

**TOWNSHIP OF WEST ORANGE
PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
March 4, 2015**

The Township of West Orange Planning Board held a regular meeting on March 4, 2015 at 7:30 P.M. in Council Chambers, 66 Main Street, West Orange, New Jersey.

Vice Chairman Heller called the meeting to order at approximately 7: 35 P.M. It was announced that notification of this meeting was given to the Township Clerk, and posted on the Township Bulletin Board on December 11, 2014 in accordance with the requirements of the "Open Public Meetings Act".

PRESENT: Robert Bagoff, Tekeste Ghebremicael, Lee Klein, Councilwoman Susan McCartney, Vice Chairman Ron Weston, William Wilkes II

ABSENT: Chairman Ben Heller, Joanne Carlucci, Jerome Eben, Gerald Gurland, Jason Lester

ALSO PRESENT: Paul Grygiel, AICP, PP, Acting Township Planner, Frank Russo, PE, PP, Omland Engineering, Township Consulting Engineer, Leonard P. Lepore, Municipal Engineer, Patrick J. Dwyer, Esq., Board Attorney, Robin Miller, Board Secretary, Debbie Dillon, Audio-Digital Transcription Service

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Vice Chairman Weston requested all persons stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Robert Bagoff, Joanne Carlucci, Jerome Eben, Tekeste Ghebremicael, Gerald Gurland, Chairman Ben Heller, Lee Klein, Jason Lester, Council President Susan McCartney, Vice Chairman Ron Weston, William Wilkes II

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The next Planning Board regular meeting will be held on April 1, 2015 in Council Chambers at 7:30 P.M.

SWEARING IN

Frank Russo, PE, PE, Omland Engineering, Township Consulting Engineer.
Paul Grygiel, AICP, PP, Acting Township Planner.
Leonard Lepore, P.E., Municipal Engineer (Approximately 8:27 P.M.)

RESOLUTION(S)

PB-14-06/AutoZone Northeast, Inc. Store No. 4744

Block: 60; Lots: 1.01 and 2.01; Zone: B-1

7 Main Street

Preliminary and final major site plan and minor subdivision with "c" variances.

DISCUSSION

None.

The Board voted on the Resolution as follows:

Motion: Vice Chairman Weston

Second: Councilwoman McCartney

Bagoff:	Yes	Carlucci:	Absent	Eben:	-	Ghebremicael:	-
Gurland:	-	Klein:	-	Lester:	-	McCartney:	Yes
Weston:	Yes	Wilkes:	-	Heller:	Absent		

APPLICATION(S)

PB-14-25/McKay Brothers, LLC

Block: 84.01; Lot: 22; Zone: B-2

10 Marcella Avenue

Conditional Use Site Plan to install eight antennas to existing tower and ancillary equipment within an existing building.

Carried from the February 4, 2015 regular meeting.

EXHIBITS

A-1: Letter correspondence including color photograph of building interior at 10 Marcella Avenue signed by Kyle Faust, PE, American Tower Corporation, dated 1/2/2015.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Klein requested recusal from participating in the Application hearing; he left the dais at approximately 7:37 P.M.

Reginald Jenkins, Jr., Esq., Price, Meese, Shulman & D'Arminio, attorney for Applicant, addressed the Board; the Application was for the installation of eight (8) dish antennas on to an existing 200 feet high communications tower. Two antennas would be installed at a centerline height of 172 feet, and six antennas at a centerline height of 110 feet. The supporting antenna equipment to would be installed inside an existing equipment building. No ground disturbance was proposed; there would be no increase the height or footprint of the structure or property. Mr. Jenkins stated the proposal met the requirements of federal law, which preempted state and local government decisions regarding the collocation of equipment at an existing wireless tower where there was no substantial increase in the change of its physical dimensions.

Chad Schwartz, PE, Malick & Scherer, PC, was sworn in; he advised the Board he was a New Jersey licensed professional engineer with expertise in wireless design. Vice Chairman Weston noted that a different engineer, Neil J. Kuplic, had signed the original plans; he asked Mr. Schwartz's to describe his professional relationship with Mr. Kuplic. Mr. Schwartz explained that Mr. Kuplic worked for American Tower Corporation, the owner of the facility where the equipment was to be located. He said the equipment serviced his client, McKay Brothers. Vice Chairman Weston asked if Mr. Schwartz had prepared any documents for the Application; Mr. Schwartz said he had not; but he had reviewed them. Vice Chairman Weston opined that while it was unusual to have a witness testify who was not a representative of the firm that submitted documents to the Board, Mr. Schwartz could proceed as an expert in engineering and offer his professional opinion based on his review of the submitted documents.

Mr. Schwartz gave a brief description of the Applicant's communications technology, a high-speed microwave data network with a point-to-point system going through numerous towers; the system is faster than fiber networks. He said he was familiar with the site; he had designed a project for another client at that location in 2010; he had most recently visited the site that day. The current Application proposed six (6) dish antennas at 106 feet elevation and two (2) dish antennas at 172 feet elevation. The antenna cables would be fed through a cable ladder at the center of the tower, across the rooftop of adjacent building, and then fed in to cabinet located in a building at the far end of the site. There would be no increase in the existing tower height or footprint and no ground disturbance. In response to question from Mr. Jenkins, he confirmed the existing equipment building would have enough room to house the new cabinet. He said he had been inside the room for his previous project; he presented a letter with photograph showing the interior space of the existing equipment building written by Kyle Faust, PE, the site design engineer for American Tower Corporation, dated January 2, 2015. Mr. Jenkins requested the letter be submitted as an Exhibit to the Application; Mr. Dwyer advised the Board that a representative from American Tower was not present to testify to the contents of the letter, the letter was hearsay; the Board should take it for its worth. Vice Chairman asked the purpose of the letter; Mr. Schwartz said the Omland Engineering memorandum dated December 8, 2014, Comment #1, had stated that testimony from previous applications had indicated there was no additional space within the equipment building and there should be proof that there was space inside the building. Vice Chairman Weston opined he did not think the letter was necessary; the Board would base its decision on the Applicant's testimony that there was room inside the building.

Mr. Schwartz concluded his testimony. Mr. Jenkins advised the Board he had no additional witnesses.

Councilwoman McCartney asked if Applicant would be removing any old equipment for the new high-speed network; Mr. Schwartz said the Applicant did not have any old equipment on the tower. Councilwoman McCartney asked if with the proposed equipment had the tower reached its load capacity; referring to the Structural Analysis Report from American Tower Corporation (dated August 26, 2014) that was submitted as part of the Application, Mr. Schwartz said the analysis showed the tower usage currently at 90%, which was 10% under maximum.

Dr. Bagoff asked for clarification regarding the Structural Analysis Report, what equipment was included in the report to indicate 90% capacity; Mr. Schwartz said the analysis was based on leased equipment already installed on the tower; approved leased equipment yet to be installed as of the date of the report; and the Applicant's proposed equipment.

Vice Chairman Weston said the last Applicant provided extensive analysis of the structure and testified the tower was at 99% capacity, he asked Mr. Schwartz to confirm his testimony that the structure was currently at 90% capacity. Mr. Schwartz said he did know the contents of the previous report (to make a comparison). However, it was his experience there was quite a bit of reserve load on the tower. He was on the tower site that day; it appeared that some antennas listed on the (August 26, 2014) report might have been removed; it was his opinion the capacity was currently at 75%.

Referring to the Site Plan Tower Elevation, Sheet A-2 dated July 26, 2012; and the Structural Analysis Report dated August 26, 2014, Mr. Grygiel asked about the elevations; he said there were discrepancies of the number of antennas listed on the two reports. After reviewing both reports; Mr. Schwartz said he concurred; the Structural Analysis Report indicated the antennas at 115 feet; 5 feet higher than shown on the Site Plan Tower Elevation. Vice Chairman Weston and Mr. Grygiel discussed the importance for accuracy in reports and plans submitted to the Board. Mr. Jenkins stated that as a condition of approval the Applicant would agree to resolve any discrepancy on the submission of final plans.

Councilwoman McCartney asked if the five feet difference in the placement of the antennas would structurally affect the wind/ice load on the tower; Mr. Schwartz said it would create a greater "moment", which meant the greater the height, the higher the wind effect; however, he was comfortable the tower would be able to sustain the antennas.

Mr. Grygiel said Mr. Schwartz had described the high-speed communications technology the antennas facilitated. He asked Mr. Schwartz to identify the end-user of this type of technology; and to discuss what was it about the location of West Orange that made the installation of the technology appealing. Mr. Schwarz said that West Orange was in a very interesting location; the tower was at the top of a high hill with clear view to numerous other tower locations. West Orange was a hub to multiple other sites.

Mr. Russo, the Public Advocate and the Public had no questions for Mr. Schwartz.

Mr. Dwyer advised the Board that commercial antennas were a conditional use; he suggested the Applicant provide testimony regarding undue concentration. Vice Chairman Weston concurred; he requested Mr. Schwartz discuss the visual impact of the existing and proposed antennas to the surrounding area. Mr. Schwartz stated the tower had been on the site for quite some time; its sole purpose and intent was to support communications antennas; it was his opinion there was no an concentration of antennas in the area.

The Board deliberated on the Application.

Conditions:

1. The Applicant shall comply with all applicable Township, County, State and Federal laws, ordinances, regulations and directives, including without limitation, obtaining all applicable local, state and federal approvals and/or permits. Without limitation of the foregoing, prior to the signing of the approved site plans, and prior to the commencement of any land disturbance or construction, the Applicant shall submit to this Board, with a copy to the Board Engineer, proof that it has obtained all required governmental approvals.

2. If another governmental entity or agency grants a waiver or variance affecting the plans and/or exhibits submitted by the Applicant, this approval or the conditions attached to it, then the Applicant shall re-apply to this Board respecting the same and this Board shall have the right to view that issue as it relates to this approval and these conditions and modify and amend same, if appropriate.
3. In the event that any other required regulatory approval conflicts with the terms and conditions hereof, or materially alters the same, or the terms and conditions hereof are materially altered by any change in applicable law or regulation other than those municipal regulations for which change is prohibited by the Municipal Land Use Law (MLUL), or in the event Applicant or its successors or assigns construct or attempt to construct any improvement in conflict with or in violation of the terms of this approval, the Board hereby reserves the right to withdraw, amend or supplant the instant approval.
4. All construction, use and development of the property shall be in conformance with the plans approved herein, all representations of the Applicant and its witnesses during the public hearing, all exhibits introduced by the Applicant, and all terms and conditions of this resolution.
5. The Applicant shall pay all application fees and technical review fees, as well as any inspection fees that may be required hereunder. The Applicant shall pay any additional fees or escrow deposits which may be due and owing within thirty (30) days of notification or this approval shall be deemed withdrawn.
6. All notes included in the approved plans, including notes required by this Resolution, shall be deemed conditions of approval having the same force and effect as conditions expressly set forth in this Resolution.
7. Applicant to submit an accurate survey or other confirmed information regarding the elevation of the existing tower and all existing and proposed antennas.

The Board voted on the Application as follows:

Motion: Vice Chairman Weston

Second: Dr. Bagoff

Bagoff:	Yes	Carlucci:	Absent	Eben:	Absent	Ghebremicael:	Yes
Gurland:	Absent	Klein:	-	Lester:	Absent	McCartney:	Yes
Weston:	Yes	Wilkes:	Yes	Heller:	Absent		

Vice Chairman Weston announced a brief recess at approximately 8:17 P.M. Mr. Russo left the meeting.

Vice Chairman Weston reconvened the meeting at approximately 8:24 P.M. Mr. Klein returned to the dais.

PB-15-02C/County of Essex/TBZ/Giraffe Exhibit

Block: 163; Lot: 1; Zone: R-1

560 Northfield Avenue

Courtesy Review Application for Giraffe Exhibit.

EXHIBITS

- A-1:** Aerial View of Giraffe Exhibit and TBZ Café dated 1/20/2015, prepared by French and Parrello Associates, PA and Comito Associates, PC;
- A-2:** Landscape Plan for Giraffe Exhibit, Sheet LA-1, prepared by French and Parrello Associates, PA, dated 12/29/2014;
- A-3:** Rustic Pavilion Detail, prepared by Andrew L. French, P.E., French & Parrello Associates, PA, dated 3/3/15;
- A-4:** Proposed Schematic Ground Floor Plan, Sheet SK-1, prepared by Comito Associates PC, dated 1/19/2015;
- A-5:** Proposed Schematic Mezzanine Plan, Sheet SK-2, prepared by Comito Associates PC, dated 1/19/2015;
- A-6:** Proposes Schematic Building Elevations, Sheet SK-3, prepared by Comito Associates PC, dated 1/19/2015;
- A-7:** Color Rendering – Giraffe House, prepared by Comito Associates PC, undated.

DISCUSSION

Mark L. Fleder, Esq., Connell Foley LLP, special legal counsel to Essex County, addressed the Board. The County was presenting two Courtesy Review Applications, a new Giraffe Exhibit and Renovations and Expansion to Existing Café. Michael J. Piga, LLA, French and Parrello, Associates PA, Lorrie Sciabarasi, AIA, Comito Associates PC, and Sanjeev Varghese, Director, Essex County Department of Public Works and County Engineer would provide testimony.

Michael J. Piga, LLA, French and Parrello Associates PA, was sworn in, stated his credentials, and was accepted by the Board to be an expert in landscape architecture. Mr. Piga said his firm was designed the new giraffe exhibit; referring to Exhibit A-1, he described the existing site conditions; he said the new giraffe exhibit would be located behind the existing Turtle Back Zoo Hospital. Referring to Exhibit A-2, Mr. Piga said the exhibit would have an African Grasslands theme; a 15-foot wide decorative walkway originating at the east side of the hospital would proceed to an archway, a designated retail space and then to three viewing areas located to the right of the walkway overlooking the giraffe exhibit. A faux thatch umbrella or eucalyptus pergola would shade viewing areas. The main viewing area would have a timber pavilion with a faux thatch roof, design elements to include authentic tribal masks, rustic light fixtures and rustic fans. The area would be raised on a modular block retaining wall system approximately 8-feet above the finished grade; a 4-foot high rustic timber barrier would be installed along the top of the retaining wall and exhibit area. The area landscaping to include ornamental grasses, shrubs and trees similar to that found in Africa; a 30-foot by 15-foot shallow gunite pool to resemble a mud pond would be constructed. Referring to Exhibit A-3, Mr. Piga detailed the fencing for the giraffe holding area; two types of perimeter fencing, a 10-ft high chain link typical to the Zoo, and a special giraffe fence – 10-ft high, 6-in diameter post with a screen mesh on the inside – fun fact: a giraffe cannot step over a height of 4 feet. The ground would be re-contoured; approximately 150 existing trees would be removed; approximately 225 to 250 new trees would be planted. In response to question from Mr. Fleder,

Mr. Piga confirmed that the pedestrian walkway was 15-feet wide and would be able to accommodate an emergency vehicle.

Referring to Exhibit A-1, Councilwoman McCartney stated the new parking deck and educational building were not included on the aerial view; she asked Mr. Piga for clarification regarding the location of the Complex's driveway to the new exhibit. She then asked for clarification regarding the giraffe fencing; Mr. Piga said that while the giraffes were unable to step over 4-foot fence, they were able to lean a great distance, hence the need for the 10-foot barrier fencing. He said that in addition to the giraffes, the exhibit would include small African deer, antelope and ostriches.

Vice Chairman Weston stated there were no lighting details indicated on the plans; would the lighting be cut-off type; Mr. Piga said that post lights, 18-foot maximum with arches would be installed; the lamps would continue the rustic, African theme. In response to the Vice Chairman's inquiry regarding area slope and drainage, Mr. Piga said the plan would meet all water quality standards for New Jersey.

Mr. Lepore requested clarification of the condition and species of the 150 trees chosen for removal; Mr. Piga said the trees were a mixture of both healthy and dead/dying Oak and Ash.

Harvey Grossman, Esq., Public Advocate, referring to Exhibit A-1, he asked Mr. Piga to indicate the locations of the new playground, new parking area, and Cherry Lane. He asked how many live giraffes would be at the exhibit; the surface area it would cover; would the exhibit be a major attraction; would the exhibit increase the number of visitors at the zoo; would there be an increase in traffic on Northfield Avenue; and a traffic study been conducted. Mr. Piga said there would be three giraffes; the exhibit would cover approximately 2 ½ acres; he opined it would become a major attraction resulting in more visitors; he did not know if there would be an increase in traffic or if a traffic study had been conducted.

Robert Rashkes, 35 Oakcrest Road, asked the species of trees to be replanted; would the giraffe exhibit be visible from the perspective of Oakcrest Road. Mr. Piga said a variety tree species including red maple and river birch were to be planted; he was unable to determine extent of exhibit visibility from Oakcrest Road.

The Public had no further questions for Mr. Piga.

Lorrie Sciabarasi, AIA, Comito Associates, PC, was sworn in, stated her credentials, and accepted by the Board to be an expert in architecture. Ms. Sciabarasi said the County commissioned Comito Associates to design the giraffe house; referring to Exhibit A-4, she said the ground floor of the structure was approximately 7,000 square feet; she described the locations of animal stalls, exercise arena, keeper office, restroom, kitchen, mechanical/utilities, animal equipment and food storage, and building ingress/egress. Two sets of stairs led to Mezzanine area approximately 1,600 square feet (Exhibit A-5), its purpose for tamer access to the giraffes during indoor periods. The building elevations details (Exhibit A-6) included the height of the building to be approximately 50 feet; south elevation to include several window installations to allow as much natural light as possible; windows to be installed on north, west and east elevations. Ms. Sciabarasi said that Exhibit A-7 depicted the building exterior; the north side was the service side; the south side was the main exhibit where the animals would enter and exit the building to the viewing area. Building material details were to be finalized but to include a cultured stonewall façade to 10 feet height and other

natural materials including wood siding, a natural wood or thatched roof.

Mr. Klein asked if solar panels or LEED type product(s) were included in the design to make the building more energy efficient; Ms. Sciabarasi stated it would be an efficient building including radiant floor heating to keep energy costs low; the ventilation system for circulation; the amount of windows; and photocell lighting.

In response to inquiries from Vice Chairman Weston, Ms. Sciabarasi confirmed the building would be not be open to the general Public; she clarified that exterior lights would be installed in the area of the man doors. She said that floodlights and a generator would also be installed for use in case of emergency.

Mr. Grygiel stated at Technical Review there was mention that during the period the giraffes were indoor, the possibility of using a live webcam feed to a large screen monitor inside the café was an element under consideration; Ms. Sciabarasi confirmed a webcam was under consideration.

The Municipal Engineer and Public Advocate had no questions for Ms. Sciabarasi.

Robert Rashkes, 35 Oakcrest Road, asked what direction the building windows faced, (Exhibit A-7); Ms. Sciabarasi said the windows faced south.

There were no further questions or comments from the Public.

The Board deliberated on the Application.

The Board voted on the Application as follows:

Motion: Vice Chairman Weston

Second: Dr. Bagoff

Bagoff: Yes	Carlucci: Absent	Eben: Absent	Ghebremicael: Yes
Gurland: Absent	Klein: Yes	Lester: Absent	McCartney: Yes
Weston: Yes	Wilkes: Yes	Heller: Absent	

PB-15-03C/County of Essex/TBZ/Café Renovation

Block: 163; Lot: 1; Zone: R-1

560 Northfield Avenue

Courtesy Review Application for renovations to existing café.

EXHIBITS

- A-1:** Aerial View Zoo Café Location, New Parking Deck, Giraffe Barn, prepared by Comito Associates, PC, undated.
- A-2:** Zoo Cafe Renovations and Addition Title Sheet, Sheet T-1, prepared by Comito Associates, PC, dated 1/19/2015;
- A-3:** Topographic Mapping of 560 Northfield Avenue, prepared by Pronesti Surveying, Inc., dated 8/5/2014;
- A-4:** Zoo Café Site Plan, Sheet SP-1, prepared by Comito Associates PC, dated 3/4/2015;
- A-5:** Zoo Café Ground Floor Plan, Sheet SK-1, prepared by Comito Associates PC, dated 3/4/2015;

- A-6:** Zoo Café Second Floor Plan, Sheet SK-2, prepared by Comito Associates PC, dated 3/4/2015;
- A-7:** Zoo Café Rear Elevation – North, prepared by Comito Associates PC, dated 3/4/2015;
- A-8:** Zoo Café Rear Elevation – West, prepared by Comito Associates PC, dated 3/4/15;
- A-9:** Color Rendering – Zoo Cafe, prepared by Comito Associates PC, undated.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Fleder advised the Board that Comito Associates PC had also prepared the café renovation design plans; he asked Ms. Sciabarasi to describe the plan. Ms. Sciabarasi the café expansion incorporated the African Grasslands theme; she identified the location of the existing cafe (Exhibit A-1); described the existing conditions including the location of the existing kitchen area and the dining room area to be expanded (Exhibit A-3). Ms. Sciabarasi described the proposed renovations including the expansion of existing patio area, repurposing the existing kitchen and equipment, reconfiguring the food court area with various self-serve stations offering more food options and cashier kiosks. Renovations to the rear of the café would include installing an elevator, new stairs, additional restrooms, and rectangular shaped dining area (Exhibit(s) A-4, A-5). The new second floor would be accessible by interior stair or elevator; the second floor would include more restrooms, a large outdoor terrace, patio seating, thatched roof covered seating areas, small bistro serving grilled fare, and two exterior stairs to exit second level (Exhibit(s) A-6, A-7, A-8). Referring to Exhibit A-9, Ms. Sciabarasi said design materials would include natural wood railing system, natural wood siding, substantial glass, thatched roofing, and a snake design element along the path where there was a change in grade. Ms. Sciabarasi concluded her testimony.

Councilwoman McCartney asked what would be the total number of seats in the café; and would there be any storm water disturbance as a result of the renovation. Ms. Sciabarasi said 120 seats on the first floor and 200 on the second floor; there would be no storm water disturbance, the amount would be under the threshold.

Vice Chairman Weston questioned the height of the decorative signage pole; he asked if there were any fire safety concerns regarding the choice of thatched roof design for a kitchen facility, what type of roof material would be used. Ms. Sciabarasi said the decorative pole would be approximately 55-feet high; the roof would be a synthetic material.

Mr. Klein asked if Fire Department and Ambulance Squad would review site plan to determine if there was adequate emergency vehicle access. Ms. Sciabarasi said the renovation did not to disturb current vehicle access to the building; there was a service drive on the left side of the building for deliveries; and an additional access road for maintenance vehicles on the right side of the building.

Mr. Grygiel advised the Board the Fire and Police Departments had obtained the plans for the Tech Review meeting (2/11/15) and had no comments.

Harvey Grossman, Esq., Public Advocate, asked if the development of the café would adversely affect the surrounding area food establishments. Vice Chairman Weston stated the question was not relative to architecture.

The Public had no questions for Ms. Scabarasi.

Mr. Fleder advised the Board the County had concluded its presentation. Vice Chairman Weston asked if Public would like to comment prior to Board deliberation.

Robert Rashkes, 35 Oakcrest Road, stated that motorists visiting the South Mountain Complex continued having difficulty maneuvering access to the site; signage was bad; vehicles were still turning around on Aspen Road, an area on Northfield Avenue where there were no pedestrian sidewalks.

Mr. Varghese was sworn in, he said that a result of the concerns voiced by the Board during recent previous applications, the County had hired a consultant to create easy-to-follow signage from the point when vehicles exit Route 280 and continue on to the Complex destination. He presented examples proposed signage; he said the consultant had completed approximately 80% of the project. All obsolete signage would be removed. He described the new traffic signal located at the point of exit for the new parking deck; it would be time-signalized with the existing lights.

Councilwoman McCartney stated her continued concern has been motorists (unfamiliar to the area) traveling west Northfield Avenue did not have adequate directional signage nor ample time to correct lane error to access the necessary exit. Mr. Klein opined the temporary sandwich boards directing motorists where to park during summer months seemed adequate. Mr. Grygiel asked if the sign examples should be marked as exhibits; Vice Chairman Weston determined the not to enter the sign illustrations as an exhibit as they were not part of the original Application; he advised the Board reference to the signs part of the County Engineer testimony that the issue of traffic was addressed. The Board had no further questions for Mr. Varghese.

Vice Chairman Weston noted the Applications were for Courtesy Review; he thanked and acknowledged the County for all the recent tree plantings along Cherry Lane.

The Board voted on the Application as follows:

Motion: Vice Chairman Weston

Second: Dr. Bagoff

Bagoff: Yes	Carlucci: Absent-	Eben: Absent	Ghebremicael: Yes
Gurland: Absent	Klein: Yes	Lester: Absent	McCartney: Yes
Weston: Yes	Wilkes: Yes	Heller: Absent	

MEETING ADJOURNED at approximately 9:20 P.M.

Minutes adopted April 1, 2015 .



Robin Miller, Planning Board Secretary
Township of West Orange

**THE NEXT REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING BOARD WILL BE
WEDNESDAY MAY 6, 2015 AT 7:30 P.M. IN COUNCIL CHAMBERS**