

TOWNSHIP OF LOPATCONG  
PLANNING BOARD MEETING

March 28, 2018

The meeting of the Planning Board of the Township of Lopatcong was called to order by Chairman VanVliet at 7:00 pm. A silent prayer was offered followed by the Oath of Allegiance.

Chairman VanVliet stated “adequate notice of this meeting has been provided indicating the time and place of the meeting in accordance with Chapter 231 of the Public Laws of 1975 by advertising a Notice in The Star Gazette and The Express Times and by posting a copy on the bulletin board in the Municipal Building.”

Present: Members Correa, Johnson, Pryor, Schneider, Vice-Chairman Fischbach, Chairman VanVliet. Also present were Attorney Bryce, Planner Ritter and Engineer Sterbenz.

Chairman VanVliet modified the proposed schedule on the agenda for interest of time and compacting the meeting in order to be out by 10:00.

Minutes – Approve February 28, 2018.

Council President Pryor – Noted he was present for all the meeting except the application on Autumn Ridge.

Attorney Bryce – Noted he would abstain for that portion of the minutes.

Chairman VanVliet approved the minutes with the comments made. All in favor.

Chairman VanVliet asked Attorney Bryce to hand out his draft of Rules and Regulations regarding the Planning Board meetings and followed up by noting they are draft and will be subject to discussion over the next several meetings. He asked everyone to review and make comments at the next meeting.

Chairman VanVliet – Asked to take a few minutes to address the application with K&S.

Attorney Shimanowitz had not objections.

Chairman VanVliet - K&S Enterprises, LLC – Block 100, Lot 2 amended site plan for completeness. A letter was received from their attorney indicating that they are not going to be at the meeting tonight and are asking to extend the meeting to April whether that occurs or not and asked Engineer Sterbenz to provide background on what is happening here.

Engineer Sterbenz – The Board had deemed this application to be incomplete at the last meeting on February 28<sup>th</sup> for a variety of deficiencies that we had found during the completeness review. Since that time the applicant has supplied some of

the missing material including the Traffic Report and a Geotechnical Engineering Report but there are still some deficiencies; most notably, the lack of a Consistency Determination from the Highlands Council and that automatically requires the Board under our approved petition to deem the application to be incomplete. So I'm recommending that the Board deem the application to be incomplete again tonight. With respect to the adjournment that was requested by the applicant's attorney, that's fine. We would not have been able to hear it tonight. The Board will have to make a decision as part of the adjournment request as to whether or not you want to carry the notice to the April meeting that's really at the Board's discretion and I'll defer to Mr. Bryce as to how the Board should handle that from a legal perspective.

Attorney Bryce – The Board as Mr. Sterbenz cited that it is the Board's discretion. They did notice for tonight. If there is any member of the public that is able to notify the public that they're carrying the meeting to a future date, with no further notice to be required so the motion would be, if the Board is so inclined, to continue to deem it incomplete but also carry the notice to the April meeting with no further notice being required.

Chairman VanVliet – Thank you. Any questions from the Board about that?

Member Pryor – He does not have to notice again, is that what we're

Attorney Bryce – That would be correct.

Member Pryor – Okay.

Engineer Sterbenz – What we did discuss though, let's say we get here in April and there's no Highlands Consistency Determination and remains incomplete and then it happens in May again and the Board may not want to see the notice carried and may want to see a re-notice at that point.

Chairman VanVliet – So this is only a month by month determination from our Board. Thank you. Any further questions on that motion? I'll entertain a motion then for

Member Pryor – I'll make that motion that we continue to April and there's no further notice requirement at this time.

Chairman VanVliet – And we will deem this incomplete or do you want

Member Pryor – Right deem it incomplete.

Attorney Bryce – Is that one motion will be fine.

Chairman VanVliet – Okay. Do we hear a second?

Vice-Chairman Fischbach – Second.

Chairman VanVliet - Beth roll call please.

AYES: Members Correa, Johnson, Pryor, Schneider, Vice-Chairman Fischbach, Chairman VanVliet.

NAYS: None

Member Johnson – Mr. Chairman I have a quick question. It does reflect K & S but not what we just took a motion on. Is, does these plans reflect the construction that's currently going on out at the site, right now? Looks like there's a building being erected.

Chairman VanVliet – Yes. I don't want to get into a full discussion on it and I'll let Paul handle

Engineer Sterbenz – What they've done is they're characterizing the additional construction at the site as being Phase II and there is an indication on the plan of a demarcation or limits between Phase II and what they're calling out to be Phase I which is the current construction. Sorry about the long winded explanation answer, but the answer is yes.

Chairman VanVliet – The other thing I would like to do is take up the Highland Center Planning Study II. I received a letter from the Highlands Commission last Friday indicating that they really would approve this with some minor modifications to the information that Mr. Ritter has supplied to them and George would you highlight that for us a little bit please.

Planner Ritter – Basically, the Highland's has reviewed the report that was (inaudible) by the Board last fall and actually got around to giving us a review letter. Essentially they said that the report has drawn is fine except for two conditions; one they wanted us to consider removing the request to amend the size of the center. If you remember we had put in there that we were considering and we would like them to consider expanding the center to including the property behind the mall and to rezone that from residential to commercial. The Highlands has indicated that is not something they would like us to consider at this time that the requirement would be to go back and revisit the full center designation to include it in which would mean going back and redocumenting everything and going through that whole process again. Instead they said they would basically prefer that we hold that out of the center to either a future date or not at all if that's the discussion of the Board but they would not like to consider it as part of this study. So one of the questions before the Board is obviously whether or not we want to proceed to seek a new center designation or whether we just simply going to hold off that decision to some future time and continue to operate the center as currently existed. The second recommendation which was not a direct requirement or one that they suggested as if you recall there was the lot size designation in our Mixed Use Zone on 22 where we had a recommendation to consider expanding the size of the lot for commercial development from 7500 square feet to 10,000. The Highlands comes back and says well do you want to do that because it will make more commercial lots potentially non-conforming because the lots in the district are relatively small. If you recall that at the time, the general feeling of the Board at that time was that we wanted to make the commercial development, if it occurred at all in that development, in that zone to actually assemble enough land that they could supply parking and that sort of stuff with the buildings. So that was really our reason for requesting that the lot size be increased. They

raised the question well if you do that; it might create more non-conforming lots. Don't disagree. Our intent though was at the time, was to encourage them to actually assemble larger parcels so that the commercial development would actually fit better on them. So that's the second recommendation. So really it's just how the Board feels about that one. Whether or not they want to continue to except the recommendations in the report to increase the lot size to 10,000 square feet for commercial development or to simply redeem it as it currently is at 7500. So those are the two recommendations. My feeling is that I would agree with the Highlands that we ought to drop the recommendation to expand the size of the center designation and on the second one, I'd always felt that the commercial lots were quite small in that district and made it difficult to provide adequate parking and that type of thing with it. If the Board still feels that way the Highlands does not object to us keeping it in there but they were asking us to reconsider whether we wanted to do that or not. So that's really the question for the Board tonight. How you want to handle that. If you want to go with their recommendation; keep it the way it is or expand the lot size for commercial development. Those are the two requests they had other than that they were quite comfortable with it and how ever the Board feels is the way we'll do the final draft and get it up to them. So I guess really the question this evening is where do you want to be on those two conditions that they've proposed. As I say I would agree with them that it does not make a lot of sense to go through a formal expansion of the center designation at this time and I would support their condition that we not do that and in terms of the lots sizes, that's really a question for the Board. I felt that the time that we were comfortable at 10,000 square feet but if the Board feels differently that's fine too. We can leave it stand as is.

Member Pryor – George, is there a sense of urgency that we have to, you have to get this done by next month?

Planner Ritter – Well no, there's no sense of urgency. It's just a matter of cleaning the report up.

Member Pryor – Personally, I'd like to refresh my memory and look at it.

Planner Ritter – Okay.

Member Pryor – That's just me. I'd like to table it till next month. We can make a good decision. I'm prepared next month to make an intelligent decision.

Planner Ritter – Okay.

Vice-Chairman Fischbach – George, the properties that are 75, are they grandfathered in actually.

Planner Ritter – Well, the ones that are down there would all be grandfathered in. It would be in someone came in and decided to buy one of the homes and try to convert it to a commercial use, the only question we'd have, you know, can he get enough land around it to actually be able provide some parking because one of the problems; well I think there

was two issues that the Board had. One, there wasn't a great sense, at least my sense of it, there wasn't a great sense to encourage commercial development down there; that our rezoning actually involved trying to stabilize that neighborhood and keep it more residential than commercial and then the other aspect was well is somebody's going to do it, at least do it in a way that we can get some parking and that sort of thing with it and most of the time, the lots are so small and the homes occupy so much of it, that there's virtually no room to park or provide even minimal parking with these things. So our sense was to try to up that square footage. So that's really the two, other than that the recommendations that are in the report would stand. If you need more time to think about it, no there's no time pressure quite frankly. We could discuss it at the next meeting.

Chairman VanVliet – I would like to go with the fact that we would eliminate the proposed change in zoning in the area behind the Phillipsburg Mall and that the Highlands is probably out of it. I went through those hearings with the Highlands on that and they had a lot of other areas in the Township that we kind of made the trade off on to get commercial designations for those properties and we would leave that this one would be Highlands Agricultural Preservation Area. That's the overlay. Even though our master plan shows that there is multi-family housing development, the problem with going back to redo it as George indicated was we would be starting from ground zero on making our application and it may endanger our stormwater management plan, our sanitary sewer plan that's been approved already and I don't think we really want to get into that depth of the problem. I mean if it comes up in the future, we'll address it then but I would like to see that we adopt those two proposals for modifying the application. It also goes on to indicate and George didn't mention it but I will, is the fact that if they approve this, we can now start getting payment through the grant money to reimburse George for the work he's done for the last year, two years actually on some of this and get that moving and we kind of sit back and weigh what we're going to do. We have to go for the re-examination of our master plan and put it under that designation that's a modification

Planner Ritter – Yes, the next step, if this report is finally approved by the Highlands then would be to undertake a re-examination of the master plan which would be essentially taking this report and adding some detail to make it a re-examination, hold public hearings on it, invite the public to come in and then the Board would finally take final action on it as an amendment to the master plan and after that, whatever the Board ends up recommending would then become, could be forwarded to Council for their consideration whether they want to rezone or not rezone, that would be their call but that would be up to us to forward it. So there is another step in here before it ever ends up in Council's area of interest is actually go through the re-examination process.

Chairman VanVliet – Would you like to depart further discussion till next meeting.

Member Pryor – I would prefer it, I always like to refresh myself.

Chairman VanVliet – Put it on the agenda for next month and take action on it then. I just wanted to make the Board aware that Highlands did what you guys had submitted last year

and they approved it with those modifications and we should get the process going because I'd like to get that grant money approved and start being spent so.

Member Pryor – I do have a quick question for George. If this goes through, you know, based on these recommendations and we get some great proposal for the mall and Pohat asks us to participate in some way that would require this change, do we start over with the whole plan or we just and move forward with an amendment.

Planner Ritter – No. It would be back doing an amendment on a specific area if that came to be if there was something that happened over at the mall that the Board felt that we had to address differently than what we have out there today. I would assume it would simply be an amendment to where we are. It would focus only on that area.

Member Pryor – Okay, I would still like to review this.

Member Johnson – I would like to as well. I don't have a problem extending it for a month but the one thing that we do have to touch off on at some point, we never addressed the ROM District on how we want to implement the Highlands into that; whether it's best practices that we get that incorporated into our master plan.

Chairman VanVliet – Yeah this only concerns the center designation at this point.

Member Johnson – Right exactly so it's something down the road.

Chairman VanVliet – It's not, you know, if we can incorporate it further on but this is just to get this off the ground to start getting that money.

Member Johnson – Understand. Just wanted to refresh your, we kind of left that as an outstanding item in November.

Chairman VanVliet – Any further discussion? If not, I don't think we need a motion to do anything just defer to a discussion next meeting. Okay with that one out no we can, I think we're at the point where we would like to listen to the Autumn Ridge people who are here. Thank you very much for your patience. Please let the record indicate that Member Pryor has recused himself.

Attorney Shimanowitz – Good evening Mr. Chairman and members of the Board Ron Shimanowitz back before you on behalf of Larken Associates Limited Partnership. We were before you at your last meeting on February 28<sup>th</sup> at which time we presented our case. We presented our site engineer Mike Ford, our architect Rob Larsen, as well as our traffic engineer Jay Troutman. Out of that presentation, there was some issues that arose and some revisions that were necessary. Since that time we did revise the plans and resubmitted and we have new, fresh review letters from your consultants that reacted to those revised plans. We think we have a very clean application now. We've gotten rid of all the variances, addressed many of the comments from your consultants. Once housekeeping item I want to mention is that we had originally asked for a minor subdivision approval that would have

implicated some variances. We've withdrawn that request. So at the last meeting we said we would re-notice but there's no reason to re-notice. The plan is not changing in any way so the original notice is good. My game plan tonight is to call back Mike Ford our site engineer just to tell you what the changes are in a summary fashion and call back Rob Larsen our architect and have him do the same and then look at the review letters and see if we have any open items. So with the Chair's permission unless there is any other housekeeping items, I'd have Mike Ford come back up.

Chairman VanVliet – Please do.

Attorney Shimanowitz – Okay Mike.

Engineer Ford - Good evening.

Attorney Bryce- Well, you've been sworn.

Attorney Shimanowitz – You acknowledge that's you're still under oath?

Engineer Ford - Yes.

Attorney Bryce - Sorry.

Attorney Shimanowitz - Okay. Mike, before you get going I think you have a new exhibit you're going to use.

Engineer Ford - Yes.

Attorney Shimanowitz - I think, my notes say A-7 is the next exhibit. So let's get your next exhibit and we'll mark that exhibit A-7.

Attorney Bryce - That is correct counsel.

Attorney Shimanowitz - Okay good. Tell us what that board is by title and date?

Engineer Ford – Yes, this is actually still has minor subdivision on this but it's the site plan. Basically, it's our colorized rendering of the subtle changes that have been made since the last hearing.

Attorney Shimanowitz - What is the date on that Mike?

Engineer Ford - This would be revised on March 12, 2018.

Attorney Shimanowitz – Okay, if you could take us through what the changes will be.

Engineer Ford - Most of the changes have been many great details that really don't show up on this rendering and are visible from where you're sitting. Overall a layout has stayed the

same. None of the buildings have been moved, changed. Any of the roadway layout. As we discussed at the last hearing, we had a sign, a site sign at Rt. 57 and an additional sign has been added at Baltimore and the detail for that sign has been revised to eliminate the height variance; that was one of the variances that Mr. Shimanowitz referred to that in our original notice has now been eliminated. There was also and the architect will speak to this a variance or a potential variance for storage that's been cured from a site plan engineering standpoint that was cured by adding a basement to the senior apartment building and the subtle change to the site plan there is that an additional door to that building. The foot print of the building hasn't changed at all. Just an additional door to provide access to that basement storage has been added to the site plan and then overall a variety of the changes have really included enhancements; that is additional landscaping to the west of the garage apartments in that open space area, additional landscaping around the senior apartment building area and then with regards to stormwater management, I described at the last hearing that we have a bio-retention basin at Rt. 57 which handles the majority of the site. There was a small portion of a driveway that comes up into the development from Baltimore that was flowing into the existing storm drainage system in Baltimore. What was suggested by Maser Consulting, Mr. Sterbenz's office, is that we try to collect that stormwater and while we don't need to treat it for quantity, we've handled the quantity, but perhaps treat it for water quality and this actually tied into the Highlands review that we received. So what we've actually added is catch basins to capture that water just before it gets to Baltimore and then put it into a little bio what I call a rain garden; a small bio retention system which actually provides some additional landscaping buffer between that last apartment building in Baltimore. So they're the subtle changes that have been made. We've received the March 23rd review memorandum from both your planner and engineer and we would address all those comments to their satisfaction as a condition of any approval this Board might bring.

Attorney Shimanowitz - Thank you Mike. Nothing further Mr. Ford.

Chairman VanVliet - Any questions.

Member Johnson - I have a quick question. Your development is very close to the Class I water, are you disturbing any wetlands or get a permit for what you working in the repairman zone there?

Engineer Ford - No. We've stayed out of the riparian zone but for the conversion of that existing like road that goes through there now, is part of the landscaping business that we turned into a pedestrian pathway as part of the open space and that is an existing disturbed area that can continue to be disturbed in that fashion and then we received a fresh water wetland letter interpretation from DEP and there are no wetlands or wetland buffers present on this site.

Member Johnson - Okay. Great thank you.

Engineer Ford - You are welcome.



Engineer Sterbenz - There is one comment that Mr. Shimanowitz and I spoke about; there is a condominium shown on the map and I don't quite understand it and I just wanted an explanation just so the Board knows how to handle it; we may need to a condition over and above what I recommended in my letter to review condominium documents. It may trigger some changes in the future to our tax assessment maps and I just want to understand it. I don't it's a traditional condominium where you have a building of like the senior building where they're going to be selling units and everything outside the building; the parking areas, the lawn areas are all common that are shared by those owners. I think this is something a little different; just asking to elaborate a little bit and how will this condominium cross access would be permitted between the age restricted site and the balance of the site.

Chairman VanVliet - Are you prepared to discuss that?

Attorney Shimanowitz – Yeah, I am. That's a very fair question. We started out with the idea of a subdivision and we withdrew that application because it did implicate some variances. So we're trying to simplify some things. The idea now is the create two condominium units. It's a little bit creative; these would be land unit condominiums. We are all used to the traditional condominium which is the one we live in. This is actually a situation which has been done all over the state where Land Unit No. 1 would be the larger lot that will serve the non-age restricted units. Land Unit No. 2 would be the smaller lot serving the age-restricted units. What we are trying to accomplish is a legal separation of some sort because the age restricted needs to be marketed separately and under federal housing laws needs to be treated separately. So we thought the best way to do that was by a land unit condominium and to Mr. Sterbenz point, that can, the issues of sort of the coordination between the two units will either be through the condominium documents and/or reciprocal easement agreement. We haven't worked out all the details of that but there'll be some legal documentation that makes sure that the common area is properly attended to.

Chairman VanVliet - Okay just so a little clarification for us not being entirely involved with the legal situation here is that even though you say condominiums, these will still all remain rentals units.

Attorney Shimanowitz - Yeah, what's actually being created as a condominium is the land area.

Chairman VanVliet -Okay.

Attorney Shimanowitz - It's a little bit different than what we're all used to but it's been done throughout the state and it's been financed by lenders and it's fairly common but it's a little bit different then what we're all used to yeah, but the how we propose the actual living units is unchanged for sale, rental, whatever our proposal was is unchanged.

Chairman VanVliet - Mr. Bryce.

Attorney Bryce - No I just, I think for clarification I think counsel would agree that right now the entire parcel will be part of a master condominium, if you will.

Attorney Shimanowitz - That's a fair way to access that.

Attorney Bryce - That will have within two separate units treated by land but not by individual units so there will be an agreement between the master condominiums will probably provide for areas, common elements amongst the two separate parcels, for lack of a better word without being subdivided.

Attorney Shimanowitz - That's exactly right. That's how it will be handled.

Chairman VanVliet - Paul, any further

Engineer Sterbenz - Yeah I think we have to add a condition about the submission of condo documents for the unit approval by the board attorney and myself and within that, they'll have to be provisions for cross-access between the two land units and then I think there needs to be a condition that if there's any costs to be incurred by the Township, updating the tax maps, that the Township being reimbursed for those in connection with this condominium.

Chairman VanVliet - You accept.

Attorney Shimanowitz - Yes.

Chairman VanVliet - Thank you. George do you have

Planner Ritter - Well, no. The applicant has indicated that they're willing to address any of the minor landscaping issues in text. The only issue I don't think that was discussed, at least according to my notes at the last meeting, was given that the pool is in close association with a residential unit that's directly adjacent to it, even though it's within the business district, it is still a house, the question came up as whether or not there would be any outdoor speaker systems put in for the pool and that stuff or whether there was none. So that was the only condition and I don't think that you directly addressed but by modifying the plan, is there any intent to put speakers or anything on the pool deck itself for the seniors?

Attorney Shimanowitz - I don't know if the plan has evolved to that point yet but certainly whatever condition the Board thinks reasonable with regard to that whether it is your noise ordinance. We are amenable to working that through, but I don't think we're that far along that we know the sound system for the pool area. I understand your concern but maybe there's a

Planner Ritter - Well, the question I have is just that it not be too loud. I don't even, I just don't want somebody that happens to purchase the house next door, listening to, gets a phone for so and so come on in that kind of stuff. That's the only think I'm concerned

about is just that maybe the best way to have it is just put a condition in there and I'm not quite sure how we enforce it. If you are going to have a system that the sound level be set enough that it's not particularly (inaudible) beyond the property line

Attorney Shimanowitz - That's fine. We can we get to a resolution Mr. Bryce I can work through some language that will satisfy

Planner Ritter - That's fine. The rest of my comments deal with landscaping and as indicated I think we can get that resolved without any problem.

Attorney Shimanowitz- Very good.

Engineer Sterbenz - Then with respect to what Mr. Ford indicated, he is going to address the comments in my letter as a condition of any approval and that's fine. I think the comments are all technical in nature. They're all fairly minor in nature and I think Mr. Ford did a very nice job between the last meeting on February 28th and this meeting to address the previous letter and take care of a lot of those technical comments.

Chairman VanVliet - So you are satisfied?

Engineer Sterbenz - I'm satisfied and I have no problem with those being rolled into a resolution.

Engineer Sterbenz - Then with respect to, I mean, Mr. Ford indicated that he's going to address the comments in my letter as a condition of any approval and that's fine. I think the comments are all technical in nature. They are all fairly minor in nature and I think Mr. Ford did a very nice job between the last meeting on February 28th and this meeting to address previous review letter and take care of a lot of those technical comments.

Chairman VanVliet - You're pleased, you're satisfied.

Engineer Sterbenz – I'm satisfied and I have no problem.

Chairman VanVliet - Board members have any questions or

Engineer Sterbenz – Yeah, I just have one other comment. Just really fast, there is a comment recommending referral to the Police Department, Fire Department and the Board of Education and I think we should include that as a condition that the applicant be required to provide those plans to those different agencies within the town for a review and comment.

Chairman VanVliet - You may want to especially contact the Fire Department on the Regs. of the hose connections. There's been some problems in town with providing standard connections and Lopat doesn't have standard connections. So you might want to just coordinate with them and see that we don't run into a problem.

Attorney Shimanowitz – Yeah, okay.

Chairman VanVliet - Further questions. If not, I'll open it the public for any questions on the overall application of the applicant. Seeing none, I propose the Board move forward on this one and I would entertain a motion that we grant preliminary and final site plan approval. Is there any objection to that with the resolutions and the conditions that we've been stated here? Do I hear a motion?

Vice-Chairman Fischbach – Motion.

Chairman VanVliet - Do I hear a second?

Member Johnson - So that's for preliminary and final?

Chairman VanVliet - Preliminary and final

Vice-Chairman Fischbach- With the resolutions.

Member Johnson - (Inaudible) of course. Okay. Did you hear a second yet?

Chairman VanVliet - No.

Member Johnson - I'll second.

Chairman VanVliet - Beth roll call please.

Secretary Dilts - Yes.

AYES: Members Correa, Johnson, Schneider, Vice-Chairman Fischbach, Chairman VanVliet.

NAYS: None

Attorney Shimanowitz - Thank you.

Chairman VanVliet - Good luck. We'll take a five-minute recess on this. We're going to do something a little bit different right now that is the fact that I'm going to allow public comment on anything that we didn't have public comment on before. If someone would like to come up because we're going to have a training program on stormwater environmental protection area it is a power point presentation I believe so if the public doesn't want to, it will be about 40-45 minutes so if you don't want to stay that's fine, but we'll have the public comment on what's been heard so far now if anyone would like to come up, John.

John Betz - Brakeley Gardens - I'll just call it condolized. Can those buildings be condolized on that land?

Attorney Bryce - There can always be a future application to change into a condo. That would be a separate application.

John Betz - and that would have to go before the Planning Board and the Council?

Attorney Bryce - To be honest with you, usually it works in the opposite direction. Usually if you (inaudible) apartments, there's conversion that would have to do. I suppose that in the broadest sense of it, anybody that owns an apartment building by law, I think by law, can turn it into a condo at a future date. That may not necessarily have to come before at any time to go from apartment building to a condo. They would have to file that with the Department of Community Affairs though and there would be a filing with the state board. I can take a look, that's a good questions and I should actually take a look at that to see if there is any type of requirement to convert that to a condo. I'm not familiar with one.

John Betz - Okay Mr. Bryce, thank you. Thank you, sir.

Chairman VanVliet - Any further comments from the public. Hearing none, I will close the public portion of this and move onto our training.

A discussion was held regarding those members who were not present how they would be trained. Chairman VanVliet indicated they would be able to go to a meeting of the Zoning Board of Adjustment. After that they would look to get it on their own. Engineer Sterbenz said the Board member cans watch it at their house but a certification form would have to be created. The completion date is **June 30, 2018** of this year. Attorney Bryce will create the certification and distribute so it can go into the records.

The Board members proceeded to watch the video on Stormwater Water Resources Program presented by Rutgers Cooperative Extension along with the NJDEP and the Association of New Jersey Environmental Commissions. This program took approximately 45 minutes to complete and was facilitated by Adam Wisniewski of Maser Consulting.

Chairman VanVliet – Thank you very much. We appreciate it. Motion to adjourn.

Motion by Member Schneider, seconded by Member Pryor to adjourn. All in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret B. Dilts  
Secretary to the Board