

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD
ZONING HEARING BOARD
MINUTES – MARCH 4, 2025

The regular meeting of the Zoning Hearing Board of the Township of Lower Makefield was held in the Municipal Building on March 4, 2025. Mr. Dougherty called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. Mr. Dougherty stated at this point there are only four members of the Board present; and if there was to be a tie vote, that would result in a denial of the Variance request. He stated Applicants present could decide to request a Continuance or wait until later in the meeting to see if the fifth Board member arrives.

Those present:

Zoning Hearing Board:	James Dougherty, Chair
	Peter Solor, Vice Chair
	Christian Schwartz, Secretary
	Mike McVan, Member (joined meeting in progress)
	Judi Reiss, Member

Others:	Dan McLoone, Planner
	Adam Flager, Zoning Hearing Board Solicitor
	Suzanne Blundi, Supervisor Liaison

APPEAL #Z-25-3 – SIMCOX/HOGANCAMP
Tax Parcel #20-004-070
2121 E WELLINGTON RD, NEWTOWN, PA 18940

Mr. Flager marked the Exhibits as follows: The Application was marked as Exhibit A-1. The Site Plan was marked as Exhibit A-2. The Proof of Publication was marked as Exhibit B-1. The Proof of Posting was marked as Exhibit B-2. The Notice to the neighbors was marked as Exhibit B-3.

Ms. Jennifer Hogancamp and Mr. Daniel Hogancamp were sworn in.

Mr. Hogancamp stated that they requesting an impervious surface increase to exceed the stated amount so that they can install a pool and patio off the back of their house.

Mr. Nathan Simcox, contractor, was sworn in.

Mr. Simcox stated the permitted impervious surface is over. He stated they are changing a deck piece out that will become patio as well. He stated they are looking to install a fiberglass, in-ground swimming pool. They will increase the impervious surface and mitigate it with stormwater management/infiltration trench to compensate for any existing run-off.

Mr. Schwartz asked about the fencing drawn in on the Plan, and he asked their intentions with the fencing around the area. Mr. Hogancamp stated they installed a 6' vinyl privacy fence that is around the side and the back, and that fence will stay in place. He stated they do not have any specific pool fencing around the pool given that the existing fencing meets the requirements of the Code. Mr. Schwartz asked if the 6' fence on the E Wellington Road side of the property was existing, and Ms. Hogancamp stated they obtained a Permit for that last year. Mr. Schwartz stated at the bottom of the drawing bordering the neighbor it indicates a 4' high split rail fence, and Mr. Hogancamp stated that is on the neighbor's property.

Mr. Schwartz asked if they obtained a Variance for the fence on the E Wellington Road side; and Ms. Hogancamp stated no Variance was needed, and it was approved by the Township without a Variance. She stated they are on a corner. Mr. McLoone stated typically for a side yard fence it needs to be set back 9' from the road so they may have to move it back a little bit even though they got a Permit for it. He stated the Ordinance states that for a corner lot for every foot in height it needs to be set back 3' so a 4' fence would need a 3' setback, a 5' fence would need a 6' setback, and a 6' fence would need a 9' setback from the road. Mr. McLoone stated he will look at the Permit. Mr. Hogancamp stated he would be curious why the Township approved the Permit if it was not appropriate. Mr. Simcox stated in the worst-case scenario, they would move the fence if it has to be moved.

Mr. Solor asked about stormwater mitigation. Mr. Simcox stated they will mitigate for the full increase, and Ms. Holmes will initiate that and it will be confirmed by the Township engineer as to the size and the volume necessary. Mr. McLoone stated roughly 3 by 6 by 20 would work. Mr. Simcox stated they will add that to the Plan, and re-submit the Plan. Mr. McLoone stated that will bring it back to the existing impervious surface of 24.6%. Mr. Solor asked where it will be located on the property. Mr. Simcox stated Ms. Holmes will add it to the Plan, and they will submit it with the Permit Application to make sure that it fits the requirements of the Township engineer's review.

Mr. Schwartz asked if there is any indication as to where it would be located on the drawing, and Mr. Simcox stated it could be elongated in trench form down the long side of the back side of the pool so that any run-off that came off the pool or around the front or back side of the pool could hit the trench. He stated it could also be down toward where the topsoil stockpile would be to catch water as it flows down toward the swale to the street. Mr. Simcox stated typically the engineer would “clear” that the location and size were appropriate.

Mr. Dougherty stated generally when the Board is presented with Plans it is preferable to have the infiltration trenches shown on the Plans presented so that the Board can make a more-informed decision. He stated he sees that the location of the stockpile would be a commonsense location for it to go; however, there are no topographical features so they do not know which way the water runs. Mr. Simcox stated they have done trenches around the sides and back of the footprint of a pool. He stated it could also be where the stockpile is shown because that is the directional run-off of the yard. He stated the pool would have to be higher than all of the ground around it and it would run away from the pool in the direction of the yard toward the street. Mr. Simcox added that there could be a trench/ditch style that runs parallel to the long side of the fence line which could be appropriate as well.

Mr. Dougherty stated he is comfortable with voting on this tonight and having the Township engineer work with the Applicant to choose the best place for an infiltration trench. Mr. McLoone stated the Township has dealt with Ms. Holmes in the past, and Mr. Majewski could work with her on the right location.

Mr. Schwartz stated he is still concerned about the location of the fence. Mr. Dougherty asked Mr. Flager if that should be included in the vote this evening or would that be something that the Board would ask to have the Township engineer look into and make a decision. Mr. Flager stated the Board is allowed to put reasonable Conditions on an Approval, but whether it is reasonable for this fence when it has been previously Permitted may not be appropriate now. He stated Mr. McLoone could work with the homeowners on this. Mr. Flager stated technically the fence is Permitted, and we do not know at this point whether it was Permitted in error.

Mr. Schwartz stated he has seen around the Township people getting Permits and installing something; and after it is seen by the neighbors, it is realized that it needed a Variance, and the item had to be moved. He stated he bought a house with a shed that was within 10’ of the property line, and he had to get

a Variance to put his pool next to it. Mr. Flager stated at this point we do not know all of the information as far as what was in the Plans, what was in the Approval, and whether it was put exactly where it was supposed to be. He stated he feels these issues can be dealt with by the Township.

Mr. McLoone stated he assumes there was an inspection so he assumes that it was put in right. Ms. Hogancamp stated there was an inspection.

Ms. Reis asked how far the fence is now from the street. Mr. Hogancamp stated it is probably 3' to 4' of grass, and then the sidewalk, and another 1' or so off the sidewalk.

Ms. Hogancamp stated the fence Application was sent September 7, 2022. Mr. McLoone stated he cannot find it in the system, and he will look into this further. Ms. Hogancamp stated Mr. McLoone's name was on the e-mail she received on September 13, 2022 indicating that the Permit was approved.

Mr. Dougherty stated he does not feel that this should not be a Condition of tonight's request.

While Mr. McVan had joined the meeting at this time, he indicated that he would not be voting on this matter.

Ms. Reiss stated she feels that 1' off the sidewalk is very close, and it is close for people trying to walk on the sidewalk with strollers or with a young child on a bike, and they have to use the street; and she feels that it should be moved an appropriate distance.

Mr. Schwartz stated he does not feel comfortable approving the request until we have a resolution to the fence issue, and he suggested that there be a Continuance until the records can be brought out on the fence to see if there was a reason why it was approved where it is at. Mr. McLoone stated that is not relevant to the Variance that is being requested. Mr. Flager stated when they are talking about a reasonable Condition, the reasonableness standard has to be related to whatever the requested relief is. He stated the location of this fence is a completely unrelated issue, although he agrees that the Township should deal with it. Mr. Dougherty stated that is how he feels as well. Mr. Schwartz and Ms. Reiss accepted the explanation that the fence is a separate issue that the Township should deal with, and it does not have anything to do with the pool.

There was no one from the public wishing to speak on this matter.

Mr. Schwartz asked if they talked to the surrounding neighbors; and it was noted that they did speak to them, and they had no issue.

Mr. Solor moved and Mr. Schwartz seconded to approve the Appeal as presented with the full mitigation of the increase in impervious area to the satisfaction of the Township engineer utilizing infiltration methods. Motion carried with Mr. McVan abstained.

APPEAL #Z-25-4 – SMITH

Tax Parcel #20-072-056

1551 BROOKFIELD ROAD, NEWTOWN, PA 18940

Mr. Flager marked the Exhibits as follows: The Application was marked as Exhibit A-1. A two-sheet Petition signed by neighbors was marked as Exhibit A-2. The Proof of Publication was marked as Exhibit B-1. The Proof of Posting was marked as Exhibit B-2. The Notice to the neighbors was marked as Exhibit B-3.

Mr. Brian Smith and Ms. Diane Wuest (his wife) were sworn in.

Mr. Smith stated they are present to discuss Ordinance 215-9 Home Occupation Class 2. He stated he has a document that was uploaded to support a home golf instruction business. He stated he and his wife moved to the Township less than a year ago with a goal to support the community and those who serve it while also building meaningful connections, and it has been encouraging to see their neighbors welcome their family and support his business idea which he believes will enrich the community. He stated there is no construction required, and the business will operate within the existing home. He stated it does not require any structural modifications or additional buildings on the property. He stated there will be no traffic impact. He stated lessons will be scheduled by appointment only insuring only one client vehicle is present at a time which prevents excessive traffic in the neighborhood. He stated parking will be available to clients on the property. He stated appointment times will be spaced out to eliminate congestion and insure smooth transition between clients. He stated he had uploaded petitions that their four immediate neighbors have signed, and those neighbors have also expressed interest in lessons.

Mr. Smith stated he is a qualified instructor, a Licensed 5 to 12 educator, U.S. Kids Golf Certified Coach, Certified Instructor from the Professional Golf Teachers' Association, and Certified Coach of the National Federation of High Schools. He stated his goal as an educator is to provide services to people. He stated he has also been hired as the Solebury School Varsity Golf Coach. He stated this is also supported by the head professional at Makefield Highlands, and he recently spoke to him and knows him fairly well.

Mr. Smith stated the Ordinance permits home occupations that provide instruction in music, art, dressmaking, or millinery (hat-making) services. He stated golf instruction as a specialized skill-based training aligns with the intent of the Ordinance in providing one-on-one educational services in a home setting. He stated the Ordinance specifically prohibits outside employees which aligns with his business structure of sole proprietorship by the homeowner. He stated adhering to this rule eliminates any additional traffic or personnel on site. He stated the Ordinance requires that no external signs indicate business operations, and his business will not display any signs on the property maintaining the Residential aesthetic of the neighborhood. He stated the Ordinance allows clients to visit the home for instruction-based services similar to the permitted categories of music, art, dressmaking, photography, and hat-making instruction. He stated golf instruction is a specialized skill-based training aligned with the intent of the Ordinance in providing one-on-one educational services in a home setting; and similar to how a music student would bring in their instrument for a lesson, his students bring golf clubs. He stated during a music lesson a student would play a part of a piece and request feedback from the instructor; and during golf lessons, the student will hit golf balls into the simulator and require analysis and feedback. Mr. Smith stated this will be all indoors so that there is no risk of golf balls going throughout the neighborhood.

Mr. Smith stated the Ordinance requires that it is clear that the business is an incidental use to the primary use of the home as a residence insuring the integrity of the Residential area remaining intact.

Mr. Smith stated he feels that a Traditional Home Business as outlined in the Zoning Ordinance is limited, and he feels it could be more comprehensive. He stated he feels what he is proposing falls in line with is allowed in the Ordinance.

Ms. Reiss stated she is glad to see this type of business.

Mr. Schwartz asked where the golf simulator will be located, and Mr. Smith stated it will be in the third bay of their garage. Mr. Schwartz asked the height of the ceiling, and Mr. Smith stated it is 12' high.

Mr. Dougherty asked what enforcement methods there will be to insure that clients are parking in the driveway and not the street. Mr. Smith stated the lessons will be staggered so there will not be additional traffic. He stated during the booking process, he will advise clients to pull into the driveway. He stated there will only be one client at a time.

There was no one from the public wishing to speak on this matter.

Mr. Dougherty stated he agrees that the occupations included as permitted in the Ordinance are quite outdated.

Mr. Solor moved, Mr. Schwartz seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Appeal as written subject to the limitation of one client at a time and parking will be limited to the driveway.

APPEAL #Z-25-6 – LALLI/NEWHOOK

Tax Parcel #20-025-241

841 WINTHROP DRIVE, YARDLEY, PA 19067

Mr. Flager marked the Exhibits as follows: The Application was marked as Exhibit A-1. The Site Plan was marked as Exhibit A-2. The one-sheet Rendering was marked as Exhibit A-3. The Proof of Publication was marked as Exhibit B-1. The Proof of Posting was marked as Exhibit B-2. The Notice to the neighbors was marked as Exhibit B-3.

Ms. Nicole Newhook was sworn in.

Ms. Newhook stated she is seeking a Variance for the setback. She stated currently there is a slab on the back of the house that is a patio, and they would like to replace the existing slab with a screened-in deck. She stated a Variance is needed because now it will be a covered structure. She stated the footprint will be exactly the same as it is currently as a patio.

Mr. Schwartz asked Ms. Newhook if she spoke to the neighbors behind her property. Ms. Newhook stated while it was posted, she did not speak to them. She again stated that the footprint will not change. Mr. Solor stated there are sometimes comments from neighbors regarding sight lines. Ms. Newhook stated no one behind her has said anything; but other people have asked, and she advised that it will be the same size, but they needed a screen because they could not use the outdoor space in the summer because of the mosquitos.

Ms. Reiss stated it appears that there are trees in the back, and Ms. Newhook agreed. Mr. McVan stated the property is offset so there is not a direct look at it.

There was no one from the public wishing to speak on this matter.

Mr. Schwartz moved, Ms. Reiss seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Appeal for the covered screened-in deck within the 50' rear yard setback creating a new setback of 35' 9".

APPEAL #Z-25-7 – MOSENDZ

Tax Parcel #20-046-145

56 BLACK ROCK ROAD, YARDLEY, PA 19067

Mr. Flager marked the Exhibits as follows: The Application was marked as Exhibit A-1. The Site Plan was marked as Exhibit A-2. The Proof of Publication was marked as Exhibit B-1. The Proof of Posting was marked as Exhibit B-2. The Notice to the neighbors was marked as Exhibit B-3.

Mr. Aleksandr Mosendz was sworn in.

Mr. Dougherty stated this is the third time Mr. Mosendz has been before the Zoning Hearing Board. He stated the height of the fence went from 6' to 5', and now the request is down to 4'.

Mr. Mosendz stated he is seeking a Variance to get the maximum height he can for the fence. He stated while he would prefer that it be 6', they were not able to get that. He stated 4' is his last option.

Mr. Dougherty asked why the fence cannot be connected to the end of the building. He asked if there is a financial hardship. He also asked if Mr. Mosendz is living on the property or did he sell it. Mr. Mosendz stated he was the builder. Mr. Dougherty stated there are homeowners who were expecting a 6' fence on the front of the property, and Mr. Mosendz agreed. Mr. Dougherty asked how this will impact Mr. Mosendz if the homeowners do not get the 4' fence. Mr. Mosendz stated he will be impacted in a very major way, and he will most likely have to go to trial. He stated he was able to convince them to go to 5' and barely convinced them to go to 4'. He stated he understands that he is responsible for the situation that he is in. He stated the property owners were expecting one thing and paid a lot of money for it, and he is not able to deliver on that; and he is trying his best to deliver something. Mr. Dougherty stated he understands that there is a financial hardship.

Mr. Mosendz stated the Board had indicated at the first meeting that they were entertaining the idea of doing the Ordinance at 4'. He stated he knows that other Townships in the area are at 4'. He stated while he would want to go higher, as long as it is a good-looking fence, he would not be opposed to go to 4'.

Mr. Dougherty stated he did not see any renderings in the package as to what the 4' fence would look like. Mr. Mosendz stated it would look the same, and he would just cut it down to 4'. He stated he would have to remove 2' of the concrete blocks and the panels themselves between them would go down.

Mr. Dougherty asked if there are any lights on top of the concrete posts; and Mr. Mosendz stated there are, and he will have to move the lighting down, which while difficult, is not impossible. Mr. Dougherty stated if the Board were to agree to a 4' fence will it really be a 4' fence or will it be a fence with lights on top of it will really be more like at 5' fence. Mr. Mosendz stated there are no lights on top, and the lights are on the side and are up lit.

Mr. Schwartz stated if the Board agrees to a number for the height, it would not just be along the front, and it would also be along the right-hand side all the way back to the front corner of the house. He asked if the homeowner is aware of that, and Mr. Mosendz stated they are not. Mr. Schwartz stated that was brought up at the other two meetings. Mr. Schwartz stated from the front corner of the house out to the street and across it is all the same Ordinance. He stated if the neighbor on the other side was facing the same street, it would be the same number over there; but that is the back of their house, and that is their fence.

Mr. Mosendz stated he would ask for the right side to remain at the current 6' height. Mr. Flager stated if that is the case, the matter will have to be re-advertised since he is asking for more than it was advertised for which was 4'. Mr. Solor stated this was discussed previously. Mr. Dougherty stated it would have to be re-advertised if Mr. Mosendz wants to try to get the 6' all the way down the right side. He stated the Board could vote tonight on 4' from the corner down the right side and 4' across. Mr. Flager stated a Continuance would be required.

Ms. Reiss stated she would not be comfortable with the 6' unless the neighbor came in and indicated that they did not have a problem with 6' along the side of their house. She stated she has heard from a number of residents about this fence. Mr. Mosendz stated he is friends with that neighbor. Ms. Reiss stated Ordinances are put in place for a reason, and people want to do what they want and then come before the Board and apologize and try to fix it. Ms. Reiss stated it is important to do things right the first time and follow the Ordinances. Mr. Mosendz stated originally there was an old wooden fence that was rotted out and they threw it out. He stated the property was abandoned completely. He stated that existing fence was not 4'. Ms. Reiss stated if the Board is going to give relief it should at least encompass to the corner of the house.

Mr. Dougherty stated he does not have a problem with what the Applicant is proposing. He stated he does recall that a neighbor came before the Board previously who definitely had a problem with the fence being over 3' tall along the street, but he does not recall that she had an issue with the fence along the side. He stated he does recall Mr. Schwartz bringing this matter to the Board's attention.

Mr. Solor stated he is fine with the 4' fence in the front, and he would be willing to defer to the neighbor's opinion as to the height of the fence on the side since they are the ones with the driveway right against it. Mr. McVan stated he agrees with Ms. Reiss. Mr. Schwartz stated he is leaning toward the side fence being the same as the front because that is what was indicated at each of the last two meetings; and even the attorney had indicated that was an easier one to cut down.

Mr. Dougherty asked Ms. Reiss her opinion if the neighbor did not have an issue; however; Ms. Reiss stated she believes that it is more than one neighbor, and it is people who live in that area who drive by every day as well as the people across the street. She stated it should be re-advertised and sent out to everyone on what the new plan is.

Mr. William Nash, 55 Black Rock Road was sworn in. Mr. Nash stated he is directly across from the property in question. He stated he feels they have done a wonderful job with the property, and he has no concerns with the fence the way it is today.

Ms. Dakota DiMattio, 59 Black Rock Road, was sworn in. Ms. DiMattio stated when the fence was originally installed, the exterior lights were extremely bright and were occasionally malfunctioning. She stated she wants to insure that the current lighting standard is maintained. She stated if there are any changes with the fence, she would not want the lights to be any brighter than they are now. Mr. Mosendz stated the lights will be the same as they are now. Mr. Dougherty asked Ms. DiMattio her opinion on a 4' fence; and Ms. DiMattio stated she does not love the fence that is there now, and they do not really know what it will look like if it is changed. Mr. Dougherty stated it would be a shorter version of what is there now. Ms. DiMattio stated she was more concerned about light pollution.

Mr. Schwartz stated if the fence was shortened 2', that would also shorten the lights; and Mr. Mosendz agreed. Mr. Schwartz asked if the lights currently go to the top, and Mr. Mosendz stated they are more toward the middle. Mr. Schwartz asked how much the lights would be shortened; and Mr. Mosendz estimated they are 18" long, so he would probably go down 6" off the top and go down.

Mr. Dougherty stated he hears resistance from three of the five members of the Board to 6' down the right side past the corner of the house. He stated the Board could vote tonight on a 4' Variance from the corner of the house on the right side and along the front or Mr. Mosendz can request a Continuance. Mr. Dougherty stated it will then be re-advertised to see how the Board feels at a future meeting. Mr. Mosendz requested the Continuance as he would like to talk to the neighbors as he feels that most of the neighbors like the design and the fence. He stated the neighbor next door has never complained, and he also tree shrubs along his line. He stated there was one neighbor in particular the first time he was before the Board, and he does not see how she is effected by the fence since her property is not on Black Rock Road. Mr. Mosendz stated he does not believe that 6' fence on the right side is an issue to the neighbor on the right side.

Mr. Schwartz stated at the last meeting, the Applicant's attorney pointed out that the "relative height of it" would be difficult to match because of the style they used. He stated he does not believe that other than a Historical District, we can dictate different rules for different styles. Mr. Schwartz

stated he also heard and has seen comments on social media that you can see through the front of the fence so that it is not so obtrusive. Mr. Schwartz stated you could say the same thing about a chain link fence, and he feels a lot of people have a different opinion about that type of fence. He stated he does not want those items to be the issue, and the issue should remain the height and what it means to everyone else who wants to resolve the same issue regardless of the style and regardless of its transparency.

Mr. Schwartz moved, Ms. Reiss seconded and it was unanimously carried to Continue the meeting to April 15, 2025.

APPEAL #Z-25-8 – FRIEDMAN

Tax Parcel #20-038-110-001

2210 YARDLEY-MORRISVILLE ROAD, YARDLEY, PA 19067

Mr. Flager marked the Exhibits as follows: The Application was marked as Exhibit A-1. The Site Plan was marked as Exhibit A-2. The Shed Specs were marked as Exhibit A-3. The Proof of Publication was marked as Exhibit B-1. The Proof of Posting was marked as Exhibit B-2. The Notice to the neighbors was marked as Exhibit B-3.

Mr. David Friedman was sworn in.

Mr. Friedman stated he is requesting a Variance for impervious. He stated behind the garage on the left side there is a decent amount of property that he wanted to make into a garden. He stated he would like to put in a movable structure behind the garage. He stated it will not be attached to the garage and would be about 1 ½' away from the garage. It will be a 20' by 11' rectangle, a picture of which was included in the Application. He stated it is consistent with the feel of the house, and he intends to use it as a sunroom to enjoy the garden. Mr. Friedman stated he spoke to the two neighbors behind him who would be able to see it, and they did not have any issues other than one neighbor indicated that he felt that the Board would discuss with him any water issues.

Mr. Friedman stated what he is proposing will increase the impervious by about .3; and he understands the .3 may actually be overstated because the people who did the survey included the pool as impervious, and he understands

that in this Township a pool does not get included. Mr. Friedman stated to his knowledge there have never been any water issues affecting the neighbors, but he would do whatever remediation would be called for.

Mr. McLoone stated Mr. Friedman is working with Dumack who did the Plans. Mr. McLoone stated they would probably just have to put in a very small infiltration trench; and while it is not shown on the Plan, Mr. Majewski could work with Dumack to do an infiltration trench which could be as small as 2 by 4 by 12 which would cover the increase in the stormwater.

Mr. Solor stated the square footage of the pool of 653 was applied to both the existing and future circumstance so it is not impacting how much is being requested, but it does impact the percentage. Mr. McLoone stated it was advertised at 27.16% existing and 27.49% proposed. He stated without the pool, which would be the case since the Township's current Stormwater Ordinance does not consider the water in the pool impervious, the actual calculations would be 26.1% existing and 26.5% proposed so it is a very negligible increase in impervious surface.

Ms. Blundi stated she would like to see a picture of the proposed shed since the Township recently found out that someone put a shipping container on their property and was calling it a shed, and they want to stop that from happening again.

Mr. Friedman showed the specs of the proposed structure which had been included in the packet. Mr. Flager stated it is marked as Exhibit A-3. It is not a shipping container.

Mr. Schwartz stated while it was stated that it was a movable structure, he assumes Mr. Friedman does not plan to move it once it is there. Mr. Friedman agreed he does not plan to move it.

There was discussion whether the Board should require that the impervious be mitigated back to the allowable. Mr. Solor stated past Board decisions have been that when the request is this small, the Applicant is just asked to mitigate what they are doing or slightly more; but this is at the discretion of the Board. Mr. McLoone stated the allowable amount is 18%.

There was no one from the public wishing to speak on this matter.

Ms. Reiss moved and Mr. Schwartz seconded to approve the Appeal as shown mitigating the increase in impervious surface and with the approval of the Township engineer.

Mr. Solor stated he assumes that there is no height issue with the structure; and Mr. McLoone stated that there is not, and it is less than 15'.

Motion carried unanimously.

CANCEL MARCH 18, 2025 AND APRIL 1, 2025 MEETINGS

Mr. Solor moved, Mr. Schwartz seconded and it was unanimously carried to cancel the March 18, 2025 meeting.

Mr. Solor moved, Mr. Schwartz seconded and it was unanimously carried to cancel the April 1, 2025 meeting.

There being no further business, Ms. Reiss moved, Mr. Schwartz seconded and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Christian Schwartz, Secretary