

Present: Peterson, Betesh, Canonico, Waterbury, Fisher, Clark, Garley
Forrester (Attorney)
Cranmer (Engineer)
Absent: Walsh, Stambaugh

All saluted the flag, and the presiding officer's statement was read.

Mr. Forrester gave the oath of offices for 2010:

Ms. Waterbury
Ms. Clark

Ms. Peterson announced that the purpose of this meeting is the reorganization for 2010

REORGANIZATION FOR 2010:

ELECTION OF CHAIR PERSON:

A motion was made by, Ms. Canonico, seconded by Mr. Fisher, nominating Mr. Betesh as Chairman for 2010
Mr. Betesh decline the nomination

A motion was made by Ms. Canonico, seconded by Mr. Betesh nomination
Ms. Waterbury as Chairman for 2010, with no other nomination

Roll Call:

Affirmative: Peterson, Betesh, Canonico, Fisher, Clark, Garley
Negative: None
Abstained: Waterbury

ELECTION OF VICE PERSON:

A motion was made by, Mr. Betesh, seconded by, Ms. Canonico nominating
Mrs. Peterson as Vice Chairman for 2010 with no other nominations:

Roll Call:

Affirmative: Betesh, Canonico, Waterbury, Fisher, Clark, Garley
Negative: None
Abstained Peterson

APPOINTMENT OF BOARD ATTORNEY:

A motion was made by, Ms. Canonico, seconded by Mr. Betesh nominating Mr. Forrester as Board Attorney for 2010, with no other nominations:

Roll Call:

Affirmative: Peterson, Betesh, Canonico, Waterbury, Fisher, Clark, Garley
Negative: None

APPOINTMENT OF BOARD ENGINEER:

A motion was made by, Mr. Betesh, seconded by, Ms. Canonico to appoint Mr. David Cranmer of Cranmer Engineering as the engineer for 2010, without any further nomination;

Roll Call:

Affirmative: Peterson, Betesh, Canonico, Fisher, Clark, Garley

Negative: None

APPOINTMENT OF BOARD CLERK:

A motion was made by, Ms. Canonico, seconded by Ms. Peterson, nominating Mrs. Kelleher as Board Clerk for 2010, with no other nominations:

Roll Call:

Affirmative: Peterson, Betesh, Canonico, Waterbury, Fisher, Garley

Negative: None

**FIXING TIME & PLACE, NEWSPAPER, & POSTING OF AGENDAS:
FOR MEETING FOR 2010**

A motion was made by, Ms. Waterbury, seconded by, Mr. Betesh

- that the meetings be set on the 1st Wednesday of the month, @ 7:30 p.m
- meetings to take place in Municipal Building as listed
- Asbury Park Press & Two River Times are the official newspapers for publications
- posting the agendas will be in the bulleting board in the lobby of the Municipal building.

All approved.

A motion was made by, Ms. Canonico, seconded by, Ms. Peterson to adjourn the reorganization meeting. All approved.

Ms. Canonico Announced the opening of the regular meeting of the Zoning Board of Adjustment @ 7:30pm.

All saluted the flag, and the presiding officer's statement was read.

Present: Canonico, Stambaugh, Betesh, Waterbury
Forrester (Attorney)
Cranmer (Engineer)

Absent: Peterson, DeNofa, Walsh

Correspondence: none

Minutes:

A motion was made by, Mr. Betesh, seconded by, Ms. Canonico to adopt the minutes of the December 2, 2009 meeting. All approved.

Planning Board Representative:

- K Hovnanian application was carried to 1/14/2010 @ 7:30 pm

Rules & Regulations: carried to 2/3/10

Unfinished Business:

Azgara Bowl LLC:

Adoption of Resolution

Bl: 7, Lot: 1

A motion was made by Mr. Betesh, seconded by Mr. Fisher to adopt & memorialize the resolution of approval for Azgara Bowl as submitted.

Roll Call:

Affirmative: Betesh, Fisher, Clark

Negative: None

New Business:

M/M James Pouso

Bulk variances for 2nd story addition

121 Beechwood Dr

Bl: 52, Lot: 14

Mr. Forrester announced that he has reviewed service and finds it to be adequate and the board has jurisdiction to hear this matter.

Mr. & Mrs. James Pouso were both sworn.

Mr. Pouso testified that they are seeking permission for a 2nd story which will be for 4 bedrooms and bath, with covered porch in the front, the first floor will be converted into a master suite/with a bath.

Mr. Forrester marked the following:

A-1: Survey prepared by Charles Surmonte 5/12/99

A-2: Architectural Plans, 3 sheets prepared by Mr. Pouso showing all elevations

A-3: 7 - Photos of existing conditions taken by Mr. Pouso

Mrs. Pouso explained that there are 3 bedrooms on the first floor, 1 bedroom will be converted into the entry way and the other 2 will be combined into 1 master bedroom for a total of 5 bedrooms.

Ms. Waterbury asked if the 1 car garage will remain and Mr. Pouso said yes. There was a discussion of the "bump out" of the driveway which is not shown on their shown. It was decided that since this will increase their impervious coverage Mr. Cranmer will send his surveyor out to get the correct impervious coverage, and he will advise the homeowner of the % increase that they need to work with or an additional 357 sq. ft.

Ms. Waterbury asked Mr. Cranmer if the driveway that is existing meets the requirements for a 5 bedroom home? Mr. Cranmer said that under the RSIS requirements for a bedroom home, they would need 3.5 parking stalls, and the one car garage and the driveway would give them the required number of parking spaces.

Mr. Forrester suggested that the driveway portion not be any closer to 5' to the property line.

Mr. Forrester asked Mr. Pouso if he intends to comply with the storm water management ordinance? Mr. Pouso said yes, they will submit their plan to Mr. Cranmer for review and approval.

A motion was made by Mrs. Peterson, seconded by Mr. Betesh to open the meeting to the public. All approved.

There were no comments/questions.

A motion was made by Ms. Canonico, seconded by Mrs. Peterson to close the meeting to the public. All approved.

All board members agreed that the proposed construction is characteristic with what is going on in the neighborhood, with the condition of mitigation of the impervious coverage the application can be approved, and that the driveway is 5' from the property line.

Mr. Forrester asked if the surrounding properties are already developed? Mr. Pouso said yes. Mr. Forrester asked if the other lots in the neighborhood are of similar size? Mr. Pouso said yes, and that he could not purchase any additional land.

A motion was made by Mr. Betesh, seconded by Mr. Fisher to approve the application of Mr & Mrs. James Pouso:

- for building coverage of 18.3% coverage, where 15% is allowed,
- impervious coverage of where 20% allowed, with the additional percentage of the driveway and that the engineer will do a final calculation of the overage
- 5' set back of the driveway

Roll Call:

Affirmative: Waterbury, Betesh, Canonico, Peterson, Fisher, Clark, Garley

Negative: None

Resolution 2/3/10.....

Mr. Gordon Litwin:
44 Patterson Ave
Bl: 19, Lot: 1

Bulk Variances for 1st & 2nd floor
additions with variances

Mr. Forrester announced that he has reviewed service and find it to be adequate and the board has jurisdiction.

Mr. Gordon Litwin, was sworn
Mr. Jeremiah J Regan, Architect, was sworn
Mr. Richard Litwin, was sworn

Mr. Litwin explained that his home was damaged by fire in June 2009 leaving the back of the home with the need of being rebuilt. His application is to even off the rear of the home, no extension past the existing home is proposed. This will enlarge the kitchen & the dining room, with a bedroom and bathroom upstairs. There are no plans to add any additional living space. He feels this would upgrade the neighborhood and make the house more useable. They are planning to construct a deck on the rear portion as shown in their architectural.

Mr. Forrester marked the following:

A-1: Survey, prepared by Charles Bell, 9/23/87

A-2: Architectural Plan, 11/5/09, revised 12/18/09 prepared by Jeremiah J Regan, A.I.A.

A-3: 6 Photos of existing conditions

A-4: Note from Carolann Perry (50 Patterson Ave.) advising familiar with project and no concerns

A-5: Note from John Regan & Katherine Tahamont (40 Patterson Ave) advising familiar with project no concerns

Mr. Regan, Architect, described the project:

- 8 - pre existing non conformities: lot size, frontage on Patterson Ave, front yard set back for both Patterson Ave & Allen St., side yard set back, accessory building set back, building & lot coverage, front yard set back on Allen Street for the 2nd floor

Ms. Waterbury asked what is the square footage of the addition? Mr. Regan said that it is 6'x 11'. The Allen Street set back would change since the existing building is escued; changing the right rear corner from 15' off the property line to 14.87.

Mr. Regan explained that the first floor addition increases the kitchen area nook and the dining room area, as shown on the floor plan. The 2nd floor would expand the bedroom and bathroom. There is an existing loft area and that will remain the same. The new ridge will be slightly lower than the existing ridge, so the height of the residence will not increase in height the existing ridge is 28' and the new will be less than 28'.

Mr. Regan explained that the new deck will be 14 x 24' and will be approximately 40' from the garage.

Mr. Fisher asked if they are planning a dry well on the property? Mr. Regan said yes and he used the formula that he was given by the owner to calculate the run off and they proposing to install it in the rear to the left of the deck and the back half of the roof will be connected to the down spouts. The dry will be able to accommodate 490 sq ft vs. the 84 sq. ft. advised by the Engineer. After a brief discussion the applicant agreed to relocate the dry well on the western side of the property where there isn't another adjacent property since the dry well has to be 10' from any foundation.

Mr. Litwin advised that they cannot acquire any other property in order to comply with the building/impervious requirements due to the fact that they are on a corner lot.

All board members agreed that the proposed construction would be a welcome addition to the neighborhood, and commented that the property is kept very nice, and that the family needs to get back into their home.

A motion was made by Mrs. Peterson, seconded by Mr. Betesh to open the meeting to the public. All approved.

There were no comments/questions.

A motion was made by Mr. Fisher, seconded by Mrs. Peterson to close the meeting to the public. All approved.

Approval:

A motion was made by Mrs. Peterson, seconded by Ms. Canonico to approve the application of Mr. Gordon Litwin as submitted with the following conditions:

- Installation of dry well on the western portion of the property, with the approval of the Board Engineer.
- variances: building coverage of 21.4%, impervious coverage of 30.6%
front yard set back on Allen St of 14.87 where 15' exists

Roll Call:

Affirmative: Waterbury, Betesh, Canonico, Peterson, Fisher, Clark, Garley

Negative: None

Resolution: 2/3/10.....

Paul David Partyware:
60 Riordan Place
Bl: 291, Lots 24 & 25

Use Variance & Pre/Final Site Plan Approval

Mr. Forrester announced that the service was carried and the board has jurisdiction to hear this matter.

Mr. Edward McKenna, Esq represented the applicant.

Mr. McKenna explained that the application is for Paul David Partywares, located 60 Riordan Place on 1.3 acres of land with holds his warehouse. He is proposing to add 8,400 sq. ft. currently where there is 14,000 sq. ft., which is inadequate and the additional 8,400 sq. ft. would enhance his operation. No additional employees, no additional truck traffic to the site. The hours of operation are 8:00 am to 5:00 pm during the week would extend when returning his rented goods.

Mr. Paul David Kessler, owner was sworn, and gave an overview of the business:

- party rental company with an unusual and unique line of products in addition to the normal equipment that they rent.
- They engineer sites for functions for clients
- They move party equipment back and forth from his facility, washing, caring for it and storing it
- They want to do the same type of business and be competitive and to be competitive they must buy new equipment which needs to be stored. The additional space will allow him to be efficient and competitive for the future

Mr. Kessler described the uses on each floor:

- 1st floor, a new loading area/dock/access
- storage on both the 1st & 2nd floor
- new wash area for the dishware which would enlarge the existing area
- a larger wood shop for their own designs
- lunch room for his employees
- new area for the tent washing machines, currently they wash the tents manually and the new machine would all them to be more efficient

Mr. Kessler advised that his hours of operation are 8:00 am to 5:00 pm, with picks up on the weekend. He starts picking up his equipment on Sunday morning which allows them to clean and get the equipment ready for Tuesdays. During the summer there are 11 full time employees, currently he has 7 full time people. The proposed changes would allow him to retain more people in the winter which would make his business more efficient.

Mr. McKenna asked if they have ever had difficulties with parking? Mr. Kessler said no, he makes sure that his employees do not in the front of the loading area.

Mr. McKenna asked if this addition is a mirror of what is existing, no additional variances are being created? Mr. Kessler said that is correct, but he will be correcting

some situations, he wants to bring the lumber which he stores outside to bring it indoors, which he is allowed to do, but he would like to bring the materials or rental products inside.

Mr. Garley asked what type of new equipment will he be installing? Mr. Kessler explained that the dishwasher already exists but in the future he is hoping to install a washing machine for tents, currently he has a wash facility for linens but the new one will be larger. He plans to expand his existing wood shop when they move it upstairs after construction, and they will be able to store some of the fabrications that they build and the raw materials (exotic woods).

Mr. Garley asked if he plans on purchasing additional trucks? Mr. Kessler said that he plans on changing his fleet by changing out the vans for a box truck, which would not impact any of his parking issues. Currently he does not promote retail sales but when a committee for a fund raiser comes into the shop he may use a few more spaces, a caterer may tell his client to go and look at the colors or equipment that is available for his catering. He explained that these items are on display in his showroom.

Mr. Kessler stated that he currently has 4 box trucks, 3 pick up trucks, 2 vans, 1 mobile show room/office which he has a designated parking area for these vehicles.

Mr. Kessler explained that the woodshop is complete but he would like to go to computer controlled milling machines, which would help him. He does not have a paint booth, he hand vanishes/paints each item, and they are not for retail only his use.

Mr. Kessler explained that the Fire Marshall has recommended that the varnishes/paints be stored behind the building, but he testified that his main product is water based and less volatile. In his wood shop he does have a dust collection system, which he feels is a must. The noise which is created is contained within his own building.

Mr. Kessler explained that when and if he purchases the new washing machine it will be upstairs with the material storage and equipment storage will be movable which will give him the opportunity to clean the tents upstairs manually, which is very labor intense.

Mr. Kessler stated that he has 11 full time employees in the winter and 3 part time people, and 7 full time employees in off peak season, currently he is not sure how many employees will be working next season, the ability to automate will dictate as to how many people he will have. His goal is to have 11 full time employees.

Mr. Cranmer asked what types of deliveries go to his facility? Mr. Kessler said in the winter nothing, UPS comes everyday, but in the summer 1 tractor trailer per week with his materials and other customer's products, which is delivered on site, and there is adequate movement for deliveries, which are delivered between 8 am to 5 pm only.

Mr. McKenna referred to the trash enclosure on site; he asked if he has had any problems or complaints with it? Mr. Kessler said that he currently has a front loading enclosure which is picked up by a front end loading truck, they come once a week, he has 2 barrels on site for his motor oil, which is pumped out twice a week, and rarely does he ever put trash out for the town to pick up, and he does not plan on any additional dumpster or barrels.

Mr. Cranmer asked if the applicant can supply a floor area plan? Mr. McKenna said that he has explained the floor area, but he can supply one if the board wants one.

A motion was made by Ms. Canonico, seconded by Mr. Betesh to open the meeting to the public. All approved.

No comments/questions.

A motion was made by Ms. Canonico, seconded by Mrs. Peterson to close the meeting to the public. All approved.

Mr. Frederick Kniesler, Jr., Planner was sworn, he was accepted as an expert witness.

Mr. Kessler described the proposed use for the addition that is before the board, and surrounding uses. Mr. Kessler testified that the building is located on a dead end street of mixed uses. Monmouth Building Lumber Yard, Thornebrook Community, Office & commercial uses, and light industrial uses.

Mr. Kniesler explained the existing site:

- 1 story building with 2 sections - 1700 sq. ft
- 2 story building of 10,000 sq. ft.
- 2 way access drive
- 15 paved parking spaces
- loading area
- wood deck cleaning pad outside
- dumpster area
- 3 storage sheds in the rear for storage and the storm water management
- 8400 sq. ft. will be added
- use variance was granted for this use previously and now he is expanding his preexisting non conforming use in the LI Zone
- the 2 bulk variances previously granted are not be expanded - new building is within the permitted footprint on the site

Mr. Kniesler described the permitted uses as any light industry and Mr. Kessler will not create any odors, gas, smoke, dust or glare. Section 94-4.1 states that all uses must be carried on within the enclosed structure and Mr. Kessler complies with the requirement. The variances that have been granted are not being expanded. This site is not appropriate for some of the other permitted uses within the LI Zone i.e.: bank, indoor theatre,

automobile sales, or business offices since this property is not accessible from the highway. Prohibited uses in the LI zone i.e.: warehouse, which Mr. Kessler is not. Mr. Kessler is not seeking a change in use, only an expansion of the preexisting non conforming use.

Mr. Kniesler referred to the Master Plan, and the proposed construction is not inconsistent with the goals and objections of the Maser Plan. The use is a low traffic operation on a dead end street. The applicant will do all of his parties off site and there is no retail on the property. The applicant is working toward an efficient and modern facility.

Mr. Kniesler testified that the site is suited for the proposed use, with off street for employee and customer vehicles and the use is self contained within the building. The applicant will provide additional landscaping and on site storm water management. The proposed expansion of the existing building will be consistent with the existing businesses along Riordan Place and has existed for many years. The proposed construction will be of similar appearance to crate a unified look. Existing parking patterns will enhance the site and the neighborhood. The proposed use promotes the general welfare and public good, since the peak hours do not conflict with other businesses in the area. The use is inconsistent with the intent & purpose of the Borough of Shrewsbury Zone Plan Ordinance.

Mr. Kniesler advised that this use does not need highway frontage only a building to store his equipment and conduct business. The granting of the granting will not be detrimental to the public good if the variance is granted, and is not impairment to the Zone Plan of the Borough of Shrewsbury. There will not be any change to the number of employees or frequency of clients to the property, and is consistent with the intent of the Ordinance to encourage light industrial uses in this area. Granting of the variance would not impact the Master Plan or Zoning Ordinance since the use has been in operation for over 12 years.

Ms. Waterbury asked what types of uses are within the business? Mr. Kniesler explained that the furniture which is fabricated is not for sale, only for the use within his business, which are ancillary to this use and could not be run as a separate “wood working shop” or a tent cleaning operation? Mr. Kniesler said that is correct, the building would have to be retrofitted for those uses.

Mr. Forrester marked the following into evidence:

A-1: Site Plan 10/8/09 10 sheets

A-2: color rendering of site plan

A-3: aerial photo

Mr. Kniesler referred to the aerial and described the surrounding uses.

Mr. Cranmer asked Mr. McKenna if any of the uses on this site would be restricted from the use variance that was granted on 4/7/99? Mr. McKenna said no.

A motion was made by Mrs. Peterson, seconded by Ms. Canonico to open the meeting to the public. All approved.

There were no comments/questions

A motion was made by Mr. Betesh, seconded by Ms. Canonico to close the meeting to the public. All approved.

Break: 9:15 - 9:25 pm all present at roll call.

Odoba Restaurant Corp. (Mexican Grill):
Hwy 35 & Shrewsbury Plaza
Bl: 31, Lot: 1

Use Variance &
waiver of site plan

Mr. Peter Falvo, Esq. represented the applicant

Ms. Waterbury advised that this matter will be carried to the February 3, 2010 meeting under Unfinished Business

Continuation of Paul David Partywares:

Mr. Dan Dougherty, Engineer, was sworn, gave his educational & professional background and was accepted as an expert witness in engineering.

Mr. Dougherty described the site and referred to colored rendering of A-2 which included the existing building, new proposed construction, the dumpster and landscaping areas. He advised that there are currently 18 parking spaces and the new plan will have 26 parking spaces. They will meet the existing needs of the business with a few additional spaces. He explained that there will not be any new variances created from the proposed construction; the variances that have been granted in the past will remain.

Review of Engineers letter dated 11/25/09:

1.1 to 1.16: Testimony given by Mr. Kniesler on Zoning & Planning

2.1: Mr. Dougherty stated that he will provide a break down of the architectural space of the building in order to assign parking rates to the uses within the building. He explained that the intensity of the building will not change from the existing conditions and they are proposing more parking than what exists today. He feels that the proposed 26 stalls will satisfy the employees and the customer base. Mr. Kessler described as the uses as well as the office was only 500 sq. ft. which supports the existing warehouse house, which is not your typical warehouse use, this is for storage of materials and operating a business which uses those materials.

Mr. Forrester asked Mr. Cranmer what would be the most intensive use on this site? Mr. Cranmer indicated the office space vs. warehouse house vs. retail space. He would like to see a square footage assigned to each of the uses to get an aggregate parking demand. We need to ensure that the parking assigned is adequate to the building for future uses. Mr. Forrester suggested that a condition be attached that no more than a certain square footage be allowed? Mr. Cranmer would like to take a look at the plan. Mr. Cranmer feels that the proposed will work, but our Ordinance states that if you exceed the parking they must demonstrate the reasons why which would necessitate additional impervious coverage.

Mr. McKenna stated that they are representing that the office is only 500 sq. ft. with no expansion of the office space, which does not generate an increase in the parking requirement, which is the one use that would trigger an increase in the parking. They will provide the architectural as requested, and he would request that this be made a condition of approval. Ms. Waterbury feels that this will clarify exactly how many spaces are allowed for the Zoning Officer in the future.

2.2: No retail use, but there is parking for customers to come and choose their materials that they are planning to rent. Mr. Kessler testified that there are only 1-2 cars during a busy summer day, worse case would be 8 customers or less and 50% of the day there are no customers. He explained that the employee and showroom parking is entirely separate.

2.3: trash enclosure located south of the building and the same access is to remain, which allows the truck to maneuver in and out of the site, which has currently existed for the last 13 years. The trash is collected early in the morning when customers are not on site. After a brief discussion it was agreed to modify the landscaped island to the south adjacent to the building to allow a better maneuverability and will minimize the impervious coverage, he will work with Mr. Cranmer

2.4: w/c

2.5: testimony given on the number of deliveries

2.6: testimony given on the adequacy on the 3 loading zone

2.7: w/c

2.8: w/c

3.0: Grading Drainage & Utilities:

3.1: w/c

3.2: w/c, Mr. McKenna will supply a letter dated 5/29/08 from the DEP advising “no flood plain”

3.3: No proposed changes in the existing utilities, they will fixture for a larger tent washing machine; he testified that he has adequate water supply.

3.4: Fire Official has no concerns

- 3.5:** Engineer will work with Mr. Cranmer with respect to the Stormwater Management System re: rain garden/detention basin & the water quality on site. If they cannot meet their 80% requirement he will be seeking a waiver from this requirement, he will be working with Mr. Cranmer on this issue.
- Mr. Cranmer stated that if they are going to seek a waiver from water quality then he would recommend that the board must determine what the percentage would be if they cannot meet the 80% which is required. He stated that 60% would be an extended detention basin where it holds the water for extended period of time, he feels that would be a reasonable compromise using a vegetated filter strip, more frequent cleaning of the paved surface. He feels that a combination of a filter strip, different planting, filters in the outlet structure may get the percentage to the 60%. He recommends that he return with his best plan and the board can make the determination.
- Mr. McKenna asked that the board add a condition of approval that the applicant submit additional information for site plan preliminary/final approval.*
- Ms. Waterbury suggested that the board address preliminary approval only.*

3.6: w/c

3.7: w/c

3.8: testimony given to use sand on the under drain to allow better drainage

3.9: w/c with Mr. Cranmer's comments when D.E.P. approval is received

3.10: w/c

3.11: testimony on run off patterns and they will w/o that no run off will be directed to adjacent property to the south.

3.12: w/c

3.13: w/c

3.14: w/c

4.0: Landscape & Lighting:

4.1: w/c

4.2: new fixture will be added @ 250watts

4.3: testimony given on existing lights of 4.4 foot candles

4.4: S.T.C. approval received.

5.0: Miscellaneous:

5.1: no new signs are proposed

5.2: w/c

5.3: w/c

5.4 a - h: w/c

Mr. McKenna stated that he is amending his request for **Use Variance and Preliminary** approval and will return with the outstanding issues.

Ms. Waterbury noted that there was no one in the audience other than the applicant's professionals.

A motion was made by Mr. Betesh, seconded by to approve the application for a Use Variance for an expansion of the existing non conforming use, and Preliminary site plan approval, subject to the following:

- *Review letter comments of 11/25/09*
- *Mr. Cranmer's comments with regard to Storm Water Management*

Mr. Kniesler reviewed the 6 bulk variances that are being requested in the November 25, 2009 review letter section 1.11 a,b,c,d,e,f which refer to off street parking, loading & buffering

1.11a: Off street parking location, within 20' of any street or right of way line, set back 5'.3 proposed.

b: Parking with 20' of building, 5' exist

c: Parking in front yard, exists on cul de sac and screened

d: loading zones : 2 proposed 14' x 27.4 where 12' x 35' is required

e: 20' buffer required, none currently exists site developed prior to requirement

f: parking not permitted within 5' from side or rear yard line, 2'.2 exists, landscaping and grading will improve the condition

Mr. Kniesler testified that the site will be improved and will improve Riordon Place as well.

Ms. Waterbury announced that there is no one in the audience except the applicant's professionals.

A motion was amended by Mr. Betesh, seconded by Ms. Canonico, to amend the motion to include the 6 variances being requested in addition to the Use Variance & Preliminary approval.

Roll Call:

Affirmative: Waterbury, Betesh, Canonico, Peterson, Fisher, Clark, Garley

Negative: None

Resolution 2/3/10.....

A motion was made by Ms. Canonico, seconded by Mr. Fisher to adjourn the meeting at 10: 50 pm. All approved.