

**WEST AMWELL TOWNSHIP
PLANNING BOARD MEETING
November 16, 2010**

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 28, 2010. Notice has been posted on the bulletin board at Town Hall on November 12, 2010, 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.

Attendance – Roll Call

Present: Lonnie Baldino
Stephen Bergenfeld
George Fisher
John Haug – *(arrived at 7:36 PM)*
Tom Molnar
Sean Pfeiffer
Hal Shute
Chester Urbanski
Joan Van der Veen
Zach Rich – Alt. #1 – *(arrived at 7:39 PM)*
Rich Storcella – Alt. #2
Attorney Shurts
Planner McManus – *(filling in for regular Board Planner Hintz)*

Excused: No one

Approval of Bill List

A motion by Bergenfeld, seconded by Baldino to approve the vouchers for payment as listed on the Board's 11/16/10 bill list was unanimously approved by roll call vote.

Applications

It was noted that there were no applications listed on the agenda.

Resolutions of Approval

Resolution PB#2010-15: Extension of Time to File Deeds – Block 32 Lot 4

Attorney Shurts explained this is the standard extension of time that often gets requested because applicants can't always meet the 190 day filing requirement if there are conditions of approval that must be met. In this case, Mr. Lucarini's Attorney requested a four month extension. It was noted that the original time to file deeds expires on 11/24/10 and the four month extension would be good through 3/24/11 as indicated in the Resolution.

A motion by Bergenfeld, seconded by Fisher to approve Resolution PB#2010-15 granting a four month extension of time, through 3/24/11, to file deeds was unanimously approved by roll call vote.

Chairman Pfeiffer addressed Mr. Lucarini in the public audience and asked him if he had any comments or questions for the Board. Mr. Lucarini remarked that he would like to finalize the matter soon commenting that it has been a long a process.

Unfinished Business

Update on SADC Approval of Farmland Preservation Plan

Chairman Pfeiffer commented that the State Agriculture Development Committee (SADC) has approved the Township's Farmland Preservation Plan at their meeting on 11/4/10.

Discussion – Recreation Plan Element

Chairman Pfeiffer explained that Mr. Shute had sent the Recreation Plan Element documentation over to Planner Hintz for his review after the Board's discussion at their last meeting. It was noted that Planner Hintz's Office had no additional comments to add to the Element.

Discussion – Circulation Plan Element

Chairman Pfeiffer noted that an updated draft of this Element was distributed this evening. He pointed out some revisions on page 2 under "Collector Roads" including spelling out Rock Road East and Rock Road West. Additional comments dealt with scenic roads and other minor recommendations. Planner McManus noted that there was a recommendation that the Township include Routes 202, 179, 29 and possibly Route 31 as scenic corridors to provide protection in the event applications come in that may be detrimental to the rural and agricultural character of the area.

Chairman Pfeiffer asked if those highways are specifically listed, but other roads like Mt. Airy Harborton Road or Rocktown-Lambertville Road are not listed, does that give potential billboard applications a doorway to argue that all scenic roads within the Township were not specifically named. Planner McManus explained that if the road is not listed as scenic in the Master Plan, the weight of the policy is not behind the Board should a billboard application come in that may be detrimental. She

noted that she believes with the additional language, the Master Plan now identifies all of the roads that are likely to be targeted by a billboard company. Planner McManus stated that the Board has identified those roads that are most scenic and gone a step further to specify the commercial roads within the Township which have scenic characteristics and are now identified as such.

Mr. Shute commented that the lead in to the list of scenic roads states that the Board should establish special design and development standards in order to limit disturbance caused by new development. He expressed that if the Township was going to have new development, he would hope to see it along these highways. Planner McManus stated there are two issues: (1) If there is new development, the Township must establish where they would like to see it happen and (2) Identifying these roads as scenic provides the Board with the opportunity to craft regulations which will preserve the quality of the roads.

Ms. Van der Veen suggested Route 579 be added to the list of scenic roads. Planner McManus agreed that parts of Route 579 are scenic and believed it would be a good addition to the list. Mr. Fisher asked if the Board was listing specific roads just to hinder development. Chairman Pfeiffer noted the focus was not the issue of development, but rather billboards. Mr. Fisher remarked that he didn't believe Route 579 was as likely a target for billboards as Route 202 might be. Planner McManus agreed with Mr. Fisher and added that having the scenic designation in the Master Plan gives the Board the ability to prepare ordinances that would reflect the scenic character.

Mr. Urbanski and Ms. Van der Veen were in favor of adding the list of scenic roads to the Master Plan including Route 579. Mr. Bergenfeld was apprehensive about adding a list of scenic roads and commented that it gives the Board more power to impose restrictions. Planner McManus stated that the list of scenic roads will provide policy guidance in the event a development application comes in that may be detrimental to the character of West Amwell along these specified corridors. She also noted that it is important to have the foundation and establishment of the billboard ordinance within the Master Plan in the event a billboard application comes in.

Mr. Bergenfeld remarked that this policy seems to give the Board the power to request that an application for something such as a new QuickChek could be required to be built to look like a barn. Planner McManus clarified that the policy gives the Board the power to establish architectural standards that may require QuickChek to look like a barn.

Chairman Pfeiffer remarked that from his perspective regarding billboards, and with the guidance the Board has received from Planner McManus, there already is a standard that West Amwell does not want to see billboards within the Township but there is recent Court precedent establishing that in order to enforce the no billboard standard, the Township must have appropriate language in the Master Plan and in the Township's sign ordinance which is what the Board is trying to do.

Mr. Bergenfeld again expressed that he felt the language could give the Planning Board the power to perhaps be too restrictive in the future. Ms. Van der Veen said an ordinance could be crafted to create reasonable guidelines. Chairman Pfeiffer noted that any Township Committee can also amend any ordinance at any time with the proper notification. Mr. Shute remarked that generally speaking

Boards/Committees never make ordinances less restrictive and once this type of language becomes the policy then the ordinances will start getting worked on to become more restrictive. Chairman Pfeiffer noted that is not always the case, and stated that the Board has previously discussed relaxing regulations regarding agricultural fencing while reviewing the Land Use Element.

It was the consensus of the Board to move forward with the suggestions made by Planner Hintz's Office.

Discussion – Review of Natural Resource Inventory (NRI) for Adoption as Appendix to Master Plan

Cathy Urbanski of the Environmental Commission was present for this discussion. Mr. Haug asked about the review period for the NRI. Ms. Urbanski came forward and commented that the Environmental Commission had wanted the NRI to be reviewed every 3 years but since the Master Plan is reviewed every 6 years, she noted her recommendation would be to compromise on reviewing the NRI every 4 years. Mr. Haug remarked that the current NRI is referred to as the 2008 NRI throughout the document and he asked if the date should be taken out. Chairman Pfeiffer commented he believes that the date should be included because it reflects the date of the data.

There was some discussion by the Board Members regarding Figure 8-A, a stream map of the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) stream network, which is an appendix in the NRI. Ms. Urbanski noted that the map was done through Stony Brook Millstone Watershed and it took over a year to complete, and she stated it was done for free.

Mr. Shute commented on some language he thought should be considered for the next revision of the NRI including descriptions contained in Figures 18, 19 and 21. Chairman Pfeiffer remarked that previous Planner Bolan had indicated the cost to do the NRI would be about \$50,000 and by the Environmental Commission taking on the task, they saved the Township several thousands of dollars. He expressed full support for the Environmental Commission continuing to work on future revisions of the NRI.

Chairman Pfeiffer noted that the Board will hold public hearings at their meeting next month for the adoption of the Recreation Plan Element, Circulation Plan Element and the adoption of the NRI as an appendix to the Master Plan.

It was noted that Chairman Pfeiffer reordered the agenda in an effort to be able to excuse Planner McManus from the meeting early and save money.

New Business

Planning Board Review of an Ordinance Amending Chapter 109 – Signs

Chairman Pfeiffer noted this Ordinance was introduced by the Township Committee earlier this month and the public hearing is scheduled for December and because the Ordinance is a revision to the Land Use Code, it is required that the Ordinance to be sent to the Planning Board for review and comment. He explained the Township Committee is looking for the Planning Board to find the Ordinance consistent with the Master Plan.

A motion by Haug, seconded by Van der Veen to find the sign ordinance consistent with the Master Plan and recommend adoption by the Township Committee was unanimously approved by roll call vote.

Planner McManus was excused from the meeting at this time, 8:10 PM.

Unfinished Business

Discussion – Community Facilities Plan Element

Chairman Pfeiffer noted that he had reached out to Rob Tomenchok and Mr. Campbell who is the President of the South Hunterdon Board of Education for input with this Element. He stated that to date they are still waiting to receive the updated statistics from the elementary school. Chairman Pfeiffer remarked that they had received some information for South Hunterdon's Superintendant. It was noted that Ms. Van der Veen is working on revising the text for the Element. She also added that she had spoken with Fire Chief Jeff Ent and incorporated some suggestions she received from him. Further contact will be made with the West Amwell Police Department and then the Community Facilities Plan Element can be finalized.

Discussion – Economic Plan Element

Mr. Shute commented that he had contacted Tax Assessor David Gill regarding the commercial properties within the Township and then created an inventory listing which he provided at tonight's meeting. Mr. Shute remarked that he is still working on identifying vacant commercial properties within the Township. He commented that he may try to include the name of the business in the listing and stated the next step is to use this information to draft an outline to be used for creating an Economic Plan Element for West Amwell.

Ms. Van der Veen remarked that she had recently attended a meeting in Flemington where they are working on developing the concept of establishing a Business Improvement District (BID). She stated that this concept may not be relevant to West Amwell because the Township does not have a small town center, but the outline Flemington comes up with may be a good source of information for West Amwell to review. Ms. Van der Veen noted she would forward the BID outline information she had to Mr. Shute. She indicated the point Flemington made was that if there is a mall, there would be mall management and that is what BID is all about—getting a group of people together that are business representatives and government representatives that are managing the business in the municipality.

Chairman Pfeiffer commented that he would like to see what commercial business is within the Township and what is vacant and the information created should be consistent with the other Elements in the Master Plan. He explained that for example, the Land Use Element indicates that new commercial development should be consistent with overall community character and on private well and septic. He noted that within that constraint he would like to see what sort of Element can be drafted.

Mr. Shute asked about home based businesses. Chairman Pfeiffer noted that the Board identified in the Land Use Element that they wished to develop standards for home based businesses. Mr. Haug asked if tax revenue would be generated from home based businesses. Mr. Bergenfeld noted he had

spoken to Tax Assessor Gill regarding this matter and he explained that Mr. Gill indicated home based businesses do not increase the real estate value. Mr. Bergenfeld commented that the only way this could benefit the community would be if the Township established fees/licenses for home based businesses. Mr. Baldino noted that he believes home based businesses should be registered and monitored. He noted that in the previous town he worked for, home based business owners would come in annually to renew their licenses.

Chairman Pfeiffer suggested that perhaps such things as agricultural tourism and internet based businesses requiring warehousing space can be tied into ways of raising revenue. He commented that he didn't think conventional retail businesses would thrive in West Amwell because there isn't the population density to support it and said it is not likely that people will drive a long distance for a retail store in West Amwell. He stated that it may actually be cheaper for some people to conduct business in West Amwell if all they are doing is selling and shipping from here. Ms. Van der Veen referenced a business in Milford, NJ who recently took over a retail store front to conduct a computer based sales operation.

Chairman Pfeiffer remarked that the Board has mentioned solar in the past and noted that the Township does have the power lines running through it. He indicated there may be appropriate places within the municipality that could generate some type of ratable as indicated by the Board's Planner, but the proper standards must be developed. Ms. Van der Veen noted that the SADC is having a dinner on 11/30/10 at 6:30 PM for \$25 per person at the Flemington VFW where solar, as it relates to farmland, will likely be discussed. Mr. Baldino commented that commercial solar facilities will bring in revenue on the area/land that becomes commercially used.

West Amwell Township Planning Board Minutes – 11/16/10

Chairman Pfeiffer remarked that the Township must develop appropriate standards for solar facilities. He stated the fact that the Municipal Land Use law (MLUL) changed within the past year declaring these types of operations inherently beneficial means that there is a limit to what the Board can do to actually regulate them.

Discussion – Review of Revised Fee Ordinance

Mr. Baldino reported that he had no update on this matter at this time and explained that he is continuing to work on a revised fee ordinance. It was noted that this matter will be listed on the Board's December agenda for further discussion.

Attorney Shurts was excused from the meeting at this time, 8:27 PM.

Status of Plan Endorsement

Chairman Pfeiffer reported that there is no update on this matter at this time.

New Business

Discussion – 2011 Professional Service Contracts

Chairman Pfeiffer reported that Clerk Olsen had noticed all 3 of the Board's Professional positions: Planner, Attorney and Engineer. He indicated the Board has received one response for each position from Planner Hintz, Attorney Shurts and Engineer Clerico who decreased his hourly rate from \$150 to \$146. Chairman Pfeiffer remarked that the request for proposals was done using the fair and open process under the State contracts law according to Clerk Olsen's memo.

Ms. Van der Veen asked if there was some sort of unspoken gentleman's agreement since only one response was received for each position. Mr. Fisher noted that the request for proposals was only posted on the Township's website. Mr. Molnar commented that the request for proposals should have also gone out to the League of Municipalities, but noted that it did not. Chairman Pfeiffer stated the deadline for submitting proposals was 11/10/10 and he indicated that Clerk Olsen had discussed with the Township Committee how the request for proposals would be done. Mr. Rich and Mr. Bergenfeld both asked if the request for proposals could be extended and/or re-noticed. There was some discussion on whether or not there was enough time to do so prior to the Planning Board's reorganization in January. Chairman Pfeiffer commented that input may need to be received from the Township Attorney regarding the fair and open process and the re-requesting of proposals.

Mr. Molnar commented that normally requests for proposals are advertised in the local newspaper(s) and on the League of Municipalities website as well as the Township's website but in this case, due to the lack of funds, they didn't advertise in the newspaper(s). Mr. Molnar commented that he believes the Township Committee assumed the request for proposals would have gone to the League of Municipalities as well as on the Township website when Clerk Olsen said she was going to notice.

Mr. Haug reminded the Board that when they requested proposals for a new Board Planner last year there were only 3 responses.

Mr. Fisher commented that he has done some inquiring and noted that the fees charged by the Board's professionals are not out of line. Mr. Bergenfeld remarked that he doesn't have an issue with what the professionals charge the Board, but rather with what they charge to the applicant's. Ms. Van der Veen commented that on some applications, the applicant's are wasting their own money by submitting incomplete paperwork.

Chairman Pfeiffer asked for some direction on how the Board wished to proceed on the matter and if they wished to use the current professionals for 2011. He remarked that it makes sense for the Township to utilize the same Engineer for the Board(s) and Township Committee for consistency. Mr. Molnar agreed but commented that there have been quite a few questions raised regarding the Engineer in the past few years and he stated he believed now was the time to address it. Chairman Pfeiffer suggested someone from the Township Committee provide the Engineer with some direction and feedback specific to the issues that have been raised. Mr. Molnar indicated that discussions have occurred and the issues seem to have been remediated, although there have been no major applications since then. Chairman Pfeiffer noted that he feels the Board should give the Engineer a chance to address any issues. Ms. Van der Veen agreed. Mr. Molnar noted that Engineer Clerico had advised him that if the Board/Township was unhappy with his services, then perhaps someone else from the firm (Van Cleef Engineering) could provide engineering services.

Mr. Storcella remarked that he believed some issues with the Engineer came up when old bills surfaced several months ago and he stated now that the billing procedures/process has been discussed and improvements are being made on the fee and escrow ordinance that this matter may resolve itself.

Mr. Urbanski commented that he believes Engineer Clerico does a superb, thorough job for the Board/Township and he remarked that it would be difficult to ask him *not* to be so thorough.

Mr. Rich said that there are union and non-union employees that are treated differently and if it comes down to a question of \$20,000 or \$30,000 he stated he would rather know that he received fair market value or put everything on an even playing field, and put the money in the police pockets instead of in the professional's pockets. Chairman Pfeiffer remarked that the Planning Board budget for 2010 shows the Board spent \$109 for engineering services. He stated the money is coming primarily from the applicant's escrows. Mr. Rich commented that he doesn't believe the request for proposals was bid properly.

Mr. Haug suggested that the Board utilize the current professionals and review the contracts again next year if need be. Mr. Fisher agreed. Mr. Molnar asked for a show of hands as to whether or not the request for proposals should be re-bid. Mr. Rich, Mr. Bergenfeld and Mr. Baldino raised their hands indicating they wished to re-bid for each of the professional's positions. Since the majority of Board Members disagreed with this suggestion, it was noted that the Planning Board will move forward with their current professionals for 2011, making it known that the positions will likely be re-bid annually.

Chairman Pfeiffer commented that he wanted to clarify the fixed monthly fee for Attorney Shurts vs. an hourly rate. He explained that it has been past practice for over 20 years to have a monthly fee and the Board may be shooting themselves in the foot to go to an hour rate when Attorney Shurts has shown a willingness to cut the Planning Board some breaks when there hasn't been a lot of work during the slow months. Chairman Pfeiffer noted that if Attorney Shurts spends 3 hours on Planning Board work in a month, the Board will be paying more with an hourly fee than the monthly fixed rate. He added that from a budgeting perspective, the monthly fee makes sense. Mr. Molnar agreed. It was the consensus of the Board to continue paying Attorney Shurts a fixed monthly fee for 2011.

Chairman Pfeiffer asked Mr. Rich if he would be willing to review the current professional's contracts and report back to the Planning Board if there are any issues. Mr. Rich agreed to do so.

Discussion – 2011 Planning Board Budget

Chairman Pfeiffer noted that it is not known what some of the costs from Planner Hintz will be to review such things as a potential Economic Plan or zoning ordinance review in 2011. He suggested that Mr. Baldino call Planner Hintz to discuss the type of things the Board will be reviewing next year and try to establish a cost to be worked into the budget. Chairman Pfeiffer noted that the conditional use ordinance has been put off for a while due to budget issues and he commented that it needs to be reviewed in addition to developing standards for solar facilities.

It was noted that Chairman Pfeiffer will provide feedback to Ms. Andrews regarding the Planning Board's 2011 budget which will then be forwarded to CFO Luhrs.

Discussion – Establishing Standards for Solar Facilities

Chairman Pfeiffer noted that the Environmental Commission has volunteered to start working on establishing standards for renewable energy facilities. Mr. Urbanski commented that the Agricultural Advisory Committee (Ag Advisory) is opposed to the use of the word *farm* when referring to large solar arrays. He noted that the State refers to these proposals as *solar facilities* and he stated that he would like to get into the proper mindset and refrain from calling large solar projects, solar farms—but rather solar facilities. The Board agreed.

Mr. Bergenfeld asked why the Planning Board is establishing solar facility standards and asked if they have to be allowed. Chairman Pfeiffer said yes and noted that the MLUL was amended within the past year to state that renewable energy facilities are inherently beneficial uses. Therefore municipalities can regulate them to a certain extent but cannot prohibit them.

Mr. Bergenfeld asked if the Township can charge the solar facilities based on per kilowatt of energy produced. Mr. Baldino indicated that this could not be done and Chairman Pfeiffer noted the other issue that must be considered is that part of the recent legislation grants almost automatic approval to lots larger than 20 acres in industrial zones. Mr. Bergenfeld remarked that he has no problem allowing solar facilities if they are a financial benefit to the community, but stated he has an issue if they are only a financial benefit to the owner of the project. Chairman Pfeiffer noted that Planner Hintz has indicated the financial aspect is not a criteria that can be used to consider these types of applications.

Mr. Baldino commented that the assessed value is what the Township gets out of renewable energy facilities. He stated in Hamilton Township they allowed PSE&G to put up a 16 acre solar facility and they are making \$40,000 total per year in tax revenue because of the change in use. He noted that only about \$4000 of that money goes to Hamilton Township.

Chairman Pfeiffer addressed the two members of the public. They came forward and identified themselves as Attorney Walter Wilson from Lebanon, NJ and Engineer Chris Nusser from a firm in Clinton, NJ. Attorney Wilson explained they represent Garden Solar LLC., a local solar developer. He indicated they wished to offer some suggestions on the development of West Amwell's solar ordinance.

Attorney Wilson noted they anticipate filing an application soon, in connection with a property in West Amwell Township. He stated they have two approved solar sites in Kingwood Township, a pending approved site in Lebanon Township and a newly submitted application in Raritan Township.

Attorney Wilson quoted the following statistics from a study done by JCP&L in November 2010 regarding the percentages of renewable energy sources JCP&L distributes and sells:

Nuclear Power	40%
Coal	36%

Gas	12.5%
Oil	3.25%
Solid Waste	3%
Wind	1%
Methane Gas	1%
Wood	.13%
Hydroelectric	.06%
Solar	.05%

Attorney Wilson noted that the State Legislature has deemed solar an inherently beneficial use and has adopted and put into law about a dozen different statutes that deal with renewable energy. He indicated that the Solar Advancement Technology Act requires utilities in New Jersey by the year 2024 to generate 20% of the power they sell from renewable energy sources. The way this is being encouraged is through an energy penalty that will be imposed against the utility if they don't meet the State's objectives.

Attorney Wilson noted that Garden Solar looks at smaller sites that may generate between 2 and 10 megawatts. He stated that solar facilities have practical limitations on how many megawatts can be fed into the various power lines. He remarked that there will come a point in various municipalities where the individual power lines will require significant substation improvements that would not likely be desirable for potential solar developers.

Attorney Wilson outlined the following issues the Planning Board should consider when crafting a renewable energy ordinance:

1. Noise
2. Dust control when the solar facility is accessed
3. Vibration
4. Height of the solar panels
5. Maintenance/Decommissioning of the solar facility
6. Method of installation
7. Setback requirements for solar panels
8. Security fencing
9. Lighting
10. Minimum lot size standards
11. Landscaping requirements
12. Type of panels – Attorney Wilson suggested the ordinance ban cadmium telluride panels which he said are a low efficiency, cheap panel that some argue contain carcinogenic material. Attorney Wilson recommends panels that utilize crystalline technology.

Chairman Pfeiffer remarked that an advantage to the Planning Board's informal application review is that applicant's can provide escrow funding to be able to speak to the Board's professionals prior to coming before the Board.

Mr. Shute asked Attorney Wilson what type of taxes their solar projects are susceptible to as a power plant. Attorney Wilson stated that he didn't know if large scale solar installations are subject to the Board of Public Utilities (BPU) regulations. He indicated there have been arguments that a solar facility on a site that was farmland assessed remains an agricultural use and therefore the land continues in farmland assessment and the taxation occurs on the improvement which is a limited driveway access and the supporting structure. Attorney Wilson noted the other argument is that the land would come out of farmland assessment and be taxed accordingly.

Mr. Baldino asked if the grants/rebates are expected to continue through the end of the year. Attorney Wilson noted there are federal credits for solar projects that end 12/31/10. He explained that Garden Solar has a unique approach to their projects noting that they bring their proposed sites to the energy companies first which provides them with a queue number to be connected to the power grid. He remarked that Garden Solar's impact analysis is completed and approved prior to coming to the municipality.

Chairman Pfeiffer asked Attorney Wilson if the solar application he is currently working on in West Amwell contains power lines/high tension wires running through the property. Mr. Nusser commented that the large towers are not what the solar gets connected to. Mr. Baldino asked if the Garden Solar project will feed into the local power grid in the same way a substation feeds into the local grid. Attorney Wilson said yes and clarified that it is done so in a very limited way.

Chairman Pfeiffer thanked Attorney Wilson and Mr. Nusser for their comments.

Correspondence

Mr. Haug asked about the correspondence on the agenda from Clerk Olsen to Reverend Naylor regarding Block 16 Lot 17.02 and the permitted uses on the property. Chairman Pfeiffer noted the Planning Board was copied as a courtesy.

Chairman Pfeiffer commented that there is proposed State legislation regarding the Council on Affordable Housing (COAH). He remarked that one of the proposed bills indicates municipalities will have to zone 20% of their vacant land for 4 houses per acre or 8 townhouses per acre. He said it seems to have dropped out of subsequent versions of the proposed bill and suggested the volunteers on the Affordable Housing Committee be aware and keep an eye out.

Approval of Minutes

It was noted that the Board agreed any revisions made to the minutes will no longer be spelled out page by page in the next month's minutes. The motion to approve the minutes will simply reflect whether or not revisions were noted and the final approved minutes will be posted on the website as is currently being done.

A motion by Haug, seconded by Urbanski to approve the Board's 10/19/10 minutes as revised was approved by roll call vote with Mr. Fisher and Mr. Molnar abstaining.

Adjournment

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

The meeting adjourned at 10:04 PM.

Maria Andrews, Planning Board Secretary