

**Mannington Township Planning Board
Regular Meeting
March 12, 2026**

MEETING RELOCATION

The Regular Mannington Township Planning Board meeting was relocated in anticipation of high public attendance. The meeting was moved to the Ware Agricultural Office Complex located at 51 Cheney Road, Woodstown, New Jersey 08098.

Present:

Michael Colletti, Nicholas Culver, Robert DiGregorio, Richard Eber, Donald Richman, John Sakewicz, Gaynel Schneeman, Dory Emel, Andrew Carpenter, Larry Pompper, Jr., Neal Sheppard, Joanne Wright, Donna Miller (representative from Clark, Caton & Hintz), Cory Gaskill, Justin White, Esquire, David Cadwallader (7:10 pm)

Absent:

Michael Sullivan

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm by Rebecca Gower Ferguson, Secretary. The Sunshine Law Statement was read. The Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America was recited. Roll Call was taken to justify that there was a quorum in attendance. The secretary of the planning board has given adequate notice of the meeting.

Richard Eber made a motion to approve the February Regular Meeting minutes. Nicholas Culver seconded the motion. All in favor.

Block 3, Lots 17 & 19

Robert DiGregorio

80 Warner Road

CARRIED TO 4/2026 Application Continued for a Variance

Block 7, Lot 13

Cal-Maine Foods, Inc.

249 and 249A Fenwick Road

Resolution 2026-12

Larry Pompper stepped down from the board at this time.

Gaynel Schneeman made a motion to approve Resolution 2026-12. Nicholas Culver seconded the motion.

ELIGIBLE TO VOTE: MC, NC, DR, JS, GS & NS

Roll Call

YES: MC, NC, DR, JS, GS & NS

NO:

ABSTAIN:

(Resolution to immediately follow.)

RESOLUTION NO. 12-2026

MANNINGTON TOWNSHIP PLANNING / ZONING BOARD

**USE VARIANCE APPLICATION of CAL-MAINE FOODS, INC.
249 FENWICK ROAD
BLOCK 7, LOT 13**

WHEREAS, Cal-Maine Foods, Inc. (the "Applicant") has made application before the Planning / Zoning Board of Mannington Township in Salem County, New Jersey (the "Board"), seeking a use variance pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70(d)(1) and Chapter 70 of the Township Code, for property Applicant owns at 249 and 249A Fenwick Road, Block 7 Lot 13 (the "Property"); and,

WHEREAS, the Property is located in the Township's Rural Residential / "RR" zone; and,

WHEREAS, the Applicant's application for a use variance is further described as a request to allow two (2) single-family dwellings on the Property for a determinable period. There presently exists a single-family dwelling and the Applicant intends to construct a new single-family dwelling to replace the one that exists. The existing dwelling will eventually be razed. There will be an overlap period during which the two single-family dwellings will co-exist on the Property;

WHEREAS, the RR Zone prohibits more than one (1) single-family dwelling one a lot; and,

WHEREAS, the relief sought by the Applicant requires a use variance pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70(d)(1); and,

WHEREAS, the Applicant's Development Application included:

- A. A completed Application for Development Review Form dated December 26, 2025;
- B. A completed Schedule "A" Mannington Township Land Development Application Checklist;
- C. An Affidavit of Ownership of the Property (undated);
- D. A list of witnesses to testify on behalf of Applicant (undated);
- E. A stockholder disclosure statement (undated);
- F. A survey of the Property prepared by William J. Olbrich, P.L.S. of Fralinger Engineers dated September 4, 2025;

G. A septic design and survey for the proposed new dwelling prepared by Stephen Nardelli, P.E. of Fralinger Engineers (date illegible);

H. A Project Narrative and Variance Justification Statement by Applicant's Counsel;

I. Proof of paid taxes;

J. A 200' property owners list;

K. Proof of Publication, thereby confirming the Applicant's compliance with the requirements of N.J.S.A. 40:55D-12(a);

L. An Affidavit of Proof of Service, thereby confirming the Applicant's compliance with the requirements of N.J.S.A. 40:55D-12(i);

WHEREAS, at a public hearing conducted on February 12, 2026, the Applicant appeared and was represented by counsel, Adam I. Telsey, Esq. and offered the following proofs and/or elicited the following in support of Applicant's application:

1. Items A-L of the Application, such items described above, were received and considered by the Board.

2. Applicant's counsel introduced the Application. The Property is primarily farmland. There is presently a single-family dwelling on the Property.

3. Cal-Maine Foods is a commercial farm. The Property and its dwelling are used to house Cal-Maine's facility manager and his/her family.

4. Applicant plans to demolish the existing dwelling and replace it with a new single-family dwelling.

5. The Application was deemed as complete by a unanimous vote, with seven (7) Board members in favor and zero (0) opposed.

6. Applicant's representative, **Ted Brown**, was sworn and gave testimony in support of the Application.

7. Mr. Brown explained that the new dwelling will use the existing private well.

8. A new sanitary septic system will be constructed to service the new dwelling.

9. The relief sought by the Application is temporary in nature. The Applicant proposes that the resident(s) of the existing dwelling will continue living therein while the new dwelling is constructed. Once the new dwelling is constructed, there will be an overlap period during which both the existing and the new dwellings are on the Property. During the overlap period, the resident(s) of the existing dwelling will transition and move to the new dwelling.

10. Once the aforesaid transition is complete, the existing dwelling will be demolished. Upon demolition, Applicant shall obtain such approvals / permits as may be necessary to allow lawful and permanent occupation of the new single-family dwelling.

11. After the existing dwelling is demolished, the only principal structure on the Property shall be the new dwelling. Applicant agrees that as a condition of approval, after the existing dwelling is demolished a second dwelling on the Property shall not be constructed absent a new application to this Board for variance and/or other necessary relief.

12. Applicant proposes to construct the new dwelling within one hundred twenty (120) days from the date of a Resolution approving the requested variance.

13. Applicant further proposes that the existing dwelling will be demolished within thirty (30) days after the new dwelling is constructed.

14. The Applicant's counsel made argument as to the so-called "positive" and "negative" factors with regard to the criteria for a "d(1)" variance.

15. The meeting was opened for public comment. **Ricky Watts** was sworn and gave testimony. Mr. Watts is a neighboring property owner that received notice of the Application. Mr. Watts advised that he thought he had to appear because he received notice. Mr. Watts has no objection to relief requested in the Application.

WHEREAS, the Board considered the testimony offered by the Applicant's witness to be credible; and,

WHEREAS, in addition to the conclusions set forth above the Applicant has fulfilled the procedural requirements of the use variance request; and,

WHEREAS, the Mannington Township Planning / Zoning Board finds that the proposed use variance can be approved pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70(d)(1). The Board is satisfied that there exists in this particular case special reasons to allow departure from the Township's Land Use Ordinance, and that departure from same in this particular case will not be detrimental to the public good, but rather will promote the general welfare and the overall intent and purpose of the Master Plan and the Land Use Ordinance; and,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Mannington Township Planning / Zoning Board, as follows:

1. The Application of Cal-Maine Foods, as aforesaid, is deemed to be complete.
2. The Applicant has offered sufficient proof to establish cause for receiving a use variance to temporarily allow two (2) single-family dwellings on the Property for a determinable period. Applicant has carried its burden of showing that the benefits of granting a use variance from the Land Use Ordinance outweigh any detriment that may result from granting the variance.

3. The use variance pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70(d)(1) requested by Cal-Maine Foods upon the property located at 249 and 249A Fenwick Road, Block 7, Lot 13, be and hereby is **GRANTED**, subject to the following conditions:

- a. The Board relied upon the testimony of the Applicant and factual finding discussed above in this Resolution, and such testimony and findings are incorporated as conditions of this approval as though set forth herein.
- b. Compliance with all federal, state, county and local laws, rules, regulations and other governmental approvals which may be required in implementation of this development, including but not limited to: (i) the Township of Mannington Construction Office; (ii) the Local / Regional Code Enforcement Office of the Department of Community Affairs; (iii) the Salem County Planning Board; and (iv) the Salem County Soil Conservation District.
- c. If another governmental agency grants a waiver or variance of a regulation, affecting this approval or the conditions attached to it, then this Board shall have the right to review that issue as it relates to this approval and these conditions and modify or amend same.
- d. The Applicant shall pursue with good faith and due diligence any and all additional approvals as may be required and shall provide the Board with copies of all reports and approval from same, including copies of any and all applications filed.
- e. The Applicant shall pay all escrows, costs and professional fees associated with this Application pursuant to the Township's Ordinances and the MLUL within thirty (30) days of notice of said fees and costs, absent any challenge by the Applicant as to the correctness or amounts of such fees and costs.
- f. A zoning permit(s) shall initially be issued to Applicant for the: (i) construction only of the new single-family dwelling; and (ii) demolition of the existing dwelling.
- g. The Applicant shall pursue with good faith and due diligence the completion of the construction of the proposed new single-family dwelling within one hundred twenty (120) days of this Resolution.
- h. The existing dwelling shall be demolished within thirty (30) days of the completion of construction of the proposed new single-family dwelling.
- i. The new single-family dwelling shall not be approved for permanent occupancy until such time as the existing dwelling is demolished.

- j. Once the existing dwelling is demolished and the new single-family dwelling has been approved for permanent occupancy, a second dwelling and/or other second primary structure shall not be constructed or allowed on the Property absent a new application to this Board

4. The conditions of this approval shall run with the land and be binding on all successors in interest, purchasers and assignees. In the event that the Applicant does not perfect this approval should § 70-22E of the Ordinance be applicable, this approval shall be void, unless, for good cause shown, the Applicant seeks extension thereof.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this Resolution shall be provided to the Applicant's attorney, and that notice of the actions recited herein shall be published in accordance with prevailing law.

The vote upon the Motion made to grant the Applicant's request for a use variance was recorded, as follows:

	MOVED	SECOND	AYES	NAYS	ABSTAIN	RECUSE	ABSENT
John Sakewicz			X				
David Cadwallader			X				
Nicholas Culver			X				
Michael Colleti			X				
Donald Richman		X	X				
Gaynell Schneerman			X				
Neal Sheppard (II)	X		X				
Richard A. Eber, Jr. (I)					X		
Robert DiGregorio (III)					X		
Dory Emel, Alt 1							
Andr. Carpenter, Alt 2							
Joanne Wright, Alt 3							
Lry. Pompper, Jr., Alt 4							

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this Resolution shall be forwarded to the Applicant and to all who request a copy for a reasonable fee. In addition, a copy of this Resolution shall be filed in the Office of the Clerk of the Township of Mannington.

By: Rebecca G. Ferguson
Rebecca Ferguson, Board Secretary

By: John I. Sakewicz
John Sakewicz, Chairman

**Block 60, Lot 4
Mannington Mills Road
Completeness and Application for a Use Variance**

Adam Telsey presented the application.

This is a zoning board matter so Mayor Eber and Committeeman DiGregorio have to step down.

The tenant would like to bottle the food grade oils at the approved site.

A1- Sketch of the warehouse

Three minor improvements.

- (1) Container wall.
- (2) Concreate pad for a nitrous tank and
- (3) bottom corner is a bed for a transformer. Both will be added on asphalt.

Hours: 6:30 am – 3 pm and 3 pm to 11 pm (previously 7 am – 4 pm)

Now four employees

No change to lighting. 2 to 3 trucks per day. No change to parking.

Brian Foster was sworn in. He is the operations manager for the site.

David Cadwallader arrived. 7:10 pm

There are no hazardous materials. This is food grade oil.

The application is an extension of the current operations.

Corey Gaskill reviewed the Engineer's letter.

This is an expansion of a prior granted use in connection with existing operations.

The application was signed on the missing line.

Justin White reviewed the criteria for the use variance.

The meeting was opened to the public.

The meeting was closed to the public.

Nicholas Culver made a motion to deem the application complete. Michael Colletti seconded the motion.

ELIGIBLE TO VOTE: MC, NC, DR, JS, GS, NS & DE

Roll Call

YES: MC, NC, DR, JS, GS, NS & DE

NO:

ABSTAIN:

Nicholas Culver made a motion to approve the use variance application. Donald Richman seconded the motion.

ELIGIBLE TO VOTE: MC, NC, DR, JS, GS, NS & DE

Roll Call

YES: MC, NC, DR, JS, GS, NS & DE

NO:

ABSTAIN:

Block 39, Lot 33

Block 40, Lot 21

Block 45, Lots 1, 11, 11.02, 11.03 and 15

Block 46, Lots 5 and 6

Block 47, Lots 10, 12 and 16

Fenwick Creek Solar, LLC

2180 South 1300 East, Suite 500, Salth Lake City, Utah 84106

Application for a Favorable Interpretation of the Zoning Ordinance, or, in the Alternative, Use Variance Relief (Continued)

This application is being continued from the November 13, 2025, December 11, 2025, January 8, 2026 and February 12, 2026 meetings. The application was amended and new public notice was provided.

This is a zoning board matter so Mayor Eber and Committeeman DiGregorio have to step down.

Due to a conflict, Michael Colletti stepped down.

Due to a conflict, Andrew Carpenter stepped down.

Due to a conflict, David Cadwallader stepped down.

This is a Zoning matter so 7 members will vote.

Eligible to vote at this time: Nicholas Culver, Donald Richman, John Sakewicz, Gaynel Schneeman, Neal Sheppard, Joanne Wright, Dorey Emel and Larry Pompper (if needed)

Keith Davis gave a brief overview of the application.

Mr. Dadio was sworn in. He has previously sworn in as an expert.

Ms. Wright asked about chemical contamination and compaction.

She asked about the compaction under the posts. How would they be tested and how long would it take for those soils to return to farmland.

Mr. Dadio stated that the sheep would graze around the posts.

Angelo Fatiga was sworn in Collier's Engineering and design.

As part of the decommissioning process, they test prior to construction using criteria established by DEP.

This is checked before construction and thirty years later at decommissioning.

Mr. Davis stated that there is no negative chemical impacts as a result of the solar facility. If the board wants testing every five years, they could discuss this possibility. The decommissioning plan has been submitted and a bond will be in place to allow the township to resolve any outstanding issue.

There could be a chemical leakage at the inverters.

Laura Kellogg was sworn in.

Ms. Kellogg stated that for the soil testing they will follow the protocol as described. A detailed plan could be discussed during the site plan application. There may be 10,000 pilings but they are spread out. How deep depends on the soil.

Mr. Davis stated that the state does not view the posts as impervious coverage. There will be fencing for the pastures. The board can impose reasonable conditions. If they receive use variance approval additional specialists can be brought in for further testimony.

Kellogg. The panels are made of glass with copper wiring. And they are surrounded by aluminum. If a panel would be broken they would come in to clean it up. There will be 24 hour monitoring

Substation and switchyard are areas that could have the highest potential environmental impact.

Mr. Gaskill confirmed that they applicant would need to present these site plan applications to the planning board.

Ms. Wright asked about the pollinator plan and what would happen if they do not meet the criteria.

Ms. Kellogg stated that they would have a financial penalty.

Ms. Morrissey was sworn in.

Ms. Wright asked if Ms. Morrissey saw anything in any of Mannington's ordinances or elsewhere that would prohibit any farmer from applying for farmland preservation through any program. These farms are targeted for farmland preservation.

Ms. Morrissey stated that the property was not targeted in the township's plans.

Mr. Culver stated that this site is targeted in the 2022 County Plan. There was discussion regarding the County, State and municipality plans.

Ms. Wright stated that Mannington's plan states that the municipality cooperates and coordinates with the county on preservation.

The state planning document was discussed. Mannington Township is a PA4 area. The project falls within the state limits for Salem County. Mannington is identified as a rural, environmentally sensitive planning area by the State. Ms. Morrissey did not discuss this during her prior testimony. Ms. Wright

stated that Mannington's planning goals align with the state development and redevelopment plan.

Ms. Morrissey stated that this falls within the state criteria,

Ms. Wright asked about the Sica test criteria. The state and the municipality stress importance of maintaining tracts of contiguous farmland. The proposed project is surrounded by preserved farmland.

Mr. Davis stated that the BPU has determined what percentage of the farmland meets the appropriateness of this development.

Mr. Davis stated that this would advance a state policy.

The applicant stated that they are using 1.3% or 1.6% of the qualified farmlands. This will include the sheep and pollinator program.

Ms. Morrissey stated that there was a pollinator bee advertisement in a neighboring community, so there is a need.

300 acres will be solar arrays. The remaining property outside of the fenced area, which is not a wetland, will be used for farming purposes.

Ms. Wright clarified that none of the 635 acres of the project will be in farmland preservation and none will be farmland assessed.

There could be a renewal of the lease. The use variance runs with the land.

Ms. Miller stated that the board cannot make a decision based solely on the property tax change as a financial benefit.

Mr. Gaskill asked if the applicant would be aware of the potential for roll back taxes.

Ms. Wright stated that a primary goal of the Master Plan was to maintain scenic vistas and the rural and agricultural characteristics and activities of the municipality. Much of the land slated for this project was specifically designated as "of particular importance" to this goal. She asked how the applicant's plan maintains this priority and priority of maintaining contiguous tracts of farmland.

Ms. Morrissey stated that the Ag zone allows other industrial uses. This is better than what you would get with 250 homes or other construction changes to the landscape. The applicant would provide bonding to eliminate the added buffering. There is balancing.

Ms. Miller stated that she disagrees. The conditional permitted uses are not by right. This is true even in the building of homes. Homes would be a less visual impact. She does not believe that visually this would be the same impact.

Ms. Wright asked about the Sica test. In relation to other inherently beneficial uses. How does this compare to other inherently beneficial uses.

Ms. Morrissey stated that this is specifically listed as an inherently beneficial use. The BPU and CSI requirements that add to the state policy.

Ms. Wright asked about the lack of meaningful locations in Mannington that Ms. Morrissey spoke about in her testimony for this type of project. Ms. Morrissey stated that there is not a large enough location to meet the program requirements for the award that they received. Ms. Wright asked if Mannington was required to provide a site for this type of application. The MLUL requires 20 contiguous acres in the industrial zone and Ms. Morrissey had stated that Mannington had about 80 acres there.

Ms. Kellogg stated that solar is a low-cost form of domestic energy. Nuclear is considered a clean energy but it takes a long time to permit new plants and it costs more. Solar is a good solution on the pending problems.

Justin White with regard to the height variance – how many posts are being proposed.

Paul Hughes was sworn in. He stated that there would be four 65 foot masts. He referenced Exhibit A4.

Mr. Davis stated that Ms. Morrissey stated that these are accessory uses and they believe that they are a C variance.

Justin White asked the timeline for the site plan application, if approved. The applicant stated that this would be submitted within 18 months.

Justin White asked if this would change Mannington Residents ability to obtain rooftop solar.

Ms. Kellogg stated that this is different regulations.

Ms. Wright asked if the applicant would consider agreeing to reduce the size of the project.

Ms. Kellogg stated that there are limitations based on the financing of the project. CSI awarded 50 MW DC but AC is 38 MW. It is the same, just different measuring tools.

Justin White asked if there is the possibility that the technology enhances and the size of the panels could be reduced.

Ms. Kellogg stated that this would be based on technology.

5 minute break

Motion to open to the public

Steven Dimatteo 5144 Venice Ave, Hammonton
Previously a long time Salem County resident. President of IBEW351 Local
There are a bunch of union members to ensure that Salem County residents are used on this project. He asked that the 20 million dollars of pay and benefits to workers on the project be considered.

Ed Kalinowski – 59 Tavaris Westville, NJ

Local operating engineer in favor of this project to provide clean energy and local tax revenue. This is better than a warehouse or houses. He has a friend that lives near a solar panel and states it's the best neighbor he has ever had.

Jan Hanselman 440 Welchville Road

She supports clean energy. She does not support a fragmented project of an industrial scale project. This application does not include transmission lines or a switching station. Under the MLUL cannot approve a segmented application. The full environmental, stormwater and drainage, emergency and engineering are not presented. Large solar projects change the rural identity of a community. They increase conflict, are largely viewed as industrial zones. This may change property values. Industrial solar facilities in agricultural zones have documented declines on property values. No cumulative impact analysis can occur. This partial application is a strategy. She asks that the application be deemed incomplete and delay the application until the full project is submitted. She asks that financial benefits be disclosed. Anything less is not fair to the residents who live here. She has a document that she would like to share that shares troubles and complaints of residents impacted by solar array construction.

Mr. Davis has an objection that they have provided notice twice. He does not believe that the information can be accepted about complaints at other locations.

Mr. White stated that the board does not have a financial benefit from this application. The applicant has the right to present a bifurcated application. The applicant would have to come back within 18 months. He believes that this has been a very transparent application.

Mr. Davis echoes Mr. Whites sentiments. Property values are not part of the applications.

John Cinelli 163 Curlin Road. Salem, NJ

Lives two miles from the solar site. He is a union member who worked on the Pilesgrove site. It made him and his family a lot of money.

Alice Waddington – Affirmed – 912 Greenwich Court Woodstown. Lived in Mannington for 65 years. She made a list of farms milking 12 or more cows. All of these farms have found it unprofitable with the exception of the Cadwalladers. There are too many large dairy farms that make it unprofitable for small farms to compete.

Steve Waddington - 352 Kings Highway

Has known the Cadwalladers all of his life. In 30 years the price of milk has gone up 30 cents by the government. It is not sustainable.

Chanda Williams - Affirmed - 174 Victory Avenue, Salem

She has worked with Andrew Cadwallader at the community garden for years. He cares about the garden and community. Andrew has been instrumental in teaching the gardeners about native plants. This is his deep love for the local ecosystem. Native pollinators are losing their habitat in New Jersey. This raises concerns for biodiversity and agriculture in New Jersey. She applauds the Cadwalladers for their plan and cited the benefits of the plan.

Janet Sheridan – 159 7th Street, Salem

She has documented the historic farm on the property. If the farm isn't viable then the structures are at risk. She hopes to see the family standing on the farm in 30 years. She supports this application and community preservation. AES has partnered with Marshalltown Preservation with an 8k donation for their programs. She stated that she supported this project prior to their donation.

Andrew Cadwallader – 350 Acton Station Road, Mannington

The number of dairy farms has declined. Are they going to stay with dairy or change. They are at a crossroads. He stated that he isn't sure that he can come back to the farm and get paid. Solar grazing isn't different than cattle grazing, except there is share from the panels. One pound of lamb is 3 or 4 dollars vs 16 cents for a pound of milk. NJ Farm Bureau supports of agrivoltaics. This could also be a learning center for the community. I grew up that we want more farmers and more farms. Let's make good on our promise to help protect our farmers.

The meeting was closed to the public.

Keith Davis provided a summation of the application. He appreciated the attentiveness of the board and the back and forth. This is an interim application before the property returns to farming. He recapped previous testimony from his witnesses. He stated the Sica vs. Wall requirements to be considered. He believes that this benefits public interest. There are perceived visual impacts. All medium voltage lines will be buried underground. 300 head of sheep will be on the facility. Mr. Davis does not believe that this use would have a substantial detriment. The applicant would have to come back to the board for site plan review and public comment. He believes that the application has met the burden. A D variance would require five affirmative votes.

Mr. White stated that he has determined that the height variance could be a C Variance because it is not a primary structure.

Mr. White stated that the planner stated that the local ordinance falls within the ordinance.

Ms. Miller read from the ordinance that the masts would be exempt from the height requirement. They are under 70 ft. Testimony states that the max height would be 65 so, based on the testimony.

Ms. Wright stated that she believes that there is a detrimental environmental impact. She also believes that breaking up contiguous farmland is detrimental. Ms. Wright asked what reasonable condition the applicant would propose for the detriment of losing contiguous farmland to an industrial use and that is surrounded by preserved farmland.

Mr. Davis stated that they don't believe that it is going to be broken up. Only a small portion will be purchased by the applicant. Mr. Davis offered that there could be a deed restriction on the purchased property. They cannot speak to the leased portion.

Ms. Kellogg stated that they are buying the parcels in the southern area. They are not buying all of the property. They are leasing from the owners. Some of the property is conservation.

Mr. White reviewed the use variance standards. He reviewed the legal requirements to justify a variance. He read from the MLUL. The inherently beneficial use was defined. The negative criteria was defined. Inherently beneficial uses are not all equal. Some conditions would be subject to an approved site plan, within 18-month approval. This would include the items to limit the visual impact, pollinator program, posting of a bond, deed restrictions, and NJDEP and any other permitting, commercial scale sheep farm within one year of electrification. Lines will be buried, and all other conditions as agreed upon during the testimony.

This is a Zoning matter so 7 members will vote.

Eligible to vote at this time: Nicholas Culver, Donald Richman, John Sakewicz, Gaynel Schneeman, Neal Sheppard, Dorey Emel and Joanne Wright.

Nicholas Culver made a motion to approve the D1 Use Variance with all of the agreed upon items during the testimony. Dorey Emel Seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote (7 Members)

ELIGIBLE TO VOTE: NC, DR, JS, GS, NS, DE & JW

YES: JS

NO: NC, DR, GS, NS, DE & JW

ABSTAIN:

Miscellaneous Business

The meeting was opened to the public.

The meeting was closed to the public.

Public Portion

The April meeting will be at this same location, the Ware Building.

Miscellaneous Business

The meeting was adjourned at 10:07 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,
Rebecca Gower Ferguson
Planning Board Secretary

