

BOROUGH OF WILDWOOD CREST
Planning Board
Meeting Minutes – 2 October 2024 5 p.m.

The following are the minutes of the Wildwood Crest Planning Board as held on Wednesday October 2, 2024, at Borough Hall. The proceedings of the meeting are recorded and available for public inspection.

CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Mr. Davenport called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m., lead the Pledge of Allegiance and read the statement of compliance with the open Public Meetings Act.

ROLL CALL:

Patrick Davenport: present	Barbara Hunt: present	Brian Melchiorre: absent
Don Cabrera: present	Joe Franco: present	Angela Daniels: present
Fred Mettler: present	Brian Stuart: present	Vince Tenaglia: present
Bradley Vogdes: present	Jane Reynolds: present	
Board Secretary Pamela Riper: present		
Rob Belasco: present		
Engineer Marc DeBlasio: present		

MINUTES:

Mr. Mettler moved to dispense with the public reading of the minutes of the meeting of 4 September 2024 and approve as distributed, Mr. Vogdes second, minutes approved as distributed.

Patrick Davenport: yes	Barbara Hunt: yes	Don Cabrera: yes
Joe Franco: yes	Angela Daniels: yes	Fred Mettler: yes
Brian Stuart: yes	Vince Tenaglia: abstain	Bradley Vogdes: yes
Jane Reynolds: yes		

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING BOARD ACTIONS:

Resolution PB-24-13 for **Application PB-24-11** for 205 E. Syracuse Avenue a/k/a blk 135 lots 15 in Zone R-2 owner Glen & Kimberely Gibbs; seeking “C” Variance. Denied.

Ms. Hunt moved to approve, second by Mr. Vogdes:

Patrick Davenport: yes	Barbara Hunt: yes	Don Cabrera: yes
Joe Franco: yes	Angela Daniels: yes	Fred Mettler: yes
Brian Stuart: yes	Vince Tenaglia: abstain	Bradley Vogdes: yes
Jane Reynolds: yes		

Vincent Tenaglia recuses himself and leaves meeting at 5:10pm.

APPLICATIONS:

Application PB-24-16 5900 Park Boulevard a/k/a blk 29 lots 6, 6.01, 7, 7.01 in Zone R-1A owner Carmen Alamenno; seeking “C” Variances. Adjourned to 6 November 2024.

Application PB-24-10 for 8501 Bayview Drive a/k/a blk 140 lots 16, 17 & 18 in Zone R-1A owner David DiStefano; seeking Minor Subdivision & “C” Variance.

The Applicant was represented by John Amenhauser, Esquire who outlined the nature of the application and the relief sought in connection with same.

The subject property is located at 8501 Bayview Drive, a/k/a Block 140, Lots 16, 17, and 18, and it is currently developed with a single-family dwelling.

The subject property is an oversized lot located partially in the Borough’s R-1A zone and partially in the R-2 zone.

The Applicant is proposing to subdivide the property to create a 70.25ft. x 80ft. lot (proposed lot 16.01) and a 40ft. x 80ft. (proposed lot 16.02). As a condition of approval, the Applicant must confirm the lot numbers and property addresses for the proposed lots with the Borough Tax Assessor and reflect same on a revised Subdivision Plan.

In addition, as a condition of approval, the Applicant is responsible for the payment of a \$100 tax map maintenance fee for each proposed lot.

The existing single-family dwelling will be maintained on the proposed 70.25ft. x 80ft. corner lot. This single-family dwelling is oriented towards Bayview Drive.

A new single-family dwelling is proposed to be constructed on the 40ft. x 80ft. interior lot.

Mr. Amenhauser advised the Board that the proposed subdivision will create two (2) fully conforming lots; however, the subdivision triggers the need for variance relief in connection with the existing single-family dwelling.

The Applicant is requesting 'C' variance relief in connection with minimum deck or porch coverage fronting streets, the minimum rear yard setback, and from § 85-92(h)(1) of the Borough Code requiring subdivided corner lots to be oriented towards north/south streets.

David Distefano, the Applicant, and owner of the subject property, appeared, and he was placed under oath to testify before the Board.

Mr. Distefano advised the Board that he purchased the subject property in November of 2022, and he currently resides in the existing single-family dwelling on a full-time basis with his family.

Mr. Distefano testified that the proposed minor subdivision would allow him to maintain the existing single-family dwelling while also constructing a new single-family dwelling for his parents.

He indicated that he has no intentions on renting either dwelling.

Vincent Orlando, P.E., P.P., L.L.A., C.M.E. with Engineering Design Associates, P.A. appeared before the Board on behalf of the Applicant. Mr. Orlando was accepted by the Board as an expert in the fields of engineering and land planning and he was placed under oath and testified from the proposed Minor Subdivision Plan, prepared by The Hyland Group, consisting of one (1) sheet, dated April 24, 2024, and last revised September 11, 2024, which was received by the Board, and which is incorporated herein as fact.

Mr. Orlando confirmed that the subject property is an oversized, 8,762.65SF lot that is developed with a single-family dwelling.

The existing dwelling contains improvements that encroach within the required minimum side yard setback, but complies with all other bulk requirements.

Mr. Orlando testified that the Applicant is proposing a subdivision to create a 70.25ft. x 80ft. lot (5,562.64SF) that will contain an existing single-family dwelling and a 40ft. x 80ft. (3,200SF) that will be developed with a single-family dwelling.

He indicated that both proposed lots meet or exceed the bulk requirements in the R-1A and R-2 zones.

Mr. Orlando testified that the proposed 40ft. x 80ft. interior lot (lot 16.02) requires no variance relief.

He indicated that the proposed subdivision creates the need for variance relief in connection with the existing single-family dwelling (proposed lot 16.01) as the subdivision will result in non-conforming building coverage, combined deck/building coverage, minimum rear yard setback, and minimum lot depth.

Mr. Orlando testified that lot 16.02 is a corner lot with frontage along Syracuse Avenue and Bayview Drive.

He indicated that the Borough's Ordinance allows a property owner to designate their front for the purposes of calculating lot depth.

Mr. Orlando testified that lot depth when measured from Bayview Drive is 68ft. whereas 80ft. is required.

He indicated that if lot depth is measured from Syracuse Avenue complies with the requirements of the R-1A zone.

Mr. Orlando testified that the Applicant is experiencing a hardship which supports granting the requested 'C' variance relief.

Mr. Orlando testified that the proposed lots conform to the requirements of the Ordinance.

He opined that the existing single-family dwelling, and its location on the proposed lot establishes exceptional topographic conditions or physical features unique to the subject property.

He further opined that the strict application of the Borough's zoning ordinance establishes peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties supporting the Applicant's request for variance relief.

Mr. Orlando indicated that the variances can also be considered under the C(2) criteria.

Mr. Orlando opined that several of the purposes of zoning, outlined within N.J.S.A. 40:55D-2, are advanced in connection with this application and support the relief sought by the Applicant as it:

Encourages municipal action to guide the appropriate use or development of all lands in this State, in a manner which will promote the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare as the proposed lots meet the applicable area requirements and are consistent with the surrounding neighborhood;

Promotes the establishment of appropriate population densities and concentrations that will contribute to the well-being of persons, neighborhoods, communities and regions and preservation of the environment

as single-family dwelling is proposed which is permitted in the zone and consistent with the surrounding neighborhood; and

Encourages coordination of the various public and private procedures and activities shaping land development with a view of lessening the cost of such development and to the more efficient use of land. Mr. Orlando further opined that the application can be granted as there are no substantial detriments to the public good and the application does not impair the intent and/or purpose of the zone plan or zoning ordinance.

Mr. Orlando testified that the size and dimensions of the subject property, and the fact that the neighborhood contains primarily 40ft. x 80ft. lots provides an adequate basis to find that the Borough's intent was for the subject property to be subdivided, consistent with what the Applicant is proposing. Borough Engineer Marc DeBlasio, P.E., P.P., C.M.E., prepared an Engineer's Report dated July 2, 2024, which was received by the Board, and which is incorporated herein as fact.

Mr. DeBlasio appeared at the meeting and reviewed said Report for the benefit of the Board, and he noted the conditions outlined therein. As a condition of approval, the Applicant will comply with any and all comments/conditions set forth within the Engineer's Report.

Mr. DeBlasio confirmed the relief sought in connection with the Applicant's proposal.

Mr. DeBlasio discussed in detail the definition of 'lot depth' and the ability of the Applicant to designate the front yard of a corner lot at the time of development. He confirmed that the lot depth, when measured from Syracuse Avenue, is 80ft. and complies with the Ordinance.

He indicated that the lot depth, when measured from Bayview Drive, is deficient and would necessitate variance relief.

Mr. DeBlasio advised the Board that the Applicant's decision to measure lot depth from Syracuse Avenue results in a lot that complies with the area requirements of the R-1A zone, but results in the need for variance relief to address non-conforming conditions that are created by virtue of the proposed subdivision.

At the conclusion of the Applicant's presentation, the Meeting was opened to the public for comment. Mary Vassallo, owner of the property located at 8503 Bayview Drive, appeared and she was placed under oath to testify before the Board. Ms. Vassallo advised the Board that she lived next to the subject property. She indicated that she was opposed to the application and the relief sought by the Applicant. She expressed concerns that the subdivision would result in the creation of a narrow lot that would be inconsistent with the Block. She expressed additional concerns about impacts to light, air, and open space.

No additional members of the public addressed the Board in connection with this application.

Accordingly, the public portion of this application was closed.

Board Members expressed concerns in relation to the fact that the proposed subdivision would result in the creation of non-conforming conditions associated with the existing single-family dwelling.

Several Board Members indicated that the subdivision and the non-conformities it would create have a negative impact on light, air, and open space.

A Board Member expressed concerns about the density of the surrounding neighborhood.

Several Board Members indicated that they weren't necessarily opposed to the proposed subdivision but had significant problems with the creation of non-conforming conditions that require variance relief.

Mr. Amenhauser advised the Board that the Applicant could eliminate an existing deck and part of the existing garage in order to eliminate the need for coverage variances.

He requested that the application be tabled so that the Applicant could modify the proposed Subdivision Plan in an attempt to address concerns raised by the Board.

The hearing was continued to the meeting of October 2, 2024.

Mr. Amenhauser reviewed the testimony provided during the August Board meeting, and he discussed revisions that the Applicant was proposing to address concerns associated with the non-conformities that would be created in connection with the proposed subdivision.

He advised the Board that the Applicant was proposing to remove an existing deck and reduce the size of the existing garage which would eliminate the need for lot and building coverage variances, and which would result in a conforming side yard setback.

Mr. Amenhauser indicated that the Applicant was designating the southern portion of the lot as the rear yard which requires a 16ft. setback whereas 6.01ft. is proposed.

He stated that the condition exists regardless of whether this area of the lot is considered a side or rear yard.

It should be noted that the setback would confirm if this area were designated as a side yard, and variance relief would be required for the rear yard setback due to the proposed subdivision.

Mr. Amenhauser distributed three (3) exhibits which were received by the Board and marked as follows:
Exhibit A-1: A packet containing seven (7) pages containing renderings of the existing single-family dwelling, the proposed single-family dwelling, and both dwellings next to one another.
Exhibit A-2: A packet containing two (2) pages depicting renderings of the existing dwelling and proposed modifications when viewed from Syracuse Avenue.
Exhibit A-3: A page containing photographs depicting utility connections along Syracuse Avenue adjacent to proposed lot 16.02.

Mr. Orlando discussed that modifications made by the Applicant in detail.
He advised the Board that the changes to the plan were limited to proposed lot 16.01 which will contain the existing single-family dwelling.
The existing garage was reduced in size by approximately 341.9SF, and an existing deck will be eliminated, further reducing the size of the existing single-family dwelling by 225.3SF.
Mr. Orlando testified that the modifications result in building coverage and combined building and deck coverage being brought into compliance with the bulk requirements of the R-1A zone eliminating the need for variance relief.
Moreover, Mr. Orlando testified that the reduction in the size of the garage and the elimination of the deck provides more light, air, and open space thereby advancing a purpose of zoning.
Mr. Orlando further testified that the Applicant elected to continue to measure lot depth from Syracuse Avenue which results in a depth of 80ft. which complies with minimum lot depth in the zone.
He indicated that the Applicant has elected to now designate the southern portion of the lot as the rear yard and the eastern portion of the lot as the side yard setback.
Mr. Orlando testified that the designated side yard setback complies with the requirements of the zone; however, the rear yard setback is deficient as 16ft. is required whereas 6.01ft. is proposed.
Mr. Orlando indicated that the southern setback to the neighboring property will exist regardless of whether the yard is designated as a side or rear yard.
He reviewed the remaining variances that are requested in connection with the proposed subdivision.
The Applicant is requesting a variance in relation to the minimum deck or porch fronting along a street as .8% exists whereas 3% is required. He noted that this is a pre-existing condition; however, a variance is required by virtue of the fact that the subdivision will create a new lot.
The Applicant is also seeking a variance from 85-92(h)(1) of the Borough Code which requires that lots created by virtue of the subdivision of a corner lot must be oriented towards north/south streets.
Mr. Orlando testified that the interior lot, lot 16.02, does not comply with this requirement; however, he opined that the lot itself fully conforms to the area requirements of the R-2 zone, and same is consistent with lots in the surrounding neighborhood.
Nevertheless, he opined that the Applicant's proposal meets the intent of the Ordinance as the existing single-family dwelling will continue to be oriented towards Bayview Drive.
Mr. Orlando reiterated the purposes of zoning, outlined within N.J.S.A. 40:55D-2, that he previously indicated would be advanced in connection with this application and support the relief sought by the Applicant.
He indicated that he believed that the Board could also find purpose (i) is advanced as the proposal promotes a desirable visual environment through creative development techniques and good civic design and arrangement.
Mr. Orlando testified that utility connections along Syracuse Avenue were also provided in the location of proposed lot 16.02 evidencing the fact that the Borough anticipated that the subject property could be subdivided resulting in the development of additional dwellings along Syracuse Avenue.
With respect to off-street parking, Mr. Orlando advised the Board that three (3) off-street parking spaces will be provided on lot 16.01, which complies with the requirements of the Ordinance.
The existing single-family dwelling contains five (5) bedrooms requiring three (3) parking spaces. Mr. Orlando indicated that a concrete pad is proposed to be added to the eastern portion of lot 16.01 to facilitate the third parking space. As a condition of approval, the Applicant will submit a revised subdivision plan depicting three (3) parking spaces for lot 16.01 and the location of the proposed 9ft x 20ft. concrete pad.
He indicated that two (2) parking spaces will be provided for the proposed single-family dwelling.
A discussion ensued between the Board and the Applicant regarding the lot depth measurement and the Applicant's decision to change the previously designated side and rear yards.
Board Members expressed concerns that regardless of the designated side and rear yard, non-conformities are created which require variance relief.
The Board received an updated review memorandum from Mr. DeBlasio dated September 26, 2024.

Mr. DeBlasio reviewed the modifications made by the Applicant and the impact that same has on the need for variance relief. He confirmed that two variances were eliminated by virtue of the removal of the deck and the reduction of the size of the garage. Mr. DeBlasio noted that the proposed location of HVAC mechanicals will require variance relief. In response, the Applicant indicated that the HVAC mechanicals would be relocated to the rear yard, eliminating the need for variance relief. The Board reopened the Application for public comment. No members of the public addressed the Board. Accordingly, the public comment period was closed. Board Solicitor Robert Belasco, Esquire reviewed the variance relief sought by the Applicant and provided the findings of fact for the record.

Findings of Fact accepted on motion of Ms. Daniels and 2nd by Ms. Reynolds:

Patrick Davenport: yes	Barbara Hunt: yes	Don Cabrera: yes
Joe Franco: yes	Angela Daniels: yes	Fred Mettler: yes
Brian Stuart: abstain	Vince Tenaglia: abstain	Bradley Vogdes: yes
Jane Reynolds: yes		

The Board accepted the findings of fact and thereafter opened the Application up for deliberation. A majority of the Board continued to express concerns about the fact that the proposed subdivision results in the creation of non-conforming conditions which results in the need for variance relief. A minority of the Board commended the Applicant for modifying the plans to address concerns associated with setbacks and coverage issues. As a condition of approval, the Applicant indicated that they would record a Deed Restriction prohibiting construction in the area of the proposed 16ft. side yard setback.

On Motion of Ms. Daniels and 2nd by Mr. Mettler for approval:

Patrick Davenport: no	Barbara Hunt: no	Don Cabrera: no
Joe Franco: yes	Angela Daniels: yes	Fred Mettler: yes
Brian Stuart: abstain	Vince Tenaglia: abstain	Bradley Vogdes: no
Jane Reynolds: yes		

Application DENIED.

Joe Franco, Don Cabrera & Angela Daniels recuse themselves.

Application PB-24-09 for 5611 Pacific Avenue a/k/a blk 11.01 lots 11 & 12 in Zone R-2 owner Blue Bee Pro LLC; seeking “C” & “D” Variances. The Application was heard at the Board’s September 4, 2024 and October 2, 2024 meetings.

September 4th, 2024 Meeting:

The Applicant was represented by Jeffrey Barnes, Esquire who outlined the nature of the application and the relief sought in connection with same.

The subject property is located at 5611 Pacific Avenue, a/k/a Block 11.01, Lots 11 and 12, in the Borough’s R-2 zone and it is currently developed with a pre-existing non-conforming mixed-use structure that contains three (3) residential units and one (1) commercial unit that previously operated as a deli. The Applicant is proposing to renovate the existing structure in order to maintain the three (3) existing residential units and the existing commercial unit will be converted to an office.

In connection with this Application the Board received the following plans, which are incorporated herein as fact:

Architectural Plans entitled “Renovations to Existing Mixed Use Dwelling: 5611 Pacific Avenue, Wildwood Crest, NJ 08260” prepared by Ralph H. Wesner, R.A., of RWA Architecture, consisting of three (3) sheets, dated March 1, 2024, and last revised September 24, 2024.

Site Plan entitled “Preliminary/Final Site Plan, 5611 Pacific Avenue, Block 11.01, Lots 11 & 12, Borough of Wildwood Crest, Cape May County, New Jersey,” prepared by Gregory K. Schneider, P.E., P.L.S., consisting of two (2) sheets, dated July 20, 2023, and last revised September 26, 2024.

Mr. Barnes reviewed and confirmed the relief sought in connection with the Applicant’s proposal. He discussed the history of the subject property and the prior applications that were filed by the Applicant which were denied by the Board.

Mr. Barnes informed the Board that the structure has been completely gutted at this juncture; however, the Applicant intends to maintain what remains of the structure and renovate same.

He confirmed that the ground-floor consists of one (1) commercial unit that previously operated as a deli, and one (1) residential unit.

One (1) residential unit also exists on the second and on the third floors, for a total of three (3) residential units on site.

Mr. Barnes indicated that the Applicant is proposing maintain all three (3) residential units and is proposing to convert the commercial space to an office to be used by his construction business.

He reviewed and confirmed the relief sought by the Applicant in connection with this proposal.

Mr. Barnes advised the Board that six (6) variances are requested to address pre-existing non-conforming conditions, more specifically lot area, lot width, lot frontage, minimum front yard setback, minimum side yard setback, and maximum building height.

He advised the Board that seven (7) of the variances that were originally requested are being eliminated as the Applicant intends to comply with the requirements associated with said items.

More specifically the Applicant will comply with the following requirements:

The Applicant will comply with the requirement to provide street trees;

The existing freestanding sign will be relocated from the site triangle;

The freestanding sign area will be reduced to comply with the Ordinance;

The freestanding sign setback will be increased to comply with the Ordinance;

The height of the freestanding sign will be reduced to comply with the Ordinance;

The height of first finished floor will be increased to comply with Base Flood Elevation; and

The average lighting footcandles within parking lot will comply with the Ordinance.

Mr. Barnes indicated that revised plans will be submitted if the Application is approved confirming compliance with the items identified above.

He further advised the Board that the Applicant is seeking waivers from providing a traffic study, a landscaping plan, a scale model of the proposed development, an environmental impact statement, and community impact statement.

Mr. Barnes stated that a neighboring property owner raised concerns about drainage issues and impacts to neighboring properties. As a condition of approval, the Applicant agreed to submit a grading and drainage plan which will include underground ground-water stormwater retention systems for review and approval by the Board Engineer.

Ralph Wesner, R.A. with RWA Architecture, appeared on behalf of the Applicant. Mr. Wesner was accepted by the Board as an expert in the field of architecture and he was placed under oath and testified from the proposed architectural plans.

Mr. Wesner advised the Board that he was responsible for designing the proposed renovations to the existing building.

He indicated that the intent was to maintain the existing appearance of the building, and to bring it into compliance with current construction, flood, and fire codes while maintaining consistency with the surrounding neighborhood.

He noted that the existing structure is an iconic building that has existed for decades and which has long-standing historical ties to the Borough.

Mr. Wesner confirmed the existing floor plan, noting that the building consists of three (3) residential units, one on the first, second, and third floors, and a ground-floor commercial unit.

He testified that the ground-floor commercial unit historically operated as a deli/food market.

Mr. Wesner confirmed that the structure has been gutted and renovations are proposed to the entire building.

Mr. Wesner testified that the habitable space of second floor residential unit is proposed to be increased by reducing the size of an existing wrap-around exterior porch.

In response to a question posed by the Board, Mr. Wesner testified that he was unable to confirm the square footage of the existing residential units.

He confirmed that the size of the third-floor unit will not be increased.

With respect to proposed bedrooms, Mr. Wesner testified that a two (2) bedroom unit is proposed on the first floor, and three (3) bedroom units are proposed on the second and third floors.

Mr. Wesner testified that the first-floor ceiling height is approximately 12ft. He indicated that the Applicant will be raising the floor joists in order to ensure compliance with applicable flood requirements and to ensure that the first finished floor is above the based flood elevation.

In response to a question posed by the Board, Mr. Wesner indicated that the first floor will be raised by approximately 1ft.; however, he indicated that the building itself will not be raised.

Mr. Wesner reviewed the exterior building elevations for the benefit of the Board.

He stated that the exterior of the building will be refaced, brick is proposed around the bottom of the structure, and the Applicant plans to utilize hardy board siding, a standing seam metal roof, azek trim, new windows, sliding glass doors, a new gambrel roof and dormers on the roofline. Dmitry Kaptsov, the Applicant and principal of Blue Bee Pro, LLC, appeared and he was placed under oath to testify before the Board.

Mr. Kaptsov discussed the exterior materials that he intends to utilize during renovations and he confirmed the modifications that are proposed to the interior of the structure.

Mr. Kaptsov testified that bricks will be installed around the bottom of the structure for aesthetic purposes and to provide additional waterproofing for the commercial unit.

Gutters are proposed to be installed in an effort to mitigate stormwater and drainage issues. The gutters will be tied into the underground retention system proposed on site.

Mr. Kaptsov testified that his goal is for the structure to appear as if it is a residential dwelling since the property is located in a residential zone.

He advised the Board that the proposed siding will be gray in color, and black windows will be utilized to create a desirable visual environment.

He confirmed that the floor in the first-floor residential unit will be raised to comply with current flood regulations, and that the existing commercial unit will be maintained as it currently exists, with the exception of interior modifications to create individual office space and to meet the needs of his business.

Mr. Kaptsov testified that a fire escape will be constructed in the rear of the structure to provide an additional means of egress from the third floor.

With respect to the proposed expansion of the second floor, Mr. Kaptsov testified that 8ft. of an existing wrap around porch facing Pacific Avenue will be eliminated to increase the habitable area of the residential units.

Board Members expressed concerns that the second-floor deck was previously identified by the Board as an architectural feature that they believed should be maintained.

Mr. Kaptsov testified that a small porch will be provided along the Pacific Avenue frontage; however, he indicated that he felt that larger units were necessary given current market demands.

He indicated that a load bearing wall is proposed to be incorporated due to the gambrel style roof in order to ensure structural integrity.

He indicated that maintaining the second wrap-around floor porch would significantly increase construction costs associated with shoring up the structural integrity of the building.

Mr. Kaptsov testified that he does not see a need to maintain a large, 1,000SF porch for units that are approximately 800SF in size.

He confirmed that the porch along Lavender Road is being maintained.

Mr. Kaptsov testified that a previously proposed pool has been removed, and an existing garage will also be eliminated to reduce building and lot coverage, and to accommodate the proposed off-street parking area.

Three (3) parking spaces are proposed along Lavender Road, and to the east three (3) rows of three (3) stacked off-street parking spaces are proposed.

The stacked parking will be used by the residential units.

A parking variance is required for one (1) space associated with the commercial unit.

Mr. Kaptsov testified that individual unit owners will need to coordinate the removal of stacked cars.

In response to a question posed by the Board, Mr. Kaptsov testified that HVAC units will be installed within the structure above BFE.

He also confirmed that a 250SF storage space is provided on site beneath the proposed exterior staircase and in the rear of the structure for each unit.

He indicated that the elimination of the pool provides ample space for additional storage space if required.

In response to a question posed by the Board, Mr. Kaptsov indicated that two (2) bedrooms are proposed within the first-floor unit, and three (3) bedrooms are proposed within the second and third floor units.

Board Members expressed concerns in regards to the proposed density on a 100ft. x 70ft. lot.

He indicated that the office that he is proposing will be utilized primarily on an appointment-only basis.

He testified that he also owns commercial property offshore where storage and vehicle parking is handled, and he confirmed that no commercial vehicles will be parked/stored on site overnight.

Board Members expressed additional concerns about the potential future conversion of the office space to a more intense retail/commercial use in the future.

It should be noted, that commercial uses are not permitted within the R-2 zone, and any modification to the existing office space or change of use, would require a new application to the Board for any and all required approvals. As a condition of approval, the Applicant will record a Deed Notice and a copy of the

Board's Resolution providing that the commercial space is approved exclusively as an office and any modification would require a new application to the Board.

Paul Kates, P.E., P.P. with Kates Schneider Engineer, LLC, appeared on behalf of the Applicant. Mr. Kates was accepted by the Board as an expert in the fields of engineering and planning and he was placed under oath and testified from the proposed site plan.

Mr. Kates reviewed the existing site conditions for the benefit of the Board.

He testified that the residential units are proposed to contain 918SF of habitable space within the ground floor residential unit, 1,317SF within the second-floor unit, and 1300SF within the third-floor unit.

Mr. Kates testified the elimination of the existing second-floor wrap around porch adds approximately 200SF of habitable space to the property.

Mr. Kates advised the Board that the existing first-floor unit is being reconfigured as a room that was previously used as an office will now function as a bedroom.

Mr. Kates reviewed the proposed off-street parking arrangement for the benefit of the Board.

He testified that three (3) rows of three (3) stacked vehicles are proposed for use by the residential units.

The parking spaces start as a concrete pad and then transition to parking strips in an effort to reduce overall lot coverage.

He indicated that three (3) additional parking spaces are proposed in front of the building which will be utilized by the commercial unit.

An existing curb cut will be maintained so as to not disturb on-street parking spaces, and one (1) on-street parking is maintained along Lavender Road and two (2) are maintained along Pacific Avenue.

In response to a question posed by the Board in relation to the limited walkways provided from the parking area to the structure, Mr. Kates testified that individuals accessing the site have ample space to walk in front of parking spaces and there is a 3.8ft. gap between the structure and parking area provided.

He indicated that adequate lighting will be provided in the parking area. As a condition of approval, the Applicant will submit a lighting plan to the Board Engineer for review and approval.

Board Members expressed significant concerns in regard to the triple stacked parking configuration and the conflicts that it will inevitably create between unit owners.

Mr. Kates indicated that 3 spaces could be eliminated which would result a shortfall of four (4) parking spaces; however, he indicated that the Applicant felt it was more beneficial to the project to provide more parking.

He indicated that the parking difference between a two (2) bedroom unit and a three (3) bedroom unit is .1 spaces due to the type of use proposed.

Mr. Kates testified that the Applicant is proposed to separate the residential and commercial parking spaces to eliminate the potential for conflict between unit owners and the two uses proposed on site. Alternatively, individuals would need to walk from the parking area to the public right-of-way to access the structure.

He indicated that the Applicant attempted to maximize parking based upon prior applications; however, doing so prevents the Applicant from providing a 10ft. buffer between the parking area and the structure. A 5.17ft. buffer exists between the structure and the commercial parking spaces; however, compliance cannot be achieved for the stacked residential parking spaces.

Complying would result in the loss of three (3) spaces.

Mr. Kates testified that the Applicant has removed a large amount of concrete and incorporated green space/landscaping in an effort to reduce impervious coverage.

The elimination of the existing garage will also reduce overall building coverage bringing the site into closer compliance with the regulations of the R-2 zone.

Mr. Kates confirmed that all four (4) units located on site will be provided a 250SF storage area as required by the Borough's Ordinance.

He also confirmed that a trash and recycling area will be provided in the rear of the structure beneath the HVAC units.

In response to a question posed by the Board, Mr. Kates indicated that four (4) common trashcans will be provided to service the entire structure, and the Applicant will be on site on a daily basis, and has the ability to remove trash if it becomes an issue.

Mr. Kates testified that, given the intended use of the commercial office, limited trash will be generated as there will be no employees on site on a daily basis.

Mr. Kates reviewed the variances sought in connection with the Application, and he reiterated the variances that are eliminated due to the Applicant's intention to comply with applicable regulations.

More specifically:

The Applicant will provide streets for every 40ft. of frontage;

The existing freestanding sign will be relocated out of the site triangle;
The freestanding sign area will be reduced to comply;
The freestanding sign setback will be increased to 5ft. or the sign will be eliminated;
The height of the freestanding sign height will be reduced to 6ft.;
The average footcandle in the parking will comply and will be reflected on a lighting plan.
The height of first finished floor will be raised to comply with the applicable base flood elevations.
He indicated that variance relief is also sought to address pre-existing non-conforming conditions associated with lot area, lot frontage, lot width, minimum front yard setback, minimum side yard setback, and maximum building height.

With respect to variance relief that is required due to the proposed development:

Maximum lot coverage will be reduced from 90% to 70%;

Maximum building coverage will be reduced from 45% to 36.5%;

Maximum front yard impervious coverage will be reduced from 98% to 60%.

Mr. Kates indicated that a D(1) use variance is also required to permit the mixed use building and the proposed office space.

Mr. Kates opined that several of the purposes of zoning, outlined within N.J.S.A. 40:55D-2, are advanced in connection with this application and support the relief sought by the Applicant as it:

Provides adequate light, air and open space;

Secures safety from fire, flood, panic and other natural and man-made disasters;

Promotes the establishment of appropriate population densities and concentrations that will contribute to the well-being of persons, neighborhoods, communities and regions and preservation of the environment;

Provides sufficient space in appropriate locations for a variety of agricultural, residential, recreational, commercial and industrial uses and open space, both public and private, according to their respective environmental requirements in order to meet the needs of all New Jersey citizens; and

Promotes a desirable visual environment through creative development techniques and good civic design and arrangement.

Moreover, the Applicant's proposal serves to preserve the character and aesthetics of the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Kates further opined that the Applicant's proposal presents no substantial detriments to the public good nor does it in anyway impair the intent or purpose of the Borough's zone plan or zoning ordinance.

Mr. Kates testified that converting the commercial space from a deli to an office will result in a dramatic reduction in the intensity of the site as foot and vehicle traffic will be reduced if not eliminated.

He acknowledged that the Applicant cannot convert the office use to an alternate use without obtaining additional variance relief.

Mr. Kates discussed the waivers sought in connection with this Applicant.

Borough Engineer Marc DeBlasio, P.E., P.P., C.M.E., prepared an Engineer Report dated June 27, 2024 which was received by the Board and which is incorporated herein as fact.

Will Hanson, P.E., C.M.E. appeared at the meeting and reviewed said Report for the benefit of the Board, and he note the conditions outlined therein. As a condition of approval, the Applicant will comply with any and all comments/conditions set forth within the Engineer's Report.

Mr. Hanson confirmed the variance relief sought in connection with this Application.

The Meeting was opened to the public for comment. One (1) individual addressed the Board, namely: Andrew Catanese, Esquire appeared on behalf of Cindy Neville and Mark Anderson, owners of the property located at 213 E. Lavender Road. Mr. Catanese indicated that his clients are the owners of an adjacent property. They opposed the first subdivision application; however, they have no objections to the current application. He indicated that his clients had concerns about potential drainage and stormwater management issues, but they were satisfied to learn that the Applicant will be submitting a grading and drainage plan as a condition of approval. He indicated that the Board would be approving an office and any change to the use would require a new application to the Board.

No additional members of the public addressed the Board in connection with this application.

Accordingly, the public portion of this application was closed.

During deliberations, Board Members indicated that they liked the design of the structure; however, they took issue with the removal of the second-floor wrap around porch.

The Board indicated that the parking is not ideal, but they felt that same was functional. A contingent of the Board expressed significant concerns about the proposed stacked parking arrangement and the limited access/walkway provided.

Board Members indicated that maintaining the building is a benefit notwithstanding it has been entirely gutted.

Mr. Barnes requested that the Application be adjourned to afford the Applicant an opportunity to revise the plans in an effort to address Board concerns.

The Application was continued to the meeting dated October 2, 2024.

Mr. Barnes advised the Board that the Applicant revised the proposed plans in an effort to address concerns raised by the Board during the September hearing.

The Applicant revised the proposed architectural plans to reduce the size of the commercial unit by 400SF, eliminated a proposed porch for the ground-floor unit, modified the bedrooms count within each unit to limit same to two (2) bedrooms, doubled the size of the proposed trash enclosure, eliminated the triple stacked parking, and prepared a grading plan which includes an underground retention system.

Mr. Barnes indicated that personal offices were added within each unit.

Board Members expressed concerns that the proposed offices would be utilized as bedrooms notwithstanding the fact that the Applicant is identifying them as offices.

Mr. Barnes stated that a new lighting plan was designed to improve safety in the parking area and the proposed second floor porch was modified to reduce its size by 6ft. as opposed to the 7ft. that was proposed during the September meeting.

A total of nine (9) off-street parking spaces are now provided on site whereas ten (10) spaces are required. As a condition of approval, the Applicant agreed to install parking bollards adjacent to the parking area to further enhance the safety of the site.

Paul Kates discussed and confirmed the modifications that were made to the plans to address Board concerns.

Mr. Kates testified that the reduction of 400SF from the commercial unit reduces the overall parking requirement by two (2) spaces, and the commercial unit now complies with applicable parking requirements.

Mr. Kates advised the Board that the first-floor residential unit was also reduced in size, and two (2) bedrooms are now provided along with an office. The number of bedrooms within the second and third-floor units were also reduced to two (2).

Mr. Kates testified that a small porch previously proposed along the ground-floor on Lavender Road has been eliminated.

He indicated that the wrap around porch on the second-floor was increased in size, and same will project 5.5ft.

He indicated that the wrap-around porch is still being reduced in size compared to what historically existed on site in order to facilitate a larger living space for the second-floor unit, and to maintain the aesthetics of the building.

Board Members reiterated concerns about the proposed offices and the potential that same will be utilized as a third bedroom.

A number of Board Members took issue with the fact that the wrap-around porch was not being maintained in its current condition.

Mr. Kates testified that the offices have no doors or closets, and there is an open floor plan to ensure that they cannot be converted to bedrooms.

He indicated that the proposed trash enclosure will now accommodate a total of eight (8) trash/recycling cans whereas four (4) were previously proposed.

Mr. Kates testified that the triple stacked parking configuration was modified to provide double-stacked parking to address Board concerns.

Mr. Kates testified that a pool has been added back to the site to provide outdoor space for use by residents.

A grading and drainage plan was submitted which complies with the Borough's stormwater management Ordinance and which addresses the concerns raised by neighboring property owners.

A lighting plan was provided which confirms that the average footcandle within the parking area is .5, and the lights will be shielded to ensure there is no impact to neighboring properties.

He confirmed the variances that are still requested in connection with the Application, and he reiterated the purposes of zoning which he argued are advanced by the Applicant's proposal which were identified and discussed in detail during the September hearing.

Mr. Kates opined that the Applicant's proposal is a better zoning alternative compared to what previously existed on site. He reiterated that the proposed office use is much less intense than the deli that previously operated on site.

The Applicant previously agreed to a condition of approval requiring the filing of a Deed Notice indicating that the approved use of the commercial space is an office, and any modification to same will require approval from the Board.

As a condition of approval, the Applicant agreed that, in the event the building is ever converted to the condominium form of ownership, any recorded Master Deed will incorporate the Deed Notice reiterating that the commercial unit can only be used as an office, and any proposed modification to the use must be approved by the Board.

Mr. Kates opined that the site is particularly suited to accommodate the proposed use given what previously existed on site, and the fact that the overall intensity and density of the site is being reduced. Board Members indicated that they were pleased to see that the second-floor wrap-around porch is being maintained; however, they raised concerns about the fact that the Applicant was still reducing the size of same in order to increase the size of the residential unit.

Borough Engineer Marc DeBlasio, P.E., P.P., C.M.E., prepared an Engineer Report dated September 30, 2024 which was received by the Board and which is incorporated herein as fact.

Will Hanson, P.E., C.M.E. appeared at the meeting and reviewed said Report for the benefit of the Board, and he note the conditions outlined therein. As a condition of approval, the Applicant will comply with any and all comments/conditions set forth within the Engineer's Report.

Mr. Hanson reviewed and discussed the modifications to the proposed plans, and the variances that are still required in connection with the Applicant's proposal.

He advised the Board that the grading and drainage plan that was submitted was acceptable; however, he suggested that the Applicant incorporate yard drains to further improve the overall drainage on site. As a condition of approval, the Applicant will modify the grading and drainage plan in order to incorporate yard drains/inlets to ensure that any runoff accumulated on site is captured and directed toward the street.

In response to concerns raised by the Board, the Applicant agreed to maintain the existing wrap-around porch as it currently exists on the second-floor which in turn will reduce the size of the second-floor unit.

As a condition of approval, the Applicant will submit revised architectural plans confirming that the existing second-floor wrap-around porch is being maintained as it currently exists.

Board Members indicated that the wrap-around porch was vital to the aesthetics of the building and several Board Members complimented the Applicant on agreeing to maintain same.

Mr. Barnes indicated that the proposed free-standing sign has also been eliminated.

Board Members questioned why the Applicant is proposing to add a pool back to the site when same was previously proposed, but was subsequently eliminated by the Applicant to reduce overall lot coverage and to facilitate a more functional off-street parking area. As a condition of approval, the Applicant agreed to modify the proposed outdoor area to eliminate the pool in order to incorporate a fire pit area on site.

Board Members raised additional concerns about the offices proposed within each residential unit.

Mr. Katpsov testified that the offices are proposed in area of the units which contains sloped roof which further limits the ability to utilize same as a bedroom.

He indicated that he was willing to remove a wall from the proposed office to further open up the floor plan to provide additional protections from same being converted to a bedroom. As a condition of approval, the wall located adjacent to Pacific Avenue in the offices will be removed.

The meeting was reopened to the public for comment. Two (2) individuals addressed the Board, namely: Joe Viscomi, owner of the property located at 308 E. Washington Avenue, appeared and he was placed under oath to testify. Mr. Viscomi advised the Board that he supported the project. He indicated that renovating a dilapidated building was a benefit to the Borough and the neighborhood.

Michael Gericke, owner of the property located at 5501 Pacific Avenue, appeared and he was placed under oath to testify. Mr. Gericke advised the Board that he supported the application and the proposed development.

No additional members of the public addressed the Board in connection with this application.

Accordingly, the public portion of this application was closed.

Board Solicitor Robert Belasco, Esquire reviewed the variance relief sought by the Applicant and provided the findings of fact for the record.

Findings of Fact accepted on motion of Mr. Vogdes and 2nd by Mr. Stuart:

Patrick Davenport: yes	Barbara Hunt: yes	Don Cabrera: abstain
Joe Franco: abstain	Angela Daniels: abstain	Fred Mettler: yes
Brian Stuart: yes	Vince Tenaglia: absent	Bradley Vogdes: yes
Jane Reynolds: yes	Brian Melchiorre: yes	

During deliberations Board Members commended the Applicant for addressing concerns that were previously raised.

The Board indicated that while the project may not be perfect, it is significantly improved in comparison to what was originally presented.

Several Board Members raised concerns about the increase in size of the first-floor residential unit. As a condition of approval, the Applicant agreed to eliminate the proposed office within the first-floor residential unit and will relocate a bedroom in order to increase the size of the kitchen and living space.

Request to adjourn to 2 October 2024.

Adjournment approval on motion of Ms. Hunt and 2nd by Ms. Reynolds:

Patrick Davenport: yes	Barbara Hunt: yes	Don Cabrera: abstain
Joe Franco: abstain	Angela Daniels: abstain	Fred Mettler: yes
Brian Stuart: yes	Vince Tenaglia: absent	Bradley Vogdes :no
Jane Reynolds: yes	Brian Melchiorre: yes	

October 2nd, 2024 Meeting:

Request for adjourn to December 4, 2024 meeting.

Request to adjourn to 4 December 2024. Request DENIED.

Adjournment approval on motion of Mr. Stuart and 2nd by Ms. Reynolds:

Patrick Davenport: no	Barbara Hunt: no	Don Cabrera: abstain
Joe Franco: abstain	Angela Daniels: abstain	Fred Mettler: no
Brian Stuart: yes	Vince Tenaglia: abstain	Bradley Vogdes: no
Jane Reynolds: no		

The Board, after hearing the testimony and reviewing the application and evidence submitted, made the following findings of fact and conclusions of law

The Applicant is the owner of the subject property and has standing to come before the Board.

The taxes are current on the subject property and the notice requirements have been satisfied by the Applicant.

The Applicant was represented by Jeffrey Barnes, Esquire.

The Application was heard at the Board's September 4, 2024 and October 2, 2024 meetings.

The subject property is located at 5611 Pacific Avenue, a/k/a Block 11.01, Lots 11 and 12 in the Borough's R-2 zone.

The property is currently developed with a pre-existing non-conforming mixed-use structure that contains three (3) residential units and one (1) commercial unit.

The Applicant is proposing to renovate the existing structure in order to maintain the three (3) existing residential units and commercial unit.

The commercial space was previously used as a deli and the Applicant is proposing to convert same to an office.

In connection with this Application the Board received the following plans, which are incorporated herein as fact:

Architectural Plans entitled "Renovations to Existing Mixed Use Dwelling: 5611 Pacific Avenue, Wildwood Crest, NJ 08260" prepared by Ralph H. Wesner, R.A., of RWA Architecture, consisting of three (3) sheets, dated March 1, 2024, and last revised September 24, 2024.

Site Plan entitled "Preliminary/Final Site Plan, 5611 Pacific Avenue, Block 11.01, Lots 11 & 12, Borough of Wildwood Crest, Cape May County, New Jersey," prepared by Gregory K. Schneider, P.E., P.L.S., consisting of two (2) sheets, dated July 20, 2023, and last revised September 26, 2024.

The Applicant is requesting preliminary and final major site plan approval, a D(1) variance, 'C' variance relief, and waivers.

The site contains a number of pre-existing non-conforming conditions which are not being exacerbated in connection with the proposed development.

Dimitry Kaptsov, the applicant and principal of Blue Bee Pro, LLC, appeared and testified before the Board.

Mr. Kaptsov discussed the history of the subject property and his proposal to renovate the mixed-use structure located on site.

At the time that Mr. Kaptsov purchased the subject property it contained three (3) residential units and one (1) commercial unit.

Extensive renovations/demolition has taken place prior to the presentation of the Application.

Ralph Wesner, R.A. with RWA Architecture, appeared on behalf of the Applicant. Mr. Wesner was accepted by the Board as an expert in the field of architecture and he was placed under oath and testified from the proposed architectural plans.

Mr. Wesner discussed the architectural plans and the renovations that are proposed to the building. The original plans proposed to maintain a two (2) bedroom unit on the first-floor, and a three (3) bedroom unit on the second and third-floors.

The plans were modified prior to the October hearing to reduce the overall number of bedrooms to two (2) within each unit.

Offices are proposed within each unit. In an effort to ensure that same are not utilized as a third bedroom, the Applicant is eliminating a wall located adjacent to Pacific Avenue.

The Board found Mr. Wesner's testimony to be credible.

Paul Kates, P.E., P.P., C.M.E. appeared on behalf of the Applicant, and he was recognized as an expert in the fields of planning and engineering. Mr. Kates was placed under oath, and he testified from the proposed site and architectural plans, which were received by the Board, and which are incorporated herein as fact.

Mr. Kates reviewed and discussed the existing and proposed site conditions for the benefit of the Board. He reviewed the existing and proposed floor plans and building elevations for the benefit of the Board. There are a number of pre-existing non-conforming conditions affecting the property which will not be exacerbated by the Applicant's proposal.

The Applicant is proposing to incorporate nine (9) off-street parking spaces on site whereas the proposed use requires a total of ten (10) off-street parking spaces.

An outdoor area is proposed on site which will include a fire pit.

No pool is proposed on site.

The Applicant originally proposed a triple stacked parking arrangement; however, same was modified to address concerns and a double stacked parking arrangement is proposed for use by the residential units.

The Board found this modification to be acceptable.

A free-standing sign that previously existed on site is being removed which eliminates the need for variance relief to address non-conforming conditions associated with same.

An existing second-floor wrap-around porch will be maintained in its current condition.

Mr. Kates identified and discussed the relief sought by the Applicant and he provided testimony relative to the basis upon which he contends that the Board should grant same.

He opined that the subject property can accommodate the proposed expansion given the fact that the site is already developed with a mixed-use building which is proposed to be maintained in connection with this proposal.

Mr. Kates identified purposes of zoning which he contends are advanced by the Applicant's proposal and which support granting the requested variance relief.

Mr. Kates opined that the Applicant's proposal presents no substantial detriments to the public good and does not impair the intent or purpose of the Borough's zone plan or zoning ordinance.

The Board found Mr. Kates testimony to be credible and persuasive.

Public comment was received from a total of three (3) individuals who all supported the project.

The Applicant agreed to the following conditions of approval:

The Applicant agreed to eliminate the proposed office within the first-floor residential unit and will relocate a bedroom in order to increase the size of the kitchen and living space.

The wall located adjacent to Pacific Avenue in the offices will be removed. the Applicant agreed to modify the proposed outdoor area to eliminate the pool in order to incorporate a fire pit area on site.

The Applicant will submit revised architectural plans confirming that the existing second-floor wrap-around porch is being maintained as it currently exists.

The Applicant will modify the grading and drainage plan in order to incorporate yard drains/inlets to ensure that any runoff accumulated on site is captured and directed toward the street.

The Applicant agreed that, in the even the building is ever converted to the condominium form of ownership, any recorded Master Deed will incorporate the Deed Notice reiterating that the commercial unit can only be used as an office, and any proposed modification to the use must be approved by the Board.

The Applicant agreed to install parking bollards adjacent to the parking area to further enhance the safety of the site.

The Applicant will comply with any and all comments/conditions set forth within the Engineer's Report. the Applicant will submit a lighting plan to the Board Engineer for review and approval.

The Applicant will record a Deed Notice and a copy of the Board's Resolution providing that the commercial space is approved exclusively as an office and any modification would require a new application to the Board.

The Applicant agreed to submit a grading and drainage plan which will include underground ground-water stormwater retention systems for review and approval by the Board Engineer.

Findings of Fact accepted on motion of Ms. Hunt and 2nd by Mr. Stuart:

Patrick Davenport: yes	Barbara Hunt: yes	Don Cabrera: abstain
Joe Franco: abstain	Angela Daniels: abstain	Fred Mettler: yes
Brian Stuart: yes	Vince Tenaglia: abstain	Bradley Vogdes: yes
Jane Reynolds: yes		

During deliberations, Board Members acknowledged the modifications that the Applicant made to the plans between the September and October meetings and the fact that same alleviated many of their concerns.

The Board agreed that the benefits associated with the Applicant's proposal outweighed any detriments. Board Members agreed that the Applicant's proposal advances several goals and objectives outlined within the Borough's Master Plan.

The Board found that the purposes of zoning identified by Mr. Kates would be advanced in connection with this proposal and supports granting the relief requested by the Applicant.

In addition, the Board found that the subject property is particularly suited to accommodate the proposed mixed-use and office space as the site previously and will continue to contain three (3) residential units and a commercial unit which is being converted to an office.

The proposed modifications will reduce the overall intensity and density of the site, and same is a better zoning alternative compared to what currently exists on site.

The Board finds that granting the proposed variance relief presents no substantial detriment the public good nor will it impair the intent or purpose of the zone plan and zoning ordinance.

On Motion of Mr. Vogdes and 2nd by Mr. Stuart for approval:

Patrick Davenport: yes	Barbara Hunt: yes	Don Cabrera: abstain
Joe Franco: abstain	Angela Daniels: abstain	Fred Mettler: yes
Brian Stuart: yes	Vince Tenaglia: abstain	Bradley Vogdes: yes
Jane Reynolds: yes		

Joe Franco and Don Cabrera return to meeting.

ADMINISTRATIVE RESOLUTIONS:

None

OLD BUSINESS:

Bike Connectivity Path

NEW BUSINESS:

Revisions to Ordinances. Rob Belasco to propose revisions for review next meeting.

Review of Green Team Resolution.

OPEN TO PUBLIC COMMENT:

Joe Viscomi, owner of the property located at 308 E Washington Avenue. Suggests further clarifying front yard/side yard ordinance.

ANNOUNCEMENTS: The next regularly scheduled meeting is 6 November, there are three applications scheduled at this time to go before the board on that date.

ADJOURN: On motion of Ms. Reynolds, second by Mr. Vogdes and unanimous voice vote, the Chairman adjourned the meeting 8:30pm.

Pamela Riper
Planning Board Secretary