

MARCH 22, 2011

A regularly scheduled meeting of the Wantage Township Land Use Board was held on Tuesday, March 22, 2011 at the Wantage Township Municipal Building. The meeting was held in compliance with the provisions of the Open Public meetings act, P.L. 1975, Chapter 231. It was properly noticed and posted to the public.

ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Mssrs. Bono, Cecchini, DeBoer, Gaechter, Grau, Slate, Stefanelli, Vander Groef, Mmes. Kanapinski and Kolicko. Attorney Glenn Kienz, Engineer Harold Pellow.

ABSENT: Mssrs. Smith and Cillaroto. Ms. Gill.

Board member Mr. DeBoer arrived at 7:32 p.m. Mr. Stefanelli arrived at 7:35 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Grau made a motion seconded by Ms. Kanapinski to adopt the minutes of February 22, 2011.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

THOSE IN FAVOR: DeBoer, Gaechter, Grau, Kanapinski, Vander Groef, Kolicko, Slate.

THOSE OPPOSED: None. MOTION CARRIED.

RESOLUTIONS

L-13-2010 ROY DAVIS / SUSAN NIXON

Mr. Grau made a motion seconded by Mr. DeBoer made a motion seconded by Mr. DeBoer to adopt the resolution granting preliminary and final site plan approval and conditional use approval with "c" variance relief to Roy Davis and Susan Nixon for Block 135, Lot 8.01 located on Brown Road in the RE-5 zone, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-46, N.J.S.A. 40:55D-50, N.J.S.A. 40:55D-67, and N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70(c), subject to the following terms and conditions:

1. The development of this parcel shall be implemented in accordance with the plans submitted and approved as specifically indicated on plans entitled Site Plan of Block 135, Lot 8.01, Township of Wantage, Sussex County, New Jersey prepared Kenneth A. Wentink and Associates, consisting of four (4) sheets with a latest revision date of January 14, 2011.
2. The Applicants shall meet all specific requirements contained in the report prepared by Harold E. Pellow, P.E., L.S., dated January 4, 2011, last revised February 8, 2011 except as modified herein.
3. Ballisters shall be planted between the barn door and stairs to protect access, subject to the review and approval of the Board Engineer.
4. In the event that the property ceases to be used as a farm, the Applicants shall be required to return to the Land Use Board of the Township of Wantage for a specific determination of the new lot line and the size of the new parcel. The Board shall specifically retain jurisdiction over this matter.
5. Prior to the issuance of any construction permit, the Applicants shall file with the Board and Construction Official an affidavit verifying that the Applicants are in receipt of all necessary agency approvals other than the municipal agency having land use jurisdiction over the application and supply a copy of any approvals received.
6. The Applicants shall file a Deed specifically containing restrictions as to the land use so that they conform with the decision of the Board.
7. Payment of all fees, costs, escrows due or to become due. Any monies are to be paid within twenty (20) days of said request by the Board's Secretary.
8. Certificate that taxes are paid to date of approval.
9. Sussex County Planning Board approval.
10. Subject to all other applicable rules, regulations, ordinances and statutes of the Township of Wantage, County of Sussex, State of New Jersey, or any other jurisdiction.

ROLL CALL VOTE: DeBoer, Gaechter, Grau, Slate, Kanapinski.

THOSE OPPOSED: None. MOTION CARRIED.

APPLICATIONS

L-14-2006 STEVEN LANG

The applicant is requesting third one-year extension of final major subdivision approval. This application was originally approved February 27, 2007 and memorialized March 27, 2007 with the latest extension granted to March 27, 2011. The property is known as Block 9, Lot 152 and is located on Ramsey Road in the RE zone.

Attorney Michael Gaus appeared before the Board on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Gaus stated that an amendment to this application was necessary due to certain permits that the applicant needed to obtain. He stated that the paperwork was almost ready and that the new application would be submitted shortly. Mr. Gaus requested to have this application carried to the April 26, 2011 meeting of the Board in order to finalize appropriate paperwork with the present owner of the property.

The Board unanimously agreed to grant the request.

L-16-2008A 565 LAND DEVELOPMENT, LLC

The applicant was proposing to amend prior site plan approval. The property is known as Block 117, Lot 38.01 and is located on Route 565 in the HC and R-5 zones.

Board members Cecchini, DeBoer, and Gaechter stepped down.

Attorney Michael Gaus and applicant Thomas Zummo appeared before the Board.

Mr. Kienz suggested doing an interpretation first with the council members present and taking part and then doing the rest of the application with the council members.

Mr. Gaus explained that the application included adding compost as part of the soil removal operation that is currently approved at the site. The site has operated as soil removal under a series of resolutions going as far back as 1981 which included use variances at that time. Since that time soil removal has been added as a permitted use in the HC zone which is the front 15000 ft. The property is split zone, the rear of the property is R5 where soil removal is not permitted as a permitted use. There was a use variance for the soil removal from Section 2 which is the R5 zone, in addition there was a use variance granted approximately two years ago in conjunction with the proposed end use of the property. Because of the split zoning the applicant had a preliminary major subdivision approval of 8-9 commercial lots subject to site plans down the road but there was a use variance granted in connection with them as it relates to the properties that would be within the R5 side. The applicant has now asked for interpretation that bringing in certified clean compost to mix with the onsite materials as part of the soil removal is part of the permitted use within the HC zone. The applicant intends to do this part of the operation in the HC zone. The applicant has asked in the alternative, if it is ruled that it is not part of the permitted use, to request a use variance in order to be allowed to do that. In that case, Mr. Gaus stated that he believed Mr. Kienz would rule that would disqualify the Class 1 and Class 3 members.

Mr. Kienz asked if the soil removal in the front of the property was just a site plan or if it involved a use variance because it would then connect it in the rear to other zones. Mr. Gaus did not believe it involved use variances. He stated that the resolution talked about the use variances and recognized the existence of the use variance issue but it did not specifically say that the use variance was needed or not. Mr. Gaus added that a use variance was not needed in the HC zone because it was a permitted use. Mr. Kienz inquired as to whether or not any movement or activities of soils were being conducted in the other zone.

Mr. Kienz concluded that there was a use variance overriding the entire site. He advised the Council members that it would probably be best for them not to get involved. Mr. Kienz stated for the record that this interpretation took longer than the prior applications heard tonight.

Mr. Gaus reviewed the documents submitted to the Board members. He indicated that a letter dated March 10, 2011 requesting the interpretation or in the alternative, a use variance to allow the proposed use to take place. Attached to the letter as Exhibit A were details of the Statutory

and Regulatory requirements that govern those companies that do composting in New Jersey. Mr. Gaus wished to make it clear that the applicant was not intending to do any composting on that property whatsoever. The application was simply seeking to be able to allow Mr. Zummo to purchase from other regulated licensed certified sites in New Jersey, clean compost, bring it to his site, mix it with his on site materials in order to get a better quality product for him to be able to move in the marketplace which will enhance the process of getting this property to the point of its ultimate use which is the 8 or 9 lot commercial subdivision that he mentioned previously. Also submitted was a letter dated March 9, 2011 with attached copies of minutes and resolutions from two other applications that the Board had heard in the past: Tri State Soil and the Roy Road project. He believed they both set a precedent for a favorable interpretation that the Board had previously allowed the importation of clean compost as part of a soil removal operation. The applicant also submitted plans consisting of three (3) sheets prepared by Kenneth Wentink, P.E. dated March 7, 2011 entitled Top Soil Production, a planner's report from Jill Hartmann, PP dated March 6, 2011, and an undated report as part of the amendment letter of March 10, 2011, prepared by Sylvester Fletcher, P.S.S., a soil scientist.

Mr. Tom Zummo stated that he had been working at the property for approximately three and a half (3 ½) years. He stated that the prior property owner had a soil removal operation on and off over the years and he added that compared to the prior owner, during his ownership, the volume of soil being removed had significantly increased. His prior approvals were discussed, most recently the 8 lot commercial/light industrial subdivision with a 27 acre lot designated for conservation purposes. Mr. Gaus pointed out that the deed for that part of the subdivision had already been filed, while Mr. Zummo continued to remove the soil from the rest of the property in order to bring those lots to the topography that is necessary to develop such lots for commercial and light industrial purposes. When asked, Mr. Zummo stated that he had to remove approximately one million yards before the property is ready for development. Mr. Zummo stated that the first year after starting the operation, approximately 75% of the total volume was moved and that it had slowed due to the economy. His plan was to try to increase sales by producing by producing another product that would be more marketable. He stated that he primarily sold very fine sand which is excellent for topsoil manufacturing, having sold quite a bit of that to TriState, RER, and Top Soil Depot. He also sells bank run sand and gravel which is used for septic systems. He added that there very few septic systems being installed at present. He stated that the cost now days is in trucking, and that even though your price is less, people will buy it where the closest supplier is. Mr. Zummo indicated that he wished to produce up to 100,000 cubic yards per year of topsoil to be sold in the general market place. It was discussed that by doing that, the applicant would be moving this project faster towards its ultimate goal of development. He added that the operation would be kept in the HC zone, approximately a 2 acre zone.

Mr. Gaus introduced Exhibit A1, a copy of the plans that were prepared by Mr. Wentink, with some areas colored in pink. Mr. Zummo indicated that the areas marked in pink showed the location of the screen plant, the location of the raw materials coming in, the proposed topsoil production area, and the finished product.

Mr. Kienz stated for the record that a site walk had taken place when the application was first submitted and asked if the pink part was the level area. Mr. Zummo replied that it was.

Mr. Zummo explained his plan of operation. He explained that materials would be imported on an as needed basis, they would be trucked in, and blended immediately. He stated that the materials would only be purchased from certified providers. The providers would be suppliers with Class B or Class C, fully composted or partially screened and plastic bottles would be removed from the site. There would be no change to the existing hours of operation, bonds are posted with the municipality, Mr. Pellow inspects once or twice per year, and noise will not be any different. Mr. Zummo stated that he currently has approvals for screening outside all day and nothing would be added. The trucks bringing in the compost would be very similar to trucks that access the site today, approximately eight (8) trucks were anticipated on a daily basis. Mr. Zummo said that since this is a seasonal business, any approvals granted tonight would not benefit them until next year. Mr. Gaus stated that the applicant had reviewed prior resolutions for his approvals in order to confirm the number of trucks that were allowed. Mr. Zummo indicated that up to 100 trucks per day had been approved. In the last three or four years of operation, the most trips made in one day have been fifty five (55). Part of the application seeking a favorable interpretation that this operation was allowed under the current zoning it was indicated in a letter dated March 9th that the applicant felt that there were two

other applications that had previously come before the Board that had been approved, that had been allowed to do similar operations. One of those applications was the Tri State site located on Route 628, the area of operation was approximately 2 acres and they have been importing compost and sand and blending it for a few years. The applicant stated that he shared a common boundary line with that site along five acres, that no soil removal was taking place there, that all was brought in, and that they had been doing this for approximately 7 or 8 years or longer. The second project that was cited in the March 9th letter was the Roy Road project in which the applicant was involved in at the time of those approvals. The site is located on Route 565 and Roy Road, across from Beemer Church and it was approved for topsoil manufacturing and importation of compost to be mixed with materials on site. The applicant stated that he was not involved in that project any longer and he did testify before the Board on this application. He also stated that he reviewed copies of the minutes from those hearings and that his testimony was correct.

The meeting was opened to the public. Attorney Keith Hyche, representing Emil Conforth, adjacent property owner asked Mr. Zummo if he was proposing to test the compost coming in to which Mr. Zummo answered that he was not. At Mr. Hyche's request, Mr. Zummo described that the process involved blending all the materials together and then stockpiling them, very similar to what Tri State did. Mr. Hyche asked if he brought in any other materials to mix with his materials, did he know if the materials were DEP certified? Mr. Zummo stated that he was not sure. Asked if he brought materials from Thor Labs in Newton, NJ, Mr. Zummo said he did, however, he had no documents about it. Mr. Hyche asked if the applicant had any plans to dispose of existing topsoil on the property, Mr. Zummo answered he did not.

Mr. Robert Lange of 125 Lewisburg Road asked what the definition of clean compost was and if the materials would have an odor, Mr. Zummo explained that clean compost was a product that was tested on an annual basis to certify that it was clean. He added that it would have no odor as it would be something that you would buy at Home Depot. Mr. John Nuss asked what were a Class B and a Class C in terms of compost. Mr. Zummo explained that they were permits to recycle or compost or reprocess materials for the marketplace.

There were no other members of the public wishing to come forward on this application. The application was closed to the public and opened to the Board. Mr. Slate asked how often was the compost certified? Mr. Zummo stated that selling sites had to meet state regulations according to state mandates, as opposed to some materials that came in this town nobody said anything. Ms. Kanapinski asked if it was clean compost why would it have plastic bottles? Mr. Zummo explained that when they refer to it as fully composted they are talking about organic content; he felt that his soil expert, Mr. Fletcher, would be more qualified to talk about that. He added that companies sell the material screened for approximately \$20/yard or unscreened for approximately \$12/yard. Ms. Kolicko asked why bring the compost in instead of shipping the sand out, was it more economically viable to do that, how was it packaged, if the compost was going to be sitting for a while prior to being screened, would this increase the number of employees, and how was he going to make sure to have documentation from the companies that deliver the compost. Mr. Zummo stated he already sold sand to TriState and that he wanted to be able to offer other products for sale and he explained that topsoil was a much more valuable commodity and that it sold for a higher price than the sand and that he could not really ship his sand far enough to make it work financially, he stated that topsoil was not packaged and that it would be sold by the truckload, that the material would not sit there long because he would not want to lose it to erosion, that he would have approximately two to three more employees, and that he would make sure to obtain the documents from the companies that delivered the compost. Ms. Kolicko was really concerned about were the products that were left over after the materials were screened would remain prior to them being disposed of.

The Board took a five-minute recess.

Mr. Kienz stated that the latest the testimony would last would be until 10:15 p.m., that the Board wanted to hear from Mr. Fletcher, and that there would be no more questions from the Board. He asked if there was any one else from the public wishing to ask questions to Mr. Zummo regarding his testimony. There were no other members wishing to come forward.

Mr. Gaus asked Mr. Zummo to describe the ratio of on-site materials vs. materials brought in that are used. Mr. Zummo stated that 75% of on-site materials and 25% of off-site materials were used. He explained that there would not be any more dust from this proposed

operation than that of the result of the existing operation, that the materials that were purchased from Thor Labs were used for road base to build up roads in the back of the property. Mr. Gaus wished to clarify that Mr. Zummo had not done anything improper and it was discussed that one or two truckloads that were purchased from a site last year, leaves, were still on site, that Mr. Pellow had seen the product prior to it being mixed, and that Mr. Zummo had used it exactly as he said he would use it and that, to his knowledge, Mr. Pellow did not have a problem with it. Mr. Pellow stated that he had seen the leaves there last summer, that he had written a report to the Township, and that he asked Mr. Zummo not to bring those materials again. It was discussed that bottles and other items from screening would be placed in a dumpster and then taken to a recycling facility. Mr. Kienz asked if Thor Labs had been cited as being a DEP clean up site, Mr. Zummo stated he did not know. Mr. Kienz indicated that to his knowledge, that was a clean up site and that was the reason why it sat hollow for some many years.

Mr. Sylvester Fletcher, a soil scientist, was offered as a witness. Mr. Fletcher had testified before this Board many years ago and before other boards and courts on a number of occasions. Mr. Kienz asked Mr. Fletcher if he had any special training or special knowledge in understanding rules and regulations involving the State Department of Environmental Protection that would help with the issues of Class B and Class C licenses. Mr. Fletcher replied that he was familiar with them. Mr. Kienz suggested the Chairman check with Mr. Hyche regarding any questions he might have as far as Mr. Fletcher's qualifications to which Mr. Hyche responded that he did not. Mr. Hyche asked if to his knowledge, was there compost resulting from dead chickens, Mr. Fletcher responded that there was not. Mr. Gaus stated that he would like the Board to qualify the witness in the general field of soil science and the impact that compost has on mixing with sand and gravel products. The Board accepted Mr. Fletcher as a qualified witness

Mr. Fletcher's report entitled: "Statement: In response to Environmental Complaint on Soil Removal/Topsoil Formulation Project", was entered as Exhibit A2. Mr. Fletcher stated that compost was not refuse matter, but organic matter or geologically digested waste. Compost was a major method of solid waste management in which organic waste is biologically digested under controlled conditions to form a stable product which can be handled, stored, or applied to the soil with no adverse environmental impact. He added that organic matter was a key part of the soil and that the fact that it came from compost was just another fact. He added that organic matter was just one of the keys to make the soil alive. He added that the compost formulated and used at the site would be going by standards set forth by NJDEP recycling rules. He stated that topsoil reduced runoff and erosion and that compost would not contaminate the groundwater. He stated that topsoil would hold more water. Therefore, contamination would not be passed to groundwater. Mr. Fletcher described the different types of compost. He explained that classes of compost were set up so that each class was certified to handle those materials. Mr. Fletcher added that, once mixed with compost, the topsoil will about fifteen times more water than the same amount of soil that was not mixed with compost. Mr. Fletcher referred to Mr. Conforth's opinion that commercial compost had adverse environmental consequences. Mr. Gaus explained that when Mr. Zummo filed the original application back in November 2010, Mr. Conforth distributed a document to some of the Board members. The document was prepared by Mr. Conforth and consisted of five articles dealing with issues regarding compost. The application was since put on hold pending revisions. When Mr. Fletcher was asked to prepare a report, the applicant felt that instead of preparing two reports, it would be better to prepare one report, combining the proactive nature as well as the reactive nature that would address the concerns of Mr. Conforth. Mr. Gaus stated that he did have objections to what Mr. Conforth submitted and he did not think it should be considered by the Board. It was discussed that the document had been delivered by Mr. Conforth and some of the Board members did not recall ever seeing it. Mr. Kienz and Mr. Gaus opted to skip over that part of the report. Mr. Fletcher added that the materials that Mr. Zummo proposed to use came mainly from leaves and woody waste and from food waste, the bulk of what is in Class C compost. He added that compost is processed at temperatures between 130-140 degrees for 3-4 days. Referring to earlier comments that refuse and decayed matter would be brought to the site, realistically, what would be brought would be geologically digested waste. Organic matter is vital to the soil and to the function of topsoil. Some of the benefits of organic matter include an increased water holding capacity of the soils, soil tilt is improved by making the soils easier to cultivate, it enables the soil to hold more nutrients for a longer period of time making it possible to be used by the plants, and it reduces run off and erosion. He stated that the 565 Land Development project would only utilize certified compost purchased from sites that operate under NJDEP recycling set of standards. The top soil product produced would be

environmentally safe and he did not feel it would cause an adverse environmental impact on the community. He stated that contamination of ground water would not be a problem associated with the use of compost.

Mr. Gaus asked Mr. Fletcher what was it about the articles included in his report that helped him render the opinions that he rendered during his testimony. He stated that his testimony was not from the articles but rather from areas of his knowledge of soil and land use throughout the years and that the articles in his report came from Rutgers, the EPA, and that they were written by Ph.D's.

The meeting was opened to the public for questions to Mr. Fletcher regarding his testimony. Mr. Robert Lange, asked if since Class C compost was kept at 140 degrees to break it down, would it be broken down prior to entering the site, if there could be other materials mixed in to that Class C refuse. Mr. Lange also asked why it would be necessary to filter other materials out if they should not be there in the first place since according to testimony they had already been broken down. It was determined that this question would be addressed by Mr. Gaus at the next hearing. Mr. Lange also asked if, since Class B has concrete, tree stumps, leaves, branches, woody things, would they have to be filtered out on site? There was a discussion of prior testimony as far as what items would be coming into the site for mixing with the topsoil.

Ms. Anne Smulowicz of 108 Route 23 asked if food would be coming in. Mr. Kienz explained that Class C compost had food waste materials.

There were no other members of the public wishing to come forward on this application. Ms. Kolicko asked regarding the quality of compost, if it varied depending of where it came from and if it would be a different product. Mr. Fletcher explained that woody things would have a high fiber value and compost from food waste would likely have a higher nutrient value. Ms. Kolicko also asked if any of these facilities processed animal waste. Mr. Fletcher indicated that not in those classifications. It was discussed that the code for animal waste could be found on the NJDEP site under NJAC 7:26a-1.

Mr. Kienz stated that this was opening night for this application and that it could not be completed at the time. Mr. Kienz suggested that the attorneys could meet prior to the meeting to review the packets. It was discussed that a full hearing night would be devoted to this application. A motion was made, duly seconded and carried to carry this application to the June 28th meeting with no further public notice necessary. Mr. Gaus stated that if a special date for the meeting could be set, then the applicant would notice. The applicant agreed to grant extension of the application until September 1, 2011.

L-1-2010 - 80 LEWISBURG ROAD, LLC

The applicant is requesting to discuss Condition No. 7 of his minor subdivision approval memorialized April 27, 2010. The property is known as Block 18, Lots 15 & 25 and is located on Lewisburg Road in the RE-5 zone.

Attorney Michael Gaus and applicant John Sarracco appeared before the Board. Upon obtaining minor subdivision approval approximately one year ago, Condition 7 called for proof of right of the existing driveway to the existing house. Said driveway appeared to straddle the property line across Lot 26. There was no specific dedicated easement recorded to that effect. The applicant and Mr. Gaus have done everything in their power to find proof of said easement, but unfortunately, were not able to find such a document. The road in question has been used and shared for several years. The deed description that had been used back in 1949 was still being used. The applicant requested to have the Board waive that condition, minor modification to condition of approval. Mr. Gaus stated that if the Board deemed it necessary, the applicant would notice for a full hearing. After some consideration and a brief discussion, there did not appear to be a need to enforce Condition No. 7. The Board agreed that said driveway access was an existing condition and deemed Condition No. 7 to be satisfied.

Mr. Cecchini made a motion seconded by Mr. Grau to grant the request.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

THOSE IN FAVOR: Bono, Cecchini, DeBoer, Gaechter, Grau, Stefanelli, Kanapinski, Vander Groef, Slate. **THOSE OPPOSED:** None. **MOTION CARRIED.**

L-11-01 PATRICK & JILL STEFANELLI

The applicant proposes to construct an addition to his existing one-family dwelling. A side yard setback variance is being requested. The property is known as Block 142, Lot 7 and is located on Clove Road in the RE-5 zone.

Mr. Patrick Stefanelli and his wife, Jill Stefanelli, appeared before the Board. Mr. Stefanelli stated that he wished to build a sitting area/family room and that eventually, as money allowed, he planned to upgrade the septic system to a four-bedroom septic and add more bedrooms. He added that, by adding the addition on the chosen location would provide the most use of the existing layout with minimal damage to the structure. He felt that this addition would not impact the neighboring properties as its location was next to an open field and the nearest house was about 300 to 400 ft. away. Mr. Stefanelli's position was that, the addition being 659 sq.ft., was modest in size and did not represent making the house oversized. The addition would also not encroach upon a front yard but only encroach upon the side yard. A rear deck is proposed as well. It was discussed that the front yard setback was 185 ft.

Mr. Pellow's report was reviewed. Item 4 of the report discussed the lot area requirement of 5.0 acres and 4.40 acres existed. It was discussed that the applicant's property taxes were up to date and the notices were satisfactory. Items 2.06, graphic scale on the architect's plans, Item 2.07, reference meridian, and Item 2.08, North arrow, submission of a survey map showing existing conditions listed in Item 3.01, the applicant's professionals to certify that there are no wetlands within 150 ft. of the proposed land disturbance, and the existing horse barn on the lot to be shown on the map, could be made conditions of completeness.

There was no one from the public wishing to come forward on this application. Mr. Slate opened the application to the Board. Mr. Cecchini stated that this dwelling was already a non-conforming use and that adding 659 sq.ft. would not be a drastic change. There was a discussion regarding the septic. Mr. Stefanelli explained that he was moving the tanks to make room for the addition and that in the near future he wished to upgrade the septic and add bedrooms.

Mr. Cecchini made a motion seconded by Mr. Bono to approve this application, subject to Mr. Pellow's report. ROLL CALL VOTE:
THOSE IN FAVOR: Bono, Cecchini, DeBoer, Gaechter, Grau, Kanapinski, Vander Groef, Slate. THOSE OPPOSED: None. MOTION CARRIED.

The applicant requested a waiver to receipt of the resolution in order to start the work. The Board unanimously agreed.

INFORMAL

Mr. Jorge Meza appeared before the Board with regards to an addition to his one-family home located in Lake Neepaulin. He was denied by the Zoning Officer due to exceeding the floor area. The Board advised Mr. Meza to get together with the Construction Official and with the Zoning Officer to let them help him out.

Ms. Melissa Hensley appeared before the Board with regards to a single-family home that she owns. The property is located on Route 23. There was a question concerning the use of the home. After a brief discussion, the Board determined that she would be allowed to maintain the original use of the house, a single-family home, and that she would be allowed to refurbish the property and occupy the same.

GENERAL

Ms. Smulowicz asked if a bond for clean up was in place for Rachel Manor. It was suggested that she check with Mr. Jim Doherty's office.

Mr. Kienz discussed the revised proposal for a planner.

ADJOURNMENT

On a motion duly made seconded and carried, the meeting was adjourned at 10:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Stella Salazar, Secretary