

HILLSBOROUGH TOWNSHIP BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES
May 15, 2013

Chairman Fenwick called the Board of Adjustment meeting of May 15, 2013 to order at 7:30 p.m. All stood for the Pledge of Allegiance. The meeting took place in the courtroom of the Municipal Complex.

Chairman Fenwick announced that the meeting had been duly advertised according to Section 5 of the Open Public Meetings Act, Chapter 231, Public Law 1975 ("Sunshine Law").

ROLL CALL

Michael Volpe – Present	Frank Valcheck – Present
John Stamler – Absent	Shawn Lipani (#7) – Absent
Helen Haines, Vice Chairman – Present	Frank Herbert (Alt. #1) – Present
Marian Fenwick, Chairman – Present	Curtis Suraci (Alt. #2) – Present
Walter Dietz, III – Present	Kenneth Hesthag (Alt. #3) – Present
	Michele (Horst) Boronkas (Alt. #4) – Present

Also in attendance: Mark Anderson, Esq., Board Attorney, Woolson Sutphen Anderson, P.C.; William H. R. White, III, PE, Engineer, Maser Consulting; David Kois, Zoning Officer/Assistant Planner/Board of Adjustment Administrative Officer/Secretary; and Lucille Grozinski, CCR.

ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES

None

ACCEPTANCE OF RESOLUTIONS

None

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT BUSINESS

None

BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

None

PUBLIC HEARING - APPLICATIONS

BELLE MEAD TIRE (LaRue) – File #BA-12-13 – Block 180.01, Lot 2 – 882 Route 206.

Richard Schatzman, Esq. appeared on behalf of the applicant and stated that at the last meeting, the Board Engineer requested we design a stormwater management system due to the excessive impervious coverage for the site. We also met with the Fire Official and have resolved the issues from his memo, like changing the access and removing the dumpster.

We had to get permission from the owner for the soil testing in order to properly design the stormwater management system. We were delayed in getting everything done. We now have the report but were not able to provide it to the Board Engineer in time for his review. Since we had to do a stormwater management system, we would no longer like to bifurcate this application. We will just need to add the lighting and landscaping plans for a full site plan with 'c' and 'd' variances. We will also need to pay the fees.

After discussion, a motion and a second was made to carry the application to June 19. All but Mr. Dietz were in favor; Mr. Dietz was opposed. Mr. Schatzman provided an extension through July 31, 2013 for the time of decision. Mr. Schatzman stated he would be providing new notice.

Rohul PATEL and Urja SHUKLA – File #BA-13-05 – Block 207.10, Lot 17 (formerly known as Block 208, Lot 77.07) - 13 Ethan Court. Applicant seeking 'c' Bulk Variance for relief from Maximum Impervious Coverage and such other variances, waivers and approvals as are necessary to permit the applicant to construct an additional paver patio and walkway, rear patio and additional walkway on property in the R District.

Urja Shukla and Rohul Patel, husband and wife, were sworn in and gave the following testimony.

Ms. Shukla said we are looking to increase our impervious surfaces to 20.15% in order to build a paver patio around our swimming pool and in the back of our home, as well as appropriate pathways.

Mr. Dietz asked if there were two frontages on the property.

Mr. White explained there is a conservation easement there so you cannot gain access to Hillsborough Road. It has two frontages.

Mr. Patel said my understanding is that 50 ft. behind the conservation was my property. After the 50 ft. mark was

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING MINUTES

May 15, 2013

township property.

Mr. Anderson said the survey you submitted indicates that Hillsborough Road is immediately adjacent to the back of your lot which means you have two front yards. The Ordinance does not allow for improvements to be made in the front yard.

Mr. Kois reminded the Board that within the past year, an ordinance was adopted that allows for this accessory structure by making the rear yard just that, while adhering to front yard setback requirements. Prior to that, anytime a property had a through lot, they technically had two front yards and would have needed a variance for that. This ordinance changes the setback in this situation from the 1 1/2 time the height requirement to that of the front yard setback.

Mr. Dietz asked why the patio and walkways have to be so extensive.

Ms. Shukla said we have calculated the amount of space needed for the furniture for our family.

Mr. Dietz said there are reasons why there are restrictions on impervious coverage; one is to recharge the ground water, another is to protect our neighbors down the rivers from being flooded.

Mr. Patel said we are empathetic to those who have been flooded. We are hoping we are able to mitigate that by some of the choices we have made. We have done a lot of research of stormwater runoff after having attended a previous meeting and learning this was a big concern to the Board. We do not have any plans for leaving anything bare on the property; we plan to put more plants and vegetation around the pool. Anything that does not have plants or pavers will have grass and/or mulch in an effort to help mitigate runoff.

Vice Chairman Haines said you are asking for an additional 1,400 sf. of additional impervious coverage. It does not sound like are trying all that hard.

Ms. Shukla said we are willing to compromise.

Chairman Fenwick asked if the walkway from the driveway to the patio could be eliminated.

Mr. Patel said my wife and I had talked about possibly not having the patio go all the way around the pool so that we could have more vegetation, trees and bushes back there. We could eliminate 3 ft. at the back of the pool which would save 100 to 150 sf.

Mr. Dietz asked about the way in which the pool would be covered.

Mr. Patel said we spoke with our pool company about a cover that can be anchored into the ground.

Mr. Dietz asked again about the removal of the walkway from the driveway to the patio.

Ms. Shukla said we are looking to have a resolution of this tonight so we are willing to make compromises. You cannot tell from the plan but where the walkway you are suggesting to be removed, there is an exit from the house with a wood deck on it. We would like everything to look cohesive. That is another entrance of the house that our children use. We are looking to remove the small existing wood decking. We have had wood decks before and find that they require a good deal of maintenance and eventual replacement. The pavers we have found are more affordable for us than building a large wood deck.

Mr. Herbert asked about the possible option of pebble stones.

Mr. Kois clarified if the stones are in a pathway where people will be walking and compacting the stone, then it is considered impervious; if only for decorative landscaping in plant beds and the like, it is not considered impervious.

Mr. Hesthag pointed out it is important to keep the patio and walkway around the pool but there may be an opportunity to reduce by losing a foot all around the pool. Instead of having a solid walkway all around the pool, you might consider stepping blocks every other foot, the same with the walkway from the patio to the pool.

Ms. Shukla said we are already agreeable with shortening the amount of patio all the way around the pool, especially in the back of the pool. We would like to keep the walkways if we can.

Mr. Patel said for a cohesive look, we would like to keep the travertine all around. If the Board wishes, we will consider reducing the patio space around the pool. We will work within whatever number you give us.

Mr. Kois added, my biggest concern is the location of the pool to the conservation easement. Originally when the permit was granted, you proposed a pool that did not require any sidewalk on the part of the pool facing the conservation easement. It now appears there is going to be a walkway a few feet before the conservation easement and there is going to be a fence between there. Perhaps you may want to move the pool closer to the house so that you can maintain the grass

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING MINUTES
May 15, 2013

around property and leave the conservation easement in its natural state.

Ms. Shukla said there is a privacy fence the contractor built. When we had gotten your report and read your concerns, we decided not to have the walkway behind the pool and just have vegetation and landscaping. Currently there is not grass behind the fence it is just trees and wild brush; we have not touched it.

Chairman Fenwick said I remember when we did this subdivision application at the Planning Board. The conservation easement was very crucial and run-off was a big issue for the neighboring properties with stormwater.

Mr. Patel said removing the back end of the pool patio and making the pool area a little smaller, we would reduce the impervious to 1,300 sf.

Mr. Dietz asked if there are 2 existing lawn inlets.

Ms. Shukla said yes. We are hoping that with the amount of landscaping we plan to put in it can slow the run-off that goes into those outlets. We are planning on grading our backyard appropriately. The pool is already built. We set the pool in that location to allow for some running area for our twins.

Mr. Dietz asked if the deck outside of the family room could be shortened.

Ms. Shukla said it could. We could also get rid of the walkway behind the pool. Around the patio we are just looking for enough area to make it safe and put out a couple of lounge chairs. We approximated about 5 ft. for the area from the pool to the fence.

Mr. Dietz asked how the area around the pool is calculated.

Mr. White said we use a planimeter to measure odd shaped areas. The plan submitted is not to scale. I have a concern as to whether the areas have been measured correctly.

Vice Chairman Haines asked, if they were to increase the impervious coverage by 1,000 sf., what would that percentage be?

Ms. Shukla answered 18.52%.

Vice Chairman Haines said that is about how high I would like to go. Chairman Fenwick agreed.

Mr. Herbert asked about pervious pavers.

Mr. White said there are semi-pervious pavers but none of the stormwater regulations have address that issue yet other than to say that the gap between the pavers could be considered pervious but that would be a very small percentage of the overall surface area. There are pervious asphalt, pervious concrete and pervious pavers. The problem is the maintenance of them. They have to be power washed all the time, leaves have to be removed, etc. otherwise the pores will get clogged with dirt. It is green technology but if you do not keep up with the maintenance it is not going to work and it could be a zoning nightmare for code enforcement.

Mr. Kois said I try to encourage people to reduce the impervious coverage such as using stepping stones rather than a full 3 to 4 ft. walkway that may be seasonal, narrowing the opening of the driveway, and other design alternatives.

Ms. Shukla said you do bring up a good point that this will be seasonal. We will not need these walkways 12 months out of the year. We selected travertine because of the non-slipage for around the pool area. At 1,150 sf. we are 19.01%. In talking with our neighbors, it seems that 19% is the percentage that has been granted by this Board. We were hoping to get the same consideration. We can make the changes to get it down to 19%.

Mr. Dietz said I can live with that. You should consider, as David said, whether you are ever going to use the walkway from the driveway to the patio. You have an odd shaped lot. Your neighbors may have larger lots too.

Mr. Kois reminded the Board that with this development, the builder built the houses almost to maximum impervious coverage, leaving little room for any walkways, including that from the front door.

Mr. Dietz suggested granting 19% impervious coverage and have the applicant figure out how they are going to use it.

Ms. Shukla said we would be amenable to that.

Mr. Anderson asked for clarification on the location of the pool equipment.

Ms. Shukla said the pool equipment is to the right side of the pool towards the back corner. We will include the pad for the pool equipment in our calculation.

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING MINUTES

May 15, 2013

Public questions/comments

None

Close Public

A motion to approve the maximum impervious coverage at 19%, with the applicant to decide how the patio and walkways will be configured was made by Mr. Dietz, seconded by Mr. Valcheck.

Roll Call: Mr. Valcheck – yes; Mr. Volpe – yes; Mr. Dietz – yes; Mr. Herbert – yes; Mr. Suraci – yes; Vice Chairman Haines – yes; Chairman Fenwick – yes. Motion carries.

LONG HILL KENNELS – EXPANSION – File BA-13-04 – Block 171, Lot 50.01 – 380 Long Hill Road.

Ernest Renda, Esq. representing the applicant presented exhibits for marking and stated the following:

This application is seeking 3 variances; (1) Use Variance for expansion of a nonconforming use which was granted about 40 years ago for a commercial kennel on the property; (2) to allow two principal uses on the same property, a residence and a commercial kennel which was the result of a merger of two lots in connection for a subdivision to create open space for Somerset County about 10 years ago; and (3) a bulk variance for impervious coverage of approximately 10.2%.

Our witnesses tonight will be Diane O'Donnell, owner and operator; James Mantz, P.E.; and Shirley Yannich, P.P.

Diane O'Donnell was sworn in and gave the following testimony in response to questions asked by Mr. Renda:

I have owned Long Hill Kennels since the summer of 2007. Ms. O'Donnell reviewed her credentials for animal care then stated, since I have owned the property we have completely renovated the inside run area, the back outside area including the concrete which has been refurbished, enclosed the porch area for additional office space, the repair and resealing of the parking area, new septic system, all of the water lines have been replaced, the well pumps were replaced and those not being used were properly sealed.

We do discount rescue boarding which is boarding for homeless animals for rescue groups at a deep discount and also regular customer boarding which fills up during vacation times. We have an average of 57 dogs on any given day throughout the year. We have two separate sides to the kennel. The one that is indoor/outdoor has 38 runs; the small dogs area also has room for 38 dogs.

Exhibit A1 – Occupancy Calculations was marked

Exhibit A2 – Drop-off/Pick-up Calculations

The average is 6.5 customers per day. We are open 8 a.m. to 7 p.m. and do not have specific hours for drop-offs and pick-ups; it is an all day thing. It is rare when there are more than 3 customers there at one time. The indoor/outdoor runs are in more demand and versatile. I am asking for 50 more spaces. The kennel is gaining a good reputation and more in demand. We have waiting lists for just about every peak period. I would like to help with disaster recovery. I have had to say no to some larger recovery organization because I did not have the room.

Vice Chairman Haines asked if the kennel was down during the storm.

Mrs. O'Donnell said we have a generator that powers the whole kennel. During storm Sandy, our kennels became full from people who were without power. We have really turned the kennel around. It was minimally functioning when we purchased it. We have done everything to make the kennel safer and more efficient.

Power goes out in that area and the road get closed so being a less populated area, we tend to be last on the list of the power companies. Since we are talking about living animals, they need someone there full time to provide care.

Mr. Dietz said he recalled that this property was before the Board previously to address having 2 uses on 1 property.

Mr. Renda said the Resolution from 2003 addresses two uses however, it was heard by the Planning Board. There was a variance granted in 1974 for the kennel with a site plan approved with it. Then there was a gap of time until 2003 for a re-subdivision and merger of lots. The original kennel was on a 3 acre lot with the residence on a separate lot. When the open space application was done, there was an adjustment to the lot lines. Even though not conforming, they were able to keep the impervious coverage in compliance. The lot ended up being 6.5 acres when the merger occurred and as far as I can tell, there was no separate determination by the Board of Adjustment. There is a house on this property which was converted into an office for the kennel back when the variance was originally granted in 1974 and then there is the "house next door" that the O'Donnells now live in.

Mr. Dietz asked how the noise of that many dogs once they get barking will be controlled for the neighbors.

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING MINUTES
May 15, 2013

Mrs. O'Donnell explained the different types of barking: alarm barking, attention barking and aggression barking, and different ways in which each is controlled. The dogs tend to bark more when they are stressed. One of the biggest things to lower the stress of the dogs is to provide larger enclosures with indoor and outdoor space. We have also increased the walls from 2 ft. to 4ft. to cut down on the dog's visibility to see each other. The dogs go out three times a day for exercise. The new part of the kennel can use better technology.

Chairman Fenwick said in Dr. Belnay's memo dated today, he notes that there has never been a complaint by neighbors or customers of noise or sanitary problems so you must be doing a good job.

Mrs. O'Donnell said our nearest neighbor is about 250 to 300 ft. away. The dogs are kept in at night. The runs are shut down for the dogs and also for security and temperature control.

Vice Chairman Haines asked for more information about the generator.

Mrs. O'Donnell said the kennel draws from 2 of the wells on the property. The generator can run for 6 days even with the air conditioning on. It is powered by propane.

Public questions

None

Mr. White asked how many employees work at the kennel now and how many do you project with the extra runs.

Mrs. O'Donnell said full-time year round is one full-time employee, one part-time employee plus myself, and another part-timer on the weekends. During the summer I can go up to 5 or 6 employees. I think I am going to have to have at least a 50% increase with the additional runs.

Mr. White said one of my concerns is that you are going from 6 employees to 9 employees but there are only 5 parking spaces.

Mrs. O'Donnell said they are not all there at the same time. I am open 8 a.m. to 7 p.m. There are 6 spaces at my personal driveway. They park in my driveway so they do not take up the spaces. We have 11 spaces between the two sites. Our hours of operation are 7 days a week.

James J. Mantz, P.E. was sworn in, gave his credentials as a professional engineer, was recognized by the Board and gave the following testimony:

Exhibit A3 – Site Plan was displayed for the courtroom. This property, containing 6.25 acres. It is located on the westerly side of Long Hill Road. The existing house and kennel do not meet front yard and side yard requirements but they are existing conditions. The proposed kennel and runs will be behind the minimum 150 ft. setback requirement with the exception of a hallway that will connect the existing office space with the new kennel. We have delineated the wetlands but have not yet obtained a Letter of Interpretation from the State. The plan shows a 150 ft. delineation buffer line. All of the proposed improvements will be on slopes that are less than 12%. The proposed building will not have a basement; it will just be on a slab.

I looked at the soil testing that was conducted as part of the septic system improvement. It is a managed system. The seasonal high water table is approximately 30 in. below grade. The soils map of the area supports that. **Exhibit A4 – Site Plan** on a 20 Scale was displayed. In Exhibit A4 I tried to address some of the comments in the review letters. There will be approximately 7 trees, 15 in. to 20 in. caliper, that will need to be removed for the kennel and stormwater management area. At the time of the subdivision, the gravel areas were not included in the impervious coverage areas so at that time the calculation was 5%. All existing areas covered by gravel are calculated at 7.21% impervious coverage calculation; after construction we would have 10.2%. I understand from a zoning point of view the gravel areas are impervious but the way in which the dog runs will be constructed, with filter fabric and approximately 3 or 4 in. of stone, that will allow a certain amount of water to percolate into the soil. This area will not be for a driveway, parking area or walkway. These dog runs take up approximately 4% of the proposed calculation for impervious coverage.

Mr. Dietz asked if the property around the kennel is preserved land.

Mr. Mantz said the property to the west and to the south is preserved by the County, to the southeast is the quarry property, to the north is the pipeline and Pirozzi properties, directly across the street is one residence.

Mr. White asked how many trees have to be cut down to create the detention facility. What is its purpose?

Mr. Mantz said as shown on the plan, 5 trees. The purpose is to control runoff from the proposed building and to promote some groundwater recharge. The amount of impervious coverage is less than ¼ acre with less than an acre of disturbance.

Mr. White said you are not creating enough of a disturbance to trigger the township's stormwater requirements; you are

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING MINUTES
May 15, 2013

doing this on your own. Downgrade is the County property with wetlands. Would anyone be impacted if you just let the run-off run?

Mr. Mantz said no, not in my opinion.

Mr. White said my concern is that you are creating a point discharge; pulling all of the water together in one spot and discharging it to one area on a slope and may be doing more harm than good. You stated the groundwater was about 30 inches below grade. You need a 4 ft. cut to create that basin so you will be in groundwater to begin with.

Mr. Mantz said we put this on the plan to let the Board know we were thinking about stormwater. If we are going to do stormwater, I am going to do something different, probably some filling along side of the kennel to create a dike rather than excavation into the ground.

Mr. White informed the Board I do not think this is an appropriate place to put stormwater; I do not see the need for it. My concern with gravel driveways is that the roadstone and clay harden over multiple passes of vehicles and become like a rock. That is not the case here. I do not see this stone becoming compacted.

Mr. Dietz asked what will be in the stormwater run-off.

Mr. Renda called Mrs. O'Donnell back up to answer the question.

Mrs. O'Donnell said the stone in the yard is round river rock. I use that for the dogs so it does not get caught in their feet.

Mr. White stated that does not compact well.

Mrs. O'Donnell continued, when we do disinfection, any of the urine goes to the septic tank. We pick up the solids, put them into plastic bags which are put in the trash. There is no run-off and will not be.

Mr. Mantz said if you do not include the dog run gravel as impervious, we will be at 6.4%.

Questions from the public

Caroline Katmann

Ms. Katmann asked about the gravel in the dog runs not being impervious. How many dogs will be running on them on a daily basis?

Mr. Mantz said from a stormwater management perspective, I do not think it is.

Mrs. O'Donnell said on each yard there are approximately 20 dogs that use each yard 3 times a day for about 5 to 10 minutes. The runs are also used for an occasional playtime for 15 - 20 minutes, as ordered by the customer. The dogs are not let out together unless they are in the same family. Otherwise, it is one dog at a time.

Break

The hearing resumed at 9:21 p.m.

Mr. Renda noted for the record that the requirement for the applicant to contact bordering properties to seek land to lessen the nonconformity was met with no affirmative responses.

Shirley Yannich, P.P., A.I.C.P. was sworn in, reviewed her credentials, was accepted by the Board and gave the following testimony:

Ms. Yannich stated I have submitted my report dated January 21, 2013. I believe the special reasons that support the flexible 'c' variance is that this municipality has 26 zoning district, none of which allows a kennel as a permitted use or conditional use. Veterinary hospitals are allowed in 5 districts as either a permitted or conditional use and horse boarding stables are allowed in the AG District as a conditional use. This kennel has been in operation since 1973. The rural characteristic has been maintained. There is an employment factor involved as well.

On page 3 of my report, after hearing Mrs. O'Donnell's testimony, my count of 100 dogs is incorrect. My reference on page 8 of my report that 39% of households have pets further supports the need for kennels.

The surrounding areas are comprised of County open space to the south and west, 52 acres of which immediately abuts the property; the Texas Eastern Pipeline is to the north; 2 residences on Pirozzi Lane within 200 ft. of the property; and 1 residence across the street on Long Hill, bordered by the quarry. The property is surrounded mainly by open space with the exception of the 6 properties on Pirozzi and Long Hill.

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING MINUTES
May 15, 2013

Mr. Renda clarified the 200 ft. is from the property line. The kennel itself is some distance from that.

Ms. Yannich agreed. She continued, this property is in the Mountain Zone. There was a time when the minimum lot size was 3 acres. That changed in 2002. With the Planning Board subdivision for the County, their application must have come in prior to that rezoning. They must have been grandfathered since a little over 5 acres was left. Five acres is what was required up to December, 2002. Since then it has gone up to 15 acres.

The kennel is a thriving business. The hardship would be no kennel service in this part of town. There is another kennel on Roycefield Road which is also a nonconforming use. The site is suited because it is surrounded by open space; very few residential properties are affected.

Minor points were referenced from the 1990 Industrial Commission Report and Master Plan. Ms. Yannich said the kennel has been in operation for 40 years, the septic system has been updated, the well is not strained by expansion and the business is licensed. The negative criteria would be noise, which will be mitigated; traffic which will not be significant because it does not come at 9 a.m. and leave at 5 p.m.; and odor which was already well spoken to by the owner regarding fecal matter.

The public interest is to continue the service expected. In my estimation the positive criteria outweighs the negative in so far as the stewardship the owner has maintained in taking care of this property. The issue of having multiple uses on one lot could have been taken care of at the time of the subdivision but it was not so we are asking for that now. I do not see this application as a detriment. The rural character of the area is being maintained.

Mr. Dietz asked do you think having a larger impervious coverage on this single lot would have a negative impact on the surrounding 100 or so acres given that most of it is pervious and will never be built on.

Ms. Yannich said as a Planner, I do not see a problem with it. The regulations for odors is controlled by a Health ordinance, not a Zoning ordinance.

Mr. Renda said that completes our testimony.

Comments from the Public

Caroline Katmann

Ms. Katmann was sworn in and said I am the Executive Director of the Sourland Planning Council and making a statement on behalf of the Sourlands Planning Council tonight. As part of our mission is to protect the ecological integrity of the Sourland Mountain region, we are opposed to granting this variance because it would double the allowable impervious coverage. Water is a fleeting source in the Sourlands and the rocky lands severely limits the recharge. This impacts (1) the thousands of people who depend on the water for everyday use; (2) stream flow because groundwater discharges into stream channels providing the base flow that keeps them running during dry periods; and (3) ephemeral features like vernal pools which provide critical breeding areas for native amphibian species. We are also concerned with any land use changes that trigger the Stormwater Management Ordinance. We also point out that the implementation of stormwater should not take the place of mitigation or remediation required for impervious cover or other land changes that will result from any new construction at the site. Those must be offset by further mitigation projects such as woodland replacement, natural restoration and preservation of riparian corridors or other projects the Township may require.

Mr. Renda noted that the applicant is not here on a site plan application but that the applicant is committed to meeting whatever stormwater standards is necessary. A straight-line calculation with regard to the percentages may not totally apply given the nature of some of what is technically called "impervious coverage" on this particular property. Here you are looking at an existing business for which the use was approved 40 years ago having determined there was a need. The testimony you have heard tonight supports that ongoing need. I believe that needs to be balanced carefully against the environmental restraints.

Diane Jordan – Longhill Road

Ms. Jordan was sworn in and said I live across the street from the kennel. They have taken good care of the kennel and made many improvements. We have no complaints at all. As for the water situation talked about, we have approximately 4,000 acres behind us. I do not think what they are going to do is going to make much of a difference.

Close public

Mr. Dietz said I think this is a good application. The impervious coverage is increasing but it is de minimus with respect to the surrounding properties, most of which will be preserved forever.

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING MINUTES

May 15, 2013

A motion to approve was made by Mr. Dietz, seconded by Vice Chairman Haines. Vice Chairman Haines agreed and said this property was originally much larger. As a public service it was sold to the County for public use. This business serves a public use. Dr. Belnay’s letter highly recommends the way it is being run at this point.

Roll Call: Mr. Valcheck – yes; Mr. Volpe – yes; Mr. Dietz – yes; Mr. Herbert – yes; Mr. Suraci – yes; Vice Chairman Haines – yes; Chairman Fenwick – yes. Motion carries.

Chairman Fenwick said I would like to commend you for the work you do. I am impressed with the work you have been doing and the work you have done to this property. I agree that Dr. Belnay’s letter speaks volumes to this Board about everything you are doing. You will be back for site plan.

Chairman Fenwick took an informal poll on attendance for the June 19 meeting. Discussion ensued regarding attendance.

Mr. Anderson reminded the Board that an appeal on the Roth matter would have to have been filed by this past Monday. We have no notice that an appeal has been filed.

Vice Chairman Haines asked Mr. Kois if there has been compliance on that site.

Mr. Kois said I have been in contact with one of the neighbors. What I have been told is that there are a number of issues going on. I will need to get further documentation for the early morning hours. I have received some calls but I do not know exactly what is going on out there until I see it. I believe the site plan application has to be filed by July 1, 2013.

CORRESPONDENCE

None

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:59 p.m.

Submitted by:
Debora Padgett
Planning Board/Board of Adjustment Clerk

Approved