

**WEST AMWELL TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
February 15, 2011**

The West Amwell Township Planning Board meeting was called to order at 7:30 PM by Chairman Pfeiffer followed by the salute to the flag.

The following statement of compliance with the Open Public Meetings Act as listed on the meeting agenda was read into the record by Chairman Pfeiffer: This meeting was called pursuant to the provisions of the Open Public Meetings Act. This meeting was included in a list of meetings transmitted to the Hunterdon County Democrat and Trenton Times on January 27, 2011. Notice has been posted on the bulletin board at Town Hall on February 10, 2011, and has remained continuously posted as to required notices under the Statute. A copy of this notice is available to the public and is on file in the Office of the Planning Board and Township Clerk.

The following general policy statement of the Board was read into the record by Chairman Pfeiffer: The Board's general policy is to end the presentation of testimony on applications by 10:30 PM and to conclude all Board business by 11:00 PM. When necessary, the Chair may permit a reasonable extension of those time limits.

The meeting was recorded via digital recording system and a copy of the CD is on file in the Office of the Planning Board.

**Oaths of Office**

It was noted for the record that Attorney Shurts had administered the Oath of Office to Nella Hamtil prior to the start of this evening's meeting. Ms. Hamtil was not present at last month's reorganization meeting. She will serve on the Planning Board as Alternate #2 with her term expiring on 12/31/12.

**Attendance – Roll Call**

**Present:** Lonnie Baldino  
Stephen Bergenfeld  
George Fisher  
John Haug  
Tom Molnar  
Sean Pfeiffer  
Hal Shute  
Chester Urbanski  
Joan Van der Veen  
Rob Tomenchok – Alt. #1  
Nella Hamtil – Alt. #2  
Attorney Shurts  
Engineer Decker  
Planner McManus

**Excused:** No one

### **Discussion Items with Board Professionals**

#### **Discussion: Ordinance 2, 2011: An Ordinance to Amend Chapter 109 of the Code of the Township of West Amwell to Provide Regulations Regarding Renewable Energy Facilities**

Chairman Pfeiffer noted that the Township Committee had not taken any action on this Ordinance at the public hearing due to some revisions that have been distributed this evening. Ms. Urbanski of the Environmental Commission explained that she and Mr. Fisher had worked on the revised draft which also included some comments from Attorney Walter Wilson who had appeared before the Planning Board and the Township Committee to provide input on the Renewable Energy Ordinance.

Ms. Urbanski commented that Attorney Wilson stated the Township cannot regulate renewable energy facilities or make them conditional uses but her research indicates otherwise. Ms. Urbanski remarked that a recent presentation at the Association of New Jersey Environmental Commissions (ANJEC) conference stated municipalities are crafting ordinances that establish commercial solar facilities as conditional uses in residential zones.

Chairman Pfeiffer asked the Board's professionals to provide guidance on what inherently beneficial means as it relates to solar facilities and whether or not conditional use standards would be appropriate for facilities located on properties not governed by the State Statute—specifically those properties outside of the Light Industrial Zone.

Attorney Shurts explained that inherently beneficial is defined in the Municipal Land Use Law (MLUL). He noted the statute states it is a use which is universally considered of value to the community because it fundamentally serves the public good and promotes the general welfare. Attorney Shurts commented that the Statute was specifically amended to include wind, solar and photovoltaic energy facilities or structures as inherently beneficial. He noted that the MLUL mandates in Section 66:11 that renewable energy facilities on 20 acre contiguous parcels or larger, owned by the same person or entity, are permitted uses in every industrial district in all municipalities.

Attorney Shurts noted that the MLUL provides for authority/regulation/conditions to be established. He stated that because renewable energy facilities are inherently beneficial they meet the positive criteria burden for variance considerations, however because such uses don't necessarily belong on every parcel the Board(s) have the ability to review each application and ultimately determine if the negative criteria are met and establish reasonable regulations where appropriate.

Chairman Pfeiffer asked Attorney Shurts if the Township did not adopt any Renewable Energy Ordinance, would all applications then go to the Board of Adjustment creating a situation where the burden of proof for the applicant is much higher. Attorney Shurts commented that it would be tougher on applicants with no Ordinance noting that with conditional uses, if the conditions are satisfied, then there is no difference from any other permitted use. He added that the burden of proof for a variance from a specific condition of a conditional use is not as difficult as the burden when reviewing a use which is not permitted.

Mr. Shute asked what the benefit is to the Township. Attorney Shurts stated the benefits are generally spelled out in the findings with the notion that it is always a good idea to develop sources of renewable energy.

Planner McManus commented that in terms of crafting a Renewable Energy Ordinance, the Ordinance should address the impact of the use. She noted the importance of regulating the visual and nuisance aspects of renewable energy facilities. Planner McManus elaborated that the visual aspects refer to the screening of the facilities through plantings, fencing, signage and setbacks. From a nuisance perspective she noted the Board should focus on setbacks comparing the potential noise that may be generated from a substation to a residential property line. Planner McManus encouraged the Board to review the existing Ordinance regarding nuisance issues and determine whether or not the requirements are adequate for renewable energy facilities.

With regard to conditional use standards, Planner McManus noted establishing standards in an industrial zone is not appropriate because it would be contrary to State Statute. However, she indicated in other zones it is appropriate to keep renewable energy facilities as conditional uses. She noted solar arrays are relatively new and everything is still not known as to how neighborhoods will be affected and by providing those conditions it allows the municipality to retain some additional control over how the use will be developed.

Engineer Decker commented that establishing conditional use standards for renewable energy facilities does help applicants because it sets the expectations making it easier for them to design and present their application. He noted that without that design criteria every application would have to go to the Board of Adjustment.

The revised ordinance was reviewed page by page with the following areas noted:

Chairman Pfeiffer noted the suggested revision on page 3 is to add, "...minor solar ground mounted facilities containing more than 10 panels or located less than 50' from the nearest property line shall require minor site plan approval prior to obtaining a zoning permit and shall have setback requirements consistent with building regulations." There was some discussion on the *10 panel* language vs. *solar arrays* when referring to solar facilities.

Planner McManus commented that including the term array in the definition of a panel could be cumbersome. She suggested the Board consider defining the area dedicated to solar by square footage or by a percentage of the lot area as opposed to *10 panels*. Ms. Urbanski remarked that the definition in the Ordinance is from the State. Planner McManus stated she advocates consistency with the State whenever possible but believes the language is flawed and recommended that the Board not follow it. She indicated that changes can be made so long as they are not inconsistent with the State Statute and in this case that is what she recommends.

Chairman Pfeiffer noted that under the permitted accessory use paragraph on page 3 it states, "...in the case of a surface level or ground mounted system, the systems shall consist of 10 or fewer photovoltaic panels and shall be situated more than 50' from the nearest property boundary line." He

suggested the words *shall consist of 10 or fewer photovoltaic panels* be removed and replaced with *shall be situated more than 50' from the nearest property boundary line* and the next sentence should read, "...minor solar ground mounted facilities located less than 50' from the nearest property boundary line shall require minor site plan approval prior to obtaining a zoning permit and shall have setback requirements consistent with building regulations." Chairman Pfeiffer remarked this change may solve the problem because there will be no reference to the number of panels. The Board agreed.

The next discussion focused on the suggested revision of changing the existing 50' landscape buffer language to a 25' landscape buffer. Mr. Fisher commented that he and Ms. Urbanski reviewed the Township's existing setbacks in the various zones and the 25' conformed more closely to the existing setbacks than the 50' buffer. Chairman Pfeiffer noted that in most cases the setbacks in the existing Township Ordinance require more than 50'. Mr. Fisher commented that generally speaking they thought 25' was sufficient noting that you can easily stagger two rows of trees and bushes within a 25' area.

Planner McManus commented that the topography of the land contributes to whether or not a 25' buffer will be adequate. She cautioned the Board that if they establish a minimum standard of 25' they will be hard pressed to require an applicant to have a larger buffer area. Ms. Urbanski added that she did additional research and found that the Springfield Township, NJ Renewable Energy Ordinance notes a 50' wide visual screening from residential zones, a 30' wide visual screening from public roads and a 20' wide visual screening from non-residential zones.

Engineer Decker noted Kingwood Township, NJ implemented a 50' wide visual screening in their Renewable Energy Ordinance because they believed it to be adequate and appropriate. He noted an applicant can always make a case for natural buffering and request a lesser buffer such as 25'. He remarked it is difficult to ask an applicant to establish a 50' buffer if the Ordinance only indicates 25'.

It was the consensus of the Board, and the recommendation of the Board professionals to use the language in the Springfield Township, NJ Renewable Energy Ordinance noted above for screening buffers. With regard to setback requirements, Chairman Pfeiffer suggested the language read, "...the minimum principal setbacks shall be equivalent to the minimum vegetative buffer size or the minimum setback in the zone, whichever is greater." The Board and the Professionals agreed with this suggestion as well.

The next discussion focused on changing the 50' maximum allowed height for small wind turbines to 100'. Ms. Urbanski commented that the other ordinances done regarding wind in this area address small wind energy systems. Chairman Pfeiffer remarked that based on what the

Planning Board has heard, it is unlikely an application will be submitted for a large wind facility in this area. Planner McManus agreed.

Mr. Bergenfeld commented that he indicated in a previous Board meeting that 120' – 150' is the appropriate height for wind turbines. Planner McManus remarked that if the Township is going to permit small wind turbines it should be done so at a height that is reasonable in order for people to

develop wind energy in an economically feasible fashion. She added that if 100' is inconsistent with what someone needs to produce power then she recommended the Board find that small wind facilities are not appropriate for the Township or that the height be increased.

Engineer Decker commented that he doesn't know enough about wind energy to make a height recommendation to the Board. He noted that if a parcel is along the ridge line and there is enough wind just above the trees, then the turbine would be shorter—as opposed to a parcel sitting below the ridge line which would require a taller turbine in order to be efficient. Planner Decker indicated that he did not believe the wind currents in this area are conducive to wind energy and therefore did not think the Board would be seeing applications for wind energy facilities.

Chairman Pfeiffer indicated the only structure currently in the Township's Ordinance that allows for a 100' height is wireless telecom towers which require a 500' setback from the nearest existing residence. He noted that the Board cannot require that type of setback for wind turbines because the State Statute won't allow for a setback greater than 150% of the height of the turbine. Chairman Pfeiffer asked if a height scale could be implemented based on lot size. Planner McManus commented that if the setback is based on the size of the turbine, then a larger parcel will be needed to accommodate a taller turbine. Mr. Bergenfeld noted that 150' turbine would require about a 5 acre parcel to meet the setback requirements. Chairman Pfeiffer noted there is a 6 acre lot in the Calton development and a 14 acre lot in the Orleans development commenting that theoretically there could be large turbines installed in those areas and he questioned how the neighbors would react.

Mr. Fisher suggested leaving the turbine height at the suggested revised height of 100' and noted that property owners could go to the Board of Adjustment if they needed to install a taller turbine. Ms. Urbanski commented that Ocean City, NJ has a maximum height limit specifying, "...is as high as necessary to capture the wind energy resource but not to exceed 135'."

Ms. Van der Veen commented that the height comparison is being made to cell towers and she noted that a cell tower has no motion and is small at the top as opposed to wind turbines that move and are large at the highest point. Mr. Bergenfeld noted that cell towers have not been deemed inherently beneficial. Chairman Pfeiffer commented that he had recently read an article indicating the cell tower technology is evolving into smaller installations being made on top of existing structures.

Mr. Tomenchok remarked that wind energy is the perfect compliment to solar energy explaining that when solar is ineffective, wind is more effective. He stated that West Amwell Township is a Class II wind area which means it is really not economically viable to install wind energy here. Planner McManus indicated the American Wind Energy Industry suggests the average height for small wind turbines is between 80' and 140' depending on location and need.

It was suggested the Board Members be polled on what they believed the maximum allowed height of wind turbines should be. The following comments were made:

Rob Tomenchok: 140'

Nella Hamtil: Indicated she liked the language Ms. Urbanski quoted allowing the turbine(s) to be as high as necessary to capture the wind energy resource

Joan Van der Veen: 50'

Chester Urbanski: Indicated he thinks wind turbines are an eyesore but understands the energy part of it and said 100'

John Haug: Indicated he agreed with Mr. Urbanski and said 100'

Lonnie Baldino: 100'

Hal Shute: 140'

George Fisher: Indicated he agreed with the language Ms. Hamtil referred to

Steve Bergenfeld: 140'

Tom Molnar: 140'

Sean Pfeiffer: Indicated he was fine with 100' but didn't object to allowing a higher threshold

A motion by Bergenfeld, seconded by Shute to allow wind turbines to be as high as necessary to capture the wind energy resource but not to exceed 140' was approved by roll call vote.

There was some brief discussion on the *where as* clauses regarding some of Attorney Walter Wilson's comments after his attendance at the Township Committee meeting. Chairman Pfeiffer commented that the suggestion on the first *where as* provision which seems to be directed to net metering systems, should be clarified and expanded to include direct grid connected systems. Planner McManus commented that the intent is meant to be read a bit more literally. She stated residential properties are turning to solar either as a principal use or as an accessory use.

Chairman Pfeiffer commented on the third *where as* which refers to the MLUL stating that there is a comment from Attorney Wilson that there is a permitted use in all zones allowing for industrial uses rather than in industrial zones and Planner McManus indicated she deferred to the exact language in the MLUL because the intent is to rely upon the revision to the MLUL permitting renewable energy in industrial zones. Attorney Shurts commented that he found the language in the ordinance to be consistent with the MLUL and noted he would not change it to the phrasing suggested by Attorney Wilson because it should be made clear that what is required is limited to 20 acres or greater of contiguous tract(s) of land within industrial zones.

Chairman Pfeiffer commented on the fifth *where as* which refers to the word "balance." Planner McManus indicated that the reference to balance is appropriate noting that towns consistently struggle with such things as the balance of residential vs. commercial uses and economic development vs. preservation of environmental features. She remarked that she believes it is appropriate to balance renewable energy with farmland especially in a rural community like West Amwell. Engineer Decker and Attorney Shurts agreed with Planner McManus' comments.

Chairman Pfeiffer opened the floor to public comment noting that he intended to limit each person's comments to 5 minutes.

Bruce Gage of 346 Rock Road East came forward and expressed concern over the Board allowing wind turbines in the Township. He remarked that they are inappropriate and not efficient in this area for energy development. Mr. Gage noted that a 140' wind turbine is the equivalent of a 14 story building. He questioned whether or not anyone had done any assessments on the impact such a structure would

have to property values and commented that even though State Government promotes this type of energy it is not mandated. Mr. Gage also suggested the Board recast their vote on the maximum allowed height for wind turbines commenting that he is aware of a Board Member who is planning on installing a wind turbine and his voting on the matter is a conflict of interest.

Chairman Pfeiffer remarked that if Mr. Gage is making an allegation against someone it should be put on the record. Mr. Gage stated he knows Mr. Bergenfeld is planning on installing a wind turbine. Mr. Bergenfeld stated he did not know where Mr. Gage was getting this information from. He commented that he would install a wind turbine on his property but has not done any testing on his lot for wind energy nor has he contacted any companies regarding such. Mr. Gage noted Mr. Bergenfeld has stated publically, his intentions to install a wind turbine on his property. Mr. Bergenfeld said he may have said that 8 years ago but hasn't done anything yet and has no plans to do so today or within the next year. Mr. Bergenfeld maintained that he has not contacted any wind energy companies and stated he knows the rules and does not have to abstain from the vote. Mr. Gage apologized stating he was under a misconception and reiterated his belief that wind energy is not appropriate for West Amwell Township.

Mr. Urbanski commented that he shares Mr. Gage's sentiments but noted he didn't know how wind turbines could be stopped/prohibited. Mr. Tomenchok remarked that he believes the parameters with which the Ordinance is crafted regarding wind energy are reasonable.

Arthur Foran of 60 Frontage Road came forward and asked for clarification on the 20 acre threshold regarding solar facilities referred to in the Township Ordinance. Chairman Pfeiffer explained the minimum lot size of 20 acres applies, for conditional use standards, on renewable energy applications outside of the light industrial zone. He added that inside the light industrial zone the 20 acre minimum lot size does not apply for conditional use standards.

Dan Goodman of 31 Ferris Wheel Drive came forward and thanked the Board for their work in creating a Renewable Energy Ordinance and expressed concern with being able to achieve adequate screening specifically on hilly topography. He noted the Ordinance references a 75% screening within 5 years commenting he believes this will be difficult to accomplish and remarked that the residents shouldn't have to wait 5 years. He also suggested noise studies should be required to be done by a third party and not by the applicant's engineer.

Planner McManus indicated she understands the residents may have concerns over waiting for screening to mature over 5 years but stated that this requirement is an aggressive Ordinance standard. She noted it is impractical to require 20' tall trees be planted at a site because it is not economically feasible.

With regard to the noise studies, Engineer Decker noted that typically the applicant's Engineer conducts the study and the results are reviewed by the Township Engineer. He commented that the Board can always add a requirement that additional field testing be conducted after installation of a renewable energy facility.

Attorney Walter Wilson came forward on behalf of Garden Solar and commented that he still has issues with the 20 acre minimum lot size. He noted that a number of parcels they are looking at are lots with less than 20 acres because it is likely the Township will see fewer large scale direct grid connected solar facilities. He said the smaller sites have economic viability and they are much easier to screen. Attorney Wilson also commented that he believes the 75% screening within 5 years may be too aggressive. Lastly Attorney Wilson questioned the need for a bonding requirement associated with the decommissioning of renewable energy sites. Engineer Decker commented that the bonding requirement was established because there is no other “re-use” for a solar facility—unlike an abandoned building that can be reused for another business. Chairman Pfeiffer added the bonding requirement provides the Township with a little more protection.

A poll of the Board on whether or not to remove the bonding requirement from the Ordinance determined that the consensus was to remove it because ultimately it is a mute point since the bond would be required to be posted at the time of decommissioning to ensure that the work is actually going to be done which Mr. Fisher remarked is almost “useless” because if the company isn’t going to dismantle the site, then they aren’t going to post a bond.

Ms. Urbanski remarked that she will make the noted revisions and forward the revised Ordinance to the Township Committee for introduction.

A motion by Fisher, seconded by Bergenfeld to recommend the draft Renewable Energy Ordinance as amended be sent to the Township Committee for introduction was unanimously approved by roll call vote.

#### **Discussion: Site Plan Review Requirement**

Mr. Baldino commented that upon his review of the Township’s ordinance, he can approve permitted uses in commercial zones without Planning Board review. Chairman Pfeiffer noted that the MLUL states that site plan review should be required for commercial uses. He asked the Board’s professionals for their input.

Planner McManus recommended site plan review be required for any commercial development. Engineer Decker agreed. Chairman Pfeiffer asked Planner McManus and Engineer Decker if they have a model ordinance they could provide that would be applicable to West Amwell for the Board to review. Planner McManus indicated she would put something together.

Engineer Decker was excused from the meeting at this time, 9:37 PM.

#### **Discussion – Question Regarding Sign Ordinance Impact on Temporary/Election Signs**

Chairman Pfeiffer addressed Planner McManus noting Mr. Shute had a question on temporary election signs on public property with respect to the Ordinance. Mr. Shute remarked that he believed the Ordinance should contain an exemption for political and free expression signage. Mr. Baldino commented that most towns have guidelines for political signs where they can’t be put up more than 45 days prior to an election and they must be removed within 15 days after an election.

Chairman Pfeiffer clarified that Mr. Shute's issue is that any sign on public land can be considered litter. Mr. Shute agreed and stated that he believed election signs should be added to the list of exemptions in the Ordinance. Chairman Pfeiffer suggested that due to budget constraints, Mr. Shute revise the Ordinance for the Board to review at next month's meeting. Mr. Shute agreed to do so.

Planner McManus was excused from the meeting at this time, 9:42 PM.

### **Approval of Bill List**

A motion by Haug, seconded by Van der Veen to approve the vouchers for payment as listed on the Board's 2/15/11 bill list was unanimously approved by roll call vote.

### **Resolutions for Approval**

#### **Resolution PB#2011-08: Heritage – Block 5 Lot 15.01 – Request for Extension of Time to File Deeds**

A motion by Haug, seconded by Urbanski to approve Resolution PB#2011-08, as revised, was unanimously approved by roll call vote.

Chairman Pfeiffer reordered the agenda to address item 2-C under correspondence: *Letter dated 1/14/11 from Mr. & Mrs. Gross, re: Block 32 Lot 4.02*. He explained that the Tax Assessor had made an error on the certified list of property owners within 200' of Block 32 Lot 4.02 and while the property owner has the right to rely on the certified list, Tax Assessor Gill has acknowledged West Amwell Township Planning Board Minutes – 2/15/11

that there is an error and it would seem that a corrected list should be sent to the property owner to be used for all future notifications.

Attorney Shurts indicated it would make sense to provide a corrected list and the Board could request Tax Assessor Gill do so. Mr. Tomenchok commented that he finds it highly objectionable that this sort of thing happens because Mr. Gill is supposedly a seasoned professional that the Township is relying on and this type of mistake makes the Township look bad.

It was the consensus of the Board to send a letter to the Township Committee requesting they ask Tax Assessor Gill to send a corrected certified list of property owners for Block 32 Lot 4.02 and also to request that the tax map be corrected accordingly.

Attorney Shurts was excused from the meeting at this time, 9:56 PM.

Mr. Haug left the meeting at this time, 9:58 PM.

### **Unfinished Business**

#### **Discussion – Community Facilities Plan Element Update**

Chairman Pfeiffer noted he had spoken with Harry Heller who provided updated information regarding Amwell Valley Rescue Squad. He remarked that he believes all of the information in the Element has now been reviewed and updated.

Ms. Van der Veen noted some minor grammatical and word changes throughout the document. Chairman Pfeiffer indicated he would make the noted changes and send the Community Facilities Plan Element to Planner Hintz's Office for final comment.

#### **Discussion – Economic Plan Element Status**

Mr. Shute commented that he is still working on the Element and remarked that in doing so he discovered the most recent census numbers are incorrect. He explained there is a 60% increase in population over the last 10 years – 1450 people. Chairman Pfeiffer remarked that this may be a problem with the Township's Council on Affordable Housing (COAH) requirement. He suggested Shirley Bishop should be consulted and asked whether or not the census numbers will cause a problem with COAH.

#### **Discussion – Revised Fee Ordinance Status**

Chairman Pfeiffer noted that he and Mr. Baldino will meet to discuss suggested revisions to the fee ordinance over the next month.

#### **Discussion – Conditional Use Ordinance Review Status**

Chairman Pfeiffer noted that he, Mr. Baldino and Mr. Haug met since the last meeting to work on suggested revisions to the Conditional Use Ordinance. He indicated they are focusing on the general requirements and the first two specific requirements: Public utilities and wireless telecom West Amwell Township Planning Board Minutes – 2/15/11 because they are aware of issues that need to be addressed. Chairman Pfeiffer asked for guidance on Planner Hintz's suggestion to have language (for commercial utilities) saying, "all equipment, structures and buildings shall be screened from public view and from adjacent properties in accordance with standards set forth in the zoning code...all landscaping and other improvements comprised in the buffer area shall be visually impervious after 5 years of maturity and shall be maintained to provide an effective buffer in perpetuity...landscaping which is dead, diseased or damaged by wildlife shall be replaced with landscaping which is of like maturity to that which was diseased, dead or damaged...any structure approved as part of the buffer requirement shall be maintained in good condition."

Chairman Pfeiffer also noted setback language suggested by Planner Hintz that, "...all equipment, structures and buildings shall maintain a minimum distance of 100' from public street right of way and 300' from side and rear lot lines adjoining a residential use or residential zone district and 200' from side and rear lot lines adjoining a non-residential use or a non-residential zone district."

It was the consensus of the Board to soften some of the language/requirements, including the setbacks, suggested by Planner Hintz. Chairman Pfeiffer noted he will pull language from the renewable energy ordinance and provide a rough draft to the Board for review.

#### **Status of Plan Endorsement**

Chairman Pfeiffer noted there was no update on Plan Endorsement at this time.

#### **New Business**

##### **Discussion – Establishing a Special Meeting Fee Ordinance**

Ms. Andrews noted that Board of Adjustment Secretary Ruth Hall would like to establish a fee ordinance to cover paying the Board Secretary's time at special meetings. Ms. Andrews noted she does not expect to get paid to cover special meetings for the Planning Board, but noted she can't speak for other secretaries. Ms. Andrews also noted that Deputy Planning Board Secretary Griffiths had resigned and Ms. Andrews and Ms. Hall have agreed to cover for each other's Boards when necessary.

The consensus of the Board was to endorse a fee ordinance for payment of the Board Secretary's at special meetings.

The Deputy Secretary matter will be placed on the Board's March agenda for further discussion.

**Approval of Minutes**

A motion by Van der Veen, seconded by Urbanski to approve the Board's minutes from the 1/18/11 meeting as revised was unanimously approved by roll call vote.

**Adjournment**

A motion by Bergenfeld, seconded by Urbanski to adjourn was unanimously approved by voice vote.

The meeting adjourned at 10:34 PM.

---

Maria Andrews, Planning Board Secretary