

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD
ZONING HEARING BOARD
MINUTES – DECEMBER 4, 2018

The regular meeting of the Zoning Hearing Board of the Township of Lower Makefield was held in the Municipal Building on December 4, 2018. Mr. Gruen called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m.

Those present:

Zoning Hearing Board: Jerry Gruen, Chairman
Anthony Zamparelli, Vice Chairman
Keith DosSantos, Secretary
James McCartney, Member

Others: James Majewski, Director Planning and Zoning
Adam Flager, Zoning Hearing Board Solicitor
John B. Lewis, Supervisor Liaison

Absent: Pamela Lee, Zoning Hearing Board Member

APPEAL #18-1816 – PATRICK MILLER

Mr. Gruen noted that there are only four members present this evening and a tie vote would be a no vote. He stated the Applicant has the option to Continue the matter until there are five Board members. The Applicant asked to proceed at this time.

Mr. Patrick Miller was sworn n.

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 impervious surface breakdown was marked as Exhibit A-3. Two photos were marked as A-4A, which shows the retention basin and A-4B, which shows the addition area. 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. Gruen stated Mr. Majewski had indicated that there were some corrections needed to the impervious surface numbers. Mr. Majewski stated he reviewed the calculations, and there are some minor discrepancies. He stated the actual existing impervious surface coverage is 4,400 square feet which for this lot area of about 18,000 square feet giving an impervious surface coverage of 24.4% that is existing.

He stated the proposed addition will be approximately 720 square feet which will result in the total impervious surface area of 28.4%. He stated it will be a 4% difference between the existing and the proposed.

Mr. Miller stated his father-in-law just passed away at 100 years old, and his mother-in-law is left by herself; and she cannot afford to live in the house she is in right now at her home on Sunnyside Lane. Mr. Miller stated they want to have her move into their home. He stated she is semi-disabled with a bad hip, and they want to put an addition on the first floor for her.

Mr. Zamparelli stated this is a big increase in impervious surface, and he asked the plan for mitigating it back to at least what they have now. Mr. Miller stated they could either do a trench system or plant some more trees or both. He stated he could have his architect and engineer get together with the Township. Mr. Zamparelli asked if they have considered a dry well, and Mr. Miller stated he would agree to that. Mr. Gruen stated they would work with the Township engineer to determine the size of the dry well needed, and Mr. Miller agreed.

Mr. Gruen asked the allowable impervious surface, and Mr. Majewski stated it is 18%. Mr. Majewski stated as the Board is aware from a number of previous Applications, many of these developments that were built in the 1970s and 1980s the only requirement they had was for building coverage of 15%; and therefore every home in Yardley Hunt, Sandy Run, etc. all exceed the 18% by varying amounts anywhere from 3% to 10% over what is currently allowable.

Mr. Gruen asked Mr. Miller if his lot is sloping in the back in any direction, and Mr. Miller stated it slopes away from the property toward the basin.

Mr. DosSantos asked when they moved in, and Mr. Miller stated it was in 2004. Mr. DosSantos asked if they have added any impervious surface since 2004 such as a patio or a shed. Mr. Miller stated the patio was there, and they “dressed it up.” Mr. DosSantos asked if they worked over the existing footprint of the patio, and Mr. Miller agreed. Mr. DosSantos asked if the shed was existing when they purchased the property, and Mr. Miller agreed.

Mr. Gruen stated since the property backs up to the basin, he does not feel it would impact the neighbors; and if Mr. Miller is willing to do remediation to the 24%, he would go along with that. Mr. Zamparelli agreed.

Mr. McCartney asked if there have been years where there was standing water or water issues in the rear of the property between the yards. Mr. Miller stated they have the retention basin in the back; and since it flows constantly, he believes

there are springs back there or it is stormwater. Mr. McCartney asked where the addition will be, and Mr. Majewski stated the addition will be on the right side of the house behind the garage.

Mr. Gruen stated he feels he should work with the Township engineer to determine the best place to put the remediation trench. Mr. Gruen stated it should outflow toward the basin. He stated they could also add trees as well as long as they are not in the right-of-way to the basin.

Mr. McCartney asked if there will be a separate entrance to the addition from the outside, and Mr. Miller agreed. Mr. McCartney asked if there will be any kind of kitchen, and Mr. Miller stated there will not. He stated it will be a bedroom and a bathroom addition.

There was no one present in the audience wishing to speak on this Application.

Mr. DosSantos moved, Mr. McCartney seconded and it was unanimously carried that the Plan submitted be approved subject to the Applicant putting in appropriate stormwater management so that the effective impervious goes down to the existing 24.4%.

APPEAL #17-1792(A) – ERIN DEVELOPMENT CO.

Mr. Edward Murphy, attorney, was present. Mr. Gruen stated the Board had wanted to hear from someone from the Township the reasoning why the Township preferred one Plan over the other. Mr. Murphy stated for the benefit of Mr. Zamparelli and Mr. DosSantos who were not present when this was last discussed, he advised that the Applicant had made a presentation that included a review of multiple Sketch Plans for the development of this site some of which required no Zoning relief; and the one that was submitted at the request of the Applicant and the Township, did require some modest relief. He stated the preferred Plan required a unified housing mix as opposed to a combination of unit type which the Ordinance would otherwise require. Mr. Murphy stated they submitted three different Plans besides the preferred Plan. He stated one of them contained apartments and quads, one of them had apartments and singles, and one of them had quads and townhomes. Mr. Murphy stated the Plan that was submitted as part of this Application was all quad units.

Mr. Murphy stated the second item of relief that is sought involved seeking in one spot relief from the woodland buffer requirement. He stated the Township Ordinances have various natural resources established, woodlands being one; and depending on the character of the resource, there is a varying buffer. He stated in this particular case with woodlands, there is a 50' buffer, and from one specific point where a building is located, they need relief of 17' – not into the woods but into the 50' buffer adjacent to it.

Mr. Murphy stated as Mr. Gruen just indicated, at the conclusion of the last presentation, the Chairman and others asked if Mr. Murphy could present to the Zoning Hearing Board a representative of the Township who could explain the thinking of the Township as to why the Township would be supportive of the Plan that is the subject of this Application.

Mr. DosSantos stated it is his understanding that there was one Plan which required no relief at all in that it had the mixed use and it did not require buffer relief, and Mr. Murphy stated several of the Plans did not require any relief.

Mr. Murphy stated several days after the meeting he contacted the Township Manager to make him aware of what happened at the November meeting, and asked if he would make himself available to testify this evening so that he could represent the position of the Township. Mr. Murphy stated Mr. Ferguson agreed to do so, and he is present this evening. Mr. Murphy stated as indicated previously, Mr. Ferguson was present for various meetings the Applicant and its consultants had with the Township staff including certain Supervisors; and Mr. Ferguson is in a position to answer any questions the Zoning Hearing Board may have about how the process evolved to the point where the Applicant felt confident making the Application that they did and seeking the several items of relief that the preferred Plan required.

Mr. Kurt Ferguson was sworn in.

Mr. Gruen asked Mr. Ferguson why these Plans from 2015 are only now resurfacing and he asked what was the “hold up.” Mr. Gruen asked if they were rejected before. Mr. Murphy stated he can provide information on that. He stated he does not believe he was asked that before. Mr. Gruen stated he saw the 2015 date on the Plan. Mr. Ferguson stated he has been the Township since July 16, 2018.

Mr. Flager stated the Exhibit that was marked last meeting as Exhibit A-5 is dated January 27, 2015, but the Plans that they are requesting relief for are dated February 24, 2016. Mr. Majewski stated the Zoning Plan has a revision date of 9/24/18. Mr. Murphy stated the Exhibit A-5 that Mr. Flager referred to is the series of the three other Plans that he mentioned which do bear an initial date of January 27, 2015, but all of them had various revised dates in the legend

as of 12/1/17. He stated they can discuss what has happened in the intervening years. He noted on the Plan where the revision dates are shown, and Mr. Gruen stated it was so small he did not see that.

Mr. Gruen stated some of the Board members were wondering why the Township prefers the Plan that requires a Variance for the resource protection area over the Plan that requires no Variances.

Mr. Ferguson stated almost immediately as starting as Manager, he started provide “Land Use Meetings” for developers, and those representing developer or property owners that have some interest in doing something with their property; and the goal of those meetings is to discuss what they would like to do with their projects, what the obstacles are, and what sort of relief they may need with some of those projects so that the Township can help identify what path they can undertake most efficiently to receive a vote of some sort which initially could be through the Zoning Hearing Board and then through the Land Development process. Mr. Ferguson stated those have been fairly well received to help get the projects through the system so that they can get an answer one way or another.

Mr. Ferguson stated this is one of the projects that came before them, but he cannot speak to the intervening three years prior to that other than what he has seen and conversations he has had with staff. Mr. Ferguson stated as part of the process when we have developers in, once a project reaches a certain point that they wish to move forward, the Township provides the opportunity for Supervisors, no more than two and typically one at a time, to come in and see the Plan and provide feedback to the Applicants regarding questions, concerns, problems etc. Mr. Ferguson stated they did that in this instance where they met with all five Supervisors where they each had a half hour to get the same project overview from Mr. Murphy and to also get context as to the history of the projects since there are several Supervisors who are new.

Mr. Ferguson stated after the presentation by Mr. Murphy and the developer, all five Supervisors felt comfortable in the presentation that was made regarding not just the intrusion into the setback but also for the single use. He stated the general feeling was that what they were presenting would retain value, would have a resalable value to those properties in time, would not include rentals, and in the Township’s mind would be a more desirable project.

Mr. Ferguson stated he comes from an area that has had similar developments of quads that had waiting lists to be sold and are reselling at amounts that exceeded what the original sell price was, and he brought that perspective as well to the Board of Supervisors that this seemed to be a very viable option. Mr. Ferguson stated the Supervisors’ questions regarding Variances were initially whether there

was density relief being sought, and the answer was that there was not; and it was just to go the single use for the units and the intrusion into the buffer. Mr. Ferguson stated the Board of Supervisors did not find that objectionable. Mr. Ferguson stated the Board felt that what was being presented by the Applicant was more desirable.

Mr. Zamparelli stated at this point the single use is the preferred Plan including the Variance into the setback, and Mr. Ferguson stated the feeling of the Board was that the Variance into the setback was a marginal request and that the single use was preferable option. Mr. Zamparelli stated these would not be rentals, and Mr. Ferguson agreed.

Mr. Gruen stated he understood that the two Plans were identical and there were no rentals, and the only difference between the two Plans that they submitted was the one without the Variance had just different types of buildings. He stated they were smaller buildings versus all quads, and there was no mixed use and it was just different sized buildings. He stated the exception was that one of them was encroaching into the resource protection area – one corner of one building. Mr. Gruen stated he must be misunderstanding, and Mr. Ferguson is saying that one of the Plans is different than the other.

Mr. Murphy stated there were four different Plans. Mr. Gruen stated the Zoning Hearing Board has three. Mr. Murphy stated they have three Plans as Exhibit A-5 which were the alternate Plans that had been submitted, and the fourth Plan is the one they are proposing. Mr. Murphy stated the three Plans that are all marked as Exhibit A-5 have a mix of units and two of the three have apartments which would be rentals.

Mr. McCartney asked if the Zoning Hearing Board is inclined to deny the Plan that needs the Variances, would the developer lean toward doing the Plan that has rentals. Mr. Murphy stated he would have no choice but to do one of the three other Plans that do not require Variances. Mr. McCartney asked if this would be based on highest and best use, and Mr. Murphy agreed.

Mr. Gruen stated he understood from the last time that the two Plans were identical which was why it did not make sense to him. He stated he never understood that there were rentals involved. Mr. Murphy stated it can be seen from the Plans, two of them have apartments. Mr. Gruen stated it does not say “rentals.” Mr. McCartney stated one is condo flats that would not be a rental, and Mr. Murphy disagreed and stated it is more than likely that they would be rentals as well as the apartments. He stated the condos would typically be rented. Mr. McCartney asked if they are doing condos, is the entire complex going to be under the Master Plan. Mr. Murphy stated it would be two separate HOAs – one for the condo flats/apartments and

one for the either singles, townhouses, etc. Mr. McCartney asked if all of those uses are permitted under the current Zoning, and Mr. Murphy stated they are. Mr. Murphy stated under the current Zoning you are required to have a mix of units, and that is what collectively wanted to get away from. Mr. Murphy stated the Township expressed a clear preference to avoid any type of rental situation.

Mr. McCartney stated at the prior meeting it sounded like there were some people who were saying from a continuity standpoint it would not look right with townhomes, etc. Mr. Murphy stated that is correct. Mr. McCartney stated that is who the Zoning Hearing Board wanted to talk to, and to find out who was saying from a continuity standpoint it would not look right with townhomes and quads.

Mr. Murphy stated that as he noted on November 8, this Ordinance provision was developed when the adjacent Regency project was “not yet on the books;” and the Ordinance to require a mix of uses was designed for a much larger piece of ground, and that is what they wound up with at Regency where there were 200 singles, 200 condos, and 200 carriage homes. Mr. Murphy stated applied to this small piece of ground, the feeling of the Township was that for such a small piece “over kill” to require multiple uses on a small piece of property. He stated it made sense for a larger piece, but not for this.

Mr. McCartney asked if Regency has condos. Mr. Murphy stated when it was originally approved, it had 200 singles, that are fully built and occupied, 200 carriage homes that are under construction, and it was approved for 200 condos; but earlier this year that condo plan was modified to now provide for an approved 62 additional townhomes/carriage homes. Mr. McCartney asked if that was based on a market analysis, and Mr. Murphy agreed. Mr. McCartney stated they could make an assumption that if the Zoning Hearing Board grants no Variance, and the developer looks at the three Plans, based on that same type of logic, they would lean more toward the townhome/quad type versus the condo. Mr. Murphy stated with market changes, that is possible; however, there are three potential alternatives that they could choose from. Mr. McCartney stated those three have no Variance requirements, and the developer could do any of the three and meet current Zoning; and Mr. Murphy stated he believes that is accurate.

Mr. Murphy stated if the Zoning Hearing Board would grant approval of what they have submitted, it would be all for sale quad units. Mr. DosSantos stated when they say “no rental,” they are talking strictly that there would be no apartments; and there would be no restriction on “alienation,” and Murphy stated there could not be. Mr. Murphy added it would be a 55/65 and older community which would be stable and all for-sale with people stepping down from larger homes.

Mr. DosSantos stated that is where the market is, and Mr. Murphy stated agreed adding that was what people felt comfortable with. Mr. Gruen stated they would be owner occupied.

Mr. McCartney stated a project was noted in Newtown, and he asked what the project was; and it was noted it was the Villas in Newtown.

Mr. Gruen stated he and he believes some of the other Zoning Hearing Board members misunderstood Mr. Murphy at the last meeting, and they felt the two Plans were identical as far as usage, except that some of the buildings would be “different shaped.” He stated the word “rental never entered.” He stated he felt they were asking for relief not to build single-family homes and mix them with carriage houses and other type of buildings.

Mr. Murphy stated the other unit type would like be rentals. Mr. Gruen stated the word “rental was never entered at the Hearing.”

Mr. Murphy stated with regard to the delay from January, 2015 to the present, this Plan has gone through numerous changes, not the least of which has been a reduction in the density. He stated he has had two or three different Zoning Hearing Board Applications that he has submitted that he has had Continued, and each time he revised it, he reduced the scope of relief. He stated over time as the Plan has matured, it has gotten multiple airings publicly, and it keeps changing as they got resistance from different elements of it. He stated the density was continually been reduced to the point where they are not seeking any relief as to the density. He stated there were other intrusions into other natural resources like wetland buffers, etc. which have now been eliminated. He stated they also moved the recreation area to avoid other types of Zoning relief that would have been required. He stated after all this time, they are now at a point that all they need to do this are the two Variances they have mentioned. He added that as Mr. Lewis knows, the composition of the Board of Supervisors has also changed over the last few years. Mr. Murphy stated each time they felt they were making headway, there were new Supervisors, and they had to start over.

Mr. Zamparelli stated the Plan showing the quads is what they are presenting, and they are all for sale. He stated the only Variance required is the one corner. Mr. Murphy stated they also need a Variance to allow that they all be quads since the Ordinance requires a mix of units.

Mr. Zamparelli asked if they will be two-story, and Mr. McCartney stated if they are building them like the Villas, they are two-story. Mr. Murphy stated the master bedroom is on the first floor. Mr. McCartney asked if they will have basements, and Mr. Murphy stated they will not. Mr. McCartney asked how many units are at the Villas, and Mr. Ferguson stated he believes it is over two hundred. He stated there was an immediate waiting list, and they are very popular. He state that was only recently completed finished.

Mr. Zamparelli stated he likes the Plans, and he does not feel the minimal Variance seems like much. Mr. Zamparelli stated there is parking for the quads, and he asked if there is any other parking for visitors. Mr. McCartney stated the 55 and over that he has seen just have parking right in front of the units. Mr. Murphy stated there is no separately defined parking area for overflow parking.

Mr. Gruen asked if the Plan went before the Planning Department, the Engineering Department, or the EAC. He asked if anyone reviewed the Plan or if the Zoning Hearing Board is the first to approve it. Mr. Gruen asked if it is not common in other Townships that it go there before it comes to the Zoning Hearing Board, and Mr. Ferguson stated it is not. He stated in his experience before he would suggest to a developer that they need to incur time and money for a Plan that they do not know whether they will get the relief to pursue, they could be wasting their time and resources on something that the Zoning Hearing Board may not approve. Mr. McCartney stated the other Boards are Advisory Boards. Mr. Ferguson stated they would be asking them to advise on something that the developer does not have approval yet to construct. He stated if they get the relief being requested, the developer still has to go through the Land Development process that would have all those components as part of it. Mr. Gruen stated where he was before you had to get approval first from the various Departments. Mr. Ferguson stated it is his experience that is not what is done. Mr. Gruen asked if there was any engineering study done on this project. Mr. Murphy stated the Plans are fully engineered in prior iterations and have been reviewed. Mr. Ferguson stated at this point he would not have a Township engineer review it because he wants to wait until it is a Land Development Plan and the developer posts escrow that they would pay for the Township engineer to review it so that the taxpayers are not paying for a preliminary submission that does not have anything posted. Mr. Ferguson stated when he has the Land Use Meetings, and they are preliminarily discussed, oftentimes he will have the engineer at the meeting to give insight regarding the submission of the Plan and what they would need to see. He stated in this instance because it has been on the books for so long, Mr. Majewski has been here for quite some time in various capacities, so he did have Mr. Majewski participate in those meetings to provide insight.

Mr. Gruen stated the reason he has asked this is because he recalls part of the problem with this development was that it required a 100' or 75' resource protection area, and in this Plan there is 50'. He stated it was mentioned at the last meeting it had something to do with the Township mowing the grass. He asked who will determine if it is the proper resource protection area. Mr. Murphy stated this Plan has gone through that kind of scrutiny more than any Plan he recalls. He stated every tree on the site has been measured and field located. He stated they had to do that for the prior engineer in terms of making sure they met the definition of a woodlands under the Township Ordinance.

Mr. Majewski stated as Mr. Ferguson stated it is quite often that you go for your Variances first before you incur all the expenses for engineering and Land Development approval. He stated this developer actually did this sort of concurrently; and they have submitted this version of the Plan before the Zoning Hearing Board to the Township, and it had been reviewed by the Township engineers in 2016. Mr. Majewski stated the EAC, the Citizens Traffic Commission, and all the Advisory Boards did weigh in on the project back then. Mr. Majewski stated it also went to the Board of Supervisors who did not like the recreation area off to the side of the project, and they requested that it be moved inside the project. Mr. Majewski stated they will comply with the 100' buffer requirement, and the actual distance to the recreational facilities exceed the minimum 100' buffer that is required.

Mr. Gruen stated if they meet the 100' buffer, they do not need a Variance; and Mr. Murphy stated they are not asking for any relief for that. Mr. Gruen stated they are asking relief for the one corner of the building. Mr. Murphy showed on the Plan where they need the relief. He stated this is a buffer to the woodlands – not the wetlands. Mr. Murphy showed the area of the wetlands buffer. Mr. Murphy stated for reasons that no one can explain, the Township Public Works Department mowed that area and has done so for a generation. Mr. Murphy stated the Ordinance states that depending on the height of the plantings in the defined wetland area, that is what triggers the width of the buffer adjacent to the wetlands. Mr. Murphy stated the Township mowed it, and it was flat; and Mr. Majewski had indicated that they could not have a buffer that was only 50' because it is flat. Mr. Murphy stated they have since let it grow so now the buffer can be much less. Mr. Murphy stated they took that all off the table by moving the unit away so there is no issue about meeting the 100' wetland buffer adjacent to the wetlands. He stated the only area where they need relief is a location he showed on the Plan which is 17'.

Mr. McCartney stated he assume the builder does not want to take that unit off the Plan, and Mr. Murphy agreed.

Mr. DosSantos asked Mr. Ferguson from a Township perspective from a tax base is the proposed Plan more advantageous given the number of Units. Mr. Ferguson stated he believes so. He stated if they are looking at quads, although he cannot speculate as to the selling price, he feels you could reasonably assume that 76 units could generate between \$80,000 to \$100,000 a year in property taxes. He stated it is not just able the property tax, and it is also about the ability when those units go back on the market to be marketable and retain their value. He stated he feels much more comfortable about a project that has a permanent owner occupied units versus rental units that could have other problems that may make the sellable units less desirable. He stated he feels what is proposed brings the most value, helps retain the most value, and brings the most money to the Township. Mr. Zamparelli stated he agrees with that assessment.

Mr. Gruen stated if the Zoning Hearing Board approves this, it will still go back to the Township engineer, etc. Mr. Murphy stated they are starting over again; and if they get approval from the Zoning Hearing Board, they will start submitting the fully-engineered, Revised Plans and go through the normal process. He stated they are not looking to avoid any step in any of that process.

Mr. Ferguson stated he was asked to be here, and the point of the Board of Supervisors was that they had no objections to this Plan. He stated he also feels that Township staff feels the same way, and he also feels that it is a much more preferable Plan to have seventy-six units that all match that are for sale but meet the Conditions of the Ordinance versus a mix that he does not feel anybody could predict how marketable they would be. Mr. Gruen stated he does not feel the Zoning Hearing Board had a problem with that, and he feels they were in favor of that as opposed to a mixed use.

Mr. McCartney asked if they have an idea on the price, and Mr. Murphy stated they do not. Mr. Ferguson stated the Villas go from \$500,000 to mid \$500,000; and he feels if they are building something comparable it would be reasonable to assume that would not be an unreasonable expectation. Mr. Murphy stated the issue was stability of the community, and the Board of Supervisors was looking for a stable community as well as the transfer tax and ratables. Mr. McCartney asked if this builder has any other experience building 55 and over, and Mr. Murphy stated they do; and this project is likely to be done by a builder/developer although it may not be this Applicant or it may be a joint ventures with others who have done this type before.

Mr. Peter Solor, 28 Edgewood Road, stated he is co-Chair of the Township EAC. Mr. Solor was sworn in and stated he is glad to hear that some of the concerns they raised in the previous Plan reviews were addressed. He noted the wetlands issue, and feels if the others were not resolved, they will come out during the Land Development process. Mr. Solor stated overall the EAC feels that with the relative limited amount of land left in the Township, we should not be relaxing our standards; and the EAC would like to see the buffers maintained.

Mr. Zamparelli stated it is only 17' in one corner, and Mr. Solor stated in general the EAC wants to see them maintained given the concerns the EAC has had about other developments in the Township, and there has been a "steady creep of additional things happening." He stated he is happy to see the other changes.

Mr. DosSantos asked Mr. Solor if he feels the Applicant has been cooperative in the process to address some of the concerns of the EAC; and Mr. Solor stated he is happy to see the level of cooperation that is coming now, and some of their other comments which could be read from their previous comment letters were being re-stated at every single Plan review. He stated he forwarded them to Mr. Gruen a few days ago, and Mr. Majewski has seen their letters as well regarding the previous Plan reviews. He stated they still have a concern about stormwater management, but they will see how their engineering and Land Development goes with that.

Mr. Gruen stated in the previous meeting, they stated that the "builder would be willing," but under the Ordinance there are supposed to be various facades; and the buildings will not be "cookie cutter." Mr. Murphy stated there will be variation in elevations and they did discuss making sure that it was varied and that the Township would have the right to make sure they were comfortable with it.

There was no one else present in the audience wishing to speak to this Application.

Mr. DosSantos moved, Mr. Zamparelli seconded and it was unanimously carried to grant the Variance as requested with the understanding that the Applicant has indicated that they work with the Township to have a variation of facades, colors, and elevations.

CANCEL DECEMBER 18, 2018 AND JANUARY 2, 2019 MEETINGS

There being no Applications, Mr. DosSantos moved, Mr. McCartney seconded and it was unanimously carried to cancel the meetings of December 18, 2018 and January 2, 2019.

December 4, 2018

Zoning Hearing Board – page 13 of 13

There being no further business, Mr. McCartney moved and Mr. DosSantos seconded to adjourn the meeting at 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Keith DosSantos, Secretary