

**RIVERTON BOROUGH PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES
December 20, 2005**

The Public Session of the Planning Board was called to order at 7:00 PM by Chairman Frank Siefert.

Public Notice of this meeting pursuant to the Open Public Meetings Act has been given in the following manner:

1. Posting notice on the official bulletin board in the Borough Office on January 21, 2005.
2. Required Service of notice and publication in the Burlington County Times on January 23, 2005.

PRESENT: Frank Siefert, Christopher Halt, Robert E. Smyth, Mayor Martin, Councilwoman Alls-Moffat, Alan Adams, Joseph Katella, and Suzanne Wells.

Also Present: Secretary Ken Palmer, Solicitors Tom Coleman and Charles Petrone, Board Planner Tamara Lee and Patrick Ennis, PE of Lord Worrell & Richter for Board Engineer Mark Malinowski.

ABSENT: None.

MINUTES: A motion was made by Suzanne Wells and seconded by the mayor to adopt the minutes of the November 15, 2005 regular meeting as distributed. The voice vote was unanimous.

CORRESPONDENCE/ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. 11/28/05 and 12/16/05, new/revised submissions for Brandenburger/Sheridan Site Plan Application distributed to all board members and others as required.
2. 12/14/05, Affidavit of Service and Publication with proofs of publication and mailing from Flaster Greenberg for Brandenburger Site Plan Application (Copy of notice given to board for reference).
3. 12/19/05, copy of Tamara Lee's review of new/revised materials for the Brandenburger/Sheridan application which was distributed directly to the board.
4. 12/20/05, copy of Mark Malinowski's review of new/revised materials for the Brandenburger/Sheridan application which was distributed to the board.
5. 12/19/05, copy of the ARC review letter concerning the Brandenburger/Sheridan application.
6. 11/16/05, memo from County Department of Resource Conservation Division of Solid Waste Management regarding recycling considerations for multifamily site plan approvals.
7. 11/16/05, copy of letter to Mary Longbottom from DVRPC regarding that the Riverton Light Rail Station is included in the Increasing Intermodal Access to Transit (Phase III) study which is examining pedestrian and bicycle access accessibility of transit stations throughout the region both in PA and NJ.
8. 11/28/05, copy of "Mayor's Fax Advisory" newsletter from NJLM providing an update on progress of implementing the New Education Requirements for Members of Planning, Zoning, or Joint Use Boards. Copies provided to all board members.
9. 12/13/05, copy of "Mayor's Fax Advisory" newsletter from NJLM updating Wastewater Management Planning and proposed statewide amendments by the state has been extended until May 2006.
10. 12/16/05, copy to chair of letter to the mayor from COAH acknowledging receipt of the Borough's petition and deeming the submission complete. Also included were instructions and procedures for proper notification of the 45 day comment period.
11. 12/16/2005, copy of letter to the mayor from the State Department of Community Affairs, Office of Smart Growth concerning proposals to revise the scope of work to be done under the Smart Growth Grant. Attached to the letter was a copy of an e-mail dated 12/19/05 from Tamara Lee to Khara Ford, Area Planner, Office of Smart Growth replying as requested that Council had discussed the matter and had decided that the grant be used to conduct a traffic and parking study for the Borough. The e-mail also outlined the scope of the work to be done.
12. Four vouchers/invoices as presented under New Business.

PUBLIC HEARING

Continued from 11/15/2005: Application by Brandenburger/Sheridan, Inc. for Preliminary Site Plan Approval and All Required Variances As Needed to Redevelop the “Nu-Way” and “Riverton Motors” Properties on Broad Street (Block 1501, Lots 20, 21, 22, & 23)

Introduction: The chair introduced the topic and introduced David Oberlander, counsel for the applicant. The secretary attested that the applicant had properly re-noticed and that all jurisdictional requirements had been met and the board solicitors concurred that the hearing could proceed. Mr. Petrone reviewed that since Mr. Halt had not been present for the previous session of the hearing he can participate in the hearing; however, he cannot vote on the matter.

Testimony and Board Questions: Mr. Oberlander reviewed the application and plans and progress to date. He explained what he hoped to be accomplished at this hearing. The witnesses were introduced and sworn in. Andrew Ott, the applicant’s engineer, and Jim Brandenburger, the applicant, were returning. The following additional witnesses were introduced and sworn in:

- David Shropshire, Shropshire Associates LLC
- Mike Buckless, CVS Realty Company
- Paul Albert, Larson Design Group
- Robert Oelenschlager, National Sign Services

The following new exhibits were entered:

B1 – revised site plan application

B2 – site plans, 11/22/05

B3 – survey and topography plan, 11/22/05

B4 – landscape plan, 12/12/05

B5 – signage plan, 11/22/05

B6 – building elevations and signs, four sheets, 11/15/05

B7 – traffic engineering assessment 11/14/05

B8 – wetland evaluation

B9 – 12/14/05, Affidavit of Service and Publication with proofs of publication and mailing from applicants attorney (reviewed and attested to completeness by the secretary).

Mr. Brandenburger summarized the application and the revisions made. The revisions primarily address suggestions from the board’s planner and engineer. He referenced a colorized version of the revised site plan which was marked as B10. A presentation booklet was marked as B11 and was distributed to the board which addressed renderings of the proposed strip stores, pictures of the proposed architecturally appropriate lighting, a revised landscape plan, and revised lighting survey. There has been a decrease in parking spots from 143 to 137. Additional landscape islands have been added. The height of the proposed five single light and six double light standards has been reduced to 16 feet from 25 feet. The style of the lights is similar to the new street lights in Palmyra and the lights are compatible in style with the gas lamps on the property. They are designed to reflect down. The revised lighting study shows that all requirements will be met with no spillage onto adjoining properties. The proposed style lights are significantly more costly than standard “cobra” style lights. No new gas lamps will be installed and all existing gas lamps will be preserved and relocated if needed. The double lights will be on the property. Muriel Alls-Moffat inquired why the revised light fixtures were 16 feet instead of the 12 feet recommended by the ARC. Mr. Ott explained that 12 foot fixtures would require another five or six fixtures mostly of the double style or an increase of approximately 50% in the number of fixtures to meet the requirements for site lighting. That would cause an undesired increase in the source points of lighting. The higher fixtures also result in a more even spread of light with less “hot spots” of intensity. This provides a better overall ambience and still meets the requirement for sufficient lighting of the site. While higher than the existing residential style gas lamps, it was noted that gas lamps cannot meet the lighting requirements. The change in the number of parking spaces was to address the board professional’s suggestions to add landscape islands and increase pedestrian access. The revised number of parking spaces shown on the landscape plan has not been added to the site plan.

Mr. Shropshire was introduced, his qualifications attested to and the traffic study was reviewed. A minor degradation of existing service may occur at Fulton and Broad Street during Saturday peak hours. He feels there will not be any problems in obtaining County approval. He explained level of service and addressed Muriel's concerns about changes to the level of service on Fulton Street. Chris Halt is concerned about possible increased use of Fourth Street as an alternate highway by people trying to avoid accessing Broad Street. He has noted an increase since Broad Street was reconstructed. County approval was explained since Broad Street is a County road. The applicant does not know yet if the County plans to take the rest of the right-of-way shown on the plan. The plan assumes that may occur and the area will be landscaped appropriately to minimize impact if the right-of-way is later used. Possible acceleration/deceleration lanes while not proposed are shown in case the County mandates them. It was noted that the Borough's gas lamps on the site are currently within the County's currently unused right-of-way. Truck traffic on Fulton Street was discussed. It was explained that all deliveries would be required to enter the site from Broad Street and directed to only exit left towards Broad Street from the Fulton Street entrance. As to restricting and posting "no truck" signage on the residential portion of Fulton Street, that is a local enforcement issue. Fulton Street is wide enough for the proposed designed use. Making Fulton Street one way is a local issue. Bob Smyth asked about current vs. forecast figures in the study. Mr. Shropshire explained that current figures are used and then accepted methods for projecting future growth rates are applied. The impact estimates included in the report are deliberately conservatively high such as counting trips to the center stores individually when in reality visits to multiple stores may be in one trip. Muriel feels the new development in Cinnaminson and the projected future growth in Palmyra will have a significant impact.

The chair opened Mr. Shropshire's testimony to public questions and comments:

- Eric Saia, 401 Martha's lane, asked if the impact on the light at Cedar Lane and the light rail crossing was included. The answer was yes and was explained. Mr. Saia asked about imposing weight limit restrictions on truck traffic on Fulton Street. It was explained such a decision was a municipal issue and that municipalities usually preferred to go with the "local deliveries only" restriction. Mr. Saia asked if the turning radii were sufficient. It was explained that yes they are based on the proposed access/egress flow and the size of the trucks. Large vehicles will probably not exceed one or two a day. There may be additional smaller delivery vehicles.

There was no further public comment and the hearing was closed to public comment.

The board inquired about the traffic humps recommended by Tamara on the site and about including one at the Fulton Street entrance. Mr. Ott explained that a raised hump at Fulton Street might cause a drainage issue; humps intend to increase noise when trucks go over them, and such a hump is not needed at Fulton Street since it would be an exit point for trucks which are starting at that point from a full stop. Mr. Ott further explained why he thought they could cause safety issues and that the use of colored and/or distinctive paving materials at the crossings was preferred. Tamara said she could understand Fulton Street; but, still has concerns within the site, particularly along the central aisle way. Mr. Shropshire explained why the use of stop signs at cross aisle locations was not recommended. There were no further questions of Mr. Shropshire and he was excused.

Mr. Buckless was introduced and presented his credentials. He explained the history of the CVS interest in the site and why CVS feels it is a good choice. He reviewed operation considerations. The use of the enclosed trash compacting equipment will limit collection at the store to approximately once every one or two months. Once in the store, the discarded material never leaves the store except through the enclosed equipment. Use of the drive-through should not exceed perhaps five per hour during peak hours. It is for pick-up and drop-off only; not waiting. He feels customers will predominantly exit to the left towards Broad Street from the Fulton Street access. All deliveries will occur during normal business hours usually between 9:00 AM and 3:00 PM. They will be instructed and made to adhere to the entry only from Broad Street and exiting to the left on Fulton Street. There will be at most one delivery a week from the large CVS trucks. CVS can and will control deliveries from their vehicles to best suite the town's desires. Deliveries, such as soda from smaller vehicles, may occur more frequently; but, always during the previously stated times. The projected operating hours would be from 8:00 AM to 10:00 PM. Bob Smyth reviewed his research of both the Moorestown and Princeton stores and how he hopes that the signage and store design will be similar to the Moorestown store. Mr. Buckless stated that the upcoming presentation on the signage and store design will hopefully address his concerns. The signage presentation will

hope to reduce the current signage and address concerns. He stated that the Riverton site is not a Moorestown site; but, most definitely it is not a Route 130 or major highway site either. Muriel asked why the store had to be on the corner location and Mr. Buckless reviewed the rationale for that CVS requirement. Muriel is concerned about what the properties across Fulton Street were going to be looking at. The proposed landscaping along the street was briefly discussed as well as the signage issues that will be addressed. It was also noted that the CVS store will be at least 60 feet further back on the site than the current structure with a landscape buffer along the street.

Mr. Ott was asked to review the requested variances and the engineer's and planner's review letters. The proposed lot coverage while exceeding the zone's requirements is less than what exists now. It is a much better design. The Martha's Lane right-of-way area was not included; however, the unused County right-of-way was included in the calculation. The buffering along Fulton Street is adjacent to a street and not an adjoining residential property. Mr. Ott reviewed why he felt there was no detriment to the public good from the variances requested and that they represented a recognizable improvement to the current site. Green areas will be spread throughout the site. Having only a 12 foot buffer along the back of the property in addition to the existing pathway and the green space provided by the retention basin area as well as the fact that the buildings are 115 feet off the property line should be sufficient to provide more than adequate buffering. The run-off retention basin is of all natural materials, not concrete, and will be shielded by fencing and buffering. If the basin needs to be moved to allow the 20 foot landscape buffer as defined in the code, it would necessitate redesigning it and making it closer to Fulton Street. Mr. Ott and the applicant feel it is best to have the basin located as far back as possible. The current Riverton Motors site is 100% impervious and the proposed design will have green space. The variance for the size of the parking stalls is appropriate for the planned use and commonly acceptable. The design standards waiver regarding the light standards being 16 feet instead of 12 feet has been previously discussed.

The review letters were discussed. In Tamara's letter the site plan issues specifically related to pedestrian use and buffering were discussed at length. Tamara feels strongly that the use of "raised" walkways for traffic calming is needed; however, she will ultimately defer to the board's engineer on the subject. Alternatives to the raised areas were discussed. Adequate drainage on the site is an issue and is properly controlled on the plans as submitted. Buffering of the parking areas was discussed and it was agreed to make sure headlights were shielded along Fulton Street yet not construct the buffer so as to either reduce right the right of way sight lines or visibility of the property. The issue of one vs. two drive-through lanes and their design/location was discussed. Mr. Ott stated he would continue to work with the board's professionals on the issues. Regarding the development fee ordinance, it was discussed that it is approved. Concerning using brick in the plaza area, the applicant has no problem using a less maintenance intensive product such as pressed concrete materials similar to that used in the pedestrian walkways on the site. The issue of planting additional trees in the plaza area will be subject to county review and must not impact sight triangles at the Fulton Street intersection. Mr. Ott and Mr. Ennis reviewed Mark's review letter. The square footage issue was again clarified and agreed that it will be clarified on the plans. All existing sidewalks along Broad and Fulton Streets will be replaced and done in coordination with any Borough efforts. The dumpster issue for the retail stores will be deferred to the fire marshal. The CVS units are fully self-contained. Fire Lanes will be included and delineated. It was agreed to provide stop signs at all street access points and not require them at crossing aisles on site. Green space and traffic calming between the buildings will continue to be discussed but access for a large tractor trailer rig needs to be maintained. It was agreed that the applicant's proposed location of the bank's trash enclosure was more appropriate. The split rail fence around the three sides of the basin with a board on board on the fourth side was agreed as appropriate. Any sanitary line issues will be deferred to local MUA. Concerns with parking lot grading issues will be resolved as needed.

Mr. Oelenschlager was introduced and his credentials attested to. Exhibits B12 and B13 were introduced which were enlarged versions of other exhibits. Concerning the retail building, the only variance at issue is a size variance for the main sign on the building. The height and width are needed to properly identify the building. Only the main sign will be externally illuminated by goose neck lights. No internally illuminated signs are proposed. The individual store signs will be fully comply with the ordinance. Exhibit B14 was entered which represented the initial proposal for the standalone street sign. It will be located near the corner plaza area. It will be double sided and advertise CVS as well as the other retail tenants. It will feature carved, externally lit signage. The tenant signs will be removable to allow changing as needed. The design as presented is 20 feet in height and two feet wide and tries to incorporate the design architecture of the building. The general consensus of the board

is that it is too tall and too massive. While the need to advertise the site is not being debated, it was felt it was too big given that the speed limit in the area is reduced. Asked why the Moorestown sign is much smaller, the applicant's professionals replied that the issue is different. The Moorestown site is standalone and located in a downtown area. Riverton's site is a center and the CVS and other tenants need to be advertised. The design also tries to be architecturally appropriate. Asked about room to compromise, the applicant's representatives stated that is what they hoped to do. The design was not presented as a take it or leave it proposal. If there are serious issues give them some guidance and they will work with the town as much as possible. They only ask that all establishments on the site be allowed to adequately advertise their existence. The board concurred that they feel the proposed scale was too large for the traffic flow and the size of the site. The design criteria used concerning size, location, speed limits, etc. was discussed. It was also agreed that the issue needed to be visited further. Following a short break, Exhibit B15 was entered which represented a proposed alternative sign almost half the size of B14 and less "massive" in design. The style of the carved panels will be similar. The sign face is reduced to 80 square feet from 115 square feet. The structure is also not as tall. There was discussion concerning the location of the lighting and further reducing the overall mass of the structure. Walter Croft of the ARC, when asked, stated that he would be willing to work with the applicant and the board to help facilitate a consensus. The applicant feels a sign is needed to advertise the location and it needs to be of sufficient size that it is noticed before it is passed. The board is of a consensus that the overall scale is an issue that needs to be resolved. Perhaps pictures of actual examples of various sizes and designs would help the board better visualize what is proposed. Mr. Oelenschlager agreed to provide examples. The board appreciates the efforts to customize the sign for Riverton.

The CVS store façade signage was discussed. A color rendering was entered as Exhibit B16. It was noted that the rendering was actually a reverse image of the proposed building. Tamara's and the ARC reports were reviewed and taken into consideration and CVS' representatives are prepared to reduce where possible the signage. Exhibit B17 was entered to show the reduced number of signs. The reduction of the actual size of the "CVS" signs was presented. The removal of all signs except CVS on the Fulton Street facade was presented. The removal of all signage on the "center side" except for the drive-through was presented. Along Broad Street, CVS feels the three signs shown are needed. All of the signs are carved and exterior lit by goose neck lamps. The revised package has reduced the number of signs from 13 to six or seven and is over 271 square feet less. The signage variances were reviewed. Mr. Oelenschlager reviewed how they want to remove directional signage from the Fulton Street access to further emphasize that customers should utilize the Broad Street entrance. Exhibit B18 was entered to demonstrate the reduced signage and comparisons to the Moorestown and Princeton locations was discussed. Mr. Buckless stated that the customer will not agree to making the CVS signs any smaller than presented.

A revised building design rendering was entered as exhibit B19. This revision addresses the concern that the "rounded" tower design did not follow the design of the Yacht Club as intended. The tower portion has been squared off and the spire redesigned. The signage does not represent the reduced signage as discussed; however the style is representative. The consensus of the board is that they preferred the new design. To the possibility of redesigning the retail strip building to closer resemble the CVS building, the consensus of the board was to not change the retail strip building. The board is also inclined to support the design represented by exhibit B19. The chair asked Walter "Hank" Croft of the ARC to comment. Hank was pleased with the repetitive pattern of the brickwork and feels it would be nice to repeat the pattern on all the walls. Hank feels the pedestrian arcade might be lowered some. After confirming that the height of the building complied with the code, Hank asked if the height of the parapet walls could be lowered. He was informed the height was designed to conceal the mechanicals for the building. The board discussed various other architecture designs of the retail strip building. The building materials to be used in both buildings were discussed.

Public Comment: The hearing was opened to public comment:

- Hank Croft, 2 Woodside Lane, questioned the split rail fence around the retention basin. Mr. Ennis stated that it provides a safety factor. However, there is nothing to stop its removal if it was a concern for the board. Hank asked if the sign illumination will be turned off after business hours and he was told yes. Hank suggested that, if needed, the board include stipulations concerning delivery hours.
- James Moffat, 202 Fulton Street, suggested that the signs for the retail stores be upper-lower case.
- Joe Van Bernum, 310 Manor Court, asked for details concerning the depth of the retention basin, the landscaping and fencing plans, light from the site, noise issues, location of the grease trap, and traffic flow. Mr. Ott and the applicant provided answers to his questions. Joe asked about pumping overflow water from the site instead of using the basin and it was explained that the applicant doesn't have the right to pump across property he doesn't own.
- Barry Emens, 18 Laurel Road, as chair of the Shade Tree Commission offered the commission's services if they would be helpful. He likes the plan and feels it is essentially sound from a landscape position.

There being no further comment, the hearing was closed to public comment.

Board Deliberation: The chair asked if the board had additional concerns or questions. There were none and the chair asked counsel to aid in reviewing what the board was being asked to vote on. Chuck Petrone guided the board. He stated that preliminary and final site plan approval with variances is being requested. Since there are remaining issues, the board was advised that preliminary approval and granting of all or a portion of the variances was warranted, if the board so chooses. The waivers and variances being requested are:

- design waiver for 16 foot light standards instead of 12 feet
- variance for lot coverage of 66.3% from the maximum 60% permitted
- variance for 9x18 foot parking spaces where 10x20 feet is required
- variance for a 15 foot buffer along Fulton Street where 20 feet is required
- variance for a 12 foot buffer along the rear property line where 20 feet is required
- variance for a free standing sign
- variance for the seven façade signs where one is permitted on the CVS building
- variance for square footage of the signs on the CVS building
- variance for square footage of the main sign on the retail strip building
- variance for ground identification signage where none is provided for.

Unless the board feels the matter can be concluded tonight, final approval is not advised since there are unresolved issues from the review letters and the street side sign is still under review and revision. Preliminary approval expresses general satisfaction with the presentation while allowing that there is work still to be done. Approvals allow the applicant to proceed with the issues that have been approved. Only those variances the board is prepared to grant should be considered. The applicant has agreed to comply with most of the open issues in the professional's letters and compliance can be made a condition of any approvals. Action can be taken separately on items or a single motion can be made. The board decided that it would take a single vote on a motion that would include as delineated by Mr. Petrone:

- grant preliminary site plan approval conditioned on all outstanding agreed upon issues addressed in the planner's and engineer's review letters are resolved
- grant a variance for the increased lot coverage
- grant a variance for the 9x18 parking stall size
- grant a variance for the 15 foot buffer along Fulton Street as long as the revised landscaping requirements are adhered to
- grant a variance for the 12 foot buffer at the rear of the site
- grant variances for the number and size of façade signs on the CVS building as long as they comply with the revised proposals presented in tonight's testimony
- grant a variance for the main sign on the retail strip building
- grant a variance for the ground identification signs
- grant a design waiver for the height of the light standards.

The mayor so moved that the motion as delineated by Mr. Petrone be approved and the motion was seconded by Alan Adams. A roll call vote was conducted with aye signifying approval and nay denial. Mr. Halt could not vote. The motion was approved by a vote of 7 to 0 as follows:

Mr. Siefert	aye	Mr. Smyth	aye
Mayor Martin	aye	Councilwoman Alls-Moffat	aye
Mr. Adams	aye	Mr. Katella	aye
Mrs. Wells	aye		

Continuance: The applicant agreed that he wished to continue the hearing until the next meeting. The applicant stated that he would re-notice if there were additional changes to the application. A motion was made, seconded, and unanimously approved to continue the matter at the applicant's request.

The Planning Board of the Borough of Riverton approved the following resolution at its regular meeting on December 20, 2005:

Be it resolved by the Planning Board of the Borough of Riverton, County of Burlington, and State of New Jersey that consideration on the application by Brandenburger/Sheridan, Inc. For Site Plan Approval and all related variances as needed to redevelop the "Nu-Way" and "Riverton Motors" Properties on Broad Street (Block 1501, Lots 20, 21, 22, &23) is continued, applicant having requested an extension of time for consideration of the matter until the next regular meeting of the Board on January 17, 2006.

This notice provides the only official notification required of this continuance granted by the applicant unless subsequent amendments to the application require that formal notification be made.

OLD BUSINESS

Petition to COAH for Third Round Certification – At the time the letter from COAH was read; Bob Smyth extended thanks and compliments to everyone on the board and to Tamara and Council for their efforts in meeting the deadline for the submission of the petition.

Table Old Business – Due to the late hour (11:15 PM), the chair stated that unless there was anything critical to discuss under old business he would entertain a motion to table all other old business until the next meeting. There was no objection and a motion was made by Councilwoman Alls-Moffat, seconded by the mayor and passed unanimously to table all old business.

NEW BUSINESS

Vouchers and Invoices:

1. 12/1/05, Tamara Lee, \$913.75, for third round COAH certification work in November.
2. 12/1/05, Tamara Lee, \$977.50, for work on the Brandenburger/Sheridan application in November (PAID FROM ESCROW).
3. 12/5/05, Raymond and Coleman, \$600.00, for general business advice, COAH matters, and meeting attendance at the November special and regular meetings.
4. 12/5/05, Raymond and Coleman, \$833.00, for work on the Brandenburger/Sheridan application in November (PAID FROM ESCROW).

A motion was made by Suzanne Wells, seconded by Councilwoman Alls-Moffat, and passed unanimously to pay the items as presented. The secretary will have them signed and submitted for payment.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The meeting was opened to public comment.

- Eric Saia, 401 Martha's Lane, asked if the Reexamination of the Master Plan was still ongoing. The answer was yes; however, nothing new has occurred due to concentration on the COAH petition. The subcommittee is aware that Mr. Saia has volunteered to work on the subcommittee and will contact him when the subcommittee resumes its work.

There was no further comment and the meeting was closed to public comment.

MOTION TO GO TO CLOSED SESSION

At 11:20 PM, the mayor made a motion that the board enter closed session under Section 8 of the Open Public Meetings Act, C231, P.L.1975 to discuss professional contractual issues. The motion was seconded by Bob Smyth and a voice vote was unanimous. At 11:30 PM Councilwoman Alls-Moffat motioned to return to public session. Suzanne Wells seconded the motion and a voice vote was unanimous.

Meeting adjourned at 11:30 PM.

Next meeting:

- **Regular Meeting is on 1/17/2006 at 7:00 pm in the Borough Hall. This is also the annual reorganization meeting.**

Tape is on file.

**Kenny C. Palmer, Jr., Secretary
RIVERTON PLANNING BOARD**