

AMENDED MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 23, 2014

PLANNING BOARD

LONG HILL TOWNSHIP

CALL TO ORDER AND STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE

Chairman Pfeil called the meeting to order at 7:31 P.M. He then read the following statement: Adequate notice of this meeting has been provided by posting a copy of the public meeting dates on the municipal bulletin board, by sending a copy to the Courier News and Echoes Sentinel and by filing a copy with the Municipal Clerk, all in January, 2014.

MEETING CUT-OFF

Chairman Pfeil read the following statement: Announcement is made that as a matter of procedure, it is the intention of the Planning Board not to continue any matter past 10:30 P.M. at any Regular or Special Meeting of the Board unless a motion is passed by the members present to extend the meeting to a later specified cut-off time.

CELL PHONES AND PAGERS

Chairman Pfeil read the following statement: All in attendance are requested to turn off cell phones and pagers as they interfere with the court room taping mechanism.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

On a call of the roll, the following were present:

J. Alan Pfeil, Chairman
Brendan Rae, Mayor's Designee
Ashish Moholkar, Member
Guy Roshto, Member
Timothy Wallisch, Member
David Hands, 1st Alternate

Kevin O'Brien, Bd. Planner
Thomas Lemanowicz, Bd. Engineer
Dan Bernstein, Bd. Attorney
Cynthia Kiefer, Bd. Secretary

Excused:

Guy Piserchia, Mayor
Suzanne Dapkins, Vice-Chairman
Gregory Aroneo, Member

Ms. Kiefer advised Chairman Pfeil that he had a quorum and could proceed.

X X X X X X X X X X X

EXECUTIVE SESSION - It was determined that there was no need to hold an executive session.

PUBLIC QUESTION OR COMMENT PERIOD

Chairman Pfeil opened the meeting to the public for questions or comments pertaining to topics not on the agenda for this evening. Seeing none, he closed the meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING

1221 VALLEY ROAD, LLC
1221 Valley Road
Block 10411, Lot 1

#14-02P
Minor Site Plan, Dev. Permit
Waiver, Bulk Variance

PROOF OF SERVICE PROVIDED

Present:

Xuming Wang, Applicant

Mr. Bernstein commented that technically, corporations should be represented by an attorney. He recommended that for relatively simple cases, he saw no problem with the applicant presenting the case without an attorney. He added that if it was a controversial application, the applicant should have an attorney.

Chairman Pfeil asked what the Board had done in the past.

Mr. O'Brien answered that in the past the Board had taken the stance that LLC's were not treated as corporations or other corporate bodies because of the nature of an LLC in the State of New Jersey. He noted that Mr. Bernstein's predecessor took that view and that had been the policy since.

Mr. Bernstein reiterated that if the application was controversial, even if it was an LLC, the applicant should be represented by an attorney. However, in a case such as this, he did not have a problem.

There were no comments from the other board members so Chairman Pfeil asked the applicant to proceed.

Mr. Bernstein swore in the applicant.

The applicant stated his name as Xuming Wang, 1221 Valley Road, Stirling, New Jersey, 07980.

Mr. Bernstein swore in the professionals.

Mr. Wang stated that after Hurricane Sandy, he wanted to install a generator. He referred to Mr. O'Brien's Planning Report dated September 17, 2014 which noted small trailers on the property and also a shed built along the back which were deemed to be not in compliance with the zoning for the building. Those things had been taken care of. The shed had been removed and the small trailers were parked elsewhere.

Mr. O'Brien referred to page 3, Item B where he had stated that the generator had to be above the Base Flood Elevation line which was what Mr. Wang's site engineer had proposed. He suggested that it be placed higher by another foot or two as insurance.

Mr. Wang answered that that would not be a problem.

Mr. O'Brien asked if he would consider putting some sort of enclosure around it so it would not be so obvious.

Mr. Wang said that he would plant trees in the front that would block some of the view.

Mr. O'Brien said that that was not in the current plan. He asked how high above Base Flood Elevation it would be.

Mr. Wang said currently it was three (3) feet but if he added one (1) or two (2) feet, it would be four (4) or five (5) feet above the surface.

Mr. O'Brien clarified that that would be two (2) or three (3) feet above Base Flood.

Mr. Wang said the warehouse was on the "base height" and the generator would be one or two (2) feet above that.

Mr. Lemanowicz said that if the generator was two (2) or three (3) feet above the grade, it would not be an issue.

Chairman Pfeil asked that they settle on Base Flood plus three (3).

Mr. O'Brien said that that would be four (4) or five (5) feet above grade.

Mr. Lemanowicz clarified that that would be the bottom of the generator and asked how high the generator was.

Mr. Wang answered that it was about five (5) feet high.

Comm. Roshto asked why they would raise it two (2) additional feet.

Mr. O'Brien answered that it was for insurance.

Comm. Roshto asked what had been the highest elevation of flood in that area.

Mr. Lemanowicz answered that Base Flood was 214. The surface next to the generator was 215 so the surface was one (1) foot above base.

Comm. Roshto asked what the likelihood of flooding higher than that elevation was.

Mr. Wang said that during Hurricane Irene, it reached the retail store level which was about two (2) feet from the base.

Mr. Lemanowicz asked if the floor was the same elevation throughout the building.

Mr. Wang said that the retail was on a lower base. The warehouse was newly built in 1995.

Mr. Lemanowicz asked if during Irene, which was worse in Long Hill than Sandy, water got into the warehouse.

Mr. Wang answered no.

Mr. Lemanowicz said that the finished floor of the warehouse was 215.21 which was the same elevation as the grade where the generator was proposed. If it was placed one (1) foot above grade, it would be more than one (1) foot above Irene. He felt that Irene was a reasonable benchmark.

Mr. Moholkar clarified that that would be one-foot-and-one-half (1-1/2) above Irene.

Mr. Lemanowicz agreed.

Mr. O'Brien said that that would be less than two (2) feet above surface.

There was some discussion about the actual height. Mr. Lemanowicz suggested that the bottom of the generator should be one (1) foot above the warehouse floor elevation since they knew that the warehouse floor was dry during Irene.

Mr. Wang said he was comfortable with that. Neither Irene nor Sandy had reached even close to the warehouse.

Mr. O'Brien said that the generator would be elevated several feet so he suggested an enclosure.

Mr. O'Brien noted that on the plan, there was a proposed garage door behind the location of the proposed generator.

Mr. Wang said that he would not be installing that door. Instead he planned to place the generator at that location.

Mr. O'Brien said that verbiage to the effect that the garage door would be removed from the plan should be added to any document generated by the Board.

Mr. Wang agreed.

Mr. O'Brien referred to the banked parking which ran to the west of the building, adjacent to the easement which ran back to the Community Center and the DPW. He asked Mr. Wang if there was any reason to build those spaces at this point.

Mr. Wang said that he needed that parking since the business had grown. At times parking had been a problem in the summer when parents came. He wanted to get the parking done also. He noted that it had been previously approved.

Mr. O'Brien agreed saying that there were twelve (12) spaces plus the generator per the plan.

Mr. Lemanowicz noted it was revised May 2, 2014, prepared February 19, 2014.

Mr. Wallisch asked if Mr. Wang was officially applying to pave those twelve (12) spots.

Mr. Wang answered that he was.

Mr. Wallisch said that because it was banked, he did not have to seek further approval.

Mr. O'Brien answered that that was correct however he did have to build them in accordance with the site plan as approved previously.

Mr. Lemanowicz said that, looking at those site plans, grading information was not given for those spots. It just showed them as spots without showing how the grades were going to work. It did not show the extent of the driveway to get into these spots. In his report of July 1, 2014, he said the access drive that went down towards the sewer plant was an easement that was provided by the owner of the property to the west to the township and the applicant could not provide any verification that he also had rights to use that access.

Mr. O'Brien noted that it was referred to in the previous resolution.

Mr. Lemanowicz said that nobody could provide documentation that the property owner who granted the township the right-of-access had also granted this property owner the right-of-access. He reiterated that he could not check grades and there was no limit of the access to get into those spaces.

Mr. Lemanowicz said that as a condition of approval, the Board could ask for a design of the reserve parking area.

Mr. O'Brien said that when Mr. Wang met with the professionals as part of the technical review, he stated that he did have difficulties getting some documentation about the access because of the property owner. It was Mr. Wang's understanding and the understanding of the prior resolution that he did have access to that right-of-way.

Mr. Wang agreed with that statement.

Mr. Bernstein asked if Mr. Wang could supply an easement or right-of-way document for the Board.

Mr. Wang said that after seeing the survey, it was the first time that he saw that part of his property. He did have the deed in the closing documents and it did not have all those details. There was no such document describing the easement and its access in his closing papers.

Mr. Bernstein asked if anyone had complained that he was using it.

Mr. Wang said that he had been using it without anyone complaining about it. He noted that during the technical meeting, it was stated that the township used the same easement for the Community Center.

Chairman Pfeil stated that if the applicant paved the banked spaces and did not have an easement or approval from the neighboring lot, he would be unable to access those spaces. It would make common sense to get that clarified before the Board approved the parking lot.

Mr. Bernstein agreed.

Mr. O'Brien said that during the course of the application, an indenture was discovered dated May 7, 1962 (he handed it to Mr. Bernstein) which he believed described the easement subject to a pipeline grant to the Transcontinental Gas Pipe Corporation. He believed that that was the document referred to in the original resolution.

Mr. Bernstein asked if it was owned by Ridge Pharmacy.

Mr. O'Brien answered that it was transferred to Mr. Wang from Ridge Pharmacy, chain of custody.

Mr. Bernstein asked who the Rosenbergs were.

Mr. O'Brien answered that they had sold the property to Ridge Pharmacy.

Mr. Bernstein noted that it was in the chain of title but he did not see where it said that it was an easement. He asked who the neighbor was.

Mr. Wang said that he thought it was a utility company.

Mr. O'Brien answered that it was the Holland Company.

Mr. Bernstein said that the Holland Company would have to give the applicant a right-of-way easement. He reiterated that it would make sense to get the right-of-way easement before he paved the parking spaces otherwise he would not be able to use them.

Mr. Wang said that it was his understanding that in 1995, the Board granted that plan for the parking lot.

Mr. Bernstein said that at times, boards would hear testimony where someone would say that there was an easement and it was not actually physically presented. He advised Mr. Wang that before he went through the expense of paving the lot, he should provide proof to the town that he did have access.

Mr. Wang reiterated that before he got his construction permit, he would get that proof.

Chairman Pfeil said that it could be a condition of approval.

Mr. Bernstein said that proof would have to be submitted to the Planning Board office and Board engineer with respect to the design of the parking area and the grading.

Mr. Lemanowicz said he would review the original approval to see if the stormwater design accommodated that parking lot. He said that at times, when there is banked parking, the Board forces the applicant to design the basin for the banked parking and sometimes not.

Mr. Hands asked, in regard to the parking, if this plan was the most current.

Mr. Wang said that it was the only plan.

Mr. Hands asked if the parking design was sufficient for people to get in and out. It looked tight to him.

Mr. Lemanowicz answered that it was not a street but an expanded driveway. If it was a street, one would not normally back out into it from a parking area. He felt that as an easement, it probably had light traffic so he didn't feel he needed to make a big fuss over it. There were some lines missing as to where the curbing would go but that could be straightened out.

Comm. Roshto asked for clarification as to whether the banked parking had already been approved.

Mr. Wang answered that it had.

Comm. Roshto asked if Mr. Wang would have had to come back before the Board if he had not been doing this site plan application.

Mr. Lemanowicz said that he would have to review the resolution. The Board approved its *location*. There was no grading. When completed, it would change the parking count which might have an effect on his handicapped parking requirements.

Comm. Roshto said he was trying to ascertain whether it was a condition of approval for tonight since it had been previously approved.

Mr. Bernstein said it could be argued both ways. If the Board found that the plan left gaps, he would argue that the Board had the right and the duty to ensure that it was designed correctly considering the drainage issues facing the township.

Mr. O'Brien said the original application was approved in 1992. If there was any change in that site plan that was approved in 1992, the applicant would have to come back before the Board for an amended site plan. He felt it was in the applicant's interests to get the banked parking as part of this application so that he could go forward without having to

amend what had already been done and allow the Planning Board staff to review it for engineering to make sure it was done properly.

Mr. Lemanowicz said that when this application began, it was just a generator. As of tonight, it included paving. If he went back to the 1995 plan and found that there was a sheet with the grading, he would not have to do anything.

Mr. Bernstein recommended that if the grading was not there, grading plans should be submitted to the Board engineer for his approval. It could be approved tonight without seeing the actual grading plan.

Chairman Pfeil agreed.

Mr. Lemanowicz said, for the record, the grades that were shown were very mild. He didn't see that Mr. Wang would have to build retaining walls since it was relatively flat. It would be relatively simple to do.

Chairman Pfeil said that the banked parking and the access easement had been covered.

Mr. O'Brien said that the pavement would require the removal of approximately half of the trees. He suggested that the Board ask Mr. Wang if he would consider planting additional trees elsewhere on his property. Staff could propose a landscaping plan as a condition of the resolution.

Mr. Wang said that that would not be a problem.

Mr. O'Brien said that there had been several trailers parked on Mr. Wang's property. That evening when Mr. O'Brien went by, there was a trailer in that back driveway. He noted that overnight parking of trailers was not allowed in the township and he asked Mr. Wang what his intentions were.

Mr. Wang said that that trailer was being used and not just parked. Someone would be coming back from a business activity and take that trailer to Berkeley Heights where he had another warehouse.

Mr. Bernstein asked where in Berkeley Heights since overnight parking was prohibited there also.

Mr. Wang said he was surprised when he found out that he could not park vehicles overnight and he had tried very hard to ensure that he had a long term plan so that he would not be in further violation of local ordinances.

Mr. O'Brien said that parking of vehicles in a commercial parking lot was not allowed either. He asked if the vans would be removed also.

Mr. Wang said that they would. They would be brought here only during the daytime. He noted that at times the business activity dictated that they didn't return until 9 or 10 p.m. so there may be several vehicles there at 7 p.m. but they would be moved. By 11 p.m., they would all be gone.

Mr. O'Brien noted that there were pallets and other debris south of the trash enclosure.

Mr. Wang said that the pallets got used from time to time. They saved the pallets for shipping and were there only temporarily. He added that he could put them away. He had no problem with that.

Mr. Lemanowicz noted that there was also a pile of pallets partially buried in the woods.

Mr. Wang said that he would take that away.

Mr. O'Brien said that the dumpster was in the parking lot to the east and south of the building. It was not within the trash enclosure.

Mr. Wang said that that was done that day. There had been some kind of animal in there and the dumpster was removed.

Mr. O'Brien said that the enclosure gates had no fabric.

Mr. Wang said that it would be put back.

Mr. O'Brien noticed a disconnected drain pipe on the southeast corner of the building.

Mr. Wang said that it had been fixed after the last report and then it was damaged again. He said he would fix it.

Mr. Lemanowicz said that in reviewing the application, he noticed that the wetlands transition line went through the area where the sheds had been. He asked if the sheds were going to be put back.

Mr. Wang answered no. He wasn't sure whether he was required to remove the platforms however if necessary, he would remove them.

Mr. Lemanowicz said that they appeared to violate the wetlands transition area and also counted towards impervious and outdoor storage.

Mr. Lemanowicz noted that the signage for the handicapped parking space was not in accordance with the manual on "Uniform Traffic Control Devices".

Mr. Lemanowicz also noted that there was an area light on a "finger of curbing" which had to be repaired.

Mr. Lemanowicz said that aside from the easement issues and the outdoor vehicle and trailer storage, he had nothing more.

Mr. O'Brien stated that this was a site plan application. Minor site plan approval was requested. The accessory structure variance would stand because the generator would be within ten (10) feet of the building.

Mr. Hands said that he often saw cars on the left side of the street to the south. He asked if they were associated with Mr. Wang's business.

Mr. Wang said that if they were on the north side of the street, they were his vans, not passenger cars.

Mr. Hands asked if he planned to keep them there or would the additional parking take care of that.

Mr. Wang said that they were not supposed to park there overnight.

Mr. Lemanowicz noted in his report that that area was shown in a picture with a "NO PARKING" sign along with a van that was marked "Metro Swim Shop". There were two (2) more vans and a passenger vehicle parked on the grass which was in the easement. Immediately next to those cars was a "No Parking Anytime" sign.

Mr. Hands asked who owned that land.

Mr. Lemanowicz answered that it was belonged to the property owner next door--the Holland Company. He noted that it was a municipal sign but he did not know if the sign was authorized by ordinance for enforcement by the local police department. There should be no parking at any time in that area.

Mr. Wang said that that sign was not there when he bought the building. It was erected about two (2) or three (3) years back.

Mr. Lemanowicz said that the cars were not on his property.

Mr. Wang said that this was the first time he was aware that that was not his property.

Mr. Hands said that the new parking area would provide a solution for that.

Chairman Pfeil said that the generator pad and the enclosure of that generator were driving the variance.

Mr. O'Brien agreed.

Mr. Hands said now that that the banked parking area would be used for store vehicles, it would be an active lot.

Mr. Wang said that the vehicles would come in to load and unload from the other side since it was closer to the back door.

Mr. O'Brien asked if they would impact the ability of customers to park at either the front parking lot by the front door or this parking lot on the other side.

Mr. Wang answered that it shouldn't.

Chairman Pfeil said that this would be a diminimus variance which could be offset by service to the public by having a generator to keep his business open.

Mr. O'Brien asked Mr. Wang if he would agree with the statement that the size and shape of his lot was such that this was the best way to accomplish the goal of placing a generator.

Mr. Wang agreed with that statement.

Mr. O'Brien asked if Mr. Wang agreed that the benefits of placing the generator at that location outweighed any detriments.

Mr. Wang agreed.

Mr. O'Brien asked if Mr. Wang could see any impact to the community or any detriment to the surrounding area.

Mr. Wang said that he did not see any.

Chairman Pfeil noted that there were no members of the public present for public comment. He closed the meeting for Board discussions.

Mr. Wallisch asked to hear the final proposal before he commented.

Mr. Bernstein said that it appeared that the conditions for the site plan were more important than the conditions for the variance. There were existing non-conformities and existing non-compliances. He said that if the Board wanted a resolution of the non-conformities, the Board would condition that the generator could not be installed until the site was cleaned up. Or, the Board could allow immediate installation of the generator and have the applicant take care of the site issues at a future date. The former option provided more leverage and he recommended that option.

Mr. Bernstein referred to the banked parking and said that the applicant would have to show staff and him that he had an easement and there would have to be a new plan. This was different than the housekeeping items.

Mr. Wallisch stated that the Board was not an enforcement body. He added that this application was for installation of a generator and for paving a parking lot. If there were constituents that were concerned about the other items, they could bring it to the attention of the enforcement officer. He felt that the board members' responsibility was to say "yay or nay" on what was proposed.

Comm. Roshto stated that he did not feel that they were "piling anything on." He felt that he had heard agreement that the applicant would do those things and when the board members heard the summary they would have to decide if those were the things that they wanted. Once they had that decision, they could decide whether to leverage or not. He wanted to hear the summary.

Mr. O'Brien listed the conditions: (1) prepare a grading and parking lot plan to the satisfaction of the Board engineer, (2) provide proof of the easement, (3) provide a landscaping description or plan to provide additional trees, (4) remove trailers and vans from the property, (5) remove the pallets and debris from the outside especially the south lawn, (6) place the dumpster inside the enclosure, (7) rebuild the enclosure gates, (8) remove the shed platforms, (9) repair the parking lot light, and (10) construct an enclosure around the generator.

Mr. Lemanowicz listed these conditions: (1) place the generator one foot above the warehouse floor elevation, (2) place trailers temporarily parked on the property in a space or in the "bump out" area so as not to block the access aisle.

Chairman Pfeil added that the proposed garage door had to be removed from the plan.

Mr. Bernstein added that there should be no overnight parking and no parking on the township's property.

Mr. Moholkar stated that the first three (3) items on Mr. O'Brien's list were related to the parking lot. The remainder were essentially housekeeping. He expressed concern about putting them all together since the parking lot seemed like a separate issue.

Mr. Bernstein said that that Mr. Wang would not have to decide to do anything about the parking issue. It would not be a condition to the generator installation.

Chairman Pfeil asked if the resolution should be split into two (2).

Mr. Bernstein answered no. With the reserved parking, the conditions would be that Mr. Wang had to prove that he had access and he would have to revise the plans. Neither of these had to be done before he could install the generator. As for the other issues, the Board could discuss whether or not they wanted to leverage them.

Dr. Rae said that he was against the whole idea of leverage. He agreed with Mr. Wallisch and felt that the Board should allow the generator to be installed as quickly as possible, given the time of year and the potential negative impact a storm could have on business. He was in favor of allowing the generator to be installed and then following up with the enforcement officer.

Mr. Bernstein asked Dr. Rae if those non-conformities should be mentioned in the resolution as items that should be taken care of. In other words, would they be conditions that did *not* precede or should they just be noted in the factual findings as items that should be done and give a copy of the resolution to the enforcement officer.

There was agreement amongst some board members.

Mr. Wallisch said that he felt they should vote on the application and let the zoning officer take care of the other items.

Comm. Roshto asked Mr. O'Brien what was on the list that was not an enforcement issue. He noted that trees had been discussed.

Mr. O'Brien said that a landscaping plan or description was suggested because approximately six (6) trees would have to be removed as a result of paving.

Comm. Roshto asked if there were any requests related to the generator that were not enforcement issues.

Mr. Bernstein said that the applicant had offered to plant trees in front of the generator which would then be a condition of the generator.

Mr. O'Brien stated that the issues directly related to the generator were the raising of the generator and the enclosure around the generator as well as taking the proposed garage door off the site.

Mr. Wallisch said that those would be requirements in order to get approval.

Mr. O'Brien reiterated that the "musts" that directly impacted the generator would be raising the generator, enclosing it, providing the bushes as described, and removing the garage door.

For the parking lot, Mr. O'Brien listed provide a grading plan to the satisfaction of the board engineer, provide proof of easement, and provide description of landscaping.

Mr. Moholkar asked about the broken light.

Mr. O'Brien noted that that light existed on the current parking lot on the east side.

Mr. Hands asked if the generator would be sitting in the parking area when it was built.

Mr. Wang said that it would sit on the grassy area. It would not be in a paved area.

Chairman Pfeil asked for a motion to approve the application based on the conditions just for the generator and just for the parking lot without conditioning the housekeeping issues.

Mr. Bernstein asked if he should mention the housekeeping issues in the resolution or ignore them.

Mr. Wallisch recommended not mentioning them at all since this was all about the generator and the parking lot.

Comm. Roshto did not see any harm in listing them. He felt that even though the Board was not the enforcement arm of the Long Hill Township government, it should communicate with them.

Dr. Rae agreed and recommended that they be listed in the factual findings but not as conditions.

Chairman Pfeil and Mr. Moholkar agreed.

Mr. Hands noted that it was part of the testimony.

Mr. O'Brien said that if the Board was concerned about burdening the resolution, it could send a list of non-conformities to the zoning officer.

Mr. Bernstein felt that a letter would have more force than a list in the resolution.

Chairman Pfeil felt that that crossed over into enforcement.

Mr. Bernstein said that he would prefer to list them in the resolution. He noted that the applicant had already stated that he would take care of them in due course.

Mr. Wang agreed.

Mr. Wallisch motioned that the application be approved with the items concerning the parking and the generator placement as described by the Board planner.

Mr. Moholkar seconded that motion.

A Role Call Vote was taken. Those in Favor: Mr. Moholkar, Dr. Rae, Comm. Roshto, Mr. Wallisch, Mr. Hands, and Chairman Pfeil. Those Opposed: NONE. Motion for approval was passed unanimously.

Chairman Pfeil asked if there was other business.

Comm. Roshto stated that he had an update on the Master Plan Committee which met the previous night. He said that at the last Planning Board meeting, the "Valley Road Business District" element was sent back to the Master Plan Committee for a quick review. The Metzler area was reviewed to decide whether or not to turn it into a residential zone as opposed to its current zoning as business. It was decided that it would be going too far to zone areas on Plainfield as residential however if a small planning area of seven (7) properties that were currently residential on Metzler and the corner of Plainfield and Metzler were zoned as residential, it would be a good thing.

Comm. Roshto stated that in the *Limited Industrial Overlay (LIO) Zone** on Bay Street, Magnolia, and Poplar, the Master Plan Committee reduced that zone from nine (9) properties to three (3) based on the feedback from the Planning Board. The current uses of those properties would be the permitted uses in the LIO Zone in an ordinance.

Comm. Roshto said that another planning area that was reviewed was Valley and Main. One of the directions from the Planning Board was not to reduce any conservation areas. The Master Plan Committee thought that the south side of Valley and Main should be rezoned as conservation thereby *adding* to the conservation areas.

*NOTE: subsequently corrected at the 11-11-14 Planning Board meeting by Comm. Roshto to read, "...in the B-2 Zone..."

Comm. Roshto said that the Plainfield Road area was the fourth area of discussion and the Master Plan Committee recommendation was to let that remain as a business area. There was a long triangular piece of property which connected Plainfield and Bay. They discussed if Plainfield and Bay could be connected, would it make sense as a business area to make a complete loop. Bay would connect to that little strip all the way to Plainfield and then come around and connect to Valley Road. He asked if the Board wanted them to pursue that line of discussion and come up with a plan.

Mr. Hands motioned to adjourn. Dr. Rae seconded. A Voice Vote was taken and the motion was unanimously approved. The meeting adjourned at 8:52. p.m.

CYNTHIA KIEFER
Planning and Zoning Secretary

Date