

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD
ZONING HEARING BOARD
MINUTES – MAY 3, 2016

The regular meeting of the Zoning Hearing Board of the Township of Lower Makefield was held in the Municipal Building on May 3, 2016. Vice Chair Gruen called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

Those present:

Zoning Hearing Board: Jerry Gruen, Vice Chair
 Anthony Zamparelli, Secretary
 Keith DosSantos, Member
 Matthew Connors, Alternate Member

Others: Steve Ware, Keystone Municipal Services
 Maryellen Saylor, Township Engineer
 Randall Flager, Zoning Hearing Board Solicitor
 Jeff Benedetto, Supervisor Liaison

Absent: Paul Bamburak, Zoning Hearing Board Chair
 James McCartney, Zoning Hearing Board Member

APPEAL #16-1753 – WILLIAM HARRISON

Mr. Gruen noted that there are only four members present this evening; and if there is a tie, the Appeal would be denied. He asked the Applicant if he would like to proceed or postpone to a time when there are five members present, and Mr. Harrison agreed to proceed.

Mr. William Harrison, homeowner, and Mr. Rob McCubbin, Anthony Sylvan Pools, were sworn in.

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. Flager noted that they have received six letters which were marked Exhibits C-1 through C-6. Exhibit C-1 was from Elizabeth Clark, Exhibit C-2 was from Ron and Rita Bitner, Exhibit C-3 was from Robert Everest, Exhibit C-4 was from Lee and Charles Narwicz, Exhibit C-5 was from the Morrow family, and Exhibit C-6 was from Renee Trimble. He stated all of them are in opposition to the proposed Appeal. The letters were provided to the Board this evening.

Mr. McCubbin stated they would like to build an in-ground swimming pool. He stated they had a survey done, and found that the property was already over the permitted maximum impervious which is 18%. He stated the property is already at 19.92%. He stated they are seeking relief to go to 22%. He stated it not a very big pool, but they need to do a little bit of a retaining wall and a little bit of a patio. He stated the total they are proposing is 759 square feet to be added to the property. He stated in order to mitigate that, they will be proposing a stormwater management plan that mitigates the area back down to 18%. Mr. DosSantos stated it will then below what is existing, and Mr. McCubbin agreed.

Mr. Gruen asked how they will mitigate it; and Mr. McCubbin stated typically they have been doing level spreaders or seepage bed around the swimming pool, but that has not yet been designed. He stated based on the outcome of this evening's meeting, they will design that if the Variance is approved. Mr. McCubbin stated they will collect the water on the down side of the property, the rain water will seep into the ground, and it will then leave the property as ground water rather than surface water run off. Mr. Gruen asked if they will send it down the street; and Mr. McCubbin stated there will not be any piping it sending it anywhere, and it will be captured into the basin and allowed to perc out. He stated they will follow Best Management Practice calculations as set forth in the regulations.

Mr. Zamparelli asked Ms. Saylor if this is a viable method; and Ms. Saylor stated she had done the calculations to see what it would be to go to 19.92%, but since they have now indicated that they will go to 18%, she will need to calculate that. Ms. Saylor stated the yard slopes down to the property line where the pool is going to be, and the pool is at the lowest spot. Ms. Saylor asked if she would have the level spreader between the pool and the property line, and Mr. McCubbin stated he is assuming it will be an L-shape running behind the pool toward the shed and then making a 90 degree turn and coming back toward the house depending on the length and width since they have not yet done the calculations. He stated the shed is going to be removed. Ms. Saylor asked if they are going to install some yard drains to make sure they are capturing enough; and Mr. McCubbin stated he can discuss this with the engineer since he is not an engineer, and he does not know what the engineer had in mind for that. He stated they will put together a full plan when they apply for the Permit.

Mr. Zamparelli stated it appears that they are willing to do what it takes to keep the water from running off the property to the neighbors, and Mr. Harrison stated he is. Mr. Zamparelli asked if there is a lot of water running off the property currently, and Mr. Harrison stated if there is, he is not sure where it goes. He stated he is not aware of any flooding on his property.

Mr. Gruen stated there is a setback of 13.2' for the concrete deck from the side yard, and he asked if there is a requirement that it has to be 15' away; however, Mr. Ware stated it only has to be 10' from the side yard. He added that the limit of disturbance for grading is 5'.

Ms. Saylor stated they have 13.2' from the pool deck to the property line, and when you take out 5', this would give them 8' and they want it to be at least 6' wide and that would still give them 2' so physically they could still fit it there. Mr. McCubbin stated typically the way they see them when they come through, they are 3' to 4' wide and 3' to 4' deep. Ms. Saylor stated with the infiltration trench it is really recommended that the width be twice the depth. She stated she feels they can still be 5' away from the property line and 2' away from the pool. She stated while this is not in the Ordinance, it is a guideline; and if it has to be a bit more narrow, that would be fine.

Mr. DosSantos asked Mr. Harrison if he has added any impervious surface since he moved into the property approximately one year ago, and Mr. Harrison stated he has not. He stated they did repave the driveway which was already there.

Mr. DosSantos stated on the south side of the property there is a 4' high wooden fence, and he asked if there is fencing around property; and Mr. Harrison stated it does not go all the way around the property. Mr. DosSantos stated while he did not see it as part of the Application, he assumes there is proposed fencing; and Mr. Ware stated there has to be by Code, and he added there are specific rules for pool fences.

Mr. Zamparelli noted the concrete deck, and he asked if they could use pervious material instead of concrete. Mr. McCubbin stated it would still count as impervious surface. Mr. Gruen stated if they were going to use pervious pavers, the Board would look more favorably on the project. Mr. McCubbin stated they had not considered that. Mr. Zamparelli stated they are proposing to mitigate quite a bit.

Mr. Gruen asked if they have a separate section where they are going to put the overflow from the pool when it rains. Mr. McCubbin stated they rarely see pools overflow since from the top of the coping to the water line, there is 5" of surface space. Mr. Zamparelli stated he had a pool for many years, and it never overflowed.

Mr. Flager stated he has been advised that two people wish to become Parties – Ms. Elizabeth Clark and Mr. Robert Everest both of whom were present this evening. Mr. Everest stated he did not really know what that meant. Mr. Gruen stated it

Mr. Gruen stated what it means is they have to notify the Parties of the Board's Decision; and if the matter goes to Court, the Parties will be notified, and they will have a chance to speak in Court. Mr. Flager stated Parties can present evidence and cross examine Witnesses. Mr. Everest stated he does want to discuss an issue; and Mr. Flager stated everyone will have an opportunity to speak, but being a Party is a legal distinction.

Mr. Everest stated he did not wish to be a Party.

Ms. Elizabeth Clark, 3 Central Drive, stated she does wish to be a Party.

Mr. Frank Morrow, Jr., 1710 Wrightfield Avenue, asked to be a Party; and he was sworn in. Mr. Morrow stated he would like to ask the Zoning Hearing Board to pay attention to the current water restrictions. He stated the area that is being requested is a tremendous run off down the hill away from Makefield Road which goes into his and a lot of people's back yards. Mr. Morrow stated he lives behind the property. He stated there is a serious water problem that has to be addressed. He stated the Township has tried to address it in various ways, but they have not solved the problem. He stated there is a problem because the run off comes off Makefield Road, and they would have to put a culvert into the sewer system up on top of the Road. He stated they have discussed this for many years, and it always comes up to money. He stated the basic issue with the property is that it has a run off onto other people's property, and it will make it worse by giving an exception which he does not feel makes sense.

Mr. Flager asked Mr. Morrow if he has any specific questions of their Testimony concerning the fact that they are going to reduce the run off, and Mr. Morrow stated he does not understand how they can reduce it if they put in a catch basin since he does not understand where it goes when it gets filled. Mr. Gruen stated it is not a simple catch basin, and what they are proposing is a dry well; and he described how the dry well works. Mr. Morrow stated while he understands that, he used to have a drain in the back yard; and they eliminated that by taking it to the sewer. Mr. Zamparelli stated you are not allowed to do that. Mr. Morrow stated they built a drain to the sewer. Mr. Morrow stated the water run off is a problem, and if the Board changes the rules and makes it less, he does not feel they should do that.

Mr. DosSantos stated the Applicant's proposal is to reduce it from the current situation, and to actually improve it from the current circumstance. He stated what they are proposing is a pool which will catch some water as well as the stormwater management they are proposing which will take it down 2% from

where it is existing which should be a benefit. Mr. Morrow stated while he hears this, there are seven people who live in proximity do not want this for the water reason.

Ms. Barbara Basheda, 1709 Makefield Road, was sworn in. Ms. Basheda stated her property is on the south side, and they have the four foot fence that they discussed earlier. She asked how far this will be from her property since she is the one in view of the pool, and the water comes in between the two properties. She was shown a copy of the Plan, and it was noted it will be behind the house.

Mr. Gruen asked to be shown where they propose to put the swale to catch the water from going into Makefield Road; and Mr. McCubbin stated they are not putting in a swale, and he noted on the Plan where there is an existing swale. Mr. Gruen checked the Plan, and stated according to the topo, the Applicant's water will not go to Makefield Road since Makefield Road is higher than the pool, and the water will go in the other direction.

Mr. Greg Webber, 1801 Makefield Road, stated he lives across Central; and he is upstream of the Applicant's property. He stated his purpose for coming this evening was only to reiterate what his neighbors have said which is that the water management at the corner of Makefield and Central is very bad. He stated the water comes down Makefield, across his property which is on the corner, and then to Central down. He noted pictures he took this morning which represent a typical day, and his yard is soaked all along the edges, through the yard, and all the way down to Central. He stated depending on how the Applicant calculated the 2%, if they are just taking into account rainfall that falls onto their property, there is really a lot more water that ends up on their property after it passes through his property. Mr. Webber stated this is why the neighbors are concerned exasperating an issue that is already bad. He stated he has lived at the property twenty-one years; and they put in storm management along Wrightfield with drains and storm sewers leading it away, but they never put anything down Makefield, and they never connected it. He stated if the water had been collected along Makefield and turned the corner underground to hook up with Wrightfield, they would not be having a problem. Mr. Webber stated both their yards get very soaked, and not from rain that falls on their yards. He stated the water comes from the north/east and it is going southwest past the Applicant's house.

Mr. Zamparelli asked Mr. Webber if he understands that the pool will collect water, and he is also putting in the mitigation as well. Mr. Webber stated while he understands this, he is not an engineer; and he does not know what they took into account in terms of the calculations. Mr. Gruen stated whatever they propose to do will have to be reviewed and approved by the Township engineer.

Mr. Gruen stated he lives in this neighborhood, and there is no storm management except for in front of Makefield Elementary where there are some storm drains. He stated for the rest of the area, the water will stay there all day in a one inch event. He stated he has discussed this before with the Board of Supervisors, and one day maybe they will do something about it. He stated the water that is coming down the street is not being created by Mr. Harrison. Mr. Gruen stated the water that he will displace will be kept on his own property, and he will actually keep more than what it is now because he will reduce the impervious surface from 19.92% to 18% which is what is legal and is what the Code calls for. Mr. Gruen stated there is nothing Mr. Harrison can do about the rest of the water that comes down Makefield. Mr. Gruen stated they should speak to Mr. Benedetto after the meeting as he is a Township Supervisor.

Mr. Webber stated he was not clear how the process worked and it the Board's prerogative to approve or not approve; but his objective was to say there is a major problem at the corner, and the engineers have to understand that. Mr. Flager stated they are just saying that Mr. Harrison is not legally responsible for the water problems in the neighborhood, which they all agree does exist. Mr. Flager stated he is responsible for the increase in impervious on his own property; and the proposal, after review by the engineer, should take the impervious from the 20% which he has now down to 18% so the water running off there will be reduced although it will not be completely eliminated since the water is more than that. Mr. Webber stated while that is good, the letter they received did not state it that way; and the letter stated, "for a Variance to allow more impervious surface." Mr. Gruen stated Mr. Harrison came in with a mitigation system which most people do not since they just come in and ask for relief. Mr. Gruen stated in this case, Mr. Harrison came in with a plan to reduce the amount of water that will come off his property. Mr. Gruen stated he does not like to increase impervious surface even by 1% because there is a cumulative effect, and the whole Township is increased; and they all know that there is a water problem here. He added that in this particular case, whatever comes off Mr. Harrison's property will be reduced. Mr. Webber stated he does not disagree, he was just present to give information. Mr. Gruen stated they do like people to come in and participate.

Mr. Flager stated Mr. Benedetto is present and is taking notes, and he is the Chairman of the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Webber stated he has taken pictures of all the driveways down Makefield Road, and they are all cracked and broken because the water comes down and it is impossible to keep them from not freezing up and drying.

Ms. Elizabeth Clark, 3 Central Drive, was sworn in. She stated she is directly behind this property. Ms. Clark asked for an opportunity to look at the Plan, and she was shown the Plan at this time. She stated she does have water in her basement now as a result of the rain the last few days so that was her main concern.

Mr. Zamparelli stated he feels this is going to make the situation better.

Mr. Connors stated he is hearing that he is going to do mitigation, but he is not seeing where it will be on the Plan. He also stated that they indicated that they were going to remove the shed, but the shed is still shown on the Plan. He stated he would prefer to see more detail. Mr. Connors stated the Plan is basically an existing condition Plan where they have the pool, but everything else is very conceptual and being talked about. He stated there is also a swale that runs into the rear of the property, and he would like to have more detail as to what they are approving and have an understanding of the Plan.

Mr. Zamparelli asked if the engineer will tell them where to put the stormwater management since they do not show exactly where they are putting it. Ms. Saylor stated they will definitely look at where the engineer is putting it, the drainage area it will collect, and how the impervious surface is collected; and they will look at this on the Building Permit Application. Mr. Zamparelli asked if the seepage pit would be the length of the pool, and Mr. McCubbin stated it probably would. Mr. Zamparelli stated it would be the length of the pool, 6' wide, and 3' deep. Ms. Saylor stated with the infiltration trenches and the seepage pit, they like them at least 15' away from the house so it does not compromise the foundation. She stated she would like to see if there is anything that says not to put it that close to the pool as well. She stated there may be reasons to move it over but still catch the same amount of impervious. Ms. Saylor stated it may be good to put in some yard drains. Mr. McCubbin stated they would probably want it 2' to 3' away from the concrete patio of the pool. He agreed that what they have shown in not a complete Plan, and it is not what they would go to Permit with. Ms. Saylor stated they will review everything when the Permit is submitted.

Mr. Gruen asked if they require a perc test since if this is solid clay, he questions what good the pit would be; and Ms. Saylor stated the Ordinance does not require this for small Site Plans which this is considered. She added they have an assumed infiltration rate that is very conservative, and that is factored into the calculations that the Ordinance has. She stated the calculation they use to size it from the Stormwater Management Ordinance and also from the DEP Manual gives you an assumed, very conservative rate taking into account that it could be a slow rate.

Mr. Gruen stated if the Board decides to grant the Variance, they could put as a Condition that the storm management would be approved by the Township engineer.

Mr. Connors stated he is concerned that this is “loose,” and they are indicating that they will have a pool and do what they want them to do, but they are not showing it on the Plan. Mr. Gruen stated he is showing the percentage reduction, and it is up to the Township engineer and the builder to get together and put it somewhere where it is acceptable to the Township. Mr. McCubbin stated they have not pulled a Permit on this yet. He stated the Township does go out and inspect the trench. Mr. Connors stated he understands how it works as he is a Civil Engineer, but he feels the Plan is very loose.

Mr. Zamparelli stated when they go in for the Permit, it has to be exactly what they are going to do, and Mr. McCubbin agreed. Mr. Ware stated Mr. McCubbin is very familiar with the Township’s Permit requirements from past projects.

Mr. Gruen stated he understands that the shed will be removed, and he asked if it will be installed somewhere else. Mr. Harrison stated it will be removed, and it will not be replaced.

Mr. Connors asked the reason for the wide driveway, and Mr. Harrison stated that was the way it was when they bought the house. Mr. Connors asked if he would be interested in reducing the size of the driveway, and Mr. Harrison stated he would not be interested in that.

Mr. Webber stated the previous homeowner had a medical practice there so the driveway was that size to allow for parking for patients.

Mr. Gruen asked Ms. Saylor if she needs to see something on the drawing as to where he is going to put the stormwater management; and Ms. Saylor stated if there is a Condition made tonight it should be that they will mitigate it down to 18%, and the location would be reviewed during at the time of the Building Permit Application, that would be satisfactory.

There being no further comments, Testimony was closed.

Mr. DosSantos moved, Mr. Zamparelli seconded and it was unanimously carried to grant the relief requested Conditioned that the shed be removed without replacement, and that the stormwater management be put into place subject to the Approval of the Township engineer reducing the effective impervious surface ratio down to the allowed 18%.

APPEAL #16-1755 – NANCY AND RICK TUSTIN

Mr. Nancy Tustin, Mr. Rick Tustin, and Mr. Paul Tustin were sworn in.

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, and Notices to the neighbors were marked as Exhibit B-3.

Mr. Gruen asked if they wish to proceed recognizing that there are only four members present this evening, and Ms. Tustin stated they would like to proceed.

Ms. Tustin stated they purchased the home in June, and moved in October. She stated Mr. Rick Tustin does not live with them, but he is present with them for moral support. She stated initially they had asked for a Permit for the shed and found out about the impervious surface rule so they did not do anything about the shed at that time. She stated they decided to ask for a Variance so that they could enlarge the cement patio that they currently have. She stated this is their first suburban home, and they wanted to be able to enjoy the outside of the property. Mr. Gruen stated it seems that the lot is 17,000 square feet.

Mr. Zamparelli asked the current impervious, and Mr. Gruen stated it is 25.7%. Mr. Ware stated they are permitted to have 18%. Ms. Tustin stated it is a ranch home. Mr. Ware stated this property has a large footprint. It was built in 1980 so it is a Schedule B lot. Mr. Ware stated this property was already over the permitted impervious surface when the Ordinance was changed.

Mr. Zamparelli asked the Applicants if they increased the impervious since they have moved in, and Ms. Tustin stated they have not. Mr. Zamparelli asked the proposed size of the patio; and Ms. Tustin stated currently it is 10' by 19', and she would like to make it 20' by 30'. Mr. DosSantos asked if they are adding onto the existing patio, or are they tearing out the old patio and replacing it; and Ms. Tustin stated they would be tearing it down, and replacing it. She stated in the numbers she put in the impervious surface breakdown, she subtracted the 190 square feet that was already there, and put the amount that would be the additional.

Mr. Gruen asked how large the shed will be, and Ms. Tustin stated it will be 12' by 18'. Mr. Gruen stated that is an extremely large shed compared to the average sheds around here. Ms. Tustin stated they have to house a lawn mower, snow blower, and the patio furniture; and they would like to park the two cars in the garage.

Mr. Zamparelli asked if they talked to their neighbors behind the house about their proposal; and Ms. Tustin stated she has discussed it with the neighbors on either side, and she did have a brief conversation with the one neighbor behind the house. Mr. Zamparelli asked if there is any water on the property now when it rains heavily, and Ms. Tustin stated they do not. She stated the yard is pretty flat, and the driveway slopes a little bit down to the street.

Mr. Gruen noted the discussion with the previous Applicant regarding impervious surface, and Ms. Tustin stated they were proposing to use rain barrels for mitigation. Mr. Gruen stated he is not in favor of those because rain barrels in the winter could freeze, and they could be removed easily. He stated he does not feel they are a solution. Ms. Tustin stated the ones she looked at were 75 gallons, they could be put in a daisy chain. Mr. Gruen stated they are hard to manage, and there is no way for the Township to check to make sure that in a year or two they are still there. Mr. Gruen stated they have a large impervious surface area, and the shed and patio are large. He asked if they would consider reducing them in size somewhat and putting in a different type of mitigation system such as an in-ground system. He stated they are already at almost 26% which is 8% above the allowable, and they want to go to 28% which is 10% above what is permitted. Ms. Tustin stated it was a surprise for them to find that now that they have a property of this size that there was a problem, and they did not know anything about impervious surface until three months ago.

Mr. Gruen stated they cannot reduce their driveway because the garage is on the side, and they have to get to it; and he does not see anyway to reduce that. He stated he feels their best hope would be if they were willing to put in a system.

Ms. Saylor stated she feels the impervious surface ratio that they are asking for is actually higher because they will have a shed of 216 square feet, and they are going from a patio of 190 square feet to 600 square feet so that is an addition of 410 square feet. Ms. Tustin stated when they had someone come out to give them an estimate, they indicated that they could have rounded corners and the square footage is actually 515, and that was accounted for in the breakdown chart. Ms. Saylor stated they need to make that clear on the Plan since on the Plan it is listed as 20' by 30', and it is drawn as a square. Ms. Saylor stated if it is 515 square feet, she would then agree with their numbers.

Mr. DosSantos asked if they got a smaller shed would that get the calculations closer to what is existing; however, Ms. Saylor stated that would not make that much of a difference.

Mr. Ware stated with a ranch house they have a large footprint as opposed to a two-story house so that contributes to a lot of the coverage.

Mr. Gruen stated an in-ground mitigation system is not that costly; and whoever is doing the patio could dig a trench, fill it up with stone, line it with fabric and cover it with topsoil so they will never even see it. He stated they could put grass on top.

Mr. Zamparelli asked how large of a dry well they would need to get it down to 25%, and Ms. Saylor stated they could do it 3' deep, 6' wide, and 15' long. Mr. Gruen stated he would like it brought further down than 25%, and he suggested that they do it 30' along the patio.

Ms. Saylor asked if the back of the yard drains toward the rear property line, and Ms. Tustin stated it does not and it all goes to the street. Ms. Saylor stated if they put the dry well on the edge of the patio, it would be higher than the patio if the yard is grading from the rear down to the street. Ms. Saylor stated she assumes they would be grading the patio away from the house and into it, and Mr. Gruen stated if they grade the patio into it, that would be ideal since the patio will probably be raised at least 6" above grade. Ms. Saylor stated they would want it along the long edge of the patio, and they would not want it any closer than 15' to the house.

Ms. Tustin asked if it could also go along the shed. Mr. Gruen stated another possibility is a combination called a rain garden; and Ms. Tustin she did look into rain gardens, but that seemed to be more expensive. Mr. Gruen stated the only additional expense are the plantings which would beautify the property.

Mr. Gruen asked Ms. Saylor if they provide advise on rain gardens; and Ms. Saylor stated the BMP Manual and the Stormwater Management Ordinance have a whole design, but they would have to be able to drain the impervious surface to it. Mr. Gruen stated they could do the system around the patio and put in wet-foot plants in it.

Mr. Zamparelli asked if it would be appropriate to let them choose what they want to do provided it gets the impervious surface down to 25% subject to the approval of the Township engineer. Mr. DosSantos stated it should not be a portable solution such as a rain garden.

Mr. Gruen asked if there are any trees in the back yard, and Ms. Tustin stated there are six arborvitaes behind the shed and to the left. Mr. Gruen asked if they are planning on putting in any trees, and Ms. Tustin stated they have not gotten that far yet. She stated the front is landscaped with existing trees. Mr. Gruen suggested they plant trees that like water, and he suggested river birch.

Ms. Saylor stated she feels the system could be 3' by 6' by 16'.

Ms. Tustin asked if it would be possible to put part of it by the patio, and part of it by the shed as long as they wind up with the amount the Board stated; however, Ms. Saylor stated it would be best to have it all along the patio since that is where most of the impervious is. Mr. Gruen stated it would also be less expensive doing it all in one location than digging in two areas especially if they are going to put plant material on top. Mr. DosSantos stated there could be grass on it so they would not see anything. Mr. Paul Tustin asked if it is acceptable to plant grass over the top, and it was indicated that this is acceptable. Mr. Gruen stated if they were to divide it and put a section by the shed whoever digs it will have to dig in two locations. There was a difference of opinion by some Board members about rain gardens.

Ms. Tustin asked the proper name for what they are suggesting, and Ms. Saylor stated it is an infiltration trench. Mr. Rick Tustin asked if there are specifications, and Ms. Saylor agreed there are in the Stormwater Management Ordinance which is available on-line. She agreed to e-mail them the page.

There was no one present in the audience to speak to this matter, and Testimony was closed.

Mr. DosSantos moved, Mr. Zamparelli seconded and it was unanimously carried to grant the relief requested subject to stormwater management as Approved by the Township engineer to bring the effective impervious surface down to the current level of 25.7% and that such stormwater management be a permanent in-ground solution as opposed to a portable rain barrel type solution.

CANCEL 5/17/16 MEETING

Due to lack of an Agenda, Mr. Connors moved, Mr. DosSantos seconded and it was unanimously carried to cancel the meeting of May 17, 2016

There being no further business, Mr. Zamparelli moved, Mr. DosSantos seconded and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 8:35 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Anthony Zamparelli, Secretary