

Stanhope Land Use Board
May 12, 2025
Regular Meeting Minutes

CALL MEETING TO ORDER:

Chairwoman Maio called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

Chairwoman Maio invited all those present to stand in a salute to the colors.

STATEMENT:

Adequate notice for this meeting has been provided according to the Open Public Meetings Act, Assembly Bill #1030. Notice for this Regular Meeting was forwarded to the New Jersey Herald and Daily Record on January 14, 2025, was placed on the municipal bulletin board and on the official website of the Borough of Stanhope.

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:

Najib Iftikhar - absent	John Rogalo - present
Glenn Kurtz – present	Edward Schwartz - present
Christine Lipinski - present (arrived @7:05pm)	Scott Wachterhausser - present
Thomas Pershouse – present	Paula Zelif-Murphy - present
	Rosemarie Maio - present

Others Present: Maxwell Smith, Esq. for Board Attorney Glenn Gavan, Board Engineer Eric Keller, Board Planner William Hamilton and Board Secretary Ellen Horak

MINUTES

April 14, 2025 Regular Meeting – On motion by Mr. Kurtz, seconded by Mr. Schwartz, the Minutes of the March 10, 2025 meeting were approved by unanimous voice vote.

CORRESPONDENCE:

04-22-25 Bernd Hefe, Esq. - Site Plan Application re: First Impressions Day Care, Blk 11102, Lot 10
04-22-25 Glenn Gavan - Resolution of Memorialization re: Gray Tischler Variance Application Blk 10609, Lot 1
05-07-25 William Hamilton - Housing Element and Fair Share Plan
05-07-25 Sussex County Health Department - Comments re: First Impressions Day Care, Blk 11102, Lot 10 Site Plan Application

On motion by Ms. Zelif-Murphy, seconded by Mr. Schwartz and carried by unanimous voice vote, the Correspondence List was accepted and placed on file.

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC FOR NON-AGENDA ITEMS:

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

COMPLETENESS:

25-03, First Impressions Day Care School

Block 11102, Lot 10 - Site Plan Application

Appl. Rec'd: 04/22/25

45 days: 06/06/25

Chairwoman Maio stated the Completeness Review Committee has reviewed the application and recommends it be deemed complete. On motion by Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Ms. Zeliff-Murphy and carried by the following unanimous roll call vote, 25-03 First Impressions Day Care School Site Plan Application re: Block 11102, Lot 10 was deemed complete:

AFFIRMATIVE: Mr. Kurtz, Ms. Lipinski, Mr. Pershouse, Mr. Rogalo, Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Wachterhauser, Ms. Zeliff-Murphy, Chairwoman Maio
OPPOSED: None
ABSTENSIONS: None

NEW HEARING

25-02, Cassandra Constandelis

Blk 10703, Lot 7 - Variance Application

Deemed Complete: 04/14/25

120 days: 08/12/25

Chairwoman Maio stated the applicant was unable to notice the hearing within the appropriate time and therefore, this hearing will be carried to the June 9, 2025 meeting.

25-03, First Impressions Day Care School

Block 11102, Lot 10 - Site Plan Application

Deemed Complete: 05/12/25

45 days: 06/26/25

Bernd Hefe, attorney for the applicant, came forward on behalf of the applicants, Jason and Nicolew Ventresca, owners of First Impression Day Care School located at 19 Linden Avenue. The applicants propose to add three classrooms to the existing Day Care Center. They purchased the property a couple of years ago and made major renovations to the building. Mr. Hefe noted they are seeking a d-2 variance as well as variances for impervious coverage, parking spaces and steep slopes.

Noting this is a d-2 variance, Mr. Wachterhauser as the Council representative and Mr. Schwartz as the Mayor's representative stepped down from the dais.

Jason Ventresca was sworn in. Mr. Ventresca testified that he purchased the property in October of 2022 and made major renovations to the building. Currently it has four classrooms servicing Hopatcong preschool students. They are proposing to add three classrooms beginning this fall to service Stanhope residents only. There is a contract in place with the school district and themselves. Mr. Ventresca stated they have drop off and pick up by the parents and by 3:03 pm to about 3:04 pm the street is completely empty of parents. They have an expedited drop off and pick up and they stagger class times. The hours of operation are 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. They have before and after care. There is about one classroom of students that arrive before the start time. They currently have 60 students and propose to add another 45. They have 9 staff members and there would be 6 additional staff with the addition. Mr. Ventresca noted they have parking on-site. They have 17 parking spaces, which is sufficient. The staff stands at the front door and greets the students so the parents only need to drop them off and then leave. Pick up is handled in the same manner. They currently stagger two different groups and will increase it to staggering three groups next year. Mr. Ventresca stated they have no issues with drop off and pick up at the site.

Ms. Zeliff-Murphy asked if there are any buses that go to the school. Mr. Ventresca responded that it is only the parents dropping off and picking up their children. The ages are 3 to 4 year olds for the entire school and it will remain 3 to 4 year olds with the contract for next year. Mr. Ventresca explained that it is part of a pre-school expansion grant through the State and it is for Stanhope residents to attend as a result of the State grant.

John Hansen, engineer for the applicant, was sworn in. Mr. Hansen provided his educational background and credentials to the Board. Mr. Hansen stated he has worked in this field for over 30 years, his license is in good standing and he has testified as a professional engineer numerous times. Mr. Hansen spoke of the existing conditions of the property. The property is one and a half acres located in the HVR zone. The main frontage is on Linden Avenue, but it also fronts Route 183, but has no access and will continue to have no access in the future. The grade of the property drops from Route 183 down to Linden Avenue. To the east of the building is a fenced in grassy area. There is currently a shed on the property that will be relocated and a walkway that needs to be removed. They will be removing only one tree and there is a utility pole that will also need to be removed. Mr. Hansen presented a colorized version of the Site Plan dated May 9, 2025, which was marked Exhibit A-1. Shown in light grey is the existing paved and sidewalk area. The area in dark brown shows the shape of the addition. There are two spots that are dark grey that represent pedestrian access. The building will also have access from the east side which is the rear and the west side which is the front. They are not proposing any additional parking and they will use the existing water, sewer and electric. Mr. Hansen addressed stormwater management and noted this is not a major development. Mr. Hansen stated they intend to take water from the roof and put it in the ground. They did a soil test on the site for a drywell system and the soil is good and acceptable. It is designed that the roof water will be collected through two leader drains that will discharge into the underground system. Mr. Hansen spoke about the lighting and stated there are building mounted lights on the north and south side and the light shields downward. They will continue with the same type of lighting on the addition. Mr. Hansen noted there is presently little landscaping on the site. They want to provide a foundation plan and proposed some Boxwood plantings, but they will change that as per the Board Engineer's recommendation in his report.

Mr. Pershouse questioned if the testimony was the entrance to the addition would be in the back. Mr. Hansen responded yes that is correct. There will be an entrance in the back in addition to the one in the front. Mr. Pershouse stated that on the existing building, none of the entrances are handicap accessible and the current handicap parking space is deficient, as it is on an angle that does not meet handicap standards. Mr. Pershouse stated the rear access would have to be handicap accessible. Mr. Pershouse asked if they plan on relocating the handicap parking spot. Mr. Hansen responded in the negative stating they proposed to keep the handicap space as it is. Mr. Pershouse again noted that parking space is insufficient and since they are putting in an addition, it must be addressed. Mr. Hansen stated they will look into the handicap parking space. Mr. Keller agreed with Mr. Pershouse, stating where the route is from that space, it appears that there is a lip onto the sidewalk and of the existing building, the parking spaces are about 3-½' to 4' above the first floor of the existing building. Mr. Keller said they should look at how to get access to the back of the building, which is something that is necessary. Mr. Keller noted his comment regarding the existing sanitary sewer. It comes out of the northeast corner of the building and seems to arc around and he asked what the plans are for it. Mr. Hansen said they will cut it off and disconnect the plumbing to the addition and connect it into the same unit. He does not expect that they would do any kind of excavation into the roadway unless absolutely necessary. Mr. Keller stated if they are going to make it part of the plumbing of the addition and they are going to connect the existing

building into the new one, it will fall under the purview of the construction official. Mr. Keller noted his comment #7 requesting a note be placed on the plans that the existing retaining wall and the Linden Avenue concrete sidewalk that is damaged or that is in disrepair is to be repaired and/or replaced. Mr. Hansen stated they are agreeable to the request. Mr. Keller stated the survey notes remains of a concrete wall in two places and they are proposing to only remove one and he asked their intent by the inlet. Mr. Hansen responded the inlet provides a lip and if a large storm were to occur, it will address the water. They will enclose it with fencing and plantings. Mr. Keller noted his comment #14 regarding the shed and that no walkway is being shown and he asked if a walkway is necessary. Mr. Hansen responded they do not think a walkway is needed. The intent is to try to hide the shed as much as they can and keep as much as they can away from the children's area. Mr. Keller noted, with respect to the stormwater, they have the rear area by the new walkway where there is an inlet on the bottom below the retaining wall, but there is not one on the upside and he asked about run-off going across the sidewalk. Mr. Hansen stated they will put a yard inlet in. Mr. Keller stated a yard inlet would be acceptable. With respect to Mr. Keller's comment #17, Mr. Keller asked that a note be put on the plans indicating that soil logs are to be performed and witnessed by the Borough Engineer prior to the installation of the drywells. The note should also state that the drywells may be relocated if necessary due to subsurface conditions that may be found. Mr. Hansen stated they are agreeable to the request. Mr. Keller noted the floodlights and he asked where they are located and which way they point. Mr. Hansen responded there are two on the north side and two on the south side. They want to keep the floodlights, adding they have had no impact on the neighbors. They will keep the lights on the south side and the ones on the north side will need to be removed because that is where the addition is going to be. Mr. Hansen said they do not need to put another flood light by the addition because there are other lights going on at the addition site. Mr. Keller expressed concern with no lights on the north facade because of the residences on the north side. Mr. Hansen stated they will have building mounted lights like the ones they have now that shine down and would not impact the residents. Mr. Keller noted the existing walkway that leads from the north side of the parking lot across the back of the existing building towards the shed and he asked if all of it is coming out and being replaced. Mr. Hansen responded they will keep what they can and take up what needs to be removed and reuse them. If they need more to complete the walkway, they will use the same type so the look of the walkway is consistent. Mr. Keller noted since that is the accessible route, the pavers cannot have lips. Mr. Hansen agreed. Mr. Keller noted the light fixtures and asked the color temperature of them. Mr. Hansen responded they are somewhere in the 4,000K and are a yellowish light, not a bright white light. Mr. Keller stated they prefer 3,000K. Mr. Hansen agreed to tone down the lights, adding they want them to be soft in nature. Mr. Keller noted the landscaping and asked if they would be agreeable to more plants across the front. Mr. Hansen responded in the affirmative. Mr. Keller stated the proposed Boxwood are not native and directed Mr. Hansen to some of the examples of appropriate plantings he provided in his report. Mr. Hansen was agreeable to choosing one of the plantings Mr. Keller recommended.

Mr. Rogalo asked the location of the dumpster. Mr. Ventresca responded it is located in the parking stall that is farthest to the southeast. Mr. Rogalo asked if the dumpster has a lockable lid, noting bear sightings in the area. Mr. Ventresca responded that he does not think it is, but if it becomes an issue with bears being present, he will contact Blue Diamond and get one. Mr. Ventresca stated they have garbage pick-up two times per week which will hopefully mitigate any issue with bears.

Kenneth Fox, Ledgewood, New Jersey, architect for the applicant was sworn in. Mr. Fox provided the Board with his credentials. He is the architect and professional planner for the applicant. He has testified before this Board numerous times as well as many other Boards in the area of the State and his

licenses as professional architect and planner are current. Mr. Fox testified that he submitted an existing floor plan of the building with the addition to the north side. In the center is the main entrance with stairs into the center and a long hallway that runs north and south and there are four classrooms along the Linden Avenue side. On the south side there is an entrance with a ramp to that door on the inside and on the outside the area is sloped, but there are no steps. It is not ADA fully compliant because it is too steep, but is available as a fire exit for the handicap, Mr. Fox noted that on the north side are stairs and they will be relocating the platform and stairs to put in the addition towards Linden Avenue so the exit will be out towards Linden Avenue. The addition is 59-feet across and 83-feet long. They propose three new classrooms that create an extension "t" intersection corridor that connects the new to the old. The back grade is higher than the floor and they worked with the applicant's engineer to make sure it was at an elevation that they could in fact provide an ADA ramp on the interior of the building so they would have an ADA egress on that portion of the building. They will now have ADA egress on both sides of the building that does not currently exist. Mr. Fox stated they have a two toilet lavatory constructed for each of the classrooms. The three new classrooms are designed to be over 750 square feet which is the requirement for the grant and for the classroom size First Impressions is using at that location. Mr. Fox described the existing and proposed layout. For the exterior of the building they created a flat roof (minimal pitch) to the internal leaders that connect to the stormwater system. They are providing a cornice across the top and a brick exterior. Mr. Fox noted they will try to match as closely as possible to what currently exists. The proposed construction will be no higher than what currently exists. They are not exasperating the height and do not need a height variance for the addition. The windows on the addition will be similar to what exists. Mr. Fox outlined the variances they are seeking: "d-2" for expansion of a non-conforming use for the daycare center where the ordinance permits public schools, but does not call out private use. Mr. Fox noted they must meet the positive and negative criteria and special reasons can be made. Mr. Fox stated the only non-conforming aspect of the application is the fact that the ordinance lists only public schools as permitted and does not mention private schools. Mr. Fox noted this site is suited for a daycare school and has been used as the same for the last couple of years. The building has been used as a public school for the Borough for many years. Mr. Fox stated there is no detriment to the public good or the zone. They are far enough away and do not need setback variances to any of the neighboring properties. Mr. Fox stated they did their best to make sure there was no impact to the neighbors. The zone was intended to allow for school children. The "c" variances needed are for impervious coverage, the number of parking spaces, steep slopes, and for a non-conforming setback regarding the front yard which is currently existing and not a new variance. The existing shed from grade to peak is approximately 11-½' and 8' is allowed. A "c-1" variance permits the unique characteristics of the project allows it to be a hardship for the property. The property is suited as a school. The parking need is 9 spaces utilized with six new required for the employees being hired. The 15 parking spaces will be able to fit at the site and leave one to two parking spaces available for i.e. maintenance person or special teacher who may show up. There is no parking issue. Mr. Fox noted there is no negative impact because of the parking on the property. There is also street parking on one side of the street. They intend to keep their parking all on their site, but there is still street parking available. Mr. Fox stated when they put together this application with the existing survey, they took the survey data in the area that was needed for construction so when the engineer went and took his calculation at the site, they could not give the percentage of the slope. Mr. Fox said, on the north side of the building, the land goes up a couple of feet to the wall in the front, then slopes up as you go along the north side of the building, then there is a quick incline and goes up to the back. They are impacting that steep slope area, but it is very de minimis. The entire area they are disturbing has already been disturbed. Mr. Fox noted none of this is virgin steep slopes. They are not changing the grade of the outside other than to put in the addition. There is no negative impact in relation to the steep slopes.

Mr. Fox stated they need a variance for impervious coverage in order to build the addition. There is a hardship with what is already developed on the site. There is no negative impact because of the same stormwater system that is developed to take care of the run-off from the new construction.

Mr. Pershouse stated Mr. Fox said they have an accessible exit, but did not go into the fact that they need an accessible entrance into the building from the parking lot. Mr. Fox responded that the only two places they have the ability to create accessibility is on the south end of the building, existing, and the new construction. The addition is handicap accessible. Mr. Pershouse questioned if it is accessible from the route from the parking lot. Mr. Fox noted as testified to earlier, the handicap parking spaces are on the south side of the building. Mr. Pershouse stated the present parking spaces do not meet the handicap requirements. Mr. Fox noted they are pre-existing and they are not proposing to expand the parking lot. Mr. Hefeled stated that they are subject to the requirements and they will be required to meet the handicap accessibility regulations. They are agreeable with a condition in the resolution of approval that they need to address handicap accessibility in accordance with the law. Mr. Fox stated, they could relocate the handicap spaces to the northeast end of the parking lot where they are up the hill where it levels off. They are already rebuilding at least half of the walkway and they can rebuild all or as much of that route from the parking spaces over to the entrance as needed to make it handicap accessible according to the regulations. Mr. Pershouse said that under the new regulations, the sidewalks have to be wider to accommodate a motorized wheelchair. Mr. Keller questioned if the change would change the amount of impervious coverage. Mr. Hansen responded that if they are going to meet the width requirements for ADA compliance, they would need some flexibility in the Resolution to allow for the impervious coverage to accommodate what they need for ADA. Mr. Keller noted they are currently asking for 32.3% impervious coverage which is 2.3% over what is permitted or 1,514 square feet over. Mr. Hefeled suggested that for the Resolution they should have that variance plus whatever is required in order to address the ADA requirements. Mr. Keller noted that the Board has to grant a specific number for impervious coverage. Mr. Hansen stated he believes they would need another 1,000 square feet of impervious coverage. Mr. Keller suggested making it an even 34% total impervious coverage which is 4% over what is allowed and if they do not need it, they will not use it. Mr. Hansen agreed. Mr. Keller noted the drywell system that is proposed more than offsets the 4% increase in impervious coverage. Mr. Hansen responded that the drywell system is designed for the increase from the roof area, adding that the roof is 3,895 square feet. Mr. Keller stated 4% of impervious coverage for this lot is 2,632 square feet.

Mr. Rogalo noted the windows on the addition that from the outside are very close to grade and he asked if there are any requirements that they be safety glass especially since there will be children in the area. Mr. Pershouse responded that if it is below 18" of the floor in the building they are required to be safety glass, but there is no requirement for outside of the building. Mr. Fox said they will look at the elevation and check if the windows should be safety glass.

Ms. Zeliff-Murphy questioned how long the building has been a school. Mr. Hefeled responded that the use as a school pre-dates the Borough's zoning ordinance.

Mr. Keller noted Mr. Hansen mentioned that the shed is about 11-1/2' high and he asked him to talk about the variance needed for that because the size meets the requirements, but the height does not. It has to be 15% of the lot's width which means it needs to be 44.33' off the property line and they are only 11'. Mr. Fox responded that, as testified before, the main reason is because that would be getting into the play area for the children and they felt, with the children running back and forth, it would be in a dangerous location. For safety reasons, they felt it best to keep the shed as far to the north as possible.

Mr. Keller stated the plans currently show it as 11' so there would be a variance needed for an 11-foot setback for the shed where 44.33' is required.

Chairwoman Maio opened the meeting to the public for comments or questions on this hearing. Seeing no one from the public wishing to speak, Chairwoman Maio closed the public portion of the meeting.

On motion by Mr. Pershouse, seconded by Mr. Rogalo and carried by the following unanimous roll call vote, the Board approved the variances requested, being a variance for the parking spaces, a variance for impervious coverage of 34% versus 30% permitted, a variance for steep slope disturbance as impacted by this addition only, a variance for an 11' setback for the accessory structure (the shed) and the "d-2" variance:

AFFIRMATIVE: Mr. Kurtz, Ms. Lipinski, Mr. Pershouse, Mr. Rogalo, Ms. Zelif-Murphy,
Chairwoman Maio

OPPOSED: None

ABSTENSIONS: None

(Mr. Schwartz and Mr. Wachterhauser were not eligible to vote.)

Mr. Schwartz and Mr. Wachterhauser returned to the dais.

RESOLUTION OF MEMORIALIZATION:

25-01, Gray Tischler

Blk 10609, Lot 6 - Variance Application

Approval Granted: 04/14/25

On motion by Mr. Schwartz, seconded by Ms. Zelif-Murphy and carried by the following majority roll call vote, the Resolution of Memorialization granting the Variance, filed by Gray Tischler for Block 10609, Lot 6 was adopted:

AFFIRMATIVE: Mr. Kurtz, Ms. Lipinski, Mr. Rogalo, Mr. Schwartz, Mr.
Wachterhauser, Ms. Zelif-Murphy, Chairwoman Maio

OPPOSED: None

ABSTENSIONS: Mr. Pershouse

BILLS:

Bowman Consulting Group Ltd.

04/28/25	Re: First Impressions School	\$708.75
04/28/25	Re: Gray Tischler Variance	\$472.51

On motion by Ms. Lipinski, seconded by Mr. Kurtz the aforesaid bills were unanimously approved by the following roll call vote:

AFFIRMATIVE: Mr. Kurtz, Ms. Lipinski, Mr. Pershouse, Mr. Rogalo, Mr. Schwartz, Mr.
Wachterhauser, Ms. Zelif-Murphy, Chairwoman Maio

OPPOSED: None

ABSTENSIONS: None

OLD BUSINESS

Housing Element and Fair Share Plan - Board Planner William Hamilton came forward to speak about how to address the housing requirements for the Borough of 101 affordable units. He was directed by the Board to look at areas for proposed rezoning to possibly accommodate affordable housing. Mr. Hamilton stated he looked at 12 different areas in the Borough and his proposal allows for a total of 114 affordable units to be provided within those 12 areas. Mr. Hamilton provided a summary of the areas. Area 1 is the NC zoned area on the west side of Route 206 which is about 3-½ acres. If this area were to be rezoned for Highway Commercial Residential, you would be looking at a mixed use zone. There would be commercial on the first floor and residential on the second floor. You would have about six dwelling units per acre. Second floor units are currently not permitted in the Highway Commercial Zone. Area 2 is the PIC zoned area across Route 206 (Black Forest area) as well as a number of lots north of the Black Forest. Mr. Hamilton stated they propose that area be rezoned for HCR Zone which is 15 units per acre and does not have a commercial component. Mr. Pershouse noted that those lots are occupied by residents. Mr. Hamilton said he is aware of that and they would stay as is, but the rezoning would permit something possibly in the future. Area 3, Zoned HC, is on the north side of Route 183 below Stonegate Village and Area 4, zoned HC, is on the north side of Route 183 east of Dell Road. They propose that area be rezoned an overlay zone which could be 15 units per acre. There is some land on the north side of Route 183 which could have the Highway Commercial Residential Zone with residential use on the second floor. Mr. Hamilton noted they would only get about 6 units per acre and to 200' from Route 183. Area 5 is the south side of Route 183 which is wider than the north side. In Area 6 there is an area at the intersection of Main Street and the south side of Route 183, owned by the Borough, to possibly consider. It has slopes and is questionable if it is buildable, but is an area that could be rezoned. There is a home on the lot adjacent to the town's lot. Area 7 is the area at High Street zoned Village Business and is currently the Stanhope House. There was a redevelopment plan for 51 units that the Council decided not to move forward with. Mr. Hamilton stated it might be appropriate to reconsider that site. The building that had been proposed was too large, but if you took off one story of the building they proposed, it may make sense. Mr. Hamilton noted you could get about 35 units on that site. Area 8 is the site on Sparta Road that the town has rezoned High Density Residential Zone. The concept for the project is 205 units which has 41 affordable units proposed. Mr. Hamilton said there may be the ability to look at the plan and increase the number slightly on the plan. Mr. Hamilton said Area 9 is an area he would rather avoid if he could. It is the area west of Valley Road School. The DCA identified that as vacant land and it is within the sewer service area. Mr. Hamilton noted a possible small lot single home would be appropriate. Area 10 an area identified by the DCA which are vacant lots. At the end of Baker Street near Highland Avenue there is one lot to the west that is privately owned and the town owns the lot to the east which is in the sewer service area. Mr. Hamilton said he does not think it is appropriate for multi-family housing, but it may possibly be appropriate for a Habitat for Humanity housing with small units on the lots. Area 11 is the area on the north side of Smith Street and is another area identified by the DCA as a vacant lot. Mr. Hamilton said it is somewhat isolated and he does not recommend they use the lot. Area 12 is the area at the end of Smith Street adjacent to the DPW that should be looked at for identifying about 15 affordable housing units. Mr. Hamilton said that looking at the 12 areas, there is the potential for 114 affordable housing units and the Borough needs 101 affordable housing units so there are a couple of areas they could eliminate and a few they could expand the acreage. Mr. Hamilton said he would revise the land use plan and submit it to the governing body for their review and then the Board would adopt the plan at their June meeting. The plan must be submitted to the Court by June 27, 2025 and they have about one year to come up with new ordinances to reflect the zones shown on the revised plan. The Board discussed Mr. Hamilton's proposal. Mr.

Keller said, if there are areas the Board does not think are appropriate, they could push the density up along Route 186 and Route 206. The traffic will not create an issue. Mr. Keller noted the town has a river and lake with a 150-foot riparian buffer zone. Chairwoman Maio noted there are spotty lots behind the school that are not wetlands; however, there are wetlands around those areas. Mr. Hamilton asked for direction from the Board. The Board asked Mr. Hamilton to prepare the formal plan to be submitted to Council and the Board. Chairwoman Maio thanked Mr. Hamilton for his work on the plan.

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC FOR NON-AGENDA ITEMS:

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

ADJOURNMENT:

On motion by Mr. Rogalo, seconded by Ms. Zeliff-Murphy, and carried by unanimous voice vote, it was the consensus of the Board to adjourn the meeting at 8:55 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,



Ellen Horak
Board Secretary