



**PLANNING BOARD**  
**Monday, April 16, 2018**  
**APPROVED MINUTES**

*You couldn't pick a better place.*

**OPENING:** The meeting was called to order by Chairman John Osorio at 7:30 PM.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:** Led by John Osorio.

**OPMA STATEMENT:** Read by John Osorio in compliance with the Sunshine Law.

**ROLL CALL**

- **Members in attendance:** John Osorio; Betty Adler; Carolyn Jacobs; Marlyn Kalitan; Hugh Dougherty; Moly Hung; Sam Kates; William Carter; and Sheila Griffith.
- **Professionals in attendance:** Lorissa Luciani, PP, AICP, Director of Community Development; and Cosmos Diamantis, Esq., Solicitor; Natalie Barney, Community Development Supervisor; and Stacey Arcari, PE, Planning Board Engineer.

**ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS**

*Adoption Meeting Minutes from March 19, 2018.* Sam Kates made a motion, which was seconded by Betty Adler, to adopt the Meeting Minutes from March 19, 2018. Affirmative votes by Adler, Jacobs, Dougherty, Hung, Kates and Griffith. Minutes are approved.

**Agenda Item 1:**

**18-P-0010**

Block(s) 7.01 Lot(s) 1 & 3

Zone: Highway Business (B2)

**L-N Rt 70, LLC and CHNJ Owner, LLC**

2339 and 2349 Route 70 W

Cherry Hill, NJ

*Relief Requested: A preliminary and final major site plan with bulk (C) variances to consolidate access along Route 70 between Cooper Health Systems and Crowne Plaza Hotel with parking modifications and the installation of a dedicated left turn signalized intersection along Route 70 westbound.*

**Applicant's Representatives:** Erin Szulewski, Esq., Parker McCay – Applicant's Attorney

**Exhibits Submitted:**

- A-1: Existing Conditions Plan
- A-2: Illustrative Proposed Site Plan

Ms. Szulewski noted that the address and block and lots associated with the application. She also indicated that lot 3 was currently vacant and lot 1 was occupied by the Crowne Plaza hotel.

Ms. Szulewski noted that a Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan with bulk (c) variances was approved for this site in March of 2016 and that the plan that are presenting tonight are a modification of those plans related to the installation of a traffic signal and subsequent parking lot connections that will need to be made to accommodate the traffic signal.

Ms. Szulewski withdraw a portion of the proposed modifications in regard to a proposed sign which she stated would be brought to the appropriate land use board at a future point in time.

Ms. Szulewski stated that the modifications before the board this evening included bulk (c) variances in regard to open space and lot coverage, a parking variance which would be shown to be mitigated by the shared parking agreement with the Crowne Plaza, and design waivers.

The board swore in a number of persons that would potentially be providing testimony including Susan Bass Levin, representing Cooper Health System, Kyle Humphreys, PE from T&M Associates, and Nathan Mosley, PE of Shropshire Associates, LLC.

Ms. Levin testified that she is the President and CEO of the Cooper Foundation overseeing the application for the site.

Ms. Levin summarized the application for the board stating that there would be no changes to the use as it was previously presented to the board. It would continue to be utilized to consolidate a number of medical services in one location. She stated that there would be no change to the footprint of the building as previously proposed and that the present application was only in regard to the access to the site.

Ms. Levin stated that the Rt. 70 eastbound access to both sites currently has two points of access, one to the Crowne Plaza and one to Cooper. The proposal would provide for one shared drive for both entities to utilize and close the current access to the Crowne Plaza.

Ms. Levin also stated that the proposal included the installation of a new traffic signal on Route 70 that would permit a left turn lane into the site from Rt. 70 westbound but would not permit a left turn onto Rt. 70 westbound. She noted that the addition of the traffic signal necessitated the internal circulation and parking changes that were being proposed.

Ms. Levin testified that both entities would share parking with no marked or reserved spaces for either entity and that the shared parking arrangement worked well because they generally have differing peak hours of operation.

Ms. Levin indicated that permits had already been obtained from the New Jersey Department of Transportation (DOT) and that all shared parking and other necessary easements would be signed and recorded with copies provided to the Township.

Ms. Kalitan asked Ms. Levin why the shared entrance and shared parking were important.

Ms. Levin responded that decreasing the number of entry points improved safety by reducing turning movements off of Rt. 70, that the single entry point will improve the site aesthetics, and that the left turn into the site will reduce or eliminate traffic generated by both sites from using the Cuthbert Blvd jughandle to turn around.

Ms. Levin also noted that the access to Park Blvd would remain and reiterated the safety, convenience, and aesthetic value of the proposed changes.

Mr. Hung asked if this Cooper site is predominantly a healthcare facility with the goal of its end users in mind and if there were any conflicts with the Crowne Plaza.

Ms. Levin stated that the site was a specialty services healthcare facility and that the actions they were taking were with the well-being, convenience, and safety of their users in mind. She noted that there is no conflict with the Crowne Plaza and that this change would make access to their site safer as well and provide additional parking for their events.

Ms. Kalitan asked what the hours at the Cooper facility would be.

Ms. Levin stated that generally they would be open on Monday through Friday from 7am to 6pm with some hours on Saturday, but not on Saturday evenings.

Kyle Humphreys, PE of T&M Associates provided his credentials and was accepted as an expert witness by the board.

Exhibit A-1 was submitted, Existing Conditions Plan

Mr. Humphreys testified that the existing conditions on the site included 324 parking spaces and the single entrance for Cooper and the intent of the changes is to move the existing entrance and reconfigure the parking on the western portion of the site and at the ingress and egress onto Park Blvd.

Exhibit A-2 was submitted, Illustrative Site Plan

Mr. Humphreys noted that the signal would be installed on Rt. 70 to the north of the site and that an extended deceleration lane would be added from the Cuthbert Blvd ramp onto Rt. 70 that would extend to the entrance to the site. The driveway would then split off to enter the Crowne Plaza site to the west and the Cooper site to the east. He also noted that this drive would extend straight all the way to the Park Blvd ingress and egress.

Mr. Humphreys noted that the current entrance to the Cooper site was a Right In/Right Out only that is located to the east of the proposed drive and the Crowne Plaza is a Right In/Right Out only that is located to the west of the proposed drive and that the shift of the proposed entrance is approximately 60' west of the current approved entrance.

Mr. Humphreys indicated that additional parking would be added to the Crowne Plaza lot. The new parking area would consist of 78 parking spaces, 14 of which already exist, and would be located where the entrance to the Crowne Plaza is currently. The Crowne Plaza site would also be losing 3 parking spaces so the total net gain on the Crowne Plaza site would be 61 parking spaces. He also noted that the new parking area would include new landscaping and lighting that would be consistent with what was proposed on the Cooper site and around the new entrance.

Mr. Humphreys indicated that there was de minimus impact to the open space and lot coverage calculations and that the new entrance would also provide a better turning radius for cars coming in and out of the site creating a safer turn off of Route 70.

Mr. Humphreys stated that because of the disturbance of the site being greater than one acre they have provided for an underground Stormwater detention system located under the parking area to the south of the site and the detention system would connect to existing infrastructure on the site that drains across Park Boulevard.

Ms. Kalitan asked if the ramp lane that comes from Cuthbert Blvd north to Route 70 eastbound would continue all the way to the entrance that is being proposed.

Mr. Humphreys noted that the lane would continue all the way to the entrance so people would not have to weave into Route 70 if their intent was to turn into either site.

Ms. Jacobs asked if both access points to the sites would remain open and active during construction.

Mr. Humphreys stated that the closures would be phased during construction but that he was not the appropriate person to describe the construction phasing.

Mr. Mosley was accepted as an expert witness by the Planning Board.

Mr. Mosley stated that the ramp from Cuthbert Boulevard onto Rt 70 eastbound currently tapers out and merges into the Route 70 eastbound through lanes right in front of where the existing Crowne Plaza driveway is today.

Mr. Mosley restated that the ramp lane would be extended to the proposed entrance which would eliminate some of the weaving that occurs at this location today.

Mr. Mosley noted that they would be adding a dedicated left turn lane within the existing median area that would be approximately 250' long to provide the appropriate queuing needs. This will also include all new traffic signal equipment, crosswalks and ADA accessible ramps, pedestrian push buttons and a screen for a pedestrian countdown, and everything else that is required of them to provide safe access into and out of the site.

Mr. Mosley indicated that the way the light would work would be that there would be a trigger for the light if someone was waiting in the left turn lane or the right turn exit from the site. The light would turn red for the eastbound traffic and green for those turning left into the site and for those turning right out of the site and for all westbound traffic. He noted that the only time that the westbound traffic would stop would be if a pedestrian pushed the button to cross.

Mr. Mosley noted that there was an existing bus stop right near the entrance to the Executive Campus on the westbound side of Rt 70 and that this light would provide safe access across the road without having to walk all the way down to the light at Cornell Ave.

Mr. Mosley stated that they have already received all the necessary NJ DOT major access permit approvals for the closures of the existing curb cuts, the new curb cut, and the traffic signalization, and are just waiting for final comments to finish up with the Developer's Agreement to build the improvements as shown on the plan.

Ms. Luciani noted that all of the signed agreements and documents that the NJDOT approves will need to be submitted to the Township as a condition of approval.

Ms. Jacobs asked how many cars could stack in the left turn lane and how many could make the turn during a twenty second green light.

Mr. Mosley stated that conservatively 10 but possibly up to fifteen and that approximately 5 or 6 cars would be able to get through a twenty second light.

Ms. Jacobs noted that her concern was just during high peak hours at the hotel that his timing would potentially lead to backups on Route 70.

Ms. Luciani asked Mr. Mosley if NJDOT had taken into account that the cloverleaf was also still an option for people trying to access the site.

Mr. Mosley stated that NJDOT does look at all the options for someone trying to access the site.

Ms. Jacobs asked about the construction phasing and the closure of the two access points relative to the opening of the new entrance.

Mr. Mosley stated that they would construct as much of the new entrance without disturbing the roadway and when they do eventually have to close the Crowne Plaza entrance to construct the new lane and curb cut, for a short period of time they would direct traffic down Harvard Ave to access the Crowne Plaza site from Park Blvd.

Ms. Adler asked what the anticipated construction time was.

Mr. Mosley stated that total construction would take months but that, hopefully, the detour onto Harvard Ave would only last for approximately 2 weeks.

Mr. Dougherty asked if there was currently any shared parking or access easements or if there was any way to access the two sites internally.

Mr. Mosley stated that there is currently no legal shared parking or a way to get between the two sites with a vehicle.

Mr. Dougherty asked if the cross access agreement would help alleviate some of the traffic on Route 70.

Mr. Mosley noted that it would create a more noticeable access point that would improve the safety in and out of the sites.

Mr. Dougherty asked if the Cooper site would be losing spaces and the Crowne Plaza would be gaining spaces.

Mr. Mosley indicated that the Cooper site would be losing 40 parking spaces but with the addition of the parking spots at the Crowne Plaza there would be a net increase of 20 parking spaces for both sites. He also noted that the parking studies that were completed showed opposing peak usage times for the sites with the medical office being more active during the day and the hotel more active in the evening.

Mr. Dougherty asked if Mr. Mosley believed that this arrangement made for a safer intersection.

Mr. Mosley stated that he did believe so as it would reduce weaving movements, create safe turning movements into and out of the site with the traffic signal and provide for pedestrian crossing from the westbound side of Route 70.

Mr. Hung noted that the end-users of this site would be patients and hotel guests that have never been to this area before and that access to this site can be stressful and that these changes would be a significant improvement for them and pedestrians as well, thereby alleviating the stress associated with accessing the site.

Mr. Mosley agreed with this sentiment.

Ms. Jacobs asked if there would be internal signage to assist in wayfinding and will it be adequate to ensure safe circulation on site.

Ms. Szulewski indicated that there would be internal signage.

Ms. Levin stated that the signage was only removed because if it was included the whole application would have had to go to the Zoning Board, so they will apply for the signage at a later date.

Ms. Luciani noted that the internal signage for directional purposes was permitted by right as long as it complied with ordinance requirements and that the MUTCD signage was approved through NJDOT.

Ms. Luciani asked if Mr. Mosley was still confident that the parking analysis completed by Cooper for the site was still applicable since there was a variance granted with the original site plan for a significant reduction in parking.

Mr. Mosley stated that he still believed that the parking calculation based on the 3 parking spaces per 1,000 sf of medical office space provided in the analysis was still appropriate for this site and that the shared parking agreement actually led to a net increase in spaces.

Ms. Luciani asked if there were any disagreements with the conditions in either the Community Development Review or the Environmental Resolution, Inc. review.

Ms. Szulewski stated that they did not have any problems with complying with the comments in either review.

Ms. Arcari stated that the applicant had complied with all of the requests in the ERI review letter and that the Stormwater issues could be addressed as a condition of approval.

Ms. Luciani stated that a Stormwater Basin Maintenance Agreement and any other conditions in the Community Development review would have to be submitted prior to the issuance of any permits.

Ms. Adler asked about lighting on the site.

Ms. Luciani noted that the standard language was included in the letter and the applicant would be subject to a night light function test as a condition of approval.

Mr. Diamantis asked the applicant to agree once again to all the conditions in the reviews and any conditions that had been discussed as part of the application that evening.

Ms. Szulewski noted that the applicant would comply.

Mr. Hung asked if they should take the Crowne Plaza letter regarding the shared access and parking agreement as a favorable support.

Ms. Szulewski noted that the Crowne Plaza was indicative of their favorable support of the application.

### **Public Comment**

Scot Tomaszewski  
5 & 7 Harvard Avenue, Cherry Hill

Mr. Tomaszewski stated that he was happy to see Cooper redeveloping the site but that he had some concerns regarding the proposed changes.

Mr. Tomaszewski noted that he was concerned about why the possibility of putting a full jughandle through the Lee Stone site on westbound Route 70 was not considered that would allow for full turning movements at a new light. He felt that this would be a better alternative. He also stated that he was concerned that the time for pedestrians to cross at the intersection was not sufficient.

Mr. Tomaszewski stated that the applicant should be required to put a full sidewalk along the portion of their site that abuts Harvard Avenue and/or through their site from the entrance on Route 70 to the exit at Park Blvd and that these sidewalks should be ADA compatible.

Mr. Tomaszewski also noted that he did not think that people should be able to turn left onto Park Blvd since the street is already congested and with people parking along the shoulder it makes it difficult to see and a dangerous place to make a turn.

Ms. Luciani noted that the site was ADA compliant for pedestrians seeking to access the Cooper building from the light but that she would verify that with the Construction Official.

Anne Einhorn  
1017 Edgemore Rd., Cherry Hill

Ms. Einhorn stated that in her opinion a traffic light will slow westbound traffic on Route 70 which is already slow as new jobs in Camden and development at the Garden State Park are adding to traffic on our roadways.

Ms. Einhorn stated that she felt that the existing jughandle onto Cuthbert Blvd South and then staying on the ramp onto Route 70 east is safer than providing a left hand turn lane. She noted that the Dwell development on the other side of Cherry Hill was not able to get a left turn lane into their development because of the added traffic light.

Ms. Einhorn stated that visitors to either site can make a left turn onto Cornell Ave from the turnaround through the Pavilions then turn right onto Park Blvd to access both sites.

Ms. Einhorn believed that the increasing development and traffic on the west side of town was eroding the quality of life in the 08002 and 08034 zip code areas and devaluing home prices in these areas.

Ms. Einhorn stated that she also believed that there should be more sidewalks around this site as there is a lack of them around the township and that there is a lack of greenspace around the township so any reduction of open space should not be permitted.

Ms. Einhorn once again noted that there is an erosion of land on the west side of town and too much congestion along Rt. 70. She also noted that she did not believe that there were sufficient traffic police in the township to deal with the increased congestion and that all of this continues to devalue homes on the west side of Cherry Hill.

Bryan Everett  
15 E. Miami, Cherry Hill

Mr. Everett stated that he had a Master's Degree in public administration and felt that this project was an overall terrible idea as the traffic on Route 70 towards Camden was already bad and that a light would just add to that congestion. He added that the cloverleaf backs up which most likely means that the turn lane into the site will also back up adding to delays and that the time it would take to move over to take the cloverleaf if the left turn lane was full is not sufficient. He added that this is already happening with the backup turning left into Wegman's and the back up in the right lane turning into the car wash.

Ms. Luciani noted that the installation of the traffic light was not up for consideration by this board and that NJDOT had already approved the new light.

Mr. Everett said that he still felt that the light was only for the benefit of these two users and he's concerned about similar approvals for other users. He also asked what they can do to get a better seat at the table when applications like this are being considered.

Ms. Luciani noted that all applications for new traffic signals are reviewed by NJDOT to ensure that all standards that need to be met are being met. She also pointed to the new lights that were integrated into the redevelopment of Jefferson Hospital on Cooper Landing Road and Chapel Avenue.

Rena Margulis  
28 School Lane, Cherry Hill

Mr. Margulis stated that she was concerned that residents have no way of finding out about proposed new traffic lights that may affect them.

Ms. Luciani noted that public notice is under the jurisdiction of NJ DOT.

Mr. Mosley noted that notice of the opening, closures, and traffic light were sent to both Cherry Hill Township and Camden County and they were under review for at least 9 months.

Ms. Luciani noted that there is no requirement on the part of the Township to notify all its residents of notices that we receive.

Ms. Margulis asked what Ms. Luciani was going to do to stop another new traffic light from being approved.

Ms. Luciani noted that notice to the residents is not under the purview of the Department of Community Development and if residents take issue with the notice requirements of the NJDOT they need to contact their legislators.

Ms. Margulis asked Mr. Mosley what the assumptions were made regarding the number of people that would be using the light.

Mr. Mosley stated that they looked at how much traffic is coming into the Crowne Plaza at the existing driveway along Rt. 70 and they used a percentage of the traffic and moved it to the left turn lane and assuming that much of the daytime usage at the hotel is actually coming from Philadelphia that would not need to use the turn lane. The other assumption was based on the existing distribution of traffic in the area, where they are coming from and where they are going to and added calculations for those trips as well.

Mr. Mosley also noted to clarify for others that had made comments about the westbound traffic is that the only time it will stop will be if there is a pedestrian that is seeking to cross at the crosswalk. Otherwise it stays green for the entire peak hours. In addition, eastbound traffic only stops if there is a vehicle waiting.

Mr. Mosley added that to further clarify the pedestrian crossing that the timing of the pedestrian crossing is 40 seconds as opposed to the 20 seconds that vehicles get if no pedestrian is present.

Ms. Margulis asked if the traffic signal would always be waiting for the timed synchronized green.

Mr. Mosley stated that the NJDOT controls the synchronization based on offsets from the previous lights in order to maximize flow.

Ms. Margulis asked if the light would turn if nobody was waiting.

Mr. Mosley stated that the light would stay green as long as there is no vehicle waiting to turn left in or turn right out and that the signal would change when appropriate with the other light synchronization.

Ms. Margulis thought that was worse and asked what amount of time this would add to people's commutes.

Mr. Mosley stated that he only believed that it would really only slow down drivers for about 5 to 10 seconds unless there is someone is using the crosswalk, but couldn't speak to an exact amount of time.

Ms. Luciani noted that this was a safer condition than people running across Rt 70 with no light which is a common occurrence at this location.

Ms. Margulis noted that she feels that people have been accessing both of these sites for over 30 years without difficulty and modern technology allows people to get almost anywhere without difficulty. She also noted that there are plenty of other sites, such as Penn Medicine, that are difficult to access but people still go there.

Ms. Margulis expressed her displeasure regarding the lack of notification to the residence and amount the installation of the light in general.

Mr. Osorio closed the meeting to public comments.

**Motion:** Following the reiteration of the conditions by Solicitor Diamantis, these included:

1. Comply with comments in Department of Community Development review of March 28, 2018 and the Environmental Resolutions, Inc. review of April 6, 2018
2. Provide a Stormwater Maintenance agreement

Community Development will verify that the site meets all applicable ADA requirements.

William Carter made a motion, which was seconded by Hugh Dougherty, to approve the preliminary and final major site plan application with bulk (c) variances. Affirmative votes by Adler, Jacobs, Osorio, Dougherty, Hung, Carter, Kates, Kalitan, and Griffith. The preliminary and final major site plan with bulk (c) variance is approved.

The following comments were made by Planning Board member during the vote:

Ms. Adler stated that she was voting to approve the application with the recognition that the approval of the light was not under the board's jurisdiction, the shared access point is a safer condition, the extended ramp lane eliminates a lot of weaving on and off of Rt. 70, and the proposed plan is an overall improvement to the site.

Ms. Jacobs noted that the variance requests were de minimus and the benefits of the changes outweigh the detriments.

Mr. Osorio felt that, based on the expert testimony, that the changes would create a safer condition.

Mr. Dougherty stated that he appreciated the comments from the public and the reuse of an underutilized site by the applicant. He noted that the proposed conditions were safer for all with the ADA acceptable crossing and that, while there will be an impact, the impact will be less than that of a full intersection. He stated that any decision is a balancing act for the board but the shared parking and improvements to the Stormwater facilities on the site outweigh the detriment of the variances being requested.

Mr. Hung also thanked the public for their testimony but as representatives of the Township they have to consider the applicant's compliance with Township ordinances and compliance with the Municipal Land Use Law and he believes that they have satisfied these requirements.

Mr. Carter stated that he felt the variances requested were de minimus though he is also frustrated by the NJDOT process for informing residents of potential changes.

Mr. Kates agreed that the variances were de minimus and felt that the shared parking was a positive improvement for both sites.

Ms. Kalitan stated that she thinks this is a great redevelopment project, there is very little new disturbance, and the connection between the two parking lots is a good thing.

Ms. Griffith stated that she was voting yes based on the presentation and that she was in agreement with the comments of the other board members.

**Resolutions:**

**8752.3A4**

Block(s) 54.02 Lot(s) 3 Qual: C0001  
Zone: Regional Business (B4) Zone

*Relief Requested: An Amended General Development Plan (GDP) to construct a 14,770 SF retail building addition as an extension of Building D (end cap is DSW Shoes) at Towne Center at Garden State Park, as well as various site and signage improvements.*

**Cherry Hill Towne Center Partners**

901-957 Haddonfield Road  
Cherry Hill, NJ

**Motion to Ratify:** Following the review of the resolution, Sam Kates made a motion which was seconded by John Osorio, to memorialize the resolution for Cherry Hill Towne Center Partners, amended GDP. Affirmative votes by Adler, Hung, Carter, Kates, Kalitan and Griffith. The resolution is memorialized.

**8752.3A4**

Block(s) 54.02 Lot(s) 3 Qual: C0001  
Zone: Regional Business (B4) Zone

*Relief Requested: An amended preliminary and final major site plan to construct a 14,770 SF retail building addition as an extension of Building D (end cap is DSW Shoes) at Towne Center at Garden State Park, as well as various site and signage improvements.*

**Cherry Hill Towne Center Partners**

901-957 Haddonfield Road  
Cherry Hill, NJ

**Motion to Ratify:** Following the review of the resolution, Sam Kates made a motion which was seconded by William Carter, to memorialize the resolution for Cherry Hill Towne Center Partners, preliminary and final major site plan. Affirmative votes by Adler, Hung, Carter, Kates, Kalitan and Griffith. The resolution is memorialized.

**8752.2B6**

Block(s) 54.01; 54.02 Lot(s) 5; 5, 5.03 & 5.04  
Zone: Regional Business (B4) Zone

*Relief Requested: An amended preliminary and final major subdivision to adjust lot lines around the clubhouse in Phase 2A (Village Place Apartments) and subdivide Phase 2B residential from 66,523 SF commercial component.*

**Cherry Hill Partners at Haddonfield Phase III, LLC**

Garden Park Boulevard  
Cherry Hill, NJ

**Motion to Ratify:** Following the review of the resolution, Sam Kates made a motion which was seconded by Betty Adler, to memorialize the resolution for Cherry Hill Partners at Haddonfield Phase III, LLC, preliminary and final major subdivision. Affirmative votes by Adler, Hung, Carter, Kates, Kalitan and Griffith. The resolution is memorialized.

**8752.2B6**

Block(s) 54.01; 54.02 Lot(s) 5; 5, 5.03 & 5.04  
Zone: Regional Business (B4) Zone

*Relief Requested: An amended preliminary and final major site plan with bulk (C) variances to construct 66,523 SF of various commercial uses (retail and restaurant) along with various site and signage improvements.*

**Cherry Hill Partners at Haddonfield Phase III, LLC**

Garden Park Boulevard  
Cherry Hill, NJ

**Motion to Ratify:** Following the review of the resolution, Betty Adler made a motion which was seconded by John Osorio, to memorialize the resolution for Cherry Hill Partners at Haddonfield Phase III, LLC, preliminary and final major site plan. Affirmative votes by Adler, Hung, Carter, Kates, Kalitan and Griffith. The resolution is memorialized.

**Meeting Adjourned:** at 9:10 PM.

**ADOPTED: 5/7/18**



---

**JOHN OSORIO, CHAIRMAN**

**ATTEST:**



---

**LORISSA LUCIANI, PP, AICP  
PLANNING BOARD SECRETARY**

