

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

**PENNINGTON BOROUGH  
REGULAR & REORGANIZATION PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
MARCH 10, 2010**

Chairman Thompson called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. and compliance with the provisions of the Open Public Meetings Act was announced.

Board Members Present: Mark Blackwell, Jeanne Donlon, Eileen Heinzl, William B. Meytrott, Katherine O'Neill, James Reilly, William Reuter, Winn Thompson, Josh M. Levy, Alternate #1, Thomas Ogren, Mayor's Designee, (Alternate #2 - Vacant).

Absent: Mayor Anthony J. Persichilli

Also Present: Cindy Coppola, Borough Planner; Edwin W. Schmierer, Borough Attorney, Mason, Griffin & Pierson; John Flemming, Zoning Officer, Mary W. Mistretta, Planning Board Secretary. Absent: Kent Scully, Acting Borough Engineer

**OATH OF OFFICE** – Taking the Oath of Office were: Mark Blackwell, Class IV, January 1, 2010 – December 31, 2013. Also taking the Oath of Officer were: Thomas Ogren, Class I, Mayor's Designee, William B. Meytrott - Class II, Eileen Heinzl, Council Representative - Class III all for the term January 1 – December 31, 2010.

Winn Thompson was appointed Chairman and Jeanne Donlon Vice Chairman. Edwin W. Schmierer and Kevin A. Van Hise of Mason, Griffin Pierson were appointed Planning Board Attorneys.

Cindy Coppola of Coppola & Coppola Associates was appointed Planning Board Planner.

The Application Review Committee was appointed and the following will continue on the committee: Jeanne Donlon, Kate O'Neill, James Reilly, John Flemming, Mary Mistretta with Mark Blackwell as an alternate.

Mary W. Mistretta was reappointed Planning Board Secretary.

The following meeting dates were approved. All the dates are the second Wednesday of the month and are to be held in the Municipal Building at 7:30 p.m. unless otherwise noticed: February 10, March 10, April 14, May 12, June 9, July 14, August 11, September 8, October 13, November 10, December 8, January 12, 2011.

The Hopewell Valley News was designated the official weekly publication and The Times of Trenton was designated as the official daily newspaper to be used only when through no fault of the applicant or the Board, it was not possible to publish Legal Notice in the Hopewell Valley News and it is a timing issue.

**OPEN TIME FOR PUBLIC ADDRESS** – Mr. Thompson asked if there was anything that the public would like to address that was not on the agenda. There being no comments, the public session was closed.

1 **APPLICATIONS**

2  
3 **Laura Huntsman & Stephen LeMenager**, Block 205, Lot 14, 40 North Main Street, Town  
4 Center Buffer Zone. Variance Application P10-002

5  
6 Mr. Thompson announced that the applicants had requested to be heard at the April 14<sup>th</sup>  
7 meeting in order to make adjustments to their plans. Mr. Schmierer announced that Proof of  
8 Publication and Proof of Notice were in order and that the Board could take jurisdiction. The  
9 Board took jurisdiction and agreed to continue the application to the April 14<sup>th</sup> meeting and  
10 no further noticing would be necessary.

11  
12 **Stephen & Kathleen Mahle**, Block 403, Lot 36, 151 East Delaware Avenue, R-100 Zone,  
13 Variance Application P10-001

14  
15 Mr. Schmierer announced that Proof of Publication and Proof of Notice were in order and  
16 the Board could take jurisdiction. The applicant is requesting bulk variances to construct  
17 roofs with dormers and windows over the existing house and garage. The variances being  
18 requested are for the combined side yards and maximum slope ratio to allow the height of  
19 the existing dwelling to be raised an additional five (5') feet. The proposed construction  
20 would raise the height of the existing dwelling from 28 feet to 33 feet which is beneath the  
21 permitted height of 35 feet.

22  
23 Mr. Stephen Mahle was sworn in. Mr. Mahle explained that he would like to construct a new  
24 gabled roof across the house which would include dormer windows to eliminate a flat roof on  
25 a small 2-story addition. The flat roof is not consistent with the architectural style of the  
26 neighborhood and it is now leaking and has also become a structural problem. Mr. Mahle  
27 described the project and the variances being requested. Entered into evidence was Exhibit  
28 A-1 Board showing the existing and proposed front elevations. He noted that the existing  
29 dwelling does not conform to the slope or the required combined side yards and the  
30 proposed construction will not increase the existing nonconformity. Mr. Mahle next  
31 addressed the issues in the Coppola & Coppola Associates review of January 26, 2010. He  
32 stated that the attic area will only be used for storage space. There is air conditioning  
33 equipment and duct work in the attic that would make it cost prohibitive to move and the attic  
34 can only be accessed by a small hatch that exists in the closet. The dormer windows have  
35 been added for aesthetic reasons. The new space above the garage will only be used for  
36 storage and will only have access by a pull-down ladder in the garage. Mr. Mahle stated that  
37 there is no land available for purchase on either side of the house to help meet the  
38 combined side setbacks and slope ratio requirements. Mr. Mahle stated that in reference to  
39 the negative criteria, there is substantial vegetation on all sides of the property that provides  
40 screening to the neighboring properties, although he feels that the proposed work will  
41 improve the house. Entered into evidence was Exhibit A-2 Pictures on a board showing  
42 screening and neighboring homes. Mr. Mahle pointed out Colonial homes in the area with  
43 gabled roofs that are higher than what he is proposing. In response to a question regarding  
44 drainage, he stated that the horizontal line of the roof and the gutters will remain the same  
45 as the existing and there will be no additional stormwater runoff.

46  
47 Ms. Donlon asked about the siding and Mr. Mahle responded that they will keep the existing  
48 cedar shingles on the house and the garage. Mr. Reuter inquired about a window being  
49 removed on the west side of the house and if it was going to be used as an access to the  
50 garage. Mr. Mahle responded that it was not being removed, but would be moved forward to  
51 the front of the house. Mr. Thompson had questions regarding the attic. Mr. Robert Meier,

1 applicant's builder, was sworn in. Mr. Meier testified that they would be providing collar ties  
2 in the attic approximately two thirds down from the ridge and this would eliminate any  
3 volume of space underneath the ridge. Ms. Coppola stated that the applicant had addressed  
4 the concerns in their review memo and she felt that they have met the positive and negative  
5 criteria. Ms. Coppola stated that if the Board chose to use Ordinance 215-50B, the required  
6 combined side yard setback would be 31.5 ft. where 30.18 ft. is provided. Ms. Coppola  
7 stated that they reviewed the layouts of the adjoining properties and the construction should  
8 not have any impact on the light and air of the adjacent houses. Mr. John Flemming, Zoning  
9 Officer, was sworn in and requested that the Board not condition the use of the space above  
10 the garage. He stated that it would be impossible to enforce and because it is a two-story  
11 building he does not see any issue in the space being used as habitable space.  
12

13 Mr. Thompson asked if there was anyone in the public who had questions or comments  
14 regarding the application, there being none the public portion of the hearing was closed.  
15 Ms. Donlon stated that she had no objection to Mr. Flemming's suggestion regarding the  
16 space above the garage.  
17

18 Ms. O'Neill made a motion, seconded by Ms. Donlon to approve the application. Voting yes:  
19 Blackwell, Donlon, Heinzl, Meytrott, O'Neill, Ogren, Reilly, Reuter, Thompson; Not voting:  
20 Levy; Absent: Persichilli. The hearing ended at 8:10 p.m.  
21

22 **PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED AMENDED HISTORIC PRESERVATION ELEMENT –**  
23 **MASTER PLAN DOCUMENT**  
24

25 Mr. Eric Holtermann stated that since the Board is already familiar with the Element, he  
26 would go over the high points and the changes that have been made from previous  
27 discussions. The Historic Preservation Element is an update to the existing Element and is a  
28 series of recommendations for Ordinances. He stated that what is proposed is consistent  
29 with the existing Element, but expands the existing recommendations and changes the  
30 historic district limiting it to the crossroad area of Main Street and Delaware Avenue. He  
31 stated that demolitions and limiting changes in the historic district was one of the main  
32 reasons to consider a historic preservation ordinance and district. Hopewell Township,  
33 Hopewell Borough, Lambertville, Lawrenceville and Princeton all have historic preservation  
34 ordinances and there have been substantial benefits. The recommendation in the Element is  
35 to have an ordinance that names a commission and the historic district and that it complies  
36 with CLG (Certified Local Government) Guidelines. Compliance with CLG guidelines means  
37 that the commission would be eligible for certain types of grant funding. It also means that  
38 the commission would not be an open lenient kind of advisory commission. The commission  
39 would issue a certificate of appropriateness which the applicant would need to obtain a  
40 construction permit. If the applicant wants to appeal the certificate they would have to go to  
41 the Planning Board. Part of the recommendation is that the Ordinance would be limited to  
42 only the portions of buildings that are visible from the street within the proposed Historic  
43 Preservation District. There would be no requirements related to the color of buildings and it  
44 would not be a maintenance ordinance. The application to the historic commission would  
45 only be required when changes are proposed and there would never be a case when the  
46 commission would go out and tell someone that they needed to make a change.  
47

48 Mr. Holtermann pointed out that the updated district is limited to the crossroads area of Main  
49 Street and Delaware Avenue with the exception of several churches that are also included.  
50 He explained that the area is much smaller than the proposed 1987 district, but it gives  
51 protection to the most significant architectural and character defining features of the town.

1 Another recommendation is that as part of the Ordinance, properties within the district would  
2 be classified as key contributing and non-contributing. Non-contributing properties that have  
3 been built within the district need not be subject to the level of review as more historically  
4 important buildings. Another proposal is that the commission would offer advice and  
5 assistance to applicants prior to making applications.

6  
7 Mr. Holtermann stated that to date they have presented the Element to Council and the  
8 Pennington Professional Business Association and have had meetings with the public. He  
9 stated that changes to the Element have come from the various meetings. If it is adopted by  
10 the Board tonight, the next step would be for the task force to continue or a group would  
11 need to be formed to write the ordinance. The recommendation of the Element is that the  
12 ordinance includes specifics about the commission and the district. They would need a  
13 survey of the historic properties, guidelines and would require the assistance of an attorney.  
14

15 Mr. Holtermann stated that once the ordinance was written it would be given to Borough  
16 Council for a public hearing. If adopted by Borough Council a commission and district would  
17 be formed.  
18

19 Mr. Mark Blackwell asked what the costs would be from this point forward and Mr.  
20 Holtermann responded that given what he has heard from other municipalities, it would be a  
21 few thousand dollars. They have a committed group that helped write the Element which  
22 saved consultant fees and will do other work which will help defray the costs. Mr. Blackwell  
23 also had questions regarding the regulatory role of the commission. Mr. Holtermann  
24 explained that it would be regulatory, but the homeowner would be able to go to the  
25 Planning Board and not have to go to court to make an appeal if they were refused a  
26 certificate of appropriateness. If the Planning Board then the request the appeal would then  
27 have to go to court. Ms. Donlon asked what type of regulatory Mr. Mark Blackwell stated that  
28 Hopewell Township has a regulatory system where the appeal must go directly to court. Mr.  
29 Flemming questioned if someone in the historic district wanted to do something that did not  
30 require a zoning or construction permit would they still need a certificate of appropriateness.  
31 It was agreed that they would, but only if it was on the façade that you could see from the  
32 street. Mr. Flemming stated that there would be quite a few things that never needed  
33 permits before, but would now need certificates of appropriateness and he asked who would  
34 be enforcing this. An example given was replacing a front door or window that was the same  
35 size as the existing and would not need permits, but would need a certificate of  
36 appropriateness. Whether a property was contributing or non-contributing they would have  
37 to go to the commission for review. Mr. Holtermann stated that they have discussed turn  
38 around time for an application and it probably would be limited to 30 days. Mr. Blackwell felt  
39 that the review by the commission will be putting an added expense on homeowners. Ms.  
40 Heinzl felt that the people who lived in the district would appreciate receiving guidance on  
41 the type of door or window that should go on their home to help keep the historic  
42 appearance. Mr. Holtermann stated that the ordinance would include guidelines to help  
43 homeowners. Mr. Meytrott asked if the commission in Hopewell Borough was advisory and  
44 how effective it has been. Mr. David Blackwell stated that there have been some issues that  
45 have not been resolved in the way that would preserve the historic character. Ms. Coppola  
46 stated that in Montgomery Township there was a historic district and historic sites. When it  
47 was set up two-thirds of the people who lived in the district had to vote on it and people were  
48 allowed to opt out. She stated that there was an advisory commission for non-residential  
49 development. It is not a requirement to go, but when an application is submitted it is  
50 recommended that they go to the advisory committee and most of the time it is successful  
51 and helpful.

1 Mr. Flemming asked what abuses there have been in the last fifty years that this commission  
2 would have protected. Ms. Coppola responded that the biggest concern is tear downs and  
3 the Borough has had a number of them on Main Street. In some cases it would be cost  
4 prohibitive to repair an existing home and Ms. Coppola felt that the commission would take  
5 that into consideration and would suggest a replacement with a similar historic feel and  
6 would fit in with the adjacent properties. Ms. Coppola stated that one key element with  
7 Pennington is that the historic area has existed for years and is representative of the  
8 character in the heart of the Borough. Mr. Mark Blackwell asked if history wasn't being made  
9 everyday and stated that if you drive down Main Street there have been changes over the  
10 years that have made the present day character of Main Street. Ms. Coppola responded that  
11 it is a policy decision that has to be made, whether the town wants to keep the historic  
12 character or prefer to let things evolve as they happen over time. Ms. Coppola stated that  
13 the specifics would be discussed when the ordinances are being heard at Borough Council.  
14 Mr. Thompson stated that it would be a help to the Board when it comes to tear downs and  
15 significant additions. He also felt that it was important to recognize that there are people with  
16 homes in the historic district that are struggling with maintenance issues.

17  
18 Mr. Ogren stated that this is a revised version of the existing Preservation Plan Element and  
19 is less restrictive than the existing Element. It is solidly based on any historic  
20 preservationist's viewpoint of what is historic in the town and is a good starting point to  
21 proceed with. He stated that a lot of the details that were being discussed would not have to  
22 be decided on tonight as there would be a public hearing when there is an ordinance before  
23 Council. Mr. Ogren questioned the following wording on page 8, "The Historic Preservation  
24 Commission shall have the responsibility." Mr. Holtermann stated that the whole section  
25 came directly from the Municipal Land Use Law. Mr. Ogren did not feel that this was clear  
26 and suggested that a clause be inserted "as recommended by Municipal Land Use Law."  
27 Mr. Ogren stated that he could not vote in favor of the revised Element if it was interpreted  
28 to mean mandatory. Mr. Meytrott stated that he also had concerns about it being considered  
29 mandatory and not advisory. Ms. Heinzl stated that Hopewell Borough has an advisory  
30 Historic Commission, but they still issue a certificate of appropriateness even though it is  
31 not mandatory. There was further discussion whether the Planning Board should endorse  
32 whether the commission should be advisory or mandatory. Ms. Heinzl felt that this was  
33 something that would be decided when the ordinance is written.

34  
35 Mr. Holtermann explained that what is recommended is a method of managing and  
36 reviewing changes in town to see that they are done in an appropriate way. Appropriate  
37 meaning that the history and the character of the town are maintained and does not mean  
38 being forced to copy historic styles. It does not preclude new construction using modern  
39 methodology and making changes to buildings. The houses on Main Street show evidence  
40 of change and that will always be part of it. There have been additions before the Board that  
41 have not exactly matched the style of the house, but have recognized the character of the  
42 house and have been appropriate and this is what they would like to recommend. Mr. Mark  
43 Blackwell stated he agrees with the word "recommend," but he does not agree that the will  
44 of the commission should be forced on people. Ms. Heinzl stated that she felt that the  
45 commission would help homeowners with what is appropriate, but she questioned what  
46 standard the Planning Board would use in determining an appeal. The Board agreed that it  
47 would be helpful to have the certificate of appropriateness with an application and would like  
48 them for renovations, but had issues regarding homeowners who would just be replacing  
49 windows or similar replacements.

50

1 Mr. Thompson asked if there was anyone in the public with comments or questions. Mr.  
2 Schmierer stated that the Board should focus on the Element and if they wish to consider  
3 adding language that might state “to implement this Element of the Master Plan an  
4 ordinance will have to be adopted, before the ordinance is adopted there shall be extensive  
5 discussion with the entire Pennington community to determine if the ordinance should  
6 provide for advisory or regulatory jurisdiction. The Board would not have to make a decision  
7 tonight whether it should be advisory or regulatory, but they could adopt the Historic  
8 Preservation Master Plan Element. The Planning Board or Council could have a work  
9 session for further public input or there would be an opportunity at the hearing for the  
10 ordinances. Mr. Schmierer stated that the Historic Commission in Princeton Township is  
11 advisory and they provide a report for applications that go to the Planning/Zoning Board.  
12 The Board agreed that this was a good suggestion and should be included. Mr. David  
13 Blackwell stated that there is a provision for emergency work and there is also a provision  
14 that the commission can view things as diminimus and skip the review.

15  
16 Mr. Jack Koeppel commended Eric Holtermann for the tremendous effort that he and the  
17 committee have done. He wanted to address several points and one was the financial costs.  
18 He stated that he was a representative of the Hopewell Valley Historical Society and they  
19 support the Historic Element and are willing to help offset some of the costs. Mr. Koeppel  
20 stated that he believes in the rights of individuals, but also feels that it’s important to  
21 consider the greater good of the community in the long run by keeping the historical integrity  
22 of the town. He feels that this process is one of the most important things the Board could  
23 do to keep the character of the town. Mr. Koeppel also feels that the Historic Element will  
24 help keep property values in the town.

25  
26 Ms. Natalie Shivers, 23 E. Delaware Avenue, stated that they bought their house about  
27 three years ago and at that time thought the Pennington had a Historic Preservation  
28 Ordinance. She supports any effort to help preserve the historic character of the town,  
29 although her house is just outside the district.

30  
31 Ms. Donlon made a motion, seconded by Ms. O’Neill to adopt the amended Historic  
32 Preservation Element with the addition of the language Mr. Schmierer suggested (“To  
33 implement this element of the Master Plan, an ordinance will have to be adopted. Before the  
34 ordinance is adopted, there shall be extensive discussion with the entire Pennington  
35 Borough community to determine if the ordinance shall provide for advisory or regulatory  
36 jurisdiction.”). Voting yes: Donlon, Heinzl, Meytrott, O’Neill, Ogren, Reilly, Reuter,  
37 Thompson; Voting no: Blackwell; Absent: Persichilli. (Mr. Levy, Alternate #1 stated for the  
38 record that he was also in support of the Element). The hearing ended at 9:35 p.m.

39  
40 **MEMORIALIZATION OF RESOLUTION**

41  
42 **Emily & James Matticoli**, Block 502, Lot 12, 117 Laning Avenue, R-80 Zone, Bulk  
43 Variances.

44 Mr. Blackwell made a motion, seconded by Mr. Reuter to adopt the resolution. Voting yes:  
45 Blackwell, Donlon, Heinzl, Meytrott, O’Neill, Reilly, Reuter, Thompson, Levy. Absent:  
46 Persichilli; Not voting: Ogren.

47  
48 **WORK SESSION**

49  
50 Priorities for 2010 – The Application Review Committee (ARC) submitted a list of suggested  
51 priorities for the Board to consider. Eliminating the slope ordinance was on the list for

1 consideration. Mr. Flemming had made the suggestion since the Board has never refused  
2 variance approval for the slope ordinance. The Board felt that it was useful in consideration  
3 of applications and made applicants consider the light and air of neighboring houses. It also  
4 gives the neighbors a chance to receive public notice regarding the changes. Mr. Flemming  
5 stated that the problem he had with it was that the majority of homes in the R-80 Zone  
6 already violate it. He also explained that many times applicants come to him with  
7 applications that do not meet the slope ordinance and do not go forward because of the  
8 costs involved with a hearing. After discussion, the Board agreed that they would not  
9 eliminate the ordinance since they felt it was very useful to them in reviewing applications.

10  
11 Ms. Donlon stated that Chapter 215-50, B in the Zoning Ordinance should either be  
12 removed or left as an automatic right. It has been in the Ordinance, but is only used at the  
13 discretion of the Board. Ms. Coppola agreed that an Ordinance could not be discretionary, it  
14 should either be applied or removed. Mr. Thompson suggested that the next step would be  
15 for ARC to prioritize the list and to make specific suggestions.

16  
17 There was discussion regarding the suggestion to eliminate the limitation of 2 ½ -story  
18 houses and allowing a third floor with habitable space. Ms. Coppola had concerns that it  
19 would allow tall, thin houses on smaller lots. Mr. Thompson agreed pointing out that he has  
20 seen some unattractive houses in a nearby municipality where people have tried to get as  
21 much space as possible on the third floor without caring about the integrity of the house.  
22 Another suggestion was to review the “Definitions.” Ms. Coppola felt that a lot of changes  
23 had been made to the list of definitions and she did not feel it was necessary to review them  
24 again unless someone had a specific problem with one.

25  
26 COAH – Ms. Coppola reported on changes that have been made with COAH. The  
27 Governor’s freeze on COAH has been overturned and they are again reviewing  
28 municipalities for substantive certification under Third Round Rules. She stated that Senator  
29 Lesniak introduced the S-1 Bill which has gone through a number of revisions and will go to  
30 the Senate in a few weeks. The bill would essentially eliminate COAH, but not the  
31 obligations for affordable housing. There are four ways a municipality can meet its  
32 affordable housing obligation and be deemed an inclusionary development under the  
33 provisions of the proposed bill. The State Planning Commission would take over COAH’s  
34 position and make the decision whether or not a municipality was an inclusionary  
35 development. The first way is that 33% of the existing housing stock is attached housing or  
36 mobile home housing. The second way is that 7.5% of the existing housing stock is price  
37 restricted, such as low and moderate. The third is that 20% of vacant, developable land  
38 which has existing access to sewer or the capacity to have sewer service easily extended to  
39 the land, is zoned for residential development with at least a 10% set aside for affordable  
40 housing. Pennington Borough has only two inclusionary sites with developable land,  
41 however, they are not entirely residential zones. The last is having received substantive  
42 certification from COAH.

43  
44 Ms. Coppola stated that she had spoken to Pennington’s planner at COAH and she was not  
45 sure where we stood as another planner, Keith Henderson, has been working on  
46 municipalities who have requested an adjustment in the growth share. If the S-1 Bill is  
47 passed municipalities will have to submit verification to the State Planning Commission  
48 within 30 days of the effective date of the act. Municipalities will have to meet one of the four  
49 criteria to be considered an inclusionary municipality. If they determine that a municipality is  
50 not an inclusionary municipality they may be subject to a builder’s remedy law suit and the  
51 municipality would be burdened with the entire legal fees. Ms. Coppola stated that they will

1 try to push along the process for the Borough's substantive certification. The Borough may  
2 have to consider rezoning the two inclusionary sites so that 20% (10% set aside) of the land  
3 is residentially zoned and the Borough should then meet the requirements for an  
4 inclusionary municipality. Ms. Coppola stated that if the Bill does not change it would only  
5 take quick action by Council to change the zoning for the inclusionary sites. Ms. Donlon  
6 asked if the YMCA would be able to go forward if the Capital Health site was rezoned 20%  
7 residential. Ms. Coppola responded that the Y has not done anything to work with the  
8 Borough on zoning changes and as far as the Borough is concerned the zoning for the MU-  
9 3 district remains the same.

10  
11 Zoning Officer's Report – Mr. Flemming stated that Sun Bank would like to move their ATM  
12 machine in the rear of the building. They are not expanding the building and it is a  
13 conforming use and he asked if they would need site plan approval. Mr. Schmierer stated  
14 that it was an exterior change with lights and it should receive site plan approval.

15  
16 Mr. Ogren reported that Council had authorized him to prepare a grant application to submit  
17 to the Association of N.J. Environmental Commission for a Smart Growth Planning Grant for  
18 the landfill. He stated that it is a grant for planning and environmental issues and he would  
19 like to include the Planning Board's support in the grant application. The Planning Board  
20 voted unanimously by voice vote to support the application.

21  
22 **MINUTES** – Mr. Blackwell made a motion, seconded by Ms. O'Neill to approve the  
23 November 12, 2009 Planning Board minutes with corrections, and the minutes were  
24 approved by voice vote.

25  
26 Ms. Heinzl reported that Council introduced the liquor license ordinance and the public  
27 hearing will be in April. If the Ordinance is adopted the next step would be to determine the  
28 terms of the license and the minimum bid. Ms. Donlon asked if anyone investigated how  
29 much a town like Pennington would get for the sale of a liquor license. Ms. Heinzl stated  
30 that the answer was no, but there is interest in the license.

31  
32 Mr. Ogren made a motion, seconded by Mr. Reilly to adjourn the meeting and the meeting  
33 was adjourned at 10:40 p.m.

34 Respectfully submitted,

35  
36  
37  
38 \_\_\_\_\_  
39 Mary W. Mistretta  
Planning Board Secretary