

Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order at 7:03 p.m. by Chairman Salvadori who read the following statement: “Notice of this meeting was given as required by the Open Public Meetings Act in the Annual Notice of Meetings. This notice was sent in writing to the South Jersey Times on January 11, 2017. A copy was posted on the second floor bulletin board of Town Hall and a copy was given to the Township Clerk.

The Board saluted the flag.

Roll call: Present – Ms. Fox, Mr. Fritz, Mr. Kozak, Mr. Mercado, Mr. McLaughlin, Mr. O’Reilly, Mr. Sebastian, Mr. Salvadori. Absent – Mr. Manfredi, (excused), Mr. Sander, (excused). Also present – Mr. Marmero, Solicitor, Mr. Kernan, Planner, Mr. Garbowski, Council Liaison.

Memorialization of Resolutions:

1. #17-13 – App. #WSP-08-17 – Jozef Les – Site Plan Waiver Approved

Motion by Mr. Fritz, seconded by Mr. McLaughlin to adopt resolution #17-13. Roll call vote: Ayes – Mr. Fritz, Mr. McLaughlin, Ms. Fox, Mr. Kozak, Mr. Mercado, Mr. Salvadori. Nays – Zero. Abstentions – Zero.

2. #17-14 – App. #17-04 – Peter Sideris – Use Variance Denied

Mr. Marmero informed the Board that when Mr. Sideris applied for the use variance for the pole barn he indicated the lot as Lot 29 and stated he believed Lots 29 and 30 were combined. After speaking with the Zoning Officer it was learned that the lots were not combined until after Mr. Sideris’ hearing on February 21st. However since the application was denied the memorialization of the resolution can move forward. Mr. Marmero stated he just wanted the information on the record in case of future litigation.

Motion by Mr. Fritz, seconded by Mr. Mercado to adopt resolution #17-14. Roll call vote: Ayes – Mr. Fritz, Mr. Mercado, Ms. Fox, Mr. Kozak, Mr. Salvadori. Nays – Zero. Abstentions – Zero.

Extension Request:

1. #16-05 – ANB Leasing, LLC – Use Variance and Site Plan Extension Request

Present – Len Schwartz, applicant’s attorney.

Call to Order:

Member's packets contained: 1. Letter dated March 3, 2017 prepared by Mr. Schwartz. 2. Letter dated March 16, 2017 prepared by the Pinelands Commission. 3. Letter dated March 20, 2017 prepared by Al Marmero.

The applicant is requesting a six month extension on the Board's condition of submitting a site plan as part of his use variance approval. In addition he is asking for a one year extension on the use variance approval; both extensions are due to delays at the Pinelands. The applicant's property is located at 2599 S. Black Horse Pike, also known as Block 8501, Lot 4 in the RG-C Zoning District.

Mr. Schwartz stated his client was granted use variance approval subject to the submission of a site plan; first they had to apply to Pinelands to obtain a Certificate of Filing which is required for the submission of a site plan application. They applied to the Pinelands and came back to the Board in October requesting an extension. The Board granted the extension but the Pinelands has just issued another letter indicating they want more information, a wetlands delineation, and additional fees. In addition Mr. Schwartz realized that the use variance approval will expire soon so he is before the Board to ask for a one year extension on the use variance and a six month extension for the submission of the site plan. If his client obtains approval from the Pinelands before the six months expires they will come back to the Board as soon as possible with the site plan. Mr. Marmero reviewed the extension requests for the Board. Motion by Mr. Fritz, seconded by Mr. McLaughlin to grant the one year extension for the use variance and the six month extension for the submission of the site plan. Roll call vote: Ayes – Mr. Fritz, Mr. McLaughlin, Ms. Fox, Mr. Kozak, Mr. Mercado, Mr. Salvadori.

Public Hearing:

1. #16-26 – Harold Paul Kanady – Use Variance – Storage of Commercial Vehicles

Present – Harold Paul Kanady, applicant, John Makowski, applicant's attorney, Tiffany CuvIELLO, applicant's planner.

Member's packets contained: 1. A copy of the applicant's use variance application, certified survey, and minor site plan. 2. Report dated July 21, 2016 prepared by Pam Pellegrini. 3. Report dated February 21, 2017 prepared by Pam Pellegrini. 4. Letter and photographs dated July 27, 2016 prepared by Rosemary Flaherty, Zoning Officer. 5. Letter dated December 29, 2016 prepared by Tiffany CuvIELLO.

Public Hearing: (continued)

1. #16-26 – Harold Paul Kanady (continued)

The applicant is before the Board seeking a use variance in order to be allowed to utilize his property for a vehicle storage yard as well as continue the residential use that has existed on the property before he purchased it. He also stores gravel, stone, and sand on the property for his own personal use to maintain the site. The property is located at 1711 Glassboro Road, also known as Block 15202, Lot 10 in the Business Park and Commercial Zoning Districts.

Mr. Makowski introduced himself as the applicant's attorney. Ms. CuvIELlo was sworn in by Mr. Marmero. Ms. CuvIELlo testified as to her credentials as a licensed professional planner. Mrs. Farrell stated for the record that both Mr. Sebastian and Mr. O'Reilly came into the office and listened to the tapes from the prior public hearings on this application concerning Mr. Kanady and if necessary they will be able to vote on the application this evening. Ms. CuvIELlo stated that they are before the Board requesting a use variance to allow the existing residential use as well as the vehicle storage yard use. The property is split zoned with Commercial zoning in the front and Business Park zoning in the rear. The Township changed the zoning in the rear of the property from Residential to Business Park in 2004; the front of the property was always zoned Commercial. The ordinance allows vehicle storage yards in both the Business Park and Commercial Zones as a conditional use. There is a question as to whether the residential use is permitted since there will be two uses on the property. Ms. CuvIELlo stated that she will provide testimony in support of the D1 variance for the two principle uses. She stated that she will also put on the record why she does not believe the use variance is required. She stated that the ordinance does permit residential uses in the Commercial Zone. Under Chapter 175-127 the ordinance states that no lot shall have upon more than one principle permitted use except that a single dwelling unit may be permitted on a lot used primarily for a nonresidential use in the Commercial Zoning District provided that the site plan shall indicate adequate parking for both uses. In the ordinance under 175-163(H) it states that residential uses are permitted if a valid Certificate of Occupancy has been issued; she noted that because the ordinance and Master Plan recognize that there are residential uses in the Commercial and Business Parks zones and allow them to remain as a permitted use. The entire residential use is located in the Commercial Zone and the vehicle storage yard is entirely in the Business Park Zone.

The area has a combination of uses such as Midway Auto Parts, and irrigation supply business, Monroe Auto Body, a residential use next door to Mr. Kanady's property that also has considerable storage in the rear as well as primary residential uses. All of the uses mix well given the zoning being Business Park and Commercial. Ms. CuvIELlo stated that Mr. Kanady has approximately eight employees that go to the property in the morning, park their personal vehicles in an employee parking area shown on the plan, and take one of the commercial trucks to the job site, and between 3:00 and 6:00 p.m. they come back and drop off the trucks and take their personal vehicle home. That is how the business operation works on this site.

Public Hearing: (continued)

1. #16-26 – Harold Paul Kanady (continued)

It is a very low intensity operation; there is no activity on the site all day other than the employees parking their cars and getting in the trucks to take them to the job site. There aren't any major maintenance repairs to the trucks on this site other than standard maintenance checks such as lights, windshield wipers, and other safety checks. The use of the property for this purpose is a permitted conditional use. Certain conditions have to be met and the ordinance has several conditions that have to be satisfied for the vehicle storage yard. The conditions include five items; the first is that there should be a minimum of 2500 square feet per vehicle stored on the property, the second is that there must be an opaque fence at least eight feet high to enclose the entire storage area, the third, when the site abuts a residential zone, not use, but zone, and this property does not abut a residential zone, the fence shall be setback twenty-five feet from the property line and the twenty-five foot strip should be suitably landscaped. This condition does not apply because Mr. Kanady's property does not abut a residential zone which doesn't mean they minimize the impact to a residential use. The fourth condition is that no maintenance or servicing of vehicles shall be permitted other than normal fueling, lubricating, or cleaning. The Board has heard testimony from past hearings that no repairs take place on the property aside from safety checks so this condition does not apply. The fifth condition is the submission of a site plan and site plan approval. A minor site plan has been submitted showing the current conditions and improvements on the site.

With regard to condition numbers one and two; a minimum of 2500 square feet for each vehicle being stored is required and a fence is required. Ms. CuvIELLO stated that the property is very large at six plus acres which is approximately 260,000 square feet. Using the 2500 square foot requirement, that would allow for 104 vehicles. Mr. Kanady does not have 104 vehicles on the property. Ms. CuvIELLO stated that the rear of the property is wooded but they could clear and enclose that portion of the property if the Board requires it to meet the 2500 square foot per vehicle condition. They believe it's a better zoning alternative not to clear the wooded area in order to meet the literal intent of the ordinance. The intent of the ordinance should be to look at the size of the lot and to make sure it functions appropriately. However if the Board interprets the ordinance to say the area to be fenced literally requires 2500 square foot per vehicle then they will need a D3 variance; Ms. CuvIELLO does not believe they require that variance for the first condition because they can clear the trees and fence in that area. They are asking for the D3 variance for the second condition regarding the eight foot high opaque fence. They recognize that there should be proper buffering between residential uses and commercial uses but they do not believe the buffers are required since they do not abut a residential zone but a residential use. Ms. CuvIELLO presented photographs for the Board and described what each photograph represented.

Public Hearing: (continued)

1. #16-26 – Harold Paul Kanady (continued)

She stated that Mr. Kanady has installed landscaping along the property lines. The one area of concern noted in the planner's report is between the residential use on the site and the vehicle storage yard. Ms. CuvIELLO displayed a photograph depicting the row of evergreen trees in the rear yard of the residential use that divides that use from the commercial use. The photographs were marked as Exhibits A1 through A10. A2 depicted the employee parking area. A3 depicted the landscaping along the western property line where the employee parking is located. A4 depicted a closer view of that area. A5 depicted the eastern property line and shows the break in the landscaping. It also shows the adjacent residential home and the storage in the rear of that property. That property is a flag lot with the home and storage in the front and a residential home in the rear. A6 depicted the extensive vegetation along the eastern property line and also the break in the vegetation which is along the area where the adjacent property owner has storage of various materials. A7 depicted the same area showing the fencing. Exhibits A8, A9, and A10 show the extent Mr. Kanady went to in an effort to screen the storage yard from the adjacent property owner of the flag lot which is Lot 8. He has planted trees and created a berm to buffer the storage yard from view. Ms. CuvIELLO stated she believes this is an adequate buffer given that they are not next to a residential zone and there isn't any activity on the site all day long; it's only when the employees pick up the trucks in the morning and come back later in the day to return them.

The applicant will require D3 variances which require a different standard of proof. The applicant does not have to prove that the site is suited to allow the vehicle storage yard or the residential use because they are permitted. What they have to demonstrate is that the site can accommodate the vehicle storage yard despite the fact that they don't meet two criteria. The intent of the opaque fence is to screen the area from any residential use however they believe the area is screened adequately with the berm and the vegetation that is planted along the property line. If the Board requires them to add landscaping in the break in vegetation along the property line they will do that but the area in the neighbor's yard that is not screened is a storage yard. They also believe there is a better zoning alternative than clearing the lot in the rear because they technically don't meet the 2500 square foot requirement for the fenced area. The site can accommodate the number of vehicles stored and there is enough room to navigate around the site and for emergency access. So the D3 variance does not require the Board to look at whether the site is suitable for the use because the use is a permitted use; the Board only has to look at the whether the property can function as intended. With regard to the negative criteria the Board has to look at the impact to the zone plan and to the community. If you look at what other uses are permitted in the BP Zone then you can determine the impact of this use. Ms. CuvIELLO stated that the BP Zone is one of the most intense zoning districts that is designed to promote industrial development on corridors that are appropriately suited for heavy traffic. This property is located on a highway, Route 322, and the amount of truck traffic that travels this road daily is considerable.

Public Hearing: (continued)

1. #16-26 – Harold Paul Kanady (continued)

Ms. CuvIELlo noted some of the permitted uses in the BP Zone so the Board can compare Mr. Kanady's use to what other uses could possibly be located on the property. The BP Zone permits Community Commercial uses, Neighborhood Commercial uses, and Planned Commercial uses, which are basically retail uses that have a lot of in and out traffic, loading areas, trash pick-up, and general activity all day long. The BP Zone also allows for offices, warehousing, used motor vehicle sales, and industrial uses. She pointed out that the other permitted uses in the BP Zone are far more intensive than a vehicle storage yard where there is relatively no activity except in the morning and late afternoon/early evening. The lot is large enough to allow for a warehouse or any of the other uses permitted in the zone. So the concerns from neighbors of Mr. Kanady's use are valid concerns but they have to be weighed in conjunction to what is otherwise permitted in the zone and on this property. The applicant is required to meet the State and County Noise Control Act; the impact of noise from the vehicles that move in and out of this site compared to the impact of noise from the other permitted uses is minimal.

With regard to buffering, the planner's report indicates that a fifty foot buffer is required; however if you look at the ordinance that fifty foot buffer is only required if the use is next to a residential zone not a residential use. Ms. CuvIELlo stated they do have to be considerate of the residential neighbors and he has been considerate of those neighbors by putting in the screening to shield his use from view. The landscaping installed is a better buffer than an opaque fence. For all those reasons Ms. CuvIELlo stated that there really isn't any substantial detriment to the public good since the use has a minimal intensity compared to what is permitted on the property. There isn't any impairment to the zoning or zone plan since this property was intentionally rezoned to Business Park in 2004. For all the reasons stated Ms. CuvIELlo believed that the Board can grant the D1 variance for the two uses on the property and the D3 variances as it relates to the number of vehicles based on the square footage and the opaque fence. She stated that development causes impact but you have to balance whether or not it is substantial and then balance that against what is otherwise permitted.

Mr. Fritz inquired as to the issue of wetlands in rear of the property. Ms. CuvIELlo stated that they did not do an official wetlands study but she did go on the New Jersey DEP I-Map site to see if there was any reason to be concerned about wetlands on this property. She distributed a copy of the map to the Board which was marked as Exhibit A11. It does show a pocket of wetlands offsite three properties over. Mr. O'Reilly asked what time the employees pick up the trucks in the morning. Mr. Kanady was sworn in by Mr. Marmero. Mr. Kanady replied that they usually pick up the trucks around 6:00 a.m. to 6:30 a.m. in the morning. On occasion a truck may have to leave a little bit earlier but they try not to do that. Ms. Flaherty stated that the ordinance for noise is 8:00 a.m. Ms. CuvIELlo stated that is only if it's a violation of the noise ordinance.

Public Hearing: (continued)

1. #16-26 – Harold Paul Kanady (continued)

The starting of a vehicle does not necessarily violate the noise ordinance at the property line and that is something the police can test with a noise meter. Ms. CuvIELlo stated that she did observe that Mr. Kanady's employees back the vehicles in the afternoon so that there will not be any beeping noises when they pull out in the morning. Mr. Mercado asked if Mr. Kanady does snow removal as well. Ms. CuvIELlo stated that Mr. Kanady does have a snow removal operation and at times those vehicles may have to start up earlier which is why they back the vehicles into the parking area so there is no beeping noises. The plows are not put on the trucks at this site; they are taken offsite. Mr. Kanady stated that if they are aware a snow storm is coming they stage the trucks at the State yard and leave from that location. Mr. Mercado inquired about the storage of materials. Mr. Kanady stated that he does store sand, stone, and gravel at the site which he personally uses to maintain his properties; he does not sell those materials.

Mr. Kernan reviewed Ms. Pellegrini's report for the Board. He stated that he did a site visit this afternoon and did note that Mr. Kanady does store those materials and he believes that Mr. Kanady does use them for maintenance as they weren't huge piles of material. He stated that even though the ordinance allows for two uses in the Commercial Zone that allowance does not extend to the BP Zone so the D1 variance is required to allow the two uses on one lot. He stated that the home has existed there for many years and it does somewhat mask the storage yard in the back. The neighborhood is mix of uses so having the home here is not an unusual situation. He stated that Ms. CuvIELlo is correct with regard to the size of the property but you also have to take into account about an acre for the residence. He stated the applicant does not want to clear the rear wooded area so maybe there can be a compromise with regard to the number of vehicles being stored in the cleared area. Ms. CuvIELlo stated that they do not intend to store 104 vehicles but even if they went with half that number it would be more than sufficient for what he stores on the property. Mr. Kernan stated that there should be some discussion on the maximum number of vehicles allowed if the variances are approved. With regard to the D3 variance being requested to not provide the opaque fence, Mr. Kernan stated he has seen the buffer and it's not a bad hedge but the plant material is kind of low and broad. With regard to the site plan Mr. Kernan suggested that if the conditional use is granted the site plan should be revised to include the entirety of the buffer provided or whatever conditions are put in place. The residential use does meet all the bulk requirements; the vehicle storage yard bulk requirements are met with the exception of the buffer. Mr. Kernan stated there seems to be a conflict in the code as to whether a fifty foot buffer is required or a twenty-five foot buffer is required. He believes the fifty foot buffer is required but only half of that buffer is required to be planted. He stated that there should be discussion on that issue as well. The plan does show a fifty foot buffer on the eastern property line all the way down to the residential use. There are some waivers that are required for the width of the driveway and for the parking lot being a paved surface where the applicant is proposing stone.

Public Hearing: (continued)

1. #16-26 – Harold Paul Kanady (continued)

Mr. Kernan recommended that waiver so as to not have any runoff. A waiver is also required for the employee parking area being five feet from the western property line. There was a question in the report concerning the location of the well and septic for the residential property and Mr. Kernan noted that the well and septic are located on the residential lot and not near the area for the vehicle storage yard. Ms. CuvIELLO commented that on both sides of the property aside from the employee parking area there is a twenty-five foot buffer width. They did not want to put the fence because they believe the landscaping is sufficient. Mr. Fritz commented that he thought the existing buffering was adequate but wanted to see the gap area planted with the same type of material. Ms. CuvIELLO stated that they will agree to put landscaping in the gap area.

Mrs. Farrell wanted the issue of site plan on the record and stated that Mr. Kanady has not formally submitted a site plan application to the Board. He has only submitted the use variance application even though he provided a limited site plan. She didn't want the Board to get into granting waivers that may be associated with the site plan. Ms. CuvIELLO commented that they submitted the site plan for the Board to see but they will take the comments and conditions and add them to the site plan when they formally submit the application. Mr. Kozak wanted to clarify that there isn't any fueling of the trucks on the site. Mr. Kanady testified that they do not fuel the trucks on the site.

Motion passed to open the hearing to the public.

1. Richard Wells, attorney for Jeanie Gullo, Bunni Bouchard, William and Doris Johnson, and Ms. Risti Talbot. He stated that his clients testified at the first hearing. He has a few quick updates and wants to summarize his client's objections to the application. He also wanted to note that they disagree with the applicant's planner's letter. He believes the application fails as a matter of law and should be denied in its entirety. His client's primary concern is noise with regard to the operation itself, the starting and moving of the trucks which created a significant disturbance to the neighborhood. His clients were also concerned about the storage of fuel and other chemicals on the site. His clients also represented that these daily disturbances represented a substantial detriment to the neighborhood. Mr. Wells submitted follow up exhibits that were marked as Exhibits O2 and O3.

2. Jeanie Gullo was sworn in by Mr. Marmero. Ms. Gullo described what is depicted in Exhibits O2 and O3. She stated that the first picture was taken from her front yard showing her view of Mr. Kanady's property. She described the second photo as being her view from her garage and also stated that when Mr. Kanady created the berm they knocked down a couple sections of her fence. She stated that the tree line or supposed buffer does not shield her view from the storage yard.

Public Hearing: (continued)

1. #16-26 – Harold Paul Kanady (continued)

Mr. Wells stated he wanted to go through a couple of things regarding Ms. Pellegrini's letter. With regard to the property taxes, the applicant has only been paying taxes on the residential use and his clients want him to pay the appropriate property taxes going forward and to pay the back taxes owed for running the business. His clients also feel the lack of the appropriate fencing is significant as well as the requirements for the buffer. His clients also agree with the letter that the use is not consistent with the goals and objectives of the Master Plan. Mr. Wells stated that although the applicant's property does not abut a residential zone special considerations should be made to protect the residential uses adjacent to the site. He stated that the greatest impact is in the morning and the evening when the residents are home which is when the trucks are leaving and returning to the site. Mr. Wells stated that the applicant is asking for an exception to the rule and his clients believe this exception should not be granted. He stated that this use is a self-created hardship and as a matter of law self-created hardships cannot satisfy the positive criteria for the variance. He stated that the applicant has not testified as to why this property is suited for his use and asked why the applicant doesn't move his business to an area more consistent with the Township's zoning plan. The impact from the noise is a detriment to the residential area. Mr. Wells stated the Board has to vote based on whether or not the applicant has satisfied the positive and negative criteria. He stated that the positive and negative criteria have not been satisfied and the application should be denied in its entirety.

Mr. Kozak asked Mr. Wells if he agreed that since the property is zoned BP that a warehouse use with tractor trailers going in and out of the site is a permitted use. Mr. Wells agreed but stated that the appropriate site plan would have to be submitted and take into consideration the surrounding uses. Mr. Sebastian commented on the fact that the ordinance states consideration is given if the property abuts a residential zone not residential uses.

3. Bunni Bouchard was sworn in by Mr. Marmero. Ms. Bouchard stated that the applicant received approvals on York Avenue and he does not follow the rules for that property. She stated she hopes the Board does not give him another variance for which he will not follow the rules. They call and complain and they do not get anywhere and she hoped the Board would not allow this variance.

Motion passed to close the hearing to the public.

Mr. Marmero stated that the applicant was given a postponement in order to hire a planner to address the positive and negative criteria and tonight Ms. Cuvillo addressed those issues in her testimony. The applicant is seeking a D1 variance for dual uses and two D3 variances from providing the opaque fence and for the square footage required for each vehicle albeit the Board has heard testimony about the vehicles and the amount of property.

Public Hearing: (continued)

1. #16-26 – Harold Paul Kanady (continued)

Mr. Marmero stated any motion can combine all three variances since they require five affirmative votes. The conditions discussed is that site plan review is required, limiting the number of vehicles, fencing the employee parking area if the Board requires it, and filling in the gap in the buffer. There was some discussion on the content and height of the buffer with Mr. Marmero stating that if the Board requires additional buffering it is usually left to the Board's planner to work with the applicant on satisfying that condition. The applicant would have to show that on the site plan. Mr. McLaughlin asked if the D1 variance can be voted on this evening and the D3 variances at site plan review. Mr. Marmero replied that the variances are usually voted on at the same time. After some discussion Mr. Makowski stated that they would prefer that the Board vote on all the variances this evening and his applicant is open to provide additional information. The subject of the number of vehicles permitted on the site was raised with Mr. Kernan stating that the only way to grow the vehicle storage yard is to clear additional trees and provide more room for expansion. He felt that the number of vehicles should be determined based on the cleared area right now. Mr. Makowski replied that he was only concerned with a technical violation if the applicant acquired one more truck and has thirty-one. Mr. Kanady stated that he would ask to be allowed to have forty vehicles without further clearing conditioned upon them showing the site can accommodate that number on the site plan.

Mr. Marmero reviewed the variances and conditions for the Board. The applicant will be required to submit a site plan, to show the site can accommodate the forty vehicles without additional clearing, supplementing the buffer and showing that on the site plan, and fencing the employee parking area. Mr. McLaughlin made a motion to approve the D1 variance based on the other uses that would be allowed on the property given the zoning. Mr. Kozak seconded the motion. Roll call vote: Ayes – Mr. McLaughlin, Mr. Kozak, Ms. Fox, Mr. Fritz, Mr. Mercado, Mr. O'Reilly, Mr. Salvadori. Nays Zero. Abstentions – Zero. Motion by Mr. McLaughlin, seconded by Mr. Kozak to grant the D3 variances with the conditions. Roll call vote: Ayes – Mr. Kozak, Ms. Fox, Mr. Fritz, Mr. Mercado, Mr. O'Reilly, Mr. Salvadori. Nays – Mr. McLaughlin. 6 ayes, 1 nay, motion passed.

Public Portion:

Motion passed to open the meeting to the public. There being none, motion passed to close the meeting to the public.

Appointment of Board Solicitor:

Mr. Fritz commented on the fact that there was only one submission for the position of Board Solicitor. Mr. Kozak stated that there have been times in the past when there has been only one submission for a professional position on a Board. Motion by Mr. Kozak, seconded by Mr. Mercado to appoint the firm of Weir & Partners as the Board Solicitors. Roll call vote: Ayes – Mr. Kozak, Mr. Mercado, Ms. Fox, Mr. Fritz, Mr. McLaughlin, Mr. O’Reilly, Mr. Salvadori. Nays – Zero. Abstentions – Zero. Mr. Coe was present from the firm and will be the Solicitor for the Board. The Board thanked Mr. Marmero for his years of service. Mr. Coe thanked the Board for the appointment as Solicitor and stated he looks forward to working with the Board.

Reports:

Mrs. Farrell stated that only resolutions are scheduled for the next meeting on April 4th; applications are scheduled for the second meeting in April.

Approval of Minutes:

1. 2/7/17 regular meeting.

Motion by Mr. Fritz, seconded by Mr. McLaughlin to approve the minutes from the February 7, 2017 regular meeting. Voice vote; all ayes, motion passed.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 9:07 p.m.

These minutes are an extract from the meeting that was held on the above date and are not a verbatim account or to be construed as an official transcript of the proceedings. The tape of the meeting is stored in the office of the Board.

Ninette Orbaczewski
Clerk Transcriber