

RECEIVED

OCT 19 2021

STANHOPE  
BOROUGH

Stanhope Land Use Board  
September 13, 2021  
Regular Meeting  
Minutes

CALL MEETING TO ORDER:

Chairman Maguire called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

STATEMENT:

Adequate notice for this meeting has been provided according to the Open Public Meetings Act, Assembly Bill #1030. Notice for this Reorganization Meeting was forwarded to the New Jersey Herald and Daily Record on January 12, 2021, was placed on the municipal bulletin board and on the official website of the Borough of Stanhope.

Furthermore, notice of the change in the meeting location was sent to the New Jersey Herald and Daily Record on June 24, 2021 and was placed on the official bulletin board in the Municipal Building.

In the event the Board has not addressed all the items on its agenda by 10:00 p.m., and it is of the opinion that it cannot complete the agenda in a reasonable period, the Board may exercise its option to continue this meeting at an agreed time and place.

At this time, please turn off all cell phones.

ROLL CALL:

James Benson - absent  
Nicholas Bielanowski - present  
Najib Iftikhar - present  
Rosemarie Maio - present  
Thomas Pershouse - present

John Rogalo - absent  
Joseph Torelli - present  
Michael Vance - absent  
Paula Zelif-Murphy - present  
John Maguire - present

Others present: Board Attorney Glenn Gavan, Board Engineer Eric Keller and Board Secretary Ellen Horak

MINUTES

**August 9, 2021 Meeting** – On motion by Ms. Zelif-Murphy, seconded by Ms. Maio, the Minutes of the August 9, 2021 Meeting were approved on unanimous voice vote.

CORRESPONDENCE

- 08-03-21 Wendy DeJesus – Site Plan (Prelim & Final) and Variance Application for Manjit Bajwa re: Blk 11702, Lot 5
- 08-16-21 Sussex County Dept. of Engineering & Planning – Minor Subdivision re: Terry Webb, Blk 10605, Lot 10
- 09-07-21 New Jersey Planning Officials – New Jersey Planner (July/August)
- 09-07-21 Paul Anderson, PE PP – revised plans re: Webb Minor Subdivision, Blk 10605, Lot 10
- 09-07-21 Glenn Gavan – Resolution of Memorialization re: Corey Kirk Variance Extension
- 09-08-21 Sussex County Dept. of Engineering & Planning–Administratively Disapproved Preliminary Site Plan Application re: Manjit Bajwa, Blk 11702, Lot 5
- 09-09-21 Eric Keller – Technical Review #2, Webb Minor Subdivision, Block 10605, Lot 10

On motion by Ms. Zeliff-Murphy, seconded by Mr. Torelli and carried by unanimous voice vote, the Correspondence List was accepted and placed on file. Mr. Torelli questioned why the date of the correspondence is not listed, noting he sometimes has difficulty determining what correspondence in his packet coincides with those listed on the Correspondence List. The Board Secretary explained that when correspondence is received, it is date stamped and the date the correspondence is received is the date listed on the Correspondence List.

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC FOR NON-AGENDA ITEMS:

Chairman Maguire opened the meeting to the public for non-agenda items. Seeing no one from the public wishing to speak, Chairman Maguire closed the public portion of the meeting.

COMPLETENESS

**21-01, Manjit Bajwa**

Block 11702, Lot 5, Preliminary & Final Site Plan and Variance Application

Appl Received: 08/03/2021

45 Days: 09/17/2021

Chairman Maguire stated the Completeness Review Committee has reviewed the application and recommend it be deemed complete. On motion by Ms. Maio, seconded by Mr. Iftikhar and carried by the following unanimous roll call vote, 21-01, Manjit Bajwa's Preliminary and Final Site Plan and Variance Application was deemed complete.

AFFIRMATIVE: Mr. Bielanowski, Mr. Iftikhar, Ms. Maio, Mr. Pershouse, Mr. Torelli, Ms. Zeliff-Murphy, Chairman Maguire  
OPPOSED: None  
ABSTENSIONS: None

The hearing for this application will be scheduled for the October 18, 2021 meeting. The Board Secretary was directed to send the application to the Board Engineer and Board Planner for their review and comments.

RESOLUTION OF MEMORIALIZATION:

**Corey Kirk**, One-Year Extension of Variance Approval

30 Linden Avenue, Block 11304, Lot 6

(Formerly Ryan Leavy Variance Application)

Mr. Gavan noted an error on page 2 of the resolution, which he will correct. The resolution states "Township" and should be "Borough." Mr. Gavan stated that according to his records, the variance is extended to October 2022. If the applicant requests another extension, he must re-notice.

On motion by Mr. Torelli, seconded by Ms. Zeliff-Murphy and carried by the following unanimous roll call vote, the Board adopted the Resolution of Memorialization, as amended, granting the request of Corey Kirk for a one-year extension to the variance granted to Ryan Leavy (former owner of property) for Block 11304, Lot 6.

AFFIRMATIVE: Mr. Bielanowski, Mr. Iftikhar, Ms. Maio, Mr. Pershouse, Mr. Torelli, Ms. Zeliff-Murphy, Chairman Maguire  
OPPOSED: None  
ABSTENSIONS: None

NEW HEARING:

**21-01, Terry Webb**

Block 10605, Lot 10, Minor Subdivision Application (with variance-appl & escrow fee submitted 9/7/21)

Deemed Complete: 08/09/2021

45 Days: 09/23/2021 (if variances included – 120 days = 12/07/21)

(Ms. Zeliff-Murphy stepped down from the dais, noting Ms. Webb is her attorney.)

Robert Ruddy, Esq. appeared on behalf of the applicant, Terry Webb, for an application for a subdivision. Ms. Webb is the owner of the property at 114 Brooklyn Road. They are asking for a subdivision of the property to construct 2 houses on the property.

Paul Anderson, the applicant's engineer, was sworn in. Mr. Anderson provided the Board with a short background of his qualifications. He has a Bachelors Degree in Science and Civil Engineering. His is currently a licensed professional engineer in good standing. He is also a professional planner in New Jersey and his license is current and in good standing. He does site planning and testimony before numerous boards on a regular basis and all have accepted him as a professional engineer and planner. Mr. Gavan recommended the Board accept Mr. Anderson as a qualified professional. Mr. Anderson provided an overview of the application. Mr. Anderson presented an exhibit marked Exhibit A-1, dated today which consists of 16 pages that have various items regarding the property, including the Tax Map, Zoning Map, Aerial Photo, the property before subdivision, the property after subdivision. Page 6 outlines the variance relief they are seeking. Mr. Anderson stated they are looking for a subdivision, not as a builder, but to get the subdivision so it can be rebuilt. They are leaving the actual house as an open item. What is listed is conceptual, as what can be built. Mr. Anderson went over the specifics of the project. The property is Block 10605, Lot 10, shown on the first page of Exhibit A-1. It is approximately 16,000 square feet; 3.7 acres. The zone requires 14,520 square feet. Looking at the adjacent properties, 14 of the 19 in this Block have frontage similar to what they are proposing and do not meet the zone requirements and 18 of the 19 lots do not meet the area requirement of the zone. Mr. Anderson stated they would have more area in the subdivided lots than 12 of those lots. It would be consistent to what is in the neighborhood. Mr. Anderson directed the Board to page 8 of Exhibit A-1 which shows the Slope Map and Analysis that categorizes them. They will be grading the entire property. They are looking for 100% disturbance of the site. Permitted is 30% or 1,101 square feet and they are proposing 3,671 square feet. In the 15% slope range they have 4,870 square feet and in the 25% and above they have 1,079 square feet. Permitted is 10% and they propose 100%. Mr. Anderson said they believe if someone builds a house on the lot, this is the disturbance you will see. There is grading in the right-of-way for site distance on Brooklyn Road; but that is a County issue. The property is in the MR Zone. Mr. Anderson stated they meet all of the other bulk requirements with the exception of those noted which is lot area. The lot area for Lot 10.01 would be 8,135 square feet and the frontage would be 69.37 feet. Lot 10.02 on the left of the property proposes a lot area of 7,895 square feet and lot frontage of 83.76 feet. Both lots would be substandard to the zone, but similar to the neighborhood. Mr. Anderson noted the lot impervious coverage and the Board Engineer having several issues regarding vehicles backing out from one garage in relation to the other garage. The zone table on Page 6 of Exhibit A-1 shows they need variance relief for impervious coverage for the 2 lots. The last page of Exhibit A-1 shows a conceptual plan which has a shared driveway with the driveway farther to the left of Lot 10.02 and he has left space for the garage and a space for the cars to park. Lot 10.01 is near coverage compliant with 25.5%, but Lot 10.02, where there is the major portion of the shared driveway has 36% impervious coverage. Mr. Anderson stated they want a shared driveway because of site distance issues. Having a shared driveway will make it much safer. Mr. Anderson

noted Page 3 of Exhibit A-1 is an aerial photo that shows all of the houses. Looking at the houses you can see the size of the lots are relatively small compared to Lot 10. Mr. Anderson noted photos taken and shown on pages 10 through 15 of Exhibit A-1 are photos of the property from different angles as well as photos of adjacent properties. The photos show the existing house on the project site which is an old-style house; a paved front driveway that turns to a gravel driveway; a photo from across the street showing the driveway going up to the property and shows the driveway being very steep and the current site distance problem on leaving the site. Mr. Anderson gave an overview of all the photos and the location taken. Mr. Anderson noted all the variances required are "C" variances. To redevelop this lot meets certain purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law. It meets the criteria under MLUL (a) which is it promotes the general welfare because you will have 2 houses more like the existing ones in the area and they will meet the current building codes. It meets purpose (c) of the MLUL to provide adequate light, air and open space. It meets purpose (e) of zoning to promote the density as it is a continuation of what is currently there. This is an area in a developed community and it is not listed as in the Highlands Preservation Area. It meets purposes (g) as it provides sufficient space in appropriate location for residential to meet needs of the citizens. It meets purpose (i) which is to promote a desirable visual environment which will be done with the 2 new homes that will be an improvement to the visual environment of that area. Mr. Anderson stated there is little detriment and no substantial detriment to the neighborhood. Mr. Anderson noted one comment in the Board Engineer's report is to submit a detailed grading plan. Mr. Anderson agrees with the Board Engineer and it should be required that whoever builds a home on this property needs to get a detailed review by the Board's Engineer to make sure it meets all requirements. Mr. Anderson said he believes the Board can grant the variances because the benefits outweigh the detriment to the zone.

The Board Engineer, Eric Keller, said he appreciates the applicant's engineer's offer for grading and plot plans, but as the Borough's Engineer, he does not see these plans unless there are stormwater issues. The application shows houses solely for the purposes of conceptual to show you can build homes on these lots. Mr. Keller noted the applicant is not seeking a set-back variance. If someone wants to build a house they will need to come back to the Board for set-back variances. The houses shown on Page 16 of Exhibit A-1 do not require setback variances. Mr. Keller stated there are details on stormwater that he has some concerns about going forward, but on the plans, they do show seepage pits which would address the additional impervious coverage. Mr. Keller stated Lot 10.02 has 37% coverage and the ordinance permits 25%, noting the difference is 12% and he asked Mr. Anderson how much additional square footage over are they on impervious coverage. Mr. Gavan noted the applicant is only requesting 3 variances on both properties. Mr. Anderson stated 12% over is approximately 950 square feet on Lot 10.02. Mr. Keller asked what the percentage of increased impervious coverage is on Lot 10.0. Mr. Anderson responded it is 81 square feet. Mr. Keller stated it is not a significant area of exceedance. Mr. Keller asked if the proposed subdivision is subject to the Borough's stormwater ordinance. Mr. Anderson responded this is a minor subdivision so it is not subject to the stormwater ordinance. Mr. Keller stated since the applicant is asking for variances, they need to mitigate run-off. Mr. Anderson stated they have seepage pits and will have roof leaders to the house connecting to it and the driveway so it is absorbed into the ground. Mr. Anderson stated this can be addressed once the real houses are determined. Mr. Keller asked if there is any stormwater facility on the property it is discharged to. Mr. Anderson responded it will go into the ground. The plans show overflow to the County road, but it needs the County's approval. They may need to add more capacity to take almost the entire volume from the roof and have only driveway and grass area running off. Mr. Keller noted a correspondence from the County on this application. Mr. Anderson responded the County wants to meet on the site and look at the property. They made no comments about the driveway design. Mr. Keller asked if they are seeking a design waiver for the driveway grade or are they deferring it. Mr.



Gavan stated it must be deferred until you know what is going to be built. Mr. Keller asked Mr. Gavan, if they need a design waiver when submitting for plot and grading plans, how does it get addressed. Mr. Gavan responded if Mr. Keller believes it is de minimis in nature, he can sign off or send it to the County.

Mr. Keller directed Mr. Anderson to page 16 of Exhibit A-1 and asked Mr. Anderson to give some dimensions as how wide is the driveway at Brooklyn Road. Mr. Anderson responded it is an 18-foot driveway and as it goes into the garage it is about 15 feet. He is assuming it will be one car in the garage and one car in front of the garage. It is setback 15 feet from the property line but it could go a little closer to the property line because there is likely going to be some grading associated with it. Mr. Keller asked where the proposed driveway on this plan is in context to the existing driveway. Mr. Anderson responded the existing driveway is just to the left of the proposed subdivision. The proposed plan would be moving it further away from the curb. Mr. Anderson said if they need to move it over another 8 to 10 feet to get additional site distance he will do that, but will need to leave about 5 feet for grading, etc.

Mr. Pershouse questioned why page 5 of Exhibit A-1 shows a different driveway than page 16. Mr. Anderson responded that is correct. Initially, they submitted plans and wanted to have a shared driveway because they are trying to make it safer. The Board's engineer looked at the plans and provided review comments in which he made good points with regard to depth and turning ability behind the garages between the 2 houses where they are sharing the driveway. What is shown on page 5 is what they submitted showing detailed grading and everything associated with the application. What is shown on page 16 responds to the comments in Mr. Keller's review letter and it addresses his comments with what Mr. Anderson believes works better and it will give the Board a good approximation the impervious coverage number for future development.

Ms. Maio asked, using the example on page 16, how many cars does it allow to be parked on each property. Mr. Anderson responded it allows for 2 cars on each property. Ms. Maio noted they are talking about potentially three-bedroom homes and they are allowing for only 2 cars. Mr. Anderson responded that is correct. Ms. Maio asked where guests would park, adding there is no parking permitted on Brooklyn Road and there is no access to any other street. Mr. Anderson responded it is not a curbed driveway so you could pull a vehicle off to the grass. Ms. Maio expressed her opinion that, although it may look nice, it does not seem practical to say there will only ever be 2 cars at a 3-bedroom house. Mr. Anderson stated it is possible to have parking on the straight-away in between where you could have 4 vehicles parked "stacked" in the driveway if there was a party. Mr. Pershouse questioned how people would get out if there was stacked parking and how the other property owner would get out if the neighbor had a party.

Chairman Maguire asked Mr. Anderson if he feels there is sufficient room on Lot 10.01 if someone had to back out of the garage and then all the way down the driveway. Mr. Anderson responded they would need a little bump out. Ms. Maio noted, if adding a bump out, would they would be adding to the impervious coverage. Mr. Anderson responded that is correct and instead of 81 feet, it might be another 20 to 30 square feet. Chairman Maguire noted the topography on the lots with them being very sloped lots and he questioned going downhill in the winter and if a vehicle would continue going downhill if the driveway was not cleared. Mr. Anderson responded the grade would be approximately 8% from Brooklyn Road up to the first house and as you turn the corner it would flatten out to a 2% pitch. It would be 8% and the driveway would be flatter going into the first garage and relatively flat where it crosses the property line.

Mr. Keller noted his concern was the parking with the original plan, but the revised plan with the wider driveway is still challenging. It is going to limit how many cars can be parked on the property. There could be issues if someone has people over and there could be some conflicts. There would need to be easements to allow for the shared access.

Chairman Maguire stated they do not permit shared driveways in Stanhope. Mr. Keller noted that is correct. Mr. Keller read from the Borough's Code, Section 100-137D that says "except for driveways servicing multiunit structures or groups of structures, no driveway shall serve more than one structure or on residential dwelling unit." Mr. Keller noted the shared driveway would require a design waiver. Mr. Keller said he thinks that being along the County road, especially with the site distance constraints, it is better, if the Board was considering subdividing the lot, to have one driveway. It is good planning, transportation planning and access management planning to have a shared driveway. Chairman Maguire asked what the site distance is on a County road. Mr. Anderson responded he thinks it is 350 feet on Brooklyn Road. Mr. Keller stated the County uses intersection site distance which is their standards. Mr. Keller stated he does not know what it is for 40 mph, but he thinks it is more than 350 feet, only because he has dealt with Sussex County on 50 mph roads and they require 600 feet of site distance. Mr. Pershouse noted there are a lot of people who have trouble trying to pull out of Central Avenue because of the curve. Chairman Maguire asked Mr. Anderson what they are providing. Mr. Anderson responded with the driveway where it is, it is about 360 feet. Mr. Anderson noted this is a County issue. Chairman Maguire asked what the elevation difference is from Brooklyn Road to the back of the property. Mr. Anderson responded the middle of the site is elevation of about 100 feet and the back is about 121 feet so the difference is 21 feet. Mr. Torelli commented that it is an extreme elevation difference, adding it would improve visibility of they could reduce that number. Mr. Anderson responded he would have to drop the grade similar to what he shows on the grading plan on page 7 of Exhibit A-1.

Ms. Maio questioned the amount of soil removal permitted, adding she believes there are requirements and limitations and she does not know where the water and sewer lines are. Mr. Keller stated he was not overly concerned about the water and sewer because they sit higher. Chairman Maguire asked where the soil will go. Mr. Anderson stated he does not have a quantity without knowing the actual house that will be built. The person building the home would remove the soil. Mr. Keller noted Chapter 118 of the Borough's Code deals with soil removal and indicates the permit shall be issued after approval of the application by the Borough Council. Mr. Anderson said once they know the exact amount to be removed, they would go to the Council. They do not need to apply to the County to remove it as long as it is clean soil and if not, it has to go to a waste dump. Mr. Keller noted the soil removal ordinance does not say anything about the amount of cubic yards. Mr. Keller also said that he has been the Borough's engineer for 16 years and he does not remember a soil removal application ever coming before the Council. Mr. Keller noted, this can be a condition of any approval. Chairman Maguire noted the purchaser of Lot 10.01 and purchaser of Lot 10.02 and he questioned when the soil is to be removed, being before either lot is developed or would they be developed independently. Mr. Anderson responded it would need to be done together.

Chairman Maguire opened the meeting to the public for questions or comments on this application.

Fred Romano, 121 Brooklyn Road, was sworn in. Mr. Romano stated his property is across the street and downhill from the applicant's property and he asked how the water will be addressed because he does not see any real drainage plan and he does not believe a drywell will work. He asked what kind

of solid drainage plan do they have for the property. Mr. Anderson responded these are conceptual homes and there is a process after this that the final grading, the final house and drainage would have to be approved by the Board and Borough Engineer, at which time he would consider the impact in much greater detail. Drywell is a standard solution. It does not always work, but does work very often and there are other things they can do. Mr. Anderson said they could take the roof run-off to some type of storage facility underground. Mr. Romano noted the recent 10"-12" rainfall in one day and said he is concerned about future rainfall. Mr. Anderson agreed it was a substantial rainfall; however, it has not changed the State's average 3" rainfall standard. If the standard for today for most towns does not meet your major stormwater permit to provide drywalls for 3" rainfall it may be the Board's opinion it needs something more, but he does not think there is a town in New Jersey that was prepared for last week's rainfall. Mr. Romano stated this should be addressed now for the future. Mr. Gavan said that until the State of New Jersey changes the rainfall standards, they must go by the 3" rainfall. Chairman Maguire asked if, since this is only 2 houses, they are not talking about stormwater requirements. Mr. Keller stated since it is less than an acre and less than a quarter acre of new impervious coverage and is not classified as a major development, it does not have to comply. Since they are asking for a variance, the Board must consider how they are mitigating the impact of the additional impervious coverage. They may need to provide seepage pits or some other storage facility. They will need to show there is adequate storage for the run-off due to the impervious coverage.

Ms. Maio expressed concern with the Board saying they can have two lots because they will be saying there is now two buildable lots and a developer may say the Board approved the two lots and is now putting a lot of restrictions on it that would prohibit him from building the two homes. Ms. Maio believes it is putting the Board in a bad position. Mr. Keller noted testimony that the purpose of planning out-weigh the detriment. They are not claiming hardship. If someone wants to purchase the property they can come back to the Board and ask for a modification of the approval. Mr. Gavan stated the Board can put as a reasonable condition that any building to be built, must come back to the Board for approval. Based on the variances needed for slope and impervious coverage, they can limit the house size based on the conceptual plan so if someone wanted to build a larger house, they would need to come back to the Board. A condition would also be the common driveway consistent on where it is proposed and subject to County approval.

Camille Mackey, 110 Brooklyn Road, was sworn in. Ms. Mackey noted the parking issue at the property. She recently tried to have her mailbox moved over a few feet and was told the mailman would not deliver her mail if it was moved. She questioned mail delivery for the property. Mr. Gavan said he believes the determination not to move Ms. Mackey's mailbox was based on Post Office's safety protocols. Ms. Mackey said she was told it was due to the clearance. Ms. Mackey also said it is difficult to back out one house over, and this may make it worse. Chairman Maguire noted it is a County road and the applicant will need the County's approval for the site distance. Ms. Mackey asked the timeline of demolition and building if the subdivision is approved because many people in the area work from home. Chairman Maguire said it depends on when they sell the lot. The Board does not control that. Ms. Mackey also asked if there is a limit on how tall the house can be. Chairman Maguire responded in the affirmative. Mr. Keller stated the allowable building height is 35'. Mr. Anderson stated they will conform to the requirements and will not be looking for height relief. If the purchaser of the property wants to build a taller house, they would need to come back to the Board.

John Bozek, 116 Brooklyn Road, was sworn in. Mr. Bozek asked how long excavation would be on the site. Mr. Anderson responded that is not something they can answer. They do not know who or when they will do the building. It would be part of the house construction. Mr. Bozek asked how far

off the property line it will be. Mr. Gavan responded they propose to build the house at the required setback of 15 feet.

Tanya Novak, 13 Lakeview Terrace, was sworn in. Ms. Novak stated she is a realtor and has worked in town and having lots and not knowing what will be built on them is an issue. She lives below the applicant's property and drainage is a significant issue they face. Her basement floods during rain storms. The rain water flows down her basement, through the garage and out to the middle of the street. Ms. Novak also expressed concern that the property is on a dangerous curve and there have been many accidents, so to make the property more approachable would be beneficial to the property owner.

Seeing no one further from the public wishing to speak, Chairman Maguire closed the public portion of the meeting.

Mr. Pershouse asked Mr. Keller if there will be grade changes on the property and whether there will be a retaining wall. He commented that you have property but do not know what will happen until the person who purchases the property gives Mr. Keller the plans for review. Mr. Keller responded that is correct. If someone submits a plan that does not comply, they will need to come before the Board. Mr. Keller noted one of his comments in his first review memorandum was about retaining walls. Mr. Anderson stated they are not looking for a variance for a retaining wall. If whoever purchases the property complies, they do not need to come back before the Board.

Mr. Pershouse stated they are removing a lot of soil off the property. Mr. Anderson said for a small lot there is a lot of fill. The grade at the property line will remain the same. The backyard grading shown only changes about 1 foot. Mr. Anderson noted the person who purchases the property will be required to come back before the Board for additional approvals. Mr. Pershouse asked if there are trees on the lot and if so, will they be removed. Mr. Anderson responded there is a large tree in the middle and smaller ones around the parameter that will most likely be removed which is why he said they would be disturbing everything.

Chairman Maguire expressed concern with testimony that they are matching what is in the area. They are pre-existing, non-conforming conditions and the applicant is asking, just because a neighborhood of houses was built 30 years ago on substandard lots, they would like to meet the same standards as was done that long ago. As a Board, they need to determine if, just because the house next door was built on a substandard lot 30 years ago, they should approve the request. Chairman Maguire voiced his opinion that there are too many unanswered questions. It has been said when someone purchases the property they can come back to the Board. Chairman Maguire noted the Board has control now and by approving this, they are leaving themselves open. It has been said that whoever is building on the property will have to deal with coming back before the Board and he is concerned with approving this application as presented. Ms. Maio stated she agrees with Chairman Maguire's comments. She feels it is taking a bad situation of lot sizes in the area and making it worse. She also has concern about the parking issue and egress. Mr. Pershouse said he also agrees with Chairman Maguire that there are too many unanswered questions.

Mr. Gavan asked the applicant if, based on what they heard during this hearing, they wanted to have the Board vote tonight, or if they wanted to carry the hearing and possibly reconsider their plans. Mr. Ruddy and Mr. Anderson agreed they would like to carry the hearing.



Mr. Gavan announced that this matter will be carried to the October 18, 2021 meeting without further notice.

(Ms. Zelif-Murphy returned to the dais.)

BILLS:

	<b>Bowman Consulting Group, Ltd.</b>	
08/06/21	Re: Juntos Holdings, LLC	\$375.00

On motion by Ms. Maio, seconded by Mr. Pershouse, the aforesaid bills were approved on the following unanimous roll call vote.

AFFIRMATIVE:	Mr. Bielanowski, Mr. Iftikhar, Ms. Maio, Mr. Pershouse, Mr. Torelli, Ms. Zelif-Murphy, Chairman Maguire
OPPOSED:	None
ABSTENSIONS:	None

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC FOR NON-AGENDA ITEMS:

Chairman Maguire opened the meeting to the public for non-agenda items. Seeing no one from the public wishing to speak, Chairman Maguire closed the public portion of the meeting.

DISCUSSION:

Ms. Maio asked why there is still an open escrow account for the Choquette application. The Board Secretary responded that once all departments involved with the project, including the building department, advises that their involvement in the project is complete, then any monies remaining in the escrow account are refunded to the applicant. With respect to the Choquette application, there was only one bill to date, which was for the legal notice of the Resolution of Memorialization. Mr. Gavan acknowledged that he has recently been deficient in sending his bills in a timely manner. He will take care of it and make sure his bills sent soon after services are rendered.

ADJOURNMENT:

On motion by Mr. Torelli, seconded by Ms. Zelif-Murphy, it was the consensus of the Board to adjourn the meeting at 8:35 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,



Ellen Horak, Board Secretary