

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES – FEBRUARY 13, 2023

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the Township of Lower Makefield was held in the Municipal Building on February 13, 2023. Mr. Costello called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

Those present:

Planning Commission:       Adrian Costello, Chair  
  Dawn Stern, Secretary  
  Tony Bush, Member  
  Colin Coyle, Member

Others:                           James Majewski, Community Development Director  
  Barbara Kirk, Township Solicitor  
  Andrew Pockl, Township Engineer  
  Fredric K. Weiss, Supervisor Liaison

Absent:                            Tejinder Gill, Planning Commission Vice Chair

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Bush moved, Ms. Stern seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Minutes of January 9, 2023 as written.

#688 – 1273 LINDENHURST ROAD MAJOR SUBDIVISION - POSTPONEMENT  
Tax Parcel #20-003-020 (formerly Plan #665 – Weldon Homes)  
R-1 Zoning District  
1273 Lindenhurst Road

Proposed subdivision of a 3.03-acre lot containing an existing stone dwelling and stone barn into 3 single-family Residential lots (creating 2 new building lots)

Mr. Majewski stated this Application is postponed to March 13, 2023.

#689 – 1101 BIG OAK ROAD MAJOR SUBDIVISION  
Tax Parcel #20-034-127  
R-2 Residential Medium Density Zoning District  
1101 Big Oak Road & Elbow Lane

Proposed plan to subdivide a 6.07-acre lot (containing an existing dwelling and garage to be removed) into 6 single-family Residential lots

Mr. Edward Murphy, attorney, was present with Ms. Kristin Holmes, project engineer, and Ms. Terry Nardone, one of the principals of Triumph Building Group, which is the Applicant.

Mr. Murphy stated they were last present on September 13, 2022 and made the initial presentation and reviewed the first round of review letters that had been received at that point. Since then a number of new review letters have been issued and there have been discussions with Mr. Majewski and Mr. Pockl. He stated one of the threshold questions that had been raised at the last meeting was whether or not there was the presence of any wetlands on the site. Since then their consultants have gone out as well as Mr. Majewski and other Township members, and everyone is comfortable that there are no wetlands present on the site.

Mr. Murphy stated Revised Plans were submitted which triggered reviews from Mr. Pockl, the EAC, and the Fire Service Director; and they addressed many of the comments that were in the prior review letters.

Mr. Murphy noted Page 2 of the January 12 review letter from the Fire Service Director suggests that they need to add an additional hydrant at the corner of Derbyshire and Big Oak Road, and that is a will comply.

Mr. Murphy noted the January 29 letter from the EAC. He stated, if everyone supports the Waiver, the recommendation in the letter regarding the nature and type of plantings, would be accommodated by the Applicant. He stated to do so would require a Waiver for the nature of the plantings.

Mr. Pockl asked Mr. Murphy to elaborate on the nature of the plantings. Ms. Kirk stated the initial request was a Waiver from the Tree Replacement Ordinance, and asked if that has now been modified under the Waiver request letter. Mr. Murphy stated Ms. Holmes will explain what they believe to be the suggestion made by the EAC and how with a partial Waiver they could comply.

Ms. Holmes stated within the EAC letter they support providing large shrubs and small understory trees within the wooded areas as replacement trees. She stated the partial Waiver request being asked for with regard to the tree replacement is to allow for that substitution of those smaller understory shrubs as a replacement tree whereas the Ordinance calls for 2 ½" to 3" caliper of a specific type. She stated they feel they can meet those replacement tree plantings within the property.

Ms. Kirk stated the EAC indicated that the Plans calculated 205 replacement trees, and she asked if 205 understory trees and shrubs will be planted in lieu of the replacement trees; and Mr. Murphy agreed. Mr. Murphy stated if no Waiver was granted, they could not physically accommodate the total number of 205 trees on the site; but they can do so with the smaller variety recommended by the EAC. Ms. Holmes stated this will help supplement and actually improve the quality of the woodlands as currently it is all taller trees and adding in the understory and shrubs will provide a nicer area.

Mr. Costello stated it will be the same number of plants, but they worked with the EAC to come up with a mix that worked better. Mr. Murphy stated the EAC came up with this proposal, and the Applicant is prepared to accept it.

Mr. Pockl stated he does not feel that there should be 200 shrubs and 5 trees in lieu of the 205 replacement trees. He stated he feels there should be a mix of trees of 2" caliper size and large shrubs. Mr. Bush asked if there is a specific number in mind. Ms. Holmes stated while there is not a specific number in mind, her landscape architect reviewed this; and they feel there would be 20 foundation plantings around each house which would be the larger shrubs which equates to 120 overall because there are six lots. She stated there would then be a mixture of trees and shrubs throughout the wooded area for the remainder. Mr. Murphy stated they will provide the breakdown.

Mr. Costello stated he would be in favor of having the EAC sign off on this. He asked if this would set a precedent for the Replacement Tree Ordinance. He stated he feels we should highlight to the Board of Supervisors that others may come in with a similar request. Mr. Majewski stated there has been discussion about modifying that Ordinance slightly to allow for something like this. He stated currently they are requesting a Waiver; and in order to do what has been suggested, a Waiver would have to be granted, and it is within the purview of the Planning Commission to make such a recommendation if they feel this provides an acceptable alternative to solely trees. Mr. Costello asked Ms. Kirk if we were to recommend approval of this, would it be appropriate to highlight in our Motion the fact that this is a Waiver that the

Board should consider seriously because it could be precedent setting. Ms. Kirk stated they would have to do that with all of the Waivers that are outlined. She stated she believes that the Supervisors are aware of some of the limitations or issues with the Tree Replacement Ordinance with respect to prior development applications that were Appealed. She stated she believes that the EAC's position is an attempt to overcome those issues. Mr. Costello stated he has been vocal about his position on the Tree Replacement Ordinance and Waivers to it. He stated he would like clarity as to how this is viewed – whether it is a new precedent or a “one-off.”

Mr. Bush stated this Applicant has come in with a request at the suggestion of the EAC because the number of trees required could not be replaced on the site. Mr. Bush stated he would not want a developer to come in on another site where there was space and ask to put shrubs around the foundation instead of trees. He stated he feels that is different from what is happening here. Mr. Costello stated he would want the Board of Supervisors to clarify their intent if they approve this.

Mr. Majewski stated with regard to precedent, any time you grant a Waiver it should be based on the specific property you are looking at and it is not a blank approval for every development, rather it is on a site-by-site basis. Mr. Costello stated the EAC being on board with this solution has a level of credibility, but he feels the Board of Supervisors should clarify exactly why they would be approving this and what the unique circumstances are. He stated he wants a message sent to future developers that this does not mean they can come in and ask for that break.

Ms. Kirk stated for a Waiver, the Applicant has to present a hardship to the property similar to a Zoning Variance. She stated it would have to be on record as to why the Waiver requirement is being reversed. Mr. Pockl stated they could also grant the Waiver contingent upon approval of the plan from the EAC and the Township engineer's office. Mr. Majewski stated it could be approved subject to the review of the Township in consultation with the EAC.

Mr. Murphy noted Mr. Pockl's review letter of January 31. He stated Ms. Holmes has also spoken to Mr. Pockl about his comments and she has updated and revised the Waiver letter. He stated he believes that the Waivers that were reviewed in September are basically the same as before, and Mr. Pockl had provided his opinion at that time about those Waivers that he would support

and those he had questions about, one of which was the Tree Replacement issue. Mr. Murphy stated in the main, the review letter itself of January 31 is a will comply.

Mr. Pockl stated they had discussed the location of utilities to individual lots, particularly Lots #5 and #6, having an impact on the woodlands on the site. He stated he had received an updated Plan that showed the trees that were diseased or dead and how the utilities for Lots #5 and #6 avoid all of the trees that will remain on the property. He stated he would not have a problem striking Comment #1 from the letter.

Mr. Pockl stated he feels the other items can be addressed without any major impact to the Plan. He stated from a stormwater management perspective, he does not see how there is any way they could comply with the comments we had and not have a major effect on the Plan.

Mr. Bush asked Mr. Murphy if there is anything that is not a will comply, and Mr. Murphy stated there is not.

With regard to Waiver #3 with regard to the specific plan procedure outlined in the Ordinance, Ms. Holmes stated with this Application they informally submitted a Sketch Plan to get initial comments, and then they went forward with the Subdivision and Land Development Application. She stated it was a slightly different less formal process as outlined in the Ordinance as they went through the steps. She stated they had a site visit at the site with the EAC which was in a different order from the process outlined in the Ordinance. Mr. Costello stated he feels it is fine as long as Mr. Pockl and Mr. Majewski are satisfied. Mr. Majewski stated they have done what they needed to do although it was not exactly following the order of the process.

Ms. Holmes stated Waiver #5 relates to showing existing features within 200', adding that it overlaps with Waiver request #2 which requires 500'; and Mr. Pockl did support that so she assumes there is a similar support for the lesser 200'. Mr. Pockl stated he would support that. He stated he is able to fully comprehend what is happening on and around the site with the features that they are showing. Mr. Majewski stated they have provided aerial photograph that shows everything in the surrounding area.

Mr. Bush stated with regard to Waiver #2, he recalls that people from Falls Township were concerned about the back end of the development within 500' of the site. He asked if we should be granting these Waivers given that we heard concerns at the last meeting when this Plan was discussed. Mr. Pockl stated he recalls that the concerns of those from Falls Township were mainly with regard to stormwater, but the grade of the site falls away from Falls Township; and he is not concerned with stormwater run-off from the site in any direction as they have provided revised calculations to demonstrate that they are reducing it from what is running off the site now for each of the individual lots in the back and for the combined three lots in the front. Mr. Pockl stated with regard to sight distance out of the driveways, they are meeting those requirements as well.

With regard to Waiver #6, Ms. Holmes stated this is a partial Waiver from providing a full Environmental Impact Assessment, which is required for more than three-lot subdivisions. She stated they are providing a lot of the required information within the Plan and subsequent reports that have been filed as part of the project although they did not finalize it into a formal EIA Report. Mr. Pockl stated given the additional information that they have provided in the recent submission, he would support the Waiver.

Mr. Costello asked if this puts the onus on the Township to sort through all of the information to put together their own Environmental Impact Assessment rather than the developer doing it. Ms. Holmes stated the more-detailed information that they provided was more than would go into the EIA, and they did this based on the concerns that they heard from the neighbors, etc. to make sure that they addressed all of the concerns with the different documents provided.

Ms. Kirk asked if instead of doing a formal EIA, is there a way to provide some kind of synopsis so that if there is a question, the Township has easy access to pull up the information. Mr. Murphy stated Ms. Holmes could do a summary of what the EIA would otherwise require as well as where the information could be found, and Mr. Costello stated that is what he would be looking for.

Mr. Murphy stated the Waiver request that is new from five months ago is the one which has already been discussed which is Waiver #9 related to their willingness to incorporate the recommendation of the EAC outlined in the January 29, 2023 correspondence provided there is Township support for it. He stated they will quantify the number of trees to be replaced and what the approximate break out is between full-size and understory smaller shrubs and plant material. Mr. Majewski stated the Waiver request letter does mimic the

EAC letter where they talk about understory trees and shrubs so it would not be just shrubs. Mr. Murphy stated they will provide the breakdown as was discussed earlier.

Mr. Pockl stated the only thing to be clarified is the number of trees to be replaced. He stated the developer's arborist went to the site and determined the number of diseased/dead trees that are on site. He stated he does not know that anyone from the Township has confirmed that. Mr. Majewski stated at this time of year it is difficult to confirm exactly which trees are actually dead/dying. He stated ultimately they will be responsible for replacing any and all trees that are not dead and not seriously diseased and dying, and that final number would be verified by the Township; and they would then have to show that on the Plan which is ultimately Recorded.

Ms. Holmes stated since the initial report was filed, there was a site visit with the EAC to discuss the trees; and some recommendations have come out of that. She stated the arborist has since gone back out to the site and marked the trees that are dead, dying, or diseased so that if anyone wanted to go out and check them, they are able to do so. She stated there will be an updated supplemental report that they will provide with the re-submission that helps further clarify the trees per the report.

Mr. Bush asked if they are requesting combined Preliminary/Final approval, and Mr. Murphy agreed.

Ms. Kirk asked if Mr. Murphy is verifying that all the other reports that were issued by the Township Fire Service Director, SAFE Engineering, etc. are will comply; and Mr. Murphy agreed.

Mr. Costello asked if there will be two separate driveways onto Big Oak Road. Ms. Holmes stated they are going with the Township's traffic engineer review; and there will be one shared driveway for two lots and a single driveway which is at the location of the existing driveway.

Mr. Coyle noted Lot #6 which borders Falls Township. He stated there is a driveway on the property line, and since driveways do not grade toward the home, it would be graded away from the home; and he wants to make sure that is not a concern as to run-off. Ms. Holmes stated the placement of the driveways on each of these lots was placed so that they would go around existing trees in order to maximize the preservation of trees as much as possible. She stated as part of the tree replacement, they are intending to use some of

those replacement trees along the shared property line so that those neighbors have some buffering from the new lots. She stated in addition to that, from a drainage perspective, they are collecting and grading so that it is all draining to the rear of each of the lots. She stated there are also individual stormwater facilities at the rear of each lot. She stated they have over-analyzed this in the sense that they have a point at each lot to insure that they are not increasing the flow from that respective lot rather than as a whole property.

Ms. Stern stated there is an existing driveway, and they will be adding one more driveway so that there will be two driveways that go onto Big Oak Road; and Ms. Holmes agreed.

Mr. Doug Marshall stated he lives in Yardley Crest which is the adjacent development to 1101 Big Oak Road, and he is familiar with the property. He stated he feels any developer like Triumph would have reviewed the Township's relevant Ordinances and Codes regarding limitations and restrictions about building. He stated he feels the Applicant understood that the Township had a 25% Tree Preservation Ordinance as part of the Code. He does not feel it is fair to the community to assume that you are going to be granted a Waiver or various exemptions whether it would be putting in trees that have a much smaller caliper or putting in shrubs. He stated the proposed house #6 is woodlands although he cannot attest to how many of the trees are healthy or not healthy, but that area is habitat for a number of wildlife including foxes, deer, rabbits, etc.; and he values that. He stated he feels that these restrictions and the Code are part of the review process because any number of Commissions such as Zoning, the EAC, Planning, and the Board of Supervisors put in that 25% because they recognize and appreciate the value of open space – trees, wildlife, habitat, etc. He stated he agrees with that and feels many people in the Township do as well. He stated he is uncomfortable with the idea of substitute vegetation as it sounds like it is "second best." Mr. Marshall asked if it is that easy for a developer to supersede what is in the Code, and he does not feel that it is appropriate.

Mr. Marshall stated he supports the free enterprise system, and he understands that Triumph wants to maximize its profits; however, he does not feel that desire should be more important than the existing woodlands. He asked if they bend over in favor of the develop so that they can build as many houses as they want or do they feel that the developer has an obligation to stick within the Code; and if they do not, they could build five houses rather than six and still make money.



Mr. Pockl stated the developer is not seeking a Waiver from the 25% maximum disturbance of wooded areas, and the development as shown meets that requirement. Mr. Marshall asked why there has been discussion about replacement trees, and Mr. Pockl stated that is a Code section that calls for replacement of existing trees that are being removed. Mr. Costello stated this development is going to have to take some trees down, and the amount of trees that are coming down are less than the 25% requirement. He stated beyond that 25% requirement, the Township has an Ordinance that requires some level of replacement and/or funding of trees. He stated the only Waiver that has been discussed around that was giving them some flexibility based on the EAC's recommendation of using non-standard plantings to meet that requirement. Mr. Pockl stated by granting this Waiver, that allows all of the plantings to be planted on the site as opposed to planting a lesser number of trees on the site and then providing a Fee-In-Lieu of where those trees would be planted somewhere off-site.

Mr. Majewski stated they would have needed a Variance if they were not going to meet the 25% requirement.

Mr. Marshall stated he thought the original EAC letter indicated that they did not see how the developer could put in six homes and remain within the 25% requirement. Mr. Majewski stated that may have been a prior letter. Mr. Marshall stated nothing has changed since then, and six homes are still proposed. Mr. Majewski stated the EAC made a site visit along with the Applicant's engineer and their arborist and walked the site which helped solidify and clarify the EAC comments.

Mr. Costello stated he understands Mr. Marshall's concerns adding that the Township has professionals who have confirmed the conclusion that they do fall within Township parameters and there is backing from the EAC as to making sure that they plant what they are supposed to plant.

Mr. Marshall stated when he sees the Plan showing the six houses with the surrounding lawns and driveways, it seems to exceed 25%. Mr. Pockl stated the disturbance is 25% of the existing woodlands on the property, and there is a significant portion of the property on Lots #1, #2, and #3 that are not woodlands so that open space is area where they are not disturbing woodlands so that would not count.

Ms. Lisa Hansen stated she is present to assist her client, Doug Marshall. She stated there were two Sections that were addressed in August by the engineers for the Township with regard to the 25% and the tree replacement requirements. She thanked Mr. Majewski for providing them with the

materials from that time until now, and she would like to know how it got from the statement from the Township engineer that for dwellings #4, #5, and #6 the proposed utilities that would pass through areas that counted as woodland would be disturbed by such utilities and that the Applicant would not be able to count those areas as preserved woodlands and would still need to preserve woodlands at another location to maintain the 25%. She asked how that has disappeared or not been addressed and not part of the Waiver. She asked why they are just talking about the kinds of trees that will be replaced. Mr. Pockl stated some of the utilities that are going to Lots #4, #5, #6 have been moved. He stated on the original Application it was a graphical representation of the utilities and the location of the woodlands, and it did not necessarily show all of the existing trees in that area. He stated once that information was provided where the existing trees were and it was demonstrated that the proposed utility lines going to the houses would remain outside of the drip line of those existing trees, that constituted no disturbance to the trees or the woodlands.

Ms. Hansen stated she understands that the appropriate body – the “Zoning Commission” and/or Planning Commission has confirmed that there is no longer the issue of violation of 20-51.B.6. Ms. Kirk Comment #1 deals with Zoning, and the Applicant either had to modify the location of the utilities so that it meets the requirements of that Zoning Section or would have to go to the Zoning Hearing Board to get relief from that Section. She stated as part of their Application, they have to meet the requirement of that Section of the Code. Ms. Hansen stated what has just been heard is that by changing the placement of the utility lines, that is no longer an issue with respect to the percent being preserved; and Ms. Kirk agreed.

Ms. Hansen stated she understands that one of the Plan sheets provided by the arborist shows where the trees are that appear to be diseased. Ms. Kirk stated that report has not yet been completed, but the Applicant has indicated to the Township that their arborist went out to the property and marked certain trees with colored ribbon/spray paint with orange for a dead/dying or diseased trees and red for a tree that the arborist determined to be hazardous.

Ms. Hansen stated the arborist is recommending removal of 119 trees, but with respect to replacement by providing 205 trees it is for removal of 40. She stated she understands it is “mid-size so it is times 7.” She asked how those numbers align with the 119. Ms. Kirk stated the way the Code is written if a developer is removing live trees that otherwise are viable, those trees have to be replaced. She stated if they are removing a tree that is 6’ in diameter, they would not be able to replace it with a tree that is 6’ in diameter, and so

there is a calculation as to how to replace the trees. Ms. Kirk stated they do not have to replace trees that are designated as dying, diseased, dead, or hazardous that are going to be removed anyway; and that is where the numbers do not match. Ms. Hansen stated the 119 that are diseased are going to have to be removed anyway, and the Waiver being requested is with respect to the 40 healthy trees that were under the Ordinance required to be replaced by “11 of them times 7 for a total of 77.” She asked if instead of replacing them with 77 trees, it will be a combination of mature shrubs and smaller trees. She stated the three “traunches” were removal of 27 of the smaller caliper, which would require 4 trees to replace each of those for a total of 108, there would then be 11 in the “mid- traunch” that would have to be replaced with 7 for each for a total of 77, and 2 of the largest ones.

Ms. Kirk asked Ms. Hansen what she was reading from, and Ms. Hansen stated she made up this sheet herself based on the numbers in the Waiver letter and the response from the EAC. She stated she looked at what the requirement was in the Code depending on the size. She stated there is a “basic traunch and then three traunches” based on the diameter or size of the tree. She stated it says for each of them how many trees have to be substituted to replace one of the trees that are coming down that are healthy. She stated if they are taking out a total of 40, the division is 27 in one “traunch, 11 in the other traunch, and 2 in the other.” She stated in the Ordinance there is a “times number of live trees that have to be replaced for each one of those, and that is how you get to the 205. She stated what she saw in the letter for the “middle traunch” of the 11 healthy trees, was that they wanted to not have to replace 3 of those so it would only be 8 of those that would have to be replaced for a total of 56 that would still be replaced. She stated she is trying to figure out the idea of a small shrub and or tree/combo and whether that applies to all of the original 205 requirement or not.

Ms. Kirk stated it was a recommendation by the EAC that there be a replacement of understory trees and large shrubs to be determined by the Township and subject to EAC approval in lieu of planting 205 trees. She stated the EAC issued a letter dated January 29, 2023 which is an update from their earlier letter after they went out and looked at the property and made certain recommendations. Ms. Kirk stated she has not done the actual calculations, and she would rely on the EAC because they are very diligent. Ms. Hansen stated they say that the Waiver is for providing 21 replacement trees for the removal of 3 existing 18” to 30” trees, and that tells you it is the middle “traunch” which requires 7 replacement trees for each of one regular tree of that size. Ms. Hansen stated the letter pointed out the discrepancy between “21 versus 28 which is the difference between 7 and 8 trees.”

Mr. Coyle stated the EAC letter of January 29 states, “The statement of 21 replacement trees for the removal of 3 existing 18” to 30” trees is erroneous and should be updated and removed.”

Ms. Holmes stated she believes that Ms. Hansen is looking at an older Waiver request letter which had the older numbers, and they have updated that letter to reflect the 205 trees. Ms. Hansen stated she agrees – and the total is 40. She stated whether it is 21 or 28 is irrelevant, and her question was out of the 40 trees to be removed that are under the Ordinance to be replaced by 205, there are three different size categories of trees. She stated based on the letter, which she understands is out-of-date, it looks like the Waiver was only with respect to the “middle traunch” of trees. She asked what exactly is being waived, and she asked if it is the requirement with respect to all three “traunches” of mature trees or is the engineer going to be able to pick and choose with respect to which of the requirements of the statute specifically based on the size of the trees is going to be applied.

Mr. Costello stated 40 healthy trees have been identified which are going to be removed, and the EAC is on board with that, and they helped come up with a workable recommendation that allows for replacement trees and replacement shrubs. He stated he feels the Motion for approval will include having the EAC verify that the final proposal meets their requirements. He stated that is the only thing that the Planning Commission is considering in terms of a Waiver.

Ms. Hansen stated she understands that there will be a decision about the 27 of one size being removed that are supposed to be replaced with 108, and that some of those will be replaced with something other than a tree of that size. Mr. Costello stated Ms. Hansen is getting into a level of detail that there is not yet an answer for. He stated the EAC, Mr. Pockl, and Mr. Majewski will be representing the Township’s interests, and Ms. Hansen could advise them of what her concerns are. Ms. Hansen stated her client and other local residents would like to see that where there is a Waiver granted with respect to what type of vegetation is replacing something that is being removed, that consideration be made to the maturity of the trees and the things that a mature tree provides as opposed to a shorter shrub or planting.

Mr. Pockl stated it is not going to be the case that of the 205 replacement plantings only 10 of them would be trees and the rest would be large shrubs, and Mr. Murphy agreed.

Mr. Bush moved and Ms. Stern seconded to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of the Preliminary/ Final Land Development and Major Subdivision Plan as submitted subject to compliance with the comments as set forth in the engineer's review letter of January 31, 2023 and the other review letters provided by the EAC, Office of Fire Service Director, Fire Service Director, and Township traffic engineer with a recommendation that the Board of Supervisors grant the Waivers as requested by the Applicant and as more fully outlined in their revised letter dated February 13, 2023 subject to these conditions: That the partial Waiver from providing an Environmental Impact Assessment be granted subject to receipt of a summary of the Assessment items set forth in the various documents to be provided by either the Applicant or the project engineer, and that the Waiver of replacing the replacement trees as recommended be modified to permit the planting of understory trees of a size smaller than 2 ½" caliper or large shrubs subject to approval by the Township engineer and Mr. Majewski with input from the EAC.

Mr. Murphy agreed to the Conditions.

Mr. Coyle stated since he is entirely new to this matter he prefers to abstain.

Motion carried with Mr. Coyle abstained.

There being no further business, Mr. Bush moved, Mr. Coyle seconded and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 8:35 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dawn Stern, Secretary

