

CALL TO ORDER: Chairman Shivas called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

OATH OF OFFICE: Jeanine Colligan was sworn in as a new Board member.

ROLL CALL: Messrs. Proctor, McElroy, Morytko, Serrilli, Smith, Walsh, Chairman Shivas, Ms. Colligan
Members Absent: Ms. Raffay, Mayor Rubenstein

Also Present: Engineer Cory Stoner, Attorney Alyse Hubbard; Planner Paul Gleitz, Secretary Caitlin Phillips

OPENING STATEMENT: Adequate notice of this meeting has been published specifying the time and place in compliance with the provisions of the Open Public Meetings Act.

FLAG SALUTE: led by Chairman Shivas

MINUTES: September 5, 2024. Mr. Proctor motioned to approve the minutes, seconded by Mr. McElroy.

Ayes: Messrs. Proctor, McElroy, Morytko, Serrilli, Smith, Walsh, Chairman Shivas

Abstaining: Mr. Walsh, Ms. Colligan

Absent: Ms. Raffay, Mayor Rubenstein

None opposed. Motion carried.

RESOLUTIONS

Z13-2024 Shawn Steffens, 99 Lake Drive, Block 249 Lot 89.02, R5 Zone

Application for second story addition and garage addition

Mr. Walsh motioned to approve the resolution, seconded by Mr. McElroy.

Ayes: Messrs. McElroy, Smith, Walsh, Chairman Shivas

Abstaining: Messrs. Proctor, Morytko, Serrilli, Ms. Colligan

Absent: Ms. Raffay, Mayor Rubenstein

None opposed. Motion carried.

SP8-2024 North Shore Water Association, 28 Allamuchy Trail, Block 148 Lot 168, R5 Zone

Application for new sanitary system for PFAS treatment, including lot subdivision and preliminary and final site plan

Mr. Walsh motioned to approve the resolution, seconded by Mr. McElroy.

Ayes: Messrs. McElroy, Smith, Walsh, Chairman Shivas

Abstaining: Messrs. Proctor, Morytko, Serrilli, Ms. Colligan

Absent: Ms. Raffay, Mayor Rubenstein

None opposed. Motion carried.

SP6-2024 Highland Avenue Properties, Block 212 Lot 1, NC Zone

Application for proposed use of a landscape and irrigation contractor business

Mr. Proctor motioned to approve the resolution, seconded by Mr. Morytko.

Ayes: Messrs. Proctor, McElroy, Morytko, Serrilli, Smith, Chairman Shivas

Abstaining: Mr. Walsh

Absent: Ms. Raffay, Mayor Rubenstein

None opposed. Motion carried.

Z12-2023 Daven Baez, 201 Lake Drive, Block 255 Lot 184-186, R5 Zone

Extension of approval for an above-ground pool, deck, and existing shed

Mr. Morytko motioned to approve the resolution, seconded by Mr. Walsh.

Ayes: Messrs. McElroy, Morytko, Serrilli, Smith, Walsh, Chairman Shivas

Abstaining: Mr. Proctor, Ms. Colligan

Absent: Ms. Raffay, Mayor Rubenstein
None opposed. Motion carried.

OLD BUSINESS

Z08-2024 Diane and William Carkhuff, 82 South Shore Road, Block 189 Lot 1, R-5 Zone

Application for construction of a new single-family dwelling

Mr. McElroy motioned to carry the application to 11/07, seconded by Mr. Walsh.

Ayes: Messrs. Proctor, McElroy, Morytko, Serrilli, Smith, Walsh, Chairman Shivas, Ms. Colligan

Absent: Ms. Raffay, Mayor Rubenstein

None opposed. Motion carried.

Z14-2024 Rupesh Patel (Kyosis LLC), 1 Catalina Drive, Block 337 Lot 9.14, R2 Zone

Application for new home construction

Mr. Proctor motioned to carry the application to 10/17, seconded by Mr. Serrilli.

Ayes: Messrs. Proctor, McElroy, Morytko, Serrilli, Smith, Walsh, Chairman Shivas, Ms. Colligan

Absent: Ms. Raffay, Mayor Rubenstein

None opposed. Motion carried.

Z01-2024 Tom Chamberlin, 2 Briar Lane, Block 365.02 Lot 1, R-3 Zone

Application for driveway expansion for a second driveway

Mr. Chamberlin remains under oath. The drawings have been updated per the suggested change in parking path of the Chairman at the last hearing. He will put rocks in front of the existing path. Chairman Shivas asked about landscaping. Mr. Chamberlin said the utilities are in that area, so he doesn't want to dig in that area. Chairman Shivas noted they need to block that area so that it can't be used again. Mr. Walsh confirmed he will use boulders. Chairman Shivas confirmed Mr. Chamberlin would rather the driveway access be grass; there should be a line of some kind so there is a route, to avoid making the area dirt. Mr. Chamberlin said when it's all grass, there will be no issues with tire marks. Chairman Shivas noted there may be issues when it rains. Mr. Chamberlin said they'd move the trailers before that. He noted putting stones down would be an eyesore for the neighbors and him. They don't use the trailers often, so there's no reason for a stone driveway. Mr. Stoner said the code says a driveway should have a stone base. This started with the area being worn down from a lot of movement. If it's not gravel, a variance is needed. Mr. Chamberlin noted if something happens with the grass he will take care of it. He let it go because he was doing the wall, and now he will have the lawn redone. Chairman Shivas doesn't want the whole side of the yard to be a driveway. Everyone will back up a trailer differently, so it needs to be outlined on a certain path. Mr. Chamberlin said there's a wooded area that acts as a path. Mr. Gleitz confirmed they're looking for a delineation of the grass area. He mentioned a product that has a reflective strip—if the applicant puts a few of them along the way, it will show the route. Mr. Walsh asked if this could be done through landscaping. Mr. Stoner said Mr. Chamberlin has a wall on the left and a line of trees and landscaping on the other. Mr. Morytko said if the zoning officer goes on site, he'd like to make sure they know what's approved. Mr. Stoner said the plan can be updated to show the trees and blockage near the entrance. The tree line and shrubs should remain and should be shown on the plan. Mr. Chamberlin said the utility companies are constantly in that area. Mr. Stoner noted there should be a delineation so this doesn't become another driveway in the future. Mr. Smith noted boulders can move and trees can be cut down, but if there is a delineation on the plan, it shows an approved path.

Mr. Morytko asked about the other paved area, and confirmed it's not a driveway because it doesn't have its own opening. Mr. Stoner noted that area is for the recreational cars. Mr. Walsh confirmed the slope of that area doesn't allow for parking vehicles. Mr. Stoner noted it is gravel and should not be enlarged. Mr. Walsh noted his concern for having another owner think this area is a driveway. Mr. Gleitz asked about

the recreational vehicles and their connection with the Motor Vehicle Commission. It could be stated that area can't be used for motor vehicles per the MVC, only for off-road recreational vehicles.

Chairman Shivas opened to the public. Jack Moran remains under oath from the last hearing. He asked if the trailer parking area will have screening. Mr. Chamberlin said the trailers have been there—it will be the same as it was. Mr. Moran confirmed he won't be moving the recreational vehicles along the wooded trail area. Chairman Shivas closed to the public.

Mr. Stoner said the driveway should not be dirt. Mr. Chamberlin said it will kept up. Mr. Stoner reviewed the variances. Mr. McElroy asked about the accessory buildings and confirmed it's not a variance. The Board discussed the square footage for the structures. Mr. Morytko noted conditions including landscaping or hardscaping to close the gap, marking the driveway, and having the survey delineated. Mr. Gleitz noted prohibiting motor vehicles in the paved area. Ms. Hubbard noted if any structures are less than 6 feet apart then they would be moved. Mr. Walsh motioned to approve the application with the discussed conditions and variances, seconded by Mr. Morytko.

Ayes: Messrs. Proctor, Morytko, Serrilli, Smith, Walsh, Chairman Shivas

Abstaining: Mr. McElroy, Ms. Colligan

Absent: Ms. Raffay, Mayor Rubenstein

Motion carried. Ms. Hubbard discussed the appeal period. Mr. Stoner said he should make sure zoning permits are obtained for the structures.

NEW BUSINESS

SP1-2024 Byram Waterloo LLC (Starbucks of Byram), 33 Route 206, Block 36 Lot 40, VB Zone

Application for pylon sign, related to site improvements

Steve Polhamus represented the applicant. He submitted **Exhibit A1**, a packet detailing photos and historical information regarding the sign. Mr. Polhamus noted they're looking for a certificate of nonconformity to prove the sign has been on site prior to the current sign ordinance. From the records it looks like the sign has been there since the late 1970s, and is there today. He reviewed item 1 in the packet, of images of the sign, along with item 2, a site plan from 1993. There have since been other approvals, along with some re-branding for the businesses on site. Mr. Gleitz asked if variances were needed in 1993 for the sign. Mr. Polhamus said a variance wasn't granted for the sign then, but it was there around the time of the approval. He reviewed item 7, a 2008 approval including road widening. The waiver of site plan application was to have the sign moved to accommodate the road. There are a series of letters proving the sign location. Ms. Hubbard confirmed the zoning ordinance changed in 2015. Mr. Polhamus noted they are also here for a variance for the use of the wording "drive through," as a content variance. Chairman Shivas said he's been on the Board more than 40 years and that sign has been there. Mr. Morytko said there seems to be differences in the size of the sign. Mr. Polhamus believes there was an engineering error in the documents. The current dimensions are in item 14 of the exhibit. Mr. McElroy confirmed the sign hasn't changed since 2008 based on the evidence. Mr. Walsh noted regardless of the inconsistencies of the sizes in the documents, the sign is there today and that's what they're reviewing. Mr. Proctor doesn't have an issue with the sign, but found an item in the code from 2018 about non-conforming signs. Mr. Walsh said the sign has not been modified since then; Mr. McElroy confirmed they don't plan to modify it. He confirmed the illumination will be the same. Mr. Polhamus noted the technology has changed since the past approval but they will make it consistent. Mr. McElroy asked if the votes are separate for the nonconformity and the content. Ms. Hubbard said they can vote on the application itself or separately.

Michael Pessolano was sworn in as a professional planner at 140 Elmwood Avenue in Pagoda NJ. He has worked in Bridgewater, Raritan, Flemington, Lafayette, and Jefferson; his license is in good standing and

he was deemed an expert. He noted the sign has always been an accessory structure. He submitted **Exhibit A2**, aerial photos of the site from April. He noted other signs in the area also say “Drive Through,” so there is no negative impact. They’re proposing the logo and these words, which are two elements of content where three are allowed. Having clear signage will help drivers navigate more safely. Mr. Morytko asked if they considered the size, as it is much larger than their standards, as is the wording of “Drive Through.” Mr. Polhamus said the sign has been there for over 40 years, and they think there is a value in it having existed. The design is similar to the Dunkin’ Donuts nearby. They are following the design from the Starbucks standards. They determined the siren logo is recognizable rather than wording. Mr. Smith noted in other signs nearby, the “Drive Through” is smaller, and secondary to the name of the business. If you don’t know what Starbucks is, it can be confusing—they’re counting on people recognizing their branding. Mr. Morytko noted this is in the center of town; he wants to hear why this has equal value for the company name. Mr. Polhamus said this design is from the Starbucks national office, so any information he provides would be speculation. Mr. Morytko noted no one from Starbucks is here to elaborate. This is about aesthetics and functionality, and what the ordinance says. Chairman Shivas noted if the wording was smaller it wouldn’t look as good because it balances the sign the way that it’s proposed. Mr. McElroy said the applicant is constrained by the sign that they have. Ms. Hubbard said they could have a conforming sign. Mr. McElroy said the way other Starbucks signs are, the logo is separate; they’re trying to do their marketing without needing additional variances. Mr. Morytko said the restrictions are self-imposed—they decided to use this sign rather than put in a conforming sign. Chairman Shivas confirmed this a double-sided sign. Mr. Walsh noted if they’re okay with the dimensions, he’s okay deferring to Starbucks to determine if this is a functional and pleasing sign to their customer base. Mr. Morytko noted marketing objectives are different than design standards. Mr. McElroy said the township tries to help businesses market their businesses to be successful. There is a community benefit to allowing, within reason, businesses to market themselves. Mr. Proctor noted the sign is pretty simple, with minimal colors and elements.

Chairman Shivas opened to the public. Patricia Moschella was sworn in. She looked at Starbucks signs and this doesn’t seem out of the ordinary. The issue is that as the signs change, you may run into problems with businesses trying to present themselves as a Starbucks. She doesn’t have a problem with the sign. Chairman Shivas closed to the public.

Mr. McElroy motioned to approve the certificate of nonconformity and variance for the sign as submitted, seconded by Mr. Walsh.

Ayes: Messrs. Proctor, McElroy, Morytko, Serrilli, Smith, Walsh, Chairman Shivas, Ms. Colligan

Absent: Ms. Raffay, Mayor Rubenstein

Motion carried.

SP9-2024 Byram Auto, 242 US 206 North, Block 219 Lot 10, NC Zone

Application for certification of pre-existing non-conforming use

Robert LaRusso was sworn in as the applicant. He has been the owner since 1986; he is planning to sell the property. It’s been an auto-repair shop since 1947, and was a gas station for a time in between him buying it. Ms. Hubbard noted he has to prove the use existed and was permitted before the zone change. She confirmed that Mr. LaRusso is the sole owner of the LLC and the property; Mr. Gleitz confirmed he doesn’t need an attorney present. Mr. LaRusso submitted **Exhibit A1**, construction permits including a pylon sign. He confirmed the sign in the permit is what’s existing today, and has been there since 2003. The site plan in 1997 was for the original sign, for a 6’ fence behind the shop, and landscaping. Chairman Shivas noted this was also for parking vehicles overnight. Mr. Stoner noted there is a history of the site being used as a repair shop or gas station. The site is not being used according to the 1997 plan, but the application is not for this discussion. Ms. Hubbard said it would be good to have the site plan approved

while here since he's planning to sell the property. Ms. Hubbard confirmed he is also the owner of Byram Holdings. Mr. Stoner said there is a sign that hangs below the one he received approval for. Mr. LaRusso said it reads "I accept most extended warranties." Mr. Stoner noted the sign can be removed to be in conformance. Ms. Hubbard asked about the parking. Mr. LaRusso said there was never parking in the back. He came for a fence variance, and he can't park cars behind there; there is also grass. Mr. Walsh noted the issue is that the site plan was proposed by the applicant and was approved, but they weren't done. Mr. Gleitz said the resolution should explain the history of the site in the approval. Mr. Proctor confirmed the request is for continuing the use of an auto repair shop

Chairman Shivas opened to the public. Douglas Krentz was sworn in at 151 Black River Road in Long Valley; he is Mr. LaRusso's real estate agent. He asked if Mr. LaRusso striped the area and took the sign down if that makes him conforming. Mr. Stoner noted it states outdoor storage. Mr. LaRusso said there is a community well on the other side of the property; a neighbor said he was concerned that if cars were parked there gas would get into the well, so he put up the fence. Mr. Krentz said he's hoping to avoid Mr. LaRusso needing a site plan. Ms. Hubbard said if he does what's on the plan to the site then it's okay, but if he doesn't bring the site into conformance he needs a site plan. Mr. Serrilli asked if he can sell the property without the approval. Mr. Stoner noted a buyer will look into the status of the site and see that it's not in conformance. Mr. Smith noted a future buyer may want to update the site in their own way. If the applicant remains the owner he may run into an enforcement issue. A new buyer may request this work be done before they purchase it, or want to do their own plan. The Board is not involved other than making him aware. Mr. McElroy said the resolution should say the applicant was advised of this, to that people don't assume the Board was okay with the site as it is today. They should state the Board recognizes the site is non-conforming. Chairman Shivas closed to the public.

Mr. Walsh motioned to approve the certification of nonconforming use as an auto-repair facility, with the acknowledgement that the current operation does not comply with the previously approved site plan from 1993, seconded by Mr. Morytko.

Chairman Shivas opened to the public. Anthony LaRusso was sworn in. He noted they should be specific to what regard the site is not compliant. It's a red flag to a buyer and isn't fair to the applicant. Mr. Gleitz said it shouldn't be dispositive since they didn't do a formal review. Mr. Walsh said this application is not about the site. It should be a notification to buyers, who would do their due diligence. It's not appropriate to be specific because there could be more things they find in a formal review.

Mr. Walsh reiterated his motioned to approve the certification of nonconforming use as an auto-repair facility, with the acknowledgement that the site is not conforming to the approved site plan. Ms. Hubbard said they can state the Board takes no position, since the Board hasn't reviewed the site plan. Mr. Walsh amended his motion to state this, seconded by Mr. Morytko.

Ayes: Messrs. Proctor, McElroy, Morytko, Serrilli, Smith, Walsh, Chairman Shivas, Ms. Colligan

Absent: Ms. Raffay, Mayor Rubenstein

Motion carried. Ms. Hubbard explained the appeal period.

Z31-2024 Kathy Dobrich, 560 East Shore Trail, Block 293 Lot 5, R3 Zone

Application for accessory structures, addition to a single family home, and disturbance of critical areas

Kathy and Dan Dobrich were sworn in. Mr. Dobrich said they already removed the honeycomb structure for firewood storage. They had a violation notice for mucking the pond and disturbing the soil. They had DEP site visits and a soil inspector. There are two accessory structures on the property, one being a kiln to dry wood. They are removing the kitchen addition from the plan. The other accessory structure is a shed, and another honeycomb shelf. Ms. Dobrich said Lake Mohawk said this needed to be removed. Mr.

Dobrich said they had site visits with the DEP and that was all taken care of. Ms. Hubbard said they had to dredge the pond. Mr. Dobrich said the DEP gave them a permit, and said the only issue was not calling them first. The wood storage that was honeycomb shaped was removed. The existing structure is the kiln, which has plexiglass. Mr. Stoner reviewed his report and the variances. Chairman Shivas explained how to find the front yard, noting that the structures are in the front yard. Mr. Dobrich noted they then have four acres of front yard. He added that he owns the neighboring property.

Mr. Dobrich said they put the structure there to allow for the sun to come in. Ms. Dobrich said the more it's moved in, the more it's visible because the road goes up. Mr. Dobrich said the Lake Mohawk Club said to put bushes around it. Mr. Serrilli said it's very visible from the road. If they move it in, it gets moved down. He likes the wood storage. Mr. Dobrich noted the Board is a government agency and he had to go to a private club for an approval. Ms. Hubbard noted they bought the home in the Lake Mohawk community. Chairman Shivas said when the town was built there was a reservation, and that's what the Lake Mohawk area is, and it's mentioned in the deed. So even if the Board is okay with the work, the Lake Mohawk group also needs to approve it. Ms. Hubbard noted the Board doesn't have jurisdiction to remove that requirement.

Mr. McElroy asked the purpose of the kiln. Mr. Dobrich said the home is old, and they were proposing a kitchen addition. They were going to make their own panels and beams, which need to dry. Now, they are using it for firewood. Mr. McElroy asked now that the firewood storage is removed, where is it placed. Mr. Dobrich said it's covered on the side. Mr. McElroy asked if it's used for the home, why is it so far from the home? He asked if they have plans to sell the wood or have a commercial aspect. Mr. Dobrich said they wanted to but were told it's not allowed. When they bought the property it was neglected, so they did the maintenance themselves. Mr. McElroy confirmed they have no plans for selling the wood. Chairman Shivas asked about the Lake Mohawk determination. Mr. Dobrich said they want it moved 10 feet if possible, whatever the Board says, and they want it covered with bushes. Chairman Shivas said the bushes can't be too high, otherwise they can't dry anything. Mr. Stoner asked if the determination from Lake Mohawk was in writing. Mr. Dobrich said there's meeting minutes. Mr. Smith asked if there is another spot for this structure on the property. Mr. Dobrich said he could go anywhere, but if it's in the middle of the lawn it would look bad. He wants to keep it on that end because of the woods. Mr. Smith confirmed it's not hard to move. Mr. Dobrich said they like that spot because it's the most hidden while also getting sun. Mr. Serrilli said he goes down that road and can see it from there. It sticks up through the trees. Mr. Smith said it has to be moved out of the right-of-way and be screened. Chairman Shivas suggested moving it back and in 10 feet. Mr. Morytko noted other applicants with smaller properties ask for similar items and the Board asks them to do more than that. Chairman Shivas said there are trees around the property. Mr. Gleitz noted they'd want to maintain the southern exposure for the sun. He suggested an alternate location. Ms. Dobrich noted there is a pool nearby and they'd be able to see the structure from there. Mr. Stoner noted the pool is not close to that area. Mr. McElroy said he doesn't see anything about the lot that makes it a hardship for having it in the front yard. Ms. Dobrich said the back yard is stone. Mr. Smith asked about the elevation in the front yard, confirming the road is the high point. Mr. Dobrich said the structure is not finished—he plans to put siding on it, but stopped because of the violation. The siding will be natural wood planks; Mr. Serrilli confirmed they mean like a live-edge design. Mr. Proctor said looking at the photos, it doesn't look that bad, and because of the slope, if it's moved back, you see more of it. Mr. Morytko said they should move it way further back because they have a lot of room. Mr. Smith noted the applicant needs to propose something. Chairman Shivas suggested along the road planting tall bushes. Mr. Stoner noted they need to meet the Club's requirements as well. Chairman Shivas suggested moving it more than 10 feet, because they need to make sure the minimum is met. Mr. Gleitz noted its current spot is the furthest from the applicant's home and closest to the road. Ms. Dobrich said this was the best access to dry the wood. Mr. Dobrich said the

Page 6

neighbors aren't impacted. Chairman Shivas said there's no one here to complain about this. They have three acres of front yard, so anywhere in the front yard would need to come to the Board. Mr. Dobrich said he can go 15 feet back and 10 feet in.

Chairman Shivas opened to the public. Robert Moschella was sworn in. He noted a previous applicant was allowed multiple accessory structures and driveways, and this applicant wants one shed on a large property. Mr. Stoner said the site is different and it goes by the code. Mr. Dobrich asked about changing the zoning. Mr. McElroy said the zoning board doesn't decide the code—the Council decides the ordinances; people then make applications to the Board when there are variations from that, and the Board analyzes whether or not to allow that, but the Board doesn't make the laws. Mr. Stoner reviewed the variances. He noted their violations and which ones have been addressed. The resolution should note that a variance would have been required for steep slope disturbance, but it was resolved with the DEP.

Mr. McElroy motioned to approve the application with the conditions discussed, including it's approved by Lake Mohawk, there is no commercial use for the firewood; Chairman Shivas added that the shed should be finished with siding, and bushes should be added. Mr. Smith said it should comply with the side yard setback and be a minimum 30 feet from the right-of-way. Mr. Stoner recommended a minimum of 30 feet or what is required by Lake Mohawk. Mr. Walsh noted whichever is great. The motion was seconded by Mr. Walsh.

Ayes: Messrs. Proctor, McElroy, Serrilli, Smith, Walsh, Chairman Shivas, Ms. Colligan

Nays: Mr. Morytko

Absent: Ms. Raffay, Mayor Rubenstein

Motion carried. Ms. Hubbard explained the appeal period. Mr. Stoner reminded them to apply for zoning permits.

DISCUSSION ITEM: Basic Accessory Structures / AC Condenser Units

Mr. Gleitz explained his memo. There have been issues with people looking to have AC units and needing to come to the Board. They're looking to make it easier for people to add AC units, with three options laid out in the memo. Mr. Smith said this sounds great when replacing something that's already there, but wants to maintain control when it's something new being added. He doesn't want people to put an air conditioner anywhere. Ms. Phillips noted AC units usually need to be close to a house by default. Mr. McElroy said he doesn't remember denying an application for this, and doesn't want to have other people need to come in for this. It's a hardship to have residents come in here because they're trying to anticipate an issue. Mr. Walsh noted his concern about having to consider other items not limited to AC units. Mr. Stoner noted Mr. Gleitz's suggested screening it in the front yard. Chairman Shivas noted an issue with a resident where it was in the rear yard and additional permits were needed. He noted the air conditioner is part of the house, and doesn't have an issue with the unit being in the front yard. Mr. Gleitz noted this is about items that service the building. Mr. McElroy asked the professionals what other towns do. Mr. Stoner said they don't let them in the front yard. Ms. Hubbard doesn't know another town that has a basic accessory definition. Mr. Serrilli noted if you put an AC unit in an inconvenient spot away from things, it reduces the system's efficiency. Some older houses make it hard to find a spot to fit them.. Ms. Phillips noted a lot of places in town have more than one front yard, so it's hard to find a place that meets the code. Mr. Smith noted if they're making exemptions for one thing, they should consider other items. Mr. Proctor noted to consider lot lines where properties are close together, as well as considering how many zoning permits are filed for AC units. They'd like to see it as an extension of the house. Mr. Morytko noted how many people go through this now, and how many people would this affect if it was changed. Mr. Gleitz noted this was in the zoning report to the Council. Chairman Shivas said this needs to be discussed further at another meeting.

DISCUSSION ITEM: Hampton Township Resolution Regarding Home-Based Businesses

Chairman Shivas said this needs to be discussed at a later meeting. Mr. Gleitz provided a review memo for this. Ms. Hubbard noted if this statute is enacted, they lose control of home occupation, and people get certifications of pre-existing non-conforming uses. Chairman Shivas said a lot of people work from home. There's a law that regulates it, but this is whether or not you can have people in and out of your house. Mr. Stoner said this is about a home-base office.

BILLS:

Harold Pellow and Associates (19): \$5,746.63. A motion to approve the bill was made by Mr. Walsh, seconded by Mr. Morytko. All were in favor. Motion carried.

Maraziti and Falcon (14): \$5,889.23 A motion to approve the bill was made by Mr. Walsh, seconded by Mr. Morytko. All were in favor. Motion carried.

REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

Architectural Review Committee: Ms. Phillips confirmed the Council hasn't discussed this.

Environmental Commission: Mr. McElroy said they reviewed applications.

Open Space: Mr. Morytko said there's a meeting Monday.

Township Council: Mr. Proctor said they awarded the bid for the C.O Johnson project. They appointed an architect for the police station project. They are likely to receive a grant to rehabilitate the police station into the courtroom. They had a resolution for moth control, and a second reading for capital expenditure for fire-fighting apparatuses. They introduced a resolution to vacate a street into a driveway and amending the flood damage prevention ordinance.

Mr. McElroy said for Board of Health, they will have a special meeting to amend an ordinance. This was passed in 1997. There is a requirement for 100 feet between wells and disposal fields in the state code, but provides for an exemption of 50 feet if a person has water-tight casing on a well. Permits can't be issued if the well or septic is within the 100 feet, and they're looking to remove that restriction to match the state code.

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

Chairman Shivas opened to the public and no one spoke so he closed to the public.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made at 11:30pm by Mr. Walsh, seconded by Mr. Proctor. All were in favor. Motion carried. The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by Caitlin Phillips