

BOROUGH OF WILDWOOD CREST
Planning Board
Meeting Minutes – 6 December 2023 5 p.m.

The following are the minutes of the Wildwood Crest Planning Board as held on Wednesday December 6, 2023, 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: present
Don Cabrera: present	Joe Franco: present	Angela Daniels: present
Gerry D'Antonio: present	Fred Mettler: present	Pete Cava: present
Brian Stuart: present	Vince Tenaglia: absent	Bradley Vogdes: absent
Jane Reynolds: present		
Board Secretary Pamela Riper: present		
Solicitor Rob Belasco: present:		
Engineer Marc DeBlasio: present		

MINUTES:

Ms. Daniels moved to dispense with the public reading of the minutes of the meeting of 1 November 2023 and approve as distributed, Mr. Melchiorre second, minutes approved as distributed.

Patrick Davenport: yes	Barbara Hunt: abstain	Brian Melchiorre: yes
Don Cabrera: abstain	Joe Franco: yes	Angela Daniels: yes
Gerry D'Antonio: yes	Fred Mettler: abstain	Pete Cava: abstain
Brian Stuart: abstain	Jane Reynolds: yes	

APPLICATIONS:

Angela Daniels, Joe Franco & Don Cabrera recuse themselves.
Brad Vogdes enters meeting at 5:08pm.

Application PB-23-13 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" variance, preliminary & final site plan approval.

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 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.

The Applicant is proposing to renovate the existing structure in order to maintain the three (3) existing residential units and commercial unit. A pool is also proposed to be installed in the rear yard.

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 September 7, 2023.

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 one (1) sheet, dated August 15, 2023.

Mr. Amenhauser reviewed and confirmed the relief sought in connection with the Applicant's proposal, noting that many of the 'C' variances are associated with pre-existing non-conforming conditions that will not be exacerbated by the proposed development.

Dimitry Kaptsov, the Applicant and principal of Blue Bee Pro, LLC, appeared and he was placed under oath to testify before the Board.

Mr. Kaptsov advised the Board that he filed a prior application to subdivide the subject property which was ultimately denied by the Board back in 2022.

Mr. Kaptsov testified that he is now proposing to renovate the existing mixed-use building with minor alterations to the building footprint.

Board Members expressed concerns about the level of demolition that has taken place as the building itself appears to already have been completely gutted.

Mr. Kaptsov testified that he has already begun renovations and the building has been partially demolished pursuant to a validly issued demolition permit.

Mr. Kaptsov indicated that he also received a footing and foundation permit to begin foundation repairs to the existing structure.

Mr. Kaptsov further testified that he needed to renovations prior to presenting this application to determine the structural integrity of the building and to address existing structural issues.

In response to a question posed by the Board, Mr. Kaptsov testified that the structure contained three (3) residential units and one (1) commercial unit at the time that he purchased the property.

He indicated that all three floors contain individual kitchens and bathrooms.

In response to a question posed by the Board, Mr. Kaptsov testified that no new bedrooms are proposed in connection with the renovations.

The first-floor residential unit contains two (2) bedrooms, the second-floor residential unit contains three (3) bedrooms, and the third-floor residential unit contains three (3) bedrooms.

Board Members expressed concerns regarding the fact that the structure has already been substantially demolished which makes confirming the number of units that previously existed within the structure difficult. 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.

Mr. Kates advised the Board that the subject property previously contained a deli, d/b/a Tommy's Market, and three (3) residential apartments.

Mr. Kates testified that the subject property sat vacant for several years and fell into a state of disrepair necessitating substantial renovations to maintain the existing structure.

Mr. Kates testified that the Applicant attempted to maximize off-street parking through proposed modifications to the site.

Mr. Kates advised the Board that the Applicant is proposing to renovate the existing structure/units and is proposing to reduce the size of an accessory garage currently located on site in order to accommodate off-street parking and a rear yard pool.

Mr. Kates indicated that a total of twelve (12) off-street parking spaces are required whereas seven (7) spaces are proposed.

Mr. Kates distributed a revised site plan which was received by the Board and which was marked as **Exhibit A-1**.

The Applicant intends to utilize the existing curb cut in order to access proposed off-street parking spaces. The result is that no on-street parking will be lost in connection with this proposal. As a condition of approval, the Applicant will maintain the existing curb cut and no expansion/relocation of same will be permitted.

He noted that each residential unit will be assigned two (2) off-street parking spaces and the seventh spot will be designated as a handicap parking space for use by the commercial unit. As a condition of approval, the Applicant will designate six (6) parking spots for use by the residential units, assigning two (2) per unit. No additional parking is proposed on-site for the commercial unit.

Mr. Kates further testified that the reduction in the size of the existing garage will also reduce lot/building coverages which exceed that which is permitted in the zone.

The Applicant intends to provide individual 250ft.³ storage units for use by each residential unit. As a condition of approval, defined storage space for each individual unit will be provided under the northwest stairwell and same will be reflected on revised plans.

In response to a question posed by the Board, Mr. Kates testified that the Applicant intends to utilize the commercial unit for his own business purposes.

The Applicant operates a construction company and plans to meet with clients within the commercial unit.

Mr. Kates testified that the proposed use of the commercial space will generate minimal traffic and the volume of patrons at the site will be controlled exclusively by the Applicant.

Board Members expressed concerns about the fact that the commercial space is proposed to have one off-street parking space which will be designated as a handicap parking space which essentially results in no off-street parking on site for the commercial unit.

Mr. Kates reviewed the 'C' variance relief sought in connection with this application, noting that many of the variances are tied to pre-existing non-conforming conditions that are not being exacerbated by this proposal. The Applicant is requesting a D(2) variance in connection with the proposed expansion of the pre-existing non-conforming use.

He indicated that a small addition is proposed to the footprint of the existing structure as the Applicant intends to convert an existing deck to enclosed, habitable space.

Mr. Kates indicated that the Applicant's proposal will result in the creation of a less intense use than what previously existed with the former deli, while also providing more parking on site.

Mr. Kates testified that the subject property is particularly suited to accommodate the proposed expansion of the non-conforming use as the structure already exists on site, and, but for the minor increase in the footprint of the structure and the installation of a pool, the site will remain largely unchanged.

He indicated that the proposed pool will comply with the Borough's Ordinance requirements and same will be secured by a fence with a self-latching gate.

Mr. Kates opined that the Applicant's proposal essentially amounts to a minimal expansion of the existing structure and simply fills in an existing void 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;

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

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.

He proceeded to review the requested waivers and he outlined the basis upon which he believes that the requests are reasonable and can be granted by the Board.

Mr. Kates advised the Board that no signage is proposed on site, and the Applicant intends to install soffit/security lighting fixtures on the structure rather than install external lighting throughout the site.

Mr. Kates reviewed the proposed floor plans for the benefit of the Board, noting that the floor plans are consistent with the floor plans within the existing structure prior to the substantial demolition completed by the Applicant.

He confirmed that the first-floor residential unit will contain two (2) bedrooms, the second-floor residential unit will contain three (3) bedrooms, and the third-floor residential unit will contain three (3) bedrooms.

A discussion ensued between the Applicant and the Board regarding the number of units and bedrooms that existed in the structure prior to the demolition that was performed by the Applicant.

Board Members expressed concerns that the Borough Tax Assessor's records reflected that the first-floor unit had one (1) bedroom, the second-floor unit three (3) bedrooms, and the third-floor unit two (2) bedrooms.

Mr. Amenhauser produced a conflicting email from the Tax Assessor which reflects the bedroom count testified to by the Applicant. The Board ultimately agreed to accept the Applicant's testimony in regards to the number of units and bedrooms that historically existed within the structure.

In response to a question posed by the Board, Mr. Kates testified that the ground floor residential apartment will be modified to comply with current flood regulations, and flood-proofing measures will be installed within the commercial unit.

Board Members expressed additional concerns about the expansion of the non-conforming use and the fact the Applicant's proposal would intensify the use of the site while not adequately addressing parking issues.

Mr. Kaptsov testified that the expansion of the building, specifically the elimination of a wrap-around porch, was necessary to provide more living space for the unit. He further contended that eliminating the wrap-around porch allowed him to reinforce load-bearing walls.

Board Members expressed additional concerns in regards to the Applicant's desire to maintain the existing garage and to install a pool in the rear yard as these elements preclude additional off-street parking. The Board took issue with the fact that the garage and the proposed reduction in size will likely result in same not being used for off-street parking.

As a condition of approval, the Applicant will provide for a defined trash enclosure under the southeast stairwell, and same will be reflected on revised plans.

In response to a question posed by the Board, Mr. Kaptsov testified that the pool will be limited to use by the occupants of the residential units.

Borough Engineer Marc DeBlasio, P.E., P.P., C.M.E., prepared an Engineer's Report dated November 2, 2023 which was received by the Board and which is incorporated herein as fact. DeBlasio, P.E., P.P., 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. DeBlasio confirmed the variance relief sought in connection with this Application. As a condition of approval, the Applicant will comply with Borough sewer regulations outlined within Chapter 61.

The Meeting was opened to the public for comment. Three (3) members of the public addressed the Board, namely:

Andrew Catanese Esquire, appeared on behalf of Mark and Cindy Neville Anderson, owners of the property located at 207 E. Lavender Road. Mr. Catanese advised the Board that his clients have no objection to the Applicant’s proposal; however, they requested that the Applicant agree to provide a detailed stormwater management plan to ensure that grading and drainage issues are addressed on site. As a condition of approval, the applicant will provide a detailed stormwater management and grading plan, subject to the review and approval of the Board Engineer.

Scott Selby, owner of the property located at 5606 Pacific Avenue, appeared and he was placed under oath to testify before the Board. Mr. Selby advised the Board that the Applicant built his home and he supports the Application.

Jamie Peterson, owner of the property located at 5701 Pacific Avenue, appeared and he was placed under oath to testify before the Board. Mr. Peterson expressed reservations in regards to the Applicant’s proposal. He indicated that he and his wife have concerns based upon how the Applicant managed the property since purchasing same. He indicated that he has concerns about the lack of off-street parking, but he supports the overall project and the improvements proposed to the site.

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 Ms. Hunt and 2nd by Mr. Cava:

Patrick Davenport: yes	Barbara Hunt: yes	Brian Melchiorre: yes
Don Cabrera: abstain	Joe Franco: abstain	Angela Daniels: abstain
Gerry D’Antonio: yes	Fred Mettler: yes	Pete Cava: yes
Brian Stuart: yes	Bradley Vogdes: abstain	Jane Reynolds: abstain

The Board accepted the findings of fact and thereafter opened the Application up for deliberation.

During deliberations, Board Members expressed significant concerns in relation to the Applicant’s proposal. A Board Member raised a concern that the use associated with the subject property had been abandoned as the property has been vacant and in a state of disrepair for approximately 10 years.

The Board took issue with the fact that the subject property is developed with a number of pre-existing non-conforming conditions, and while the majority of these conditions are not being exacerbated, the proposal to expand the non-conforming use serves to exacerbate the non-conforming nature of the site.

Board Members expressed concerns in regards to the parking deficiency and the impact that same will have on the Borough and the surrounding neighborhood. Moreover, the Board recognized that the Applicant’s intended use of the commercial space may not be overly problematic, but approving the commercial use with only one (1) off-street parking space, a handicap parking space at that, presents a substantial detriment to the zone plan and the public good.

Board Members questioned the need to install a pool in the rear yard of the site when the area in question could be utilized to provide for more off-street parking to further lessen the parking deficiency.

Additional Board Members expressed concerns about the density of the site and the fact that the site itself appears to be overdeveloped as it is, and the Applicant’s proposal to expand the existing non-conforming use only serves to exacerbate that situation.

The Board unanimously agreed that the purposes of zoning identified by Mr. Kates would not be advanced in connection with this project.

The Board found that the Applicant’s proposal presents substantial detriments to the public good, and same serves to impair the intent and purpose of the Borough’s zone plan and zoning ordinance.

On Motion of Mr. Stuart and 2nd by Mr. Mettler to approve:

Patrick Davenport: no	Barbara Hunt: no	Brian Melchiorre: no
Don Cabrera: abstain	Joe Franco: abstain	Angela Daniels: abstain
Gerry D’Antonio: no	Fred Mettler: no	Pete Cava: no
Brian Stuart: no	Bradley Vogdes: abstain	Jane Reynolds: abstain

Application PB-23-11 for 8300 Pacific Avenue a/k/a blk 131 lots 1.01 in Zone R-2 owner Stephen & Terrie Rosania; seeking “C” & “D” variances.

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

Mr. Catanese advised the Board that the subject property is an existing undersized 46ft. x 100ft. lot located in the Borough's R-2 zone at the intersection of Pacific and Toledo Avenues.

Mr. Catanese informed the Board that the subject property is currently developed with a single-family dwelling and a single-family semi-detached (duplex) dwelling. A total of three (3) residential units exist on site.

The Applicant is proposing to convert the existing 1-story, two-family dwelling to a 2-story single-family dwelling. The existing single-family dwelling that is also located on site will be maintained on site as it currently exists.

Mr. Catanese advised the Board that the Applicants purchased the subject property in 2001 and recently retired with the intentions to reside at the subject property full-time.

The existing dwelling does not meet the Applicant's needs, and they are proposing to renovate and expand the existing duplex located on site while converting same to a single-family dwelling.

The existing duplex will be raised to provide parking on the ground floor within a two-car garage.

Mr. Catanese indicated that the R-2 zone permits the development of single-family semi-detached dwellings; however, the Applicant is proposing to maintain two (2) separate and distinct principal structures which triggers the need for variance relief.

In light of the fact that two (2) principal structures already exist on site and the Applicant's proposal amounts to an expansion of the existing non-conforming use, a D(2) variance is required.

Mr. Catanese reviewed the 'C' variance relief that is also requested in connection with the Applicant's proposal, noting that many of the 'C' variances are tied to pre-existing non-conforming conditions that are not being exacerbated by the proposed development.

He indicated that the Applicant's proposal will improve the off-street parking on site, reduce the overall density of the site, and ensure that the structure complies with current flood regulations.

Pamela Fine, R.A. of Fine Architecture, P.C. appeared on behalf of the Applicant and she was recognized as an expert in the field of architecture. Ms. Fine was placed under oath and she testified from the proposed Site and Architectural Plans, consisting of three (3) sheets, dated September 2, 2022 and last revised June 20, 2023, which were received by the Board and which are incorporated herein as fact.

Ms. Fine reviewed the existing site conditions for the benefit of the Board.

She confirmed that the subject property is currently developed with a 1-story single-family dwelling that contains a total of three (3) bedrooms, and a 1-story single-family semi-detached dwelling with two (2) units that each contain one (1) bedroom.

She distributed a photograph depicting the existing structures viewed from Toledo Avenue which was received by the Board and which was marked as **Exhibit A-1**.

Ms. Fine advised the Board that the Applicant is not proposing any modifications to the existing single-family dwelling. The renovations are tied exclusively to the existing 1-story duplex located on site.

Ms. Fine testified that the existing site provides parking for four (4) vehicles; however, the parking spaces are undersized and encroach into the public right-of-way.

She indicated that a 30ft. wide curb cut currently exists which will be reduced to 20ft. which will likely result in the creation of one (1) on-street parking space.

Ms. Fine reviewed the proposed site and floor plans for the benefit of the Board.

She advised the Board that the Applicant is proposing to utilize the existing duplex's block walls to provide for a garage space, and intends to construct a new second-floor above same.

Ms. Fine testified that the existing front porch will be eliminated to facilitate off-street parking. The existing porch projects 5ft. from the front façade of the structure which will improve the size of the existing off-street parking spaces; however, they do not meet the required 9ft. x 18ft. dimensions necessitating variance relief. A total of five (5) off-street parking spaces are proposed.

Ms. Fine testified that the three (3) off-street parking spaces proposed in front of the garage will no longer encroach into the public right-of-way as they are proposed to measure approximately 9ft. x 16.1ft.

In response to a question posed by the Board, Ms. Fine testified that the two (2) parking spaces within the garage comply with the 9ft. x 18ft. requirement.

Ms. Fine further testified that the Applicant will be removing large areas of concrete to improve impervious coverage while also installing substantial landscaping around the perimeter of the site. The site currently contains 80% impervious coverage whereas this condition will be improved to 62.3%.

Downspouts and a catch basin are proposed on site to address stormwater management. As a condition of approval, the Applicant will ensure that stormwater is diverted off-site either through grading or through ground spouts and a catch basin. The Applicant will provide a detail grading and drainage plan, subject to the review and approval of the Board Engineer.

Ms. Fine advised the Board that the proposed second floor will contain two (2) bedrooms and one (1) bathroom.

The renovated single-family dwelling will comply with current building, fire, and flood regulations.

In response to a question posed by the Board, Ms. Fine testified that the proposed single-family dwelling will not exceed maximum building height and a 6:12 roof pitch is provided.

She indicated that there is no modulation proposed to the building walls as the structure to be renovated already exists on site and the Applicant intends to utilize the existing block walls in connection with the proposed renovations.

Ms. Fine testified that a D(2) variance is required in connection with the proposed expansion of the pre-existing non-conforming use.

She opined that the site is particularly suited to accommodate the proposed expansion because same will reduce the density of the site, provide off-street parking, and several pre-existing non-conforming conditions will be improved.

Ms. Fine testified that the fact that the subject property is a fully developed undersized lot presents practical difficulties in complying with the area and bulk requirements of the Ordinance, and establishes a hardship to the Applicant which supports granting the requested variance relief.

Ms. Fine 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;

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; and

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

Ms. Fine 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.

Borough Engineer Marc DeBlasio, P.E., P.P., C.M.E., prepared an Engineer's Report dated August 23, 2023 which was received by the Board and which is incorporated herein as fact. Marc DeBlasio, P.E., P.P., C.M.E. appeared at the meeting and reviewed said Report for the benefit of the Board. As a condition of approval, the Applicant will comply with any and all comments/conditions set forth within the Engineer's Report.

The Meeting was opened to the public for comment. No 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 Ms. Daniels and 2nd by Mr. Cava:

Patrick Davenport: yes

Barbara Hunt: yes

Brian Melchiorre: yes

Don Cabrera: abstain

Joe Franco: abstain

Angela Daniels: yes

Gerry D'Antonio: yes

Fred Mettler: yes

Pete Cava: yes

Brian Stuart: abstain

Bradley Vogdes: abstain

Jane Reynolds: abstain

The Board accepted the findings of fact and thereafter opened the Application up for deliberation.

During deliberations, a majority of the Board agreed that the purposes of zoning identified by Ms. Fine would be advanced in connection with the Applicant's proposal and support granting the requested variance relief. The majority agreed that reducing the overall density of the site while significantly improving the appearance of the existing duplex and improving a number of pre-existing non-conforming conditions outweighed any detriments associated with the Application.

A majority of the Board found 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.

Moreover, the Board agreed that the subject property is particularly suited to accommodate the expansion of the existing non-conforming use as two principal structures currently exist on site, and the elimination of one (1) residential unit is an improvement to the site and surrounding neighborhood.

On Motion of Ms. Daniels and 2nd by Mr. D'Antonio to approve:

Patrick Davenport: no

Barbara Hunt: no

Brian Melchiorre: yes

Don Cabrera: abstain

Joe Franco: abstain

Angela Daniels: yes

Gerry D'Antonio: yes

Fred Mettler: yes

Pete Cava: yes

Brian Stuart: abstain

Bradley Vogdes: abstain

Jane Reynolds: abstain

Application PB-23-14 for 6501 Ocean Avenue a/k/a blk 50.04 lots 3, 4, 7 & 8 in Zone M-1A owner Mahalo Wildwood Crest, LLC; seeking “C” variances, preliminary & final site plan approval.

Nic Talvacchia, Esquire, represented The Compass Family Resort opposing the application to be heard. In their opinion they felt the new application was too similar to the original application that was denied. The applicant now applies to develop substantially the same hotel at the same location, only moving the new tower 5 feet towards the beach with a slightly altered, yet still unrealistic, parking circulation plan. The number of proposed parking spaces has, in fact, been reduced. There has been no effort made to satisfy concerns regarding the view corridor on Rosemary Road. Applicant has not reduced the number of rooms or changed anything else of substance. Thus, the application must be barred by the doctrine of *res judicata*.

On Motion of Mr. Vodges and 2nd by Ms. Hunt to approve hearing application PB-23-14:

Patrick Davenport: yes	Barbara Hunt: yes	Brian Melchiorre: yes
Don Cabrera: absent	Joe Franco: absent	Angela Daniels: yes
Gerry D’Antonio: yes	Fred Mettler: abstain	Pete Cava: yes
Brian Stuart: absent	Bradley Vogdes: yes	Jane Reynolds: abstain

Adjourned to February 13, 2024. No renote required.

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING BOARD ACTIONS: None

ADMINISTRATIVE RESOLUTIONS: None

OLD BUSINESS:

Bike Connectivity Path

NEW BUSINESS:

Structure of Planning Board Application

OPEN TO PUBLIC COMMENT:

None

ANNOUNCEMENTS: The next regularly scheduled meeting is 9 January, there are no applications scheduled at this time to go before the board on that date.

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

Pamela Riper
Planning Board Secretary