that's not the answer. The criteria are being misapplied and that is a fatal defect in this report. Mr. Riordan asks Mr. Steck if he agrees with any of the criteria in the study. Mr. Steck states that he represents TCM and Pana Associates. Mr. Riordan asks specific questions regarding the properties that Mr. Steck is representing. Mr. Steck replies to questions. He does not think any of the issues with those properties would result in a blightness designation. Mr. Steinhagen states Mr. Steck is describing physical conditions of the properties as well as pre-existing conditions with the properties.

E. Lichstein questions Mr. Steck on recommendations for curb cuts and parking lots. Mr. Steck replies. Dr. Lichstein asks if a faulty arrangement has to result in an injury. Mr. Steck states substantial credible standards must be met. It cannot be speculative. Mr. Steinhagen states that evidence must be in the record that the health, safety, and welfare of the public have been compromised to justify the designation.

Councilman Z. Horvath asks for explanation of blighted in comparison to area in need of redevelopment. Mr. Steck states the two are identical.

E. Alter states that it seems like condemnation is being used as a scare tactic. Mr. Steck states this just emphasizes the seriousness of it and has advised his clients.

Board Engineer Statile to Board Attorney Nabbie, all of this conversation of condemnation vs non condemnation should not be considered by the board.

E. Alter comments that Mr. Steck's testimony is using scare tactics and speculation concerning spot zoning. Mr. Steck states he is trying to let the board know what can result and that there can be severe impacts. Mr. Statile states this is an issue for the Mayor and Council not the planning board.

Board Attorney Nabbie asks attorney for Patricia Brady - 105 Pascack Road to return to the room. The time is 10:20pm and the redevelopment hearing hasn't concluded. The board is unable to hear another application.

## DRAFT

PZ-02-19; Block 501, Lots 9 & 10; Patricia Brady; 105 Pascack Road

The application will be carried to the July 17, 2019 meeting at 7:30pm and will be placed first on the agenda. No further notice will be published.

Questioning of Mr. Steck continues.

M. Kates questioned Mr. Steck's primary objection. Mr. Steck states the proof does not support that the area is in need of redevelopment.

Mayor J. Ruocco asked Mr. Steck about the term blighted. Mr. Steck states that it wasn't removed from the state constitution. It's a power of the state which has been handed off to municipalities through local redevelopment and housing law. Proofs are identical to declaring an area blighted or in need of redevelopment. The terms are identical, there is no distinction. M. Kates states blighted has three legal definitions. Mayor Ruocco states it also has a connotation of being very rundown. Mr. Steinhagen says our position states that's why the state legislature took the word out of the statute. Mayor Ruocco states to Mr. Steck, you seem to have an issue with the statutory criteria. Mr. Steck states criteria D hasn't changed in years.

Board Attorney Nabbie to Mr. Steinhagen, can we agree the board is focusing on an area of redevelopment. - statute 4812A-5. Can we also agree that based on the testimony from Mr. Reiner that he has given his opinion that it meets criteria D of section 5 of local redevelopment housing? Mr. Steinhagen agrees that it's Mr. Reiner's opinion. Ms. Nabbie, can we also agree that the term blighted is not in criteria D of section 5. Mr. Steinhagen agrees and does not dispute the statutory language.

F. Franco asks questions of Mr. Steck and which properties he has concentrated on. Mr. Steck states the properties have the same conditions so therefore there should be consistency.

Mayor J. Ruocco comments on what the statutory criteria is for criteria D.

Board Attorney Nabbie asks Mr. Steck about Mr. Reiner's statement referring to no changes in underlying zoning. Mr. Steck states that declaring this property in need of redevelopment there's no change to zoning, but that gives the governing body discretion to take other steps. Ms. Nabbie questions whether that is speculative. Mr. Steck agrees that it is speculative, but in his opinion, changes are in the works for a redevelopment plan. Ms. Nabbie doesn't agree and would like Mr. Reiner to weigh in because this is non condemnation. Mr. Steck comments that as far as he's concerned this is a non condemnation area, however there is a possibility of change.

Mayor J. Ruocco comments on affordable housing.  
Mr. Steinhagen also comments.

Chairman M. Giancarlo states this is not the venue to discuss affordable housing.

Mayor Ruocco states there is no redevelopment plan at the moment. Under an affordable housing plan, the things that Mr. Steck says might occur and he is not doing his clients justice by limiting that possibility.

Board Attorney Nabbie states there's nothing that stops anyone from applying for a D variance. Mr. Steck states that can change with this decision.

Chairman Giancarlo states that the Planning Board is not part of the decisions that the town council makes. The two areas are separate. Mayor Ruocco states he is commenting on knowledge that is public.

Opened to the Public for Questions. There were none.

## DRAFT

Board Attorney Nabbie asks Mr. Reiner to address Mr. Steck's comments regarding erasing the underlying zoning. The designation does not change the underlying zoning. Another option is to designate the area in need of rehabilitation which would be a lower threshold with different paths and options. Mr. Steinhagen asks if Mr. Reiner's report suggests rehabilitation. Mr. Reiner states he is simply providing a hypothetical scenario. Mr. Steinhagen asks Mr. Reiner if he's ever been involved with an area that has been designated for redevelopment that didn't happen. Mr. Reiner has been involved with projects that didn't move forward. Mr. Steinhagen asked who paid for the study that Mr. Reiner prepared. Mr. Reiner stated that the borough paid for the study.

Chairman Giancarlo asks Mr. Steck about case law regarding inspections of properties and deciding whether they are in need of redevelopment. Mr. Steck responds with examples.

Mr. Steinhagen calls witness Anthony Cavaniola - 107 Prospect Place - Owner Pana Corp. Mr. Cavaniola is sworn in. Mr. Steinhagen questions the witness.

### Questions from Public.

Joseph Camillieri - 555 Piermont Ave. Mr. Camillieri who is representing his father, questions Mr. Reiner on the disparity between properties. Mr. Reiner explains the differences between properties and references several properties. Mr. Camillieri asks how he could incorrectly report on the lighting of the property. Mr. Reiner states that there was a misunderstanding and the lighting was indicated in the report. Mr. Camillieri states that he is representing his father who is 86 years old and not in a position to renovate. He asked the board to consider how this is impacting the property owners.

Mr. Reiner quotes a citation. An unpublished decision of the appellate decision Civic JC Inc. vs Jersey City Inc. A-4356-15 November 1, 2017.

Mr. Reiner continues to clarify statements.

Mr. Steinhagen asks Mr. Reiner about page 84 of original report. He questions why the original report states that the site lacks lighting and why it was changed. He also asks if any additional changes or conclusions had been made to the report. Mr. Reiner states that no other conclusions in the May report have changes from the original report.

Mr. Steinhagen summarizes. Evidence of conditions being harmful to the health, safety, and welfare of community must be in the record. The facts that determine that properties are in need of redevelopment aren't there and legally unsupportable. The evidence doesn't justify the conclusion.

Board Attorney Nabbie states that the Planning Board will be voting at the special meeting being held on June 27, 2019.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:00pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Maria Haag  
Acting Deputy Secretary