

**MINUTES
Of the Township of West Milford
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
February 28, 2012
Regular Meeting**

Robert Brady, Board Chairman, opened the Regular Meeting of the Zoning Board of Adjustment at 7:36p.m. The Board Secretary read the Legal Notice.

Pledge

The Chairman asked all in attendance to join in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The Board Attorney Stephen Glatt administered and had members sign oaths Vivienne Erk became a regular Citizen Member #7, Michael Siesta the 1st Alternate and Michael Gerst is the 2nd Alternate Member of the Zoning Board of Adjustment. The Chairman explained that there was one regular member absent and Michael Siesta will be there in that place making it a full Board. Mr. Brady explained to the public about the Board of Adjustment, explained the Open Public Meetings Act of the State of New Jersey. Appeals go to the Superior Court of the State of New Jersey. He introduced the Board Attorney. Applicant explains the application first then anyone speaking for or against the application is given the opportunity to do so.

Roll Call

Present: Russell Curving, Steven Castronova, Frank Curcio, Arthur McQuaid, Vivienne Erk, Michael Siesta, Michael Gerst and Robert Brady

Also Present: Stephen Glatt, Board Attorney, William H. Drew, Michael Cristaldi Board Engineer, Denyse Todd, Board Secretary

Absent: James Olivo

MEMORIALIZATIONS

**RONALD HEDDY
RESOLUTION NO. 1-2012
BULK VAR. ZB07-10-09
Bl. 7515; Lot 2
7 Ash Road, LR Zone**

Motion by Russell Curving to memorialize Resolution No. 1-2012
Second by Vivienne Erk

Roll Call Vote:

Yes: Frank Curcio, Arthur McQuaid, Vivienne Erk, Robert Brady
No: none

**STEPHEN GLATT, ESQ.
RESOLUTION NO. 2-2012
Professional Contract**

Motion by Frank Curcio to memorialize Resolution No. 2-2012
Second by Vivienne Erk

Roll Call Vote:

Yes: Russell Curving, Steven Castronova, Frank Curcio, Arthur McQuaid, Vivienne Erk, Michael Siesta, Robert Brady
No: none

WILLIAM H. DREW, P.P. AICP
RESOLUTION NO. 3-2012
Professional Contract

Motion by Steven Castronova to memorialize Resolution No. 3-2012
Second by Vivienne Erk

Roll Call Vote:

Yes: Russell Curving, Steven Castronova, Frank Curcio, Arthur McQuaid, Vivienne Erk,
Michael Siesta, Robert Brady
No: none

ROBERT C. KIRKPATRICK
RESOLUTION NO. 4-2012
Professional Contract

Motion by Steven Castronova to memorialize Resolution No. 4-2012
Second by Michael Siesta

Roll Call Vote:

Yes: Russell Curving, Steven Castronova, Frank Curcio, Arthur McQuaid, Vivienne Erk,
Michael Siesta, Robert Brady
No: none

MICHAEL CRISTALDI
ALAIMO GROUP
RESOLUTION NO. 5-2012
Professional Contract

Motion by Steven Castronova to memorialize Resolution No. 5-2012
Second by Russell Curving

Roll Call Vote:

Yes: Russell Curving, Steven Castronova, Frank Curcio, Arthur McQuaid, Vivienne Erk,
Michael Siesta, Robert Brady
No: none

JAMES AMBROSE
RESOLUTION NO. 6-2012
BULK VARIANCE #ZB11-11-13
Block 10706; Lot 9
10 Pool Drive; LR Zone

Motion by Steven Castronova to memorialize Resolution No. 6-2012
Second by Michael Siesta

Roll Call Vote:

Yes: Steven Castronova, Frank Curcio, Vivienne Erk, Michael Siesta, Robert Brady
No: none

FRANCESCO PETROSILLO
BULK VARIANCE NO. ZB12-11-16
Block 10810; Lot 1
645 Otterhole Road, LR Zone

Bulk variance relief requested for a side yard setback where 30 feet is required 17 exists and 8 is proposed, to construct a home addition.

The Board Attorney swore in the applicant Francesco Petrosillo of 645 Otterhole Road. The applicant testified that they want to put in an addition and expand the kitchen by approximately 5 feet. They would like an additional bedroom upstairs. The septic system is already a 3 bedroom septic system. The additional bedroom would not be a problem. The variance is needed because of the side yard offset. The applicant indicated it would be a 3 bedroom and the den is to remain a den

he has no plan on making it a 4 bedroom home. With regard to the 60 foot distance to the well or septic system, he does not believe they are encroaching on either. According to the information he was provided by the Health Department he does not believe he is encroaching, providing his own septic system is not in the 60 foot setback. Mr. Brady commented that they mean all septic systems and wells. The applicant indicated that the house presently is within the 60 feet. Mr. Brady added that the well has to be 60 feet away from the septic field. Mr. Brady asked Mr. Drew the planner and he indicated that it was a Health Department regulation. Must locate all wells and septic systems within 60 feet of the proposed addition. The submitted plan does not have a 60 foot radius around the addition showing other septic systems or wells. The Planner indicated that it might be referring to the house on adjacent lot number, which has a house on it. The applicant stated that according to the plans on file with the Township from 2001 when the septic system was planned and installed, that septic field was well beyond the 60 foot radius. His own septic field is within the 60 foot radius but the field on lot 2 is not. The applicant brought a photocopy of the Health Department record it was marked in evidence as A-1. It shows his lot and septic systems and wells. He overlaid on top of that the addition as planned and the 60 foot offset from each extreme corner and everything is beyond the 60 foot radius. He did it himself as the Health Department memo was only given to him the day before. Number 3 on the Health Department wants to know any wells or septic systems within 60 feet of his addition.

The plan the applicant submitted is not to scale. If the application is decided tonight then it should be conditional upon submission of a new plan to scale showing the 60 foot radius around the addition to make sure there is no encroachment to existing structures, septic and wells. The Chairman explained that the septic system is configured by the amount of bedrooms in the home. There are 4 children living in the home. Mr. Brady asked if there were any questions of Board Members. Mr. Glatt asked for zoning reasons. Mr. Brady asked if there was any property available for purchase. The applicant explained there was no available property to purchase. It is a double corner lot, like a peninsula. There are a half a dozen homes with equal or lesser offsets on their structures. Mr. Glatt asked if this conforms to the community and the applicant indicated it would. Not better than not detrimental to the community. There is no place else to put on the addition it would be the same wherever he put the addition. Mr. Glatt asked for additional testimony on the lot. The applicant indicated it was triangular, fronts 2 streets on 3 sides. Mr. Drew asked if there was any reason it had to be located there could it be moved to improve the setback? The applicant said no that is where the septic tanks are. He is restricted because of the septic location. The Chairman asked if there were any other questions of Board Members.

The Chairman opened the meeting to the public. Mr. Edward Flores Jr. and Mrs. Cheryl Flores, 641 Otterhole Road, West Milford. They have 5 lots total Lot 2 they are the neighbors to the left of the applicant. The lot goes front to rear. Mrs. Flores explained that she is not sure of the lot versus the footprint of the home, the percentage of coverage. The proposed addition will be closer to their property line. They indicated the fence and 2 sheds are either on the property line or on their property. The setback should be 5 foot. They brought topical photos of the property and it shows how much is on the property. 2 sheets were given to the attorney it says 645 Otterhole Road. They are marked O-1 & O-2, the attorney asked for the photos to be referred to as O-1 & O-2. There are additional photos which will be marked in evidence. Mr. Castronova inquired whether there was a lot coverage variance being applied for and there is not only side yard. Mr. Flores commented that the foundation will start 8 feet or so from the property line but it will be closer. The placement is bothering the objectors. The Board will assume that the lot coverage is not required. A Board Member commented that normally everything is shown on the plan such as fences, sheds. Mr. Flores asked what a bulk variance was. The attorney stated it was a dimensional variance. The requirement for a side yard is 30 feet, what is existing is 17 and what they are asking for is deviation from 17 and allow him to go to 8 feet. The Board Planner and Member indicated that there is nothing on the plan indicated the applicant is exceeding lot coverage which would be 10% plus 3% accessory structure. There is a free standing garage which is one accessory structure. The planner asked the objectors about the other items on the property. They indicated there were 2 sheds Mr. Drew commented that the survey does not show the sheds. There are 2 sheds there now and are in the pictures that the objectors brought. Mr. Glatt told the neighbors to tell the Board their concerns and they have the right to ask the applicant about items that may or may not exist and the Board has the right if they feel it is appropriate to ask the applicant additional questions relating to the issues they may raise. The photos were marked into evidence if they are redundant; it is not necessary to talk about each one. Mr. Glatt indicated that the Board was not giving general zoning information each lot in each zone might have a different requirement. The setback in an ideal world is 30 and it is 17 now. His zoning reasons are irregularity of the shape of the property, the physical conditions such as septic and wells dictate where they can locate. If the Board feels that he has hardships that justify it, (positive criteria) are not off set by any negative criteria then the Board has the right to grant the application. The objectors seem to have concerns with the negative. This is a site-specific application. Exhibits O-3 through O-22 were marked into evidence.

Mr. Glatt asked the applicant to come forward and indicated that there were issues being raised by the Objectors, the Board does not know about the accuracy or what it is about. Evidently they are raising issues about other out building or accessory buildings on the property. The applicant's site plan does not have some of those structures if they do exist. There seems to be lot coverage issues. The applicant indicated they do not have a foundation so they are not permanent structures. Mr. Glatt indicated that he would let them testify and he has the right to defend himself.

Mr. Flores' understanding that any structure permanent or not should be 5 feet off of the property line. Mr. Glatt indicated that the Ordinance will be checked and the Planner will advise. There was one shed when the house was sold to the applicant and Mr. Flores said leave it where it is until he sells his house and then it may have to be moved. Then he put a second shed over the property line Exhibit O-18. It shows 2 sheds, they did not notice it until the winter came. O-17 shows the sides of both sheds. The fence and one shed were encroaching the other shed is even more so because of the shape of the property. Mr. Glatt indicated that the issue of the items being on their property would have to be taken care of between the property owners and perhaps they will need an attorney. The existing fence is on the property line and maybe more so. O-12 shows the lower deck and that is 3 feet from their property, the new addition will be close at 8.1 feet. The roof over hang will probably be even closer. The distance of 17 feet is the furthest point from the property. The closest part is less at 13.5 feet. The numbers do not seem to be correct. He indicated that the variance is not 17 feet existing but actually 13.5 feet. The 2nd floor addition is not their concern, he has a problem with the 2nd den, it is very close to the property, it is not a necessity, he has a den already down stairs, he indicated that it was a bedroom, he has been in the house. There are 2 bedrooms upstairs and he is adding a 3rd. There is a daughter, a set of twins and an older son and he and his wife. If he wants a four bedroom house he should have a four bedroom septic. Mr. Flores has a four bedroom house and it was done to code. He indicated that he did not move to West Milford to have someone live right up close to them. His deck is about 3 feet from the septic tank lid. The attorney indicated that the Board of Health governs anything with septic and well.

Mr. Castonova asked Mr. Flores if he could not see the structure because of a fence or shrubbery and the sheds were moved would it be a problem. Mr. Flores indicated that if a fence was put up so he could not see it, he would not have a problem. Mrs. Flores added that his percentage of what is existing is high there is no property at all. Mr. Flores indicated that it has to be 50 or 60 percent and that is a concern.

Mr. Drew indicated that in light of the testimony and the objection from the neighbor, it appears the Board does not have a survey that accurately depicts the property as it presently exists. Mr. Brady indicated that he was waiting to get as much testimony as possible, there are inconsistencies with plans, questions that have been asked, no scale drawing of where the well is located with regard to other wells. There is a situation where there are no absolute setbacks, there is no scale of accessory structures, these items will need to be cleared up before a decision can be made. Mr. Brady proposed to carry the application for the information to be provided to the Board at the next meeting. Mr. Glatt indicated that in light of what has been heard it would be appropriate for the application to be carried and the Board can see what the conditions are. This will not preclude the applicant nor the objectors from additional testimony.

The objector indicated that the applicant approached him last summer about purchasing 15 feet of property from him, since that time Mr. Flores has thought about possibly selling his home and had plans for a garage as part of the sale. He no longer has property to sell. Mr. Brady asked Mr. Flores if the application was carried would he be able to return for the next meeting and he said sure. Mr. Brady indicated that since items were missing from the drawing, it would be unfair to vote on the application without giving the applicant the opportunity to complete all of the information.

Mr. Brady indicated to the applicant that if it is voted on as is it may not go favorably for his application. Please supply the Board with additional information the Board could make a better decision on the application. The applicant indicated that he would be happy to comply as long as he knows exactly what information to provide. Mr. Brady indicated that the Planner will be able to help him with that. The applicant asked if it would be inclusive or would it be a repeat process. Mr. Brady also indicated that his engineer should take another look at the information to be provided to the Board.

Mr. Drew added that the Board and the professionals will need the 60 foot radius around the new addition. The new addition be accurately dimensioned on the property and the 60 foot radius be accurately dimensioned and all structures, wells and septic systems shown that are involved in the radius. There was a question about lot coverage and Mr. McKittrick should prepare a lot coverage calculation as it relates to the provision of the zoning ordinance to make sure it is in conformance

and that if an additional variance will need to be applied for and notice will have to be given. The survey accurately show all of the structures that exist on the property whether the applicant considers them to be temporary or otherwise. Mr. Glatt indicated that it might behoove him to have Mr. McKittrick at the next meeting. Mr. Petrosillo explained that Mr. McKittrick's survey was only used for reference by his current engineer. Mr. Glatt amended and said whoever his professional was it might help him to have a professional at the meeting as the testimony would have greater weight. The 60 foot off set from the Health Department was only told to him the day before.

Mr. Drew brought up another point from the Board Engineer that the dimension should be provided from the sheds to the property line so that it will be known if they comply with the zoning requirements.

Mr. Brady indicated to the applicant that his professionals could be in direct contact with the Board's professionals. If new plans need to be submitted it has to be at least 10 days before the meeting for time to review.

Mr. Petrosillo asked the Board for an extension until the next meeting which is March 27, 2012.

Motion by Arthur McQuaid to carry the application for Franceso Petrosillo, Bulk Variance No. ZB12-11-16; Block 10810; Lot 1; 645 Otterhole Road, LR Zone to be carried to the next meeting.

Second by Frank Curcio

All in favor to carry the application

The attorney indicated that at this point there was no further notice required to the public so if there are interested parties, the application is carried to the March 27, 2012. If there is a major change to the application they may be required to give new notice.

ESTATE OF DEMBIA

BULK & USE VAR. NO ZB12-11-17

Block 3201; Lot 12

Lakeside Road, R-4

Use variance approval requested for the installation of a septic system on vacant property without a structure to service a house on a separate lot. Associated bulk variance approval as follows:

Block 3201, Lot 12 (vacant land)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Required</u>	<u>Existing</u>
Min. Lot Area:	4 acres	0.39 ac.
Min. Lot Frontage:	300.0'	170.23'
Min. Lot Width:	300.0'	160'
Min. Lot Depth:	275.0'	155'
Min. Rear Yard Setback:	125.0'	n/a
Min. Front Yard Setback:	125.0'	n/a

Block 3202, Lot 1 (206 Lakeside Drive)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Required</u>	<u>Existing</u>
Min. Lot Area:	4 acres	0.13 ac.
Min. Lot Frontage:	300.0'	169.10'
Min. Lot Width:	300.0'	160'
Min. Lot Depth:	275.0'	41'
Min. Side Yard Setback:	60.0'	54.6'
Min. Rear Yard Setback:	125.0'	0'
Min. Front Yard Setback:	125.0'	5.3'
Max. Bldg. Coverage:	10%	18.6%

John Barbarula is the attorney for The Estate. Paul Lapatka took over for Mr. Ballester as the Engineer for the project. Mr. Paul Lapatka, 1811 Union Valley Road. He has a Bachelors Degree in Civil Engineering from NJIT, also a Masters in Environmental Engineering from NJIT as well. He has been licensed in NJ since 1994. He has appeared before Zoning Boards in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware and Connecticut. The Board approved the Engineer.

Mr. Barbarula began explaining the application it is another house in the Lake Residential LR Zone. The existing septic system for the house that is closest to the water is in a state of failure. The property could have a sealed system and because of an existing lot on the other side of the road, they could put a house there. The Estate decided that it could be detrimental and not good for the community as well as economically since it is difficult to sell a home with a sealed system. On behalf of the Estate, the two properties are going to be merged once they receive approval so there can be

no building. The Board Engineer supplied a report stating the same but that was their intent from the beginning. It took them almost a year to go through Passaic County to get approval, they become an actual utility. They had to go through one dig and get approval, had to prove how they would bore underneath the County Road, determine the pumping, what signage would be on the road. They received all approvals and will supply the office with any copies of approval. They will be subjugating the empty lot to the house on the lake by doing that they create a situation where the septic system is the furthest from the lake that they can get. They have conditional approval from the Health Department.

Mr. Barbarula began asking Mr. Lapatka some questions. What would the upper lot across the street look like after the installation of the septic system. The response was the only disturbance would be a cleared grass area where the septic system is, other than that it would be vacant and look like a field. Mr. Barbarula asked about the general area and what it looks like. The response was the homes are right on the lake, the uphill side is a sloped area on the other side there are homes adjacent to it, typical of Greenwood Lake frontage. Mr. Barbarula asked with regard to the uphill lot will there be any structures to interfere with the use and enjoyment of the adjoining properties the response was no there will not. Will there be anything sticking up out of the septic system like a tower other than the pipes? He indicated minor the inspection ports but with the growth of the grass you would not see them. The adjoining properties would not be able to tell there is anything there.

Each of the individual lots, lot 12 and lot 1 are located in a 4 acre zone. The size of the vacant land is approximately .39 of an acre. Since it is a pre-existing lot, with what they did with the septic system they could get a permit for a dwelling on the lot. By doing this application it is a less intense use since there will be no dwelling.

The bulk requirements were discussed as follows: Lot 12 is to be discussed first the lot size is .39 acres, the frontage, width and depth are all preexisting nonconformities. There are no variances that they are asking because of the activity they are proposing.

Lot 1 has .13 acres where 4 is required, frontage, width, depth, side yard setback, rear yard setback, front yard setback and lot coverage are all preexisting nonconformities. This is the property on the water with the structure. They are not proposing to add any additional space to the existing structure. All of the variances are the result of the existing structure which has been there a long time.

Mr. Barbarula asked if there was anything in the pumping station, the signage or the septic system itself that would protrude outside the surface that would have any impact on the light or air from an engineering stand point to the adjoining properties? The response was not whatsoever no.

It is a use variance but a unique one it is not as if they are putting a tent or a tower or anything in that regard. Based on the fact that it is a septic system serving another property there will be no additional Planning testimony, other than the unique character of the property and the project.

Mr. Brady confirmed that there will never be a structure placed on the uphill property, Mr. Barbarula explained that was part of County approval as well and it would have a deed restriction. The only wording Mr. Barbarula would want would be except any structure required in the future for the septic system, they could say an aerator may be required in the future. There will be no garage, shed so there are no problems restricting the properties.

They are not asking to put a septic in a garage or anything to change this, this is a situation where a conscious effort was made what would be the best overall utilization and rather than a sealed system and a new house, the better idea was a septic system on a separate piece of property, enhancing the lakefront property. This is the least intensive use for the property. A Board Member asked where the septic system is now and it on the property with the house. There is probably a seepage pit. There is a pump station to pump uphill.

Mr. Glatt asked if there were any County conditions that the Board needs to know about? Mr. Barbarula indicated there was not but a street sign had to be paid for by the applicant as part of the County approval. The street sign is for a crossing, you cannot dig. Mr. Barbarula explained to the Board that the County Council has not finished writing the agreement. It has been approved by all 14 people. Mr. Glatt would like to see information from the County before it is memorialized.

Also Mr. Glatt asked about cross deeds. Mr. Barbarula will have to give the Board as part of a condition a deed from the Estate to the Estate restricting it and merging it. It will be a deed subjugating one property to the other. That is by Joiner of Title not merger. They are on two separate deeds presently. They will be crossed where they are part parcel of each other. Mr.

Barbarula explained what he does is he takes lot 12 and indicates it is subject and subjugated to lot 1 as a septic system for lot 1 and must remain in unbuilt condition other than the septic system and anything else that is required to process sewage. Lot 1 has the superior rights on lot 12. Mr. Glatt would like the resolution attached to it and recorded as well so there will be no question in the future. Mr. Barbarula indicated that would not be a problem and they have a good title company.

Mr. Brady asked if there were any underground utilities at this time and there is not. Mr. Barbarula commented that they had to file as a utility. Mr. Glatt asked if DEP approval was received and the applicant said no currently they were filing a Treatment Works Approval for the septic system on the other lot from the DEP. Mr. Drew asked if there was any issue with regard to the 300 foot riparian buffer against Greenwood Lake? They do not believe so because of the road. It should be within a reasonable time frame to receive the permit; they should get the application done within a week or so. The field is about 675 and 665 is required, the normal required is 500. They are required to go to the state for a Treatment works approval because it is not on the same lot as the dwelling. The estate owned the lot.

James Napolitano, co-executor of the estate was sworn in, the decedent was a relative of his property occupied by elderly people. There were no concerns about a septic because it was a weekend home. It cannot be sold as it is because of the septic situation. Mr. Castronova asked about the lot where the septic system will be installed, if the property could be cleaned up since so many trees have fallen. Mr. Barbarula explained that the area in question is the Right of Way and they are not doing anything in that area. They will be replacing the existing tanks with 1 pump tank and a septic tank. They are not replacing the existing tanks they will be abandoned. Mr. Castronova asked if a metal lid could be used so it could be bolted down, not just a concrete lid that could be lifted. The pump chamber is required to have an access port. They will be above the fled level. It seems close to well it would be good to have the lid bolted down.

Mr. Barbarula wanted confirmation from Mr. Napolitano on his statements on the applicant's behalf. They are subjugating lot 12 to lot 1 and indicate in cross-deeded easements that there will be no structures other than a septic treatment field and any items that may be required. No structures, no garages Mr. Napolitano agreed. The existing structure dates back to the 60's. Mr. Barbarula told the Board that was it they have the chance to make a better situation for the existing house rather than a sealed system. They have a chance to go from two potential houses, which will increase the density to keeping it low density by restricting lot 12 and subjugating it to lot 1. Nothing will protrude to affect the neighbors. He is asking for the preexisting bulk variances and the use variance to be granted so it can restore the house.

Mr. McQuaid asked about the lot next door and it would still be substandard even if it was purchased. No further questions, opened to the public. Seeing nobody for or against the application Vivienne Erk moved to close the public portion. Second by Steven Castronova.
All in favor to close the public portion.

Mr. Barbarula was asked for his summation, he indicated that even if the applicant were to buy the lot next door it would not help the bulk variances it would still be substandard. This will be the least impact on the area, it is appropriate for a use variance, he feels it is appropriate to approve the preexisting bulk variances and asked for approval.

The applicant offered to put the metal lids on the septic tanks without any question. They will not touch the Passaic County Right of Way.

Motion by Steven Castronova to approve application Bulk and Use Variance #ZB12-11-17 with the stipulation that they use the bolting metal tops. There will be no further development, the recording of the cross deeds with the resolutions attached.

Second by Frank Curcio

Roll Call Vote:

Yes: Russell Curving, Steven Castronova, Frank Curcio, Arthur McQuaid, Vivienne Erk, Michael Siesta, Robert Brady

No: none

APPROVAL OF INVOICES FOR PROFESSIONALS

Motion by Steven Castronova to approve invoices for Stephen Glatt

Second by Russell Curving

All in favor to approve the invoices

Motion by Russel Curving to approve invoices for William Drew

Second by Steven Castronova
All in favor to approve the invoices

Motion by Steven Castronova to approve invoices for Michael Cristaldi, Alaimo Group
Second by Russell Curving
All in favor to approve invoices.

DISCUSSION

The Objector did not get the remand as he requested. There was a trial date set for the second count which as nothing to do with the Board. The council for the Plaintiff has to have surgery so that will go off. They are trying to get someone to decide the prerogative writ because that has to be decided first.

Motion Steven Castronova to approve the Reorganization minutes of January 24, 2012.
Second by Vivienne Erk
All in favor to approve the Reorganization minutes of January 24, 2012.

Motion by Michael Siesta to approve the Regular minutes of January 24, 2012.
Second by Steven Castronova
All in favor to approve the Regular minutes of January 24, 2012.

Mr. McQuaid thanked the Board for their vote of confidence again with regard to nominating him Vice-Chairman.

Motion by Vivienne Erk to adjourn the meeting of February 28, 2012
Second by Steven Castronova

All in favor to adjourn the meeting of February 28, 2012

Meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Adopted: March 27, 2012

Respectfully submitted by,

Denyse L. Todd, Secretary
Zoning Board of Adjustment