SAYREVILLE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

**MINUTES OF JULY 23, 2014**

**The regular meeting of the Board of Adjustment was called to order by Mr. Kuczynski, Vice Chairman and opened with a salute to the flag. Mr. Kuczynski announced that the meeting was being conducted in accordance with the Sunshine Law.**

**Members of the Board of Adjustment present were: Mr. Kuczynski, Mr. Kreismer, Mr. Green, Mr. Corrigan, Mr. Emma and Mr. Henry**

**Absent Members: Mr. Walsh, Ms. Catallo and Ms. Fisher**

**Also present were: Mr. Sachs, Attorney, Mr. Cornell, Engineer and Mr. Leoncavallo, Planner**

**#14-01 Dance Stop 3213 Bordentown Ave. Use Variance $ 2,000.00 App.**

**$ 6,938.00 Esc.**

**Mr. Sachs stated he reviewed the affidavit of publication and proof of public service and the Board had jurisdiction to hear the application. Mr. Kuczynski asked for motion to deem application complete,**

**Mr. Kreismer made motion; Mr. Corrigan seconded, motion carried.**

**James Clarkin, attorney for the applicant addressed the board and clarified that the application was not for a Use Variance as shown on the agenda, but it was for a Site Plan. The applicant owns two lots, one with the current dance studio and one with a single family residence. They intend to demo the single family home, construct a 2nd floor on the existing dance studio and combine the two lots. This is a variance free application as it’s a permitted use in the Overlay Zone. Mr. Clarkin addressed the parking requirement for 34-40 spaces; the applicant is proposing 44 parking spaces which exceeds the requirement. He said the primary purpose of the application is to expand the facility with dedicated rooms 1 room will have a stage another with storage and office space, there will be practice rooms added to accommodate classes and specific dance instructions.**

**Mr. Sachs swore in Gina Forcella, Owner who stated that she has been in operation for 30 years; 25 years at this location. The hours of operation are Monday-Friday 10:00 am – 9:00 pm; Saturday 9:00 am – 3:00 pm during the daytime is mostly office work. This application would provide better accommodations as the rooms at present are small and it’s a challenge to educate the students and perform necessary dance moves; the larger rooms will provide much better/needed instruction. There will also be less limitations for private instructions/lessons as there will be four (4) private dance rooms as well as space for storage and office space the entrance will also have a small store where members can purchase items pertaining to dance. While there will be a capacity to increase registrations they prefer to remain the same. Parking needed for employees will probably be approximately 4-6 spaces. Both lots now have a total of 30 spaces they are proposing 44 spaces. Mr. Green asked if the parents stay while children are practicing; Mrs. Forcella said only parents of the younger children usually stay and those classes are done by 3:00 PM. She talked about another group of students called the “Troop Members” which encourages more serious dancers for future schooling and scholarships. These students have blocked off hours, which leaves not much room for recreational dancing. With the new addition proposed they will be able to provide a room for the “Troop Member” students to do homework, and will be able to accommodate all phases of dance; the total headcount is 229 students. Classes are staggered so parking will be sufficient. Deliveries are from UPS and these deliveries are for costumes, shoes, etc. 2-3 times per week. Mr. Green asked how many students were in each class, Mrs. Forcella said 10 students is the average size of the classes. Mr. Green asked how long the classes lasted, Mrs. Forcella said approximately 2 hours for the older students and 1 hour for the younger students. Mr. Henry asked how many students were in the building at one particular time; Mrs. Forcella said she is very careful at making the schedule; Mr. Green said there could be at least 30-40 students in the building, Mrs. Forcella said “yes.” Mr. Clarkin asked if the senior dancers were dropped off and picked up, Mrs. Forcella said “yes.”**
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**Robert W. Adler, Jr., Architect spoke on behalf of the applicant; Mr. Kuczynski asked for motion to accept credentials; Mr. Kreismer made motion; Mr. Corrigan seconded, motion carried. Mr. Adler stated that he knows the site as his daughter participates in the “Senior Troop.” He prepared the drawing being presented and described (pages 5 & 6 of 6) the façade and stated that the main entrance will remain in the rear and they will be removing the existing fire escape, they will provide 3 steps more which will make a safer ingress/egress. He stated signage on the front will be simple and in code. He described the retail area and said it will be for basic dance items. The reception area and studios 1 & 2 with the new addition the access to Studio 1 will be changing and the entrance will also have the office, conference room, homework room and locker room area; the larger studio area will be on the lower floor as shown on sheet 3 of 6.**

**Sheet 4 of 6 shows the level where they will combine the existing spaces, Studio 4 and the stage, which will only be used for dance rehersal and smaller than the first floor. All the studios have doors and some degree of privacy. Mr. Henry asked about signage; they currently have a free standing sign and they will add wording directly to the building. The lighting will face the signage not the street. Mr. Cornell asked if there would be a basement; the applicant said it was only used for storage.**

**Mr. Sachs swore in Mark Rasimowicz, LPE, whose credentials were accepted from the prior testimony. Mr. Rasimowicz stated he also has three daughters involved in the dance studio and then described the site and surrounding uses (page 1 of 10). He then showed the existing site to the east of the dance studio and showed the temporary parking lot being used for the last two years (page 2 of 10.) He then described Exhibit A-1 - Rendering of Proposed Site and Landscaping. He said the existing entrance will remain the same and they will be modifying the rear 44 spaces which are currently in a circular pattern, eliminating the connection to the OJO Trucking. Emergency vehicles will have full access. Landscaping buffer in the rear will not be touched and he then described the additional buffering proposed for the surrounding the property and added to OJO parking lot and their new lot.**

**Mr. Rasimowicz then talked about the lighting (page 4 of 10) stating there would be lighting throughout the parking lot and it meets all the ordinances. He addressed the draining and said the infiltration system of 3’ diameter pipe connected to existing system on Bordentown Ave. and meets all requirements.**

**Mr. Clarkin addressed the CME Report:**

**Item #1 – They understand they need all necessary government approvals.**

**Item #2 - The aesthetics testified to by Mr. Adler they hope are all interesting**

**Item #3 - Will comply with meets and bounds descriptions for proposed easement and lot consolidation**

**Item #4 - Buffer requirement minimum 50’ landscape seeking waiver there is an existing house and existing**

**fence previously approved waiver**

**Item #5 - No parking in front yard; their parking area is 2’ closer to Bordentown Ave. then front of building**

**triggering front yard waiver. Regarding the parking in the rear yard encroaches onto the adjacent**

**property and there is an easement that they are proposing to allow vehicles to park across the line; they**

**have a signed easement from the property owner, he said this was previously granted under the**

**temporary parking area in the rear of the home.**

**Item #6 - Request for waiver of loading area and based upon testimony this evening on infrequent deliveries**

**and the small size of the trucks they are requesting this waiver.**

**Mr. Kuczynski asked if there were any comments from the board members; Mr. Cornell said he had no problem with any of the waivers requested as most have been previously granted on the original approval or with the temporary approval granted recently by this board.**
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**Mr. Rasimowicz then addressed the water distribution system:**

**Item #1 – They have no problem complying**

**C. Storm Drainage - Impermiable Barrier – no problem meeting engineer’s requirements**

**D. Landscaping and Lighting -**

**Item #1 – They are seeking a waiver for trees along frontage of site. In this area there is a sanitary sewer**

**easement 20’ wide almost to the front of building and encompasses almost the entire front of**

**property. They are proposing smaller shrubs, evergreens and some lighting. Mr. Clarkin stated**

**this was a county road and they don’t want trees along the roadway.**

**Item #2 - There is a typo on the plan but there are 32 existing today and they will provide additional trees.**

**Item #3 - Already discussed the waiver regarding the buffer**

**Item #4 - The applicant will comply**

**Item #5 - Maximum lighting intensity should be ½’ candle the area not in compliance is the rear corner**

**of the property but the amount of light is not overbearing**

**Item #6 1’ candle required on all sidewalk areas they are requesting a waiver for this item**

**Item #7 the applicant will comply with house side shields**

**E. Proposed hours of operation – the applicant has provided this information during testimony.**

**Item #2 Loading and unloading will only be by UPS – will add this note to the plans**

**Item #3 Waiver for sidewalks along all parking lot access isles and driveways. They are not changing**

**entrance so no sidewalk is proposed they are providing sidewalks along the entire front of**

**property and providing from Bordentown Ave. into property adjacent to the parking lot**

**on the west around the building. The waiver is for the entrance driveway.**

**Mr. Cornell stated the majority of the items have been addressed and they have no problem with the waivers.**

**Mr. Clarkin then addressed John Leoncavallo’s report; Page 3 Planning Comments:**

**Item #1 Hours of operation and parking – testimony given regarding proposed parking being sufficient**

**for parents as well as hours of operation how it is scheduled and staggered**

**being in compliance with ordinances.**

**Item#2 Deliveries – item has been addressed in testimony**

**Item #3 Lighting – item addressed in testimony**

**Item #4 Traffic Circulation – item addressed in testimony**

**Item #5 Negative Impact – professionals feel there will be no negative impact on surrounding properties**

**Item #6 Comply with request for a note – for landscaping and dark colored mulch**

**Mr. Clarkin stated this was the conclusion of their testimony for the application and he had no summation as the testimony has been clear and indicates a concern for both the instruction of their students and the accommodations for the parents.**
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**Mr. Kuczynski asked for motion to open public portion; Mr. Kreismer made motion to open public portion,**

**Mr. Corrigan seconded, motion carried. No one spoke. Mr. Kuczynski asked for motion to close public portion; Mr. Kreismer made motion to close public portion, Mr. Corrigan seconded, motion carried.**

**Mr. Kuczynski asked for motion to approve/deny this application. Mr. Henry made motion to approve the application, Mr. Kreismer seconded. Roll Call:**

**Yes: Mr. Kuczynski, Mr. Kreismer, Mr. Green, Mr. Corrigan, Mr. Emma, Mr. Henry - complimented the applicant and the professionals and said that he thought it was a very nice Site Plan.**

**8:35 P.M. – Mr. Kuczynski asked for a 10 minute break**

**8:45 P.M. – Meeting resumed with all board members present**
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**#14-13 David Weltz 13 Martha Blvd. Use Variance/2 Family Units $ 1,000.00 App.**

**$ 2,500.00 Esc.**

**Mr. Sachs stated he reviewed the affidavit of publication and proof of public service and the Board had jurisdiction to hear the application. Mr. Kuczynski asked for motion to deem application complete,**

**Mr. Kreismer made motion; Mr. Corrigan seconded, motion carried.**

**John Wisniewski, Esq. Attorney for the applicant addressed the board. He stated that his client had purchased the property which has been vacant for more than a decade and was asking for relief for a pre existing structure/garage on the outside and would like to refurbish the interior to be used as a separate dwelling unit for rental. Mr. Wisniewski said that the applicant David Weltz and Jeffrey Carr, LPE and LPP will testify tonight.**

**Mr. Sachs swore in David Weltz, owner of 13 Martha Blvd. Mr. Weltz stated he purchased the property back in 2012 at a Bankruptcy Auction. The property was in very dilapidated condition; the pool was in bad repair, landscaping was overgrown, the main structure had a foul odor and animals inside. He has been fixing and repairing since he purchased the property and plans to reside in the main house on the property. He is seeking a Use Variance for the structure which is laid out to be residential. Mr. Wisniewski then addressed Exhibit A-1 for which showed the structure and Mr. Weltz pointed out the retaining wall he put up, he said it was going to have landscaping, trees and a patio. Mr. Wisniewski showed photos of the property which was marked Exhibit A-2; Mr. Weltz described the property in its entirety. He showed all the pre existing conditions windows, garage, etc. Mr. Kuczynski asked if the rooms inside were already built; Mr. Wisniewski present photos marked A-3; Mr. Weltz said the framing was already there it was just a matter of finishing a job started. Mr. Kuczynski asked how many bedrooms the applicant said it could be two or three. Mr. Henry asked about the three garage doors, Mr. Weltz said he was going to keep two, not sure about the third. Mr. Henry asked if it would be a two story building; Mr. Weltz said it would and described the two stories. Mr. Kuczynski asked if the sewer and water service was already provided for; Mr. Wisniewski stated for the record in the process of doing the work on the property the applicant discovered there was water service but no water meter. In the process of doing the renovations the Borough now has another water account how this occurred with no meter he had no idea; Mr. Weltz indicated there were two water services with no meter. Mr. Wisniewski addressed Exhibit A-1 and asked the applicant where people would park; Mr. Weltz showed the paved area and parking spots already existing including the bays in the garage. He explained the circulation and showed the two entrances onto Martha Blvd. and where they meet at the bottom. He described the photos such as the barn, tennis court, etc.**

**Mr. Sachs swore in Jeffrey Carr, LPE & LPP. Mr. Kuczynski asked for motion to accept credentials; Mr. Kreismer made motion, Mr. Emma seconded, motion carried. Mr. Carr gave an overview of the R-20 zone and the application. He presented Exhibit A-4 Tax Maps he showed the property and showed it abuts the R-10 zone it follows the properties to the left. He described the multiple lots on the property and how it is unique and differs from all the others. He said the relief being requested is for a D1 Variance; Use Variance a deviation from the ordinance. Apartments are not permitted in the zone; he discussed permitted uses and conditional uses and stated this could also be a house of worship. He described the property in comparison to surrounding properties and said there is no density issue. He pointed out from the planner’s letter and the impact if any, on the Master Plan. He read from the Master Plan and described the redevelopment of the site and how it meets the plan compared to others. He compared the main house, the barn structure and the garage lower in elevation and the two story house adjoining. He addressed Exhibit A-5 which is a view from Martha Blvd of the main house and the two-story with garages. The house has history and character and is well landscaped. Alternative would be to subdivide and build homes. There is no new construction planned just working on what currently exists. He stated a variance can be granted, there is no other property located close to this property. Mr. Wisniewski stated there would be no impairment and the circulation for an emergency vehicle is present more so on this property.**
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**Mr. Leoncavallo asked about the gray shaded areas on the exhibit; Mr. Carr showed where a portion of the area was stoned and other areas were paved. He stated the lighting is typical lighting on any residential property and garbage collection is the same as other residences. He said there will be no business uses and non are proposed.**

**Mr. Sachs asked in terms of the positive criteria was it his testimony that it satisfies Goal E to promote the establishment of appropriate population densities and concentrations that would contribute to the well being of persons neighborhood and communities, Mr. Carr said yes, this was what he was eluding to. Mr. Kuczynski asked if this is granted would this remain a single family residence. Mr. Wisniewski said it would only be one rental unit.**

**Mr. Green asked about the pool and tennis courts and asked if they would be utilized; would the tenants be using the pool and tennis courts, Mr. Weltz said they would be able to use. Mr. Henry asked about the green area behind the apartment. Mr. Carr stated it was basically a retaining wall and described the proposed residence and showed this area on Exhibit A-2. Mr. Henry asked for the height of the wall, Mr. Carr said approximately 3 ft.**

**Mr. Kuczynski asked for motion to open public portion; Mr. Kreismer made motion to open public portion,**

**Mr. Emma seconded, motion carried.**

**Mr. Sachs swore in Joseph Bulman, Esq. Mr. Bulman stated he represented Mrs. Virginia Ogborne, 19 Martha Blvd. which is to the right of the property. He stated there is a dramatic slope down to where this garage is her bedroom is on that side of the house and she is very concerned about the use of the garage and affect it might have on her, she is older and lives alone. He felt the lighting, noise and parking issues were not adequately addressed and the application should really have been for a Site Plan. There were no specific dimensions and delineation of exactly how big the parking area will be and the number of bedrooms and apartments. There will probably be lighting around the proposed house as it is in a dark area on the property. It’s conceivable there may be parties which would disturb his client. He stated there also appears to be a need for one bulk variance; on the survey it indicates that the rear yard has a separation of 16.5’ between the bottom of the slope and his client’s house and the garage. The R-20 Zone requires a 30’ rear yard and there may be other bulk variances but this is not known. He does not consider this to be a non conforming structure they are clearly changing the character of it from a garage to a residence. They should abide by the bulk requirements in the R-20 Zone. The use regulations in Schedule 1A for residential districts specifically provides that the uses permitted are things like sheds and pools not apartments. He felt this application represents a significant departure from a single family residential area and not enough details of site issues have been addressed. He said the board should have a solid answer to the applicant’s intentions on the site. Because of the issues he feels have not been addressed properly, he felt the application should be denied.**

**Mr. Wisniewski addressed the concerns:**

**- He wanted reflected on the record that he had a strong objection regarding the concern of who the**

**applicant might rent to this was not anyone’s jurisdiction as to who it is rented to as long as it is rented as**

**residential.**

**- Regarding parties the applicant certainly can entertain and this is not against the land use**

**- Based on testimony one unit was very clear with two bedrooms, two parking bays and one outside.**

**All existing asphalt/pavement allows for other parking.**

**- This is in the R-20 Zone and if this property had it not been rescued by the applicant it could in fact  
support at least four (4) non conforming properties. He has preserved the character of the neighborhood**

**and the zone plan.**

**- This is all existing structures. When this building was constructed it was constructed with these set**

**backs the applicant didn’t chose them. It is either presumed that the board or what other approving**

**authority at the time passed this and it’s been inherited by purchase.**
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**Mr. Weltz described the property line on the right side in Exhibit A-1. He said the retaining wall was put up to flatten out the area and put trees around the property to make it look much nicer. At the time the neighbor was quite happy. He did the plantings on both sides of the property at her request and permission, this also increased her privacy level.**

**Mr. Sachs asked the applicant if he agreed to the following:**

**- That this would remain a single family home**

**- That there would be no more than four (4) bedrooms**

**- Number of garage bays will be two (2) with one space outside**

**- Lighting in the rear of the house will be one (1) light**

**Mr. Sachs stated he did not feel this application required a Site Plan. Mr. Leoncavallo stated this was an accessory structure with an apartment limited to a number of bedrooms with will remain a single family home. Mr. Wisniewski stated they were in agreement. Mr. Wisniewski said part of it will remain a garage and this was a pre existing use. He submitted photos A-5 and A-6 which he passed around showing all landscaping done. Mr. Green asked what the distance was from the single family house to the main house, Mr. Weltz said approximately 75 ft.**

**Mr. Sachs swore in Jan Williams – 20 Martha Blvd. Mr. Williams stated that he lives across from the property. He moved there in 2002 and has watched it deteriorate. With hurricane Sandy it was really bad. Mr. Weltz purchased in 2012 and has turned the property around. He was impressed by the contractor who periodically**

**invited all the neighbors to view the construction going on. When he was asked what he thought about the rental he said that he had no problem. He said he was here to speak on the applicant’s behalf and that he has no objection.**

**Mr. Kuczynski asked for motion to close public portion; Mr. Kreismer made motion to close public portion,**

**Mr. Emma seconded, motion carried.**

**Mr. Wisniewski gave a brief summary of the application and the property. He addressed the testimony of the professionals. He asked that the board approve the Use Variance.**

**Mr. Kuczynski asked for motion to approve/deny this application. Mr. Henry made motion to approve the application with the requirements of no more than four (4) and other stipulations discussed, Mr. Kreismer seconded. Roll Call:**

**Yes: Mr. Kuczynski, Mr. Kreismer, Mr. Green, Mr. Corrigan, Mr. Emma, Mr. Henry**
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**#14-22 Ken Steiner 14 Furman Ave. Bulk Variance/Fence $ 50.00 App.**

**Mr. Sachs stated he reviewed the affidavit of publication and proof of public service and the Board had jurisdiction to hear the application. Mr. Kuczynski asked for motion to deem application complete,**

**Mr. Kreismer made motion; Mr. Henry seconded, motion carried.**

**Mr. Sachs swore in Ken Steiner home owner. Mr. Steiner said he wanted to install a fence in front which is not allowed according to borough ordinance. He stated all his trees and arborvitaes were destroyed from Hurricane Sandy. The 3 ft. fence will mostly be on the vacant lot.**

**Mr. Leoncavallo stated the variances:**

**- Fence not allowed in front yard, he is asking for a 3 ft. setback. The proposed fence will mostly be**

**on a vacant lot which looks like it’s owned by the applicant.**

**The applicant said he took measurements so he could get a visual going in and out of the driveway. Mr. Kuczynski asked if the arborvitaes were in the same place as he is proposing for the fence. He said that the arborvitaes provided privacy and the fence would provide the same. He was proposing a 6 ft. wooden stockade board on board. Mr. Henry asked if it was 3 ft. The applicant said he is going 5.7 ft. from the sidewalk. Mr. Henry asked why he didn’t want to replace shrubs, the applicant said he wanted to replace the trees with a fence. Mr. Henry asked how much water he had, the applicant said roughly about 2.5 ft. around the house and now he was in a flood zone. Mr. Green asked Mr. Cornell what the setback was for a front fence; Mr. Cornell said 20 ft. He said in this instance there is already a variance with the existing house. Mr. Henry asked why fences were not allowed in the front of a home; Mr. Leoncavallo explained that a 3 ft. fence may be allowed but aesthetically not higher. Mr. Green asked Mr. Cornell what the ordinance in reference for front yard fencing; Mr. Cornell said the ordinance for this particular zone is 20 ft. Mr. Green looked at the property today and asked the applicant if the arborvitaes present were his, the applicant said they did belong to his property and they go right up to the neighbor’s fence line. Mr. Green said the only problem he had was bringing the fence all the way out it would not be conducive to the neighborhood for sight and on the survey it indicates that it is 15.3 ft. The applicant presented pictures of houses and buildings in bad shape; Mr. Green indicated that they would be coming down in the near future.**

**Mr. Henry asked what would happen if he didn’t fence the lot; the applicant stated he would like to possibly put in a pool in the near future. Mr. Kuczynski asked the applicant if he would be willing to split the difference and go ½ way 9 ft. from property line; the applicant said he had no problem with this suggestion. The applicant asked if there were any variances in reference to parking on the empty lot space. Mr. Sachs said he thinks he would have to park in a driveway, the applicant said he has two curb cuts as this was a driveway. Mr. Sachs said he would be concerned about cars backing out.**

**Mr. Sachs went over the suggestion:**

**- 9 ft. from property line approximately 6 ft. from the front of house**

**Mr. Green commented on the pictures shown and said one house is going down the other will be worked on.**

**Mr. Henry asked Mr. Sachs to repeat Mr. Kuczynski’s suggestion:**

**- Split the difference between the 3 ft. the applicant is asking for which will add 6 ft. to his three will**

**be 9 ft. The fence only goes partially down the side yard and will be wood board on board 6 ft., identical**

**to the other houses in neighborhood.**
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**Mr. Kuczynski asked for motion to open public portion; Mr. Kreismer made motion to open public portion,**

**Mr. Corrigan seconded, motion carried. No one spoke. Mr. Kuczynski asked for motion to close public portion; Mr. Kreismer made motion to close public portion, Mr. Corrigan seconded, motion carried.**

**Mr. Kuczynski asked for motion to approve/deny this application. Mr. Henry made motion to approve the application with stipulations discussed, Mr. Corrigan seconded. Roll Call:**

**Yes: Mr. Kuczynski, Mr. Kreismer, Mr. Green, Mr. Corrigan, Mr. Emma, Mr. Henry**
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**MEMORIALIZATION OF RESOLUTIONS**

**#14-15 George Grooms 19 Ciecko Ct.**

**Mr. Kuczynski asked for motion to memorialize resolution. Mr. Kreismer made motion to adopt the resolution; Mr. Henry seconded. Roll Call:**

**Yes: Mr. Kuczynski, Mr. Kreismer, Mr. Green, Mr. Corrigan, Mr. Henry**

**#14-18 Melissa/Michael Bomberry 16 Coolidge Ave.**

**Mr. Kuczynski asked for motion to memorialize resolution. Mr. Henry made motion to adopt the resolution; Mr. Corrigan seconded. Roll Call:**

**Yes: Mr. Kuczynski, Mr. Kreismer, Mr. Green, Mr. Corrigan, Mr. Henry**

**#14-20 Mauna Trivedi 38 Smullen St.**

**Mr. Kuczynski asked for motion to memorialize resolution. Mr. Henry made motion to adopt the resolution; Mr. Kreismer seconded. Roll Call:**

**Yes: Mr. Kuczynski, Mr. Kreismer, Mr. Green, Mr. Corrigan, Mr. Henry**

# ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES

# Mr. Kuczynski asked for motion to approve and accept the minutes of the June 25, 2014 meeting.

# Mr. Green made motion to accept the minutes; Mr. Corrigan seconded, motion carried.

**Before adjourning, Mr. Sachs stated letters were received by Jersey Cooperage and Leaf Industries and both he and Andy Mashanski will monitor the situation for increase of activity.**

**ADJOURNMENT**

**There being no further business to discuss, Mr. Kuczynski asked for motion to adjourn, Mr. Henry made**

**motion to adjourn; Mr. Corrigan seconded, motion carried.**

**Respectfully submitted,**

**Joan M. Kemble**