

Approved
BAK 12/4/19

**TOWNSHIP OF NUTLEY
PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, November 20, 2019**

A meeting of the Planning Board of the Township of Nutley was held on the third floor of the Township of Nutley Municipal Building, One Kennedy Drive, and Commission Chambers. Adequate notification was published in the official newspapers of the Herald News, the Star Ledger and the Nutley Sun on December 13, 2018.

Roll Call

- Ms. Castro – Present
- Mr. Malfitano – Present
- Mr. Contella – Present
- Mr. Kirk – Excused
- Mr. Greengrove – Excused
- Ms. Kucinski – Present
- Mr. Del Tufo – Present
- Mr. Arcuti - Present
- Ms. Tangorra – Present
- Mr. Kozyra – Present
- Commissioner Evans –Present
- Mayor Scarpelli – Present

Meeting Minutes

The Meeting/Executive Session Minutes for November 13, 2019 were accepted by the Board.

Communications/Bills

An invoice for Gail Santasieri in the amount of \$150.00 for her attendance at and preparation of the November 13, 2019 Meeting Minutes was approved by the Board.

An invoice for Barry Kozyra in the amount of \$800 for his attendance at the Special Meeting on November 13, 2019 was approved by the Board.

Resolution for the reimbursement of escrow fund balances for 340 Kingsland Street subdivision for \$274.50, 71 Centre Street in the amount of \$1,000.00, and the Cook Road substation was approved by the Board.

Correspondence addressed to Ms. Tangorra from the Federal Communication Commission in Washington, DC regarding a communication tower. No action necessary to be taken by the Board.

The proceedings in this matter were voice recorded. The recital of facts in the Minutes is not intended to be all-inclusive but is a summary and highlight of the complete record made before the Planning Board.

Old Business

None

New Business

Hearing for 91 Margaret Avenue

Tom DiBiasi, Esq., represented the Applicants. The application is for a major subdivision of an existing parcel to be divided in half for a single-family house to be built as the owners' daughter who is getting married. There is currently a three bedroom house and the subdivision will allow for a two bedroom single-family home to be built.

Thomas Bini is an owner of the parcel. He is a fire fighter for the Town of Belleville (23 years) and has lived in Nutley for almost 26 years. His goal is to help get his daughter a single-family home in Nutley and this is the best way for her to afford that home. They have been working on the plans for a year and he feels that the architect has kept the plans consistent with the character of the neighborhood. The new structure will have a stone front and aluminum siding on the remaining sides. It will be a raised ranch with a two-car garage underneath and the first floor will have a great room in the back, a kitchen and full bathroom. The second floor will have two bedrooms, a living room, dining room, full bathroom, kitchen and a nice backyard.

Mayor Scarpelli asked the Applicant where his daughter works and he answered that she is the Dietician at the Nutley Shop Right.

Commissioner Evans commended the Applicant and Architect on the thoughtfully prepared plans. He feels that they are a bit simple and he would approve an upgrade on the character of the house. He knows that the lot is undersized in terms of width and he feels the design works.

A Board Member agreed that the lot is a little undersized but it meets all the qualities of life. It will not look small as long as a fence is not put up between the houses. The Applicant agreed that no fence will be put up.

Giuseppe Barberio, 16 Portland Place, Montclair. Mr. Barberio is a licensed architect in the State of NJ and he was sworn in and accepted as an expert in his field. He works in association with Joseph Haines and is familiar with the plans.

Mr. Kozyra stated that Mr. DiBiasi has submitted a Proof of Publication and a Proof of Service on neighboring properties and are marked as Exs. A-1 and A-2. The map to be used now will be marked as Ex. A-3.

Mr. Barberio continued by stating that the existing lot is 8,170.5 sq. feet in area; frontage currently is 87.34 feet wide; it will be subdivided equally into two lots of 43.65 feet each. The floor plan is marked as Ex. A-4 and another exhibit is marked as A-5, to be testified to later. The floor plan shows entry through the front door into the ground floor – a two car garage, a door into the dwelling which brings you into a foyer, there is a mechanical room and a large rec room

in the back with a bathroom. To get to the first floor you go up the stairs where there is a living room, dining room, a kitchen with a dinette space, two bedrooms with closets, a shared bathroom between the two bedrooms and another closet for the washer/dryer.

Mr. DiBiasi asked if the materials to be used for the exterior of the house will be stone and siding and Mr. Barberio answered yes. He asked if a color(s) was picked and Mr. Barberio answered not yet. He asked if the house will fit in with the character of the neighborhood and Mr. Barberio answered yes and used Ex. A-5 to show how it will fit in. The existing structure is Lot 5.01 and the proposed structure will be Lot 5.02. The house will be set back (asking for a front yard variance) at a point average to the existing front yards.

Mr. Arcuti asked why would you build a new house on an empty lot that needs a rear yard setback? Mr. Barberio answered that the Applicant is trying to get the space needed for proper floor plan room sizing. Mr. Arcuti asked if the front yard setback on the new house is deeper than the existing house, further away? Mr. Barberio answered that the main portion is further away. Mr. Arcuti asked if matching the existing house's setback would you need a backyard variance? Mr. Barberio answered constraints of the floor plan. Mr. Arcuti asked how much further back is the new house compared to the old? Mr. Barberio answered the old is 13.54 feet and the new portion is 18 feet at the first floor, 14.4 to the front door.

Commissioner Evans stated that Mr. Arcuti was trying to get rid of two variances by asking if Mr. Barberio can move this without any negative impact before starting work. Mr. Barberio answered that the difficulty in moving would be the front entrance. Mr. Arcuti said that you already need a front yard variance and Mr. Barberio answered that they are trying to be respectful. Mr. Arcuti asked what is the rear yard setback if approved as drawn and Mr. Barberio answered 28.5 feet. Mr. Arcuti asked if you move the house two feet forward you would not need the rear setback variance, correct? Mr. Barberio answered correct. Mr. Arcuti asked what would be the negative impact be on the new house and Mr. Barberio answered that it would be closer to the existing house. Mr. Arcuti questioned if it would make the front yard smaller but still further away than the existing house and Mr. Barberio answered yes. Mr. Arcuti asked if it would make the driveway smaller and Mr. Barberio answered yes. Currently the garage and driveway will allow two cars each.

Paul Bauman, 5 Norwood Terrace, No. Caldwell. Mr. Bauman was sworn in and accepted as an expert Planner. Mr. Bauman stated that the architect and owner made the structure with a 6 feet setback on each side. With respect to Mr. Arcuti's point regarding setback, he feels that if it was abutting another residence he could understand, but it is abutting a park. Variances are needed on each lot but nothing out of the neighborhood's character. There are existing 43 foot lots on the same and surrounding streets. This structure will fit in height wise, width wise and depth wise, give or take a foot or two. He feels the architect explained why they want the rear yard variance. The other variances on both lots are small and he feels the Board can grant them under N.J.S.A. 40:55 (D7) (C2), supporting sufficient usage of land.

Mr. DiBiasi asked if this was a good plan and Mr. Bauman answered he believes it is from the standpoint of professional planning.

Mayor Scarpelli asked to go back to the rear yard setback. He asked how would you justify the variance in relationship to the open space of the park and playground. Mr. Bauman stated that this development will not impact upon the character of the open space, it is just one lot. He does not think the structure will do any damage to the structure of the neighborhood or the overall structure of the town. Mayor Scarpelli stated that if there were homes on the sides or behind the property that could present an issue but since it is open space that makes a difference.

Mr. Kozyra asked given the fact that the rear yard abuts town property how do the property owners and future owners know where their property line is? Mr. Bauman answered that the Board could impose on the applicant to install a fence. That would set a boundry but he does not know if it is necessary. Mr. Kozyra asked if there was a fence already? Mr. DiBiasi stated that his client does not have a fence there and does not feel the need for one. Mayor Scarpelli thinks that the topography is different between the park and the backyard. Ms. Tangorra feels that it would be a shame to put a fence up or to have a visual barrier. Commissioner Evans said that encroachment occurs over time and he feels the existing property already has a fence but something should be planted to mark the rear corner of the property. Mr. DiBiasi stated that his client is not opposed to that idea.

A Board Member asked if it would be better to minimize all the variances by making slight modifications like that? Not to the existing structure but the proposed one. Mr. Bauman answered that it would but that is in the architect/owner's domain. He cannot commit to sacrificing square footage of the house.

Vito Irrequéz 95 Margaret Avenue. Mr. Irrequéz has been a neighbor for over three years. He has viewed the plan and he agrees that it will fit into the character of the neighborhood.

Bill Bonzer and Danielle Green, 82 Margaret Avenue. They are across the street neighbors. They have both seen the plans and agree that it will fit into the character of the neighborhood.

Mr. DiBiasi stated that his presentation had concluded.

Public Comments

None

Mayor Scarpelli stated that if these variances were in another neighborhood he would have issues but because there is so much open space he thinks the application can be approved. Commissioner Evans agrees with the Mayor and feels it is a very thoughtful design for the neighborhood. A Board Member said he feels that the variances are not egregious.

Mr. DiBiasi stated that his client has agreed to a deed restriction on the property for no fence. He would like this deed restriction to last the length of the owners' joint life times. Mr. Kozyra stated that there does not need to be a fence restriction. They can honor it amongst themselves. He thanked Mr. DiBiasi for the offer but it is not necessary.

A motion was made to approve the application with no deed restriction regarding the fence. Mr. Kozyra said that he understands the motion to approve all the variances that have been requested and the waivers requested by Mr. DiBiasi with respect to the plan approvals. The Board will approve the waivers that it usually grants. The applicant does stipulate that they agreed to use the materials proposed in the drawings and will meet with the Code Enforcement Official as to those additional stipulations for newly constructed buildings.

Mr. DiBiasi asked if his client can file a proposed major subdivision plat or does the Board want deeds? Mr. Kozyra answered deeds.

A unanimous motion was made and approved.

- Ms. Castro – Yes
- Mr. Malfitano – Yes
- Mr. Contella – Yes
- Ms. Kucinski – Yes
- Mr. Del Tufo – Yes
- Mr. Arcuti - Yes
- Ms. Tangorra – Yes
- Commissioner Evans – Yes
- Mayor Scarpelli – Yes

Mr. Kozyra advised Mr. DiBiasi that he will have a resolution prepared for signing at the next meeting.

Hearing for 7 Hunt Place, Second Floor Addition

Ms. Tangorra announced that Mr. Contella has recused himself.

Tom DiBiasi, Esq. represented the Applicant.

Mr. Kozyra stated that Mr. DiBiasi has submitted a Proof of Publication and a Proof of Service on neighboring properties and are marked as Exs. A-1 and A-2.

Mr. DiBiasi stated that this is an application that is currently under a contract of sale with the Estate of Carmen Orechio. The applicant is not changing the footprint of what is already there with the exception of an approximate 10 square foot reduction. The size of the building will stay the same, as they want to go up one story. An indent of the proposed building has been made in light of the neighbor to the right's concerns about light and air. The applicant's goal is to have a showroom for his entertainment business. There is no residential component to this application. Parking will be inside the building on the first floor and his business is by appointment only. There will be three employees on the premises. Most of the work is done off site.

Robert Frannicola, 10 Dogwood Lane. Mr. Frannicola opened his business in 2007. The business includes "DJing", lighting designs, photo booths, etc. He wants to give potential clients the opportunity to see what they could have at their events. This plan has been under work for

The proceedings in this matter were voice recorded. The recital of facts in the Minutes is not intended to be all-inclusive but is a summary and highlight of the complete record made before the Planning Board.

four years. The only thing housed at the property would be the equipment. His DJing support staff does not operate at the potential location, they meet at the venue. The hours of operation are M-F from 10 to 6. Events are on the weekends so they do not have office hours then. They do have night appointments at times until 8:00 PM at the latest. The first floor will hold the equipment he uses at the events. The second floor will be the office space. Regarding the neighbor's concerns about light and air, the architect designed the addition with a recess with the neighbor's windows in mind. Light will never be blocked. The current footprint is being reduced 10-14 square feet. It will not be closer to the neighbors on the right, only going up. It took four years because of an oil tank issue straddling the two properties, the death of that property owner and tax liens on that property.

A Board Member asked Mr. Frannicola if the first floor was going to be a showroom and parking, and the second floor will be office space? Is it possible to run his business without adding the second floor? Mr. Frannicola answered "no". The amount of equipment is too large to be stored on a shared floor. A Board Member asked if there would be vehicles stored there along with the equipment. Mr. Frannicola advised "yes", three employee vehicles. A Board Member asked if the transport vehicles would be parked there? Mr. Frannicola advised that he rents parking spaces from Holy Family Church. That Board Member confirmed that there will not be any box trucks parked there and Mr. Frannicola confirmed. When they need to load the trucks the ceilings are going to be high enough inside so the vehicles will not need to be on the street.

Ms. Kucinski asked about a possibility of a noise/music issue. Mr. Frannicola stated that there will be music played but not like at a concert.

Public Questions

Frank Spina. Mr. Spina owns the property to the right and has questions regarding the windows on the first floor. Mr. Frannicola feels that his questions are for the architect but he said that there will be no changes to the first floor. Mr. Spina went on to make several comments and Ms. Tangorra informed him that this is the time for questions only, no comments/arguments. Mr. Spina continued to make comments about the closeness of the building to his home.

Mayor Scarpelli asked Mr. Kozyra to explain the procedure of the hearing. Mr. Kozyra explained the process and stated that the Board will weigh the public's concerns before making a decision.

Giuseppe Barberio, 16 Portland Place, Montclair. Mr. Barberio's credentials were accepted as an expert architect.

Ex. A-3 is a footprint and site plan. He stated that the footprint will stay the same except for a decrease to the rear corner of the building which was over the property line. The proposed first floor has proposed parking and office space storage. They are proposing a second floor addition which will not increase the footprint. The layout of the first floor will be brought straight up to the second floor. They will be carving out space on the second floor to provide a window well

on the one side of the building that is adjacent to the neighboring property and the front corner will mimic the neighboring first floor where he has a one-story portion. Mr. DiBiasi asked what the current condition of the building was? Mr. Barberio advised that the building is in disrepair, has mold, ceiling tiles are coming down and the interior paint is chipping. They are planning to gut the first floor. Mr. DiBiasi asked Mr. Barberio to go through his colored rendering for the Board.

Ex. A-5 shows a recess that the second floor will have. The neighboring property's second floor sits back from the first floor and they will do the same to fit in. Mr. DiBiasi hands out copies of the colored rendering. Mr. Barberio continued regarding zoning. All of the existing non-conforming requirements that they have still exist today. Nothing that they will be doing as they go up will actually encroach on or make worse any of these requirements. Mr. DiBiasi asked, in his opinion, if the proposed internal parking will help the neighborhood? Mr. Barberio answered "yes". There is space enough in the building for three parking spaces. Mr. DiBiasi asked if the color shown on the rendering is a typical color or one that the applicant chose? Mr. Barberio said the client chose the colors – monochromatic gray and black tones. In context to the front façade he has done a front scape illustrating the building height, Ex. A-6. Some of the neighboring buildings are higher than what they are proposing. Mayor Scarpelli asked how big is the window well setback from the existing building? Mr. Barberio answered 4 feet. A Board Member stated that the property to the west is extremely close. What is the distance between the two houses? Mr. Barberio answered 2 feet 4 inches. The Board Member questioned, so based on the drawing is the height of the addition going to be below the neighbor's existing soffit and gutter? Mr. Barberio answered "just about even". The Board Member asked because the building will be so close how will the neighbor be able to maintain his property? Is it going to be an issue to do work to his second floor? Mr. Barberio answered that that is what they have currently, even on the first floor. The Board Member stated that we are looking to take that same situation and double it. What is the siding going to be like on the new building? Mr. Barberio answered stucco siding with some stone at the front. The Board Member is concerned that the neighbor's view will be completely changed. He is concerned about how they will be able to maintain their home. Mr. Barberio stated that accessibility wise there will be no difference from what he has now. A Board Member stated that the property directly behind, 45 Washington Avenue, has their cable feed gong directly over the building. Do they have a way to address that? This is something this is going to have to be addressed. Mr. DiBiasi agrees that the maintenance is going to be an issue. Ms. Kucinski asked if the proposed second floor is slightly indented? Is there any way to do that on the second floor? Mr. Frannicola answered that the reason for shaving the building is because it sits on 47 Washington Place. He asked if the owner wanted to have a variance and he did not. Mr. Frannicola is willing to cut his property to make his neighbor happy. Ms. Kucinski asked if this was on the second floor? Mr. Frannicola answered "top to bottom". Ms. Kucinski questioned that he would lose too much square footage to form an indentation at the top. The existing building to the right is built all the way to the property line as opposed to having flipped their driveway with the house so we don't know which came first. Mayor Scarpelli asked if someone had any history on the building? What it was used for in the past? Mr. DiBiasi said that the three garages were owned by the Orechio family. Someone asked if 9 Hunt Place was originally Orechio owned? Mr. DiBiasi answered "no". That Board Member asked if the front yard of the existing building is set back 4 inches?

Mr. Barberio said at the highest spot yes. The Board Member asked if that is an existing non-conformance because it is not marked as such. Mr. Barberio answered "yes," in the current footprint at the first floor in the corner its 4 inches. The Board Member asked that since it is a current non-conformance you are not making it any worse and Mr. Barberio replied "no". The Board Member had the same question regarding the rear yard and side yards and Mr. Barberio answered "yes". The Board Member confirmed that a variance was not needed for the height and Mr. Barberio answered "yes." He also confirmed that out of the nine variances six are already existing non-conformance. He believes that the next door neighbor's side yard setback is a non-conformance. Mr. DiBiasi stated that he will have Mr. Bauman with testimony to corroborate that. The Board Member asked if they cut off three feet from the entire side of the second story would that impact the usage of the building and Mr. Barberio answered "yes" because it is already to the back of the property. Going further back and counter levering over it would require more structural work. Mr. DiBiasi stated that this is a difficult project because there was the underground oil tank on the two properties, which are owned by two different people. A Board Member asked if the original first floor required variances and Mr. Barberio replied "yes". All of the setbacks, front yard, rear yard, are less than what is required so those were existing non-conformances. Commissioner Evans questioned by adding the second floor are they increasing the size of the non-conformance? Mr. Barberio replied they are staying within that same footprint. They are not encroaching any further. Commissioner Evans asked if they are putting up a bigger structure and Mr. Barberio answered yes. Mr. Evans is also wondering if the next door house is also a non-conforming use. Regarding the proposed indentation on the second floor, Commissioner Evans is wondering if that indentation could be moved forward. It seems the back half of the building is not affected as much as the front. Mr. Barberio said he would have to defer to his client because as far as he knows they were trying to maximize the space.

Mr. DiBiasi asked for a 5 minute break so he could confer with his client.

A Board Member asked what type of material was used on the wall adjacent to the neighbor and Mr. Barberio said that going around the side they have a stucco finish. The Board Member asked if the colors used on the rendering are what has been chosen. Mr. Barberio replied "yes". The Board Member asked if the stucco to be used is a plaster system? Mr. Barberio answered he believes it could be a 3-coat system which choice he would leave up to his client. Commissioner Evans stated that they were concerned with what the neighbors would end up looking at, hopefully something maintenance free. A Board Member also questions emergency evacuation. He was told there is an exit in the rear corner. Ms. Kucinski asked about windows on the west side of the structure. Mr. Barberio responded that that is a solid wall with the exception to the cut out area on the second floor. Windows will be on the rear and front walls. Ms. Kucinski stated that windows on the current structure fall into place with the indentation so it is not a flat wall and there will be air space out the two existing windows, correct? Mr. Barberio answered "yes". Mayor Scarpelli asked about the 6 ft. set back over the garage. Mr. Barberio said that when you look at the streetscape and the existing house you are looking at the context of the elevations. They have basically followed the structure of the house next door. Mayor Scarpelli asked if it would be better to move it up and forward a foot so you still get a setback there and the space that you would lose if you brought the whole top floor in to where the window well is

you can gain square footage. Mr. Barberio stated that they can do something like that, some sort of shifting. Mayor Scarpelli suggested extending the well all the way to the front of the building and Mr. Barberio replied that that could be a possibility. Mayor Scarpelli commented that if they did that the square footage they would lose would not be that much and that way you give a little space back to the neighbor. Commissioner Evans asked if it would be possible in the back part of the building, where the building juts out, if they were to increase the height to make it possible for storage on the top level, moving the building further away from the house to the west. Mr. DiBiasi suggested increasing the height to a point would cause the applicant to lose jurisdiction of this Board and go to the Board of Adjustment. Mr. Barberio stated that that would be for a height variance. Mr. DiBiasi stated that in his notice he did say "any other variances that the Board deemed appropriate."

Mr. DiBiasi asks again for a 5 minute recess so he can confer with his client – which is granted.

Mr. DiBiasi states that they have come up with two suggestions and Mr. Barberio continues regarding the second floor indentation. He proposes that they would enlarge the well and continue it all the way to the side, doubling what the light well is now. It will run the entire length of the building at the same 4 foot depth. Mayor Scarpelli asked if there is a reason they would not extend the front of the building to make up the square footage? Mr. DiBiasi said that they could do that. He is hoping tonight to get a vote, if possible, so that they can set up a closing. If the Board grants approval he will set up the closing subject to the plans reflecting the Mayor's suggestion. Mr. Barberio said that leaving the office front wall where it is helps with the integrity of the building. Making the Board's suggestions would keep the character of the building. The second floor set back currently is 5'6" to meet all building codes. Mr. DiBiasi stated that to be a good neighbor they are willing to take on the maintenance of the neighboring house while his client's property is under construction. All for free so that the neighbor does not have to worry about that for the next 10-15 years. Mr. Kozyra commented, as he understands the proposal, it is to move the indentation all the way forward. He asked if anything is going to be done with the front yard setback? Mr. DiBiasi stated that they liked the suggestion from the Mayor. Mr. Kozyra asked what the new setback would become and Mr. Barberio said they could move it another two feet forward. Mr. Kozyra asked what the setback on the second floor would be and Mr. Barberio answered it would go from 5'6" to 3'6". Commissioner Evans thinks all of the comments together work in coming up with a better plan.

Paul Bauman. Mr. Bauman was sworn in and accepted as an expert witness. Mr. Bauman went over the requested variances and why he feels the Board should grant them. He feels that the construction proposed for the building will only add character to the neighborhood and will help meet the needs of Mr. Frannicola's business.

Mr. DiBiasi concluded his case by saying that some conditions they are willing to discuss some of the suggestions put on the record and abide by them.

Public Comments

John Villa, 15 Hunt Place. Stated that he and several other neighbors did not get the notification for tonight's hearing. He feels that the original intent of the building was not to be two-stories. He asked about the handicapped parking spot in front of the building. His mother-in-law is handicapped and uses the space. Mr. Kozyra advised that the parking space does not have anything to do with tonight's hearing and is something that the Code Office would deal with. Mr. Villa said he was also concerned about the trucks being loaded on the street. Mr. Frannicola advised that the building is designed for the trucks to be loaded inside the building. No trucks will be parked on the street at all. He also asked about the possibility of a shower on the second floor and Mr. Kozyra stated that the applicant stipulated that the building will not be used for residential use.

Mr. Spina. He owns the property next door and is concerned about the construction process and how it will affect his house. He is also concerned about there being loud music. Mr. Frannicola told him that when there is music it will not be loud and if he feels that it is all he has to do is let Mr. Frannicola know and he will lower the volume. Mayor Scarpelli asked if Mr. Spina understood all of the changes that were made tonight and Mr. Spina stated that he wants the property to stay the way it currently is, even though it is ugly. Mr. Kozyra stated that there will be no changes to the existing structure as it is now. They are building up, not out. He also stated that the applicant has stated that they will take care of the maintenance of his home after construction is finished.

Antonia Spina resides in the next door house and he says anything they do the structure will make it look like a jail.

Mayor Scarpelli feels that that the new changes will make it a better fit and will improve the neighborhood.

Mr. Arcuti agrees with the Mayor that the property needs a rehabilitation. The changes made tonight will not affect the proximity of the neighboring building and the project should be approved.

Ms. Tangorra agrees and thinks the proposal will be a great improvement to the neighborhood.

A unanimous motion was made and approved.

Ms. Castro – Yes
Mr. Malfitano – Yes
Mr. Contella – Recused
Ms. Kucinski – Yes
Mr. Del Tufo – Yes
Mr. Arcuti - Yes
Ms. Tangorra – Yes
Commissioner Evans – Yes

Mayor Scarpelli – Yes

Mr. Kozyra stated that it will be stipulated that the building is non-residential and the applicant has also stipulated to using the color scheme as proposed in Ex. A5. Commissioner Evans asked about public safety compliance being added and Mr. Kozyra advised that is for the Building Department to take care of.

Committee/Sub-Committee Reports

None

Executive Session

At 7:08 p.m., Ms. Tangorra requested the Board go into Executive Session to discuss their RFP decision.

When the need for confidentiality no longer exists, there will be further disclosure of the Executive Session discussion as appropriate.

The Board moved to go back into regular session and the meeting concluded at 7:22 p.m.

The regular meeting restated at 7:24 p.m. and concluded at 9:56 p.m.

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, December 4, 2019 at 7:00 p.m.