MAYOR
ALBIO SIRES | PUBLIC SAFETY
COMMISSIONER
MARIELKA A. DIAZ | PUBLIC AFFAIRS

BOARD SECRETARY
JOSEPH E. ROQUE
BOARD ATTORNEY
ROBERT FERRARO, ESQ.
BOARD ENGINEER
GISELLE DIAZ, P.E.
BOARD PLANNER
DAVID SPATZ, P.P., AICP

TOWN OF WEST NEW YORK
COUNTY OF HUDSON, NEW JERSEY

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS
PLANNING BOARD
428-60th STREET
WEST NEW YORK, NEW JERSEY 07093
(201).295.5009

CLARA BRITO-HERRERA | CHAIRWOMAN
ISRAEL FUENTEZ | VICE-CHAIRMAN
JONATHAN CASTANEDA | BOARD MEMBER
COMM. MARCOS ARROYO | BOARD MEMBER
STEVEN FERRALES | BOARD MEMBER
ALAIN GOMEZ | BOARD MEMBER
HECTOR YANEZ | BOARD MEMBER
ANDREA BOUNSIAR | BOARD MEMBER
ANGIE GUTIERREZ | BOARD MEMBER
MARKUS REHFELD | ALT. MEMBER #1
MARELIN BURGOS | ALT. MEMBER #2

MINUTES FOR REGULAR MEETING MONDAY SEPTEMBER 21, 2026

The Planning Board has scheduled a regular meeting on **Monday September 21, 2026 at 6:00 PM** via Teleconference. Call-In Number – **(929) 205- 6099** Meeting ID: **840 0476 7876** Password: **42860**

1. Meeting called to order by the Board Secretary Time: 6:01 P.M.

2. Pledge of Allegiance led by the Board Secretary

3. Reading of notice in compliance with Open Public Meetings Act by Board Secretary

This is the regular meeting of **September 21, 2026** of the **Planning Board of the Town of West New York**. Adequate notice of this meeting was provided pursuant to the Open Public Meetings Act, by at least 48 hours prior to this meeting, giving the time, date, location and, to the extent known, the agenda further indicating that formal action may be taken and this notice was (1) prominently posted in at least one public place reserved for such or similar announcements; (2) mailed, telephoned or telecopied to at least two newspapers, which newspapers have been designated by the Governing Body of the Town of West New York to receive such notices, one of which is the official newspaper of the Town; and (3) filed with the Clerk of the Town. Electronic copies of any hearing are available by contacting the Planning Board Secretary or the Town Clerk.

4. Roll Call:

	PRESENT	ABSENT
Chair Brito-Herrera		✓
Vice-Chair Fuentes		✓
Member Castaneda	✓	
Member Comm. Arroyo	✓	
Member Ferrales	✓	
Member Gomez		✓
Member Yanez		✓
Member Bounsiar	✓	
Member Gutierrez		✓
Alt. Member 1 Rehfeld	✓	
Alt. Member 2 Burgos	✓	

September 21, 2026
Planning Board Regular Meeting

Note: Member Ferrales nominated Member Castaneda as acting chair for this meeting.

5. **<u>Communications, reports, and administrative matters</u>: None**

6. **<u>Minutes of Previous Meetings:</u>** Motion to **APPROVE / DENY** the ***August 10, 2026 Minutes***.

Clara Herrera (CH)	Israel Fuentes (IF)	Jonathan Castaneda (JC)	Marcos Arroyo (MA)	Steven Ferrales (SF)	Alain Gomez (AG)	Hector Yanez (HY)	Andrea Bounsiar (AB)	Angie Gutierrez (AG)	Markus Rehfeld (MR)	Marelin Burgos (MB)

Motion:	**CH**	**IF**	**JC**	**MA**	**SF**	**AG**	**HY**	**AB**	**AG**	**MR**	**MB**
Second:	**CH**	**IF**	**JC**	**MA**	**SF**	**AG**	**HY**	**AB**	**AG**	**MR**	**MB**

	APPROVE	DENY	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Chair Brito-Herrera				✓
Vice-Chair Fuentes				✓
Member Castaneda	✓			
Member Comm. Arroyo	✓			
Member Ferrales	✓			
Member Gomez				✓
Member Yanez				✓
Member Bounsiar	✓			
Member Gutierrez				✓
Alt. Member 1 Rehfeld	✓			
Alt. Member 2 Burgos	✓			

7. Resolutions: None

8. Acceptance/Completeness:

a. Planning Board Docket #PB 2026-07; filed August 21, 2026
E Residences on the Hudson, LLC site plan – 6600 Hillside Road (Block: 167 Lot: 1.02)

The applicant is represented by J. Alvaro Alonso, Esq.
The applicant proposes to demolish an existing two-story brick industrial building, located on the above noted site, and construct a new 11 story, 101-unit, multifamily building. The building will consist of ten residential floors over three below grade and one above grade levels of parking; there will be 25 one-bedroom units, 41 two-bedroom units, 25 three-bedroom units and 10 four-bedroom units. The property is located on the western side of the intersection of Hillside Avenue & River Road, with access to Farragut Place, in the Town of West New York's Hillside Road Redevelopment Area.

Note: Upon the recommendation of our Planner and Engineer, the application was deemed complete and scheduled for a hearing on October 19, 2026. (Public notices are required.)

9. Old Business – Applications: None

10. New Business:

a. Preliminary Investigation of an area in need of Redevelopment (Non-Condemnation):
6203, 6205, 6207 Hudson Avenue, WNY (Block: 32 Lot(s): 27, 28 & 29)

1. Fran Reiner – F.A.R. Planning:
Fran Reiner, P.P., of FAR Planning was sworn and accepted by the Board as an expert in professional planning. Mr. Reiner testified that the Board of Commissioners had adopted Resolution No. 26/175 on August 5th 2026 directing that the properties be investigated. As part of the study, he conducted site visits and visual inspections, reviewed the applicable zoning and Master Plan provisions, and prepared the preliminary investigation report provided to the Board. Mr. Reiner explained that designation as an area in need of redevelopment would not, by itself, change the zoning or permit any new uses. Existing permitted uses would remain permitted unless subsequently modified through a separate redevelopment planning process. Mr. Reiner identified Criteria A, B, and D under the Local Redevelopment and Housing Law as applicable to portions of the study area. He explained that Criterion A concerns buildings that are substandard, unsafe, unsanitary, dilapidated, obsolescent, or otherwise unsuitable for wholesome living or working conditions; Criterion B concerns buildings that have remained abandoned for at least two consecutive years; and Criterion D addresses buildings or improvements exhibiting conditions such as dilapidation, faulty arrangement or design, deleterious land use, or other conditions detrimental to the health, safety, and welfare of the community. Regarding 6203 Hudson Avenue, Mr. Reiner testified that the property contains a one-story former warehouse building connected to the adjoining structure at 6205 Hudson Avenue. He stated that the building had been vacant for more than two years and exhibited unsafe and deteriorated conditions, including loose wiring, incomplete construction, and water infiltration.

New Business (Cont'd):

He further testified that the former warehouse use was incompatible with the predominantly residential character of the surrounding neighborhood. The property also contained limited window openings, no meaningful landscaping or street trees, and no stormwater management improvements. Based on these conditions and the length of vacancy, Mr. Reiner concluded that 6203 Hudson Avenue satisfied Criteria A, B, and D. With respect to 6205 Hudson Avenue, Mr. Reiner described the property as a two-story building formerly containing a warehouse use on the ground floor and residential space above. He testified that the building had also been vacant for more than two consecutive years and displayed significant deterioration, including incomplete construction, loose electrical wiring, limited window openings, no windows at the rear, standing water, water damage, and missing appliances within the residential unit. He concluded that the property satisfied Criteria A and D based upon its physical condition and Criterion B based upon its prolonged vacancy. Regarding 6207 Hudson Avenue, Mr. Reiner testified that the property contains two buildings, including a front structure and a second structure located toward the rear. He described significant physical deficiencies, including boarded windows and doors, partially boarded basement access, exposed or hanging wiring, water infiltration, substantial impervious coverage, lack of stormwater management, and a narrow accessway leading to the rear building. He also described problematic access to the rear residential units, including limited accessibility to the lower unit and constrained access to the upper unit. Mr. Reiner stated that the rear building appeared to have originally been constructed as a single residential unit and subsequently converted into two units. Although 6207 Hudson Avenue was not vacant and therefore did not satisfy Criterion B, he concluded that the documented physical and layout conditions supported designation under Criteria A and D. Based upon his investigation, Mr. Reiner recommended that 6203 and 6205 Hudson Avenue be designated pursuant to Criteria A, B, and D, and that 6207 Hudson Avenue be designated pursuant to Criteria A and D. He concluded that all three properties satisfied the statutory requirements necessary for designation as a non-condemnation area in need of redevelopment. Following Mr. Reiner's testimony, the Board indicated that it had no additional questions and opened the matter for questions and comments from members of the public. No members of the public wished to speak.

RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE TOWN OF WEST NEW YORK IN THE COUNTY OF HUDSON, NEW JERSEY RECOMMENDING THAT BLOCK 32, LOTS 27, 28 AND 29 ON THE OFFICIAL TAX MAPS OF THE TOWN, COMMONLY KNOWN AS 6207 HUDSON AVENUE, 6205 HUDSON AVENUE AND 6203 HUDSON AVENUE, BE DESIGNATED AS A NON-CONDEMNATION AREA IN NEED OF REDEVELOPMENT

WHEREAS, the Local Redevelopment and Housing Law, *N.J.S.A.* 40A:12A-1 *et seq*. (the "**Redevelopment Law**"), authorizes municipalities to determine whether certain parcels of land within the municipality constitute an "area in need of redevelopment," as defined in the Redevelopment Law; and

WHEREAS, on August 5, 2026, the Board of Commissioners (the "**Commissioners**") of the Town of West New York, in the County of Hudson, New Jersey (the "**Town**"), adopted Resolution #R26-175 directing the Town Planning Board (the "**Planning Board**") to conduct a preliminary investigation of the property identified on the official tax maps of the Town as Block 32, Lots 27, 28 and 29, commonly known as 6207 Hudson Avenue, 6205 Hudson Avenue and 6203 Hudson Avenue, along with all streets and rights of way appurtenant thereto (the "**Study Area**"), and to recommend to the Commissioners whether the Commissioners should designate all or a portion of the Study Area as a non-condemnation "area in need of redevelopment"; and

New Business (Cont'd):

WHEREAS, FAR Planning LLC, Northvale, New Jersey conducted a preliminary investigation of the Study Area to determine whether the Study Area should be designated as an area in need of redevelopment, and prepared a preliminary investigation report of the Study Area in accordance with the Redevelopment Law, entitled "Preliminary Investigation of an Area in Need of Redevelopment (without Condemnation), Block 32, Lots 27, 28 and 29 (6207, 6205 and 6203 Hudson Avenue)" dated September 2026 (the "**Study**"); and

WHEREAS, the Study sets forth the basis for the investigation of the Study Area and a map depicting the Study Area, and concludes that the Study Area qualifies as an area in need of redevelopment pursuant to the Redevelopment Law, for the reasons set forth in the Study; and

WHEREAS, the Redevelopment Law requires the Planning Board to conduct a public hearing prior to making its recommendation whether the Study Area should be designated as an area in need of redevelopment, at which hearing the Planning Board shall hear all persons who are interested in or would be affected by a determination that the Study Area is an area in need of redevelopment; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board published notice of said public hearing pursuant to P.L. 2025, c.72 on September 3, 2026 and again on September 10, 2026, the latter being at least ten days prior to the date of such public hearing, and the Planning Board mailed a copy of such notice (i) to the last owner of each parcel of property within the Study Area, and (ii) to all persons at their last known address, if any, whose names are noted on the assessment records as claimants of an interest in any parcel of property within the Study Area, on September 3, 2026, such date being at least ten days prior to the date of such public hearing, all in accordance with *N.J.S.A.* 40A:12A-6(b)(3)(d) and P.L. 2025, C.72; and

WHEREAS, on September 21, 2026, the Planning Board reviewed the Study, conducted a public hearing during which members of the general public were given an opportunity to present their own evidence and to address questions to the Planning Board and its representatives, concerning the potential designation of the Study Area as a non-condemnation area in need of redevelopment; and

WHEREAS, after careful consideration of all evidence presented and all testimony, if any, offered,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE TOWN OF WEST NEW YORK, COUNTY OF HUDSON, NEW JERSEY AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The aforementioned recitals are incorporated herein as though fully set forth at length.

Section 2. The Study, and the findings of fact and conclusions contained therein, are hereby incorporated herein by reference in their entirety. The Planning Board Secretary is hereby directed to transmit a copy of the Study and this resolution to the Commissioners.

New Business (Cont'd):

Section 3. After consideration of all evidence presented and all testimony, if any, offered, the Planning Board accepts and adopts the recommendation contained in the Study, and hereby recommends that the Study Area be declared a non-condemnation area in need of redevelopment in accordance with the Redevelopment Law, for the reasons set forth in the Study.

Section 4. This resolution shall take effect immediately.

Motion to **APPROVE / DENY Foregoing Resolution**

Clara Herrera (CH)	Israel Fuentes (IF)	Jonathan Castaneda (JC)	Marcos Arroyo (MA)	Steven Ferrales (SF)	Alain Gomez (AG)	Hector Yanez (HY)	Andrea Bounsiar (AB)	Angie Gutierrez (AG)	Markus Rehfeld (MR)	Marelin Burgos (MB)

Motion:	**CH**	**IF**	**JC**	**MA**	**SF**	**AG**	**HY**	**AB**	**AG**	**MR**	**MB**
Second:	**CH**	**IF**	**JC**	**MA**	**SF**	**AG**	**HY**	**AB**	**AG**	**MR**	**MB**

	APPROVE	DENY	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Chair Brito-Herrera				✓
Vice-Chair Fuentes				✓
Member Castaneda	✓			
Member Comm. Arroyo	✓			
Member Ferrales	✓			
Member Gomez				✓
Member Yanez				✓
Member Bounsiar	✓			
Member Gutierrez				✓
Alt. Member 1 Rehfeld	✓			
Alt. Member 2 Burgos	✓			

New Business (Cont'd):

b. Planning Board Docket #PB 2026-06; filed July 24, 2026
Five Sixty Urban Renewal, LLC site plan – 560-55th Street (Block: 118 Lot: 3)

The applicant is represented by Santo T. Alampi, Esq.
The applicant proposes to demolish an existing two-story brick industrial building, located on the above noted site, and construct a new 6 story, 70 unit, multi family building. The building will consist of four residential floors over two levels of parking; there will be 8 studio apartments, 54 one-bedroom units and 8 two-bedroom units. The property is bounded by 55th Street, Schley Place and Polk Street, east of Jackson Street, in the Town of West New York's 560 55th Street Redevelopment Area. This application was deemed complete at the **August 10, 2026 (Regular Meeting)** The Board subsequently has scheduled the first hearing for this matter for today, **September 21, 2026**. **(Public Notices are required)**

1. **Santo T. Alampi, Esq.– F.A.R. Planning:**
Santo Alampi, Esq., appeared on behalf of the applicant, 560 Urban Renewal, LLC. He requested that the notices and proof of publication be marked as Exhibit A-1 for the record. Counsel then introduced the applicant's professional team and noted that the property had previously been the subject of an area in need of redevelopment investigation presented to the Board. Following the Board's recommendation, the governing body designated the property as an area in need of redevelopment and subsequently adopted the applicable redevelopment plan. Mr. Alampi stated that the present site plan application was intended to implement the vision established by the 560 55th Street Redevelopment Plan. He represented that the proposed development complied with all applicable criteria, bulk standards, goals, and objectives set forth in the redevelopment plan and that the application required no variances.

2. **Cristiano Pereira – CPA Architecture:**
Mr. Pereira testified that the proposed development occupies the short block bounded by 55th Street, Polk Street, and Schley Place and consists of a six-story building containing two above-grade parking levels with four residential floors above. All parking would be located within the building. The project would provide a total of 77 parking spaces and 70 residential units, consisting of eight studio apartments, 54 one-bedroom units, and eight two-bedroom units. Mr. Pereira reviewed the first-floor parking plan and explained that vehicular ingress and egress would occur through a single garage entrance located toward the rear of the building near the intersection of Polk Street and Schley Place. An internal ramp would provide access to the second parking level. The ground floor would also contain the residential lobby, two elevators, mail and package rooms, mechanical and sprinkler rooms, a refuse room, transformer room, bicycle storage, and two means of emergency egress. He testified that the building would comply with applicable ADA requirements, including accessible pedestrian routes, van-accessible parking spaces, and elevator access. With respect to garbage collection, Mr. Pereira testified that the building would utilize a compactor for regular garbage and separate containers for recyclable materials.

New Business (Cont'd):

Waste collection would be performed by a private hauler, with building management coordinating the frequency of pickups based upon actual demand. Based on the proposed storage capacity, he anticipated approximately two pickups per week. Mr. Pereira described the second parking level as containing additional parking, electrical facilities located above the transformer area, building storage, the continuation of the lobby space, elevator access, and the internal vehicular ramp. The first residential level would include dwelling units together with resident amenity areas consisting of a fitness center, lounge, and an interior outdoor courtyard. The remaining typical residential floors would contain additional dwelling units in place of the amenity space. Mr. Pereira testified that the one-bedroom units generally range from approximately 653 to 770 square feet. Two-bedroom units would be located at the corners of each residential floor, resulting in a total of eight two-bedroom apartments. The roof would include an open-air resident amenity deck oriented toward views of New York City. Mr. Pereira clarified that the roof deck would not constitute an additional enclosed story. The roof would also contain proposed solar panels and designated areas for mechanical equipment and a generator. Mr. Pereira reviewed the typical apartment layouts and testified that the units would include modern residential amenities such as in-unit washers and dryers, interior water heaters, adequate closet space, ADA-compliant bathrooms where required, kitchens with islands, and combined living and dining areas. The two-bedroom units would contain two bedrooms and two bathrooms. With respect to the exterior design, Mr. Pereira testified that durable materials, including brick and substantial glazing, would be used along the lower levels, with fiber cement panels, fiber cement boards, and metal detailing utilized on the upper floors. The same architectural vocabulary and materials would continue around all four elevations of the building. Certain units facing toward the New York City skyline would include Juliet balconies. Mr. Pereira also addressed pedestrian and vehicular safety at the garage entrance. He testified that the garage would incorporate a visual warning signal to alert pedestrians when vehicles are entering or exiting, a convex mirror to improve driver visibility, protective bollards within the garage, and a clearance bar. The proposed garage door would provide approximately 8 feet 6 inches of clearance, exceeding the 8-foot-2-inch clearance required for ADA-accessible vehicles. ADA parking spaces would be located near the garage entrance to facilitate emergency access. Mr. Pereira further testified that the project would contain no commercial or retail space. Any exterior signage would be limited to a small building identification sign and street number near the primary entrance and would comply with the applicable signage requirements. Ms. Diaz from Boswell Engineering raised a question concerning potential lighting impacts from the balcony areas. Mr. Pereira clarified that the balconies were Juliet balconies rather than projecting walk-out balconies and therefore would not contain exterior balcony lighting. He confirmed that no additional lighting was proposed that would spill onto neighboring residential properties.

New Business (Cont'd):

3. **Hong Yu – 5509 Madison Street:**
   Hong Yu, questioned how noise from the proposed rooftop mechanical equipment would be mitigated. Mr. Pereira testified that the equipment would consist of small individual mechanical units located toward the center of the roof above the interior corridor and that he did not anticipate adverse noise impacts to neighboring properties. Ms. Yu also expressed concerns regarding increased traffic, pedestrian safety, the nearby school and playground, and potential impacts on public transportation. Mr. Pereira stated that the applicant's civil engineer would address site circulation and related improvements in further testimony. He added that, given the urban location, residents were expected to utilize public transportation and that the applicant did not anticipate all 77 parking spaces being occupied at all times.

4. **Dave Atwood, P.E.:**
   Mr. Atwood reviewed the civil engineering and site plans and testified that the proposed development complies with the applicable standards of the redevelopment plan. He noted that the existing property is essentially fully impervious and that the proposed development would replace the existing two-story industrial building with a conforming six-story building. He confirmed that the project would provide 77 parking spaces and that the parking supply complies with the redevelopment plan. Regarding stormwater management, Mr. Atwood testified that the proposed system would collect and manage substantially more stormwater than under the existing condition. The design would comply with the redevelopment plan and the more stringent requirements of the North Hudson Sewerage Authority, with an overflow connection to the Authority's system. He further testified that the applicant would comply with all applicable municipal and utility authority requirements. Mr. Atwood reviewed the parking garage circulation and stated that the internal drive aisles provide sufficient maneuvering area, including a 24-foot-wide two-way aisle. Vehicular access would be provided from Polk Street rather than directly from 55th Street. Although no separate traffic study was prepared, Mr. Atwood testified that the development complies with the redevelopment plan with respect to the number of residential units and parking spaces and that the location of the garage entrance was intended to reduce traffic impacts along 55th Street. Mr. Atwood also reviewed the proposed utility connections and testified that connections are available from 55th Street and Polk Street, with the final configuration subject to coordination with the appropriate utility providers and the Town Engineer. Finally, Mr. Atwood confirmed that he had reviewed the Boswell Engineering review letter and identified no comments or requested revisions with which the applicant could not comply. He agreed that the plans could be revised as necessary to address the Board Engineer's comments and any requirements imposed by the North Hudson Sewerage Authority.

New Business (Cont'd):

5. **John McDonough, P.P:**
   Mr. McDonough testified that the application is fully compliant with the 560 55th Street Redevelopment Plan and requires no variances or design exceptions. Mr. McDonough described the existing property as an obsolete industrial site containing a building dating to approximately 1920 and testified that the redevelopment plan was intended to reverse stagnation and promote residential revitalization. He stated that the proposed six-story, 70-unit multifamily development with 77 parking spaces complies with the redevelopment plan's requirements concerning permitted use, building height, number of stories, building coverage, setbacks, parking, landscaping, lighting, and stormwater management. Mr. McDonough further testified that the application advances the goals and objectives of the redevelopment plan by promoting economic development, supporting nearby commercial corridors, encouraging appropriate mid-rise residential development, and incorporating sustainable and context-sensitive design. He also noted that the site is located within walking distance of Bergenline Avenue and Kennedy Boulevard, providing convenient access to established transportation and commercial amenities. Mr. McDonough concluded that the application is consistent with both the redevelopment plan and the Town's Master Plan and is also consistent with broader State planning objectives encouraging development within established urban areas containing existing infrastructure and services. He opined that the applicable statutory criteria for approval had been satisfied and that approval of the site plan was warranted.

6. **Hong Yu – 5509 Madison Street:**
   Hong Yu expressed concerns regarding potential neighborhood impacts from the proposed development, including loss of light and views, increased shadows, wind conditions, heat impacts, aesthetics, street lighting, traffic, and public transportation. In response to Ms. Yu's question regarding lighting, Mr. McDonough testified that the project complies with the redevelopment plan's lighting standards. Mr. Atwood added that site lighting would be designed to illuminate the property without creating off-site glare or light spill. He stated that any broader improvements to municipal street lighting would fall outside the scope of the application. Board Counsel clarified that the Planning Board's role is to review the application for compliance with the adopted redevelopment plan. Broader issues involving transportation, municipal street lighting, or other neighborhood-wide improvements would need to be addressed by the governing body.

Note: **The Board voted to carry this hearing to the 10/5/2026 Regular Meeting.**

September 21, 2026
Planning Board Regular Meeting

New Business (Cont'd):

Motion to **CARRY PB 2026-06**

Clara Herrera (CH)	Israel Fuentes (IF)	Jonathan Castaneda (JC)	Marcos Arroyo (MA)	Steven Ferrales (SF)	Alain Gomez (AG)	Hector Yanez (HY)	Andrea Bounsiar (AB)	Angie Gutierrez (AG)	Markus Rehfeld (MR)	Marelin Burgos (MB)

Motion:	**CH**	**IF**	**JC**	**MA**	**SF**	**AG**	**HY**	**AB**	**AG**	**MR**	**MB**
Second:	**CH**	**IF**	**JC**	**MA**	**SF**	**AG**	**HY**	**AB**	**AG**	**MR**	**MB**

	APPROVE	DENY	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Chair Brito-Herrera				✓
Vice-Chair Fuentes				✓
Member Castaneda	✓			
Member Comm. Arroyo	✓			
Member Ferrales	✓			
Member Gomez				✓
Member Yanez				✓
Member Bounsiar	✓			
Member Gutierrez				✓
Alt. Member 1 Rehfeld	✓			
Alt. Member 2 Burgos	✓			

September 21, 2026
Planning Board Regular Meeting

11. Privilege of the Floor: None

12. Adjournment:

Motion to **Adjourn at 7:10 P.M.**

Clara Herrera (CH)	Israel Fuentes (IF)	Jonathan Castaneda (JC)	Marcos Arroyo (MA)	Steven Ferrales (SF)	Alain Gomez (AG)	Hector Yanez (HY)	Andrea Bounsiar (AB)	Angie Gutierrez (AG)	Markus Rehfeld (MR)	Marelin Burgos (MB)

Motion:	**CH**	**IF**	**JC**	**MA**	**SF**	**AG**	**HY**	**AB**	**AG**	**MR**	**MB**
Second:	**CH**	**IF**	**JC**	**MA**	**SF**	**AG**	**HY**	**AB**	**AG**	**MR**	**MB**

	APPROVE	DENY	ABSTAIN	ABSENT
Chair Brito-Herrera				✓
Vice-Chair Fuentes				✓
Member Castaneda	✓			
Member Comm. Arroyo	✓			
Member Ferrales	✓			
Member Gomez				✓
Member Yanez				✓
Member Bounsiar	✓			
Member Gutierrez				✓
Alt. Member 1 Rehfeld	✓			
Alt. Member 2 Burgos	✓			

_____
Acting Chair Jonathan Castaneda

Attest: _____
Joseph E. Roque
Board Secretary