

CHATHAM BOROUGH PLANNING BOARD
August 18, 2021 7:30 p.m.

Chairman Susan Favate called the Chatham Borough Planning Board Regular Meeting of August 18, 2021 to order at 7:30 p.m. Chrmn. Favate announced that all legal notices have been posted for this meeting. Board members, Attorney Loughlin, and other participants were all present by way of Zoom.

Name	Present	Absent
Mayor Thadddeus Kobylarz	X	
Council Member Frank Truilo	X	
Steve Williams	X	
H.H. Montague	X	
Vice Chrmn. Matthew Wagner	X	
Chrmn. Susan Favate	X	
Curt Dawson		X
Bill Heap	X – left the Zoom meeting 9:40 p.m.	
Torri Van Wie	X	
Joseph Mikulewicz	X	
Gregory Xikes	X	
Vincent K. Loughlin, Esq.	X	

Also present:
Steven Mlenak, Esq., Redevelopment Counsel for Chatham Borough

Public Comment

There was none.

Resolution # PB 2021-01

Council Member Truilo made a motion to approve the July 7, 2021 Planning Board minutes as submitted. Mrs. Van Wie seconded the motion. The July 7, 2021 minutes were approved as submitted.

Application Resolutions

There were none.

Discussion Items

Report of the preliminary investigation for determination of an area in need of redevelopment

Presented by: Dan Hauben and Francis Reiner

Mr. Francis Reiner introduced himself as a professional planner with DMR Architects. He noted that Mr. Dan Hauben, his associate, will walk the Board through tonight's presentation. A history will be given to each piece of property on River Road. Reasons will be given as to why or why not each of these properties could or could not be designated for possible development.

Attorney Loughlin swore in Francis Reiner and Dan Hauben to testify.

Mr. Hauben noted that 27 properties were included in this study. He explained in what order tonight's presentation will follow.

At Attorney Loughlin's suggestion, tonight's report by Mr. Reiner and Mr. Hauben was marked as Exhibit B-1.

Mr. Hauben explained how this redevelopment process is a 3-step process. It is dictated by state statute. The first step is to investigate a delineated area to determine whether or not it is eligible for designation. The Mayor and Council authorizes the Planning Board to investigate a particular area. The Planning Board oversees the investigation. Depending on the findings of that investigation, the Board would recommend to the Mayor and Council whether this section of the Borough should be designated. The next step would be to draft a re-development plan which will be carried out by the Mayor and Council. It will essentially be a zoning document that gives the municipality much more control over design and other aspects of any developments in the designated area. Mr. Hauben explained the site plan application process.

Mr. Hauben stated that this investigation undertaken by DMR was authorized by Resolution 20-214 which was adopted by the Chatham Borough Mayor and Council on August 17, 2020. Part of the area is being investigated for redevelopment. The entire section of this area was re-investigated for rehabilitation, which is a separate designation which will not be covered in this meeting. Mr. Reiner reviewed the sources and documents that were used for this report.

Mr. Hauben noted that the Planning Board's role is to determine, based on DMR's findings stated in their report, whether each property, or the area in general, meets the statutory criteria for an area in need of redevelopment. If so, the Planning Board will make a recommendation to the Mayor and Council to designate the area or parts of it as an area in need of redevelopment. The Mayor and Council will then designate the area as such by resolution.

Mr. Hauben reviewed three of the eight criteria in the statute for designating an area as being in need for redevelopment.

Mr. Hauben noted that there will be no change to the zoning as a result on the decided upon designation. The permitted and non-permitted uses of this zoning district will not change. None of the bulk standards will change. The designation will not force any businesses to close. In this situation, the Borough cannot condemn or take any properties. Mr. Hauben clarified that DMR is "not filling the shoes" of any enforcement officer with this report.

Mr. Hauben asked if the Board had any questions thus far.

Chrmn. Favate asked Mr. Hauben what would be the difference between rehabilitation and redevelopment.

Mr. Hauben explained that the rehabilitation designation gives the municipality fewer tools than the redevelopment process. Mr. Reiner added that there is different criteria between rehabilitation and redevelopment. Higher standards are needed to meet the criteria for rehabilitation over redevelopment.

Mr. Mikulewicz noted that many residents are away during the summer months. Could a re-discussion be held in September or October on this project? How many meetings will this project take to carry out?

Mr. Reiner clarified that what is before the Board tonight is not a decision on what is appropriate for these particular properties in terms of zoning. It will not specify on what should constructed in that area. The presentation is simply a determination of whether or not these properties meet the statutory criteria.

Chrmn. Favate pointed out that this presentation will be posted on the Borough website, making it available to the public.

Mr. Williams noted that there are 14 business or building owners from River Road watching this Zoom presentation tonight. Tonight's meeting/presentation has been advertised according to the Municipal Land Use Laws.

Mrs. Van Wie asked if this presentation was given for rehabilitation purposes, and there is no ability to coerce people or require people to sell their property, how do you guarantee this continuous parcel of land that encompasses the entire area under discussion. How does that work?

Mr. Hauben answered that the new zoning and the tax incentives that go along with it would attract developers to try and acquire land in the area and to develop it according to the redevelopment plan.

Mayor Kobylarz noted that it is important to keep in mind that part of the initial motivation for this entire process is to ensure that the Borough has a seat at the table in terms of ultimately of what takes place in Trenton. A year ago the Borough had an indication that a developer who was trying to develop some lots in this part of town. There was a concern that the developer would create a situation where the Borough would have no say in the matter. Mayor Kobylarz noted that one of the fears is that River Road will go entirely residential. He would like to preserve the character of River Road. Historically, River Road has been a quasi-industrial zone. He would like to see the business presence preserved on this street. An updating could be done of that business presence. A 21st century style presence could be created there. Mayor Kobylarz stated that one of the reasons for this study is to preserve the character of River Road.

Mr. Xikes asked why the term "Preliminary Investigation" is being used for this study.

Mr. Hauben explained that is just the phrasing from the statutes. Sometimes investigations are re-visited or expanded upon. In this particular case, it will be the final report for the Board.

Attorney Loughlin explained further that “Preliminary” in this situation indicates that it is the first step for the Board in this process and clarifies the limited role the Planning Board plays in this process.

River Road property evaluations

Mr. Hauben gave his summary of each property, using a power point presentation.

28 River Road

Mr. Hauben stated that this property is a quarter acre lot. A contracting business operates on this property. This lot meets Criteria D for a number of reasons. The existing driveway is water-damaged. There is unprogrammed circulation and parking. There is no clear separation between this lot and neighboring lots 6 and 7. There is a lack of site lighting which can be unsafe on an industrial property. There are no visible drainage systems on the site to remove water on the property.

30-34 River Road

Mr. Hauben reviewed the number of businesses currently operating at this location. A couple of buildings have been demolished, creating vacant land, some of which has been paved. No signage exists on the street for driveway outlets. Deteriorated driveways exist. There is a lack of site lighting. No sidewalks exist in this area. A downspouts empties out onto the driveway where it meets the building wall.

32 River Road

Mr. Hauben noted that an auto repair business operates in the back of this lot. Auto repair businesses and residential units are not compatible uses, unless the dwelling’s sole occupants own the repair shop and can control the quality of life. Not enough parking spaces exist on this property for two uses. Two curb openings on a property of this size is prohibited by zoning ordinances. No signs exist labeling the driveways as entrances and exits. No inground drainage was found.

No ADA entrances or ADA parking spaces were in place.

38 River Road

Mr. Hauben stated that a cluster of buildings are on this lot. He pointed out that 90% of this lot is covered by buildings or pavements. There is not enough permeable surface available. This property meets the D Criteria. The storage area on the property is unscreened which is a violation of the zoning regulations. The current storage bins create unsafe conditions. There is no ADA parking or ADA access available. There is not adequate draining on this property. The front of the building is in a deteriorated state.

48 River Road

Mr. Hauben felt the surface of this property was close to 100% covered. No inground drainage was found. The curb opening and driveway have an awkward configuration. There is a lack of lighting and drainage. There is no ADA access to the buildings.

52 River Road

Mr. Hauben noted there is deterioration on the exterior of the building. The rear of the building has a graveled area for parking and storage. The existing parking is done randomly. There is no screening for the storage area, thus exposing this industrial storage area view to the townhouses behind (Schindler Ct.). This site meets Criteria D.

58 River Road

Mr. Hauben believed this was an industrial building which was constructed in 2014 or 2015, using the foundation of a burnt-out structure. This building has no visible windows to let in light. The front yard parking area forces vehicles to back out onto River Road in an unsafe manner. The drainage is inadequate.

62-70 River Road

Mr. Hauben noted there are 4 family dwellings at these locations. These lots do not have issues regarding public safety. The Planning Board may consider them necessary for larger area development of the adjacent area.

78 River Road

Mr. Hauben explained this is a very small piece of property at the end of River Road. It is totally vacant, consisting of woods and grass. The property is municipally owned and will probably not be developed.

79 River Road

Mr. Hauben noted that this is a 7-acre lot which is municipally owned. It is mostly wooded with a utility easement running through. This property has been vacant for 10 years and has environmental constraints which may discourage future development. The topography goes downhill towards the river. This property meets Criteria C.

73 River Road

Mr. Hauben reported that a dwelling and a bus depot are situated close together on this property. These two entities are incompatible land uses and are prohibited by zoning regulations. The bus depot has no screening installed to protect residents from bus fumes, noise, etc. An existing railroad tie fence runs across this section of River Road and looks like it may collapse into the Borough right-of-way. This property is Criteria D.

8 Bonnell Street

Mr. Hauben reported that this property, on its own, did not meet the criteria for redevelopment. There is no clear parking area on the property. However, Mr. Hauben believed it should be included in a redevelopment area.

10 Bonnell Street

Mr. Hauben believed this property met the Criterion D. He reviewed the problems of the front yard parking situation. Gravel surfaces are not permitted in this area. He explained how the business use on 10 Bonnell Street was encroaching into other properties. The business use is too large to contain itself to just this one property. There are no ADA accessible entrances on this building.

20 Bonnell Street

Mr. Hauben reported this property has environmental constraints and is owned by Chatham Borough. It has been vacant for more than 10 years and is not likely to be developed through private capital due to topography and an overhead power line.

21 Bonnell Street

Mr. Hauben noted that there are wooden boards nailed over the building on this property which may cause insulation and safety problems. This building has deteriorating conditions and unwholesome living arrangements. The parking area is comprised of gravel and has no delineation of parking spaces. The lack of site lighting creates unsafe conditions. This property meets Criterion D.

67 River Road

Mr. Hauben explained why this property met Criterion D. In the rear yard, parking goes on for non-residential purposes. This arrangement is not compatible with a residential area. The existing downspouts on this building are poorly placed. The building has no railings. No drainage exists in the commercial portion of the storage and parking area.

65 River Road

Mr. Hauben noted that this property is newer and is in good condition. Unfortunately, a pooling of the property's stormwater is pooling into the street. In cold weather this pooling could freeze and create unsafe conditions. This property meets a Criterion D because of this faulty design.

61 River Road

Mr. Hauben reported that there are at least 2 dwellings on this property. The rear parking area is being used for non-residential storage purposes. There is a deck at the rear of the property which is at least 2 feet above grade with no railings or ramps, thereby creating a fall risk. Downspout placement was not well done. Stacked or tandem parking is being done in the driveway, forcing vehicles to back out onto River Road. Two walls are collapsing out onto St. James Street. Conditions on this property meet a D Criterion.

10 St. James Street

Mr. Hauben noted that this is an industrial property with two buildings. There is a lack of screening for parking, outdoor storage, etc. Parking and storage areas are not delineated. There is excessive impervious coverage and the lack of a drainage system. There is a lack of site lighting. There are no ADA accessibility or parking spaces available. An existing retaining wall is starting to collapse. This property rates Criterion D.

21 St. James Street

Mr. Hauben reported that this property has been municipally owned for a long time. It has environmental constraints and has power lines running over head. This property meets Criterion C.

Chrmn. Favate asked if there were any questions at this point.

Council Member Truilo asked Mr. Hauben if he could show the extent of the power lines. Referring to the photographs, he noted that Lots 2 through 5 show that the high tension towers were close to those properties.

Using the Zoom diagram, Mr. Hauben indicated how the power lines traveled.

Council Member Truilo asked what type of clearance or separation is need for any future development that may be proposed for the right-of-way for these properties.

Mr. Hauben answered that he didn't know for sure. That situation would probably be looked at if the stage of redevelopment is reached.

Mrs. Van Wie brought up the properties belonging to the Borough. Could this be an opportunity for community solar and use the solar power that is generated to create energy that the lower-income houses could leverage in order to give them more equitable electricity prices.

Mr. Hauben felt that arrangement could best be considered at the redevelopment stage. He pointed out that there are certain DEP regulations when it comes to installing solar.

Council Member Truilo asked if the wetlands area could be indicated. He felt that would help the Board to see what areas could not be developed.

Mr. Hauben noted that the wetlands area had been included in the study he had submitted. He would try and cover that at the end of the presentation.

Mr. Heap noted that Mr. Hauben has pointed out some violations on these properties in his study. How much does the town force some of these zoning ordinances regarding maintenance? How many of these property owners clean up a bit?

Mr. Reiner explained that the process that the Board is going through right now. The designating of these properties for rehabilitation/redevelopment, is all about how the properties can be improved by moving forward. This process is intended to assist with that goal.

Mr. Heap did not feel this area in the study should be turned into residential.

Mr. Reiner agreed with Mr. Heap's point. He further clarified that the designation is with non-condemnation, meaning that no property owner will be forced to sell a property. Also, the municipality does not have the right to take anybody's property. Mr. Reiner explained the next stop in the process, will identify what are the permitted uses are for this area of town, should it be designated as an area in need of redevelopment. If the Borough goes through and designate each property, and adopts a redevelopment plan, it will have a greater ability to determine what gets built and how it gets built.

Mayor Kobylarz stated that the prime motivation for this investigative study, was a very strong desire on the part of the governing body to preserve the traditional and small business character of this town. He pointed out that there was a fear that there were numerous developers that were

eyeing many of these properties in this section of town for the purpose of building 100% residential uses. The governing body wanted, at the very least, to have a mixed-use of structures in that part of town. There's also a desire to preserve many of the existing businesses in that section as well.

Mayor Kobylarz explained that just because designating this section of the Borough as an area in need of rehabilitation/redevelopment does not necessarily mean that businesses that are existing there now will leave or will be asked to leave in the redevelopment plan. The Borough is hoping to spruce up that section of town, but also maintain the traditional commercial character of that part of town. This investigative study will be a tool to make this happen.

Chrmn. Favate asked Mr. Reiner and Mr. Hauben if any outreach been done to any of the property owners on River Road.

Mr. Reiner answered that the engagement with the existing property owners was limited. He and Mr. Hauben were just given the assignment of looking at the property site. Actual communication with the owners was not required.

Chrmn. Favate noted that it was now 9:30 p.m. She would like to give time to the public to ask questions. Mr. Hauben asked that the questions and comments pertain only to the properties reviewed thus far.

Mr. Williams opened up the Zoom meeting to members of the public who wished to speak.

Steve Losalto, owner of 52 River Rd., reviewed the improvements that he has done to his building and property. He agreed that this part of town needed some cleaning up. He asked that the Board look at his property and comment at their next meeting when this study goes into the development stage. The Board can give any suggestions of any additional work that could be done on the property.

Attorney Loughlin explained to Mr. Losalto that the Board is not permitted to talk with him about any developments on his property unless a site plan application was involved. He reminded Mr. Losalto that the planners tonight have made it clear that this is not going to result in anyone losing development rights for their property.

Mr. Losalto indicated that he understood. He thanked Attorney Loughlin for his time.

Mr. Hauben reminded the Board and the public that nothing that he and Mr. Reiner have said about any properties and their conditions was meant to be disparaging toward the owner or the developer. They do not mean to hurt any property owners or the businesses.

Jeff Gendel, owner of 56/58 River Road, asked if the analysis done by DMR tonight is, in fact, an opinion. And in the analysis that DMR performed, did they consider the specific use cases of the building, with respect to ingress and egress and traffic flow. Mr. Gendel pointed out that many of the properties in this study are commercially oriented. He did not believe that many of these businesses had a frequent amount of ingress and egress of vehicles. In DMR's analysis,

was any consideration given for any easements or any other restrictions that the property owners have between the properties. He pointed out the paper street that exists between his property and Mr. Losalto's property. Is there a restriction that he and Mr. Losalto must pave over what is gravel? Was any consideration given to those easements or restrictions that owners have with respect to making improvements or paving over what was depicted as deterioration of a specific property.

Regarding Mr. Gendel's first question, Mr. Hauben clarified that everything in the DMR report is a recommendation to the Board as to whether the conditions that he and Mr. Reiner saw are consistent with the criteria of whether or not a property or business was eligible for the criterion if a property was eligible for redevelopment.

The DMR report is just research that guides the decision-making of the Planning Board. In answer to the second question, Mr. Hauben explained that he and Mr. Reiner at least once, but sometimes multiple times visited these properties. The history of the properties will be looked at to see how a property has changed over time. Deeds and other documents are looked at as far as possible. Easements are looked for. Mr. Hauben discussed the paper street situation next to Mr. Gendel's property. He told Mr. Gendel that he would not be faulted for not paving Willow Lane.

Mr. Gendel felt that the traffic flow should be considered by the Planning Board when they make a final decision on this study.

Mr. Gendel thanked Mr. Hauben and the Board for their time.

Mitchell Weinstock identified himself as a tenant for 38 River Road. He asked Mr. Hauben and Mr. Reiner if their job was to find all the faults of these buildings.

Mr. Reiner clarified that DMR's job was assigned to determine whether or not these properties on River Road met statutory criteria as an area in need of redevelopment. When he and Mr. Hauben walked these properties, they were looking for those issues or items that specifically meet the criteria. Not all properties met the criteria.

Mr. Mitchell asked Mr. Reiner if he and Mr. Hauben had studied any of the traffic patterns. He had concerned about even more vehicles on River Road if/when development is done.

Mr. Reiner answered that if these properties are designated, and the Mayor and Borough Council choose to move forward with a redevelopment plan, the traffic analysis for whatever is ultimately permitted in a redevelopment plan, would be a critical part of the plan. Mr. Reiner pointed out that when Mr. Hauben made a comment of the way that vehicles must enter and exit a certain property, it is a safety issue that has to be noted on the report.

At the Board's request, Mr. Hauben continued with the property analysis for River Road:

7 St. James Street

Mr. Hauben noted that it was unclear what this building was being used for. Its parking area is being used for large industrial trucks. This parking situation continues on into land owned by the municipality. The building is not in good condition. The parking area is not delineated. There

is no ADA access to the building. There are no railings to the main stairs. The site lacks lighting and drainage. No screening of the property is provided. Mr. Hauben believed the property meets Criterion A.

57 River Road

Mr. Hauben reported that a two-unit dwelling exists on this property. The conditions on this property are not severe enough to meet the threshold of being a public safety hazard. However, it was felt that this property should be included in the redevelopment area.

55 River Road

Mr. Hauben noted that there is excessive outdoor storage existing in the front and side yards. A lack of screening creating an eyesore. A lack of lighting exists throughout the area. There is a lack of defined parking and circulation. A dwelling exists on the property with an ADA banister. However, the banister is not in good condition.

21 Perrin Street

Mr. Hauben reported that this property is owned by the municipality. It may have wetlands and environmental constraints. This property may not be developed through private capital because of its topography. It meets Criterion C.

47 River Road

Mr. Hauben explained the mixed uses in the building on this property. It is unusual to have apartments on the same level as an office use. The front yard parking is hazardous. Contracting trucks are being parked in the rear, on grassed surfaces, which is not permitted. Downspouts open up onto paved surfaces. This property meets Criterion D.

45 River Road

Mr. Hauben noted that a contractor's office exists on this property. The rear parking area lacks striping and lighting. The pavement is in poor condition. No clear ADA accommodations are in place. There is no clear drainage infrastructure. Mr. Hauben explained the hazardous parking arrangements.

31-39 River Road

Mr. Hauben noted that this property included the school bus parking, dispatch area and a contractor's office. He did not believe that the bus parking and dispatch area was not a permitted use. This particular function is totally exposed to the street and residences due to a lack of screening. At least 90% of the surface is impervious. Hazardous front yard parking exists. There is lack of lighting in the storage area for the buses. There is a lack of ADA access on both properties.

3 – 7 Watchung Avenue

Mr. Hauben reported that this entire area is within a flood hazard area. Storing vehicles and equipment in a flood hazard area is a hazard to public safety. Piles of landscaping material are extremely visible from the public right-of-way. No screening has been installed. This site meets Criterion D.

Area-Wide Conditions

Mr. Hauben stated that overall, the entire area, contained trends that either crossed into other properties or were not consistent with more contemporary planning and development trends and standards for quality of life. A widespread inadequacy of drainage infrastructure exists. There were many examples of parking arrangements that would force a vehicle to back out into the busy traffic conditions of River Road. There is a lack of effective screening of the industrial units. There are examples of using residential properties for non-residential parking and storage. Encroachment has occurred on both public and private properties without recorded easements. There is a lack of sidewalks throughout the entire area.

Recommendations

Mr. Hauben noted that DMR recommends that the entire area of River Road be designated as an area in need of redevelopment. However, DMR defers to the Planning Board with respect to Block 136 Lot 2-4.

Next Steps

If the Planning Board determines if, based on this report, that these properties meet the criteria as an area in need of redevelopment, it forwards their decision and recommendation onto the Mayor and Borough Council. The Mayor and Borough Council would act on this recommendation and, by resolution, could designate this area in need of redevelopment. This designation is then submitted to the State for review and approval. If approved, the Borough can prepare and eventually adopt a Redevelopment Plan.

Mr. Reiner pointed out that the presentation given tonight by Mr. Hauben is a summary of the full findings of the report. It is only intended to be an outline or summarization of what the report is, in terms of all of the factual data that was provided in that report for each individual property, as well for the area as a whole.

Chrmn. Favate asked if the DMR Report was on the Borough website.

Mr. Williams answered that it is.

Council Member Truilo asked if there was an existing structure on a property that the Board deems is part of the redevelopment plan, however if it is decided that the property cannot be built upon because of the high tension wires, what happens then?

Mr. Hauben answered that the existing structure could remain until redevelopment is chosen. The placement of the high tension wires does not affect existing buildings. Mr. Reiner added that if the existing structure did not permit redevelopment, the building can remain in perpetuity.

Mr. Mikulewicz briefly reviewed the history of the River Road area that he had found on the website. He noted that a present day conservation area had been designated at the end of Perrin Street, which had served as a garbage-dumping site in the 1940s.

Chrmn. Favate asked if the public had any more questions.

Former Mayor Bruce Harris, 92 Elmwood Ave., brought up the First Student Bus Company at 32 River Road. At the end of 2019, the Zoning Bd. of Adjustment had adopted a resolution requiring the bus company to vacate the property by a certain date in the near future. Mr. Harris noted that the last River Road property that had been reviewed in this presentation, belongs to Rotondi, which is a yard waste recycling business. He understood that this business always operates within DEP guidelines. DEP has very strict requirements regarding encroachment on the river. Mr. Harris felt that Rotondi was “grandfathered in” as to how high their piles could be.

Chrmn. Favate asked Mr. Reiner and Mr. Hauben if the Board had to make a final decision tonight on this designation.

Mr. Reiner answered that it was entirely up to the Board. If Board members so choose, they could put forth a recommendation. Attorney Mlenak advised that if the Board decided to carry this matter to the next meeting, no further notice would be needed. Mr. Reiner explained that the presentation at the next meeting would be for rehabilitation of this area. It will not be as detailed as tonight’s presentation. He also recommended the Planning Board take separate votes on Rehabilitation and Redevelopment for this area.

The Board and Mr. Reiner discussed whether action could be taken at tonight’s meeting on the Redevelopment Study.

Attorney Loughlin gave advice on this matter. He pointed out that the presentation on the redevelopment has been concluded. It would be appropriate for the Board to consider making a motion this evening. He did not believe Board discussion was required in this situation. Attorney Loughlin noted that DMR Architects have submitted a good presentation tonight and a good summary at the end. Their report also stated that the Planning Board has the authority to approve a resolution recommending this to the Mayor and Borough Council and that Block 136, Lots 1 through 4 as being, as set forth in the report, be included in the redevelopment area. If the Board felt comfortable, it could make a motion on the redevelopment section this evening, and expedite a resolution as well.

Vice Chrmn. Wagner made a motion to approve and recommend to the Mayor and Borough Council that the delineated area on the preliminary report submitted by DMR Architects to the Planning Board herein be determined to be a redevelopment area. Also, Block 135, Lots 1-8 and 13-14, and Block 136-140, with the exception of Lots 1-4 on Block 136 have met the criteria for a redevelopment designation. Council Member Truilo seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken:

Mayor Kobylarz	-	yes
Council Member Truilo	-	yes
Mr. Williams	-	yes
Chrmn. Favate	-	yes
Vice Chrmn. Wagner	-	yes
Mr. Xikes	-	yes
Mr. Heap	-	absent when roll call was taken
Mr. Montague	-	yes

Mrs. Van Wie	-	yes
Mr. Mikulewicz	-	yes

The motion passed.

Mr. Reiner and Mr. Hauben thanked the Board for all their time listening and interacting with tonight's presentation.

Mayor Kobylarz thanked Mr. Hauben and Mr. Reiner for all their hard work on this assignment.

At 10:35 p.m. the meeting adjourned.

The Chatham Borough Planning Board meeting of September 1, 2021 will be cancelled.

The next Chatham Borough Planning Board meeting will be held on September 15, 2021, 7:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Elizabeth Holler
Recording Secretary

