

STRATFORD JOINT LAND USE BOARD
MINUTES
July 28, 2022
Via Zoom

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Mike Mancini at 7:00 pm and the public statement was read that the meeting was advertised in the Courier Post, the Collingswood Retrospect and a notice was posted on the bulletin board at the Borough Hall stating the time and place.

The Chairman led the board in the pledge of allegiance and a prayer.

ROLL CALL:

Present

M. Mancini, Chairman	Class IV
P. McGovern, Vice Chairman	Class IV
J. Keenan, Mayor	Class I
T. Kozeniewski	Class IV
K. Campbell	Class IV
T. Hall	Class IV
T. Lomano	Class III
R. Morello, Chief of Police	Class II
R. St. Maur	Class IV

Absent

M. Chicalo, Alternate I

A. Costa, Solicitor
S. Bach, Engineer, Bach Associates
Candace Kanaplue, Bach Associates
S. McCart, Secretary

MINUTES: Motion by Mr. Hall and seconded by Mr. Morello to approve minutes of June 23, 2022. All Ayes. Mrs. Lomano abstained.

RESOLUTION TO BE MEMORIALIZED: Resolution 2022:12 ACE Substation, Block 69, Lot 10

Motion by Mr. St. Maur and seconded by Mr. Morello to approve Resolution 2022:12. Roll call: Mr. McGovern, yes, Mayor Keenan, yes, Mr. Hall, yes, Mr. Kozeniewski, yes, Mrs. Lomano, yes, Mr. Morello, yes, Ms. Campbell, yes, Mr. St. Maur, yes, Mr. Mancini, yes.

NEW BUSINESS: Preliminary Need Investigation, Determination of Need Report, Block 116, Lots 14 and 14.04

Mr. Mancini recused himself from hearing. He is within 200 feet of the property.

Mr. Morello recused himself from hearing. Due to criminal and other violations ticketed against Laurel Mills, LLC and the owner as contained in the expert report pursuant to my duties as the police chief.

Mr. St. Maur recused himself from the hearing. Since the last meeting he received a phone call from the owner who expressed a desire to talk about the possibility of me playing a support roll in construction management.

Mr. McGovern replaced Mr. Mancini. Mr. Chicalo participated in meeting.

Mr. Bach and Ms. Kanaplue were sworn in by Mr. Costa. Mr. Bach introduced himself and Ms. Kanaplue. He reviewed their credentials.

The report which has been marked as an Exhibit, was prepared by myself and Candace Kanaplue. This report was on file with the Borough along with the map of the study area. This report serves as the statement of the actions that may be considered tonight at this hearing. Mr. Bach will be referring to the report for exhibit, study area interchangeably throughout his testimony. By way of back ground the Land Use Board under Resolution 2022:10, contained in section 2 of the report, authorized Candace Kanaplue and Mr. Bach to perform a determination in need investigation with provisions outlined in the resolution. In the resolution refers to the resolution that referred this matter to the Land Use Board and that is Resolution from Borough Council 2022:045. We have been directed by governing body as a Land Use Board to investigate Block 116, Lots 14 and 14.04, now known as the study area. In accordance with the local redevelopment housing law to determine whether the properties are in need of redevelopment. Very specifically whether this referral ask the board to consider a designation and investigation in an area in need of redevelopment with condemnation.

Mr. Bach reviewed the report. The planning process is outlined on page 5 and 6 of the report. We are here very specifically for determination of need whether the study area meets the statutory criteria for an area in need of redevelopment. We are not here for redevelopment plan or amendments. We are actually only looking at whether board finds that these properties meet the requirement of an area in need of redevelopment with condemnation. It is important that any redevelopment plan or amendment are not before us tonight. We are not changing any of the municipal land use regulations that currently exist. The Redevelopment area criteria on page eight was reviewed by Mr. Bach.

The solicitor has already indicated that notice is proper for this hearing by allowing this hearing to go forward. The notice has been provided as well as notice to the property owner. Also, the map and the statement, which is the report, has been on file with the borough clerk throughout the notice period.

The conditions that are outlined in the statute as criteria for a property to be in need of redevelopment were read into the record. These are criteria. I am not saying that these are the conditions or the findings of the area. These are the criteria that must be evaluated on the study area.

Mr. Bach reviewed the Applicability of Criteria to the Study Area. That is the referral to this planning board and our planning board is charged to Bach Associates. The report outlines the existing zoning. The study area is located in the Commercial zone. Page eleven goes into site description and history. It goes on to list the owners of the properties which is Laurel Mills, LLC which owns Block 116, Lots 14 and 14.04. These two properties comprise the entirety of the study area.

The Redevelopment Findings, which is this exhibit, has been completed. What is included, but not limited to, is a list of physical inspections, a physical inspection, an analysis of the condition of the subject properties, the relationship among other uses of the properties, relationship to the community and region. Based on the findings we concluded that the parcels meet at least one of the required criteria to be designated as a condemnation area in need of redevelopment.

On page twelve we list the criteria and included the lot that falls within the criteria.

NJSA 40A:12A-5a We find Lot 14 falls within these criteria. The building on this parcel is obsolete and substandard. It contains a dilapidated and obsolete and vacant strip mall. It is the subject of several code violations and outstanding fines. The code violations and outstanding fines are listed as appendix 3. We have listed as a summary sheet. These violations range from 2005 to 2021.

NJSA 40A:12A-5b Lot 14 It has been vacant for many years.

NJSA 40A:12A-5d Lot 14 and 14.04 both fall within this criterion. It is set back from the road. The layout is obsolete. It has excessive land coverage.

NJSA 40A:12A-5h Lot 14 and 14.04 Both lots fall in this area. This area is located within the Metropolitan State Planning Area. The NJ State Development and Redevelopment Plan policies support and encourage development and redevelopment.

In Conclusion the Board is going to be tasked to make a determination whether they agree with our recommendations as to whether the criteria are met as put onto the record. Specifically, criteria a, b for lot 14 and criteria d and h for lots 14 and 14.04. The requirement must only meet one of the criteria. We are recommending, based on our professional analysis, that we are recommending that you designate the area in need of redevelopment with condemnation.

It is important to note, included in the exhibit are site photos taken June of 2022. Appendix 2 is JLUB directing us to do the study with Resolution 2022:10. Appendix 3 is the list of violations. Also included is a map of study area, 2 is a zoning overlay on top of study area, map 3 is study area tax parcels, and map 4 is study area and state planning area. Map 5 is a map of qualifying areas in need of redevelopment in our opinion. In conclusion, this exhibit has been prepared for the Board's consideration as well as the testimony that Mr. Bach provided. The Board is going to be asked whether they believe the criteria has been met under the statute for a designation of an area in need of redevelopment with condemnation. That is the only thing to be acted upon. They should consider what the statute provides and what the statute requires.

Mr. McGovern open the meeting up to Board Members to ask any questions. There were none.

Motion by Mrs. Lomano and seconded by Mr. Chicalo to open to the public. Mr. McGovern, yes, Mayor Keenan, yes, Mr. Hall, yes, Mr. Kozeniewski, yes, Ms. Lomano, yes Ms. Campbell, yes, Mr. Chicalo, yes.

Mr. Peter Flannery, attorney for Bisgaier Hoff, on behalf of owner, Laurel Mills LLC stated he had submitted this afternoon a letter, dated July 28, 2022 to Mr. Costa. He wished to use as exhibit.

Exhibit 01 letter sent to Mr. Costa, dated July 28, 2022

He asked Mr. Bach as part of your due diligence, you reviewed all relevant zoning and building department documents at the borough. Mr. Bach stated as evidence by violations included in the report.

Mr. Flannery wanted to confirm a copy of report that he received was not signed or sealed, but there was a notation that the original was signed and sealed. He wanted to confirm that. Mr. Bach stated the only report prepared was July 2022 report. If you are indicating to the statutory requirement of the practice of professional planning, this report is signed and sealed at his office and can be obtained by request.

Mr. Flannery asked Mr. Bach on page 9 the statement that without interceding through redevelopment planning, the condition of the property is unlikely to be revitalized through private sector investment. Mr. Bach stated that is his opinion based on no action on the property for at least ten years.

Mr. Flannery stated on page 11, last paragraph, the economy and zoning appear to be inhibiting productive use of the properties and detracting from the development of potential new uses. Mr. Bach stated in our opinion the properties are not advancing the goals and objectives of the Stratford Master Plan. Nor are they properly serving the community.

Mr. Flannery stated in appendix 3 violations 2005 to 2021. Can you confirm twelve of the violations are from 2011 or later? Mr. Bach stated I can list off very specifically all the listed violations that we concluded.

Mr. Flannery stated he wanted to note that twelve of the 22 violations were from 2011 or later. Mr. Bach stated I would have to list off each one of the violations. I am not going to provide a summary statement.

Mr. Flannery let the record show that twelve of the violations were from 2011 or later.

Mr. Flannery asked if the property were already located in a redevelopment or rehabilitation area. Mr. Bach stated it is located in a rehabilitation area. Mr. Flannery asked when it went into effect. Mr. Bach stated 2011. Mr. Flannery asked if there was a reason why this information was not referenced in the report? Mr. Bach stated this is a determination of whether a study area specially meets the criteria of an area in need of redevelopment with condemnation. This is not a redevelopment plan. Mr. Flannery asked if there was a redevelopment plan currently in place? Mr. Bach stated there is a redevelopment place currently in place. Mr. Flannery stated your reports seem to indicate that there isn't. Mr. Bach stated we are specifically talking about a determination of need or redevelopment with condemnation. Mr. Flannery state the redevelopment plan and rehab area are the same statute requirements as a redevelopment area. Mr. Bach stated no it is not. Mr. Flannery stated it is other than condemnation powers and long-term tax exemption. Mr. Bach stated as a professional planner, I disagree with that. Mr. Flannery asked if there were development approvals for the property? Mr. Bach stated there are pending development approvals that have not been effectuated or completed. Meaning that there are land use approvals before the land use board that have not been consummated with all the conditions of approval. Mr. Flannery stated this board did approve major subdivision approval and preliminary and final site plan in 2019. Mr. Bach stated those documents are not in front of me. That is not part of my testimony or my report this evening. Mr. Flannery asked Mr. Bach if he were involved in that matter. Mr. Bach stated he was the Board Planner. Mr. Flannery asked if that approval is in accordance with the current redevelopment plan. Mr. Bach stated yes, it was conditional approval.

Mr. Flannery asked are you aware that there are construction plans filed with the borough for this project? Mr. Bach stated I am only involved in the Land Use Board applications. I cannot speak to what construction plans may have been submitted. Mr. Flannery stated in preparing this report didn't you review those files? Mr. Bach stated I reviewed the violations. Mr. Flannery stated but you didn't review any other construction files? Mr. Bach stated without the conditions of the approvals, no construction or building permits can be issued. Mr. Flannery asked if he knew what conditions were outstanding at this point? Mr. Bach stated there is a list that is already on file with the applicant, Laurel Mills LLC as well as the borough. I do not have the listing in front of me.

Mr. Flannery asked Mr. Bach if he were aware of the June 14, 2022 borough council resolution that provided for a designation of Laurel Mills LLC as a redeveloper for this property and the execution of a redevelopment agreement? Mr. Bach stated I do not have a copy of that. Mr. Flannery stated that is attached to me letter as well. Are you aware that Laurel Mills on June 30, 2022 submitted a signed redevelopment agreement consistent with this resolution? Mr. Bach stated I only have you letter of July 28, 2022 that was provided to me around 5:00 this evening. It consists entirely of what was made available to me. Mr. Flannery stated there are exhibits a through j attached to that. They are part of a drop box. I could share it with the board if you allowed me to share the screen or he could adjourn this hearing so that you and the board have an opportunity to review all of those exhibits. Mr. Bach asked are you indicating that the review of those documents is necessary for the determination in need of condemnation? Mr. Flannery stated he thought it was. Are you aware that in July 8, \$35,000 in escrow payments and fees were submitted to the Borough of Stratford? Mr. Bach stated no. Mr. Flannery asked why is Borough taking a condemnation redevelopment area designation? Mr. Bach stated the Land Use Board has been asked by resolution by governing body to under go this investigation. We are following the guide lines of the statute. We are following the request of the governing body. As to why, that does not reside with this board.

Mr. Flannery stated if the governing body were to designate this an area of redevelopment condemnation, then the borough could condemn the property and convey it to a third party. Is that correct? Mr. Bach stated if it complies with all the statutory requirements, that is a possibility. Mr. Flannery asked why would the borough seek a condemnation area in need of

redevelopment designation on this property when there is already an in need of rehabilitation, a redevelopment plan, site plan approvals, a negotiated redevelopment agreement and my client has executed that redevelopment agreement and submitted escrow monies for this property. What is the purpose of this area designation, when the redevelopment project is well under way?

Mr. Costa stated Mr. Bach already answered the question. It is not within his knowledge. Mr. Bach stated it is not within this Joint Land Use Boards purview. We were specifically tasked with making a determination, doing a study, and determining whether the area meets the criteria, under the statute, and following the guidelines of the statute and generally accepted planning process policy on whether the area is in need of redevelopment with condemnation. Mr. Flannery asked are you aware of provision in the redevelopment plan that indicates that no property will be acquired through condemnation? Mr. Bach stated if you are speaking of the existing redevelopment plan, that has been amended several times. That is a redevelopment/rehabilitation plan as noted in the report. Mr. Flannery stated that is correct. Mr. Bach stated under the rehabilitation designation, there is no condemnation. Mr. Flannery stated as you indicated in your earlier testimony, they are not changing any municipal regulations. The redevelopment plan is an ordinance and it is currently in place. There is a provision in that ordinance indicating the borough does not have the ability to condemn any properties within this rehabilitation area. How is it that this board have jurisdiction to consider a condemnation redevelopment area designation? Mr. Bach stated redevelopment plans may be complimentary. They may be overlaid in many difference provisions. That does not prohibit a designation an area in need of redevelopment with condemnation. Mr. Flannery stated but if the redevelopment plan that is in place when doing the designation indicates that condemnation is not permitted, I believe you need to amend the redevelopment plan first before going forward with condemnation. Mr. Bach stated in my professional opinion that is not the case. We are not acting on any provisions of a redevelopment plan. The board is only deciding whether the statutory criteria has been met for the study parcels for an area in need of redevelopment with condemnation. Mr. Flannery stated he believes the board and borough council is violating the current redevelopment ordinance by seeking a condemnation redevelopment area designation.

Mr. Flannery asked if Mr. Bach if he were aware of a redevelopment law, standard for condemnation redevelopment area of a reasonable and necessary standard? Mr. Bach asked what specific section are you referring to? Mr. Flannery stated section 8C. Mr. Flannery read section 8C. This goes to the powers of municipality or designated redevelopment entity it may acquire by condemnation any land or building necessary for the redevelopment of a project. There are some cases dealing with that idea and concept which indicate that municipality cannot condemn property if there are bad faith motives or arbitrary and unreasonable action involved. It is the owner's position that there is no real basis for this condemnation area in need of redevelopment. Other than taking the property and conveying it to a third party. The redevelopment process has advanced so far at this point that my client is ready to demolition on the site, do site work, and move forward with this project. Mr. Bach stated there is no action by this board that is saying a property will be condemned. There is no redevelopment plan. There are no changes in the municipal regulations governing the land use. We are very specifically indicating through this hearing whether the board finds that the study area meets the statutory requirements of an area in need of redevelopment with condemnation designation as referred to us by the governing body. A lot of your questions cannot be answered by myself or Candace Kanaplue. Most of these other items you speak of really have nothing to do with the Land Use Board action that we are here for this evening. Mr. Flannery stated he disagreed and you know that the Land Use and Planning Board hearing on designation is the main forum for support or objection a designation. Mr. Bach stated some of the questions you are asking are not before us as the Municipal Land Use. Mr. Costa stated the statute you just reference to about acquiring by condemnation, talks about the effectuation redevelopment plan not about a designation. We are here tonight talking about a potential designation. Mr. Bach stated this was a section 8 that you were talking about, upon

adoption of a redevelopment plan, all these items a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, I j, k, l, m, and n all refer to actions that are associated with a redevelopment plan. We are not here for a redevelopment plan. Mr. Flannery stated no but there is a redevelopment plan in place for this very property. Mr. Bach stated nothing that we are doing this evening would affect that. Mr. Flannery stated it was his position and his client's position that this designation as a condemnation area in need violates the redevelopment plan and the redevelopment law. We request that either that this designation not be recommended or be recommended as a non-condemnation area. Mr. Flannery had concluded his testimony.

There was no further public comment.

Mr. Flannery stated if any of the board members or public would like to go through his letter and the attachments, he was willing to do so. Mr. Bach asked Mr. Flannery if would like to take that opportunity, you may.

Mr. McGovern asked if everyone had a copy of the letter. Mr. Bach stated he did not have a copy. Mr. Flannery stated he could share his screen. Mr. McGovern stated just a note that this will be the first time many people are able to view this because of the late arrival of the letter. Mr. Costa stated he did not receive the letter until 4:45 this evening. Mr. Flannery stated for the record his firm was just retained this week on this matter. We got letter in as soon as we could. If the board would like additional time, the meeting could be adjourned and hear it at a later date so everyone has a chance to review the letter. Mr. McGovern stated let's review the letter and we can go from there. Mr. Costa stated your letter pretty much covers your cross examination. Mr. Bach stated the reason we want to afford Mr. Flannery the opportunity to read his letter, we want no question of whether Mr. Flannery had the opportunity to present whatever he wanted to present this evening.

Mr. Flannery reviewed his letter which was on the screen. The letter is the legal argument presented tonight. He reviewed the exhibits. Exhibit A is a chain of emails showing there was a negotiation between Mr. Del Duca and Mr. Platt. Exhibit B is a letter from Mr. DelDuca office, dated June 30, this is hand delivered to Stratford Borough Hall enclosing the redevelopment agreement and explaining that the checks would be forthcoming, asking the borough to execute the agreement which it did not. Exhibit C is a letter from Mr. DelDuca dated July 8 which provides the \$35,000 in escrow replenishment. The escrow was accepted but the other fees were returned. There was a redevelopment plan prepared by Bach Associates dated August 9, 2011 and it has been amended several times. There was Resolution from 2019 for proposed redevelopment project. There was this board's resolution. Exhibit G is on the borough website. It showcases the redevelopment project. Exhibit H is a copy of Preliminary need investigation Report. There is a code complaint summary.

Mr. Bach asked Ms. Kanaplue what the parenthesis are for. Ms. Kanaplue state the parenthesis are the number of violations.

Mr. Flannery continued Map 2 of the exhibits is the overlay zoning. It indicated that there is a redevelopment plan in place for this property. There was the notice that Mr. Flannery's client received. It is in order and in compliance with the statute. There is no mention of the existing designation or redevelopment plan. Finally, is a copy of the zoning map from the borough website. It has a C zoning and is cross hatched which means redevelopment rehabilitation area. Mr. Bach asked are you indicating that the report doesn't indicate what the current zoning on the property is? Mr. Flannery stated it indicates what the current zoning is but it does not indicate that there is a redevelopment plan in place.

Mr. Bach stated the majority of the documents that you just presented attached to your letter have never come before this Joint Land Use Board with the exception of the redevelopment plans which the Land Use Board was very familiar with. We still have many members of this Board who were there during that Planning Board approval process. The documents you indicted were contractual documents between a redevelopment entity, as the governing body, and your client Laurel Mills LLC. They are outside any control purview approval process, review or necessity of

being copied onto the Land Use Board. The approvals that you say are in place, not really for the Land Use Board. Land Use Board issued a conditional approval. The conditional approval was very specifically based on the standing that Laurel Mills LLC had to appear before this Land Use Board and utilize the rehabilitation redevelopment plan, Laurel Mills Redevelopment/Rehabilitation Plan. Utilize the zoning that's in place there. Whether those approvals are still valid is questionable. If there is no redevelopment agreement, I don't know that the approvals are even valid at this point. Mr. Flannery asked Mr. Bach why it would not still be valid. Mr. Bach stated how can you rely on standards of a redevelopment plan if you do not have a redevelopment designation as you indicated based on your testimony. Mr. Flannery stated it does not have to be designated as a redeveloper or have a redevelopment agreement in order to redevelop property.

Mr. Costa asked hasn't the redeveloper been removed? Hasn't council revoked the redeveloper? Mr. Bach stated to Mr. Flannery isn't that one of your attachments in your letter. Mr. Flannery stated it is not but I do have that. He introduced it as Exhibit 02. It was an email from Mr. Platt dated July 8, 2022. Mr. Flannery read the emails terminating the redeveloper. He stated they do not accept that termination. As you can see, we submitted the redevelopment agreement. We submitted by June 30 and explained why the checks were late. Mr. Del Duca, on July 14, acknowledge receipt and said he did not agree with Borough's decision.

Mr. McGovern stated he wanted to make sure that you have been fully heard. Mr. Flannery stated yes.

Mr. Bach read a section of the March 28, 2011 as amended in 2011, 2014 and 2021 of the Laurel Mills Redevelopment/Rehabilitation Plan. I want to clarify. Very specifically it says on page 7 of 20, a property owner that has not been designated as redeveloper may also make application to the Land Use Board for site plan proposal and may apply for variances from the redevelopment plans standards consistent with municipal land use law. No action between the governing body and Laurel Mills LLC is affecting the conditional approval that was given by this Land Use Board. The Land Use Board approval, I believe is still intact, I defer to Mr. Costa and Mr. Platt. We are not here to argue the merits of the negotiation or correspondence, agreements or lack of agreements, cancelled agreements between the governing body or/and Laurel Mills LLC. We are not here to interpret what the governing body's decision process was in deferring this specific recommendation of the study area consisting of two parcels, Block 116, Lots 14 and 14.04 to this Land Use Board for a determination in accordance with statutory requirement of whether these two properties meet the criteria, one or more of the criteria, for a designation of an area in need of redevelopment with condemnation.

Mr. McGovern asked were this vote to go forward, it would not change anything? It goes back to borough council and that information is given to them. It does not change the redevelopment.

Mr. Bach stated we are not acting on the existing redevelopment plan. We are not acting on any of the prior approvals. We are only saying do these properties meet the criteria of one or more items on the report and if you believe that the evidence is there, and you agree with the testimony, you can vote affirmative. If you disagree, then you would vote in the negative.

John Gentless, 111 Union Avenue, was sworn in by Mr. Costa. He asked Mr. Flannery when is your client going to demo the building? Mr. Flannery stated as soon as mayor signs the redevelopment agreement. Mr. Gentless stated he lived here all his life. There use to be a dry-cleaning business on property. If your client going to do any phase II to see if there is any type of contamination on site prior to demolition? Mr. Flannery stated I was not the Land Use attorney for the hearing so I cannot comment on that. I am sure their due diligence has been done.

Motion by Mr. Hall and seconded by Mr. Kozienski to close the public portion. All members voted aye.

Mr. Bach asked Mr. Costa you heard during the public session if this board has the jurisdiction and is acting appropriately under the local redevelopment and housing law in its proceedings. Can you advise myself and Ms. Kanaplue and the rest of the board whether we have standing and whether we can proceed with taking an action this evening?

Mr. Costa stated tonight is only about a recommendation as to whether or not this area should be in need of redevelopment with condemnation. There is an existing previous plan for rehabilitation but as I understand the wording in the statute, you can have both. The chore tonight is to make a recommendation based upon the resolution Council sent to this Land Use Board as to whether or not the Board will find that this area in the area in need of redevelopment with condemnation. The Board can, after the hearing, recommend that the delianted area or any part there of be determined or not be determined by municipal government an area in need of redevelopment with condemnation. The final word is with Borough Council. If your recommendation is a favorable recommendation, Council must adopt a resolution and take certain steps that they have to take. And then move into a redevelopment plan. The plan would either be done by Council or by the Joint Land Use Board. The recommendation is only a recommendation. If you recommend that this area is in need for redevelopment with condemnation, that is only a recommendation. It is not a final step. There are other steps that have to be taken if you find the area is in need.

Mr. Costa stated the motion would either be to recommend or not recommend back to council that this area is in need of redevelopment with condemnation.

Motion by Mr. Hall and seconded by Mr. Kozeniewski to recommend. Roll call vote: Mayor Keenan, yes, Mr. Hall, yes, Mr. Kozeniewski, yes, Mrs. Lomano, yes, Ms. Campbell, yes, Mr. Chicalo, yes. Mr. McGovern, yes.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Motion by Ms. Lomano and seconded by Mr. Kozeniewski to open to the public for any comment not related to the application heard tonight. All ayes. Hearing none. Motion by Mr. Kozeniewski and seconded by Mr. Hall to close the public portion. All ayes.

BOARD COMMENT: none

COMMUNICATION/ORGANIZATION: Next meeting August 25, 2022

ADJOURNMENT: Motion by Mr. Hall and seconded by Ms. Lomano to adjourn. All ayes