

JANUARY 7, 2014

The Manasquan Planning Board held a second meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Wednesday, November 19, 2013 in the Council Chambers of the Borough Hall, 201 East Main Street, Manasquan, New Jersey.

Vice Chairman Muly presiding read statement re: Open Public Meetings Act of 1975 and that notice was given to the Coast Star and the Asbury Park Press on December 13, 2012.

Roll Call:

Present: Mayor Dempsey, Board Members Muly, Rabenda, Harriman, Hamilton, Love, Sullivan, Apostolou, Ragan, and Young.

Absent: Council Member McCarthy, Board Members Burke and Price.

Professionals Present: Board Attorney – Geoffrey S. Cramer and Board Engineer Charles Rooney.

Salute to the flag.

Mr. Cramer went over the rules and regulations of the meeting.

RESOLUTION #53-2013 – McCarthy, Rob and Brooke – 12 S. Potter Avenue – Block: 147 – Lot: 105 – Zone: R-2

Mr. Cramer stated that this resolution memorializes the approval given to the applicant with respect to construction of a new 2 ½ story single family dwelling at 12 S. Potter Avenue.

Mayor Dempsey made a motion to approve this resolution, seconded by Board Member Sullivan. Motion carried by the following vote: “yes” Mayor Dempsey, Board Members Muly, Rabenda, Harriman, Hamilton, Sullivan, Apostolou and Ragan. “No” none.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – September 24, 2013 – Second Meeting

Board Member Apostolou made a motion to approve the minutes, seconded by Board Member Harriman. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Cramer stated that he received a telephone call this afternoon from Mr. John Burke advising that he would not be at tonight’s meeting and that he is declining the nomination to serve as the Planning Board Chairman in 2014. He stated that leaves Neil Hamilton as the only nominee for the position.

Board Member Sullivan made a motion to nominate Neil Hamilton as Planning Board Chairman for 2014, seconded by Board Member Apostolou. Motion carried by the following vote: “yes” Mayor Dempsey, Board Members Muly, Rabenda, Harriman, Love, Sullivan, Apostolou, and Ragan. “No” none.

JANUARY 7, 2014

OATH OF OFFICE

The following Members were sworn in by the Board Attorney:

Class I Member – Mayor George R. Dempsey, Jr.

Class I Member – Mayor’s Designee – Robert Young

Class II Member – Paul Rabenda

Class III Member – Council Liaison – Owen McCarthy

Environmental Liaison – Greg Love

Regular Board Members – John Muly, John Burke, Neil Hamilton, Joan Harriman, Leonard Sullivan

Alternate #1 – Mark Apostolou

Alternate #2 – Peter Ragan

Alternate #3 – Jay Price

Alternate #4 – Kevin Thompson

Board Chairman Hamilton thanked the members for his nomination to be Chairman. He recognized former Board Chairman Burke for his many years as serving as chairman of the planning board as well as the board of adjustment and he thanked him for his many hours to the community. He stated that he commends Mr. Burke for his dedication to the borough and a job well done.

Mr. Cramer read the following resolutions for approval.

RESOLUTION #A-2014 – 2014 Meeting Dates

Board Member Apostolou asked if the resolution can be amended to add that the meetings will end no later than 10:00 p.m. instead of 10:00 p.m.

Mr. Cramer stated that the resolution will be amended to read “These meetings will end not later than 10:00 p.m.”

Board Member Apostolou made a motion to approve this resolution with the amendment, seconded by Mayor Dempsey. Motion carried unanimously.

RESOLUTION #B-2014 – Designation of Official Newspapers for Planning Board

Board Member Muly made a motion to approve this resolution, seconded by Mayor Dempsey. Motion carried unanimously.

RESOLUTION #C-2014 – Appointment of Chairman and Vice Chairman

Board Member Apostolou made a motion to approve this resolution, seconded by Board Member Sullivan. Motion carried unanimously.

JANUARY 7, 2014

RESOLUTION #D-2014 – Appointment of Planning Board Secretary

Board Member Harriman made a motion to approve this resolution, seconded by Mayor Dempsey. Motion carried unanimously.

RESOLUTION #E-2014 – Appointment of Planning Board Engineer

Mayor Dempsey made a motion to approve this resolution, seconded by Board Member Harriman. Motion carried unanimously.

RESOLUTION #F-2014 – Appointment of Planning Board Planner

Board Member Apostolou made a motion to approve this resolution, seconded by Board Member Harriman. Motion carried unanimously.

RESOLUTION #G-2014 – Appointment of Planning Board Attorney

Mayor Dempsey made a motion to approve this resolution, seconded by Board Member Apostolou. Motion carried unanimously.

RESOLUTION #H-2014 – Adopting Planning Board Rules and Regulations

Mayor Dempsey made a motion to approve this resolution, seconded by Board Member Apostolou. Motion carried unanimously.

Mayor Dempsey left the meeting at 7:14 p.m. and the Mayor's Designee Robert Young arrived at 7:15 p.m.

Chairman Hamilton presided over the remainder of the meeting.

APPLICATION #01-2014 – McManus, George and Janice – 5 Pickell Alley – Block: 169.05 – Lot: 55 – Zone: R-3 – Rear Deck, Bulk Variance

Mr. Cramer swore in George and Janice McManus and Board Engineer Albert Yodakis.

Mr. McManus stated that they purchased this home in 2005 and they are before the Board tonight for a variance for a deck in the rear yard. He stated that they need a variance for the deck as the laws are written there needs to be a 20 foot setback and the architect has designed a home with a deck that is going to be 11 feet from the rear set back and because of the height of the home they raised the deck about 5 feet off the ground to be closer to the entrance to the house which is 13 feet above the ground.

Chairman Hamilton asked Mr. McManus if he received the technical review report and the T&M report from the Board Engineer.

JANUARY 7, 2014

Mr. McManus stated that he did receive both of these documents.

Mr. Yodakis stated there are really no issues to discussion as the application is straight forward and the only variances is for the rear yard setback of the deck. He stated that the current ordinance allows for a deck to be at the finished floor elevation but it can not be more than 6 feet in the air for a first floor deck.

Mr. Cramer swore in Mary Hearn, architect.

Ms. Hearn stated that the finished first floor is not 13 feet above grade but it is at elevation 13 which is approximately 9 feet above grade. She stated that the proposed deck is 5.5 feet above grade and what is planned is a landing out of the home, a half set of stairs down to a deck, and then another half set of stairs to the ground. She explained the reasoning of the deck to be at 5.5 feet and not at ground level or as high as the first floor.

Mr. Yodakis stated that the application is straight forward and plot plans have been provided which provides all of the normal details that the board would be looking for if this was a new house including storm water, pavers, driveway and all the other grading.

Photo Board was marked into evidence as Exhibit A-1.

Ms. Hearn stated that the photo shows that they are on the water which provides a significant distance from the next house to the rear. She stated that the concern with rear yard setbacks is that there is no crowding to the rear and the waterway provides a lot more distance to the house located behind the home. She advised that they are requesting a variance of 11.67 feet proposed where 20 feet is required.

Site Plan was marked into evidence as Exhibit A-2.

Ms. Hearn stated that Exhibit A-2 shows the portion of the deck that encroaches the required rear yard set back and that a majority of the deck complies but there is 8 feet short on the side and the rear property line is skewed.

Chairman Hamilton stated that in the technical review states a suggestion that the deck will be enclosed by some fashion like lattice.

Ms. Hearn stated that they would be ok with the lattice.

There was discussion on the break away walls and lattice.

Chairman Hamilton stated that this is dealing with a small deck and stated that lattice may suffice.

Board Member Apostolou stated that he noticed on the survey that there is an area of confusion for title not clear.

JANUARY 7, 2014

Ms. Hearn stated that when a home is on the water it happens often.

Board Member Apostolou stated that he was not sure if it was riparian or an actual title and he just brought it up for notice requirements.

Ms. Hearn stated that she is not a surveyor and she notes that on the survey there are two dimensions on each of the side plot lines and she stated that they used for the purpose of figuring out percentage of lot coverage the smaller dimensions. She stated that as far as noticing she is not sure where the tax department would have taken the corners from.

Board Member Apostolou asked if there is a wooden deck there now.

Ms. Hearn stated that there was a wooden deck but that it is no longer there.

Board Member Apostolou asked if there was terra firma underneath that.

Ms. Hearn stated yes there is.

Board Member Apostolou stated that he would withdraw his request of the title not clear because he does not believe it would pertain to any other property owner.

Board Member Harriman inquired about a tree that looks to be on the property and if it will make it and if not will it be replaced.

Mr. McManus stated that it is on his property and he does not believe that it will make it and he is hoping to replace it. He advised that there is only one tree on the property and he is hoping to have that one and a couple of others.

Board Member Harriman stated that Shade Tree requires that if a tree is taken down that another tree is put in.

Chairman Hamilton asked Mr. Yodakis if there are any issues with the location of the AC units.

Mr. Yodakis stated that he believes that they are located on the deck and they fully comply.

There was an inquiry of pavers in the back and if it will be all pavers.

Mr. Yodakis asked the intent of the applicant as to the pavers.

Mr. McManus stated that there is a paver driveway at the front of the home that leads from the curb into the garage which is under the home and then there is driveway on the left side of the house that will go back to the steps from the deck and that is the only place the pavers will be.

Mr. Yodakis asked what the intent of the rest of the property is.

Mr. McManus stated that it would be stone.

JANUARY 7, 2014

Mr. Yodakis stated that the way the ordinance is currently written the applicant meets all impervious coverage standards.

Ms. Hearn stated that a professional engineer has been hired for the drainage and grading.

Board Member Muly made a motion to open the hearing to the public, seconded by Board Member Young. Motion carried unanimously.

There being no comment Board Member Apostolou made a motion to close the public hearing, seconded by Board Member Young. Motion carried unanimously.

Board Member Apostolou made a motion to approve this application, seconded by Board Member Rabenda. Motion carried by the following vote: "yes: Chairman Hamilton, Board Members Muly, Rabenda, Harriman, Love, Sullivan, Apostolou, Ragan, and Young. "No" none.

Chairman Hamilton stated that the resolution will be at the next regular meeting and if you so choose to proceed prior to the 45 day waiting period you will need to talk to the planning board secretary in order to get the particulars.

APPLICATION #04-2014 – Yeager, Gerald – 345 Beachfront – 344 First Avenue – Block: 185 – Lot: 17 – Zone: R-4 – Demo and Rebuild

Keith Henderson, attorney for the applicant presented the above information to the board. He stated that all the appropriate documents have been submitted and he respectfully requested that the board accept jurisdiction of the application.

Mr. Cramer stated that all appropriate documents have been submitted and all fess have been paid.

Mr. Cramer swore in Gerald Yaeger, applicant and Yogesh Mistry, architect and Albert Yodakis, Board Engineer.

Mr. Henderson asked questions of Mr. Yaeger.

Mr. Yaeger replied to the questions. He stated that he is one of the owners of the property and the property has been in the family since the early 1960. He believes the house was originally built in 1960 and the property suffered damaged from Sandy. He advised that there are two properties one on the Beachfront and one on First Avenue and the beachfront property had structural damage. He stated that he received a letter from Sandy Ratz the Borough Construction Official advising that the property needed to be demolished, raised or removed from the site. He stated that the First Avenue house was not damaged. He advised that he made the determination to also demolish the First Avenue house. He advised that prior to the Sandy storm there were 3 units on the property and they were rented out time to time and they did not have heat. He advised that he is proposing to eliminate one of the 3 units to make a conforming First Avenue house and the Beachfront house at least as to usage. He stated that demolition is the process of

JANUARY 7, 2014

being done. He advised that he spoke with zoning officer what might be able to be done before construction started and he was advised that the beachfront house which was set back a foot on one side that it could be elevated in place and that he would not have to go through the board except for the roof line and dormer issues. He stated that he determined to center the house on beachfront and he is asking the board to give him 3.1 foot setbacks on either side.

Mr. Henderson stated that in the Technical Review Report it refers to the First Avenue house being pulled in a little bit and asked the applicant if he is willing to do this.

Mr. Yaeger stated that he is willing to do this.

Mr. Henderson stated that he will defer to the board on this issue as he is not familiar with what the Technical Review Committee is looking for. He advised that they thought 5 feet but is not quite sure what is being recommended.

Mr. Muly stated that what they are looking for is with new construction is to try and move them in a little bit so that the cars are further off the street.

Mr. Henderson stated that they do not have a problem with that but he is asking if 5 foot would satisfy that concern.

Mr. Muly stated that it would be up to the board.

There was discussion on why the board is trying to get the cars pulled in farther and the issue with the way the cars park on the First Avenue.

Mr. Henderson stated that they would be amenable but not to go to 10 feet.

There was discussion on the 10 foot set back and the reasoning of the board.

Mr. Henderson asked Mr. Mistry his credentials and asked questions of him.

Mr. Mistry stated that he designed the plans for the applicant and he went over the ordinances to determine what options there were. He advised that the first variance is an existing non-conforming lot size which is 3500 square feet where 4200 is required, the building coverage 35% is allowed and the current footprint of the two buildings is 43.2% and he plans on staying at the 43.2%.

Board Member Harriman pointed out that the documents point out that building coverage will be going to 45.7%.

Mr. Mistry stated that the zoning officer had made that statement but it was re-calculated and determined that it was still 43.2%. He stated that lot coverage is allowed 50% and the current site is 62.6% and they will reduce to 58.1%. He stated there is a walkway to the beach walkway that is concrete and that could be pavers in order to reduce the lot coverage.

JANUARY 7, 2014

Board Member Harriman asked if the walkway to the beach walk was a shared walkway.

Mr. Mistry stated that it is a shared walkway.

Mr. Henderson stated that there will be discussion on the walkway with the neighbor who stated that they are willing to convert the walkway to pavers. He stated that the plan is to have the whole walkway pavers and the neighbor has indicated verbally that is what he would like to do.

Mr. Mistry stated that the front yard set backs for the First Avenue building are currently at zero and they are proposing zero.

Mr. Henderson asked more questions of Mr. Mistry.

Mr. Mistry advised that he explored the prevailing set backs for other front yard set backs in the area and that there were many houses that were already at the property line. He stated that the houses on either side of this property are lined up with them.

Exhibit A-1 entered into evidence is an aerial of the area from Google maps.

Mr. Mistry stated that this property would be lined up with the other properties once this property was re-developed and the house that faces the boardwalk where it requires having 15 foot setback essentially he is at 6.5 feet; existing property was at 6.4 feet. He stated that one thing that would help with this argument is the portion of the new house that is at 6.5 feet essentially is a bump out bay where the first floor dining room is and on the second floor the house lines up to the straight portion of that profile. He advised that the bump out is about half of the front of the house and the other half is pulled back around 12 feet. He stated that the side yard 5 foot is required and the current set back is 1.5 on the First Avenue and 1.0 on the Beachfront and on the First Avenue house he is maintaining at 1.5 feet but the side yard on the Beachfront property is being increased to 3.1 feet. He advised that the set back is needed on the First Avenue property to accommodate the parking and the garage. He stated that the he has done the calculation on the footprint of both houses and he is competent that they are the same exact footprint that is there right now. He advised that the set back is needed on the First Avenue property to accommodate the parking and the garage. He stated that the he has done the calculation on the footprint of both houses and he is competent that they are the same exact footprint that is there right now. He advised that he is familiar with ordinance A and B for the beachfront house and the first avenue house and he voice his opinion on the options. He stated that in the proposal they are meeting the height requirement of 32 for the beachfront and 33 for the First Avenue building but currently they do not meet the Option B rule. He stated that the dormers are a tricky portion of the code and he interpreted it is that there needs to be dormers on the east and west sides of the house which would not make sense and the majority of the houses have dormers facing north and south. He stated that there is a dormer in the rear of the house that accommodates the stairs to get to the upper half story and the other side is a small dormer that allows head room in the bathroom. He went over the percentage of dormers. He stated that he is looking for the land use relief for the dormers from the board.

JANUARY 7, 2014

Chairman Hamilton stated that ordinance option A and B is being reviewed by the borough council and that the dormers will be changed as well. He stated that the entire option of A and B and dormers may disappear rather soon. He stated that the applicant would still need the variance because the ordinance is in effect.

Mr. Mistry stated that they will meet the half story requirement as well as the overall height. He advised that house will be 2 ½ story house. He stated at the time of the application he did not have the measurement from the crown of the road but he does have it now and it is 5.8 and they were measuring from the curb line which was lower at 5.7.

Chairman Hamilton asked if Mr. Mistry could review the heights of the proposed structures.

Mr. Mistry advised that the height of the First Avenue house measured off the curb was 5.7 is 31.2 ½ to the peak and if you measure off the crown of the road it would be slightly less than that. He advised that the height of the Beachfront house measured from the board walk elevation was 32.6.

Chairman Hamilton stated that in both cases there is no variance required.

Mr. Henderson stated that he has reviewed with the applicant the board engineer's report, specifically section two miscellaneous and they have no problem with replacing curb and sidewalk and section 2.2 has to do with the base flood elevation that has been discussed and a grading plan of the time for a permit and the compliance with the storm water ordinance.

Mr. Mistry stated that the ordinance is still in affect mostly for the grading plan and they do not have to include the infiltration systems.

Mr. Henderson stated that the free standing platforms are proposed to raise the air conditioning units and there are plans to have underground utilities and they will work that out with JCP&L. He stated that there is a fee to the tax collector to complete the tax map update and that has been paid.

Board Member Harriman commented on how far the proposed house goes out to the beachfront. She wanted to confirm that the house to the north, the whole porch is out farther than the proposed house and she stated that if you draw a line from the house straight over most of the porches are even behind that line. She stated that she would like to see that line kept as opposed to coming all the way out to the end of where the porch to the north is. She asked Mr. Mistry if he is saying that the porch will be back where the house was.

Mr. Mistry stated that the main house will be where the existing house was.

Mr. Henderson stated that half the house will be set back further than that.

Board Member Harriman stated that the new house will come out to where the house is now and wanted to know what else is in front of that.

JANUARY 7, 2014

Mr. Mistry stated that the proposed deck will be in the same spot as the existing deck.

There was discussion on the deck and how far out the deck comes out farther than other decks to the south of this house and there was discussion on the decks to the North of the proposed porch.

Mr. Mistry stated that he is asking for a variance on the deck set back. He stated that the setback requirement is 10 and they are currently at .1 which is right on the property line which is in the same spot as it was.

Board Member Harriman stated that if you look at the picture you can see that the porch will be coning out farther than every other house to the south of this house.

Mr. Henderson stated that what CAFRA states that you can not bring an existing house forward.

There was discussion on the deck and the surrounding decks and previous variances that have been granted.

Chairman Hamilton stated in order to understand this is that the structure itself is going back to the same footprint with the bump out in the front as the prior house.

There was discussion on the deck and whether or not it is covered or not and the second floor deck. There was also discussion on how far out the deck comes and the views that will be blocked to the south.

Ms. Mistry stated that the reason that the deck needs to be where it is to accommodate the stair and landing in as the stairs can not go straight out. He stated that they are within the property line and the deck is inside the property line.

Chairman Hamilton stated that the Board Member Harriman does not want the bump out to create any variance that goes farther east.

Mr. Mistry stated that right now the existing deck is .1 feet off the property line where the proposed deck is 1.5 feet in which is less then what is there now.

There was continued discussion on the proposed deck and the deck that was there previously and the location.

Board Member Apostolou asked Mr. Mistry if there will be any encroachments on the new construction footprints on any easements such as overhangs, rain gutters or anything.

Mr. Mistry stated that there will not by any.

Board Member Apostlou stated so there will be nothing that will extrude into the other properties.

Mr. Mistry stated no.

JANUARY 7, 2014

Chairman Hamilton stated that he would like to go back and little to understand what is being asked for. He stated that if the structure was being put back the house where it was there would be a decreasing some of the side yard set backs, the front of the house, the decking and all is pretty much similar in location as the other homes. He asked that the changes be explained to the board.

Mr. Mistry stated that the two houses are being taken down and replacing them generally in the same spot as where they were. He advised that the beachfront house is set a little bit further back by the creation of the bump out and he believes that this is an improvement. He also stated that the deck is slightly further back from .1 to 1.5 feet and also 3.5 feet gap will be created between this house and the south property line as now there is only about 1 foot. He stated that there is an improvement on the beach from 1.0 and they are going up to 3.1.

Chairman Hamilton stated that Mr. Mistry agreed to move the First Avenue house back approximately 5 feet.

Mr. Mistry stated that is correct and that he is trying to reduce the impervious by leaving the gable walkway. He stated that they are in conformance with the heights on both houses. He stated that they are both new houses and esthetically it would be an improvement to the town and property values and that they would meet all the new fire, flood, and safety codes.

There was discussion on the shower and faucet under the deck.

Board Member Harriman stated that it was mentioned that there they don't believe the house will go over any gutters according to what was discussed. She advised that when she was down at the houses the existing First Avenue house the over hang goes over the house next store.

There was discussion on this issue.

Chairman Hamilton stated that if you look at the plans where the set back is you will see the overhang on the ease of the second floor of the garage should be at or inside the property line.

Mr. Mistry stated that they are at or inside the property line.

Board Member Apostolou asked Mr. Yodakis if he was satisfied with the 5 feet after hearing the architect's discussion for the First Avenue house.

Mr. Yodakis stated that it looks like to the existing house it is about 10 feet so 5 feet will give a 15 feet actual set back from the edge of pavement or curb line to the front of the house. He stated that normally 19 feet is required but that is also gives you 2 feet on either side and he thinks that would be reasonable and a big improvement.

Mr. Henderson gave his closing statement.

JANUARY 7, 2014

Board Member Apostolou made a motion to open the hearing up to the public, seconded by Board Member Muly. Motion carried unanimously.

There being no comment Board Member Love made a motion to close the audience participation, seconded by Board Member Apostolu. Motion carried unanimously.

Board Member Apostolou made a motion to approve this application subject to reducing the proposed building coverage shall be reduced to 43.2 as opposed to 45.7 with the additional item of the First Avenue house to be moved 5 feet east, seconded by Board Member Love. Motion carried by the following vote: "yes" Chairman Hamilton, Board Members, Muly, Rabenda, Harriman, Love, Sullivan, Apostolou, Ragan and Young. "No" none.

OTHER BUSINESS:

Board Member Sullivan asked the Planning Board secretary to address the bills with the Board of Education and what the plan.

Board Secretary Mary Salerno stated that she received a letter in the mail today and she spoke to Mr. Cramer and he advised that this needs discussed but he didn't know if the board wanted to discuss it tonight.

Mr. Cramer stated that they are renewing their request for a waiver on the escrow fees.

Board Member Sullivan stated that this should not be waived. He stated that the board agreed to waive an application fee but they had to pay the professional fees and that he would not move from that position.

Board Member Apostolou agreed with Board Member Sullivan.

There was discussion on the request to waive escrow fees for the Board of Education and what was approved at an earlier meeting.

Chairman Hamilton stated that a letter should be drafted by the board attorney stating that it is the board's position that they will not reduce the fees and full payment is requested and required for the professional fees.

Board Member Muly made a motion to approve the payment of vouchers, seconded by Board Member Young. Motion carried unanimously.

Board Member Apostolou stated that he has not studied the by laws of the planning board and he needs to do that but he believes at this time there should be a review of the by laws by a sub committee just to see if anything need to be changed.

Mr. Cramer stated that it has been more than 19 years since the board adopted the by laws and he agrees that they should be reviewed and update them.

JANUARY 7, 2014

The Board Secretary handed out a draft ordinance from Mark Kitrick, Borough Attorney which he is requesting that the board review.

Chairman Hamilton stated that he believes that the board gets unfairly shot at with a change in an ordinance that the board along with the engineer and the zoning officer should be putting the data together when they are the ones that have to work with it. He stated that he does not believe that there is any reason to do any of this in a hurry up mode and there needs to be a time out and do this. He advised that there is probably a half dozen items in the "to do" list that need to be addressed. He went over items that need to be addressed by the board.

There was discussion on e-mails and the Sunshine Laws and how to take care of the list of items that the Board Members need to discuss.

It was recommended that a committee be put together to review the by laws and bring those suggestions to the Board Members at a public meeting.

There was discussion on Option A and B of the ordinance, issues with signs, and pavers as to being impervious or pervious.

Chairman Hamilton recommended that the paver issue be sent back to the Technical Committee and they can come up with a recommendation to the Board. He stated that the Technical Committee can shoot out the issue with pools in the flood zone and give a recommendation to the Board.

There was discussion on the in ground pools and above ground pools and the displacement of ground water and whether or not crawl spaces are allowed.

Board Member Love stated he would like to see the agenda items on the 7:00 p.m. Regular Meetings and not the Special Meeting at 4:00 p.m. He stated that the 4:00 p.m. session because the board knew they were going to get an influx of Sandy requests.

It was advised that according to Mr. Furey, zoning officer that the applications have picked up.

There were no audience members in attendance.

Board Member Muly made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:50 p.m., seconded by Board Member Apostolou. Motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,



Barbara Ilaria, RMC
Acting Planning Board Secretary

DATE APPROVED 5-6-14

