

**RIVERTON BOROUGH PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES
March 15, 2005**

The Public Session of the Planning Board was called to order at 7:05 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, Birnist O'Reilly, Donna Tyson, Christopher Halt, Mayor Martin, Councilwoman Alls-Moffat, Anthony Dydek, Robert Smyth, and Joseph Katella.

Also Present: Solicitor Tom Coleman, Planner Tamara Lee, Engineer Mark Malinowski, and Secretary Ken Palmer

ABSENT: None.

MINUTES: A motion was made by Councilwoman Alls-Moffat and seconded by Robert Smyth to adopt the minutes of the February 15, 2005, regular meeting as distributed. The vote was unanimous. A motion was made by Councilwoman Alls-Moffat and seconded by Birnie O'Reilly to adopt the minutes of the February 15, 2005, executive session as distributed. The vote was unanimous with Donna and the mayor abstaining.

CORRESPONDENCE/ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. **3/2/2005, revised plans and reports for the Moccia site plan application from the applicant's engineer – copies mailed to everyone 3/2/2005.**
2. **3/14/2005, response/review from board engineer of revised materials for the Moccia site plan application – copies provided to the members.**
3. **3/15/2005, copy of letter plus a subsequent correction letter to Tom Coleman from Michael Heine regarding the Moccia matter and board actions.**
4. **Three vouchers/invoices as presented under New Business.**

PUBLIC HEARING:

APPLICATION FOR SITE PLAN APPROVAL OF A PARKING AREA PAVED AND EXPANDED AT 300 BROAD STREET, BLOCK 801, LOT 13, BY MOCCIA PROPERTIES, LLC, 530 MAIN STREET, RIVERTON, NJ:

Testimony continued – The chair introduced the applicant's attorney Mr. Cureton and asked if they were ready to proceed. The secretary reviewed for the record that Birnie O'Reilly and Joe Katella had listened to the tapes of the previous portion of the hearing and attested to same. Tom Coleman stated that as such both could participate in the matter. The mayor recused himself from the matter and stepped down for the duration. Mr. Cureton started his presentation. The applicant who had previously testified was not present and had been informed by Mr. Cureton that since this portion was related to the satisfaction of professionally related conditions did not need to be present since no additional testimony by him was planned. Chris Halt asked if he could bring up an issue related to the previous granting of preliminary approval at the December, 2004 hearing. He is concerned due to the mayor's recusal if the prior approval should be rescinded. Asked by the chair, Chris made a motion that the board rescind the preliminary approval granted by the board. Tom Coleman explained that such action would require the applicant to reestablish their entire testimony to get preliminary and final site plan approval. Further, Tom feels the time limit of 45 days since date of publication in January to take action against the prior approval has expired and cautioned that this action may give cause to the applicant to expose the board to litigation. However, the decision is his to make the motion. Muriel regrettably seconded the motion due to the climate surrounding the matter. There was discussion as to the impact of rescinding the approval. Mr. Coleman stated the applicant has established the preliminary approval which arguably at this point cannot be challenged. Tom

referenced Michael Heine's letters to him and Council, but still feels that the 45 day right of challenge has expired and the action being discussed could potentially result in removal of what is now an unappealable approval. Donna asked if the preliminary approval was improper since a member voting on that approval has now recused himself from the matter. Donna asked if Bob Smyth had also reconsidered and he replied he was reserving his decision until he heard additional testimony on the matter. Tom asked Donna if she was going to participate given her relationship to Mr. Heine. Donna replied that she would recuse only if case law supported that decision. Tom replied that as with the other members, it is her decision based on her conviction as to whether she has a conflict. Donna stated she would not recuse. Tom reminded her as he had others that the decision to participate potentially jeopardizes the vote of the board as well as applicant's approval or denial. There was discussion that at this stage litigation has only been threatened not initiated. Muriel is concerned about how can the board proceed if it appears that the board has to do things Mr. Heine's way or he will sue. Bob Smyth stated that you can't let intimidation stop you from doing your job. Donna feels a vote to rescind wipes the slate clean, removes any cloud over the approval and allows the board to proceed. After additional discussion, Tom asked Mr. Cureton for his feeling on the matter. Jerry feels the 45 day period to appeal the approval has expired. He does not feel a conflict of interest exists. He feels the board cannot arbitrarily take the approval away without infringing on the applicant's rights and he will stand on those rights. Mr. Cureton wishes to proceed. The chair asked if there was a motion to end discussion. Birnie feels the applicant has no right to offer an opinion on what she feels is strictly a board procedural matter and there is nothing to say that the board can't rescind the prior approval and then go onto resolve the entire matter tonight. Tom that the applicant has a right to comment on matters that directly effect the application and he also stated that since there is no guarantee that Bob Smyth or Donna Tyson will step down, the cloud as Birnie calls it still remains. Frank feels the period to appeal or reconsider the approval has expired. Tom stated that anyone can challenge a decision of the board within 45 days after publication of the decision or the time can be expanded in the interest of justice. Frank again asked if there was a motion end discussion and act on the motion. Donna asked if a member has recused his- or herself from further participation what does that do to actions previously taken when the member participated. Tom stated it potentially exposes the board just the same as if she or any other member participates who if, in the future, is found to have had a conflict. Muriel at this point withdrew her second of the motion to rescind since she is not sure she can proceed with all the confusion over the matter. Donna started to make a new motion; but, when informed that Chris' motion to rescind the prior approval was still on the floor, instead seconded Chris' motion. Tom clarified that Bob Smyth as first alternate was eligible to vote, but if he recuses, then Joe Katella becomes eligible as second alternate. Tom asked if Mr. Smyth wished to recuse himself. Mr. Smyth stated he abstained. Tom informed him that an abstention is treated with the majority and asked if he was participating to which Bob stated he was. A poll vote was called with aye a vote to rescind and nay a vote to let the preliminary approval stand. A poll vote of the members initially approved the call to rescind the prior approval by a vote of three ayes, two nays, and two abstains as follows:

Mr. Siefert – nay	Mrs. O'Reilly – aye
Mrs. Tyson – aye	Mr. Halt – aye
Councilwoman Alls-Moffat – abstain	Mr. Dydek – nay
Mr. Smyth – abstain	

Mr. Cureton stated he felt there was confusion over the effect of a member abstaining. Tom replied that members of the board have an affirmative obligation to vote on issues unless they have a conflict of interest. Therefore if a member abstains, case law has established that the abstention is treated as agreeing with the majority decision. When discussed, the members who abstained stated they were confused as to what their action implied. Mr. Cureton asked if the board would consider a revote. Asked what the procedure is, Tom stated that if it wishes, the board needs to motion to rescind the last vote and if approved then start over. Birnie motioned to rescind the prior vote on rescinding the approval which was seconded by Muriel and passed unanimously. Chris Halt remade his motion to rescind the previous preliminary approval and it was seconded by Birnie. There was no further discussion and after making sure the members fully understood the results of their actions, a poll vote was called with aye a vote to rescind the preliminary approval and nay a vote to let the approval stand. A poll vote of the members defeated the motion to rescind the approval by a vote of four nays and three ayes as follows:

Mr. Siefert – nay
Mrs. Tyson – aye
Councilwoman Alls-Moffat – nay
Mr. Smyth – nay

Mrs. O'Reilly – aye
Mr. Halt – aye
Mr. Dydek – nay

Mr. Cureton was asked to resume his presentation. He reviewed that at the end of the prior hearing the applicant was left with several matters to resolve before a final approval could be considered. Mr. Ott, the applicant's engineer was re-sworn. Mr. Ott introduced new exhibits:

B-1 New topographical survey
B-2 Revised Site Plan
B-2 Zoning schedule which will be added to the plan

He testified that:

- A new survey has been prepared and submitted.
- The handicapped space has been moved back from the sidewalk vicinity and a space has been removed to make room for that adjustment.
- Landscaping has been provided for and added to the plan.
- The lighting survey was done and the site found wanting. Plans have been made to install additional site lighting using the garage and a neighboring building owned by the applicant to mount the fixtures.
- The zoning schedule was omitted from the site plan by accident and will be added per the exhibit provided if approved.

Mark Malinowski began his review by stating the zoning schedule submitted was satisfactory. Asked if the stall size should be on the schedule it was answered that that is a design issue and a waiver was granted at the prior hearing. As to concerns of mounting lighting on a building adjacent to the site, the applicant's engineer stated, if the board concurred, he would have the applicant enter a lease agreement with PSE&G to hang a light on the utility pole that is at the edge of the site. Concerning details of the traffic markings on the pavement, Mr. Ott stated that they would be provided. Concerning placement of any traffic signs, Mr. Cureton stated the applicant would ensure that any signs required would meet all approvals and requirements. As to the concern that any reserved signs be placed at the correct height, it was agreed they would be. Donna asked if any signs concerning the use of the property needed ARC approval. Such signs have not been discussed and are not a part of this application. Donna stated she wants all signs to be properly reviewed. Since no commercial space is proposed, the notation should be removed from the parking schedule. Mr. Ott agreed. Mr. Cureton stated that all reviews and approvals would be obtained as required by the Borough. The contoured grading plan has been provided as required. Concerning the written agreement for professional review and inspections, the applicant's professionals stated that was not a problem. A waiver for a performance bond was again requested. It was stated that the bond assured the improvements were done and if not the Borough could have them done using the bond proceeds. Asked if there was any method of guaranteeing the shrubbery would be maintained as part of this matter, it was stated that was beyond this application. The zoning schedule's area and bulk requirements will be added to the plan as discussed earlier. The stormwater runoff calculations were discussed. The figures supplied were based on a 100 year storm and the calculations were determined to be within acceptable limits. Asked how the developed figures compared to what they would be if the parking lot was still gravel, Mr. Ott supplied calculations based on no parking area at all and stated that instead of using the accepted limits he used even more conservative figures. The differences were deemed within acceptable limits by the engineers. Birnie wondered if the board should be concerned about the effects of any snow remediation efforts such as salt on the landscaping. While it was discussed that it is up to property owner to maintain the shrubbery, it is somewhat beyond the scope of the hearing. There was discussion that the planned species was known to be hardy; however, Mr. Ott stated he would check with landscape professionals in his firm. Concerning using the county inlet to capture excess runoff, Mr. Ott stated he doubted that the county would permit it and that is why he used the conservative calculations to show it should not be necessary. Mark concurred that the calculations supplied indicated that there should not be a problem. It was decided that the inlet issue should only be pursued if problems do arise. The applicant has submitted for county review and approval but has not heard anything yet. Maintenance of the public sidewalks

along the site is responsibility of the owner as is the same with all properties in the town. Birnie asked questions about where the spaces near the garage would be and feels that the spaces need to be properly marked to ensure that only the approved spaces be used. It was agreed the plan would indicate the markings and the lot would be stripped as appropriate. There being no further questions from the board or testimony, the chair indicated he would open the matter to the public.

Public Comment – The hearing was opened to public comment:

- Gene Bandine, 522B Main Street, noted the Borough's tree contractor would be trimming the trees near the site and that should improve lighting. He doesn't feel there are any lighting problems. He feels any runoff problems are not from the site but from Broad Street and Church Lane. He has not seen any problems in the lot. He feels the planned choice for the landscaping is a good choice.
- Charles Caruso, 412 Lippincott Avenue, appreciates the board's diligence but notes that parking is sorely needed.
- Michael Heine, 206 Carriage House Lane, questioned if asphalt had not been used is the paving that has been done the preferred way to improve the lot. Mark replied that most parking areas are hard paved and that asphalt is a good durable way to provide a paved surface. Mark feels the applicant has properly addressed the runoff concerns based on the state's new requirements. As to alternative materials, that is up to the applicant as long as they are suitable. Michael feels the assessment from a landscape architect should be supplied before the board considers any approval. Mark replied that there are no specific requirements by ordinance. He has stated he will review what is supplied by Mr. Ott's landscaping professionals. Mark stated that any approvals can be conditioned on such review being completed. As to his letters, Michael stated they were not directed to this application but rather addressed conduct by the board in general concerning conflicts of interest. He feels that the mayor having recused himself is a positive point but feels it is most unfortunate that Bob Smyth continues to sit on the matter.
- Mary Anne Shea, Bank Avenue, thinks paving is better than gravel as far as maintenance, safety, etc. Plus you cannot easily plow gravel and there is also a dust issue with gravel and stone.
- Phyllis Rogers, 405 Lippincott Avenue, feels the lot is a significant improvement and the town should thank Mr. Moccia for his efforts.
- Frank Ciocci, 408 Lippincott Avenue, feels the lot is needed. If the proper procedure had been followed perhaps there would not have been all the problems that have occurred. He wondered why Riverton was not included in the articles concerning the river front towns that had recently appeared in the paper.
- Bill Koltonic, 404 Lippincott Avenue, feels the lot is a plus for the town. He feels the town should do all it can to free up area for parking in town.

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

Deliberation and Vote – The chair asked if there were additional comment by the board. Chris Halt feels the lot itself is good. It is the process that was the problem. He feels the prior approval is also questionable. Bob Smyth feels the lot is a good thing and that the end process is good. The way it was started was wrong and it is right that the applicant has been made to follow the proper procedure. Donna Tyson agrees with the comments made and feels the applicant should have followed the proper process from the start and not caused the ill feelings and wasted time that has resulted from having to go back and work through the process after the fact. There is no excuse for either not knowing the proper procedure or at least inquiring before major improvements are made. Birnie also concurred with the prior comments and feels that it is unfortunate that because the proper process wasn't followed from the beginning that the process has become one filled with contention and bad feelings. She feels enforcement was lax and that Mr. Moccia should have been fined. She doesn't want there to be a feeling among people that it is okay to do the wrong thing and then seek forgiveness, but that people should know there is a process to be followed and consequences for not following process. Muriel stated she had been the first to call attention to the problem and pleaded that the proper process be followed. Birnie raised concerns about existing signs. It was mentioned that that there were no signs there. It was stated that all procedures will be followed. The chair stated it has been a painful process and that the applicant has not gotten away with anything. In fact it has been a long and expensive process for him and in the end a good process that has assured it is being done correctly. Donna again raised the issue concerning signage and Mr. Cureton stated he would ensure that his client follows all the proper procedures. The chair asked Tom if it was appropriate to call for an up or down vote at this time and there was discussion as to the format of the motion. Tom advised the board that a motion to grant final

approval was appropriate and that it was also appropriate to lay out conditions surrounding the approval. With guidance by Tom and Mark the board arrived at a motion.

A motion was made by Muriel Alls-Moffett and seconded by Tony Dydeck to grant final site plan approval for the parking lot project located at 300 Broad Street subject to certain conditions. The conditions associated with the final site plan approval are as follows:

- a. The "stop" and "do not enter" signs will be relocated;
- b. An existing flood light will be relocated off of the existing building to a pole to be erected or leased from PSE&G;
- c. The landscaping plan is approved, however, the same is subject to an approval from the planning board's engineer's office as to the species of the shrubs and trees to be utilized within the landscape plan;
- d. The applicant will enter into a professional review and inspection agreement with the planning board's engineer;
- e. A performance bond in an amount to be determined by the planning board's engineer, will be required to be delivered by the applicant to insure that all on-site improvements to be constructed by the applicant are completed;
- f. The area and bulk requirements for the applicant's lot as the same apply to the particular improvements undertaken by the applicant will be shown on the final plan;
- g. Specific details of the handicapped pavement marking will be provided on the final plan;
- h. The applicant will eliminate one parking spot from the final plan;
- i. Striping will be added to the pavement, in front of the garage so that there is a clear designation that no parking is permitted in this area; and
- j. The applicant's approval from the Riverton Planning Board will be subject to the Burlington County Planning Board approval and any other state or county agency or authority.

A poll vote was called with aye signifying approval and nay denial of approval. The result was unanimous approval of seven ayes as follows:

Mr. Siefert – aye	Mrs. O’Reilly – aye
Mrs. Tyson – aye	Mr. Halt – aye
Councilwoman Alls-Moffat – aye	Mr. Dydek – aye
Mr. Smyth – aye	

Following a five minute recess, the mayor rejoined the board and the meeting continued with old business.

OLD BUSINESS

Presentation on the Master Plan – While waiting for the applicants to arrive for the continuation of the application hearing before the board, the chair stated he would move forward to the discussion of the master plan on the agenda. The chair reviewed that the master plan must be reviewed. This involves a straight forward reexamination or can include a major revision. The effort and budget involved for the two options are vastly different. He had requested Board Planner Tamara Lee to prepare and make a presentation to the board. The chair introduced Tamara. Tamara explained that the master plan forms the foundation of the town’s land use ordinances and the decisions made by the planning and zoning boards. State law requires that the master plan needs to be reexamined every six years to make sure the ordinances are in keeping with appropriate planning policy. Unlike other requirements such as COAH’s, the six year requirement is not as unforgiving and it is more important that the reexamination be done correctly rather than quickly. Given that during the last review the plan was completely rewritten and the ordinances revised accordingly, it is not as if the town has totally ignored the process and the danger of being sued by a developer is probably minor. There are two basic options. One is a simple reexamination and re-adoption of the current plan with documentation updated as required. The board can also decide that a complete rewrite is needed. There are various steps in between these two decisions that are also appropriate. Given the comprehensive nature of the review and changes during the last review, Tamara feels a reexamination of the current plan is probably sufficient. However, that is up to the board to decide. Tamara stated she was not there nor is it appropriate for her to tell the board what it should do. She is there to help facilitate the process, provide professional guidance along the way and to help assure the finished product will

satisfy the legal requirements and conform to the goals and objectives of the plan. Under reexamination, each of the goals and objectives need to be reviewed to determine whether they are still applicable or should be revised or new ones added. Have things changed legally or otherwise that dictate revisions to the plan? There have been major changes to the COAH regulations that should probably mean a change in local planning policy. Changes in demographics, business or economic realities, and even the mindset of the community all can determine whether or not revisions are needed. Redevelopment potential and plans can also impact the plan. Tamara feels the housing element definitely need to be looked at because of the COAH changes. Ideas for the general business zone and redevelopment zone may indicate a need for revision of the plan. In each section, the planning recommendations need to be reviewed for appropriateness. In the land use element the makeup and uses of each zoning area needs to be reviewed for possible changes. Changes are made by amendments to the various sections. A reexamination report can be satisfied by recognizing that there are specific areas needing review and establishing a definitive plan to complete that process. If a dialog has already been established and a consensus is close on the direction to be pursued, it is also possible to adopt a reexamination report with amendments to the plan included. Again, this is up to the board and the town to decide. Tamara stated that there is a lot that can be done without professional involvement which will save money without jeopardising the process or plan. Tamara stated that if the housing element could be amended as part of the reexamination process it would go far to complete the work needed for COAH recertification which comes up next year. Having the housing plan element done would leave the Fair Share review and revisions. Tamara explained that the master plan belongs to the board. What it develops is the plan. However this does not and definitely should not occur in a vacuum. The results of the board's efforts should represent a meeting of the minds as to what is best for the town. That is why there is a hearing process involved when the report with or with out amendments is prepared and ready to be considered. Before that, it is recommended that the board undertake whatever processes are needed such as joint meetings, surveys, or similar methods to gather opinions and develop a course of action. A comprehensive schedule is needed and the time frame is tight; so it behooves the board to get the process moving as soon as possible. Tamara felt that a joint meeting with Council might be the best method for the board and Council to come to a consensus. If nothing more, a consensus is needed concerning the revised rehabilitation requirements of COAH and the possibly changed feelings about redevelopment of the general business district. The board discussed with Tamara how best to proceed with a joint meeting and the requirements for same. It was agreed that hopefully following next month's Council sessions and the board's next meeting a special meeting devoted to just the topic of the master plan can be held as quickly as possible so the board could begin the process needed to complete the reexamination. The need for or possibility of conducting a survey similar to that done during the last review was discussed. Tamara stated that what was needed first and foremost was to develop a realistic schedule and have the ability to show that the board is moving forward with due diligence towards its goals. That should prevent unnecessary challenges to the plan. The chair asked if there could be assistance in developing a task list and Tamara stated she would include that in her scope of work. It was determined and agreed to that the chair would agree to act as the point person to work with Tamara. It was discussed that perhaps a Monday meeting would be best. Council will try and have a selection of dates available for the board to consider at its next meeting. Tamara stated she would be happy to prepare a proposal based on her presentation and to have it available before Council's next meeting so that it can be discussed at the board's next meeting. Hopefully, decisions on how things will proceed can be decided. Asked if she could work within the discussed \$3,000.00 budget target, Tamara stated she thinks the reexamination report is definitely doable. As to any major amendment work, she needs to consider that and get back to the board. Concerning COAH, Birnie asked Tamara if she kept the Borough in mind when she attended COAH related meetings. Tamara stated she has always attempted to keep the Borough informed and has approached Council whenever she thought possible action was needed.

Goals and Objectives for 2005 – The chair reviewed that he had prepared and distributed a revised list and asked that the members look it over and be prepared to discuss them at next month's meeting.

Environmental Commission – Chris Halt reported that he did not believe Council had taken any action on the commission’s proposed revised stream setback requirements. He will be attending the stormwater management group meeting at Palmyra Cove on the 16th.

Redevelopment – Councilwoman Alls-Moffat stated that the previously reported interest by Kaplan and/or Mr. Brandenburger in the Nu-Way property has not proved to be a real issue. The mayor reported that Kaplan has been trying to meet with Council and may be looking into purchasing the Nu-Way and National Casein properties. Bob Smyth remarked that Kaplan is a major developer and has been looking to make possible acquisitions on both sides of his Cinnaminson site. He is looking in Riverside and Riverton.

Fence Ordinance Revision – Donna reported that a draft has been completed and is being reviewed by the attorney. The secretary reviewed that at the last zoning board meeting, Kerry Brandt chair of the committee had stated he wanted the zoning board members to give a preliminary review since the primary purpose of the revision is to hopefully reduce the number of fence issues that come before the board.

New Development in Cinnaminson Township – Impact on Riverton – Donna Tyson reported that she has spoken with Rick Arango for an update. He reported that the Cinnaminson Planning Board is waiting for revisions to phase II and phase III to be submitted. The commercial construction on the former Centron Coatings site is underway. Bob Smyth reported that he is reviewing the traffic study and will report to the board. There is concern among the board that the town can exercise proper control over any major redevelopment plans by major developers. It was mentioned that the draft redevelopment plan did contain design criteria. However if the plan is not on the books then it falls to the current ordinances and the master plan. These issues need to be part and parcel to the master plan review. It was mentioned that any joint meetings also include zoning. Donna stated the negotiations over the Post Office should be part of any consideration and perhaps be part of any future negotiations with Kaplan or any other developers interested in the properties in Riverton. The impact of COAH also needs to be kept in mind when consideration is made on commercial vs. residential use. The new COAH requirements now tie together commercial and residential development requirements. The entire issue of types of ratables, mixed use development, trade offs with developers has been and will continue to be a major issue. The board and Council need to continue look to all possible means to make the best of the situation and to assure that the best results for the town are obtained.

NEW BUSINESS

Vouchers and Invoices:

1. 3/15/05, Kenny Palmer, \$20.00, for creating duplicates of the 12/21/04 meeting tapes.
2. 2/28/2005, Lord Worrel & Richter, Mark Malinowski, \$1,437.50, for work on the Moccia application, 11/3/04-12/17/04. To be paid from escrow.
3. 2/28/2005, Lord Worrel & Richter, Mark Malinowski, \$150.00, for meeting attendance 12/21/04 for the Moccia application hearing. To be paid from escrow.

Donna wished to know if the escrow accounts were current and the secretary replied that they were prior to the new submissions. A motion was made by Birnie O’Reilly and seconded Councilwoman Alls-Moffat to pay the items as presented. Payment was approved unanimously. The secretary will have them signed and submitted.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The meeting was opened to public comment.

- William Harris, Cinnaminson Street, mentioned that the site of the former Lippincott Boat Works is for sale in Cinnaminson Township across the creek from the Borough.
- Anthony Fratto, 205 Fulton Street, spoke about Palmyra’s redevelopment efforts in Palmyra and the grant program efforts in the town including the streetscape improvements. He serves on committees in Palmyra and encouraged the board members to perhaps seek out and become familiar with how things are progressing. It was mentioned that Riverton does not yet have a redevelopment plan in place.

- James Moffat, 202 Fulton Street, was surprised that when a member abstains that it is not considered as a straight forward non-vote but is instead considered as if the member agreed the majority result. He also wished Bill Harris a happy birthday.

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

Meeting adjourned at 10:23 PM.

Next meeting is on 4/19/2005 at 7:00 PM in the Borough Hall

Tape is on file.

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