

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

February 11, 2026

The pre-meeting of the Planning Board was called to order by Chairman Mr. David Manders at 6:00 PM in the Second Floor Caucus Room of City Hall.

Members Present:

John Casadia
David Catalana
Michael Pantalione
Sandy Velez
Nilsa Rosario
Robert Odorizzi
Elizabeth Arthur
David Manders

Also present were:

Michael Malinsky, Planning Board Solicitor
Yasmin Perez, Planning Board Secretary
Kathleen Hicks, Supervising Planner
Ryan Headley, Planning Board Planner/Engineer
Elizabeth Jambor, Assistant Planner

PRE-MEETING

Amended Wiseco Cannabis Facility– located on the southerly side of Pine Avenue between Mill Road and Hickory Place, Block 2703, Lot 19, Tax Map Sheet #27, Project No. PBA-24-00042. Amended preliminary/final major site plan approval to establish a cannabis manufacturing facility within an existing industrial building along with additional site improvements.

Mr. Headley provided an overview of the proposed application, explaining that the property, located on Pine Avenue, previously received approval and is currently under construction. During construction, the applicant determined that they needed minor modifications to the approved layout. Specifically, grade changes in a certain areas reduced the available space for parking. In one location where three parking spaces were originally proposed, only two spaces could reasonably be accommodated. Additionally, the relocation of a fence further reduced available parking space. Although the original approval exceeded the required parking count, the revised plan now provides the twenty (20) employee parking spaces required under ordinance standards. The applicant is not requesting any variances and is instead seeking two submission waivers related to plan sheet size and the requirement to depict all structures within 150 feet of the subject property. These waivers were previously granted as part of the original approval; however, because this is considered a new submission, the waivers must be requested again. The revised plan also results in a slight reduction in impervious lot coverage due to the removal of parking spaces.

The Learning Experience– located on the southerly side of Sherman Avenue between College Drive and Delsea Drive (N.J.S.H. Route 47), Block 7001, Lots 9 & 10, Tax Map Sheet #70, Project No. PBA-25-00043. Preliminary/final major site plan approval to construct a 10,000 square foot one story daycare facility along with associated site improvements.

Mr. Headley provided an overview of the proposed application for a property located on the south side of Sherman Avenue. There is an existing medical park consisting of two developed medical office complexes. The Cumberland Christian School is located directly across the street. The applicant is proposing a daycare facility. Mr. Headley explained that the original plan included a variance for front bumper; however, following discussions with staff, the applicant indicated that the variance would likely be eliminated. Similarly, the originally proposed accessory trash enclosure located in front of the principal structure is not permitted by ordinance, and the applicant agreed to relocate it to the rear of the building to comply with requirements.

He further explained that the applicant is proposing two wall signs, including a primary entrance sign along the front façade and an additional sign on the western façade of the building. He expressed concern regarding the visibility and necessity of the secondary façade sign due to the building's setback, estimated at approximately 200 to 250 feet from the road. The applicant is also proposing a freestanding monument sign along the roadway frontage. He indicated that the anticipated variance request would primarily relate to signage, as the proposed western façade sign measures approximately 114 square feet, which exceeds ordinance standards, while the front façade sign is slightly larger at approximately 140 square feet.

There are several proposed design waivers. The stormwater management basin is proposed at the rear of the site, and fencing will be installed around the basin; however, the applicant anticipates requesting relief to permit a four-foot fence rather than the six-foot fence. Fencing is already proposed around the daycare play area as

required by applicable regulations. He also noted several setback waiver requests associated with the basin and improvements along the eastern portion of the property, which is primarily wooded, while adjacent properties to the west are fully developed. He indicated that the applicant advised that approximately forty (40) parking spaces is a corporate standard for the daycare operator but agreed to review potential revisions. Staff discussed reducing parking spaces or modifying the internal circulation pattern to a one-way loop to narrow drive aisles and address setback concerns. He noted that if certain improvements are shifted further from property lines, several waiver requests could be eliminated; however, the property is split-zoned, and moving the stormwater basin too far to the rear could place it within the IN-1 Zone, potentially requiring a use variance and Zoning Board review.

Mr. Headley also discussed driveway design and circulation, noting that most drive aisles are proposed at twenty-four (24) feet in width, with one narrower twenty-two (22) foot aisle. He raised concerns regarding the proposed driveway location near the property line along Sherman Avenue, particularly in light of potential future county roadway widening and the presence of a nearby utility pole, which could impact visibility and turning movements. He suggested revising the driveway alignment to be more perpendicular to Sherman Avenue or relocating it to the opposite side of the frontage, and the applicant agreed to evaluate those options. With respect to pedestrian improvements, Mr. Headley noted that sidewalks are not currently proposed, despite the presence of a school across the street. He advised that Cumberland County generally does not require sidewalks along county roadways but will not object if the City requests them. The option to require sidewalks was identified in the staff report.

7 Brew Coffee– located on the northerly side of West Landis Avenue between Orchard Road and Delsea Drive, Block 2707, Lot 4, Tax Map Sheet #27, Project No. PBA-25-00049. Preliminary/final major site plan approval to construct a 510 square foot restaurant (7 Brew Coffee) and a 260 square foot separate refrigeration shed along with associated site improvements.

Mr. Headley provided an overview of the proposed application involving the demolition of an existing bank building and construction of a new drive-through coffee facility. The applicant is proposing a 7 Brew drive-through coffee operation, which operates as a primarily drive-through model. He stated that the proposed building footprint is smaller than the existing structure, consisting of approximately 510 square feet of workspace for employees, along with a refrigeration or accessory structure connected by a roof element to maintain a cohesive appearance. The facility will operate entirely as a drive-through, with dual service lanes on either side of the building, similar in circulation concept to other modern drive-through facilities. No interior customer service counter is proposed.

There are several variances associated with the application. The main variance relates to minimum floor area ratio requirements, noting that the property has historically experienced this issue due to the unusually large lot size and the presence of a stream that limits the developable portion of the site. The previous bank use also required similar relief. Additional variances include a perimeter setback for the relocated trash enclosure, which is now proposed closer to the Walmart parking area, and a parking setback variance associated with employee parking located approximately fifty-seven (57) feet from the property line, where the redevelopment zone ordinance establishes a maximum setback of twenty-five (25) feet. This parking area is intended solely for employee use and includes a small employee seating or picnic area. This applicant is requesting several signage variances. Unlike other recent applications, the proposed signage is modest in scale; however, due to the small size of the building, the ordinance calculation based on building frontage results in reduced allowable signage area. The applicant proposes several wall signs and directional signage, including a small drive-through directional sign with arrows. He indicated that some signage could arguably be considered incidental; however, variances are being requested out of an abundance of caution. Additional waivers were discussed, including certain landscaping and design waivers related to an existing angled parking island and drive aisle configuration that will remain unchanged. Mr. Headley noted that an existing landscaped buffer along the property boundary exceeds ordinance requirements and will remain in place. Other waivers relate to drive-through facility design standards. He explained that modern drive-through facilities often surround buildings on multiple sides. Mr. Headley also noted that staff requested pedestrian access improvements connecting to Landis Avenue, although pedestrian demand is expected to be limited and primarily employee-related. He added that decorative street lighting and sidewalk improvements already exist along portions of the frontage, having been installed with prior development of the site.

Redevelopment Plan Amendment- Rahid Khan, 501 E. Landis Avenue, Block 4001, Lot 1.1, Project PBA-25-00040.

Ms. Hicks provided an overview of the proposed redevelopment amendment. The building is the former State office building located on the southeast corner of the intersection. Mr. Khan is proposing to utilize the first floor of the building as an Event Center for small gatherings. It was explained that although the building contains a second floor, only the first floor would be used at this time due to the elevator being inoperable. The upper floor would remain unused and utilized for storage. Initially, both floors had been proposed for event space; however, that plan was revised once it was determined that the elevator was not operational. Professional staff recommended that the Board support the application, subject to several conditions intended to ensure compliance and proper operation of the facility. The property includes approximately 48 parking spaces at the rear of the building. The applicant was identified as also owning other nearby commercial properties.

Vineyards Redevelopment Study, Block 4301, Lots 1.02, 1.03, 1.04, 1.05, and 1.06.

Ms. Hicks explained that this is the Elwyn property. She stated that a report had been prepared by Tiffany Morrisey to evaluate whether the property meets the statutory criteria to be designated as an area in need of redevelopment.

Affordable Housing Ordinance-

Ms. Hicks explained that it was only learned the previous week that the matter must be adopted by City Council no later than March 15th. The delay was due to the State's release of model ordinances, which had only recently been issued, resulting in municipalities working to meet the March 15th deadline. The Board was informed that this requirement reflects a recent change in the law. It was further noted that the board's consultant would not be in attendance; however, he indicated that the proposed ordinance is substantially the same as the prior version, with only minor revisions and clarifications, and that the changes do not alter the City's obligations.

FLAG SALUTE

Public notice pursuant to the Open Public Meetings Act was given on December 16, 2025 by posting written notice on the Official Bulletin Board in City Hall, and mailing written notices to the Daily Journal, City Clerk, and the Board members.

MINUTES

Approval of minutes from the January 14, 2026 board meeting.
The Chairman made a motion to approve the minutes.

John Casadia: Yes
David Catalana: Abstain
Michael Pantalione: Yes
Sandy Velez: Abstain
Nilsa Rosario: Yes
Robert Odorizzi: Yes
Elizabeth Arthur: Yes
David Manders: Yes

DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Amended Wiseco Cannabis Facility– located on the southerly side of Pine Avenue between Mill Road and Hickory Place, Block 2703, Lot 19, Tax Map Sheet #27, Project No. PBA-24-00042. Amended preliminary/final major site plan approval to establish a cannabis manufacturing facility within an existing industrial building along with additional site improvements.

Michael Gruccio, Esq. appeared on behalf of the applicant, Wisco NJ Limited Liability Company, in connection with an application for Amended Site Plan approval. He stated that the original site plan for the project was approved by the Board and memorialized by Resolution No. 6669, adopted on December 11, 2024, approximately one year prior to this meeting. Since that time, Wisco has entered into a Host Community Agreement with the City of Vineland with respect to the facility. The applicant submitted a perfected plan based upon the original approval, obtained approval of that plan, posted the required performance guarantee, completed the necessary site improvements, and subsequently secured the release of the performance surety. A maintenance guarantee has been posted, a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy has been issued, and the applicant is presently in line for state licensure. The application pending before the New Jersey Cannabis Regulatory Commission had been approved by the Commission's processor and submitted to the full Commission. Action had been anticipated at the Commission's February 12 meeting; however, confirmation had not yet been received. Approval was expected in the near future if not already granted. With regard to county review, he reported that on December 23rd, the Cumberland County Planning Board determined that no review of the amended site plan application was required. The applicant acknowledged receipt of the Planning Report dated February 4th and the Engineering Report dated February 6th, and accepted the findings, factual statements, and recommendations contained therein. There are two waivers requested concerning submission details previously waived at the time of the original approval in December 2020: specifically, plan size details and the requirement to delineate all structures, including mailboxes, within 200 feet of the site. He indicated that the applicant was seeking those same waivers again. He further stated that the Engineering Report revealed no material or consequential concerns. From a planning standpoint, parking at the site remains adequate despite a net reduction of two parking spaces, which the project engineer, Mr. Jeffers, would address in his testimony. Impervious coverage has been reduced under the amended plan to 78.9%, as compared to 81.3% under the original approval. No new variances or additional waivers are associated with the amended application. He acknowledged the applicant's continuing obligation to provide six printed copies and one digital copy of the plan in satisfaction of the City's perfected plan requirements. All improvements subject to the amended site plan request have already been completed, and no further construction is proposed. Accordingly,

he suggested that there is likely no need for the posting of a new performance guarantee, as the maintenance guarantee remains in place.

Mr. Teal Jeffers, Professional Engineer, provided testimony regarding the specific changes to the site conditions as compared to the originally approved plan and as reflected in the amended site plan submission. He explained that all improvements had been constructed substantially in accordance with the prior site plan approval; however, several minor field modifications during construction prompted the need for the amendment. Primarily, along the front portion of the site, the fence was installed farther back on the property than originally anticipated. This adjustment impacted the configuration of three previously approved parking spaces, reducing that area to accommodate only two spaces. Additionally, an area in front of the building that had been proposed as a striped parking space was determined to conflict with pavement crossover conditions and was converted to a striped no-parking area, thereby eliminating one additional parking stall. As a result, there was a net reduction of two parking spaces; however, Mr. Jeffers testified that the parking supply remains adequate for employees in accordance with the original approval. There was a minor modification involving a small landscaped area adjacent to a handicap parking space that had been paved. The landscaping originally proposed for that location was relocated and installed within another approved landscape bed on the site. No other substantive changes were made.

The Chairman entertained a motion to approve the application. Mr. Pantalone so moved, Mr. Odorizzi seconded.

Roll Call:

John Casadia: Yes

David Catalana: Yes

Michael Pantalone: Yes

Sandy Velez: Yes

Nilsa Rosario: Yes

Robert Odorizzi: Yes

Elizabeth Arthur: Yes

David Manders: Yes

PUBLIC HEARING

The Learning Experience– located on the southerly side of Sherman Avenue between College Drive and Delsea Drive (N.J.S.H. Route 47), Block 7001, Lots 9 & 10, Tax Map Sheet #70, Project No. PBA-25-00043. Preliminary/final major site plan approval to construct a 10,000 square foot one story daycare facility along with associated site improvements.

Jeffrey Hall, Esq. appeared on behalf of the applicant. He explained that the application before the Board is for Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan approval, including a lot consolidation and two sign variances related to one of the proposed façade signs, together with several design waivers to be addressed by the applicant's project engineer. The applicant proposes to construct a 10,000-square-foot daycare facility to operate as The Learning Experience, with associated outdoor play areas and site improvements. He described the facility as an early childhood education center designed to foster a comfortable and creative learning environment. The proposed daycare would provide a significant benefit to surrounding businesses, employees, and residents, particularly given the property's proximity to Inspira Medical Center Vineland, where accessible childcare services would be advantageous to hospital staff and nearby families. The site contains remnants of a dwelling but is otherwise unimproved. The property is located within the B-3 and IN-1 Zones, where daycare use is permitted. The entirety of the proposed development will be located within the B-3 Zone, with the exception of the sign variance relief requested. The applicant complies with all zoning requirements, except for the requested sign variances pertaining to sign face area for a sign oriented westerly and perpendicular to the roadway, rather than directly facing the street frontage, thereby requiring relief under Chapter 425-78 of the City Code. He further noted that certain variances identified in the Planner's report, including front yard buffer setback and accessory structure placement in the front yard, would be addressed through the engineer's testimony, and that the applicant intends to revise the plan to comply with the ordinance and eliminate the need for those variances. The following professionals were present to provide testimony: Project Engineer Gerard Juicero; Architect Erwin Roselle; Traffic Engineer David Horner; and Planner Phil Sartorio. Mr. Hall indicated that the architect, associated with Jarmel Associates, would testify regarding operations and architectural design, noting that the firm has designed numerous Learning Experience facilities nationwide, including approximately eighty in New Jersey. The engineer would address existing site conditions, site design, construction of the 10,000-square-foot building, outdoor play areas, stormwater detention basin, parking (including bicycle parking), and landscaping. The applicant's engineer met virtually with the City Engineer and Planner earlier in the week and would respond to outstanding comments in their respective reports. The traffic consultant would summarize the findings of the traffic report, including anticipated minimal impacts on west Sherman Avenue and internal site circulation. Finally, the planner would address the requested sign variances.

Mr. Gerard Juicero, Professional Engineer, testified on behalf of the applicant.

He introduced Exhibit A-1, an aerial exhibit dated February 9, 2026, depicting the subject property outlined in yellow. The property consists of Block 7001, Lots 9 and 10, commonly known as 997–1001 West Sherman Avenue. The combined lots total approximately 4.62 acres, and they are presently vacant, with remnants of prior residential structures having been removed. The front portion of the property lies within the B-3 Zone, with the rear portion located in the IN-1 Zone. All proposed disturbance will occur within the B-3 Zone.

Exhibit A-2, a colorized version of the site and landscape plan. He testified that the applicant proposes construction of a one-story, 10,000-square-foot daycare facility with 41 parking spaces, including two ADA-compliant spaces and one electric vehicle charging space. The facility is designed to serve 144 children. A 5,000-square-foot outdoor play area enclosed by a six-foot fence is proposed, along with a stormwater management basin located to the rear of the developed portion of the site. Access to the property will be provided by a full-movement driveway along the western property line. Interior drive aisles will generally measure 24 feet in width, with certain aisles reduced to 22 feet. The ordinance requires 10-foot-wide islands; however, the applicant proposes 8-foot-wide islands and seeks waiver relief. After discussion of alternatives, including reducing parking or modifying circulation, the Board indicated support for maintaining the 41 parking spaces while allowing 22-foot drive aisles and 8-foot landscape islands as a reasonable compromise.

He also testified regarding site grading. The property slopes approximately 30 feet from West Sherman Avenue toward the rear. Minimal grading will occur in the front parking area; however, fill will be required toward the rear to maintain level building and play areas. Retaining walls are proposed along the east and west sides of the developed portion of the site, with maximum heights of approximately six feet on the west and eight feet on the east for a limited section. At the recommendation of Mr. Headley, the walls will be relocated five feet inward from the property lines. Utilities will be extended from West Sherman Avenue, including water, gas, electric, and sanitary sewer. Due to site topography, a small pump station with grinder pump and alarm system will be required to convey sanitary flow to the municipal sewer system. With respect to stormwater management, because discharge to the County system is not permitted, all runoff from disturbed areas will be retained and infiltrated on site. A basin designed to accommodate the future 100-year storm event will be constructed with a sand bottom to provide water quality treatment and groundwater recharge. An overflow spillway will be provided for extreme storm events.

Landscaping will include deciduous trees within parking islands, evergreen screening around the trash enclosure, additional trees and shrubs along the frontage, and extended evergreen screening along the eastern residential property line. Lighting will consist of LED fixtures within the parking lot and canopy lighting at the building entrance. The outdoor play area will not be illuminated. Mr. Juicero testified that the applicant will comply with all technical comments contained in the Planning and Engineering review letters, including relocation of the trash enclosure to eliminate a variance, adjustment of the driveway to be perpendicular to West Sherman Avenue, provision of required bicycle parking, compliance with fire safety requirements, and satisfaction of electric vehicle, irrigation, and recycling standards. The remaining relief requested consists of waivers for 8-foot landscape islands, 22-foot drive aisles, a four-foot fence around the basin in lieu of a six-foot fence, and reduced basin side yard setbacks of ten feet in lieu of twenty-five feet, together with the sign variances to be addressed by the applicant's planner.

Erwin A. Kizel, Licensed Architect, testified on behalf of the applicant. He described the proposed facility as an early childhood education center serving children from six weeks to six years of age. He explained that childcare centers differ from traditional schools in several respects. The facility and its teachers are licensed by the New Jersey Department of Children and Families, and the center must obtain pre-approval from the Department of Environmental Protection, as well as a Certificate of Occupancy from the municipal construction code official prior to operation. The center's hours of operation will be Monday through Friday, from 6:30 a.m. to 6:30 p.m., with lights remaining on until approximately 8:30 p.m. for cleaning purposes. He identified three primary components of the site: the parking area, the building itself, and the playground located to the rear (south side) of the building. He testified that parents will enter the parking lot, park in spaces closest to the building, and escort their children inside to a caregiver. The same procedure will occur at pickup. He noted that drop-off times are staggered between 6:30 a.m. and approximately 9:00 or 9:30 a.m., and pickup times are even more staggered due to varying schedules, including half-day, three-quarter-day, and full-day programs. Based on experience, he stated that the drop-off and pickup process typically takes approximately five minutes. He further testified that approximately 25% of enrolled children are siblings, resulting in multiple children arriving in one vehicle, and that there is an average absentee rate of approximately 10%, which reduces daily occupancy and parking demand.

He reviewed the floorplan and explained that the building is oriented with the main entrance on the north side and playgrounds on the south side. The corridor is L-shaped, with a reception area at the entrance. The classrooms are organized by age group, with seven primary classrooms and two infant classrooms equipped with cribs. He described a flexible play space referred to as "Make Believe Boulevard," which is used by multiple age groups, particularly during inclement weather when outdoor playground use is limited. He testified that each classroom has secondary exit doors for fire safety purposes, and that there is a separate exit corridor. Security is a paramount concern; there is one primary entrance secured by key fob access for parents, while other doors function as

emergency exits only, except for the playground access door, which serves as both ingress and egress during supervised outdoor activities. Mr. Keisel stated that meals are not prepared on site but are delivered pre-prepared and distributed to the children. There is no on-site cooking. Deliveries are made by small trucks, typically no larger than UPS or FedEx vehicles, and are scheduled during mid-day hours to minimize traffic impacts. He explained that the school provides early childhood education, including structured learning and play appropriate to each age group. While it may function as preschool for older children, it does not replace formal elementary education. He noted that some five- and six-year-old children may attend depending on individual circumstances, including summer programs or delayed entry into the school system. The center operates year-round, closing only on major holidays. He added that small graduation ceremonies are held for various age groups to provide a sense of accomplishment.

Phil Sartorio, Professional Planner, testified on behalf of the applicant. He testified that the applicant is seeking C(2) variance relief for proposed building-mounted signage on the west wall of the building. He explained that C(2) variances must relate to a specific piece of property and advance one or more purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law. He further stated that such variances may be granted without substantial detriment to the public good, that the benefits must substantially outweigh any detriments, and that the relief should not substantially impair the intent and purpose of the zone plan and zoning ordinance. He emphasized that the requested variances should be considered as part of the overall application and not in isolation. Exhibit A-5, described as a copy of the forested area removal plan with the building location superimposed. He testified that the daycare use is a permitted use in the zone. He described the surrounding area, noting that immediately west of the site is the Cumberland Professional Campus, consisting of five office condominium buildings served by a central driveway that functions as an internal access road. He explained that parking areas on the west side come close to the subject property line. The proposed west wall sign, located approximately 200 feet from the internal driveway, would provide visual identification of the building and assist visitors in locating the facility. He stated that the sign would add visual interest to the west façade and prevent the building from blending into the background.

As for the negative criteria, he testified that the sign would not be visible to residential uses to the east, nor to traffic on Sherman Avenue to the north, due to existing grade changes, fencing, and landscaping. He indicated that visibility of the sign would largely be limited to the interior of the professional campus. He further testified that the ordinance limits building-mounted signs to the front wall, defined as the side predominantly oriented toward street frontage. He opined that the west façade is functionally oriented toward the internal driveway of the professional campus, which serves a similar function to a street. He noted that the proposed sign would cover less than five percent of the west elevation, approximately half of what would be permitted on the front wall under the ordinance. With respect to the balancing test, Mr. Sartorio stated that the benefits of the sign include improved identification for visitors and motorists within the professional campus, promotion of general welfare, and provision of an additional point of reference for building access, including the mechanical room and Knox Box. He concluded that the sign would not create a detrimental impact on the surrounding area and would not substantially impair the intent and purpose of the zoning ordinance.

Board members expressed concerns regarding the necessity of the west wall sign. It was noted that the sign is located a significant distance from the roadway and may not serve as an effective visual identifier. Several members indicated that visitors would likely rely on GPS navigation or the proposed freestanding monument sign located near the roadway. It was further stated that the internal driveway of the professional campus is not a public street, and that motorists entering the complex would be focused on navigating traffic and locating specific buildings, rather than viewing additional wall signage. Board members generally agreed that adequate signage is already provided through the monument sign and front façade signage, and questioned whether the additional west elevation sign was necessary.

Dave Horner, Traffic Engineer, testified on behalf of the applicant. He prepared a Traffic Impact Study dated November 3, 2025, which was submitted with the application. He stated that the primary focus of the study was to evaluate the safety and functionality of the proposed new access to the County roadway. Based on the analysis, he testified that the proposed access will operate safely and at an acceptable level of service. He further indicated that the County has granted conditional approval of the access, subject to certain modifications reflected on the revised site plan, including access orientation and related improvements. With respect to off-site traffic impacts, Mr. Horner testified that the study evaluated the adjacent signalized intersections on either side of the site along Sherman Avenue. He stated that those intersections have sufficient capacity to accommodate the projected traffic generated by the proposed childcare center and that no significant adverse impacts are anticipated.

A member of the public, Ms. Gardner of 3038 Palermo Avenue, Vineland, New Jersey, was sworn. She stated that this was her first Planning Board meeting and asked whether site plans are available for public review in advance of the hearing. The Board explained that property owners within 200 feet receive notice of the application, which advises that plans are available for review at least ten days prior to the hearing. In addition, legal notice is published, and agendas are posted on the City's website at least one week in advance. Once an application appears on the agenda, members of the public may contact the Planning Office to review the plans. Ms. Gardner then raised concerns regarding traffic on Sherman Avenue, noting that she travels the roadway daily and questioned how it was determined that the roadway can accommodate the proposed traffic. She further inquired about the feasibility of making left turns from the site onto Sherman Avenue and whether a right-turn-only exit could be

incorporated to prevent vehicles from queuing behind drivers attempting to turn left, particularly during peak drop-off and pick-up times.

Mr. Headley explained that Sherman Avenue is a County roadway, and access is governed by County standards and regulations. The County reviews proposed driveways pursuant to its access management requirements and determines whether one or more driveways are permitted based on frontage and other criteria. He explained that the County has issued conditional approval for the access, subject to certain requirements, including right-of-way dedication, full frontage improvements, submission of revised plans, and posting of performance guarantees. Final approval from the County will be required prior to issuance of building permits. It was noted that the Board does not have jurisdiction to require additional driveways on a County road beyond what the County permits.

Mr. Horner testified that the traffic study evaluated the level of service for vehicles entering and exiting the site, including left-turn movements onto Sherman Avenue. He stated that the projected level of service for the site driveway is Level C, which falls within the acceptable range of A through D, with an average delay of approximately 20 seconds per vehicle exiting onto Sherman Avenue. He emphasized that, unlike a traditional school with concentrated drop-off times, this childcare facility operates with staggered arrival and departure times over several hours, significantly reducing peak traffic demand and potential queuing. He further stated that the County reviewed and concurred with the findings of the traffic study in issuing its conditional approval.

The Chairman entertained a motion to close the public hearing. Mr. Pantalone so moved, Mr. Odorizzi seconded.

John Casadia: Yes

David Catalana: Yes

Michael Pantalone: Yes

Sandy Velez: Yes

Nilsa Rosario: Yes

Robert Odorizzi: Yes

Elizabeth Arthur: Yes

David Manders: Yes

The Chairman entertained a motion to approve the application. Mr. Pantalone so moved, Mr. Odorizzi seconded.

Roll Call:

John Casadia: Yes

David Catalana: Yes

Michael Pantalone: Yes

Sandy Velez: Yes

Nilsa Rosario: Yes

Robert Odorizzi: Yes

Elizabeth Arthur: Yes

David Manders: Yes

7 Brew Coffee– located on the northerly side of West Landis Avenue between Orchard Road and Delsea Drive, Block 2707, Lot 4, Tax Map Sheet #27, Project No. PBA-25-00049. Preliminary/final major site plan approval to construct a 510 square foot restaurant (7 Brew Coffee) and a 260 square foot separate refrigeration shed along with associated site improvements.

Sara Werner, Esq. appeared on behalf of the applicant. The applicant is requesting certain bulk variances and design waivers, which will be addressed in detail by the applicant's professionals during the course of testimony. Counsel advised that four witnesses would be presented: (1) Zachary Rosskamp, a representative of the applicant, to provide testimony regarding operations; (2) Lindsey Rice of Stonefield Engineering and Design, the applicant's civil engineer; (3) John Korak, also of Stonefield Engineering and Design, the applicant's traffic engineer; and (4) Tiffany Morrissey, the applicant's professional planner, who will address the requested variances and waivers. The applicant is in receipt of the Planning and Engineering reports dated January 14, 2026.

Mr. Zachary Rosskamp, owner, testified on his own behalf. He and his wife are the co-owners of the local 7 Brew franchise in New Jersey. He explained that 7 Brew is a national coffee brand and that he and his wife are the franchisees for the State of New Jersey. He has been affiliated with the company for approximately five years and has operated in New Jersey for the past three years. He thanked the Board for the opportunity to present the application and expressed enthusiasm about potentially joining the community. With respect to operations, Mr. Rosskamp testified that the proposed facility will be open seven days per week. Hours of operation will be 5:30 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., Sunday through Thursday, and 5:30 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. on Fridays and Saturdays. He stated that the facility will employ approximately 40 to 50 employees, most of whom are part-time and work between 15 and 25 hours per week. During peak shifts, staffing will range from six to eight employees, and during non-peak shifts, from four to six employees. He described the 7 Brew concept as a beverage-focused drive-through

operation offering coffee, tea, lemonade, flavored sodas, energy drinks, matcha, chai, and similar beverages. He testified that there is no on-site cooking and no hot food preparation. The only food item offered is a pre-packaged “muffin top,” which is pre-prepared, individually wrapped, and stored in a refrigerator for grab-and-go purchase. He explained that the operation is almost exclusively drive-through and is characterized by direct, face-to-face customer service. There is no traditional speaker box system; instead, employees approach vehicles with handheld tablets to take orders and later deliver beverages directly to the customer’s vehicle. He compared the ordering process to that used by Chick-fil-A. He further clarified that there are no mobile orders, delivery services, or third-party app orders associated with the facility. With regard to deliveries, Mr. Rosskamp testified that deliveries occur approximately twice per week, typically during off-peak hours. Peak hours are generally between 7:30 a.m. and 10:00 a.m. on weekdays and 9:30 a.m. to approximately 11:00 a.m. or noon on weekends. Deliveries typically last 15 to 20 minutes and involve limited product, given the beverage-only nature of the operation. He confirmed that the facility is drive-through only and that patrons are not permitted inside the building. While walk-up customers are not encouraged and the business does not advertise pedestrian service, he stated that if an individual arrives on foot, there is a designated safe area near the building where an employee can take the order via tablet and deliver the beverage outside. He noted that pedestrian orders account for less than 0.5% of total sales. He reiterated that no customers are permitted inside the building under any circumstances. He also testified that the average service time statewide is approximately three and one-half minutes from order placement to receipt of the beverage, which he indicated is approximately one and one-half times faster than many competitors. He explained that efficiency is achieved due to the beverage-only model and a streamlined ordering method. He confirmed that the menu includes specialty coffee drinks such as cappuccinos and frappes, and that coffee beverages represent approximately 70% of overall sales. Prior to opening, 7 Brew conducts community outreach initiatives, including “drink drops,” during which 10,000 to 20,000 complimentary beverages are distributed to local businesses, schools, hospitals, and other organizations. The company also hosts a three-day “Caffeine for a Cause” fundraiser event, with the first day dedicated to first responders (police, fire, and EMS) and the following two days benefiting local charities identified in partnership with the community. He stated that the company looks forward to engaging with local organizations as part of that initiative.

Lindsey Rice, Licensed Engineer, testified on behalf of the applicant. She presented Exhibit A-1, aerial of the site and surrounding area. The front portion of the site, just under one acre, is currently developed with a vacant bank building and drive-through facility. She explained that there is an existing stream located toward the rear of the property, along with a 300-foot riparian zone, both of which are entirely outside the limits of the existing and proposed development. The property is located within the Plaza Commercial Redevelopment District, with an underlying B-4 zoning designation. The surrounding properties consist primarily of commercial uses within the same zoning districts. Access to the site is provided by a full-movement driveway serving as the fourth leg of a signalized intersection. An existing access easement permits ingress and egress to the adjacent AT&T and Taco Bell properties. Exhibit A-2, colored rendering depicting proposed conditions. She explained that it will be a 510-square-foot drive-through-only coffee shop accompanied by a 260-square-foot refrigerated shed. The two prefabricated modular structures will be connected onsite by a canopy, creating a cohesive structure. The site plan includes two drive-through lanes, each measuring 12.5 feet in width, which exceeds typical drive-through lane widths in order to provide additional safety for employees who walk between vehicles to take and deliver orders. A two-foot-wide pedestrian strip is provided between the lanes to further enhance safety. In addition, a bypass or pass-through lane is proposed at 11 feet in width, expanding to 18 feet in the area adjacent to the parking spaces. While a 12-foot minimum lane width is required by ordinance, relief is requested for the 11-foot-wide bypass lane, which Ms. Rice stated is sufficient given the overall layout and the wider drive-through lanes. The drive-through configuration accommodates up to 23 vehicles in queue, which exceeds the capacity of similar nearby facilities. The plan proposes eight angled parking spaces, including one ADA-compliant space, intended solely for employee use. Because the building will not provide interior customer access or seating, no parking is required under the ordinance; however, the eight spaces correspond to the anticipated peak number of employees on a shift. Deliveries are expected to occur within the bypass lane along the eastern side of the building and are anticipated to be brief in duration, approximately 10 to 15 minutes, a few times per week. An employee picnic table is located beneath the canopy to provide outdoor space for breaks, as the interior of the building is primarily devoted to beverage preparation and storage. The applicant will comply with the review letter comment to provide a sidewalk connection to the public right-of-way as well as two bicycle parking spaces. Although walk-up service is not encouraged, a designated area under the canopy near a menu board will safely accommodate occasional pedestrian customers. With respect to landscaping, the applicant proposes a total of 70 plantings, including 18 new trees in addition to five existing trees to remain, as well as 52 shrubs and groundcover plantings. Shrubs are proposed along both sides of the drive-through lanes to provide headlight screening, and additional landscaping is proposed around the trash enclosure. The plan complies with the ordinance requirements for parking lot landscaping and the required 25-foot frontage buffer. A waiver is requested for the width of a parking lot island, where nine feet is proposed instead of the required ten feet due to site constraints and the need to accommodate employee parking. Initially, a waiver was also requested for irrigation; however, following Board discussion, the applicant agreed to provide irrigation along the frontage. Regarding stormwater management, the plan shows a reduction of impervious coverage compared to existing conditions and therefore did not initially require stormwater management improvements. She acknowledged that additional improvements, such as the proposed sidewalk, may slightly increase impervious coverage, so the applicant agreed to work with the Board Engineer to provide any stormwater management that may be required. Regarding the building elevations, the exterior façade consists of Nichiha fiber cement board panels with a faux brick finish, featuring a lighter-toned upper portion and a darker base to provide visual contrast. The cooler shed and trash enclosure are designed to match the principal

structure for cohesion. A Pacific blue painted metal canopy and roof tie the structures together and reflect the brand's design aesthetic. All mechanical equipment will be screened from view, either by a rear screen wall or a parapet. Ms. Rice addressed the proposed signage and related variances. The signage package includes a circular logo sign measuring 28.3 square feet, directional arrow chevron signs 7.7 square feet, drive-through and walk-up menu boards 7.8 square feet, and the re-paneling of the existing freestanding monument sign. Variance relief is requested for wall sign orientation and area, wall sign area due to the small building façade, and the size of incidental menu board signage 10.1 square feet. The existing monument sign contains a preexisting nonconforming setback condition, but the proposed panel itself complies with area requirements. Additional design waivers and variances are requested for certain drive-through facility layout requirements and building entrance orientation, given that the facility does not provide customer interior access. The applicant will comply with all remaining comments set forth in the Board Engineer's review letter.

John Corak, Traffic Engineer, testified on behalf of the applicant. He testified that the analysis began with a site visit and field investigation. He explained that the property is located on the north side of Landis Avenue on the former bank parcel within a small shopping center that includes Taco Bell and AT&T, with a larger commercial center located across the street containing ShopRite, Chick-fil-A, and other businesses. He described Landis Avenue as generally consisting of two lanes in each direction with left-turn lanes provided at signalized intersections along the corridor. The subject site is accessed via one such signalized intersection, allowing for controlled left-turn movements into and out of the property. As part of the traffic study, traffic counts were conducted at the site driveway and a level of service analysis was performed. Mr. Corak explained that level of service is graded on a scale from A through F, with A through D considered acceptable. He testified that during peak hours, the Landis Avenue approaches operate within the A to B range, reflecting efficient traffic progression along the corridor, while the site driveway approaches operate within the C to D range, which are also acceptable and consistent with prioritizing the main roadway over side street movements. He further testified that projected site-generated traffic was routed through the signalized access point and additional level of service analyses were conducted. The results indicated no significant change in motorist delay on Landis Avenue or at the site driveway. Based on this analysis, the proposed development would not have a significant adverse impact on the surrounding roadway. He also reviewed the on-site circulation plan. The site includes two drive-through lanes with total stacking capacity for 23 vehicles, as well as a full bypass lane to provide additional internal circulation and operational flexibility. He stated that the site layout is capable of accommodating the anticipated traffic demand without impacting Landis Avenue, even in the event of queuing beyond typical conditions.

Tiffany Morrissey, Professional Planner, testified on behalf of the applicant. She testified that several variances are required, most relating to signage and three relating to site design. She first addressed the minimum floor area ratio requirement within the Plaza Commercial Redevelopment Area, which references the underlying B-4 zoning standards. The ordinance requires a minimum floor area ratio of 0.25. Given the lot size of 9.42 acres, compliance would require a building of approximately 102,583 square feet. The applicant proposes a combined building area of 770 square feet, resulting in a deficiency. She explained that the environmentally constrained rear portion of the property, including a stream and riparian buffer, limits development potential, and that meeting the minimum floor area ratio would be unrealistic and impractical. She testified that the proposed building size is appropriate for the operational needs of the use and the specific characteristics of the site. As for the variance for the trash enclosure setback, the ordinance requires a 50-foot perimeter setback, whereas 9.1 feet is proposed. The trash enclosure is located toward the rear of the site, is appropriately screened and landscaped, and is adjacent to an area of existing landscaping and environmentally protected land. She explained that requiring a 50-foot setback would render the enclosure impractical and interfere with site functionality. An additional variance is required for the parking setback from the street. While the ordinance permits a maximum parking setback of 25 feet, the proposed parking is located approximately 57.8 feet from the street due to the configuration of the shared access drive serving this site, Taco Bell, and the adjacent shopping center. Ms. Morrissey testified that relocating the parking closer to the street would require redesigning multiple interconnected properties and is therefore impractical. As for signage, she explained that the ordinance permits wall signage up to 10 percent of the wall area facing the street. Due to the small size of the building, the maximum permitted sign area on the frontage is 30.9 square feet, whereas 43.8 square feet is proposed. The primary identification sign itself complies with the permitted area; however, additional directional and menu board signage results in the overall variance request. Variances are also required for wall signs located on the east and west elevations, as the ordinance contemplates signage only on the frontage facing the street. Ms. Morrissey testified that the property is visible from multiple access points, including internal driveways connecting adjacent properties, and that signage on multiple elevations is necessary for proper identification and safe circulation. She noted that such multi-sided signage is not uncommon in similar commercial settings with shared access drives and interconnected properties. The requested variances can be justified under the C(2) criteria of the Municipal Land Use Law. She testified that the application advances the purposes of zoning by revitalizing a vacant property, promoting economic activity, improving site design, and creating an attractive and cohesive commercial development. She stated that the project promotes public health, safety, and welfare; provides adequate light, air, and open space; and enhances the visual environment through thoughtful site planning and architectural design. The application is consistent with the intent of the Plaza Commercial Redevelopment Plan, which encourages coordinated development within large commercial centers, and that the proposed signage supports the purposes of the sign ordinance by enhancing aesthetics and minimizing clutter. The requested variances will not substantially impair the intent and purpose of the zoning ordinance or redevelopment plan and will not result in substantial detriment to the public good.

The Chairman entertained a motion to close the public hearing. Mr. Pantalone so moved, Mr. Odorizzi seconded.

John Casadia: Yes
David Catalana: Yes
Michael Pantalone: Yes
Sandy Velez: Yes
Nilsa Rosario: Yes
Robert Odorizzi: Yes
Elizabeth Arthur: Yes
David Manders: Yes

The Chairman entertained a motion to approve the application. Mr. Pantalone so moved, Mr. Odorizzi seconded.

Roll Call:
John Casadia: Yes
David Catalana: Yes
Michael Pantalone: Yes
Sandy Velez: Yes
Nilsa Rosario: Yes
Robert Odorizzi: Yes
Elizabeth Arthur: Yes
David Manders: Yes

Vineyards Redevelopment Study, Block 4301, Lots 1.02, 1.03, 1.04, 1.05, and 1.06.

Tiffany Morrissey, Professional Planner, prepared the Vineyards Redevelopment Study, a determination of need report assessing whether Block 4301, Lots 1.02, 1.03, 1.04 and 1.06 qualify as a non-condemnation redevelopment area. The referenced lots were created through a minor subdivision previously granted by the board. In accordance with the Local Redevelopment and Housing Law (N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-5), at least one of eight criteria must be met for a property to be considered in need of redevelopment. The report concluded that four of these criteria are satisfied. Additionally, lots that do not independently meet the criteria may be included in the redevelopment area if they are necessary for the effective redevelopment of the entire property.

The property is primarily within the IN-2 zoning district, with a small portion along Main Road in the B-3 zoning district. The site is substantial in size, historically housing Elwyn Developmental Center, and contains buildings, some operational and others in poor condition. A map included in the report identifies buildings demolished after 2001, those demolished before 2021, and the existing buildings remaining on the site. Many buildings were used for residential and office purposes and have deteriorated over time, with issues including roof damage, asbestos siding, and abandoned underground utilities such as steam lines and pipes, some of which caused sinkholes. The property, encompassing over 140 acres, has been largely inactive, and it was estimated that over the past four years, approximately \$1.7 million in theft and vandalism occurred. This general deterioration underscores the need for revitalization and redevelopment. Specifically, Block 4301, Lot 1.02, approximately 10.96 acres, contains three buildings: the Whitman Cottage, the Edgar Doll Cottage, and the Goddard Cottage. These buildings are viable, and the lot is necessary for the effective redevelopment of the overall study area due to its location and integration within the shared driveway system. Similarly, Lot 1.03, approximately 7.4 acres, contains the Creative Achievement Academy, which remains functional but is also considered necessary for the effective redevelopment of the site. Additionally, Lot 1.06 contains Building 6, which houses the Senior Enrichment Center, and Building 7, which includes vacant medical spaces as well as the Center for Learning. These buildings are not necessarily in poor condition, but they are integral to the overall effective redevelopment of the property. This leaves us with Lots 1.04 and 1.05. Lot 1.04 is the building along the frontage and contains the historic structure commonly referred to as the Scarborough Mansion or the Maximum Building. It is an architecturally attractive building with unique features, but it has not been in active use for some time. The last known use was as office space in the mid-2000s to 2010. The building lacks a central HVAC system, relying instead on window units and fans for climate control. Water service has been disconnected due to persistent leaks, and other utilities, such as gas service, have also been disconnected. A pre-demolition renovation investigation conducted by an outside agency identified pests in the building, as well as piping in poor condition. The report, on pages 15 and 16, includes photographs showing the interior's progressive state of disrepair. Lot 1.05, the largest portion of the property, includes the abandoned and boarded-up warehouse, as well as buildings used for electrical transmission. While these structures are now generally secured, they have experienced vandalism over time and do not currently contribute to the community. The same investigative report indicated that the warehouse contains asbestos and requires extensive remediation. Additionally, a cemetery located in the center of the site impacts overall site development patterns. These properties fall under the State Plan Metropolitan Planning Area 1 and are partially within the Vineland Regional Center, which was approved around 2000–2003. The New Jersey Smart Growth Explorer Beta map, included in the report, shows the site within a high and medium-high redevelopment

suitability area. This supports four conditions advanced under the redevelopment findings: Purpose A – The property qualifies because many of the buildings are substandard, unsafe, unsanitary, dilapidated, or obsolete, and they lack sufficient light, air, or space conducive to healthy living or working conditions. This applies to the large warehouse, the Maximum Building at the front of the property, and the power supply and powerhouse buildings, all of which have fallen into disrepair. Criteria B – This requires the discontinuance or abandonment of commercial, office, or industrial buildings, significant vacancies of at least two consecutive years, or allowing such buildings to fall into an untenable state of disrepair. Lot 1.05, formerly used as a school building, has been abandoned for more than four years, stripped of interior mechanical equipment, lacks power, and is boarded up. Similarly, the Maximum Building on Lot 1.04 has been abandoned for over four years, disconnected from utilities, and lacks climate control, with mold and mildew present. Criteria D – Due to dilapidation, obsolescence, overcrowding, faulty arrangement or design, lack of ventilation, light, sanitary facilities, excessive land coverage, and other detrimental factors, the conditions of the site negatively affect the safety, health, morals, and welfare of the community. Contributing factors include underground steam pipes causing sinkholes and the central cemetery impeding redevelopment. Overall, these conditions demonstrate that the site meets the standards for redevelopment under the applicable state criteria. Regarding Lots 1.04 and 1.05, they have a negative impact that abandoned and deteriorating buildings have on the community and the State of New Jersey. These conditions contribute to the qualifications under Purpose A and Criteria D of the Local Redevelopment and Housing Law, as the substandard, unsafe, and dilapidated structures affect the safety, health, and welfare of the community. Additionally, Criteria H, which requires that the designation of the delineated area be consistent with smart growth planning principles, is supported by the site's inclusion in the State Plan Metropolitan Planning Area 1 and partially within the Vineland Regional Center, as indicated by the New Jersey Smart Growth Explorer mapping system. In her opinion, the site meets four of the criteria for designation, and the remaining buildings are necessary for effective overall redevelopment of the property.

The Chairman entertained a motion to make a recommendation to City Council. Mr. Pantalone so moved, Mr. Odorizzi seconded.

Roll Call:

John Casadia: Yes
David Catalana: Yes
Michael Pantalone: Yes
Sandy Velez: Yes
Nilsa Rosario: Yes
Robert Odorizzi: Yes
David Manders: Yes

The Chairman entertained a motion to approve Resolution #6750. Mr. Pantalone so moved, Mr. Odorizzi seconded.

Roll Call:

John Casadia: Yes
David Catalana: Yes
Michael Pantalone: Yes
Sandy Velez: Yes
Nilsa Rosario: Yes
Robert Odorizzi: Yes
David Manders: Yes

Redevelopment Plan Amendment- Rahid Khan, 501 E. Landis Avenue, Block 4001, Lot 1.1, Project PBA-25-00040.

Ms. Hicks explained that this application is for a redevelopment plan amendment for the former State Office Building located at the southeast corner of Landis Avenue and the Boulevard. Mr. Rashid Khan, the local manager of the building, which is owned by his brother, proposed a small Event Center at the site. She noted that the application process has been ongoing. Staff, consisting of city professionals including Pat Finley, Derek Leary, and Brian Murray, conducted an in-person site visit and reviewed the building with Mr. Khan, providing extensive guidance to assist in completing the application. While the applicant has reviewed the staff report, no response has yet been received regarding the recommendations. Staff recommended approval of the redevelopment plan amendment for the Event Center, subject to ten conditions outlined in the report.

The Chairman entertained a motion to make a recommendation to City Council. Mr. Pantalone so moved, Mr. Odorizzi seconded.

Roll Call:

John Casadia: Yes
David Catalana: Yes
Michael Pantalone: Yes
Sandy Velez: Yes

Nilsa Rosario: Yes
Robert Odorizzi: Yes
David Manders: Yes

The Chairman entertained a motion to approve Resolution #6749. Mr. Pantalone so moved, Mr. Odorizzi seconded.

Roll Call:
John Casadia: Yes
David Catalana: Yes
Michael Pantalone: Yes
Sandy Velez: Yes
Nilsa Rosario: Yes
Robert Odorizzi: Yes
David Manders: Yes

Affordable Housing Ordinance-

Ms. Hicks discussed the recent update to the Community Municipal Enforcement (CME) ordinance. The State of New Jersey was required to provide model ordinances, which every municipality needed to adopt by March 15th. However, the model ordinances were only released approximately two weeks prior, and the Board had not been previously made aware of the timing. The City was alerted to the requirement by the law firm handling affordable housing, Jeff Sirenian's firm. CMA volunteered to prepare a draft ordinance by Friday, which was completed, and Richard Tonetta, City's Solicitor, reformatted it for City Council to complete the referral. The City's Consultant explained that the updated ordinance largely mirrors the City's previous provisions, maintaining a 1.5% contribution of equalized assessed value for every new unit built, unless density donors are applied in the multifamily zones and townhouse overlay. The ordinance does not include gross-share obligations, as the City has no obligation for new construction. Minor technical adjustments from the State model were incorporated, such as rounding procedures and other small provisions, but these do not change the City's existing affordable housing framework.

The Chairman entertained a motion to make a recommendation to City Council. Mr. Pantalone so moved, Mr. Odorizzi seconded.

Roll Call:
John Casadia: Yes
David Catalana: Yes
Michael Pantalone: Yes
Sandy Velez: Yes
Nilsa Rosario: Yes
Robert Odorizzi: Yes
David Manders: Yes

The Chairman entertained a motion to approve Resolution #6750. Mr. Pantalone so moved, Mr. Odorizzi seconded.

Roll Call:
John Casadia: Yes
David Catalana: Yes
Michael Pantalone: Yes
Sandy Velez: Yes
Nilsa Rosario: Yes
Robert Odorizzi: Yes
David Manders: Yes

ADJOURNMENT

The Chairman entertained a motion to adjourn.

Roll call:
John Casadia: Yes
David Catalana: Yes
Michael Pantalone: Yes
Sandy Velez: Yes
Nilsa Rosario: Yes
Robert Odorizzi: Yes
Elizabeth Arthur: Yes
David Manders: Yes

TIME: 9:37 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Yasmin Perez
Planning Board Secretary