

Paul Demarest
Coordinator



(201) 784-0600 ext. 491
Fax (201) 905-3420

Borough of Closter
Zoning Board of Adjustment
295 Closter Dock Road
Closter, NJ 07624

ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

Regular Monthly Hearing *(Minutes)*

April 15, 2009

Prepared by:

Paul Demarest
Coordinator

Chairman Knee called the Regular Monthly Hearing of the Zoning Board of Adjustment of the Borough of Closter, New Jersey being held Wednesday, April 15, 2009 in the Council Chambers of the Borough Hall to order at 8:00pm. He stated the meeting was being held in compliance with the provisions set forth in the Open Public Meetings Act of the State of New Jersey and had been advertised in the newspaper according to law. Chairman Knee advised that the Board adheres to an 11:00pm adjournment and no new matters would be considered after such time.

Chairman Knee invited all present in reciting the Pledge of Allegiance.



The following Board members and professionals were present at the meeting:

- Robert Knee- Chairman
- Steven Freesman, Esq.- Secretary
- Joseph Bianco, RA/PP
- Theodore West, DDS
- Mitchell Monaco
- Jennifer Rothschild, Esq.- Alternate #1
- Francis Noh- Alternate #2
- Mark Crisafulli- Alternate #4
- Thomas Hennessey- Council Liaison
- Leonard Sinowitz- Zoning Officer
- Michael Kates, Esq.- Board Attorney
- John Pacholek, PE- Board Engineer
- Paul Demarest- Board Coordinator

The following Board members and professionals were absent from the meeting:

- Lorin Sonenshine, RA/PP- Vice Chairman
- Denise Mattes, CLA
- Steven Iafrate- Alternate #3



Prior to the meeting, the Board received copies of the mail correspondence received by the Land Use Office on its behalf. Secretary Freesman read said mailings into the record.



Chairman Knee requested 3 volunteers from the Board to serve on the Subcommittee for the next Work Session to be held on Wednesday, April 22, 2009. The following were assigned: Mr. Bianco, Mr. Monaco and Mr. Crisafulli.



Chairman Knee opened the meeting to the public for anyone wishing to comment on matters not related to a case on the evening's agenda. No one wished to be heard.



Item #1

Case #Z-2008-06
170 & 176 Closter Dock Road
(Block 1301/Lots 10 & 11)

Applicant: Desan Enterprises, Inc.
Representation: David Watkins, Esq.

The applicant is seeking Conditional Use Variance and Site Plan Approvals for the conversion of office space to residential apartment units. David Watkins, Esq., 285 Closter Dock Road, Closter, New Jersey, counsel for the applicant and Elliot Urdang, Esq., 19 Engle Street, Tenafly, New Jersey, counsel for the objector (DR Schmidt Realty) introduced themselves. Mr. Urdang informed the Board he had 1 witness to examine.

David Hals, PE, of Schwanewede/Hals Engineering, 9 Post Road, Suite M11, Oakland, New Jersey, was sworn in as Witness #1. Mr. Hals stated he reviewed the proposed plans, the Borough's ordinances and visited the property to verify the applicant's compliance. He said he disagreed with the applicant's engineer (Michael Hubschman, PE) with regards to his parking space requirement calculation for the subject property being 22 as noted on his revised site plan dated January 28, 2009. The witness revealed his own computation as follows: repair facility @ 4 spaces for each of 3 bays = (12); 1 space for each of 3 employees = (3); retail sales area of 750 s.f. <based on Building Department file> @ 1 space each per 150 s.f. = (5); residential units = (7) for a total of 27; thus, the witness saw a deficiency of 5 spaces. Mr. Hals felt some of the 22 proposed spaces on Mr. Hubschman's plan were not actual spaces; for instance, he said space #'s 4, 5 and 6 on his site plan were actually garage bays for the repair facility and as per Chapter 173-47A 1 and 2 of the Borough Code, they cannot be considered spaces; he followed up by saying he was not aware of any municipality that allows for such a designation. Mr. Hals said space #7 on the site plan was located in the drive-thru area underneath a portion of the building which serves as access to the rear of the property; in its current configuration, he said, allowing for a parked car and/or drive-thru lane is not feasible. The witness said that with the removal of those 4 ineligible spaces from Mr. Hubschman's figure of 22, the count is reduced to 18. The witness said the handicap spaces were not striped in accordance with American Disabilities Act (ADA) standards. He said a part of the public sidewalk was being used in the makeup of 1 of the handicap spaces due to the 8' access area along with the irregular shape and striping of said space. Mr. Hubschman's count of 22 was now down to 17, according to Mr. Hals. In addition, he felt space #8 on the site plan, while accessible, does not meet New Jersey Department of Transportation (NJDOT) standards because of having to back out onto Closter Dock Road; Mr. Hubschman's count was now, realistically, reduced to 16. Mr. Hals said the following variances, which were not stated on the site plan, were being sought by the applicant: 1) separation requirement from the edge of the parking space to the property line; 2) # of parking spaces (as previously discussed); 3) side yard setback (0' provided for 14 of Mr. Hubschman's 22 spaces); 4) parking in the front yard (<20' provided for 7 of Mr. Hubschman's 22 spaces); 5) parking in the sight triangle (for both the exit drive aisle from the new aisle and from the adjoining property to the south); 6) parking space size (9' x 18' proposed while 10' x 20' is required); 7) parking space and driveway edging with curb. The witness pointed out that the trash collection area being proposed could not be accessed if 2 cars were to be parked side by side. In addition, he said there was not a proposed exterior lighting plan. Mr. Hals stated the existing storage container, located on the property line, received no permits for its installation. He also pointed out that the last revised site plan by Mr. Hubschman did not contain any delineation/change of the driveways; he said there was currently depressed curbing from the far right hand of the

building across the site itself in the front, a condition leading to parking spaces that require backing out onto Closter Dock Road. The witness said there was no storm drainage provided for by the applicant for a site plan proposal which required such improvements. He said an existing trench drain's destination in the rear of the property is not addressed and furthermore, the site plan has no topographical information. Mr. Hals also pointed out that there is construction debris located in the rear property that is not on the site plan. Ultimately, the witness felt this was an opportunity for the Board to exercise its right to "clean up the site."

Mr. Watkins cross-examined Mr. Hals. He asked Mr. Hals what existed on the property in 2003. The witness said based on an aerial view rendering, the buildings were close to what they are today meaning the front building was present with the 2nd floor and overhang additions along with the rear building (garage). Mr. Watkins asked that in his capacity as Engineer for the Borough of Tenafly, what procedures he follows for granting certificates of occupancy; the witness said inspections precede a report and recommendation as to whether a certificate should be issued. Mr. Watkins asked the witness' understanding of the application at hand through the eyes of a planner. Mr. Hals said that the 2nd floor offices are to be converted to 2 residential units and that 4 parking spaces total (based on a 1 per 250 s.f. formula) would be required assuming the subject area is 1,000 s.f. Both agreed that, from a parking space perspective, there is no change/increase in the requirement based on the change of use proposed assuming Mr. Hals pointed out, those spaces were previously approved in 2003. Mr. Urdang asked a question of Mr. Hals and redirected. Mr. Urdang asked the witness if Exhibit A-5, a Certificate of Occupancy previously presented as evidence by Mr. Watkins, documents any evidence of zoning compliance. Mr. Hals answered in the negative. Mr. Bianco intervened and stated that he was a licensed building inspector (highest level: HHS); he said before being able to "sign off" on a project in that role, "prior approvals" are necessary. Thus, he felt a certificate of occupancy for the work done to the subject property in 2003 could not have been issued without zoning approval prior. Mr. Urdang said that would be proceeding on the assumption that the certificate cannot be signed and continued by saying no documentation of any zoning determination for the property has ever been found. Mr. Bianco asked if Mr. Urdang felt every certificate issued in the Borough was now suspect and said that there should be reliance by the applicant that he has a valid Certificate of Occupancy. Mr. Urdang said that was for the applicant to assert but not necessarily before the Board. Mr. Bianco asked the witness if he had ever come across a "perfect" application with no variances/waivers, etc. Mr. Hals said it happens very often. Mr. Kates said it was his understanding that the objector was challenging the status of the pre-existing residential use of the subject units. Mr. Urdang said yes among with things. Mr. Kates asked if he would concede that the Board's determination to grant a "D3" variance is not predicated on the history of the property as being residential but purely from the standpoint of creating affordable housing regardless of what it was previously. Mr. Urdang agreed and said the Board also conditioned that approval upon Site Plan Review; he continued by asking if he understood that in a bifurcated application, during Site Plan Review, the Board is required to again make findings that there is no substantial detriment to the public good nor substantial impairment of the intent and purpose of the zoning ordinance. Mr. Kates was not in agreement with such a statement and felt NJSA 40:55D-76b should be read aloud by Mr. Urdang. Following his reading, Mr. Urdang said there was also the *Allocco* case which says in effect this a higher standard of proof than a Planning Board would exercise in Site Plan Review; he further stated that all of these things are relevant particularly when a residential use is being introduced and felt the Board should look at the site as a whole and see if things can be remedied. Mr. Kates

agreed. Exhibit #O-1, Mr. Hals' report dated March 6, 2009, was presented as evidence. Mr. Bianco asked the witness that if all 8 items on page 6 of his report were satisfied, would he have any further issues with the application. Mr. Hals said by doing so, the site plan would change and granting of waivers would not necessarily resolve the site plan; he felt the Board would have to go through each item and weigh the positives and negatives. Mr. Watkins stated that his client was not prepared nor will he agree to any of the 8 items outlined in Mr. Hals' report. Mr. Bianco wanted to know if the witness knew there were other ways, for example, on-street parking, to ameliorate the intensity of the variances and waivers. Mr. Urdang felt that was the applicant's burden to prove.

Chairman opened the meeting to the public for questions and comments. No one wished to be heard.

Counsel for the applicant and objector gave brief summations.

Mr. Bianco stated that the subject property has been an asset to the community but still felt that Mr. Hals' 8 items must be addressed. Dr. West felt that if the Board denied the application, the building would revert to having 2 office spaces which were previously empty due to the applicant's inability to rent them out. He felt that 2 low-income apartments would be preferable to the Borough; he also felt there was plenty of parking available in the "underutilized" nearby municipal lot (North). Ms. Rothschild said that any concerned neighbors surely would have come out to speak but that did not occur. Mr. Kates wondered if the possible monetary contribution to the Borough by the applicant for any Board-determined parking space deficiency would defeat the purpose of the affordable housing aspect. Mr. Watkins said such a contribution would make the application "a waste of time." Mr. Bianco asked what it would cost the Borough to build 2 affordable housing units from scratch using the new rate. Mr. Watkins answered depending on the municipality, the average would be \$150,000 each. Mr. Bianco felt \$300,000 on the backs of taxpayers would be quite an unnecessary burden.

Outcome

Mr. Bianco critiqued Mr. Hals' report items (all of which would be in the form of waivers) in the following fashion: 1) parking space size should be granted since the 9' x 18' design has been the standard (Mr. Pacholek felt the prior sight triangle concerns had been sufficiently addressed); 2) parking in the front yard should be granted due to the shape of the property; 3) parking in the side yard should be granted since the lot buffers up against other commercial parking lots and not residential lands; 4) parking area/driveway curbing should be granted since such an introduction of curbs to the area would lead to ponding (neighbors' natural water flow to the sewers could see a dam effect causing flooding on adjacent properties; 5) site lighting should be granted (wall packs on the side of the building shine into the parking lot according to Mr. Hubschman's testimony); 6) trash collection area should be granted (as per Mr. Pacholek's satisfaction). A motion was made by Dr. West and seconded by Ms. Rothschild, to grant Site Plan Approval with stipulated conditions previously mentioned. All members present voted in favor (6-0).



Item #2

Case #Z-2009-03
22 Mc Cain Court
(Block 2102/Lot 46)

Applicant: Juliya Novolt
Representation: Self

Dr. West recused himself.

The applicant is seeking Variance Relief for the construction of an addition, along with appurtenances, to her residence.

Juliya Novolt, property owner of the subject property and representing herself, was sworn in as Witness #1. She said she wanted to extend her garage as well as her kitchen which is not suitable for her family's size; she said her lot is irregular, thus, front and rear yard setback variances are needed. Originally, she said her deficiencies were 12.8' in the front yard and 13.5' in the rear yard. Exhibit #A-1, architectural and engineering plans last revised March 31, 2009, was presented as evidence. The witness said that her concept later involved the construction of a front porch, but even with that, said exhibit shows a reduction in the variances being requested. Mr. Kates informed that with the operative plan now being revised, the applicant is requesting a 32.7' front yard setback (38' required) and a 16.5' rear yard setback (30' required). Mr. Kates asked how close her neighbor's house is to the property line they share. The witness said she did not have any photographs of it but said that her neighbor in the rear yard is Mc Bain Farm. Exhibit #A-2, a key map of the surrounding area, was presented as evidence. Mr. Hennessey said by scaling out the distance between the property line and the dwelling located on Mc Bain Farm, he came up with a measurement of 50-60'. Mr. Bianco asked what the proposed layout is for the new 2nd level. Ms. Novolt said she currently has three bedrooms, with 1 being as small as a closet; 4 are proposed with 1 being a master. Ms. Rothschild asked if the house had an existing attic; the witness said there is one but the ceiling height is very low. Mr. Crisafulli asked if there would be enough domestic water main pressure to accommodate the additional 2 tubs and sinks to the applicant's home being the surrounding neighborhood has already been developed extensively. Mr. Sinowitz said that many of those lots were subdivided and he was sure the engineers and reviewing agencies took such issues into account; plus, he added, the Plumbing Subcode Official in the Building Department would be reviewing and inspecting the project. He also said that being the existing roof area is not being increased by at least 1/3, mandatory storm water runoff management is not required by the Borough. Ms. Rothschild asked about the proposed exterior finishes to which the witness said the existing brick veneer would remain and the cedar shingles would be replaced with vinyl.

Chairman Knee opened the meeting to the public for questions and comments.

Mary Mayer, 12 Mc Cain Court, said the applicant was very open to her neighbors' concerns in terms of the original size of the proposed addition; with the revisions, she had no objection and appreciated that Ms. Novolt had taken steps to preserve the important aspects of the land. Ultimately, she felt the variances were now within reason.

Theodore West, 1 Mc Cain Court, said the water supply/pressure on Mc Cain Court (north side) is poor and did not feel the addition would make any difference in the matter. He said the Mc Cain Court properties are furthest and highest away from the corresponding water main and

connecting to the Anderson Avenue water main would produce too much pressure. Thus, he stated he had no issue with the Board granting approval.

Paul Weissman, 21 Mc Cain Court, said he lived directly opposite Ms. Novolt and concurred with the previous 2 comments adding he appreciated the revisions and had no objection.

Outcome

A motion was made by Mr. Bianco and seconded by Ms. Rothschild, to grant Variance Approval for front and rear yard setbacks with no conditions. All members present voted in favor (7-0).



Item #3

Case #Z-2008-27
23 Storig Avenue
(Block 803/Lot 18)

Applicant: Orlando Tobia
Representation: Judith Reilly, Esq.

Ms. Rothschild and Dr. West recused themselves.

The applicant is seeking Use Variance Approval for the sanctioning of an “illegal” 2-family residence. Judith Reilly, Esq., 302 Scharer Avenue, Northvale, New Jersey, introduced herself as counsel for the applicant. Mr. Kates advised her that because 7 voting Board members were not present at the meeting and her client is seeking a Use Variance Approval (5 affirmative votes required), she could start her examination, develop a record and postpone a Board vote so that absent members could review the proceedings by audio; Ms. Reilly agreed. She stated that a subsequent amended application had been filed March 12, 2009 requesting an interpretation in addition to a Use Variance Approval (original application filed December 19, 2008).

Orlando Tobia, 65 Colgate Street, property owner of the subject property, was sworn in as Witness #1. Mr. Tobia said that his mother acquired 23 Storig Avenue in 1933 and that his entire immediately family lived there. He said she and her bank had an arranged mortgage in which she did not own the property (she was not on the deed) until it was paid for in full. The witness pointed out that his mother had saved bank books which documented all payments. He said she died in 1944, leaving the home to himself, his brother and 2 sisters. That same year, he said he entered the armed services joining his brother already serving in Japan. In 1946, his brother and his own family moved into the 1st floor while the witness’ father agreed to occupy the 2nd floor. Mr. Tobia said an entrance/exit was made for his father once he began living there. He said his family originally acquired the property when it was in default. He stated there was no kitchen or bathroom on the 2nd floor prior to 1946. The witness said he and his own family moved into the home following his return from abroad in 1948. At that point, the property was owned by all 4 children. There had been an arrangement by the bank for the children to inherit the house since the father did not have sufficient credit (due to the failure of his bakery during the Great Depression). Mr. Tobia said that when his brother moved out, his sister moved in and she bought the home outright, owning it until her death shortly afterwards. She left it to the witness and their other sister. He said he and his older sister held onto the property together for some time until he bought her out. To summarize the latter testimony, Ms. Reilly recapped using the title search information as follows: 1) 1944: property

inherited/bought by the 4 children from Closter National Bank; 2) 1949: Orlando Tobia and his wife/Angela Tobia and her husband/Peter Tobia conveyed to Rita Tobia; 1958: Rita Tobia passed away leaving property to Orlando Tobia and Angela Tobia; 1961: Orlando Tobia bought out Angela Tobia. The witness said he remained at the home for 4 years following his moving-in in 1948. His father eventually left the home as well to move in with the witness, who was building a new house on Piermont Road at the time. Mr. Tobia said the apartments on both floors were then either rented out to “outsiders” or his own children; either way, he said, the house, since then, has always had tenants occupying the 2 dwelling units. The witness only found out that the property did not comply with the Borough’s Zoning Code in 2008 when applying for a permit to re-do his driveway. Mr. Kates said it was his understanding that the house was converted, based on testimony, to a 2-family use in 1946 at the earliest. He said the relevant borough ordinance that regulates this issue was enacted in 1940, thus the subject property is not protected under non-conforming status; he, therefore, asked Ms. Reilly why she was not dealing with her planner’s testimony and the Use Variance part of the application. She said she would but that she first had to establish a record on the interpretation of that ordinance; she hoped the Board would take it in its present form and interpret what it exactly means and give the definition of what is permitted. Mr. Kates said the Board would be happy to do that but that the applicant would first need to give some guidance. The witness said he renovated the home quite a bit over the years, including “raising the roof” to form a dormer thereby enlarging the bathroom, rearranging the stairs leading to the 2nd floor, installing a back porch and the installation of a kitchen and bathroom on the 2nd floor. Mr. Tobia said the kitchen and bathroom project was inspected by then-building inspector, Fred Heck; Ms. Reilly informed that tax records documented such work in 1965. Exhibit #A-1, tax assessor records dated 1968 and 1999 confirming 2-family status, was presented as evidence. Exhibit #’s A-2, a Planning Board OPRA response stating no records found, A-3, a Zoning Board OPRA response stating no prior records found, A-4, a Building Department OPRA response stating no prior records found, A-5, a Borough Clerk’s OPRA response and A-7, a Temporary Residential Certificate of Continued Occupancy (RCCO) granting 2-family status for a 1-year period only, were presented as evidence. Ms. Reilly pointed out that there is no construction being proposed by her client. Mr. Crisafulli asked if there was anything in the construction permit records that classified the property as a 2-family. Mr. Sinowitz interjected and said that no formal designation has ever been given to the property; he said the Temporary RCCO was issued by the Construction Official for 1 year with a proviso. He continued saying that a Certificate of Occupancy only indicates that the property complies with state building codes, but that does not confer upon it legality based on the local zoning codes. Mr. Kates said that may have some bearing on the Use Variance, but the Board was still considering the interpretation aspect. Mr. Sinowitz stated that in 1940, the zoning ordinance would not have allowed for a 2-family conversion for the subject property because a minimum lot size of 9,000 s.f. was required (23 Storig Avenue is 7,500 s.f.). Mr. Bianco asked when a member of the Tobia family first owned the home. Ms. Reilly said in 1933, the mother had what she referred to as an installment contract (the bank held the deed), so in 1944, the title shows that the bank conveyed to her heirs; she further stated the mother had some kind of interest but it was not record title. Ms. Reilly said that being the mother (Erma Tobia) had some kind of property rights, she would be the outright owner once the mortgage was paid off; however, she died before that could happen. Exhibit #’s A-7, a survey of the subject property dated 1924, and A-8, Erma Tobia’s mortgage payments book reading “...in accordance with the terms of the contract to purchase the bank’s property...”, were presented as evidence.

Chairman Knee opened the meeting to the public for questions and comments. No one wished to be heard.

Katherine Gregory, PP, 96 Linwood Plaza, #350, Fort Lee, New Jersey, was sworn in as Witness #2. She stated the subject property is a 7,500 s.f. lot, located in District #2, and has a 1 1/2 stories, 2-family residence sitting on it; she added such a use is permitted in said district under certain conditions. She said that when looking at the tax map, there are numerous undersized lots, varying in shape, in the vicinity and they are located on both sides of the street. Exhibit #A-9, an annotated tax map, was presented as evidence. Mr. Kates wanted clarity on whether or not the witness was, based on said exhibit, confirming that 76 Harvey Street, 15 Storig Avenue and 240 Cedar Lane were legal 2-family properties. Ms. Gregory answered in the affirmative based on the site inspections she and Ms. Reilly made together. The witness felt the site was particularly suitable for such a use mostly due to its longstanding existence as such. She testified that in 1940, the Borough created the Limiting Schedule and in 1946, the home was converted to a 2-family use, be it legally or not. Thus, she said, it has been that way for 62 years, meaning the impacts of such a use have already been tested; she said, in that time, the property had never been “flagged” except for when Mr. Tobia applied for a driveway permit last year. Ms. Gregory said that in terms of a visual impact, the home appears to be a single-family house with only 1 entrance appearing in the front; she said, however, one could still view it as a 2-family unit because it sits on an undersized lot. She continued saying that based on the 1940 zoning requirements, all bulk standards are met except for minimum lot size. Mr. Crisafulli asked if she knew when the other 3 properties annotated on the tax map exhibit were legalized to which Ms. Gregory answered she did not know. Mr. Kates said that in terms of whether or not the 9,000 s.f. aspect should either make this application a request for a Conditional Use Variance or for a “schedule C sort of criteria,” the use would not automatically be permitted if the lot was 9,000 s.f., thus he came to the conclusion that a Conditional Use Variance should not be sought. Ms. Gregory stated that usually the Master Plan is what guides zoning but that the latter was introduced before master planning took effect; this fact, she said, leads to houses built long ago, now being non-conforming in terms of bulk requirements. Ms. Reilly said she was looking for an interpretation of Chapter 200-9B of the Borough Code, specifically on the meaning of “...other municipal ordinances and codes must be complied with...”; she wondered what put a resident on notice as to what he or she needs to comply with. Mr. Kates said that section has been interpreted to mean the Limiting Schedule and bulk requirements. Mr. Sinowitz stated that the way he, as Zoning Officer and Zoning Board of Adjustment member, has interpreted that code section has been consistent for 11 and 17 years respectively. Ms. Reilly responded by saying that the interpretation would then change when a different person assumes those official positions leading to an end in the consistency. She asked when her client was, in a rational way, put on notice that he was in violation; her concern lays in her client’s historical sequence of events and the wording of the ordinance. She further stated that there is considerable law on the subject which says that Mr. Tobia is entitled to have that. Mr. Kates said that a court must deal with estoppel issues and not the Board. Mr. Sinowitz said that Chapter 87-5.1 of the Borough Code spoke of how a property owner must show proof of 2-family status since 1990. Unfortunately, he said, that code section was overturned by a Superior Court judge; Mr. Sinowitz continued to say that the RCCO ordinance requires all prior ordinances to be complied with. Ms. Reilly asked how such a requirement could be fulfilled. Mr. Kates said the Board could not deal with the unfairness issue. He asked what was ambiguous and in need of interpretation about the condition needing to meet dimensional requirements if one wants to convert. Mr. Crisafulli asked the witness what she felt should be the “cut-off” in terms of how long a non-conforming use should be “grandfathered.” Ms. Gregory said that is up to interpretation but felt that 62 years was a lifetime.

Ms. Reilly recalled Mr. Tobia for questioning. She asked him of the “make-up” of the tenants who have rented out the 2 dwelling units. The witness said that since 1958, the house has

contained at least 1 tenant unrelated to the Tobia family; he is certain of this because he has personally collected the rent since then.

Chairman Knee opened the meeting to the public questions and comments.

Jesse Rosenblum, 65 Knickerbocker Road, commended the applicant's evidence presented for such an application.

Outcome

The Board and Ms. Reilly agreed to carry a vote, preceded by counsel's summation, to the May 20, 2009 Hearing.



A motion was made by Mr. Bianco and seconded by Mr. Monaco, to memorialize the Resolution for 432 Homans Avenue, an approved application for amendments/revisions to a plan, which was part of a prior Board-approved application (Case #Z-2007-24) to construct an addition. All members present voted in favor.

A motion was made by Mr. Bianco and seconded by Mr. Monaco, to memorialize the Resolution for 1 Railroad Avenue, an approved application for Use Variance Relief and Site Plan Review to construct affordable housing residential apartments. All members present voted in favor.



There being no further items to discuss, a motion to adjourn the hearing was made by Mr. Bianco and seconded by Mr. Monaco. All members present voted in favor. The hearing adjourned at 11:23pm.