

**Knowlton Township Land Use Board**

**Minutes**

**Tuesday, September 26, 2023**

There was a regular meeting of the Knowlton Township Land Use Board on Tuesday, September 26, 2023. Clayton Taylor led the Board in the flag salute at 7:00 p.m. He announced that adequate notice of the meeting has been provided in accordance with the "Open Public Meetings Act" by publishing notice of all regularly scheduled meetings in the NJ Herald and Express Times-NJ Zone Edition, as well as providing said schedule in the Municipal Clerk's Office and the Township Website. A moment of silence was held for our Military Personnel serving in harm's way.

**Roll call:**

**Present:** Cuntala, Drake, Baley, Mathez, Mezzanotte, O'Neill, Smith, Starrs, Werner, and Taylor.

**Absent:** Mazza

**Also Present:** Attorney Gavan, Engineer: Denis Keenan, Planner: Dan Bloch

**Approval of Minutes:**

The August 22, 2023 Land Use Board minutes were distributed prior to the meeting. A motion to approve was made by Ms. O'Neill and seconded by Mr. Baley. Chairman Taylor asked for a roll call vote to approve the minutes.

Roll call vote: Cuntala-yes, Drake-yes, Baley-yes, Mathez-yes, Mezzanotte-yes, O'Neill-yes, Smith-yes, Starrs-yes, Werner-Abstain, Taylor-yes.

**Adoption of Resolution:**

**#23-004 Quiet Valley Printing/Daniel Deroche/Deroche Truck Covers& Tarps, Inc Block 12, Lots 7, 8 and 9**

Chairman Taylor stated this is a resolution for the completeness review and asked if anyone had a motion on adopting this resolution. A motion to adopt was made by Mr. Drake and seconded by Ms. O'Neill. Brief discussion took place regarding typographical corrections that were made to the original draft.

Roll call vote: Cuntala-yes, Drake-yes, Baley-yes, Mathez-yes, Mezzanotte-yes, O'Neill-yes, Smith-yes, Starrs-yes, Werner-Abstain, Taylor-yes.

**Determination of Completeness:**

**#23-004 Quiet Valley Printing/Daniel Deroche/Deroche Truck Covers& Tarps, Inc Block 12, Lots 7, 8 and 9**

Engineer Keenan went over his new completeness review #2. Which recommended the application again be deemed incomplete subject to 5 items. These are the entities with 10% ownership, the traffic summary, architectural plans, information relative to fire protection and identification of wetlands. He stated since this review was issued he has received updated information from the applicants engineer addressing 4 of

the items. The only item that was not addressed was the architectural plans. In speaking with the applicant, they stated they would provide architectural plans for the hearing. With that as a condition he said he had no exception deeming the application complete. Chairman Taylor stated there were 2 other items in the review one being whether the application fees and deposits were received and if the certification of taxes was up to date. Secretary Apgar stated taxes were paid up until the November quarter and the application and review fees were received. Chairman Taylor then asked Mr. Keenan about the question of the sewer service area. He continued part of the property, except the steep slopes, is in the current sewer service area map from the DEP. He asked if the applicant had addressed that because they had shown a septic system area and talked about septic approval from the county. Mr. Keenan stated they have not addressed that as part of the application and that would have to be addressed as part of the testimony. He said he did check and if they are in the sewer service area they are not required to connect. Chairman Taylor and Mr. Mathez stated they would be required as it is in the township ordinance. Mr. Keenan said he would follow up with them and raise the point of the ordinance. In regard to giving relief to that ordinance Attorney Gavan stated relief can be given to general township ordinances, but he did not believe a waiver could be given to this one. Ms. Starrs asked about the different names used by the applicant on the application and supporting documents. Attorney Gavan said that would be discussed during the testimony. Ms. Mezzanotte noted she did not see details on the retaining wall addressed. Mr. Keenan said they would want to see what type of wall they will be using and that would be an appropriate comment for the hearing. Mr. Smith noted checklist D has 6 items for completeness only and 4 items waived. Checklist E has 8 items for completeness only. Attorney Gavan said when it comes to completeness all waivers are for completeness only. Regarding the different names of the business, Chairman Taylor said there was a letter from the attorney stating who the 10% owners were of the company. Attorney Gavan stated what could be done is to deem it conditionally complete and instruct him to notify their attorney that one of the conditions that is not waived (and has to be answered 14 days before the hearing) is who the exact applicant is. With there being no further discussion, Chairman Taylor asked with the addition of a letter from the applicant's attorney stating exactly who the applicant is, 2 weeks prior to the next meeting, is there a motion on the completeness. A motion to deem the application complete with waivers was made by Mr. Smith and seconded by Mr. Baley. Roll call vote: Cuntala-yes, Drake-yes, Baley-yes, Mathez-yes, Mezzanotte-yes, O'Neill-yes, Smith-yes, Starrs-yes, Werner-yes, Taylor-yes.

**Old Business:****#23-002 Makarevich, Block 44, Lot 9**

Bryce Good from Finelli Consulting Engineers was sworn in and stated he is a registered professional engineer in the state of New Jersey. He stated they had submitted revised plans on August 11<sup>th</sup> to address some of the matters that were brought up at the July meeting. The key points of what was submitted in the revised plans are: we shortened the driveways to be less than 200 feet long, there are notes on the plans referencing the buffering that was requested, he believes we have received letters from the cemetery association saying they are not interested in the parcel and the deed of easement was submitted. He then asked if there were any other concerns that weren't addressed.

Engineer Keenan then went over these new items relative to his report. He stated one of the key items that was discussed at the last meeting is stormwater management and how it would be handled on the property. He said this probably would not be considered a major stormwater project so it would need to meet all the requirements if they stay under an acre and a quarter acre impervious. Based on the updated submission they indicate they are under that threshold. But if they collectively disturb over an acre on the remaining portion of the property or generate over a quarter of an acre impervious in the future, they would have to retroactively upgrade their stormwater. Technically they don't have to do any stormwater management on this. It would be the choice of the applicant if they just want to comply with stormwater standards. Mr. Keenan stated it really hasn't been addressed. Mr. Good stated this is a subdivision application only and they understand that any development in the future would require an application. Mr. Keenan stated an appropriate consideration could be adding dry wells to support roof run-off. Chairman Taylor added that is not actually required.

Planner Dan Bloch then reviewed the updated plan. He stated the size of the parcels were not changed, but the lot width typo was corrected. The lots are still undersized and less than the required lot width and lot area so they are requesting variances for both lots. They are now showing the buffer and complying with that requirement. The 20-foot buffer along the back and the sides, so they do not need that variance. They are showing a 35-foot-wide driveway easement, so they don't need a waiver for that. A question that was added to the end of our report is whether the property is extending out to the middle of the roadway. He asked Mr. Good if the county will require a dedication to the right of way. Mr. Good stated he believes that is the case based on the testimony from the planner at the July meeting. It was confirmed the acreage shown was after dedication. Mr. Bloch asked if the copy of the deed came in from the preservation showing what the lot sizes are supposed to be. Chairman Taylor confirmed that. Mr. Bloch continued the 1.13 acres includes what's in the right of way, that is why they are asking for relief.

Questions from the board included: Mr. Mathez regarding the letter from the cemetery association which he did not see. Mr. Good stated the applicant sent it in and the applicant agreed. It was not from the department of land preservation. He continued if the board does not have it they could provide it. Chairman Taylor recalls seeing it but could not locate it. He stated we could make it conditional on providing a letter. Attorney Gavan stated they could include in the resolution the testimony that there is no interest from the cemetery and make it a condition to supply it. Mr. Smith stated he did not have a copy either. Chairman Taylor said the 2 remaining variances are the lot width for both lots and the lot area of both lots. Ms. Mezzanotte asked about prior testimony stating the lots would be sold and then there was further testimony from the applicant stating it was for their own use. It was discussed that it is true that once the lots are created, they could be sold, but that is not the applicant's intent. Ms. Mezzanotte would like that corrected if that is an inaccurate depiction of the intent of the property. Attorney Gavan then asked the applicant to speak. Gene Makarevich was still under oath. Attorney Gavan asked what his intention was for the lots. Mr. Makarevich stated both lots would be for part-time farm help to live there as part of their compensation. He has one home now and when he can afford to get another house, he will do the same thing on the other lot. If he was forced to sell them due to the economy he would, but that is not his intent. With no further questions, Chairman Taylor then asked with the variances that were pointed out is there a motion on this application. Mr. Smith made the motion but added: the conditions that our professionals review the plot plans that are being provided with respect to driveway stonework. Attorney Gavan stated the condition should be that they come back

before the board when they are building a house. Motion was seconded by Mr. Baley. Mr. Mathez asked for the motion to be explained. Chairman Taylor said the motion is to approve the application with the waiver for lot width for lot A and lot B, lot area for lot A and lot B, for the applicant to provide the letter from the cemetery association that they are no longer interested and prior to lot development the applicant come back in with a drainage plot plan and development location. Roll call vote: Cuntala-yes, Drake-yes, Baley-yes, Mathez-yes, Mezzanotte-yes, O'Neill-yes, Smith-yes, Starrs-yes, Werner-yes, Taylor-yes.

**New Business****#23-001 Triplebrook RV & Camping Resort, LLC, Block 65, Lot 3**

Gary Goodman introduced himself as legal counsel for the applicant. He stated the applicant proposes to build a 3,200 square foot pole barn for storage. This qualifies as a major site plan. One issue is that they propose to locate the barn 80 feet from the road as opposed to 200 feet which is the requirement in the ordinance. His rationale is to shelter and shield the structure from being in sight of anyone. The topography slopes down and there is a set of trees that block the site. He believes setting the barn by the set of trees at the lower part of the property would shield it from site. Mr. Goodman introduced Ira Alexander as a witness. Prior to speaking, Mr. Smith questioned the board engineer's letter saying the application should be filed as a major site plan and you were responding to the minor site plan? Mr. Keenan responded saying the exception is a clause listed in section 11-30.1A which allows a campground to come in with lesser standards of information than we would require for a major or minor. Being it was deemed complete he believes the board finds the information supplied is adequate. Mr. Goodman added he believes that is under the supplementary regulations. Ira Alexander was then sworn in and stated he is the owner of the campground and has been for 15 years. He gave an overview of the campground. He stated there are 10 permanent structures on the campground currently. The need for the pole barn is for equipment storage including mowers, backhoes and tractors used on the property on a regular basis. They have been stored outside. Mr. Alexander then showed a map with the proposed location of the barn. It is behind a hedge row on Honey Run Rd that extends 15 to 20 feet in the air. There is a depression in the land here and the topography rises as you go up the hill. If the barn were to be placed 200 feet off the road the barn would sit in the middle of the field. It would be visible to all the campers and visible to anyone coming down Honey Run Rd. Mr. Goodman then asked Mr. Alexander questions based on the French & Parrello report. There will be no plumbing needed, to the best of Mr. Alexander's knowledge there are no wetlands in this front area and there is one other small storage area on the property used for mowers. Regarding the proposed barn, they are looking to erect a steel pole barn 40x80, metal skin and roof. Mr. Goodman asked if there were questions from the board. Mr. Smith asked how far off the road the barn would be based on the drawing submitted. Mr. Alexander said approximately 85 feet from the shoulder of the road, about 60 feet from the hedge row. Regarding the right-of-way, Chairman Taylor believes this road has a 33-foot right-of-way (if there is no dedication), so 16.5 feet from the center line. Mr. Alexander stated the closest existing structure is 15 feet from the edge of road. Mr. Mathez asked how tall the building will be – 16 feet.

Chairman Taylor asked about security lighting and what side of the barn it would be on. Mr. Alexander said the preference would be towards the ball field side. Which is the opposite side of Honey Run Rd. Mr. Smith asked the board professionals about the degree of impervious coverage and asking for dry wells. Mr. Keenan felt that would not be unreasonable. Chairman Taylor asked about the percentage of impervious coverage. The applicant's engineer will speak to that. Matan Alexander was sworn in and stated he is a licensed engineer in the state of New Jersey. Matan spoke to the impervious coverage, stating the new structure will only disturb about 3,200 square feet which totals 0.1% of the total property. He continued there are no wetlands impacted in that area due to topography. Regarding Knowlton's code and bulk requirements there are no other variances needed. The focus is on the location of the pole barn. Board questions for the engineer were from Mr. Mathez regarding the orientation of the building -the long side will be parallel to Honey Run Rd; it's been rotated 90 degrees from the original drawing. Mr. Smith asked about an access driveway from within the campground – there will be one at the backside of the building. There will be no parking area. The driveway will be gravel. Ms. Starrs asked if any of the trees along Honey Run Rd were to come down would they be replaced – yes. Chairman Taylor then opened the meeting to public questions. George James spoke regarding this being the best feasible spot for the building. He owned the property in the past, the spot backs up to a hay field and there are no wetlands. If it was put back further, it would be visible. There was further discussion from the board regarding the need for dry wells and the amount of the impervious coverage area. Mr. Keenan stated a lot of the coverage existed prior to 2004 which is why it technically doesn't fall under a major development. But he stated he does not feel that is an unreasonable request. Chairman Taylor asked if there was any other development since 2004 – which there was not. He then asked Mr. Alexander if he would have an objection to putting the gutters into dry wells. He did not. This will be added as a condition. There being no further questions, Chairman Taylor noted there is a variance for the front yard set-back, then the condition of adding the dry wells, and a sketch of the building in the correct location and orientation. Also labeling where the door, the driveway and light will be located. With those conditions and the bulk variance is there a motion. Motion to approve made by Mr. Mathez and seconded. Roll call vote: Cuntalayaes, Drake-yes, Baley-yes, Mathez-yes, Mezzanotte-yes, O'Neill-yes, Smith-yes, Starrs-yes, Werner-yes, Taylor-yes.

**#23-003 JBar Pocono, LLC, Block 17, Lot 1**

Michael Selvaggi introduced himself as council for the applicant. He stated this application is for a section 68 certificate. This is Block 17, Lot 1 and 2 as was pointed out by the board's planner. This was the previous site of Hummel's Garage. The best way to explain a section 68 is "is the use grandfathered". If a use was lawfully existing and then an ordinance went into effect which prohibited the use, you are entitled to continue with that provided that the use for the ordinance was lawful and it's continued unabated since that time. The applicant wants to use it as a towing business and automobile repair shop, so we have to show that was the use before 1975 which is the year Knowlton adopted it's first land use ordinances. And then to show that use continued to the present time. Most times you have to prove the continued use with circumstantial evidence. But here we have David Hummel, who is Norman Hummel's brother. Norman is the individual who formed Hummel's Garage. We believe the operation was in effect before 1975 and continued in that manner until Norman's death in 2010.

The business was then sold to another operator and then my client purchased it from there. Mr. Selvaggi said he would like to have Mr. Hummel testify first. Mr. Hummel was then sworn in. He stated his brother purchased the property in 1961. It was used for automotive repairs and towing. He stated he also use to help his brother and the business was in operation up until his brother's death. Prior to his death Norman's son was helping him. He stated the business was in continued uninterrupted use from the 1960's up until his brother's death. It is the same building, but it's updated. Regarding the fenced off area behind the building; this was used also as the impound area. Board question from Ms. Starrs: were the repairs for just cars or cars and trucks. Mr. Hummel said cars and trucks. There was discussion on prior to Hummel's purchase this was an Esso gas station. Chairman Taylor confirmed prior to Hummel's purchase the gas pumps were no longer pumping gas. Mr. Werner asked if the in-ground tanks were removed. Mr. Hummel said they were removed before his brother purchased it; he believes around 1958-59. Mr. Mathez asked about a filter he thought Norman had. Mr. Hummel said the township requested he put in an oil and water separator which is still in existence today. Mr. Mathez asked if it was still functional. Mr. Hummel said it was supposed to catch the grease and oil if it did go there, but his brother put it in and said it didn't work anyway. Chairman Taylor asked if he knew when his brother acquired Lot 2. Lot 2 is not originally part of this application. This is behind the station where the impound area is. Mr. Hummel said he believes it was a year or two at the most after he purchased the station property. Chairman Taylor noted for clarification he believes our first ordinance in this town was in 1964, but Mr. Hummel owned this property prior to that ordinance also. He continued that he remembers the Esso station and the pumps and tanks being removed. There were no questions from the public for this witness.

Mr. Selvaggi then introduced John Gentile, who is the owner of JBar Pocono, LLC, and he was sworn in. He stated JBar Pocono is a towing and automotive repair business. He said he bought the business in 2022 from Jimmy Schlier. When asked how Mr. Schlier was using the property, he said he wasn't. When asked before he sold it to you, how was he using the property? He said for towing and confirmed there were repairs being done there also. Mr. Schlier bought the property from Mr. Hummel. He confirmed he had done upgrades and renovations to the property including fixing the roof, painting, changing the doors and basically modernizing it. He stated he did get permits, but then had discovered the non-conforming issue and stopped work at that point. Mr. Selvaggi asked what other improvements are planned for the back of the property. Mr. Gentile stated to fix the fence and add a 2-bay pole barn. Mr. Selvaggi had no further questions. Board question from Mr. Werner regarding the continued use. He said it sounded like the Hummel's stopped using the property in 2010 and Mr. Gentile purchased the property in 2022, so will there be testimony on the use in that 12-year period. Mr. Gentile said he spoke with Mr. Schlier and was told how he was using the property. Regarding his comment that it wasn't being used, he clarified that Mr. Schlier stopped using the property in preparation of selling it to JBar Pocono. Mr. Baley commented that anyone from around here knows it was vacant for 12 years. Mr. Hummel commented that Jimmy Schlier bought that property with the understanding that in the state of New Jersey he had to own property in the state of New Jersey to have towing out of that facility. That was one of the big reasons he bought that property. He said whether he used the property, he does not know. But the intent was to be able to tow out of the state New Jersey.

There was discussion amongst the board regarding the continued use in that 12-year period for the same business purpose and having evidence of such. Mr. Selvaggi said the question would be whether the use was abandoned. Mr. Selvaggi asked Mr. Gentile if Mr. Schlier would be available. Attorney Gavan said the law is very confusing on abandoned or not abandoned and agreed it would be worthwhile to try and get Mr. Schlier here to testify. It was noted Mr. Schlier is currently in Florida and Attorney Gavan agreed a phone call could be acceptable. Mr. Selvaggi said he would get Mr. Schlier to do an affidavit for the personal information and see then if he could call in for the next meeting.

Board Planner, Mr. Bloch, spoke regarding an item in his report on the actual dates of the ordinances we are trying to establish. He said because automobile service stations were a permitted use up until 2022 when it was made a prohibited use. So why are we going all the way back to 1975? Mr. Gentile purchased the property in March of 2022 and the ordinance was adopted in May of 2022. Attorney Gavan said so now the testimony has to come from the applicant and current owner to establish his intent was to always use it for automobile service and towing. Mr. Bloch continued because it was a conditional use, did it comply with those conditions? Mr. Gentile said he had no intentions on doing auto body work or painting and does not store unregistered vehicles. When questioned on truck repairs, Mr. Gentile said he does do semi-tractor trailer type truck repairs. Mr. Drake noted there is a 4-ton limit on that road except for deliveries. Questions then arose regarding the weight of the cab only and if it was towed in, does that qualify as a delivery. Mr. Werner said he would like to see some kind of hard evidence of the continued use over the 12-year period. Some kind of ledger, accounting, taxes paid something that shows this was a legitimately authorized use that continued from the previous owner Mr. Hummel. Attorney Gavan said it was the opinion of our Planner that is irrelevant because our ordinance that affects the use came in after he bought it. There was then discussion regarding facts, section 68 and the need for witnesses. Attorney Gavan suggested the applicants revisit what they are going to do based on the Planners comments today and re-present it either as a section 68 or conditional use. It is permitted because it pre-dated the ordinance and he has to present testimony that it won't violate the conditions. It wouldn't hurt to supply a tax return from that 12-year span showing towing operation. Mr. Selvaggi asked to get a copy of the 2022 ordinance. Chairman Taylor noted he only saw the deed for Lot 1 and asked were the lots merged. It was confirmed they were and it is only one lot now. It was discussed this location would only be doing towing in New Jersey. They would have to come back to the board for the construction of the pole barn. Ms. Starrs asked when the applicant comes back could they work into their plan what they are going to do about the weight limit on the road. Attorney Gavan announced without further notice this will be carried to the next meeting, October 24<sup>th</sup>.

Chairman Taylor opened the meeting to public comment. Mr. George Boesze introduced himself as the new zoning officer taking over for Eric Snyder. He stated regarding the previous applicant JBar; his predecessor, Mr. Snyder, wrote them a notice of violation for various improvements that they already had done. The board noted they were copied on the letter and thanked him. His office hours and day were confirmed.

**Other Business:**

**#ZB21-002 Belvidere Congregation of the Jehovah Witness, Block 68, Lot 10.01  
(Signatures on Final Plans)**

The final plans submitted for this application require signatures from the Chairperson of the board along with the engineer and board secretary. This was an application from the former Zoning Board of Adjustment and so the current Chairperson was not a member of the Board of Adjustment. A vote from the former board members is required to nominate a temporary Chair to sign the plans. Mr. Werner and Ms. O'Neill are the only former members who were on the board at the time of this application. Mr. Werner nominated Ms. O'Neill.

**Knowlton Township Ordinance 2023-14 Rezoning a portion of Block 34, Lot 21  
(Master plan consistency review)**

This ordinance was sent from the Township Committee for the Land Use Board's review and approval. A copy was sent to all board members prior to the meeting. Chairman Taylor noted this ordinance is to change the zoning on a portion of this block and lot. There is a small C1 zone along Route 94 at the Blairstown Township line. It is part of a farm that has gone into Farmland Preservation and the owner requested that the entirety be changed to the FPD zone. The Township Committee needs to make sure it is consistent with our Master Plan. There was no comment from the board. A motion to approve was made by Ms. O'Neill. Chairman Taylor noted the procedure would be for the board secretary to compose a letter to the Township Committee advising them the Land Use Board finds it to be consistent with the rules of our Master Plan. All were in favor. None opposed.

**Lighting Ordinance:**

Discussion took place regarding zoning officer input, measurable light trespass, the possibility of infringing on the rights of homeowners, bulb wattage, color and temperature. Mr. Werner feels if light trespass is not being committed why would the brightness matter. Mr. Bloch said as a town you can regulate what buildings look like and where the parking lots go. Other discussion took place regarding the lighting draft ordinance referencing general lighting standards including color temperature which has nothing to do with light trespass. Mr. Werner explained he does not have a problem having a light trespass ordinance. But the draft ordinance includes more than trespass and feels like an HOA type scenario, something a municipality shouldn't do. Discussion then took place regarding commercial versus residential standards. Our current ordinance does cover lighting nuisance, but the previous zoning officer felt it was not written in a way that was enforceable. That's what prompted the board to review the ordinance. Chairman Taylor added the zoning officer did not want to use a light meter. The current ordinance notes measuring foot-candles. But this would require the zoning officer working after dark. Mr. Drake spoke regarding Knowlton's diverse area of rural, semi-village and highway which the zoning officer felt made it hard to create the ordinance.



Mr. Smith noted the current ordinance references light source. Mr. Bloch said that would mean the filament or bulb, which needs to be shielded so you wouldn't see the source. That's what this ordinance is getting at. Discussion took place on trying to find shielded lighting in home stores. Ms. Starrs believes it is not the boards job to make the perfect ordinance but rather to get the bones together and forward to the Township Committee to iron out the small details. Mr. Werner feels the ordinance should not affect existing lighting. Mr. Bloch noted when someone comes before the board (the board is the Township Agency) the board has the authority to say you need to upgrade your lights. Attorney Gavan said additional verbiage should be added to say it goes with modifications or board review. He believes the board is trying to do too much as every law written takes time for the errors or clarifications to come through the system. It would be the same in zoning. Chairman Taylor said we need to talk to our new zoning officer for his input. Regarding commercial properties, if the lighting was approved on the site plan you can't do anything about it. If they made changes since, they are in violation and then it's up to the zoning officer. Mr. Bloch brought up the possibility of people getting permits from the construction office to change lighting and never coming before the board.

Ms. Starrs brought up a previous discussion on escrows being set up and held to ensure applicants did what they were instructed to do in the resolution. She asked Attorney Gavan to prepare something for the next meeting. Attorney Gavan stated the application would need to be changed to include the addition of post approval inspections. This would include the engineer or planner not just construction. It was discussed that the time line for completion should be in our ordinance. There was a question if it could also be included in the resolutions. Mr. Bloch said that is usually in the developer's agreement which is between the governing body and the developer. Attorney Gavan said they could add a condition to all the approvals which says they have to pay for all the post inspections. He continued, under the law all our approvals are conditional approvals. If you don't meet the conditions you haven't perfected your approval. Then the zoning officer has to issue a violation. Mr. Keenan added it's up to the applicant to submit their final plans – if they don't do that they would lose their approval.

Mr. Smith and Mr. Mathez discussed making an appointment with the new zoning officer to go over the existing and draft lighting ordinance for his input on enforcement.

There was also discussion on the secretary having the right to send applications back if not filled out entirely or missing the number of copies required. Attorney Gavan said most towns are requiring everything to be sent electronically in addition to paper now.

**Public Comment:**

A gentleman in the audience said he was surprised to hear we have an existing lighting ordinance and asked if the issue is it's not being enforced? Chairman Taylor replied the former zoning officer felt it was not enforceable and that's why the board started this process of going over the ordinance. We also now have a new zoning officer.

**Bills:**

Chairman Taylor asked if everyone looked over the bills. There was a motion to approve the bills by Ms. O'Neill. Motion was seconded by Mr. Baley. Roll call vote: Cuntala-yes, Drake-Yes, Baley-Yes, Mathez-Yes, Mezzanotte-yes, O'Neill-yes, Smith-yes, Starrs-yes, Werner-yes and Taylor-Yes

**Adjournment:**

A motion to adjourn was made by Ms. Starrs and seconded by Mr. Baley, all were in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 9:31 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted:



Doreen Apgar,  
Board Secretary