

MINUTES
Of the Township of West Milford
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
September 18, 2018
Regular Meeting

Robert Brady, Board Chairman, opened the Regular Meeting of the Zoning Board of Adjustment at 7:37 p.m. The Board Secretary read the Legal Notice. The Chairman asked all in attendance to recite the Pledge of Allegiance. There will be a 6 member Board Mr. Brady explained the Zoning Board and Open Public Meetings Act. He introduced the Board Attorney, Stephen Glatt. The meetings are advertised in the Herald News. The Board operates in accordance with the Open Meeting Act of the State of New Jersey. No new applications after 10:30 pm and no new testimony after 11:00 pm, after the applicant speaks then anyone can speak for or against that application. If it is needed there will be a break at approximately 9:00 pm. Under normal circumstances the Board follows a printed agenda. The appeals of this Board go directly to the Superior Court of the State of New Jersey.

Roll Call

Present: Russell Curving, Daniel Jurkovic, Frank Curcio, Arthur McQuaid, Michael Gerst, Robert Brady

Also present: Denyse Todd, Board Secretary, Steven Glatt, Board Attorney, Kenneth Ochab, Board Planner, Michael Cristaldi (sent someone) Alaimo Group, Board Engineer GET SPELLING

Absent: James Olivo, Matthew Conlon, Steven Castronova

MEMORIALIZATIONS

RYAN MALONEY

RESOLUTION NO. 12-2018

BULK VARIANCE ZB11-17-16

Block 15201; Lot 7

69 Rabbit Run Drive; R-4 Zone

Motion by Daniel Jurkovic

Second by Russell Curving

Roll Call Vote:

Yes: Russell Curving, Daniel Jurkovic, Frank Curcio, Arthur McQuaid, Michael Gerst, Robert Brady

No: none

GREEN MEADOW ORGANICS
USE & BULK VARIANCE & PREL. &
FINAL SITE PLAN

Block 4601: Lot 17 & Lot 21

Complete: 6/6/18
Deadline: 10/3/18
New deadline: 01/01/19

960 Burnt Meadow Road; LMI Zone

Use variance request, the proposal does not meet the conditions of the LMI Zone. Expansion of a pre-existing non-conforming use (compost, recycling facility), bulk variance to permit stored materials within 300 feet of a residential structure, 159 feet is proposed and to permit stored materials within 25 feet of any property line, 0 feet proposed for the internal property line between lots 17 & 21. A number of waivers are requested with the application. **This meeting was carried to a Special Meeting on October 15, 2018 at 7:30 pm at the West Milford High School Auditorium.**

CHRIS GRECH
BULK VARIANCE NO. ZB06-18-06
Block 9801; Lot 26
875 Union Valley Road

Bulk variance relief requested for an accessory structure where 800 square feet is allowed and 1,440 square feet is proposed.

We are 6 members 3 members are absent for various reasons. In order to succeed they need the majority of the votes to get the variance. If tie vote then it would be a denial. If for any reason you want a 7th Board Member than you can have it carried. We are one member short.

The attorney swore in Christopher Grech 875 Union Valley Road; they live in a bi level a little over 5 years have lived there. The house faces the road and it is set back quite a bit. The garage is to be built behind the house for storage and restoring cars and old classic cars. No outside repair work for private use. It will be wood framed, vinyl siding, regular shingles and look like a house with 3 forward facing garage doors. It will be one single level on a slab, no second floor. It will look like a residential structure, roof over it. There will be room for a lift. Mr. Ochab indicated that the request was for building coverage only. They want 3 bays wide, wants room to spread out and work inside. He has a big bubble currently. He presently works on them outside. The property is wide from the street and then gets narrow to the back. The north side of the property there is the old power line right of way, the neighbor cannot see anything, the neighbor behind him cannot see anything because of the trees at this time but in the winter they could, from the south side it would be visible, the house is about 50 or 60 feet away and to the rear it would be visible.

Daniel Jukovic asked about plumbing there will be none, electric yes, motion lights since there will be an extended driveway, nothing overhead. Houses on both sides so no vacant property to purchase. Building back from the roadway. From the front there is a slight upgrade to the back of the property. It will be about 150 feet from the road and the house will block most of the view from the front.

Douglass McKittrick, 2024 Macopin Road; Licensed in He was licensed as an engineer in the State of NJ in 1982 and it is valid today and also qualified to testify for all of the various Boards and Courts and Commissions previously stated as a Professional Engineer. He was accepted as a professional engineer

The dwelling is block 9801:26, R-1 Zone Single family dwelling, 1.053 acres in surface area, 45,865 square feet it has a deck and small patio 148 from house to left, 128 feet from the house to the right and 310 from the house to the rear the house is set back 108 feet from the road. The house is fairly isolated from surrounding properties. The house has two driveways a circular driveway in the front, a driveway goes off to a parking area to side of the house. The well is in the front yard and septic in rear about 25 feet off the rear of the house just passed the patio. He designed the septic system and it had good soil conditions. The house has a large mound in the front which is natural earth about 5 to 7 feet high. The lot slopes gently from that and up to the rear. The right side has a fieldstone retaining wall with steep topographic features property lines are not parallel and the lot width narrows from 176 feet at the right of way line at the rear line 86 feet so it tapers in from front to back. The applicant proposes to remove small shed in back. 200 feet off the road. The garage would be 36 X 40 foot and it would be 71 feet off the house and it would be about 200 feet off of the road. He is planning to extend the driveway and a turnaround in front of garage and plans to install rain barrels on the down spouts to help attenuate the increase in runoff from the site and construct a diversion swale around the back of the property to keep runoff from the garage and from the septic. The new garage if approved and constructed would be about 145 feet from house to the right 150 feet from house to the left and 200 feet from house to the rear. There is substantial separation distance from the garage to surrounding properties and from the street. The setbacks are all conforming the reason for the deviation is for the size of the building 800 square feet is allowed and the applicant is proposing 1440 square feet. Under the R-1 Zoning allowing a 10% maximum building coverage which he is not at, The 10 percent allowed, the principal structure could be 4586 square feet and add that to the theoretical maximum of 800 square feet the total impervious surface allowable on this lot would be 5,386 square feet which is 11.74% coverage. 10 percent would be from the principal coverage the proposed coverage with the house being 1266 square feet which comes out to 2.76% coverage for the principal lot structure which could be as high as 10 percent when you add the 1266 sf of the principal structure to the propose 1440 square feet for the accessory structure, the total of both is 2706 square feet which is half the allowable maximum that could be on the site. The dwelling as it stands now is about $\frac{1}{4}$ the size that the maximum size dwelling could be. The garage is about 80% larger than what is allowable but adding both together it is half the coverage for the entire lot. There is no feasible way to expand the house, the septic system is in the rear, a driveway on the left side that is pretty much against the property line, there is storm water runoff channeling down the right side plus the retaining wall. Expansion of the front yard, although from a zoning standpoint it could be done, it would be a complete rebuild of the dwelling and consider unpractical.

Daniel Jukovic asked about the 11.3% allowed, 2.79% presently, then 5.7%, Mr. Jurkovic indicated it seems like a good reason but what if they want to come back and expand the house. Could they come back and request an addition to the house since it is only 2.79 percent. Mr. McKittrick indicated they could make the argument that if approved, you could limit it to the 11.5% maximum, can only expand up going by the topography. Mr. Grech left tree line, looking like a residential use; there will be isolation, not like Upper Greenwood Lake or Old Milford Estates. Any lighting will face the house not to neighbors, motion activated.

New detached garage in the rear yard with a macadam driveway connected to an existing driveway, the garage would provide vehicle and tool space and benefits the homeowner and indoor parking, indoor storage, eliminates outdoor storage of personal items and results in major capital improvement to the neighborhood, it enhances surrounding properties. Negative criteria it does not harm surrounding property values, since the upgrade provides for aesthetically pleasing building which will elevate the overall value of the entire lot. The garage footprint exceeds the maximum allowed by zoning; it is 80% larger, the dwelling is substantially less than allowed by zoning 25% of the maximum. The maximum allowed coverage for the combined principal and accessory structure is 11.74% and the combined would be 5.9% or one half of the zone density which is well below the maximum permitted. It does not harm intent of master plan; the plan sets limits to limit the development density of a piece of property. The setbacks are all conforming. The project is consistent with other homes in neighborhood. There are other garages in the area; it will not be an anomaly in the neighborhood with the way it looks or the way it is handled. In Mr. McKittrick's opinion it is beneficial to the neighborhood and there is no substantial detriment to the Master Plan.

Mr. Brady asked if there were questions, Mr. McQuaid indicated that if it was attached and if the septic was not placed where it is the applicant would not be at the board and Mr. McKittrick indicated that was correct.

Mr. Glatt asked if there was an objection to a condition not to be used as living space and the applicant indicated it would not be. The use would be for hobby use not for commercial use or home occupation. There is no concern to the applicant if it was to be made a condition.

The Board Engineer indicated that the runoff of structure they recommend put seepage or drywell pit where connects to existing driveway to act as a groundwater recharge system, they do not object to the drywell or seepage pits.

Open to the public after seeing nobody for or against, Michael Gerst made a motion to close the application and Arthur McQuaid second. All in favor to close the public portion.

Mr. McQuaid visited the property and it seemed to him the location would be well off the street, it is a great distance from the adjoining homes, it is concealed with the natural tree barriers.

Motion by Arthur McQuaid to approve the application ZB06-18-06, Block 9801; Lot 26, 875 Union Valley Road in the R-1 Zone. It has been testified that the reason for the building is for his own personal use for his car hobby, no commercial use or home business use from the property, it has been testified that if it could have been an attached garage that it would not need any type of zoning variance however the septic system where placed would prevent that it enhances the master plan because it will increase value of this home as well as the neighbors. When one house goes up in value others will go up with it. The garage is approximately 200 feet from Union Valley Road, no commercial or home business use, or living space, no plumbing and revised drainage.

Second by Daniel Jurkovic

Roll Call Vote:

Yes: Russell Curving, Daniel Jurkovic, Frank Curcio, Arthur McQuaid,
Michael Gerst, Robert Brady

Mr. Brady indicated the variance was approved and there is a 45 day waiting or appeal period from the advertised memorialization and hopefully at the October 23, 2018 meeting it will be memorialized and 45 days from the advertisement.

MARTIN KOWALCZYK
BULK VARIANCE ZB07-18-07

Complete: 8/22/18
Deadline: 12/20/18

With deMinimus Exception

Block 4401; Lot 1

833 East Shore Road; LR Zone

Bulk variance relief requested for location permitted side or rear, proposed front yard, setback where 10 feet is required, where 8 feet is proposed maximum accessory structure is 3% and 4.9% is proposed. A deMinimus exception is also requested for access to proposed driveway from an unimproved roadway. For construction of a 2 car detached garage.

It is a rectangle approximately 280 feet from waterline to East Shore Road and a drop. There is about a 60 foot drop from East Shore to Storms Island Road, the property is 48 feet wide, no available property to purchase to eliminate the need for a variance. Kenneth Ochab, indicated that in addition to coverage of structure in front yard because of Storms Island Road, the frontage is actually East Shore the property is not split because of Storms Island Road it is basically an access easement road, all properties on that section have the same circumstances. It is called Storms Island Road but it is a dirt & gravel road. Other homes to the north have the same circumstances and they have their 2 storage garage on the east side of the road with the residence on the west side of the road. It is consistent in the neighborhood; the homes have seem to have residences on the second floor of the garage. There will be no residential use in the garage and no plumbing and no living space, cars in front of the home at this time. He may purchase a boat or watercraft in the future.

Mr. Kowalczyk indicated that the engineering memo was a surprise. General note number 10, Daniel Jurkovic indicated that perhaps it is an objection to the note. Mr. Ochab indicated that he did not see anything that could be a problem and walked with the homeowner on the site and did not see anything environmentally that would raise a red flag that would require additional information or analysis, no wetland vegetation or running water. The Board Engineer asked who controls the easement and if permission is needed for the recharge system to be in proposed area, the applicant indicated that he did not think so because well and propane tanks are behind proposed structure. The propane line is on the north side and would have to come straight down, the well is in the same location, everything would be coming down the dirt and not rock outcropping. The engineer indicated that the proposed retaining wall is on top of the propane line. The Engineer asked about the 15 foot wide easement road and asked about plowing and DPW comes down and will plow. There are 13 homes on East Shore/Storms Island Road but at the end is a

parking lot for homes on the island which is about 12 homes which use the road. Mr. McQuaid asked if it was seasonal and the applicant indicated it was, so nobody uses in the winter for the island homes. There is a lot of discussion about the easement for Storms Island Road, Mr. Jurkovic indicated it is a straight forward application but some items need to be addressed for the record. Mr. Jurkovic indicated that there should be permission granted to cross the easement because it was granted for the home does not mean it will be for this purpose. Also the engineer should address the Board Engineer comments. He is not suggesting to do or not to do anything but he could request a carry for the application. The property was purchased about 10 years ago, Mr. Glatt indicated that a title policy should reference the easement and the deed may have something. The easement should be the same for all of the homeowners. The property was in the family since about 1960. Mr. Glatt indicated that there should be a universal easement to each of the properties to indicate there would be no prohibition to something being done. Mr. McQuaid indicated he was confused about the easement and does not see how the easement is a question with the building he already has a gas pipe line already and if any relocation would be on the building side not street level. There will be nothing else interfering. There will be a separate service for garage and for electric, Yankee Propane services the property, there is no natural gas to the property. The tank is on the hill and would be behind the proposed garage. Mr. McQuaid indicated that any change will have nothing to do with the easement. Mr. Glatt agreed what was there is there and will need to read the information for the easement. Mr. Brady indicated that if the line is under the roadway and gets plowed it may be a problem. Mr. Jurkovic indicated that after Mr. McQuaid's comments it should move along it is a straight forward application.

The application was opened to the public.

After seeing nobody for or against the application there was a motion and a second to close the public portion. All in favor to close the application.

Motion by Daniel Jurkovic to approve bulk variance ZB07-18-07 with deMinimus Exception

Block 4401; Lot 1, 833 East Shore Road; LR Zone for a structure in front yard, instead of side or rear where the setback will be 8 feet and not 10 feet cannot be in back needs to be in front, accessory structure of 4.9% instead of 3% coverage, and the deMinimus exception to allow for a proposed driveway from an unimproved roadway and for construction of a 2 door detached garage. This is an application we see all of the time, it is a lake community, to lake residents the back of the house is the one by the road, unfortunately under the zoning code, the roadway is considered the front of the house which makes the garage in the front. You cannot put it in the back because it is the lake, not very practical. The request regarding the accessory structure for lot coverage of 1.9% it is a deminimus increase, reasonable, our planner testified it is consistent with other homes in the neighborhood. The 8 foot request is a deminimus type application and he does not feel it offends the zoning code in any way shape or form. It is consistent with the community; keeping storage of things in the garage makes it look better. With regard to the engineering memo, the professionals did not see any reason to pursue engineering request with regard to the note.

Second by Michael Gerst

Roll Call Vote:

Yes: Russell Curving, Daniel Jurkovic, Frank Curcio, Arthur McQuaid,
Michael Gerst, Robert Brady

No: none

Mr. Glatt indicated the variance was approved and there is a 45 day waiting or appeal period from the advertised memorialization and hopefully at the October 23, 2018 meeting it will be memorialized and 45 days from the advertisement you could pull permits

JANET LITTLE

BULK VARIANCE ZB07-18-09

Block 12901; Lot 11

285 Highcrest Drive; LR Zone

Complete: 8/30/18

Deadline 12/28/18

Bulk variance relief requested for a side yard variance where 30 feet is allowed, 23.5 is existing and 20 feet is proposed to allow the construction of a 13.2 by 8.2 sunroom (hobby greenhouse) to sit on existing deck. Lot coverage was added where 10% is allowed and 10.02% is requested.

Mr. Glatt swore in Janet Little of 285 Highcrest Drive. Ms. Little indicated that she would like to build a hobby/greenhouse on the existing deck. It will be 13 feet long by 8 feet out, glass enclosure on existing deck, 4 season sunroom, she is on the lake, will put flowers in there, 3 seasons no heat, there is a window in her bedroom and she would make it into a doorway french doors to walk out onto sunroom maybe carpet for flooring. The Health Department indicated that it cannot be heated; she will not be heating it, flowers, her cat. Kenneth Ochab indicated it has a side yard variance request, the side yard is 23.5 feet and will still be same as house is presently but because it is a new section with an overhand the variance is required for 20 feet. The lot coverage variance should be listed as well, building coverage allowable 10% asking for 10.02%. Kenneth Ochab asked about the photos, there are pools and other recreational things outside, fits with the community. It is only a small portion of the deck. In response to the Health Department memo, the applicant indicated she spoke with the Health Department, the septic system is in the front of the yard, this will be in the back of the house, there is no well they are serviced by city water and she called the water company and they will be showing the location of the water line going into the house. The house will remain 3 bedrooms and it is a requirement and any other permits required by DEP she will need to apply and receive approval.

The application was opened to the public, after seeing nobody for or against there was a motion and second to close the public portion. All in favor to close the public portion.

Daniel Jurkovic made a motion to approve bulk variance ZB07-18-09 , in block 12901; lot 11, 285 Highcrest Drive; LR Zone for variance relief requested for a side yard variance where 30 feet is allowed, 23.5 is existing and 20 feet is proposed to allow the construction of a 13.2 by 8.2 sunroom (hobby greenhouse) to sit on existing deck and for lot coverage where 10 % is allowed and 10.02% is requested. The application should be approved, they are de minimus increases or variances. The board planner testified it is an enhancement to the community, it looks nice, it is consistent and will be a positive addition to the house and

community and because variances are de minimis in nature there is no reason why the application should not be approved.

Second by Michael Gerst

Roll Call Vote:

Yes: Russell Curving, Daniel Jurkovic, Frank Curcio, Arthur McQuaid,
Michael Gerst, Robert Brady

No: none

Mr. Brady indicated the variances were approved and there is a 45 day waiting or appeal period from the advertised memorialization and hopefully at the October 23, 2018 meeting it will be memorialized and 45 days from the advertisement you could pull permits.

DISCUSSION

Discussion regarding the letter from Attorney Drew Murray relating to Randa Investments, LLC

Daniel Jurkovic recused himself from the discussion.

APPROVAL OF INVOICES-BOARD PROFESSIONALS

Review and approval of invoices for Stephen Glatt, Board Attorney, Kenneth Ochab, Board Planner, Michael Cristaldi, Alaimo Group, Board Engineer

Motion by Russell Curving & Daniel Jurkovic

All in favor to approve

Daniel Jurkovic left the meeting at 8:50 pm

Stephen Glatt indicated that the attorney, Drew Murray for Scott Leonescu for Randa Investments, LLC.

The Board heard the matter a few months ago, long extensive resolution. Mr. Murray is taking over for Mr. Barbarula. Discussion whether Mr. Leonescu could have a rehearing, based upon the application ZB02-18-02, the board made a decision denying a use variance; until the resolution is memorialized it is not an official decision. Mr. Leonescu is asking for the Board to consider proceeding with an amendment at this point from to amend original application of 10 units down to 8 units. There was a lot of discussion whether there was a need for a zone change or not. The board denied the original application was denied because it is zoned both commercial and residential as accessory and some findings of fact included too many units and made it very dense and there could be traffic issues. The only reason Mr. Glatt felt to have this discussion was because there would be no reason to stop Mr. Leonescu from refileing the application, reducing the amount of units. A good part of the decision was because it was 10 units. It could be appealed and reheard almost simultaneously, he thought he would ask if the board would consider amending, recognition of prior facts if amending. It is up to the Board.

Mr. Gerst indicated that at the meeting it was a large request and the Zoning Board made it clear how they felt of the amount being asked of them and was surprised it was not done at

that time and he thought at the time if they could table and decide. The Chairman indicated at that time the board could not edit their application; it makes sense for them to do this but was surprised they did not do it then. Mr. Glatt agreed. Mr. Glatt indicated that he asked Mr. Barbarula at the time and Mr. Barbarula indicated they would go the way it was. Mr. Murray is hear tonight not Mr. Barbarula and if the recommendation was not asked at the time it would be hard for this recommendation.

Mr. Curcio indicated that the other Board Members were not here tonight, , Mr. Glatt indicated that the Board Members eligible to vote were Mr. Curving, Mr. Curcio, Mr. McQuaid, Mr. Brady and Mr. Gerst, no Mr. Olivo or Mr. Castronova. There are 2 members we do not have.

Mr. McQuaid indicated he made the second and there were several reasons. From the Columbia Bank all the way there is no parking in the front until they hit the building next door to that property. Every other building fits into the zoning, other building back further, a large discharge into the ground and contaminated with gasoline, there are a lot of problems having residential on that property he has no problem with an office building, put grass in the front like the rest of the buildings, that does not hurt the zone. He has no problem amending or hearing application. As long as the vote does not come back to haunt us they will have a lot of proving to him that the variance would work. Mr. Glatt indicated it was not a given if the Board lets them re-present the application. Mr. Glatt indicated it should be understood that if you vote in favor of allowing them to present a revised plan that it is not a given that you are backtracking on some of the factual findings. Art indicated a citizen should be able to come back as often as they want. Mr. Glatt indicated that his thought process over the years if the applicant appeals and we go up on appeal, the first thing is a settlement conference with the judge and then the judge says is there a way to resolve it and then the applicant says we may submit revised plans meanwhile the attorney gets paid for litigation, time goes by months and months and a lot of money is being spent and we are not getting that far down the line. Mr. McQuaid indicated he believes the citizens own the town and they have the right to present whatever they want as often as they want and has no problem with them amending or resubmitting a new application. Mr. Brady agrees, we do not create zoning, we make adjustments to zoning and we do not change zoning, his last comment before voting was that they were giving up commercial development in what is essentially the downtown area because once it becomes residential it will not go back. Mr. Brady indicated nobody has made the effort to nail down a private company or State of NJ or someone to tell us whether it is still polluted or not, why would you put people in buildings over a piece of property that no one can tell you about. It is not zoning but he is throwing it out there it has the same effect if 300 people came in for that application there is a certain amount of public concern that is still our responsibility even though it is not zoning. One of the points Mr. Gerst indicated that we put a residential apartment next to a building next to a cell tower and did not feel comfortable and was told it was not a zoning issue it was health department and remembered testimony that he could not do anything until it was approved by the DEP and they cannot until it is approved. Mr. Glatt indicated that they are in a catch 22 that they cannot go into a remediation plan until they have a specific use that they are allowed to do and what they are saying they want residential and then go there and then if accepted they will give them a plan and if not accepted they are not

getting a plan. If they go back to the State and the State says they denied our use and we cannot do the other use because it does not meet the zoning criteria they are caught in between.

Mr. McQuaid indicated they could put up a nice office building, Mr. Brady indicated that the pollution is a public concern and a reasonable solution is to go to the Planning Board and Council for a change to residentially zoned. When a piece of property and it is zoned commercial for a reason and we change it, we changed the zoning not our job, overstepping their bounds in changing the zoning in that respect. He indicated that the applicant has a reasonable alternative to go through the Planning Board and then the Council to get them to change that. If they want the zoning changed that is how to do it not here we do not change it we make allowances. The zoning has not changed since the Highlands Act

Drew Murray representing Randa Investments and indicated that that the purpose was to amend the application to shave off 2 units and come back with the amended application for 8 units. Essentially the same application, Mr. Glatt indicated it would be limited to describe the new proposed site plan then hit bulk variances. There was a conceptual plan that was 10 units. There would be no need to hear about the state agencies or the uniqueness of this application if it is the same Board Members. If the Board declines the request to hear it, they can refile an application, pay all of the fees, come in and start new.

Steve indicated they could always refile everything.

Motion by Arthur McQuaid to allow them to come back with an amended application that is 8 or less units

Mr. Brady indicated that the issue of zoning is not solved. Mr. Glatt indicated that it is a stale issue and if they do not allow a re-hearing and we memorialize the resolution then it goes up on appeal, part may be for them to come back for rezoning. The fact finding did not reflect that they should go to the Council. Mr. McQuaid indicated that it was denied because they did not prove what they needed to prove a need for a variance.

Mr. Brady indicated his issue is not solved. Mr. Glatt indicated that Mr. Murray now knows how he feels about the rezoning issue. The point is listening to what is being said now, Mr. Leonescu will be a little more creative. Mr. Ochab indicated the second prong of negative criteria would need to be addressed. Mr. McQuaid added they could easily conform to the zone but we will rehear it.

Second by Michael Gerst

Roll Call Vote:

Yes: Russell Curving, Frank Curcio, Arthur McQuaid, Michael Gerst,
Robert Brady

Mr. Murray indicated there will be new plans and an amended application.

Mr. Glatt indicated to impress upon Mr. Leonescu that it is not granted, it was something that maybe should have been reconsidered at the time. Mr. Murray indicated he has notes.

COMMUNICATIONS

None

LITIGATION

None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

ADJOURNMENT

Next meeting special meeting October 15, 2018 at 7:30 at WM High School Auditorium (Green Meadow Organics)

Next regular meeting October 23, 2018 at 7:30 p.m.

Gerst to adjourn

Art second

All in favor to adjourn at 9:16

Respectfully submitted by,

Denyse L. Todd, Secretary
Zoning Board of Adjustment