

## Township of Hillsborough – PLANNING BOARD

### Approved Public Meeting Minutes

June 5, 2025

Chairman Carl Suraci called the Planning Board Regular Public Meeting of June 5, 2025, to order at 7:09 pm. The meeting was held in the Courtroom of The Peter J. Biondi Building. All stood for the flag salute.

#### NOTICE OF MEETING

Chairman Suraci announced the meeting has been duly advertised according to Section 5 of the Open Public Meetings Act, Chapter 231, Public Law 1975 (“Sunshine Law”). Notice of the 2025 Annual Meeting Schedule has been provided to the officially designated newspapers, the Township Clerk, posted on the Township’s website and available at the Hillsborough Township Municipal Complex.

Application documents have been made available on the Township’s web site

<https://hillsboroughnj.portal.civicclerk.com/>. Complete applications files are available in the Planning and Zoning Department for inspection, in accordance with the public meeting notice.

#### ROLL CALL

|                                               |                                            |
|-----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| Absent - Mayor John Ciccarelli                | Present - Bruce Radowitz                   |
| Present - Robert Wagner, Jr                   | Absent - Angelo Vitale                     |
| Present - Committeeman Shawn Lipani           | Present - Patricia Smith, <i>Secretary</i> |
| Present - Robert Peason, <i>Vice Chairman</i> | Present - Surajit Deb ( <i>Alt. #1</i> )   |
| Present - Carl Suraci, <i>Chairman</i>        | Absent - Jason Smith ( <i>Alt. #2</i> )    |
| Present - Jason Flagg                         |                                            |

Also in attendance: David Kois, PP, AICP, *Township Planning Director*; Samantha Ball, *Assistant Planner / Sustainability Program Manager*; Eric Bernstein, Esq., *Board Attorney (Eric M. Bernstein & Associates)*; Mark Mayhew, PE, CME, *Board Engineer (Pennoni Associates)*; Michael Lombardozzi, CSR, CCR, *Board Court Reporter*; Alex Pallis, *Township Videographer (Fuerza Strategy Group)*

#### CONSIDERATION OF MEETING MINUTES

- February 13, 2025 regular meeting minutes were reviewed.  
A motion to approve as written was made by Committeeman Lipani, seconded by Ms. Smith.  
No comments.

Mr. Bernstein states the members eligible to vote.

##### **Roll Call:**

Yes - Mr. Wagner  
Yes - Ms. Smith, Secretary  
Yes - Committeeman Lipani  
Yes - Chairman Suraci

Motion carries

- April 3, 2025 regular meeting minutes were reviewed.  
A motion to approve as written was made by Mr. Deb, seconded by Mr. Radowitz.  
No comments.

Mr. Bernstein states the members eligible to vote,

##### **Roll Call:**

|                                  |                            |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Yes - Mr. Flagg                  | Yes - Ms. Smith, Secretary |
| Yes - Mr. Radowitz               | Yes - Committeeman Lipani  |
| Yes - Mr. Deb ( <i>Alt. #1</i> ) | Yes - Chairman Suraci      |

Motion carries

### **CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTIONS**

- None

### **PLANNING BOARD BUSINESS**

- None

### **CONSIDERATION OF ORDINANCES**

- None

### **BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR** *(public comment for matters not on the agenda)*

Chairman Suraci opens to comments from the public. He reminds of the rules, comments only no questions (there will be an additional period for questions), no comments regarding warehousing direct or indirect\*, and there is a five-minute limit per person. He asks that each person state their name and address for the record.

(\*warehouse-related comments and questions should be expressed during the designated public hearing portion of the meeting)

**Maria Janucik** – 720 East Frech Ave., Manville (residence) / 2155 Camplain Road, Hillsborough (property owner)

- Ms. Janucik inquires who's responsibility it is to review an application upon submittance to ensure the proposed work is acceptable to the zone.

Mr. Kois explains the protocol through completeness, at which time applications submitted to the Planning Board will be reviewed by himself and Ms. Ball and Ms. McLaughlin for the Board of Adjustments.

- Ms. Janucik asks if a property is in an residential zone can an applicant submit a project suited for an industrial zone; would it come before the Board for waivers to be requested or is a determination handled prior to the application coming to the Board.

Mr. Kois explains the Planning Board is the "board of permitted uses" which means it can only hear application with uses that are permitted and the Board of Adjustments is the "board of non-permitted uses". He states if a proposed use requires a de-use variance only the Board of Adjustments has jurisdiction to do that.

- Ms. Janucik asks about a recent application that came before the Planning Board with ambiguity with regard to the easement the building sat on.

Mr. Bernstein explains it was a decision rendered by the previous Planning Director as part of a completeness application. The prior director determined it to be complete as presented. He states the result became a whole other issue.

Mr. Bernstein interjects Ms. Janucik's follow-up question stating the matter is in litigation and the Board cannot comment on it.

- Ms. Janucik expresses her belief that the application presented to the court was not accurate and should have been reviewed by the Township's governing body because the easement was owned by the Township.

There are no further comments from the public.

#### **APPLICATIONS – PUBLIC HEARING**

- **Campus Associates, LLC - File 20-PB-13-MSP (2025 Update)** – Block 58, Lot 1.05 – 5 Campus Drive (formerly known as 4 Campus Drive). Applicant to update the Planning Board on the status of the Project, every six months, no later than December 31, 2024, and thereafter, per Condition 'A' of the Resolution memorialized July 11, 2024. Status update last presented to the Board on December 05, 2024.

*Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan approval; 'c' bulk variances; and waivers previously granted to construct a multi-family development consisting of four three-story apartment buildings, each building containing twenty-four residential dwelling units for a total of ninety-six residential dwelling units, including twenty-three affordable housing units; a Clubhouse; associated parking, lighting, landscaping, utilities, stormwater and associated improvements, on Property known as Block 58, Lot 1.05 on the Hillsborough Township Tax Map, located at 4 Campus Drive (now known as 5 Campus Drive), in the Multifamily Inclusionary Overlay District within the I-3 Light Industrial Zone, with conditions. Resolution memorialized November 18, 2021; Extension Resolution memorialized July 11, 2024.*

*Participating for the Applicant: Stephen Kessler, Esq. for Fernmoor*

1. 7:17 pm start of hearing
2. **Steve Kessler**, attorney for the applicant, introduces himself.
3. Mr. Kessler gives an update: all clearing and grading has been complete and all site-work including infrastructure, pipes, storm water systems, sewer, water, and curbing have been completed. All infrastructure has been installed and is functioning.
4. Mr. Kessler states the next steps included electric layout, crossings and permanent paving.
5. Mr. Kessler updates the status of their permitting including working through issues with needed changes to the plans. He states these permits include for their clubhouse and building and are planning to start with their foundation permits. He expects to have them soon and estimates a six-to-nine-month range of work. He discusses the time-line work.
6. Mr. Kessler states they have been reaching out to and connecting with neighboring businesses.
7. Mr. Kois states permits are being reviewed to ensure all paperwork is in order especially since it is a different ownership group. He believes the zoning permits will be issues shortly and they are actively meeting with the building department and all other necessary agencies.
8. Committeeman Lipani asks for reminder of the number of buildings they are building plus a clubhouse.
9. Mr. Kessler states it is four buildings plus a clubhouse.
10. Committeeman Lipani asks if their intention is to occupy each building as it is completed or wait until final completion.

11. Mr. Kessler explains how they usually seek to occupy as each building is complete and the time between completion.
12. Committeeman Lipani asks where in the timeline the clubhouse is scheduled to be completed.
13. Mr. Kessler states they prefer to get the clubhouse up in the beginning of the process so as tenants will be able to begin utilizing services.
14. Mr. Kois explains the planning department has a very specific phasing schedule which includes a specific order the builder must go in, not including the clubhouse.
15. Mr. Kessler explains they are also working toward getting the deed restrictions filed for affordables with Mr. Bernstein's office.
16. Mr. Bernstein discusses the rationale behind the request for this appearance and asks the Board if they would like to provide the public with an opportunity to ask questions.
17. There is a motion and second to open to public questions. All are in favor, non opposed.
18. **Grant Kolmer**, 144 Taylor Ave, asks if they have connected into the stormwater pipe.
19. Mr. Kessler states the project manager has told him the stormwater system is functioning. Its not complete, but in.
20. Mr. Kolmer asks if any testing has been done.
21. Mr. Kessler states he would have to consult with their engineer.
22. **Maria Janucik** asks for elaboration on what has been done, is it only underground.
23. Mr. Kessler states yes underground improvements are complete but connections have not been made yet (ex to the sewer system), no foundations or buildings yet, stormwater infrastructure, curbing, and some temporary paving have been installed to protect everything put underground.
24. Ms. Janucik asks if everything that has been done so far is in accordance with the settlement agreement.
25. Mr. Kessler explains they took over the project after settlement agreement and have been working very well with the Township to move the project forward.
26. Ms. Janucik asks if the settlement agreement was legally transferred to the knew owner.
27. Mr. Kessler defers the question to Mr. Bernstein.
28. Mr. Bernstein states the answer is yes.
29. Ms. Janucik asks why the settlement agreement is not provided as part of these records.
30. Chairman Suraci tells Ms. Janucik her questions are going beyond the scope of the public question period and suggests making an appoint with Planning Department to review any documents she is not finding to be readily available online.
31. Ms. Janucik moves on expressing concern over fresh-water wet lands and asks Mr. Kessler if they have received proper permits from the NJ DEP.
32. Mr. Kessler states they "are pursuing the construction of the project in accordance with all required laws, ordinances, and regulations."
33. Ms. Janucik asks for details about the required regulations.
34. Chairman Suraci states her questions are outside the scope of his statements this evening and again suggests making an appointment with the Planning Department to discuss her concerns.
35. Chairman Suraci and Ms. Janucik discuss the reason for Mr. Kessler's appearance at this meeting and the scope of information to be covered.
36. There is a motion and second to close to public comment. All are in favor, none opposed. Motion carries.
37. Board members and Mr. Kessler discuss scheduling another update.
38. Committeeman Lipani motions to place this matter on one of the December 2025 agendas for a six month update on the project, seconded by Mr. Peason.

39. **Roll Call:**

|                                  |                            |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Yes - Mr. Flagg                  | Yes - Ms. Smith, Secretary |
| Yes - Mr. Wagner                 | Yes - Committeeman Lipani  |
| Yes - Mr. Radowitz               | Yes - Vice Chairman Peason |
| Yes - Mr. Deb ( <i>Alt. #1</i> ) | Yes - Chairman Suraci      |

Motion carries

40. 7:31 pm end of hearing.

- **Homestead Road, LLC – File 21-PB-25-MS/MSP(V)** – (TOD: 07-31-25 w/Ext.) - Block 200.10, Lots 32 & 33 – 203 Homestead Road and 189 Homestead Road. Applicant seeking preliminary and final major subdivision approval (determined a minor subdivision); preliminary and final major site plan approval; ‘c’ bulk variances; and waivers, to consolidate the two lots and then subdivide into two reconfigured lots; and demolish all existing structures to construct two warehouse/office buildings, with associated stormwater, parking, and site improvements, on Property in the TECD, Transitional Economic Development District. *Applicant, no longer seeking ‘c’ bulk variances. Last revised plans/reports/documents received 08-08-24. (EC Review: 03-28-22) Application continued from May 08, 2025 without further notice.*
  1. 7:32 pm start of hearing
  2. Mayor Ciccarrelli recuses himself but states he will remain on the dais to wait for the Executive Session following the hearing.
  3. **Craig Gianetti**, the attorney for the applicant, introduces himself.
  4. The Objectors introduce themselves: **Mike Pisauro, Scott Gross, John Lanahan, Laurie Cleveland, and Brian Tarantino.**
  5. Mr. Bernstein states he has a Certification by Absent Board Member Examination of Record Eligibility to Vote for Ms. Smith for the May 8, 2025, meeting therefore she is eligible to vote.
  6. Mr. Bernstein lists for the record the eligible members for this hearing: Ms. Smith, Mr. Wagner, Committeeman Lipani, Vice Chairman Peason and Chairman Suraci.
  7. Mr. Bernstein requests that the Executive Session start around 9:00 pm as he believes it will take some time and recommends an hour and twenty minutes.
  8. Mr. Gianetti summarizes where the hearing left off at the last meeting and calls their traffic engineer to testify.
  9. **Gary Dean** is sworn in and confirms there are no changes to his credentials or gaps in his certifications since his previous testimony.
  10. Mr. Gianetti states he has no further questions and agrees to continue with the public questions for this witness.
  11. There is a motion and second to open to public comment for Mr. Dean’s most recent testimony. All are in favor and none opposed. Motion carries.
  12. There are no questions from the public.
  13. Mr. Bernstein suggests since there are no more witnesses that they continue to public comment on the overall application as it was presented to the Board.
  14. Chairman Suraci states they are open to public comment for those who have not commented at the May 8, 2025 meeting.
  15. **Patricia Taylor Todd**, Jackson Ave., Montgomery Twp, states she is there on behalf of the Montgomery Township Committee, Mayor Nina Singh and the residents of Montgomery Township to make a statement in opposition to this application. She reads a statement

into the record regarding their “serious concerns regarding the proposed warehouse development at Homestead Road in Hillsborough Township, particularly with respect to the anticipated traffic impacts on the NJ State Road 206 and surrounding local roads that traverse both of our municipalities.” She discussed their concern over projected increase in truck and employee vehicle traffic and its adverse effects on roadway safety, congestion and infrastructure wear in Montgomery Twp.

16. **Bill Martin**, Hillsborough Rd, reads into the record a portion of the 2010 Master Plan Amendment which created this transitional zone. He also reads into the record a quote on the matter from Dr. Sireci, member of the Planning Board at the time, regarding the meaning of the word ‘transition’ and its reference to transition of intensity between residential and industrial, not the passing of time. He discuss concern for truck traffic and how it was projected in the application, methods of refueling, and how the truck traffic on site will make it more of a freight terminal, truck terminal or truck depot which are prohibited uses based on Hillsborough ordinance 188-97. He concludes by summarizing questions he posed to Ms. Confone at previous meetings about how the transition between the warehouse and neighboring zone. He reads quotes from her answers into the record.
17. **Meryl Bisberg**, 4 Hickory Hill Rd., states she had attended many meetings in-person and watched the rest online. She expresses concern at the sheer size of the projected facility and so close to residential neighborhoods on one side and secondary roads on the other. She discusses her belief of expectations for living in within the township ordinances protecting its residences. She reminds that truck depots are banned in Hillsborough based on its ordinances and reads her statement into the record listing the reasons why she believes this application has not been able to follow Hillsborough’s code.
18. **Pat McGee**, resident of Hillsborough Willow’s Edge, states she completed a graduate degree in geoscience in 2019 and that she is not represented by SWAT. She discusses her opposition to the proposed warehouse utilizing six points pertaining to the physical aspects of warehouse proposal, the footprint and rainstorms, the impervious nature of the footprint of the warehouse itself, and the parking lot and the chemicals that leech from truck tires and asphalt into the surrounding soil contributing to the runoff toward the Roycebrook tributary system. Her points include topography, light pollution, noise pollution, air quality, view from residences and property values.
19. **Grant Kolmer**, Taylor Ave, states he is not affiliated with any of the objectors. He states he would like to “ express the profound and deeply troubling concerns with the application” and has six areas he will touch upon which include: excessive intensity and scale of the application, traffic safety and instructional limitations, significant environmental impact and stream corridor concerns, stormwater management deficiencies, development of the fundamental incompatible with community charter, and the speculative nature of the development leaves significant questions unanswered.
20. **Keith Sherman**, Walnut Grover Rd, states he is not affiliated with the Objectors. He discusses his experience in the field of warehousing, logistics and trucking and expresses his concerns with the lack of a tenant which offers only theoretical answers to important factors. He expresses concern over lack of security, lack of plan for widening Homestead Rd and no concern of truck turning radius. He discusses his experience driving tractor trailers and incidents he ended up on small local roads not appropriate for a tractor trailer.
21. **Mindy Shaw**, Deer Run, discusses how special and desirable Hillsborough is and what is at stake with the prospect of a warehouse which will change the landscape. She discusses the need for more police patrols and potential property value decrease. She concludes by stating she urges the Board to “reject this application as it is wrong for our town”.

22. **Jim Maggot**, Beetle St. Montgomery Twp, states he is not represented by any of the Objectors. He states concern that the traffic study gave no consideration to the bypass intersection with hwy 206. He states he feels the current intersection is a “disaster of a design” and has witnessed several tractor trailers riding onto the shoulder of sideroads as they attempt left turns. He discusses his experience seeing more commercial traffic using the Route 601 exit off of hwy 206, often taking the exit too fast. He expresses concern about the lack of tenant and only hypothetical analysis based on possible tenants. He asks the Board to consider denying the application.
23. **Paul Melecki**, White Meadow, states he is not affiliated with the Objectors. He states he has been a 40-yr resident of Hillsborough. He describes his current residence specifically their backyard, out-door living space which is very special to his family. He states the proposed warehouse will become part of the view from this space. He discusses his concerns about tractor trailers on the surrounding residential roads, traffic congestion, the lack of tenant, building a “spec-warehouse”, pedestrian safety, and property values. He asks the Board to reject this application.
24. **Natie Garmin**, Winding Way, states she is not affiliated with the Objectors. She agrees with points made tonight by her neighbors and in an effort to not reiterate points she offers contemplative questions for the Board. With regards to traffic report predictions and speculations she asks how often those predictions are reviewed after a project? What if updated results exceed projections? She states the building is complete, so Hillsborough is stuck with the traffic that came with it. She next discusses the subdivision summarizing details from previous meetings including reminding while not required, the subdivision would be profitable to the developer; applicant witnesses providing details for the “one-sided benefit” of the subdivision; Mr. Bernstein’s warning that there was “no compelling reason or guarantee that this subdivision would be granted”; and the applicant proceeded without any significant revisions to the plan impacting the subdivision request. She summarizes that the subdivision would not benefit the residents, the town or local business, and would strain local resources, reduce property values, and disrupt community cohesion. Ms. Garmin states she would rather “encourage solutions that offer clear benefits to the broader community and not just the developers’ profits. This approach safeguards the well-being of current residents and ensures any development aligns with the town’s long-term vision and our values.” She asks the Board, when making their decision, to respect the life and well-being of the residents. She asks the Board to deny this proposal.
25. **Rich Garmin**, Winding Way, states he is not affiliated with the Objectors. Mr. Garmin discusses their home’s location to the proposed warehouse, the history of the proposed site’s original, if the Township has done its due diligence on home evaluations after construction of buildings or warehouses of a similar size and asks if there have been any reports on crime rate increases. He expresses concern about the water retention basins and potential flooding. He states he believes if the matter goes to the courts, the court will look at what the intent was of the zoning. He encourages the current Board and residents to read transcripts from the 2010-2011 Planning Board meetings when the members at that time “sold the zoning” to the residents and explained would and would not be permitted in the zone. He asks the Board to deny this application.
26. **Richard Onderko**, Lewis St., Manville, states he is not associated with the Objectors. He states while he is the current Mayor of Manville he is not speaking tonight as an elected official but rather as a lifelong resident of the Borough of Manville. He asks “where is the common sense” and discusses the lack of “common sense” in various details of proposed project. He discusses his experience working in Piscataway with warehouses located near

interstates, which he believes makes more logistical sense. He asks Board members to “use their common sense” to deny this application.

27. **Elaine Welsh**, Orchard Drive, states she lives on the opposite side of Hillsborough but has attended many of the meetings. She discusses the original purpose of the bypass, ‘to alleviate traffic in our downtown area’; states she is not against warehouses in general as they are necessary but believes it is *not necessary in this location*, not in a neighborhood, not with roadways that have no access to highways. She discusses the lack of exit off the bypass on Homestead Road because there was no foresight it would be needed; no reason to divert truck traffic back through the downtown area; the lack of proposal by the developer to request access road to the bypass be added in. She summarizes asking why the town build the bypass if they are going to let all this truck traffic through the downtown area.
28. **David Brook**, Winding Way, states he is not affiliated with the Objectors. He discusses having attended all meetings, questioning applicant witnesses and trying to under how these warehouses could conform to the requirements to the TEDD Zone. He states he is not convinced they can. He thanks all the members of the Board and Township professionals for their patience, insightfulness and willingness to listen to the applicant, five formal Objectors and the public. He thanks the applicant for proposing “these two outlandish, giant monstrosities” and Mr. Gianetti for his “condescending, disrespectful, and intimidating behavior” stating it has helped “crystallize broad-based and fact-based community opposition” which has been incredibly motivating, “unifying force across Hillsborough”. He thanks friends and neighbors who have given their time and energy to push for what is right for Hillsborough and all the Objectors for tirelessly rallying their resources to present critical questions to applicant experts and providing their own experts. He discusses his thoughts on an acceptable proposal for this Transitional Economic Development District Zone. Mr. Brook discusses issues of ‘common sense’, size & scale, lack of building and site improvements to minimization changes to topography & mature vegetation and applicant lacking in “good neighbor” qualities. He questions who the applicant is, Homestead Road LLC or Enhance Acquisitions LLC. He states a “scorched earth approach” or “we’ll fix it later” by the applicant does not make for a conforming application. He reminds an applicant has to conform to the required criteria, not tell us what it wants and believes the applicant has failed to do so. He asks if after 23 meetings if we know for certain the applicant is *not* building an Amazon warehouse. Mr. Brook discusses the burden of proof and Boards responsibility to review the evidence and it is his belief that the applicant has failed to meet the burden of proof thus he asks the Board to deny this application. In closing, Mr. Brook reads into the record a poem of his creation as a “candid acknowledgment of what has transpired”. The poem is entitled ‘Homestead Road LLC and the Infamous TECD.’
29. Mr. Gianetti interjects the poem with an objection stating it is insulting the applicant and achieving nothing. He argues this time is public comment, not a theatre.
30. Mr. Brook concludes his poem and time.
31. Chairman Suraci notes the time is nearing the limit.
32. Mr. Bernstein requested the next member of the public be the last so the Board will have time to discuss in Executive Session. There is a brief discussion about scheduling should the decision need to be carried.
33. **Judy Haas**, Titus Court, states she is not affiliated with the Objectors. She discusses comment made by former Zoning Officer, David Maski, at previous meetings noting how many years later they are still talking about the same application. She discussed comments made by the then-attorney describing the property as being surrounded by ‘agricultural

properties' on the north and south, Hwy 206 on the west and the TSX railroad and points out no mention of residential areas. She reviews what has since been learned about the property and clarifies its surrounding area. She questions how a subdivision can take place when properties have different owners and would first need to be merged into a single property under new ownership. She talks about lack of merge, subdivision, and bifurcation. She points out discrepancies in applicant signee and property ownership. She discusses fiscal surplus reports. She reminds none of the developers never spoke on behalf of their plans. She asks the Board to deny this application for reasons including not limited to: incomplete application – unknown and potentially problematic tenant, size and scale, masterplan goal for TECD that assures peace and solitude for residents, list of possible tenant types and evolving employee numbers, a plan with maximum square footage only restricted by an active gas pipeline and a railroad line, lack of coordination with both of these companies for preapproval, and stormwater issues in an area that regularly floods. She asks the Board to listen to their Township professionals and compliments their work. She states Hillsborough doesn't deserve this, asks the Board to protect their health and safety by denying this application.

34. **Maria Janucik** – 720 East Frech Ave., Manville (residence) / 2155 Camplain Road, Hillsborough (property owner), reads her statement into the record saying this is adding her voice in unison with her neighbors in asking the Board to deny this application.
35. **Debbie Petrock**, Millstone River Rd, expresses concern for traffic on her road stating they already have heavy dump trucks traveling down their road at 50-60 mph, they are working the Police traffic department but she has already experienced an accident with a dump truck in front of her home. She asks the Board to consider the residential nature of this road and realize it is not appropriate for tractor trailer traffic. She asks the Board to deny the application.
36. There is a motion and second to close public comment, all are in favor, none opposed. Motion carries.
37. Mr. Bernstein requests an Executive Session to speak to the Board about an unrelated matter, he estimates needing about an hour of time.
38. Mr. Bernstein advises reconvening on July 10, 2025, for the Objectors and applicant's closing statements.
39. Committeeman Lipani motions to carry the application to July 10, 2025, seconded by Mr. Wagner.
40. **Roll Call:**

|                            |                            |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Yes - Mr. Wagner           | Yes - Vice Chairman Peason |
| Yes - Ms. Smith, Secretary | Yes - Chairman Suraci      |
| Yes - Committeeman Lipani  | Yes -                      |
| Yes -                      | Yes -                      |

Motion carries
41. 9:23 pm end of hearing.

#### **EXECUTIVE SESSION TO DISCUSS ATTORNEY-CLIENT MATTERS**

- The Board will convene to discuss Weston Road litigation and Attorney-client privilege: Affordable Housing.

Committeeman Lipani motioned to go to executive session, seconded by Mr. Wagner.  
Motion outcome.

All are in favor, none opposed. Motion carries.

9:24 pm Board moves into executive session

#### **RETURN TO REGULAR SESSION**

- 11:00 pm the Board returns from executive session.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Radowitz, seconded by Committeeman Lipani. Motion carries unanimously.

11:03 pm meeting is adjourned.

*Submitted by Robyn Bittle-Abramo  
Recording Secretary*