

BOROUGH OF NEW MILFORD  
PLANNING BOARD  
WORK SESSION  
September 20, 2011  
7:30 P.M.

Chairman DeCarlo called the Work Session of the New Milford Planning Board to order at 7:34 pm. The Chairman read the Open Public Meetings Act. All recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Chairman DeCarlo	Present
Mayor Subrizi	Present
Council Liaison Berner	Absent
Secretary Castronova	Absent
Vice Chairwoman Grant	Absent
Ms. Hudak	Present
Ms. Sirocchi	Present
Mr. Santino	Absent
Mr. Pecci	Present
Mr. Loonam, Alt. 1	Absent
Ms. Prisdorf, Alt. 2	Present
Mr. Neiss - Attorney	Present
Mr. Jim Fordham – Engineer	Present

Mr. Gerald Tyne, office located in Bergenfield, attorney representing the applicants answered the Board Attorney's question regarding the Police Chief letter requesting a traffic study of the area. Mr. Tyne stated he would have traffic experts to discuss the impact of the area at the public hearing. In answer to Board Attorney, Mr. Tyne stated he would find out if the experts would be providing a written report.

Chairman DeCarlo stated River Road and Henley Avenue are both County Roads. He was unsure if Henley Avenue west of River Road was also a County Road, however he was sure the traffic light at the intersection was controlled and maintained by the County. In answer to Chairman DeCarlo, Mr. Neiss said to the Board it would be up to the applicant to interface with Bergen County Planning Board to seek if any approvals are necessary. He would advise the Board to make that a condition, if the application was to be approved due to the site being accessed from a County Road.

Chairman DeCarlo noted for the record that Board Attorney would be swearing in the professionals due to only five members being present at the work session. He said this would allow the absent members a chance to review the record, and be prepared for the public hearing.

Mr. Neuls, Hubschman Engineering, 263 S. Washington Avenue, Bergenfield, was sworn in. Mr. Neuls said he would be referring to a colorized version of the plans dated August 10, 2011 with a revision date of September 7, 2011. He said the plans are the same as

what the Board Members received the only difference was his plans were colorized. Mr. Neiss asked Mr. Neuls to mark the colorized version of the plans as A-1.

Mr. Neuls said the plans reflected a change after reviewing the Engineer's letter. He said they eliminated a curb located in the back part of the building which was an impediment. He said they removed three parking spaces to comply with the Fire Advisory Board's request to allow the emergency vehicles to better navigate the turn. Mr. Neuls said the entrance way of parking stall number 115 was striped to allow better flow for the emergency vehicles to access the site. He said they also stripped the parking stall located in front of the dumpster enclosure, after reducing the size of the dumpster enclosure therefore only eliminating one parking spot instead of two. Mr. Neuls said they revised an early version of the parking lot plan that was previously calculated for the property. He said revisions were made in order to comply with the Engineer and Fire Board letter they had received.

Mr. Fordham's questioned the filters in oil-water separator being proposed in the drainage report. Mr. Neuls said the owner is obligated to provide an operation and maintenance plan in accordance with the code. He said he was aware there would be more flooding here than at a typical site and after each flood the filters would have to be evacuated of all silt. He said the DEP approved this parking plan with the drainage calculations for this property previously, but the he was aware he would have to refile with the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) due to a different use, albeit the same size was being located on the site. In answer to Mr. Fordham, Mr. Neuls said he would have to check when the filters are changed on a typical job site not located in a flood zone. He said he recalled the filters typically having to be changed quarterly, but he would be prepared to have that information in time for the public hearing.

Chairman DeCarlo said he didn't expect this drainage system being proposed was designed to handle the river flow in the event of a storm, he assumed this drainage system is designed to handle rain runoff. Mr. Neuls agreed. In answer to Chairman DeCarlo, Mr. Neuls said if the water table winds up overtaking the system and the system are full there is an overflow, he pointed to the infiltration pipe shown on the plans connected to the manhole and then showed how the water would continue into the drainage system.

In answer to Ms. Hudak question, Mr. Neuls agreed the overflow was going into the storm drain located on Harvard Street. She said after the recent Hurricane, residents on Harvard Street had addressed the proposed site has a berm which prevents any water on Harvard Street to flow onto Henley Avenue. She was concerned that the berm would be transformed into a macadam parking lot, and the overflow going into a drain located on Harvard Street leaving residents susceptible to further water damage in the event of a storm. Chairman DeCarlo clarified there was no thru traffic on Harvard Street to address Ms. Hudak's traffic flow concern with regard to the gate location on Harvard Street. Mr. Neuls directed the Board to page A-4 of the plans of the existing conditions on the site. He said currently the proposed site is approximately two feet higher at the highest elevations. He said land would be graded to drain into the proposed storm drainage system. He said the system was designed to handle the additional runoff created by lowering the existing site for the two year storm, ten year storm and one hundred year storms. Mr. Neuls said typically in a one hundred year storm there would be flooding, the proposed drainage system would eliminate most of the silt and provide storage for the

additional runoff which does not exist today in the sites current condition.

In answer to Board Attorney, Mr. Neuls explained how the water generated over an asphalt parking lot is generally not clean with some examples being grease, sediment, non pollutants, rust pollutants, gravel and sediment. He said they have to show how the system will clean 80% of that. The water and sediment would gather in the catch basins located in different areas of the parking lot, enter through a pipe, and then filtered. In answer to Board Attorney, Mr. Neuls said yes the filter cartridges would have to be replaced periodically, typically every few years but he would suggest more frequently at this site due to the close proximity of the River. In answer to Board Attorney, Mr. Neuls said the applicant is required to maintain them, not only by this Board, but also it is a State requirement. Mr. Neuls answered Board Attorney that he would have a typical cost of the cartridges available for the next meeting. He said, the municipality has the ability to inspect them under the storm water management ordinances. He said as a result that is why the boards typically require a maintenance plan as a condition of approval upon granting these types of applications.

In answer to Chairman DeCarlo he said, this drainage system and maintenance plan would cover the entire parking lot and not just the newly proposed section of the lot. In answer to Chairman DeCarlo there is an existing inlet towards Harvard which flows out into the existing storm drain located in the street. He said they are proposing an additional new seepage pit to assist in the infiltration of the existing lot. In answer to Chairman DeCarlo, he said that seepage pit is not filtered; it was designed to collect a portion of the water from the double grated inlet.

In answer to Ms. Hudak, Mr. Neuls said the new proposed lot would be leveled to the current lot. Ms. Hudak questioned the location of the seepage pits which seemed to be all located in the westerly portion of the lot. She questioned how the water would be collected from the eastern portion of the lot. Mr. Neuls said the property would be graded to drain downward towards the west. He said there would be a small portion of the lot that would not be able to catch that water because of the already existing lower elevation than the street. In answer to Ms. Hudak, Mr. Neuls said this system they are proposing was designed to adequately handle the excess runoff from the two, ten and one hundred year storm. It was designed in strict conformance with the State requirements in its size and capacity to handle that runoff. He said, they are required to reduce the excess storm water to 50% of the two year storm, 75% of the ten year storm, and 80% of the one hundred year storm.

In answer to Chairman DeCarlo, Mr. Neuls said if you experience a flood some of its capacity would be compromised, he said typically the rain falls before the river floods, and the peak of the rainfall would be collected in the system, which doesn't exist today. He answered, the State does not require the system to be designed to handle floods, systems are typically designed to handle and reduce the water of the one hundred year storm. In answer to Chairman DeCarlo, Mr. Neuls said excess runoff would be explained by taking the existing conditions today from the site and calculate how much water is going to runoff the site. He said a portion is going to be infiltrated in the soil and part is going to be collected upon the surface, they then calculate using the same analysis for the new proposed parking lot and all the proposed impervious coverage. He said naturally there would be an increase of runoff from that. He said they are required to provide a

system that result in a decrease of runoff. He said the excess runoff is the amount that they are required to retain in order to provide that decrease of runoff. Chairman DeCarlo asked if the excess runoff is the water that does not percolate into the ground. Mr. Neuls answered that would be considered runoff, the excess is designed to handle and reduce 80% runoff from the one hundred year storm.

In answer to Ms. Hudak, Mr. Neuls read from the drainage report that the two year is 4.3” of intensity of rain per hour, the ten year is 5.71” of intensity of rain per hour, and 7.60” of intensity of rain per hour is calculated for the one hundred year storm. He said the figures are based on statistics that have been collected for many years. He said the figures are available from the State of NJ, DEP, and State Climatologists and from other sources. In answer to Ms. Hudak, Mr. Neuls said yes this system was designed for the one hundred year rain intensity and they are required to reduce 80% runoff.

In answer to Board Attorney, Mr. Neuls said the existing land today where the new parking lot is being proposed is at an elevation of 12, they are proposing to grade down to an elevation of 11, and then down to an elevation of 10 in some areas. In answer to Board Attorney, Mr. Neuls said currently the proposed site of the second parking area is higher than the existing parking lot. Mr. Neuls answered; they were required to provide a grading scheme to provide no fill in the flood hazard zone to the DEP. This meant they had to take the volume of soil below the flood hazard elevation and had to provide a zero percent net fill which was why the current site had to be lowered. In answer to Mr. Fordham, Mr. Neuls said he would have the answer available for the next meeting with regard to the zero calculations he said Mr. Hubschman had those figures in the file. He said they had to also consider the existing parking lot and had to design the new lot to be lower in order to avoid a steep incline where the water would drain to. In answer to Board Attorney he said the curb between the two lots would be 5' wide and 6" high.

Mayor Subrizi, questioned parking spot #29 in which the parking notes stated 0.00 ft. front yard setback being provided. Mr. Neuls stated they were seeking a parking variance for that spot which fronted onto Harvard Street due to it being a corner lot and considered to have two front yards. Mayor Subrizi questioned how that spot was at an elevation of 8 whereas the new lot that was being proposed showed certain spots at an elevation of 12. In answer to the Mayor, Mr. Neuls said the current elevation of the existing lot is at an elevation of 8 and they were proposing to keep it level with the existing site. He said the new parking lot would be sloped and allowed to flow into the new drainage system, and the parking stall #29 which was at an elevation 8, the water would drain into the Henley Avenue storm drain not the new drainage system. In answer to Ms. Hudak, the pipe where that system drains is directed towards the river and not toward Harvard Street. He further clarified the land slopes towards the river and the water would travel that way and not toward Harvard Street and eventually into the residential area.

In answer to Ms. Prisendorf, Mr. Neuls answered it was approximately 135' from the end of the proposed parking lot to Rose Lane. In answer to Board Attorney, Mr. Neuls said there is an existing drain by parking stall #20 which drains to a pipe under parking stall #22 into a newly designed seepage pit to the South of parking stall #22. He said this is to provide a benefit to collect additional rain volume which would currently drain onto Henley Avenue. In answer to Chairman DeCarlo, Mr. Neuls agreed the existing inlet is at the end of the current parking lot and would be considered to be located in the middle of

the new proposed parking lot. In answer to Chairman DeCarlo, Mr. Neuls said no the inlet would collect the water on the existing site while grading will direct the additional runoff towards the eight proposed filtered seepage pits. Chairman DeCarlo questioned parking spaces #29-34; he was concerned about flooding in space #29. He asked if the proposed inlet in parking space #33 would collect the runoff from those six spaces which showed an elevation of only 8. Mr. Neuls said they would be graded so they would all drain into that inlet but he agreed parking spot #29 might be flooded more than the others. In answer to Board Attorney, Mr. Neuls said the inlet located in space #33 would be 4' x 4'. Board Attorney questioned if the maintenance plan would provide for cleaning of leaves and other debris from these inlets. Mr. Neuls said he believed so, he said that these inlets are in most commercial area parking lots and are normally examined for leaves and debris. He did not feel there would be a massive influx of leaves at this inlet as most of the trees were situated far north of this particular inlet.

Chairman DeCarlo asked how snow, rock salt, sand affects these filtration systems. Mr. Neuls said the filtered systems are affected, he said generally the salt and snow dissolves but the sand is a concern which is why quarterly inspections are required to see if the system is in working order and if filters have to be replaced. He said that's why the filters are there so those type of materials do not go into our waterways. Mr. Fordham asked if any other type of porous material was looked into other than asphalt. Mr. Neuls said no. In answer to Board Attorney, Mr. Fordham said they do make several different types of porous pavements and porous concrete now, which provides that groundwater recharge. He said they are starting to be widely used in this area he has done some project in Englewood Cliffs. He said they do pose maintenance issues as they do clog up with silt and they have to be routinely vacuumed and cleaned, but they are something to be considered. Board Attorney questioned the site location; Mr. Fordham agreed that material may not be suitable for flood prone areas.

Mr. Neuls discussed the variances needed for the application. He said according to section 30-21.8e a minimum side yard buffer strip where 1.00ft is being proposed and 10' ft is required. Section 30-21.8f states parking in front yards are not permitted and they have existing front yard parking. The Zoning Ordinance requires 9'x20' parking stall size where 9'x18' is proposed. He said minimum front yard setback where 10' is required, existing is 10.50' they are proposing 0'. Side yard where 10' is required, 1' is existing they are proposing 6.29'. He said 106.7 stalls are required in accordance with the code there are 49 existing and they are proposing 115 stalls, he read the parking notes which stated one space is needed for every 40 square foot of gross floor area. He stated the sanctuary is 4,269 square feet allowing for approximately 8 additional spaces over the requirement.

In answer to Chairman DeCarlo the side yard variance is a pre-existing condition, the seven parking spaces currently exist today. Mr. Neuls agreed with Chairman DeCarlo saying the 1' buffer strip is also a pre-existing condition where a retaining wall on the property line abuts the applicants' site. In answer to Board Attorney, Mr. Neuls said 9' x 18' parking stall is the standard in the Residential Site Improvement Standard (RSIS) and it allowed them to reduce the amount of asphalt provided on the site for less impervious coverage, and less drainage to compensate for. In answer to Board Attorney Mr. Neuls said it does not increase the amount of parking spaces due to the width being the same, the length is shortened from 20' to 18' therefore reducing the impervious coverage. In

answer to Chairman DeCarlo, Mr. Neuls said a 24' wide aisle is standard and customary it is also in the Borough requirements. In answer to Chairman DeCarlo, Mr. Neuls said the current parking spaces are 9'x20'. In answer to Ms. Sirocchi, Mr. Neuls said the 6.29 ft side yard variance being proposed adjourns another commercial location and not a residential area. Chairman DeCarlo believed it was Burger King's parking lot. Mr. Fordham agreed. Mr. Neuls said he would have a GPS image to clarify for the record at the next meeting.

In answer to Ms. Sirocchi's question regarding how to get in and out of parking spaces #21- #26, Mr. Neuls answered those spaces are doubled up and do provide parking for members of the clergy or staff members of the church. In answer to Ms. Sirocchi, Mr. Neuls said yes if a person wishing to attend church parked there they could be blocked in. Chairman DeCarlo asked if signage would be provided. Mr. Neuls said, yes there would be signage designating those spots was reserved for members of the clergy.

Chairman DeCarlo questioned if the Mayor and Council were to designate sidewalks on the Harvard Street side of the property would there sufficient space provided due to the location of parking space #29 which is in need of a front yard variance. Mr. Neuls said the sidewalk is 4' wide on Henley Avenue, and there would be sufficient space to allow for the installation of sidewalks and still have 2' remaining between the curb and sidewalk. In answer to Board Attorney, Mr. Neuls said a 6" high existing curb is shown on the plans in front of parking space #29-#34 on Harvard Street. Chairman DeCarlo said he assumed that would be to not allow people coming into the lot from that side. Mr. Neuls agreed. Mayor Subrizi said she felt parking spaces #29-#34 are problematic for a couple of reasons, one being coming so close to the property line, as well as they are all located in the lowest elevation. She asked if there could be consideration to remove them since there is ample parking to cover the requirement. Mr. Neuls said he would speak to the applicants and have an answer at the next meeting. He agreed it was something to consider since they have a surplus of 8 spaces and they would still be within the requirement. Chairman DeCarlo said then the traffic flow would be better since the curbing would be removed allowing for the two lanes to flow better. Mr. Neuls agreed.

In answer to Ms. Sirocchi, Mr. Neuls said they are planning to remove and replace trees which are shown on page 3 of the plans. After much discussion it was decided they are removing approximately 44 trees and replacing 36 trees in the northern part of the site. The Secretary said she would provide them with a copy of the Shade Tree ordinance to make sure they are in compliance with replacing the required amount of trees. Mayor Subrizi asked if any consideration was made about what types of trees due to the location of the site. Mr. Neuls said 6 red maples trees, 8 norway spruce trees, and 22 white pine trees, in which he stated, were all good for a variety of land conditions. Mr. Neuls said he would take into consideration any particular variety of trees if the Board had comments to the proposed ones. Mr. Neuls said he would try to take pictures of the existing trees in time for the next meeting.

Michael Elkin, architect, 19 Park Avenue, Rutherford, said the entrance to the building is remaining in the same location. He said once in the entrance there would be an elevator, elevator machine room and an equipment room, also an office with an existing bathroom. He said the stairs are remaining where they are currently located. He said the layout is basically remaining the same, with separate restrooms for men and ladies in their current

locations. He said the showers would be removed and replaced with upgraded bath fixtures. In answer to Board Attorney, Mr. Elkin said the number of facilities is in accordance with the code. He said they would be adding a kitchen, storage, and a pantry area to the north east section of the building. He said the kitchen would service a multi-purpose room which would be utilized as a Fellowship Hall. Mr. Elkin said the rear of the building had an existing second floor. He said there would be nothing over the proposed sanctuary room. He said they are moving the sanctuary north wall, where the current walkway for the racquetball court had existed, in order to make the sanctuary room larger. He said they are proposing a youth group room which would be open above, and there would be all new exit doors on that exterior wall. He said at the end of the corridor another existing stairway was located, and there would be a new south exit door.

Mr. Elkin said they are adding a one story small 13 ½' x 11' addition for a maintenance storage area for lawn mowers, snow blowers, and other small, various, outdoor maintenance equipment. Ms. Sirocchi questioned the architect plans show an addition while the site plan showed a shed. Mr. Elkin said it would be the same thing. Ms. Sirocchi said she didn't consider it the same. He said the walls would be attached to the building and it would not be a free standing shed. Ms. Sirocchi asked what the sizes of the rooms were. Mr. Elkin said he provided the square footage of the rooms. Ms. Sirocchi wanted to know the approximate size of the nursery/ choir room. He said it is not a nursery school room. Ms. Sirocchi said she was just reading the plans. The Mayor suggested if it would be considered a crying room. Mr. Elkin said the plans should read crying room. Mr. Elkin clarified the room would be utilized during services only.

Ms. Sirocchi said she would still like to know the room sizes. Mr. Elkin said the kitchen 22'x13', choir practice room was 21'x33', pantry 10'x12'. Mr Elkin said he would have the exact dimensions of all the rooms for the next meeting as he was just giving approximations. In answer to Ms. Hudak, Mr. Elkin said the dotted lines are an architectural design in which the lines designated support columns; there would not be walls there. He said all the columns existed, and there were no changes proposed for them. In answer to Board Attorney, Mr. Elkin said there was a solid wall between the youth group room and the multi-purpose room. He said on the first floor there would not be any partition walls. In answer to Chairman DeCarlo, Mr. Elkin said those columns were used to support the second story addition the racquetball club added on, that was the reason there were no columns located in the youth group room.

In answer to Chairman DeCarlo, he said the kitchen would be a commercial kitchen with a kitchen suppression system. In answer to Board Attorney, Mr. Elkin said someone would be testifying in the manner the kitchen would be used for. Board Attorney clarified to Mr. Elkin that he would like someone to testify for the Board members whether there would be catering among other functions held there.

Ms. Hudak wanted to know whether the children for Sunday school would be using the elevator or the stairs. Mr. Elkin said the stairs. In answer to Ms. Hudak, Mr. Elkin said the pastor advised there were approximately 150 children for Sunday school. Chairman DeCarlo said the Fire Advisory Board, Police Department and Municipality is concerned about life safety, he stated if a classroom environment is being purposed he wanted to make sure egress codes are being met. Chairman DeCarlo said he understands how

egresses were added to the lower level, but he wanted make sure this design was going to meet all classroom code requirements. Mr. Elkin said the answer is yes because it has to comply, or a permit would not be issued if it does not. Mr. Elkin said the building is fully sprinkled and would be brought up to code. Chairman DeCarlo asked if the sprinkler system would be monitored. Mr. Elkin said they would have to be, because of the configuration some of the sprinkler heads would have to be relocated and tested.

Mayor Subrizi questioned, due to the repetitive flooding and the building has been vacant for so long, has anyone recently been in the building to see if there has been any structural damage. Mr. Elkin said he hasn't been in the building since Hurricane Irene but he was in the building after the 2007 nor'easter. Mr. Elkin said the structure is a steel framed building which did not suffer any damage. He said if gypsum board was damaged in the recent flood they would have to remove and replaced in accordance with the code. In answer to Mayor Subrizi, Mr. Elkin said the building has been vacant for approximately two – two and half years. In answer to Board Attorney, Mr. Elkin said the building was constructed with no wood, some sheet rock was probably used and that would have to be removed and replaced if they witnessed mold.

In answer to Mr. Pecci, Mr. Elkin said they are considering a few things to minimize any damage done by flooding. They are proposing to use portable furniture, as technology is getting better in giving warnings they would have time to clear the furniture and keep it stored up high. He said a lot of the walls are masonry which can withstand water. In answer to Mr. Pecci, he said they were considering raising the floors in the existing racquetball courts, but he felt it would not help much because when it floods the water would raise about the floors. Mr. Elkin said he suggested to the applicants to leave the floors concrete and remove the wood floors, and he felt the applicants were leaning towards that suggestion. Mr. Elkin said unfortunately they all felt it was going to flood again.

Mayor Subrizi asked the applicants if they were at the site during Hurricane Irene, and if they understood how bad it gets when it floods. The applicants said they were there at 10:30 am and it was not bad, but when they went back at 4:00 pm it was totally flooded.

Mr. Elkin said the second floor is open to the sanctuary and youth group below, the north of the building would be partition walls to provide for flexibility depending on the amount of children, and whether they will be all together or separated during certain times. He said there would be another office located upstairs with more storage areas and they would be adding two small prayer rooms one for male and one for female for meditation.

In answer to Ms. Sirocchi and all the women members of the board, Mr. Elkin said there is one existing bathroom with one toilet upstairs. He said the children would utilize the first floor bathrooms. Mr. Elkin said the people are there for only two or three hours at most and he felt the bathrooms were sufficient for that. Mr. Elkin said the parents usually stay with the children, and there would be plenty of staff to assist the children if they need to use the facilities downstairs. Chairman DeCarlo suggested to Mr. Elkin if he could speak to his clients to see if more bathroom facilities could be provided upstairs for the children. Mr. Elkin agreed.



Ms. Hudak questioned if it would make more sense to place the kindergarten, first and second graders downstairs in the youth group room, and have the youth group room upstairs. Mr. Elkin said the youth group room was designed downstairs because of the higher ceiling space, where they could play ball inside. He said they can't really do that in on the second floor. Ms. Hudak questioned using the multipurpose room; Mr. Elkin said that room would have furniture. Ms. Prisendorf questioned if the youth group room was a gymnasium. Mr. Elkin said as close to what a gymnasium would be without being a gymnasium.

Mrs. Prisendorf questioned if the chairs would be folded each day or remains open. Mr. Elkin said he did not have that answer. He said he would imagine the chairs in the sanctuary remaining open except when they are storing them for an upcoming storm. Ms. Prisendorf said what happens if it does flood and no one was able to fold the chairs. Mr. Elkin said they were proposing to use as much metal furniture as possible in the event of a flood it could be washed down and reused.

Mrs. Prisendorf questioned the plans, she said she sees a multipurpose room, a gymnasium, she said the last time the applicants spoke, they talked about different bible study times approximately two hours long, and she questioned why a gym would be needed. Mr. Elkin said some of the children might stay after and want to throw a ball around not to be used necessarily as a gymnasium. Mrs. Prisendorf said she felt this location was going to be used a lot more than what is being suggested for church and bible study classes. Mr. Elkin said at the public hearing he would clarify the times and usages of each of the different rooms.

Mr. Elkin said the board members have been very helpful and he complimented the board on how they handle applications. Chairman DeCarlo said this is going to affect and be part of the community and the Board wants it to be beneficial for both sides. In answer to Chairman DeCarlo, Board Engineer deemed the application complete. Notice and Publication would be required prior to the next meeting. Mayor Subrizi questioned if the residents are displaced on Harvard Street and if they are receiving their notices. Mr. Tyne showed the Mayor how he was receiving some of the green cards already.

Mayor Subrizi updated the board with regard to the recent ordinance changes that the board recommended to the Governing Body. Chairman DeCarlo said the Borough Administrator addressed the Board with some questions, and due to the lengthy application hearing he asked the Board Secretary to put that item on the agenda for the next work session meeting.

As there was no further business to be conducted by the Board, a motion to adjourn was offered by Ms. Prisendorf seconded by Ms. Sirocchi and carried by all. The Public Session to hear this matter would be held on September 27, 2011 at 7:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,



Maria Sapuppo  
Recording Secretary