

Call to Order:

It is 6:31 p.m. on May 9th, 2024 and this is the regular meeting of the Monroe Township Zoning Board of Adjustment. Notice of this meeting was given as required by the Open Public Meetings Act of February 1, 2024 and a copy was posted on the 2nd floor bulletin board in Town Hall and on the Township's website.

“Be advised, no new item of business will be started after 10:30 p.m., and the meeting shall terminate no later than 11:00 p.m.”

The Board saluted the flag.

Roll call: Present; Mr. Colavita, Mr. Cummiskey, Mr. Kerr, Mr. Kozak, Mr. Rice, Ms. Fasano, Mr. Fooder, Mr. Fiore, Solicitor, Mr. Warburton, Planner, Mr. Sander, Engineer. Also present; Ms. Gallagher, Secretary, Ms. Gabbianelli, Clerk Transcriber. Excused: Mr. Carino, Mr. Kernan, Mr. Heverly.

Memorialization of Resolution:

1. #34-2024 Paul D'Auria – Withdraw Application
2. #35-2024 Frank Andruzzi - Adjournment
3. #36-2024 Brian Luther – Lot Coverage Variance Denied
4. #37-2024 Frank Edwards – Buffer Encroachment Approved
5. #38-2024 Robert & Loretta Guenther – Lot Size Variance Approved
6. #39-2024 Robert Smith – Front Yard Variance Approved
7. #40-2024 Michael Jamerson – Lot Coverage Variance Approved
8. #41-2024 Poidevien Joseph – Lot Coverage Variance Approved
9. #42-2024 Aneesah Bush - Lot Coverage Variance Approved
10. #43-2024 Greyhound Angels Rescue & Adoption Inc. – Minor Site Plan Approved
11. #44-2024 John Campanella - Lot Coverage Variance Approved
12. #45-2024 William Sellers - Lot Coverage Variance Approved

Motion to approve the Resolutions. Roll call vote; Ayes- Mr. Colavita, Mr. Cummiskey, Mr. Kerr, Mr. Kozak, Mr. Rice, Ms. Fasano, Mr. Fooder. Nays- Zero.

Public Hearings:

1. #23-61 – Mario & Denise Defalcis – Use, Lot Coverage & Side Yard Variances

The applicant is requesting a use variance for an existing 3,262 square foot accessory building which is larger than the primary dwelling, a lot coverage variance to allow 40% where 25% is the maximum permitted by previous resolution PB-61-09, a side yard variance to allow 0 feet where 10 feet is required for the existing stone driveway, box trailer, bituminous pad and metal garage, and to be permitted to operate his home office as a home occupation; along with any other

1. #23-61 – Mario & Denise Defalcis – Use, Lot Coverage & Side Yard Variances (cont.)

variances or waivers deemed necessary by the Board. The property is located at 1531 Victory Avenue, also known as Block 9209, Lot 2 in the RG-MR Zoning District.

Motion passed to deem the application complete. Mr. Fiore swears in Mr. Defalcis and Ms. Defalcis. Also, he swears in the Board's Professionals, Mr. Warburton and Mr. Sander. Mr. Fiore asks if they can mark MTZB1 as the Planner's letter and MTZB2 as the Engineer's letter.

Mr. Schwartz is representing the Defalcis. He indicates the applicants are present with various variances needed. He says there is no use variance needed for the use of the property for his business only as a home occupation. In 2009 there was a subdivision Mr. Defalcis needed from the Planning Board and Mr. Schwartz was the Board's attorney. At that time a variance was granted for a 25% lot coverage. But for some reason there were not any variances granted in regards to the side yard, stone driveway, or existing garage. That is why on the Engineer's report there are a lot of pre-existing buildings, driveways, etc. At the time the existing garage had the zero-lot line side yard and same with the rear yard. The stone driveways were the same situation in regard to zero-lot line. Mr. Schwartz does not know why there were never any variances granted back then but that is the current situation. So, there is nothing new being asked for in terms of construction just a lot of variances need to be obtained.

Mr. Fiore asks if Mr. Schwartz could break down the variances that are being asked because there is a lot of history. Mr. Fiore believes they are asking for three variances and the home occupation is an interpretation. Also, he adds the Zoning Officer has not gained that the use is a home occupation. Mr. Schwartz replies the Zoning Officer did not address it other than saying it sounded like a home occupation. He agrees with Mr. Fiore that it is not a variance. Mr. Fiore asks if the size of the building was 3,200 square feet back in 2009. Mr. Defalcis answers yes. Mr. Fiore refers to the Resolution and it appears that the finding of the Board in both Resolutions was the present use of the subject matter properties residential with the existing house. The Board's finding was that the house was residential.

Mr. Schwartz states on the survey submitted the surveyor indicated that the impervious area is 23% which is below the 25% he was previously granted. The lot grading application indicated that the impervious area exceeded 30%. In conversation with the Zoning Officer, she indicated the town is presently working on changing the ordinance to provide the number to be 40%. He does not believe the applicant will exceed 40%. Mr. Schwartz and the Zoning Officer agree they would revise/apply for a 40% lot coverage variance so if Mr. Defalcis increases some of the lot coverage beyond the present application, he would not have to come back before the Board to ask for any increase. He states Pizzeilli's had it 23% but that did not include the stone driveway which would bring it over the 30%.

Mr. Schwartz asks Mr. Defalcis if he is asking for a home occupation variance/waiver/interpretation. Mr. Defalcis answers yes. The only operation of your business is in the office in the house. Mr. Defalcis answers yes. Your office size is 14 feet by 14 feet, Mr. Defalcis agrees. Asked if he uses the office for billing and phone calls, Mr. Defalcis replies yes.

1. #23-61 – Mario & Denise Defalcis – Use, Lot Coverage & Side Yard Variances (cont.)

There are not any customers coming onto his property, Mr. Defalcis agrees. What is the type of business you have, Mr. Defalcis responds remodeling. Is there any outside display of work/site goods or equipment and Mr. Defalcis says no, just personal. The buildings on site are all for personal use and there are no signs for the business on site and Mr. Defalcis agrees. Mr. Fiore asks if the applicant can describe his personal equipment. He responds a tractor, mower, backhoe. Mr. Fiore asks is he has a skid steer and he replies no. He states he has had the tractor since 2004. Mr. Schwartz indicates Mr. Defalcis has two trucks, one is personal and the other he drives back and forth to work. Any other equipment or trucks on site and he replies no. Any other employees on site and he replies no. Any customers that come to the site and he replies no.

Mr. Schwartz indicates there are no variances required for the pool in the back because it is 22 feet from the rear yard and they meet all the criteria for that, Mr. Defalcis agrees. The metal garage which was on the original subdivision application is 3,250 square feet and has not changed since 2009, Mr. Defalcis agrees. Mr. Pizzeilli's new survey that was submitted to the Board indicates that 19.7 feet is the distance to the rear lot line. The metal garage has a zero foot and lines right next to the side yard, Mr. Defalcis agrees. It has a zero-lot line. Mr. Fiore asks if this is a result of the subdivision in 2009 and he states it was on the original subdivision plan. On the plan it shows one of the garage corners was 2.39 feet and the other garage corner was 2.40 feet and the Board, at that time, approved it. The stone driveway has a zero-foot side yard. And shown on the plan Mr. Defalcis has two sea boxes. The two box trailers are behind the open porch area, Mr. Defalcis agrees. They are about 14 feet back and that is one of the issues that the Zoning Officer is raising. The sea boxes initially were extending in front of the house porch. They revised it so they are now behind the porch. Mr. Defalcis agrees that they are 14 feet behind. They have a zero-lot line as well. Mr. Fiore asks what are the sizes of the sea boxes and they believe 10 feet by 40 feet. Mr. Fiore notes it is stated on the plan the boxes are 588 square feet. Mr. Schwartz says it is 14.9 feet from behind the open porch. As indicated the Engineer's report shows there are three sea boxes but in fact there are only two. Mr. Defalcis agrees there are only two sea boxes on his property. The bituminous area between the sea boxes and the middle garage also has a zero-lot line, Mr. Defalcis agrees. On the other side of the property there is a shed which complies and has a 10-foot side yard, Mr. Defalcis agrees.

Mr. Schwartz states the applicant would need a variance for the accessory buildings because all of the accessory buildings exceed the house, which is 3,500 square feet. Mr. Fiore makes a correction and states MTZB1 is the report from the Planner. Mr. Sander has no comments for this application.

Mr. Kozak ask why are they present tonight because the application has been ongoing for some years now. Mr. Schwartz states it has been like this since 2009 and someone reported/complained to our Zoning Officer. She cited the applicant and Mr. Kozak responded that is was complaint generated. They agree and there is no other construction going to be done on the property.

1. #23-61 – Mario & Denise Defalcis – Use, Lot Coverage & Side Yard Variances (cont.)

Mr. Warburton begins his testimony the applicant is requesting variance approval to allow for a pre-existing 3,262 square foot metal frame garage that backs up to property in conjunction with permitted residential use. It sounds like they want to go under a home occupation and this is the way they are considering this business. Mr. Defalcis agrees.

Mr. Warburton clarifies the conditions. He states the standards under 175-111 for home occupations be permitted as an accessory use. The use shall be one which is customary incidental to the use of the premises as a dwelling and subordinate to the residential use of the property. There shall be no more than one employee working on the premises other than the bona fide residents of the dwelling. Mr. Warburton asks there will be no employees, just Mr. Defalcis and he answers yes. That portion of the dwelling unit utilized for the home occupation shall not exceed 30 % of the total floor area of said dwelling. He states 14 feet by 14 feet and Mr. Defalcis agrees. The occupation shall be conducted entirely within the dwelling or within an accessory building or buildings. Mr. Defalcis agrees. Mr. Fiore states that he testified to not operating any of his business out of the building and if this is accurate. Mr. Defalcis states he is only conducting business from the 14 feet by 14 feet office and not conducting business in the 3,200 square feet metal garage. Mr. Warburton agrees and asks Mr. Defalcis is only operating in the home and he agrees. There are no related displays or articles for sale shall be visible from the street and Mr. Defalcis agrees. Only articles made on the premises may be sold, asks if he is selling anything and he states no. No sign shall be larger than two square feet on each of two sides. Asked if there are any signs on the property and he replies no. No mechanical equipment may be used except that which is normally used for purely domestic or household purposes and with the exception of medical, dental or office equipment. Mr. Warburton states Mr. Defalcis testified there is no mechanical equipment that is used and he agrees. Asked if there is any off-street parking and Mr. Defalcis states no. These are the conditions for the home occupation under our Township Code 175-111.

Mr. Warburton states in accordance with 175-127, no lot shall have upon it more than one principal permitted use, except that a single dwelling unit may be permitted on a lot used primarily for a nonresidential use in the C Zoning District. It appears that the applicant may utilize the metal garage to operate home occupation business, that is how it looks from the outside. Mr. Warburton asks Mr. Defalcis for more information about the business. He states it is a home remodeling business. Asked if there are any materials or anything stored in the accessory building and he says no. Asked if there are any tools and he responds only his personal tools that he uses for work.

Mr. Fiore asks what does he store in the sea boxes. Mr. Defalcis replies one is his friend John's property who he let store his stuff in there. John is in the hospital and most likely is going to pass. How long has John's items been there and he replies four years. The other sea box has his garden tiller, snow blower, etc. He states it his personal storage. Mr. Fiore states the Board could grant as a condition for him to remove the sea boxes and asks if he understood. Mr. Defalcis says with John's condition; one can probably be removed. Mr. Fiore just wants Mr. Defalcis to

1. #23-61 – Mario & Denise Defalcis – Use, Lot Coverage & Side Yard Variances (cont.)

understand that he may have to remove both if that is what the Board chooses. Mr. Cummiskey asks if items in the sea boxes could be moved into the metal garage. Mr. Schwartz states that Mr. Defalcis has other items in the garage, such as antique cars and parts. Mr. Fiore asks how many antique cars and he replies two. Mr. Fiore asks if he has any pictures to prove what the contents are in the metal garage and he does not. Mr. Kozak is curious about Mr. Fiore question. He asks him if he wants to know what is in the garage so they can figure out if he can store his property, currently in the sea box, into the garage. Mr. Schwartz states if need be they can as a condition of approval submit pictures of the contents in the garage. The Board wants to know if the items in the sea boxes can be put in the 3,200 square feet, Mr. Defalcis said no. Mr. Schwartz states he cannot fit the sea box items in the garage and will need both. Once John's sea box is removed, there will still be Mr. Defalcis sea box and the other building, he agrees. Mr. Kozak says John's sea box, at a certain time, will be removed altogether.

Mr. Warburton continues in accordance 175-89D, any accessory buildings or structures shall be permitted in a lot associated with a principal structure, building or use, except on qualified farmland. The total combined square footage of any accessory building(s) or structure(s) shall not exceed the square footage of the principal building. Mr. Warburton states there are a few sheds out on the property, a 3,200 square foot metal garage, and 3,542 square foot house. With the sheds and garage they are going to exceed the area of the house. Mr. Schwartz says the original survey submission there were three and now there is only two sheds. Mr. Cummiskey asks that one of the sheds is completely removed from the property and they agree. Asked which shed was removed from the property, Mr. Schwartz replies a 12 foot by 12 foot shed on the other side of the property. The one that is remaining has the 10-foot side yard requirement. Mr. Fiore properly names the new survey submitted as Defalcis1. Mr. Schwartz states the revised submitted, where the two sheds were, the smaller shed has been removed. Mr. Cummiskey asks the smaller one is gone but the other two sheds are remaining and they reply yes. The larger shed on the north side shows 6 feet side yard, it is on the opposite side from the sea boxes. Mr. Fiore states 6.3 feet. Mr. Schwartz says that shed is now 10.8 feet from the property line. Mr. Fiore asks if the shed that are next to the boxes are still there. Mr. Schwartz respond there was one she that was across from the boxes on the driveway. Mr. Warburton asks if the boxes are now sitting side by side, Mr. Defalcis agrees. They are not vertical stack but side by side. Since the sea boxes were moved where did the shed go and they state it is on the opposite side of the driveway. Mr. Warburton ask if it is sitting between the house and the driveway and they agree. Mr. Fiore asks what is the size of this shed and they respond 12 feet by 20 feet and it has personal property stored in it. Mr. Kozak asks how big the shed is on the opposite side and Mr. Defalcis states 12 feet by 24 feet.

Mr. Warburton states the applicant is supposed to demonstrate sufficient "special reasons" why the proposed use carries out a purpose of zoning, or how the refusal to allow the project would impose an undue hardship on the applicant. In addition, the applicant must demonstrate that the requested variance be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and will not substantially impair the intent and purpose of the zone plan and zoning ordinance. Mr.

1. #23-61 – Mario & Denise Defalcis – Use, Lot Coverage & Side Yard Variances (cont.)

Warburton asks if any of these variances can be granted what type of hardship would be imposed on the applicant as a result of these variances not being granted. Mr. Schwartz asks Mr. Defalcis what would happen to the items in these various sheds. He states he would not have anywhere to put them. He would have to have them outside or get rid of them. Mr. Schwartz asks how long has he had the various sheds and he says since he moved in, 1995. Asked if he has had any complaints from the neighbors and he says never. So there have been no negative statements from the neighbors in regards to the various sheds, the box trailers and the garage on the property and Mr. Defalcis agrees. It would be a hardship if he had to get rid of the sheds and put the equipment on the property and he agrees.

Mr. Fiore asks how many square feet is the driveway and states there is 3,843 square feet of bituminous coverage. It is to the right of the garage and includes going in and out of the shed. He wonders why such a large driveway if it is only for personal use. Mr. Defalcis responds he likes to park sideways. Mr. Fiore states parking takes up 15% of the site and he is trying to put that into context for the Board. Mr. Cumiskey asks if he has ever had anything delivered for his business through the property and Mr. Defalcis answers no. Mr. Schwartz states on the original subdivision plans the driveway is 6,364 square feet, stone driveway. It is about 20-foot-wide out by the road and then it gets wider as it gets back to the garage. Mr. Fiore states the most recent photo on Google Map looks like the trees to the left of the metal building are cut down. Is that going to be used for Mr. Defalcis personal use. He states his neighbor gave him permission to cut them down to put solar on the garage. Basically, he cut the trees down so he can eventually have solar power.

Mr. Warburton finishes with the bulk requirements. The bulk requirements all meet the requirements except for minimum side yard setback. The minimum requirement is 10 feet. There are multiply with either zero or a little over zero. This represents a pre-existing, non-conforming conditions. The minimum rear yard setback, the metal garage is sitting at 19.7 feet where 25 feet is required. This is a pre-existing, non-conforming condition. The lot coverage maximum permitted is 20% and the applicant is well over that. Mr. Warburton asks if the drive could be shrunk into a normal size since it is a personal use. Mr. Defalcis replies it is only 20 feet at the road and then it widens out to the front of the metal garage. He would like to have use at the front of that building. Mr. Fiore asks what is the width of the building and he replies approximately 60 feet.

Mr. Kozak asks if Mr. Warburton took a look at the Defalcis's property and he replies yes. He asks in his judgement any storage or equipment that would be used for a business and not residential. Mr. Warburton says he did not see anything. He saw the sea boxes, ladders and a couple trucks. He did see a small Kubota out front.

Mr. Kerr asks if he has any neighbors on the left side of the driveway and he replies yes. Asked if he has any issues from them complaining about the sea boxes and he replies no. These are the same neighbors that told him he could cut the trees down. This neighbor has never raised any question

1. #23-61 – Mario & Denise Defalcis – Use, Lot Coverage & Side Yard Variances (cont.)

about Mr. Defalcis's driveway right up against the side yard. Mr. Kerr asks how far back are the sea boxes from the road and he replies around 95 feet. Mr. Schwartz states the sea boxes were originally sitting closer to the road and the Zoning Officer wanted them moved back. The requirements for the ordinance are the sea boxes had to be behind the house. Mr. Cummiskey asks Mr. Schwartz if the applicant would agree to a site plan as a condition of approval. Mr. Schwartz does not know the reason for the site plan because it would get into parking issues. They have submitted the drainage to the Township and doesn't feel like they need to submit more to the Board than they already have. Mr. Fiore adds the question of the site plan because the Board does not know the certainty of what is on the site. They have heard a lot of approximations so if they had a site plan than the Board could react off of it. The applicant started off with a home occupation and it is a very busy site. Mr. Warburton agrees it is a very busy site for a residential use. Mr. Schwartz believes the survey shows the exact location of all the buildings, sheds, box trailers and driveway. Mr. Cummiskey states the sheds on the survey do not have dimensions on them. It has the total 548 square footage but not the break downs. Mr. Schwartz says if they want a condition they put the dimension the revising surveys they will do that. Mr. Fiore asks would they be agreeable to tabling the application and coming back with that survey so they can act upon a revised plan. And he is leaving that up to the Board.

Mr. Kozak asks if the Board does decide to ask for the plan to be laid out better, one of the sea boxes will be removed. He suggests they put some type of time frame for the removal. Also, he suggests the sea box that will be remaining, could it be placed on the side of the metal garage. Mr. Defalcis says the right side of the garage is a garden that has been there around 20 years. Asked if he could move the garden and he said that would give him hardship. Mr. Fiore points out that there are different types of hardships and the one Mr. Defalcis is stating (about the garden) is created by the application. So, it may not be applicable in his case. Mr. Schwartz's concern is that everything on the property except for the sea boxes have been there since 2009 without any complaints from the neighbors. Mr. Fiore states that the Board might have to live with what has been there for a long time.

Mr. Fiore asks if Mr. Defalcis wants to live by this plan even though it's getting an increase of 40% he might have to come back for a site plan. Right now, the existing condition is 32% and they are asking for the 40%, so they are leaving it open ended. He can add 8% more impervious surfaces to the plan. He would agree to whatever the impervious surface is on the plan that he would live by that and not do anything else. Mr. Schwartz suggests they can leave it at the originally 32%. Another idea is as a condition, once John's sea box is removed, the other sea box with the zero-lot line be moved to that location so it has 10 feet. This would eliminate the side yard variance and replace where John's box is. Mr. Fiore asks when John's sea box would be removed. Mr. Defalcis states that John's sons have started to move his items from the sea box. Mr. Kozak asks if it would take two years. Mr. Cummiskey asks what the applicant would be more comfortable with keeping it at 32% or leaving it open ended at 40% with a site plan. Mr. Schwartz responds that his client is not looking to build on it anymore so they will keep it at the 32%. And if they need to come back at a later date then they will. Mr. Cummiskey clarifies they are going to keep it at 32% and they agree. Mr. Fiore suggest whatever the dimensions are to revise it and putting the shed dimensions

1. #23-61 – Mario & Denise Defalcis – Use, Lot Coverage & Side Yard Variances (cont.)

on the plan. Mr. Cummiskey asks if the applicant would agree to locking in the shed dimension numbers. Mr. Fiore asks if they will revise exhibit Defalcis1, which would not be a site plan just a revision of the plot plan. Mr. Schwartz says it will not change the percentage but it will show the dimensions from each of the shed. Mr. Fiore responds the total impervious surface was calculated based upon the dimension of all of those. He does not know if it would be accurate. Mr. Schwartz says the impervious is showing on the plan and the only additional item is, which can be added to the plan, showing 63 or 64 square feet for the driveway.

Mr. Fiore says 66,000 square feet is the total overall site, 23% coverage this does not include stone driveway. Mr. Schwartz clarifies that when you calculate in the driveway, you get the 32%. He suggests perhaps they put it in as 35%. Mr. Kozak asks once the ordinance goes to 40% can the Board stop Mr. Defalcis and Mr. Fiore says they condition the granting of the use variances. Mr. Warburton says the ordinance still needs Pinelands approval so what they are looking at today is what they have to go by. Mr. Kozak asks Mr. Warburton, as the Planner if he is comfortable with the presentation. He says looking at the plan on space, he agrees with Mr. Fiore that the numbers should be updated. He has two different plans with different shed dimensions. As speaking for clarity, if the Zoning Officer goes back and does the math and they are not accurate to what is out in the field, they could have to come back. Mr. Warburton is not comfortable seeing the numbers because they are not correct. In his opinion he does not see why the driveway cannot be shrunk and he understands that is existing that way. It doesn't hurt to make things look better especially if it is only residential use. Mr. Warburton asks if there have been any complaints about storm water or run off. Mr. Defalcis answers no. in his opinion, Mr. Warburton is not comfortable with the plan that isn't accurate.

Motion passed to close the public portion. Mr. Schwartz states if the Board wants the dimensions they can put them in and they can get a clarification on shed dimensions because of the removal of the one shed. Condition of approval they will submit a new plan with dimensions for each of the sheds and revision to the key map. Also, as a condition, they will give two years for the one box trailer to be moved, or sooner. Once it is moved the condition is that the other box trailer to be move 10 feet from the side yard. Mr. Fiore ask once a revised plan is completed, the percentage of the impervious coverage will be what is on that plan. They are not going to leave it open ended. Mr. Schwartz agrees.

Mr. Fiore summarizes the application to the Board. Mr. Cummiskey asks Mr. Warburton to clarify his report and he states there are only two sea boxes on the property.

Motion to approve by Mr. Fooder, seconded by Mr. Kerr. Roll call vote; Ayes- Mr. Fooder, Mr. Kerr, Mr. Cummiskey, Mr. Kozak, Mr. Rice, Ms. Fasano. Nays- Zero. Colavita- Abstained.

2. #530-SP – Capital Realty Consultants, LLC – Final Major Site Plan

The applicant is seeking final site plan approval to construct a 40,000 square footprint, three-story self-storage facility; along with any other variances or waivers deemed necessary by the Board. The property is located on Glassboro-Cross Keys Road, also known as Block 14801.01, Lot 12.03 in the Commercial Zoning District.

Mr. Fiore swears in Gary Smith, Capital Realty Consultant and Andy Simkins, Engineer. David DeClement is representing the applicant. Motion approved to deem the application complete. Mr. Fiore marks Mr. Sander's Engineer report as MTZB1 and Mr. Warburton's Planner report as MTZB2.

Mr. DeClement begins by the responding to the Professional's letters. They believe they have responded to the Professional's letter. Mr. Cummiskey agrees they do not need to go over the entire application again, just to respond to the Professional's letter. Mr. Sander had an issue with the wording in their Storm Water Management Maintenance Plan. But he received a copy of the revised plan this evening and states it is acceptable. He states everything in his report has been addressed. Mr. Warburton states everything in his report has been addressed.

Mr. Fiore asks about the size of the trees and if that is in the landscaping plan. Mr. Simkins replies yes.

Motion to open to the public. Everett Davis of 32 Panmure Way, the Greens Williamstown approaches the Board and Mr. Fiore swears him in. Mr. Davis asks if the variance of the building will remain 35 feet tall and will not be adjusted. Mr. Fiore states that was a use variance approved by resolution last time and that will be the height of the variance granted. Motion passed to close the public portion.

Mr. Fiore summarizes the application to the Board.

Motion to approve by Mr. Colavita, seconded by Mr. Fooder. Roll call vote; Ayes- Mr. Colavita, Mr. Fooder, Mr. Cummiskey, Mr. Kerr, Mr. Kozak, Mr. Rice, Ms. Fasano. Nays- Zero.

3. #24-29 – Kenneth Boyer – Rear Yard & Front Yard Variances

The applicant is requesting a rear yard variance to allow 45.9 feet where 75 feet is required and a front yard variance to allow 45 feet where 60 feet is required for the construction of a 28' x 22' x 15' two-car garage; along with any other variances or waivers deemed necessary by the Board. The property is located at 50 Grandview Avenue, also known as Block 1201, Lot 7 in the R-2 Zoning District.

Motion passed to deem the application complete. Mr. Fiore swears in Kenneth Boyer.

3. #24-29 – Kenneth Boyer – Rear Yard & Front Yard Variances (cont.)

Mr. Boyer would like to add a two-car garage on the side of his house. Mr. Fiore asks if his property on Grandview Avenue is a small/narrow lot. Mr. Boyer agrees and states he is just under a .5 acre. Asked if there are other garages similar to what he wants to construct and he replies his neighbor on the left has a two-car garage. Mr. Fiore asks if this would have a negative impact on the neighborhood or positive. Mr. Boyer would say positive.

Mr. Kozak asks what he would be using the garage for. Mr. Boyer replies he is a car guy and likes to work on them as a hobby. He is retired but he has some cars he likes to work on. Asked if it is just for personal use and not for business. Mr. Boyer replies just for himself. Mr. Kozak asks if he has any drainage problems and he answers no. Mr. Boyer states the garage is going on an existing concrete asphalt. Mr. Cummiskey asks if the exterior of the garage will match the existing house. Mr. Boyer states it is going to look like it was built with the house. Mr. Kerr asks if there will be any plumbing and Mr. Boyer says no. Mr. Fooder asks about the existing garage in the photo provided. Mr. Boyer states that is being removed and it has already been sold. It will be removed once he gets the approval from the Board.

Motion passed to close the public portion. Mr. Fiore summarizes the application to the Board.

Motion to approve by Mr. Fooder, seconded by Mr. Colavita. Roll call vote; Ayes- Mr. Fooder, Mr. Colavita, Mr. Cummiskey, Mr. Kerr, Mr. Kozak, Mr. Rice, Ms. Fasano. Nays- Zero.

4. #24-30 – Joseph Coleman – Side Yard, Rear Yard and Buffer Encroachment Variances

The applicant is requesting a variance to allow the existing shed to remain encroaching the buffer, side yard variance to allow 2.6 feet where 5 feet is required, a rear yard variance to allow 3.4 feet where 5 feet is required for the existing shed; along with any other variances or waivers deemed necessary by the Board. The property is located 521 Mills Lane, also known as Block 27.0102, Lot 34 in the RG-PR Zoning District.

Motion passed to deem the application complete. Mr. Fiore swears in Joseph Coleman.

Mr. Coleman is requesting a variance for the buffer encroachment of their existing shed. In 2009 the shed was constructed for additional storage because they had an in-law suite added. Mr. Colavita asks if the shed is on a concrete pad. Mr. Coleman says it is on stone with trim timbers. He asks what would be the difficulty of moving it 1.5 or 2.5 feet. Mr. Coleman does not think the structure would hold up. Mr. Colavita asks if he thinks it would damage the building by moving it and Mr. Coleman agrees. Mr. Fiore asks if he originally had approval when he put the shed in that location. In 2009 they had variances for the property lines for the addition. They put the shed in with those variances in mind but did not realize it was encroaching the buffer zone. Mr. Fiore states there is a buffer placed on Mills Lane where the original intent was not to build in it and asks if Mr. Coleman understands that. He understands and is aware the Board could put on a condition

4. #24-30 – Joseph Coleman – Side Yard, Rear Yard and Buffer Encroachment Variances (cont.)

on there that if you were ever to remove the shed or destroy the shed he cannot place it back in that particular place. Mr. Boyer agrees and he will not make the shed any larger.

Mr. Kozak asks what triggered Mr. Coleman to have to appear before the Board. He says he got a new survey because they are planning on putting an above ground pool. That's when he realized the shed was in the buffer. Mr. Fiore asks if he will have an issue with the impervious surface. Mr. Boyer says he is in the process of getting their pool permit. Asked if there are any other sheds similar and/or similarly located in the neighborhood. He replies yes and that the shed matches the color of his house.

Motion passed to close the public portion. Mr. Fiore summarizes the application to the Board.

Motion to approve by Mr. Colavita, seconded by Mr. Kerr. Roll call vote; Ayes- Mr. Colavita, Mr. Kerr, Mr. Cummiskey, Mr. Kozak, Mr. Rice, Ms. Fasano, Mr. Fooder. Nays- Zero.

5. #24-31 – Wayne & Madrid Matthews – Lot Coverage Variance

The applicant is requesting a lot coverage variance to allow 39.2% where 36% is the maximum permitted for the existing pool and concrete; along with any other variances or waivers deemed necessary by the Board. The property is located at 728 Davinci Way, also known as Block 110.0402, Lot 15 in the RG-PR Zoning District.

Motion passed to deem the application complete. Mr. Fiore swears in Wayne & Madrid Matthews.

Mr. Matthews states they have had their pool for over 3.5 years. The subcontractor told the Matthews that they had extra concrete and they had them install it. So, the extra concrete put the Matthews over their lot coverage. Mr. Kozak asks if there has been any run off problems with the neighbors because of its corner location. Mr. Matthews says no. Mr. Kozak asks if the lot coverage was triggered because of the Township's final inspection and Mr. Matthews answers yes. Mr. Fiore states Davinci Way is larger houses and smaller lots, he agrees. Asked if many of his neighbors have similar types of pools and he answers yes. This would not adverse the neighborhood, but would only improve it.

Motion passed to close the public portion. Mr. Fiore summarizes the application to the Board.

Motion to approve by Ms. Fasano, seconded by Mr. Rice. Roll call vote; Ayes- Ms. Fasano, Mr. Rice, Mr. Colavita, Mr. Cummiskey, Mr. Kerr, Mr. Kozak, Mr. Fooder. Nays- Zero.

6. #24-32 – Jamie & David Rosenthal – Side Yard, Lot Coverage & Encroachment Variances

The applicant is requesting a side yard variance to allow 10 feet where 15 feet is required for the proposed 35' x 28' x 18' storage building, a lot coverage variance to allow 25% where 10% is the maximum permitted, and encroachment variances to allow the frame garage to encroach the property line by 1.36 feet and to allow a portion of fence to encroach the property line by 1 foot where a 5' setback is required; along with any other variances or waivers deemed necessary by the Board. The property is located at 1520 Madrone Avenue, also known as Block 3702, Lot 6 in the RG-PR Zoning District.

Motion passed to deem the application complete. Mr. Fiore swears in Jamie Rosenthal.

Ms. Rosenthal is interested in building a three-car garage on the side of their property. Currently they have a two-car garage which they would like to convert into an office space. Mr. Rosenthal is a retired mechanic and he has a lot of tools/tools boxes so they would like a larger garage. Ms. Rosenthal states her husband will not be working out of it because he is retired and currently working for Amazon. Mr. Cummiskey asks if there would be any business conducted and she replies none. She states he does help friends out with their vehicles but not for business. Mr. Cummiskey ask if the office she reference would be her own home office. Ms. Rosenthal replies yes and she works remotely three times a week. Mr. Fiore asks where is Mr. Rosenthal going to repair that cars. She says he currently repairs the cars in the stone driveway. He wants the three-car garage so he can add a lift into there. She says he is getting older and can't get onto the ground much anymore. Mr. Fiore reiterates it will not be for business and she agrees.

Mr. Fiore ask if there are similar structures like this on Chinkapin Avenue area and she answers yes. Asked if they are smaller lots, Ms. Rosenthal states she has a larger lot, little over .5 acre. There are bigger lots in the back of the development. Mr. Fiore asks, while looking at the photo, if that is the front of the Rosenthal's home. She says it is and they are hoping to put the garage to the left where the fence is. She says it will be facing Chinkapin and her home is caddy corner on the lot. Mr. Fiore asks if they will have to remove all of the trees and she says they have already removed a great number of trees. She does not believe there are any left that they would have to remove from that space. Mr. Kozak asks if the structure will be behind the fence. She replies it will be behind the front of the house and they will remove that part of the fence. There is a gas line that runs on the side of house so it will also be behind that. Mr. Fiore marks exhibit Rosenthal1 and asks her to place an "X" where the proposed building will be. He states it is on the survey but it is hand written on there. Mr. Fiore asks if they currently have one car garage. She says they currently have a two-car garage.

Mr. Kozak asks about the shed and if she is going to put it back on her property. He states she cannot have a shed on someone's property even if they agree. Ms. Rosenthal says the owner of that home is present this evening and can tell the Board it is in a space that neither of them use. The neighbors do not care that the shed is there and it has been there before the Rosenthal's moved it. She says it is on a concrete slab and very hard to move. Mr. Kozak asks Mr. Fiore how can the Board vote on the shed even if the neighbors agree. Mr. Fiore says they cannot and the neighbor would have to file an application for it to be allow there. Asked if it is all on his

6. #24-32 – Jamie & David Rosenthal – Side Yard, Lot Coverage & Encroachment Variances (cont.)

property, Ms. Rosenthal replies it is about one foot onto his property. Mr. Fiore reiterates that the neighbor would have to come in for an application. The neighbor may speak at the public portion part and give his blessings but legally the Board cannot approve it in its current condition. So, it would have to be moved. Ms. Rosenthal says she spoke to someone who told her if her current neighbor agrees and then someone else moved onto the property then they would have to say if she would have to move it or not. Mr. Fiore replies whomever told her that it is not legally correct. Legally it is not permissible. The Board cannot approve that because it is actually another structure. Now she is adding a third structure, the house, the garage and a second structure. He tells her she would need a variance to have the second structure because she never had approval for it. Mr. Fiore reiterates that even with the neighbor's approval, the shed is existing on another property and it is really close for a fire safety standpoint but that is not the Board's jurisdiction. What Ms. Rosenthal needs to demonstrate before the Board is that she asking for a variance to allow her to put a three-car garage in the side yard. Since her mailing address is Madrone, the structure would be considered in the side yard. So, she needs to demonstrate to the Board by approving it will not negatively impact the Zoning and Planning Laws in Monroe Township. Mr. Fiore tells her she may have a large lot but the Board may find it is an unusually large building to put in the side yard. And the way she describes it is that her husband is a generous person that fixes cars for free and the Board has to consider that. They have to consider whether or not what the applicant is purposing is going to change the nature of the residential neighborhood.

Mr. Cummiskey asks how she plans to enter the purposed garage. She says from Chinkapin. He asks then would they make a left turn into it. She states there are two cul-de-sacs at the end of the streets and two cross streets. They would pass their house and make a right into it. Mr. Kozak asks where the doors would be facing and she replies Chinkapin. Ms. Fasano asks if she would be putting a driveway in leading to the garage. She responds that is why they are asking for the variances because they do not have sidewalks and the side of the yard is their grass. She says they have an existing long driveway but would want to propose a small one for an entry from Chinkapin. Mr. Kozak says Ms. Rosenthal does not indicate a driveway off of Chinkapin. He asks if the garage doors are going to face Chinkapin. She says yes. The way to get in and out is through Chinkapin. And Mr. Kozak states they cannot use the driveway on Madrone or they would have to drive across their lawn. She agrees. Mr. Kozak reiterates that Ms. Rosenthal did not indicate any driveway on the survey. Mr. Fiore agrees. He says on her survey it has storage building and Ms. Rosenthal states the Zoning Officer wrote that on the survey and drew it. Mr. Fiore states it is going to be a three-car garage and asks if her intention was to not put a driveway or an apron. She says no that was not their intention at all. He asks then how are they going to pull the vehicles in and out. Mr. Rice states Ms. Rosenthal did say she was planning on putting a driveway there. But it is not indicated. She did not realize she needed to indicate it on the survey. Mr. Kozak ask if they have curb there and she replies yes but no sidewalk. He says then there would have to be a curb cut.

6. #24-32 – Jamie & David Rosenthal – Side Yard, Lot Coverage & Encroachment Variances (cont.)

Mr. Colavita asks why so (proposed building) big. She states her father-in-law is retired, he is retired and they both have large tool boxes. They like to do car/engine work. They have two older sons that come over and use their facilities. Then plan to have a backdoor to go into the backyard so they can park their cars on the street and use it if it is raining. And that is what her husband asked for. Mr. Rice asks what she plans to use the facility for and she says, for example to go inside and get out of the rain. Mr. Kerr ask if there is going to be any plumbing and she says no just electricity. Mr. Fooder asks if this is going to be a three bay and Ms. Rosenthal says yes but two door entry. He clarifies and asks if they are going to install floor drains. She does not believe so because there is no water. He states if they did or planned on it, they would need to install an oil water separator to prevent any contamination to the environment. She understands. Mr. Fooder asks if there is a curb on Chinkapin. She replies there is a curb but there is not a sidewalk. And she says the way the house is situated this leaves it as there only option. Also, he tells her she would have to put in a compressed curb where the garage is because she does not want to have to go up over the curb. She agrees. She says her existing driveway is a single going in and widens to a double. It is a two-car garage and a two-car wide driveway.

Mr. Fiore states Ms. Rosenthal began her testimony that her husband is retired and likes tinkering with cars. Then she said her father-in-law is retired and likes tinkering with car. And now her sons are going to get involved with whether it is a hobby or not. He recommends she be consisting with what her representations are. The Board has to judge her creditability as well. Ms. Rosenthal states the reason her husband wants the three-car garage is so he can park their vehicles in the two bays and have the third one for the lift. She reiterates he does not want to get onto the ground anymore to the change the tires, etc. She says her current two-car garage is storage. Mr. Fiore asks if he is currently doing the repairs on the street and she says in the driveway on the ground. He asks when people drop off their cars where are they going to park their cars, on the street. She replies the existing driveway is three cars deep and two cars wide. Mr. Cummiskey asks the work on the cars will be done 10 feet off the street. She states that is why they are asking for the variance because of the side yard she would have needed 15 feet. Mr. Cummiskey suggests that she could move it back to be with the ordinance. She says they could move it back but it would be tight where it meets the house. He asks if she thinks she wouldn't have five feet within the two corners. She does not know if they would or not and it would be tight.

Ms. Fasano asks if this would cause issues for traffic and she replies they live in a development that does not get a lot of traffic. Mr. Kozak asks about the surface of the proposed driveway. How long of a curb cut were they planning. She says they were hoping the whole length of the garage. What would the surface be between the garage and the curb and she says concrete. The curb cut would be 35 feet long and 10 by 35 feet of concrete. Mr. Fiore tells her there is a right of way too on the side of the street and she would have to get permission from the Township to encroach upon that right way and cross over the right away. She was unaware of this. Mr. Kozak says where the sidewalk would normally be, event though there is not a sidewalk it is implied. He is aware most of the time people do walk in the streets but you have to give them the option to be able to walk on the grass. She mentions their utilities are in the street. Mr. Fiore asks if she would consider

6. #24-32 – Jamie & David Rosenthal – Side Yard, Lot Coverage & Encroachment Variances (cont.)

making it smaller and she says this is what her husband wanted. Mr. Cummiskey suggest that if she downgraded to a two-car garage the Board would not be raising all these issues. Mr. Fiore states if she wants to come back with her husband that the Board would be happy to help with him. Mr. Kozak raising the question if she has a problem with the curb cut then how will she get into the garage. Mr. Colavita asks about the automotive work and the air tools. How is that going to sit with your neighbors in a three-car garage. She says they only have a two-car garage. Also, her neighbors have a super high garage across the street and he has all the lifts and tools etc. Mr. Colavita says each application is their own and just because someone else has it doesn't mean much. Mr. Fiore states they previously asked if there were similar size buildings in the neighborhood. And not if someone was running a business in their backyard. She does not know if they are running a business but that they have an extra-large garage.

Mr. Fiore reminds the Board that this is referred to as a C-2 variance. The variance is as follows: benefits versus detriment. Ms. Rosenthal has to be able to demonstrate to the Board that if the Board would allow this type of structure to be build, it can be done without a substantial detriment to the public good. In considering it will not impair the intent and purpose of the Zoning and Planning ordinance. This is a residential neighborhood and has certain characteristics and will this negatively affect or substantial impair. The Township Council years ago created the ordinances and will it impair that or negatively effect what they attempted to do to keep it a residential neighborhood.

Ms. Rosenthal says they are not planning on doing anything extra over and above. Basically, they just want a bigger, nicer space for her husband. Mr. Fiore tells her this would be a third structure, so she is asking for a variance for three structures on the property. Where you are allowed to one accessory building even though the neighbor is giving permission, but it is added another structure. They can proceed because of any other variances that are deemed necessary. Mr. Kozak asks if they are addressing the shed that is over the property line. Mr. Fiore replies not about it being over the line but the building itself. It is already in existent and she is not asking for anything on that. Mr. Kozak just wants to be clear that the Board is not giving any blessing on the shed. Mr. Fiore asks the Board do they want 3-4 structures on the property and its all about controlling what is happening on someone's lot.

Mr. Colavita suggest that Ms. Rosenthal revisit the application and adjourn it for another time. Ms. Rosenthal is upset and she just would like to move forward with everything. She wants to get her current garage cleaned out for her office and put everything into the new garage. Mr. Colavita says there are ways for this to be done that would put her more into compliance to where she wouldn't need the Boards blessing and some issues she can take care of and come back. Mr. Colavita says the building would be allowable if you comply a certain way or possible smaller. Ms. Rosenthal doesn't understand why it needs to be smaller because it is smaller than the house that is there. Mr. Colavita answers because of lot coverage. She says it is less than the lot coverage that will be approved coming soon. Mr. Fiore says that is an ordinance that has been drafted and Pinelands could take two years out before approval. She is upset because she says all of the houses in her

6. #24-32 – Jamie & David Rosenthal – Side Yard, Lot Coverage & Encroachment Variances (cont.)

neighborhood lots are covered and she is asking for one thing. Mr. Fooder tells Ms. Rosenthal that the Board is there to help her through the process of her getting what she needs and the Board getting what they need. There is always room for compromise and they are there to try to help.

Mr. Fooder tells her there is a reason it is 15 feet and not 10 feet because if there was a side way installed, there is a 4-foot buffer from curb and 4-foot side walk. This would mean the edge of the sidewalk would be 2 feet from her front door. If she could put the garage 15 feet back it would be a safety consideration. They would be liable if anything happened with a pedestrian. Mr. Kozak asks if the garage is just for a hobby and Ms. Rosenthal says yes and for parking in it. She asks where the 15 feet is from because as of now her fence is 8 feet from the curb. The people that live behind her are 4 or 5 feet from the curb. She wants to know if the variance starts from the curb or is it from the setback. Mr. Fiore answers the Zoning Officer would identify that and the survey is going to have to identify that. If approved she would have to get a survey and she says she has a survey. He says the survey should have the dimension where the building is going to be at. He suggests a survey that the proposed building is not drawn on there and where it is actually physically going to be located. Mr. Kozak adds the dimensions of the driveway to the garage because you cannot drive over the curb. Mr. Kerr adds the gas line and they may have a number of how far you can be from that.

Mr. Fiore states that the conversations with the Zoning Officer are not relevant to the Board and the Board can ask for additional information. They have to make a decision that has to be honored and legally bound. He suggests she gets a plan from a surveyor or engineer that will put the actual location of the building, the size of the curb cut and the driveway. So that the Board can make an informed decision as to whether they agree it does not negatively impact the neighborhood. Mr. Fiore tells Ms. Rosenthal if the application does not pass this evening then she cannot come back before the Board for this same structure. She can appeal it but that would cost more money in legal fees. Ms. Rosenthal states she will take the application back. Mr. Fiore asks if she agrees it will be continued to a new date and to reach out to Ms. Gallagher on Monday so she can tell you what you need to produce to the Board. Ms. Rosenthal agrees to continue the application and table it. Mr. Fiore states there will not be any further notice to the public. To the public that is here they can be heard tonight but it is going to be continued for another hearing.

Mr. Kozak thinks it still should be open to the public because some of the comments they make may be beneficial. Mr. Fiore agrees. Motion passed to continue the application to a later date with consent to the applicant. As Ms. Rosenthal leaves the courtroom Mr. Fiore asks if she would like to stay to listen to what the public has to say. Ms. Rosenthal apologizes and states she is too upset for it.

Motion to open to the public. Janet Gabbianelli of 1521 Larch Avenue, Williamstown approaches the Board. Mr. Fiore swears in Ms. Gabbianelli. Ms. Gabbianelli lives right behind Ms. Rosenthal, their backyards pretty much touch each other. Ms. Gabbianelli submits a couple of photos to the Board. She says if she sits on her back deck she will be looking at this huge building. She states

6. #24-32 – Jamie & David Rosenthal – Side Yard, Lot Coverage & Encroachment Variances (cont.)

a shed is 10 feet high and doesn't understand why this has to be 18 feet high. The proposed building itself is almost as big as a rancher, it will be a big structure. So, when she looks out her back that is what she is going to see, almost if she built a wall behind her house. Ms. Gabbianelli has lived at her home for 46 years. Mr. Fiore asks if there are two photos and she replies yes, one is a closer view than the other. Mr. Fiore marks the exhibit as G1 and G2. The photos show if she is sitting on her deck and looking out, that is the back of Ms. Rosenthal's house. Ms. Fasano points out the back of the applicant's house. Ms. Gabbianelli says yes and the blue building is her house and the building they want to construct is to the right of the house. Mr. Fooder asks if it is where the tarp is draped on the fence and she answers yes.

Another point Ms. Gabbianelli would like to make is when the Board was discussing the curb and people walking. She says there are a lot of children in that development. They ride their bikes along there and play ball. They are always outside and they are always on that street. So, if there are going to be cars going in and out of there then it will not be safe for the neighborhood. She concludes that it is a huge building that will just look out of place.

Shawn and Jennifer Atkinson of 200 Chinkapin Avenue, Williamstown approach the Board. Mr. Fiore swears in Mr. and Ms. Atkinson. The Atkinson's state they live caddy corner to Ms. Rosenthal, where her house faces their front yard. Mr. Atkinson says esthetically he has a problem with the proposed garage and safety wise he has a problem too. They have young kids and their neighbors have kids who run around on that corner all day. The kids do play safe and watch out for traffic.

Mr. Atkinson states the Rosenthal's currently do not park their cars in the garage. They will have 2-4 cars sitting in the driveway. He questions why Ms. Rosenthal stated about the proposed garage benefiting her sons when they do not live there. He says they have motorcycles and they do not really see Mr. Rosenthal out there much working on the cars. As far as working for Amazon, he thinks the job is physically taxing but Ms. Rosenthal testified her husband physically can't get into his tools or go under the cars anymore. Mr. Atkinson suggests they pave the driveway. Ms. Atkinson says currently when he is working on cars he is doing it in the driveway so she questions why now he needs a three-car garage. Mr. Atkinson feels like this is just a convenience thing for the Rosenthals. He does not believe it is for the cars or the hobbies at all.

Ms. Atkinson states the neighbors (the Rosenthals) speed through the neighborhood on their street bikes like crazy. They aggressively rev the engines and there are usually three street bikes at a time. They really feel like it is a safety issue. Mr. Atkinson does believe it will change the nature of neighborhood. There is only one road in and out. They say there is no through traffic. He understands if there was a variance to put the garage further back into their yard. He asks how will the septic play out because the applicant already have issues with flooding in that area. They question if she really is only putting an office in the garage or are they converting it into a room. Ms. Atkinson does not feel as if they are getting the full truth. Mr. Atkinson brings up the neighbor

6. #24-32 – Jamie & David Rosenthal – Side Yard, Lot Coverage & Encroachment Variances (cont.)

that Ms. Rosenthal stated has a huge garage. He let the Board know that the person's garage is different because it is backed up into the woods.

Mr. Cummiskey lets them know that the application will be rescheduled and they can come back at that time. Mr. Kozak states he is familiar with the area and asks if part of their concern is it becoming a repair shop. Ms. Atkinson witnessed a lot of kids on bikes and the family being there. Mr. Kozak is asking if they are running a business and they do not believe they are. Mr. Atkinson asks when will they know about the new meeting. Mr. Fiore states Ms. Rosenthal will not have to renotify everybody so he suggests to check with Ms. Gallagher every few weeks. Ms. Gallagher says they can call the office and she will keep them updated. Ms. Atkinson asks at the next meeting will they be able to ask Ms. Rosenthal questions and she answers them. Mr. Kozak says the idea he was thinking was Ms. Rosenthal would stay for tonight's public portion and find out what the neighbor's concerns were. But she did not want to stay so she doesn't hear the concerns she could possibly address the next time she comes in front of the Board.

Kent Montford of 1516 Madrone, Williamstown approaches the Board. Mr. Fiore swears in Mr. Montford. Mr. Montford is present this evening to give his approval for Ms. Rosenthal's shed that is on his property line. Since the application is being continued, he will come back to address it. Mr. Kozak adds they were not addressing the shed this evening and it is another issue. The Board will not give permission for her to have a shed on someone else's property. Mr. Montford understands. Mr. Montford is on the other side of Ms. Rosenthal, opposite side of where the proposed garage will be.

Motion passed to close the public portion.

Public Portion: None

Reports: None

Approval of Minutes:

1. April 25, 2024

Motion passed to approve minutes.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned 9:06 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. Respectfully submitted by: Scottie Lea Gabbianelli, Clerk Transcriber.