

MINUTES

7:30 PM

PRESENT: R. Dodds
D. Haywood
J. Mathieu
S. McNicol
L. Voronin
S. Harris, Alt #1
K. Kocsis, Alt #2
D. Pierce

ABSENT: C. Ely
L. Frank
L. Riggio
M. Syrnick

CALL TO ORDER

It was moved by S. McNicol, seconded by J. Mathieu to appoint R. Dodds as temporary chairperson for this evening's meeting. All members present voted **AYE**.

The meeting was called to order by R. Dodds at 7:33 PM.

NOTIFICATION

In order to ensure full public participation at this meeting, all members of this Board, and members of the public are requested to speak only when recognized by the Chair so that there is no simultaneous discussion or over-talk. Your cooperation is appreciated. Due to continuing COVID19 precautions, the Planning Board meeting is a virtual meetings held online. The meeting is hosted on Zoom at the following URL address:
<https://zoom.us/j/96081450117?pwd=aDlVaEE0TE5YQVFsZUx5SjVwNW00Zz09>.

Notification of the time, date and place of this meeting has been published in the Hunterdon County Democrat and Courier News on January 21, 2021, and has been posted in the Kingwood Township Municipal Building on January 21, 2021 and has been filed with the Municipal Clerk.

NEW AND PENDING MATTERS

Proposed Ordinance No. 21-17-2021:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE TOWNSHIP OF KINGWOOD, COUNTY OF HUNTERDON, STATE OF NEW JERSEY PROHIBITING THE OPERATION OF ANY CLASS OF CANNABIS BUSINESSES WITHIN ITS GEOGRAPHICAL BOUNDARIES AND AMENDED CHAPTER 132 "ZONING," ARTICLE I "GENERAL PROVISIONS," SECTION 6 "PROHIBITED USES," OF THE CODE OF THE TOWNSHIP OF KINGWOOD TO ADD CANNABIS BUSINESSES TO THE LIST OF PROHIBITED USES.

R. Dodds stated, through the proposed ordinance, the Township will be adding cannabis businesses to the list of prohibited uses. The reason for the adding of that use to the prohibited uses was due to the State not having the rules and regulations promulgated prior to the action date required by a municipality to prohibit the use. The date the

rules and regulations are due out from the State is sometime in August and the Township had to opt out by the same time. Opting out can only be done once every five years but opting in can be done at anytime.

It was moved by J. Mathieu, seconded by D. Haywood and carried to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. 21-17-2021 to the Township Committee. All members present voted **AYE** on **ROLL CALL VOTE**.

Proposed Ordinance No. 21-18-2021:

ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 132 “ZONING,” SECTION 145 “FEES AND ESCROWS,” SUBSECTION B “ESCROW FEES FOR PROFESSIONAL REVIEW,” OF THE GENERAL ORDINANCES OF THE TOWNSHIP OF KINGWOOD, COUNTY OF HUNTERDON, AND THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY TO CREATE AN INITIAL ESCROW FEES REQUIREMENT FOR APPLICATIONS TO THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

R. Dodds stated the ordinance provides guidance for escrow fees for the Board of Adjustment. The amounts were discussed with the professionals prior to setting the amounts.

It was moved by D. Haywood, seconded by J. Mathieu and carried to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. 21-18-2021 to the Township Committee. All members present voted **AYE** on **ROLL CALL VOTE**.

Master Plan Element Re-Examinations

D. Banisch provided the following memo to the Board for their review:

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide suggestions regarding possible updates to Master Plan Elements and consider whether a Periodic Reexamination of the Municipal Master Plan and Development Regulations should be undertaken. This memorandum reviews the 2011 Master Plan and Development Regulations Reexamination Report recommendations and identifies the status of those recommendations. Master Plan update comments are included following the 2011 Reexamination Report review.

1. This first update to the Master Plan is the Farmland Preservation Plan update, which by rule, now must be updated once every ten (10) years to maintain eligibility for funding under the State Agricultural Development Committee’s Planning Incentive Grant program. The Township has secured funds from the SADC for this periodic update, which must be completed by 2023.
2. The Municipal Land Use Law provides for a “Periodic reexamination” of the Master Plan and municipal development regulations at least once every ten (10) years at N.J.S.A. 40:55D-89, as follows:

“Periodic reexamination. The governing body shall, at least every 10 years, provide for a general reexamination of its master plan and development regulations by the planning board which shall prepare and adopt by resolution a report on the findings of such reexamination, a copy of which report and resolution shall be sent to the county planning board and the municipal clerk of each adjoining municipality. The first such reexamination shall have been completed by August 1, 1982. The next reexamination shall be completed by August 1, 1988. Thereafter, a reexamination shall be completed at least once every 10 years from the previous reexamination, . . . ”

3. **2018:** The Planning Board adopted a Periodic Re-examination Report of the Master Plan and Development Regulations in 2018 for the sole purpose of advancing third round affordable housing

compliance. That report set forth recommendations for adoption of the third-round settlement agreement Housing Plan and enabling ordinances for affordable housing compliance. All recommendations identified by the Planning Board in its 2018 Reexamination Report have been addressed.

4. The 2018 Reexamination Report did not delve into the recommendations for the Master Plan and Development Regulations contained in the Planning Board's prior 2011 Reexamination Report.
5. The 2011 Reexamination Report recommended updates to the Master Plan and Development Regulations that are listed and summarized below. We have added comments in bold, underlined and italicized text regarding the status of each recommendation for the Planning Board to review these recommendations for currency and to prioritize future work that the Planning Board may wish to address.

Master Plan – the following Master Plan recommendations from the 2011 Reexamination Report are annotated with comments in bold text for consideration by the Planning Board:

1. Prepare, organize and adopt one statement of Master Plan goals and objectives addressing each Master Plan element. ***This was not addressed and should be.***
2. The Planning Board should prepare a Land Use Plan Element that evaluates and addresses the updated land use planning policies, goals and objectives that are discussed in this periodic reexamination report into a single updated document. ***This was addressed in 2012, followed by zoning amendments; however, it may be appropriate for review by the Planning Board given the passage of time.***
3. Prepare a Policy Statement as required by N.J.S.A. 40:55D-28d of the M.L.U.L., indicating the relationship of the proposed development of the municipality, as developed in the master plan to (1) the master plans of contiguous municipalities, (2) the master plan of the county in which the municipality is located, (3) the State Development and Redevelopment Plan adopted pursuant to the "State Planning Act," sections 1 through 12 of P.L. 1985, c.398 (C. 52:18A-196 et seq.) and (4) the district solid waste management plan required pursuant to the provisions of the "Solid Waste Management Act," P.L. 1970, c.39 (C. 13:1E-1 et seq.) of the county in which the municipality is located". ***This was not addressed. This is not a high priority item; however, identifying consistencies and inconsistencies between local plans and particularly the County and State Plan should be identified. The State Planning Office has been reinvigorated with new staff and a review of updated State Planning policies and opportunities should be identified and assessed.***
4. The Planning Board should prepare a Recycling Plan Element as required by the Solid Waste Management Act", P.L. 1970, c.39 (C. 13:1E-1 et seq.). ***This was not addressed.***
5. Update the Circulation and Community Facilities Plan elements of the Master Plan. In addition, a Utility Services Plan Element is needed to assess wastewater treatment capacities for centralized sewer facilities in connection with the proposed Eastern Gateway Village Center Overlay District. ***This was not addressed. A utility services plan element should be considered in conjunction with designating a sewer service area(s) to support EGVC-AH zoning.***
6. The ERI also includes an inventory of historic sites. The Planning Board should prepare and adopt a Historic Preservation Plan Element in accordance with the M.L.U.L. requirements. ***This was not addressed.***

7. There have been a number of changes in regulations, State law, regional and State planning initiatives, and local assumptions forming the basis of the master plan and development regulations since adoption of the last Land Use Plan element that suggest the need for an updated Land Use Plan, including:

- a. State Development and Redevelopment Plan Cross Acceptance III – *The State Planning Office is recently invigorated and supports municipal planning efforts for consistency and Plan Endorsement by the State agency. Plan endorsement requires a comprehensive update to a host of Master Plan Elements authorized under the Municipal Land Use Law. The benefits of Plan Endorsement should be reviewed by the Planning Board.*
- b. Hunterdon County Strategic Growth Management Plan;
- c. Transfer of Development Rights legislation; *The Township has been active in TDR planning to support the Route 12 Scenic Corridor Overlay and EGVC-AH Zoning through State grants and continues its efforts toward that end. The Board should consider reviewing and assessing the potential viability of TDR objectives in the context of Receiving Area (EGVC-AH) viability.*
- d. Stormwater management rules and the requirement that each municipality develop its own stormwater management plan; *Recent updates to requirements have been enacted effective in 2021.*
- e. Enactment of the Highlands Water Protection and Planning Act in June of 2004 and the Highlands Regional Master Plan, which together dramatically reduce opportunities for growth within the Highlands Region, which lies just to the north of Kingwood Township. The Highlands Region was the fastest growing region in New Jersey at the time that the Act became law. The anticipated impact on Kingwood Township in the future is that growth and development pressures will emerge locally that will need to be managed in a planned and coordinated fashion. The proposed Route 12 Scenic Corridor Overlay Zone and Eastern Gateway Village Center Overlay Zone are planning responses that should be adopted and incorporated into an updated Land Use Plan Element of the Master Plan. *The Township has NOT apparently witnessed any appreciable increase in demand for residential development since the enactment of the Highlands Act.*
- f. Demographics/growth – increased pace of development within the Township and a shift of development opportunities within the region as a result of new State regulations which include (1) the designation of C-1 streams in Kingwood Township with required 300’ setbacks from these water courses, (2) State stormwater management regulations, (3) new COAH rules and methodology soon to be adopted and the results of the 2010 Census. Because of these developments, the Planning Board should update the Land Use Plan element of the Master Plan. *A review of population statistics, housing characteristics and trends could be conducted by the Planning Board and considered in the context of zoning adjustments that may be indicated to address housing needs by an aging population. For example, consider amendments to EGVC zoning to accommodate age-targeted housing.*

Land Development Ordinance – the following list is truncated from the verbatim recommendations for ordinance amendments included in the 2011 Reexamination Report:

The Planning Board has identified the following recommended changes and modifications to the Land Development Ordinance and actions to support the implementation of the Township’s Master Plan. They are:

1. **This was a solar ordinance recommendation.** The Planning Board and Township have recently amended solar photovoltaic development regulations limiting the extent of site development permitted for solar arrays (Ord. No. 20-14-2020). Additional action is presumably not needed on this 2011 recommendation. ***This was addressed***
2. **This recommendation was acted on through enactment of the Eastern Gateway Village Center zoning** "... to establish a mixed use smart growth land development option at a location that supported by appropriate existing and planned infrastructure to (1) accommodate the future population growth of the Township, (2) accommodate reasonable opportunities for affordable housing development, and (3) attract beneficial growth and tax ratable development. The area identified for this mixed use development overlay is situated generally along Route 12 in the vicinity of the intersection of Barbertown-Point Breeze Road and Pittstown Road (County Route 615), which has been found to be the most advantageous location in Kingwood Township for smart growth, mixed use high-density development opportunities. ...". ***This was addressed.***
3. **This recommendation was acted on through enactment of the Route 12 Scenic Corridor Overlay zoning** "...to preserve and enhance the undeveloped rural lands situated along the Route 12 Corridor in such a manner that will maintain and reinforce the Township's rural character and existing scenic views and vistas within and along the Route 12 Corridor should be implemented. Ordinance 16-14-2011 addresses this objective, while at the same time providing for reasonable land use opportunities for lands situated within the Route 12 Corridor. ...". ***This was addressed.***
4. Based on the recommendations of the ERI the Township Committee should adopt a stream corridor buffer ordinance. **Amendments to State Flood Hazard Area regulations enacted since 2011 establish riparian zones, which may have reduced the importance of addressing this at the local level.** ***This was not addressed.***
5. The Planning Board recommends that the Township Committee adopt an ordinance amendment establishing an average front yard setback standard based upon existing / adjacent development along existing roads. This is recommended to minimize the evolving condition of a piecemeal and staggered setback pattern of development resulting from the introduction of new development, built to current standards, adjacent to existing development that is situated in close proximity to existing roads. This will help bring uniformity to front yard setbacks and also serve to reduce the undesirable condition of the front yard of a new dwelling being located rearward of the rear of existing dwellings. ***This was not addressed.***
6. The Planning Board identified an issue associated with single-family dwelling units resulting from minor subdivisions encountering problems with the siting of septic systems. Therefore the Board recommends that the Township Committee amend the Land Development Ordinance to require that the Board of Health certify the suitability of the proposed location of septic systems at the time a proposed subdivision plan is submitted to the Planning Board, not as a condition of approval. The major subdivision checklist requirements should be revised to require that locations for a primary and a reserve septic system are identified on each proposed subdivision lot. ***This does not appear to have been addressed.***

7. The Planning Board recommends that the Township committee adopt an amendment to the Land Development ordinance that requires all accessory structures to be setback rearward of the principal structure. The amendment should include a grandfather provision for existing accessory structures and an exception for agricultural structures, such as barns, sheds, coops and similar agricultural use or farm structures. **This does not appear to have been addressed.**
8. The Planning Board recommends that the Township Committee amend the sign provisions of the Land Development Ordinance for the following:
 - i. Review and amend existing ordinances for political advertising signs, specifically as regulations relate to (1) the permit process for posting such signs, (2) identifying regulations for placement of signs before and removal after political event, and (3) number of signs permitted on a single property.
 - ii. Establish sign requirements for non-agricultural activities.
 - iii. Establish a permit/review approval process for signs of non-residential uses in residential zones, and for placement of property identification signs.
 - iv. Establish requirements for Farm market signs in terms of advertising non-farm agricultural uses.
 - v. Establish a limit on the number and size of signs permitted in conjunction with nonresidential development.
 - vi. Establish permitted signage also needs to be established for the BP and the PO/R zones.
 - vii. Adopt the Route 12/Barbertown Study sign design recommendations.

These recommendations do not appear to have been addressed; however, a sign ordinance amendment regarding sign measurement was adopted in 2019.

9. As a result of increases to ordinance amendments that increased minimum lot size and bulk requirements, a large number of preexisting developed lots in the Township have been made non-conforming. An ordinance amendment is needed to permit preexisting developed dwellings on undersized lots to be expanded, enlarged, extended, or added onto within bulk standards tailored to classes of lot sizes, or in accordance with the setbacks that applied immediately prior to the adoption of changes in lot area and bulk requirements. This will serve to reduce the need for setback variance relief for lawfully existing structures that previously conformed to setback requirements, but have been made nonconforming due to changes in the ordinance. In addition, the amendment should permit the expansion of a non-conforming structure, provided that the expansion does not further extend the nonconforming condition, such as a non-conforming setback condition. **This does not appear to have been addressed.**
10. The Planning Board should prepare, and the Township Committee should adopt an ordinance amendment requiring that a standard condition be attached to all Planning Board and Zoning Board approvals, which requires an applicant to return to the approving regulatory Board to document that all conditions of approval have been fulfilled, prior to final approval in the case of major subdivisions, prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy in the case of minor subdivision, site plan and/or variance approvals. The ordinance amendment should provide the Board with the authority to determine on an individual basis whether a personal appearance or professional sign-off will satisfy this condition. In cases where zoning board variance relief has been granted, a procedure should be established to ensure that the Construction Code Official

does not issue a construction permit until the zoning officer certifies that all conditions of a variance(s) have been satisfied. **This does not appear to have been addressed.**

Additional Master Plan Comments:

Reexamination Report: A Reexamination Report could be prepared to review recommendations addressed in the 2011 and 2018 Reexamination Reports as well as comprehensively detail ordinance amendments since the adoption of the two Reexamination Reports.

Recreation and Open Space: NJDEP Green Acres rules for Planning Incentive Grant participation have been revised and Green Acres has revised the requirements for a qualifying Recreation and Open Space Plan Element to maintain eligibility in the PIG Program. An updated Recreation and Open Space Plan Element conforming to NJDEP Green Acres Planning Incentive Grant Program requirements should be prepared and adopted in 2024.

J. Mathieu stated the memo is six pages long and if the Board members go to the bottom of the memo it states generally what the Township has done and what needs to be completed. It seems as if the Recreation and Open Space Element is an element that needs to be addressed. He recommends a review of the 2011 and 2018 Re-examination reports.

R. Dodds stated the Township did a review of the Open Space and Recreation Plan (OSRP) in 2014. It is not urgent and the Township continues to receive Green Acres funds because of the 2014 review and it was modified slightly.

S. McNicol stated it was interesting to her that the first article in the NJ Planner was about the perils of planned development. It was an article written by an attorney indicating that the Township should be careful with the OSRP element to make sure that open space is protected in the future. It should be passed on to D. Banisch to ascertain that the Township's open space is protected properly. She would recommend that the Township send him the article to make sure all the Township's ducks are in a row.

L. Voronin responded to #4 on page 4 of 6 regarding to the ERI. She stated the Environmental Commission (EC) is working on it. Several people have taken the sections to update. It should be completed in a few months. The EC will provide a formal report to the Planning Board.

L. Voronin looking at the Re-Examination that was done in 2011, page 7:

There is a continuing concern regarding the groundwater yield of new wells and the potential effect a new well may have on neighboring wells serving existing residences in certain portions of the Township. Individual well groundwater yield data recently gathered suggests that certain areas of Township may have severely limited capacity for groundwater yield and may not be able to support development at currently permitted densities. The Planning Board should conduct investigations into this situation, including the collection of data to determine whether certain areas of the Township should be designated "Critical Groundwater Resource Areas", where either permitted densities could be reduced, and/or within which well testing could be required to determine whether the well for a new home or other permitted use will produce sufficient yield and will not negatively impact the production of existing wells. The Planning Board and Township Committee should make this a high priority.

She stated that this item was not mentioned in D. Banisch's memo. She is requesting if it could be added to the review. She stated it was not addressed in the 2018 Re-examination Report. She stated certain areas of the Township should be designated "critical water areas" with reduced density. There should be well testing required for a new home to make sure that it will produce a sufficient yield and will not negatively impact the surrounding properties. The Planning Board and Township Committee should make this a high priority.

In response to a question by R. Dodds, J. Mathieu responded he thought the 7 acre zoning went into effect prior to 2011. The Township hired V. Uhl who did quite a bit of work on well yields which resulted in the well ordinance being updated or amended.

R. Dodds stated the Board of Health amended the well ordinance in January of this year. The EC is looking to have the amendment rescinded and the ordinance reinstated to its original form.

L. Voronin stated the EC is gathering information but it has been slow. The EC had been hopeful to be at the Board of Health meeting in June but they will not be able to meet at that time. The EC's memo addressing their concerns will not be ready. One of the items the EC is concerned with is that previously the well ordinance required an aquifer test for subdivisions of 3 units. With the amendment, any subdivision of 3 units or less will not require any testing. With addressing the critical areas, there may be development in areas where the yield will be below and no testing will be done. The requirement of a three part pump test has been removed for the subdivision of one lot. Larger subdivision observation well distances to other wells has been changed and the number of wells decreased. That is a summary of what the EC is concerned about with the recent amendment to the well ordinance.

R. Dodds stated the Planning Board would like a review of the EC's concerns. The Board of Health is the legislative Board who has the ability to amend the well ordinance. The Planning Board would have to come up with recommendations to the Board of Health. He is actually hoping that the EC will come up with recommendations. He stated the Township Committee does not control what the Board of Health adopts.

J. Mathieu inquired of D. Pierce that even though the Board of Health is the Board of original jurisdiction, the Township Committee can make some changes.

D. Pierce responded he is not sure if the Township Committee can make changes. He stated the Board of Health can make ordinances on health related issues without the input or approval of the Township Committee. He would need to review it further to see if the Township Committee could make amendments to an ordinance adopted by the Board of Health. He hasn't looked at the statute. He is not sure that the Township Committee can limit the powers of the Board of Health once it has been created.

R. Dodds stated most of the Board members just received D. Banisch's memo. He is requesting the Board members take some time to read the six pages. Prior to the meeting, he spoke with D. Pierce regarding the prescribed uses permitted in the business district along Route 12. The zoning ordinance provides for permitted uses. If they are not specifically permitted, they are prohibited. The permitted uses are locked into the hopeful look of the 1960's and 1970's. Permitting a bowling alley or a department store was wishful thinking. If the bowling alley wanted to become a drone facility, it would not be a permitted use. It is impossible to list the possibilities what can happen inside a building. The Board should handle the appearance of the building. There are a handful of things that the Township does not want in the Township. The inside use should be up to the business owner's imagination. The Township could have lots of bowling alleys and department stores in the Township and that is okay. An information hub would not be permitted because it does not fit into the

permitted uses. He receives calls from the Hunterdon Economic Group regarding someone interested in opening a business in Kingwood but it is not a permitted use. The review of the permitted uses can be done outside of the Re-examination Report. How does the Board want to see Route 12 in the future in its commercial zones? Does it want to prescribe what it looks like or what goes on is up to the business owner?

J. Mathieu stated the City of Lambertville has many pre-existing non-conforming business areas. It would be easier to identify what would not be required in the zoning ordinance. If it is not permitted, they would have to apply to the Board of Adjustment.

R. Dodds stated the Township would love for people to come to the Township and read about the permitted uses. They would then apply to the Planning Board. The Board of Adjustment does great work but their decisions are more subjective rather than objective. There are less rules.

D. Haywood stated she would not like to leave it open ended. There should be some limitations that would preserve what the Township would want rather than say anything goes.

R. Dodds stated it is difficult to predict ahead and decide what use is something that would not be appropriate.

J. Mathieu stated the Township can try and clarify permitted uses. They could broaden uses in a category.

D. Pierce suggested that the Board could be clearer by indicating what is not permitted and to be more expansive and modernizing the list of things that are permitted.

D. Haywood suggested it as an ongoing basis with an annual review.

R. Dodds reviewed the permitted uses and thinks much of it was wishful thinking. No one would have thought of Integrated Clinical Systems which produces software for the health and drug industry as a permitted use. The Township should not try to open up the can all the way but allow for more than is allowed now. The Board should not concern itself with what goes on inside a building as long as it is a legal business and done right.

D. Pierce suggested possibly a sub-committee should be formed to look at the issue and come up with suggestions.

D. Haywood suggested it might be something that D. Banisch may have some input.

R. Dodds stated D. Banisch will have a lot of work on the Re-examination Report. The Board may want to start as a sub-committee and make some suggestions. The Board can then see if it needs to grow and be turned over to a professional or be done internally. D. Pierce can provide some legal advice on how to proceed.

J. Mathieu stated the sub-committee is a sound one. There was a sub-committee on the sign ordinances and they provided input. The Board was able to develop it without the impact of a professional fee.

R. Dodds stated it can be broken down into small pieces. Setbacks are a different issue. The sub-committee should review what is allowed and what is not. It could be done mostly virtually.

D. Pierce stated there can be no more than four (4) people on the committee. If there are more it becomes a meeting of the Board.

S. McNicol suggested that before a sub-committee is started, the Board members should take a look at the section of the ordinance concerned with permitted uses in the commercial business district. She requested R. Dodds send the Board members the sections and then at the next meeting it can be discussed a little further.

R. Dodds will send out what is permitted in each of the commercial districts to the Board members. The sub-committee may choose to tackle only one of them. He requested the Board members review them for the July meeting.

S. McNicol stated at that point the Board members will know if it is an onerous task or will take just one meeting to hash out what needs to be changed.

L. Voronin stated she would provide D. Banisch's memo to the EC for their review. They are meeting in two weeks.

Approval Minutes

It was moved by S. McNicol, seconded by L. Voronin and carried to adopt the May 13, 2021 minutes and place on file. All members present voted **AYE**, except J. Mathieu, who **ABSTAINED**.

CORRESPONDENCE

NJ Planner – March/April 2021

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

L. Voronin stated she was looking at the previous Planning Board minutes and saw that P. Althoff was hired to look at water resources. She would like to get a copy of the report. She stated the Board authorized a hydrogeological study in 2006.

J. Mathieu recalled that V. Uhl was not the prima-fascia selected hydrogeologist for Kingwood. The Board requested Request for Proposals (RFP) from P. Althoff, V. Uhl and R. Horden.

L. Voronin stated that P. Althoff was the hydrogeologist for 2005. V. Uhl became the hydrogeologist at a later date.

D. Haywood recalls the same thing. She remembers when the Township hired P. Althoff in conjunction with the well ordinance. The presentation that P. Althoff gave was superior to the other candidates and the Board hired her on that basis. She was a disappointment and was replaced with V. Uhl.

J. Mathieu suggested that we have V. Uhl involved to restructure the ordinance back to where it was previous to the recent amendment. L. Voronin and D. Haywood were in agreement with J. Mathieu's suggestion. D. Haywood stated the Board of Health put the requirements in place in order to protect the residents of Kingwood.

R. Dodds stated the Board will have to determine the next steps.

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved by J. Mathieu, seconded by L. Voronin and carried to adjourn the meeting at 8:22 PM. All members present voted **AYE**.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Laudenbach, Secretary