

Minutes of the Zoning Board of Adjustment Public Meeting of Wednesday,  
August 12, 2015

Present are Mr. Bucco, Mr. Byock, Mr. Falco, Mrs. Friedman, Mr. Phillips, Mr. Phelps,  
Mr. Apostolou

Also present are Marc Leckstein, Esq., Leckstein & Leckstein, Tim Gillen, CME  
Associates, and Christine Bell, T&M Associates.

Absent is Mrs. Gotell, who remains on a leave of absence and Mr. Forgione.

Mr. Leckstein swears in Mark Apostolou to the position of Alternate No. 2 of the Zoning  
Board.

Continued Business, **V 15-101/Air Plus Trampoline Sports, Inc., Applicant: Air Plus  
Trampoline Sports, Inc., Property Owner: Hillcrest Development, 111 Highway 35  
at County Road, Block 227, Lot 1, Block 231, Lot 1, Variance** request for second  
façade sign, 117 sq. ft., where one sign is permitted and can be no larger than 75 sq. ft.,  
on building located in the LI (Light Industrial) zone. **This application is carried from  
the March 25 Public Meeting pending payment of property taxes.**

Mr. Leckstein announces this application will be carried to the August 26 public meeting.  
Mr. Falco questions why we are carrying this application for so long. Mr. Leckstein asks  
if the Board wants to dismiss this application without prejudice. Mrs. Rescorl says it is  
the property owner's fault, not the applicant's fault, that they can't be heard, due to the  
property owner. He has settled his tax appeal, in July, but there is no date when the next  
step in the process will take place.

Mr. Phelps asks if they are in a hurry to get this heard; Mrs. Rescorl said they wanted this  
taken care of before they opened in March. The issue has always been nonpayment of  
taxes by the property owner. It could be another few months before the actual transfer of  
money.

Mrs. Friedman asks if anyone is not being heard because this application is on the  
agenda; Mrs. Rescorl says it is not affecting any application. She recommends carrying it  
to the September 9 meeting, since there is no meeting on September 23 because of Yom  
Kippur. Mr. Falco moves to carry the application with no further notice, seconded by Mr.  
Byock, and on voice vote all members agree.

New Business, **SD15-302/OZ United Enterprises, Applicant and Property Owner:  
OZ United Enterprises, 3 Cross Avenue, Block 276, Lots 16 and 17, (Minor  
Subdivision, Use Variance and Variances** application to subdivide two lots, maintain  
the existing home with modifications on proposed Lot 16.01, located in the R 75 (Single  
Family Residential) Zone), and construct a new single family home on proposed  
subdivided Lot 17.01 located in the "NC" (Neighborhood Commercial) Zone. Variances  
required for proposed Lot 17.01 are (1) Use Variance (residential homes are not  
permitted in the "NC" Zone; Variances required for (2) Lot Area 5,000 sq. ft. required,  
4,781.38 sq. ft. provided, (3) Lot Depth 80 ft. required, 47.8 ft. provided, (4) Rear Yard  
Setback 20 ft. required, 10.4 ft. provided. Variances required on proposed Lot 16.01, (1)  
Lot Area 7,500 sq. ft. required, 4,773.67 sq. ft. provided, (2) Lot Frontage 70 ft. required,  
49.91 ft. provided, (3) Lot Width 70 ft. required, 49.90 ft. provided; (4) Lot Depth 100 ft.  
required, 93 ft. provided, (5) Side Yard Setback 9 ft. required, 2.4 ft. provided, (6) Front  
Yard Setback 25 ft. required, 11.8 ft. provided, (7) Building Coverage 20% maximum  
permitted, 20.11% provided; (8) Floor Area 1,300 sq. ft. required, 960 sq. ft. provided).

Mrs. Rescorl says this application has to be carried at the request of the applicant's attorney, for modifications to the plans and application. Mr. Byock moves to carry this application to the August 26 meeting, without further notice, seconded by Mr. Phillips, and on voice vote all members agree.

**New Business, V15-105/Panzer, Applicant and Property Owner: Anthony Panzer, 131 Grove Street, Block 181, Lot 3, Use Variance** for expansion of a nonconforming use. Applicant was previously granted a Certificate of Nonconformity for three (3) residential structures existing on the property prior to adoption of the Zoning Ordinance. Applicant proposes to construct a 28 ft. x 34 ft. x 19 ft. high garage, where the maximum height for an accessory structure is 10 ft., constituting a further expansion. This property is located in the R 100, single family residential zone.

Mr. Leckstein marks as Exhibit A-1 the elevation drawings of the proposed garage dated 2/15/2015, consisting of five pages. Marked as Exhibit A-2 is a survey of the applicant's property, prepared by William H. Ziemann, Jr., Azimuth Land Surveying Co., Inc., dated September 1, 2012. Mr. Leckstein marks as Exhibit B-1 a copy of the resolution of approval given the applicant for this property dated August 22, 2012, recognizing that is a preexisting nonconforming use on the property.

Mr. Leckstein says this is a new application for an expansion of a nonconforming use. Mr. Panzer is sworn in by Mr. Leckstein. Mr. Leckstein explains to the Board the site consisted of three separate residences on one lot; the Ordinance prohibits multiple housing on a single lot, but the Board found these structures were built before the Zoning Ordinance went into effect.

Mr. Panzer says he would like to fix what he has on his property, a garage. He has a structure there now collapsing and falling apart. He wants to make it nice since it looks bad now, so he can have a garage. He has the room.

Mr. Leckstein says the only variance is the height of 19 ft.

Mrs. Friedman says looking at the plans the last time the applicant was here, there are a lot of electric junctions, so it appears to be more like a commercial use than residential. Mr. Panzer asks if he is not allowed to have electric in your garage. He wants 30 or 50 amp service to run machines, like his trailer. He wants to be able to put his boat in there and work on it, a grinder, a sander.

Answering Mr. Bucco, Mr. Panzer says there was a bigger garage there at one time that was made into a smaller shed like thing that is now falling apart. He refers to his pictures.

Answering Mr. Phelps, Mr. Panzer says he has three boats, one currently in the water, one at home on his property and one in Cape May.

Answering Mr. Falco, Mr. Panzer says the existing structure is about the same size as the one proposed, it will be a little deeper and higher. The one he has now is about 12 ft. high right now.

Answering Mr. Leckstein, Mr. Panzer says he needs a 19 ft. high garage to get his boat in there, which is 12 ft. high, the door has to be 12 ft. high, and he wants a pitch on the

garage, because we get snow. It is a garage and not a shed. Mr. Leckstein reminds him the Ordinance only permits 10 ft. high garages. Mr. Panzera says that is why he is here for a variance.

Answering Mr. Bucco, Mr. Panzera says a 10ft. high garage sounds like a shed. Answering Mr. Bucco, Mrs. Rescorl says most garages are attached to the house, so can be up to 35 ft. high. Many times an additional garage, which is considered an accessory structure if not attached to the house, is used for storage or to put a car in, so the 10 ft. height is acceptable. It has been talked about many times and always remains at 10 ft. if not attached to the house. Mr. Gillen says accessory buildings are defined at a height of 10 ft. He is not attached to the building or house, so it is an accessory building that has a limit of 10 ft. in height. For an accessory building to be higher than 10 ft., he needs a variance. In order for him to clear the door with his 12 ft. high boat, he needs a door, and the pitch of the roof and the height of the building by Ordinance is into the median of the pitch of the roof. He is looking for 19 ft. to get appropriate pitch on the roof for the elements. By definition Mr. Gillen says the building height is the vertical distance measured to the highest elevation of the finished grade, the peak of the roof. .

Answering Mr. Phelps, who is pointing to the survey, Mr. Panzera says he is pointing to the existing structure. Mr. Panzera points to the exact location of the proposed structure on the existing survey.

Mr. Panzera says there will be doors in the front and back of the garage. He says he is not running a business from the garage, and that will be a condition of approval.

Answering Mrs. Friedman about any drainage issues with the size change, Mr. Panzera says there should not be a problem with that.

Mr. Leckstein marks a series of six photographs as Exhibit A-3. These photographs were taken by the applicant; the applicant explains the photographs, from the side of his property from Grove Street, the front driveway going in from Grove Street, Grove Street and the house, and the nasty sheds that are there. Those sheds are coming down because the garage is going right there. There is a discussion whether they are sheds or garages; Mr. Panzera says it was a garage at one time, in the 60's. He is taking down multiple connected pieces of junk; he's got the room to do what he wants.

Answering Mr. Bucco, Mr. Panzera says there is one structure, but they are little additions, and will be knocked down to build one garage. There will be electric, and the garage will be on a slab. He can put his boat in it and work on it in the winter time.

Answering Mr. Falco, who says he is not showing his roof pitch, and if he drops it down to a 3 or 4 on 12, you can still have a pitch and strong enough for snow, and you can still get your boat in. Mr. Panzera would like to keep the garage the way it is proposed; everything around him is higher, including his house.

Mr. Bucco says the building inspector will determine if it should be structurally dropped. He says the applicant is here for variance relief. Mr. Falco says he is trying to see if he has room to lower the roof because it is pretty high. Mr. Panzera says he figured this is the way it should be; he is going for extra, otherwise he wouldn't be here. The problem he sees is because it is not attached to his height.

Mr. Bucco says he is here because he is building something higher than the Ordinance permits, not attaching it to his house, staying within the existing footprint and knocking down an existing building. Mr. Panzera says it will be longer. He is running electric to it, but not natural gas. There will be no wood burning stove, just electric.

Answering Mrs. Friedman's question about whether or not he has an issue matching the paint on the proposed garage to the color of the house, with the same roof, as a condition of approval, Mr. Panzera says he plans on doing that.

Answering Mr. Phelps if he will be using the garage year round or storing his boat for the winter instead of paying a slip fee, Mr. Panzera says it is a garage, and asks if Mr. Phelps uses his garage year round. Mr. Phelps says he is asking if he will be using the garage to store his boat for the winter; Mr. Panzera says "yes." He will also store cars. Answering Mr. Phelps if he works in the garage during the winter, will he use a space heater or put in heating, Mr. Panzera says he is not sure yet. He asks if he could put in a wood burning stove. He has one in his house, is he allowed to have one in his garage?

Addressing Mr. Phelps, Mr. Panzera says he wants a garage, he wants heat in there, if he has to run electric he will run electric.

Mr. Phelps asks if any other neighbors have garages; Mr. Panzera says all his neighbors have garages except him.

Mrs. Friedman says he has three garages on the property all connected that he intends to tear down and build a new garage. Answering her question, Mr. Panzera does not intend to have an HVAC system in the garage. He has no intention of putting a wood burning stove in there now, he may get a salamander to put in in the winter for heat, that's it.

Mrs. Friedman asks Mr. Gillen if there are issues for building a garage and putting portable heat in there; Mr. Gillen replies salamanders are not recommended, he would have to either put in an electric heat system or whatever would have to comply with code. It is essentially a garage with lighting and some sort of heating system.

Answering Mr. Falco, Mr. Panzera says his house is about 30 ft. high.

Mr. Leckstein addresses the Board saying the applicant already has a nonconforming lot with three nonconforming residential structures on the one lot. The property is already quite nonconforming. Now he is coming in asking for another nonconforming structure, a garage; he is asking for a d2 variance, not a bulk variance. A d2 variance is for the expansion of a nonconforming use variance. He is looking to increase the nonconformity of an existing property that is already nonconforming. Mr. Bucco asks if the expansion is to go up. Mr. Leckstein replies you take the entire lot into consideration .....Mr. Bucco is talking over Mr. Leckstein, and then Mr. Panzera talks over both saying half of his lot is not even being used besides the garage that is on there. The whole half of the property only has the garage on there. The other half has the three houses that have been there since 1780. Mr. Leckstein says he is allowed to have those houses. Mr. Panzera says you are saying he was allowed to have them, but they were there, and then the Board came along. Mr. Phelps says if the Zoning Board was in existence before the houses were built, there may have been a chance the three houses would not be allowed. Mr. Panzera says in 2012 he came to build a garage and was told he was not in compliance because he was suppose to do something, and he can't have a garage until he gets this straightened out. Mr. Leckstein says it was determined he had illegal structures on his property, he came

into the Board and said the structures are not illegal, they have been here forever. The Board agreed with Mr. Panzera. The garage was not permitted at that time. Now the applicant is coming in asking for a further expansion of the nonconformities on the property. That is what the Board has to deal with.

Mr. Panzera says so the Board is not looking at those things there now and he wants to fix it. Mr. Phelps says he is not asking to fix it but rather tear it down and build something bigger that is also not conforming.

Mr. Panzera says he advertised to everybody and let them know he is trying to do this, since April, and he still doesn't have a straight answer on it.

Mr. Leckstein says the law says you are not allowed to expand nonconformities; Mr. Panzera asks if that is what the law says, and Mr. Leckstein says that is what the law says. Mr. Leckstein says a d2 variance is not an easy variance to get. That is why the applicant is here and that is why the Board is having issues with the application. They are concerned because there are legitimate issues that they have to consider as a quasi judicial body, they are not up here to do nothing. They have to follow the law, and that is what the members are trying to do.

Mr. Bucco, addressing the Board engineer, says the variance the applicant is asking for is to tear down the existing building structure, to put one up that is a higher height, which Mr. Gillen says is correct. Mr. Bucco asks, in Mr. Gillen's professional opinion, would that degrade the neighborhood and/or his reason as to why this is negative to the property itself. He is looking at the variance as stated, and the only relief he is asking for is the height.

Mr. Leckstein swears in Mr. Gillen. Mr. Gillen, replying to Mr. Bucco, says the Board has given variances for height for garages and detached structures in the past. In this particular area, he does not think it would be detrimental to grant the variance; he is familiar with the neighborhood.

Mr. Panzera says it is not like he has a very small property. It is going to look fine, not like it is whacked out and doesn't belong. It will look normal on his big property.

Answering Mr. Bucco, Mr. Panzera says the proposed garage will blend in with all the structures on the property. It will be all vinyl and cement. They are all tan. That's the plan, to be beige like the rest of the houses. It will look good when it is done. \\

Answering Mr. Phelps, Mr. Panzera says the garage will not be used for commercial purposes.

Answering Mr. Leckstein, whether or not all three residential structures will have access to the garage, Mr. Panzera says no, just his structure, just him.

Mr. Panzera said every one of his neighbors said they were happy if he built the proposed garage.

There is no one present in the audience on this application.

Mr. Falco says at least the garage will be in proportion to the houses.

Mrs. Friedman moves to grant the approvals, with conditions, including no plumbing, seconded by Mr. Phillips.

Yes: Mr. Bucco, Mr. Byock, Mr. Falco, Mrs. Friedman, Mr. Phillips, Mr. Phelps, Mr. Apostolou

No: None

Abstain: None

New Business, **V15-107/Vivian's Tarot Card Center, Applicant: Vivian's Tarot Card Center, Property Owner: Peter Raymond, 144 Lower Main Street, Block 254, Lot 6, Use Variance** to permit Vivian's Tarot Card Center to occupy the home as a tenant and run the tarot card center from a portion of the first floor of the home, in the "NC" (Neighborhood Commercial) Zone. Single family homes are not a permitted use in this zone. In addition, this property received site plan approval in 1987 for commercial use only. This application was scheduled for the July 22 public meeting, which was canceled.

Salvatore Alfieri, Esq., attorney for the applicant, states this is an application for the Vivian's Tarot Card Center, located currently a couple of doors down, relocating to this property. It is a d variance because the applicant lives in the house, and operates the tart card business from the current location and wants to move it to this new location. Two witnesses will be called, Mr. Raymond, the owner of the property, and Mr. Stevens, the proposed occupant if this is approved, who will live with his wife in the house and operate the business.

Mr. Leckstein marks as Exhibit A-1 a survey of the property dated April 26, 2007 (May 3, 2007), done by East Coast Engineering, Inc., Jay F. Pierson, L.S., P.P. Marked as Exhibit A-2 is a layout of the floor plan. Marked as Exhibit A-3 is a business info sheet signed by Lee Stevens, dated 1/6/15, notarized. Marked as Exhibit A-4 is a Resolution of the Planning Board dated May 18, 1988. Marked as Exhibit A-5 is a resolution of the Planning Board dated May 18, 1988. Marked as Exhibit A-6 is another floor plan.

Peter Raymond, the property owner, is sworn in by Mr. Leckstein, and states he lives at 237 Medjay Lane, Toms River, NJ. Under questioning by Mr. Alfieri, Mr. Raymond says he bought the property in 2007, and it was occupied by a commercial business, a medical supply business. He thinks he was occupying the upstairs. The house is a split level, two floors. Going in the front door, there is a room to the left, approximately 23 or so feet, another area in back of that is a play area and kitchen. Go up four or five stairs, and there are three rooms on the second level. There is one bathroom in the cellar. Since he bought the property, he resided the house last year, and installed an on demand heating system. He had an oil tank removed, had the property reviewed by an environmental firm, and cleared by the state that there is no toxicity. Had all the hardwood floors redone, and had inspections from the town for fire, the heating system, and passed them all. Mr. Raymond states the shed in the rear yard was there when he purchased the property. He also cleaned up the rear of the property. The shed is old, but typically the type of shed you would store a lawn mower in. There are no utilities to the shed and none are proposed.

For the former business there was a sign, which is now just a sign post, the sign having been removed by the former company.

Mr. Raymond says there are lights in the parking lot. The front has a light, and a spotlight on the side, and another light in the back. There are front and back doors, the only two access doors. There is a finished basement, with heat.

Answering Mr. Leckstein, Mr. Raymond said you enter thru the front door of the house.

Answering Mr. Falco, Mr. Alfieri says the house will also be used as a residence; Mr. Leckstein says you are not permitted a residence in this zone.

Mr. Leckstein notes no one is present from the public on this application.

Answering Mr. Falco, Mr. Raymond says there are other buildings in the area that are occupied as businesses and homes. Mr. Raymond says there are in the surrounding area.

Answering Mr. Phelps, Mr. Alfieri says there is no intention to expand this to a multifamily use. Mr. Alfieri says the operator of the business has to live in the house, she cannot have a separate business and separate residence, they are tied together.

Answering Mr. Bucco, who asks if this will be owner occupied, Mr. Alfieri says the applicant has an option to buy the house, but right now will be renting. Mr. Raymond says he will own the building, the tenant will occupy the building, with an option to buy the building. The tenant will be a resident of the building and run a business from the building as well. Mr. Alfieri says there cannot be two different residents/users of the building, as a condition.

Answering Mr. Bucco, if we grant this variance, are we allowing the applicant to turn the bottom in a convenience store or a 7 Eleven. Mr. Alfieri says this is a d variance, it cannot be done because any approval will be limited to this exact use, the tarot card center and the owners of the tarot card business will be the occupants of the building. If they wanted to change the use, they would have to come back to the Board.

Mr. Raymond says prior to the current tenant, there was a security alarm company in the building, and prior to that a medical business.

Answering Mr. Leckstein, Mr. Raymond will agree to a deed restriction making it clear that it is only this use, and if this use ceases someone will come back to the Board. The Board is concerned that when he goes to sell the property people don't remember what was granted, but a deed restriction puts them on notice.

Mr. Alfieri says they on occasion also record the resolution of approval, so anyone buying the property would see the specific use and conditions of approval in the resolution. Mr. Leckstein is fine with this procedure as well.

Mr. Raymond wants to be sure the potential proposed tenant understands that and what he can and cannot have. Mr. Leckstein says we are not worried about that, we are concerned about a person who may buy the property in the future.

Mr. Bucco says once the Board grants a variance, the town has to live with it. That's why everything needs to be on the record to be clear.

Mr. Leckstein swears in the Board's professionals, who are both aware of their respective review letters although they did not write them.

Mr. Leckstein marks the engineering review letter from CME Associates, dated July 2, 2015, as Exhibit B-1 and the T&M planner's review letter dated July 16, 2015.

Lee Stevens is sworn in by Mr. Leckstein, and states he is the owner of Vivian's Tarot Card Center. He currently lives at 136 Lower Main Street, Aberdeen, NJ.

Under questioning by Mr. Alfieri, Mr. Stevens states he currently resides and runs his tarot card business from a location a couple of doors down from this property, for the past 18 years; he lived in the house and operated his business from the home during that time. If he gets the approval tonight to relocate to the other property, he and his wife, Susan, and his two children would reside in the home.

Mr. Stevens states the reason for the relocation is that his 20 year old daughter is returning home, and the proposed home is bigger and more comfortable for the family.

Mr. Stevens says the tarot card business will operate 10 a.m. to 8 p.m. or 9 p.m. each day of the week. She sees six people on average a day, by appointment only. The sessions are 30 minutes each. She staggers the sessions, so there is no waiting.

Referring to the floor plan, Mr. Stevens says no modification will be needed. You walk in the front door, and enter the room to the left, which has a door to be closed for private readings. There is a kitchen and dining area, and the bedrooms will be upstairs. There are no employees in the business.

Answering Mr. Leckstein, Mr. Stevens says there will be no physical separation between the house and the tarot card business.

Mr. Alfieri says in the current location Mrs. Stevens has a fluorescent lit sign in the window; it is the applicant's intention to move the sign to the proposed location. It is an indoor window sign. They do intend to put a sign on the post that is outside of the proposed location. He believes the sign will be 18 inches by 18 inches; not big at all, from memory, and it will not be lit.

Mr. Alfieri, referring to prior discussion, only Mr. Stevens' family can live in the house and work the business; he cannot move out and rent the house out to someone else nor rent the tarot card business to someone else. Mr. Stevens is ok with this condition. Mr. Leckstein says it can stay a tarot card place if the owner lives there, and Mr. Alfieri agrees.

Answering Mr. Bucco, who quotes the hours of operation stated by Mr. Stevens, who asks if, within a 200 ft. radius, are there any other businesses in that area that stay open that late and are lighted. Mr. Stevens replies there is a gas station directly across the street, the former Singin, now called 76, which opens real early and closes he believes at 11 p.m.

Answering Mr. Bucco, who says let's suppose the tarot card business takes off, will there be a parking problem the way the business schedules appointments. Mr. Stevens says as of now there is three parking in front of the property and three in the rear. No one will have to park on anyone else's property.

Mr. Stevens says surrounding the property besides the gas station is two doors to the right is a kitchen and bath remodeler and sells kitchens and bath, and next door is a photography studio also being used as a resident, to the right of the proposed location. Some are purely commercial, some, such as the one to the left is a multifamily home.

Answering Mr. Bucco, the kitchen and bath place does have customers coming in at night; there is a big streetlight giving them plenty of light. Mr. Bucco asks if he would set forth hours of operation. Mr. Leckstein said he confirmed 10 a.m. to 8 or 9 p.m. Mr. Bucco is asking this for more information, not necessarily a condition of approval.

Answering Mrs. Friedman about a separate entrance to the business, Mr. Stevens says there is a front entrance, which will be all of the business use, and there is a rear entrance the residents of the building will use.

Answering the planner, Mr. Stevens said of the two parking lots, Mr. Stevens will be using the rear parking lot for residential use, and commercial use will be in the front. There is typically one car in the front at a time.

No one is present in the public to question this applicant.

The planner suggests the Board get a print of the proposed sign, which will be a condition of approval to be approved by the planner.

Mr. Byock moves to accept the application with conditions, seconded by Mr. Phillips.

Yes: Mr. Bucco, Mr. Byock, Mr. Falco, Mrs. Friedman, Mr. Phillips, Mr. Phelps, Mr. Apostolou.

No: None

Abstain: None

**Memorialization of Resolution V15-108/Donelan and DeNardo, Applicant and Property Owner: Eric Donelan and Danielle DeNardo, 157 Idlewild Lane, Block 56, Lot 10, Use Variance** to install 4 ft. PVC vinyl fence in second front yard (Imbrook Lane), where fences are deed restricted in front yard area, on property located in the R75/PC zone, is summarized into the record by Mr. Leckstein. Mr. Falco moves to memorialize, seconded by Mrs. Friedman.

Yes: Mr. Bucco, Mr. Byock, Mr. Falco, Mrs. Friedman, Mr. Phillips, Mr. Phelps

No: None

Abstain: None

**Memorialization of Resolution V15-106/Wilson, Applicant: Robert Wilson, dba Weathervane Services, Inc., Property Owner: SWBC III RFEO, LLC, 220 Cliffwood Avenue, Block 165, Lot 1 and Block 167, Lot 9.01, Use Variance** approval to relocate overflow business work trucks from main business location on Lower Main Street, Aberdeen, and use existing building for minor maintenance of vehicles and storage of overflow business work trucks. Any deliveries via any form of truck will be between 10 a.m. and 3 p.m. No office or employees will be on site. Site is located in the R100 single family residential zone and was formerly The Milu Bus Service, Inc. site. Milu operated a school bus company from the site prior to 1981, and stored school buses on the property when not in use. They ceased operations in 2011, and the property was

taken over by a bank, is reviewed into the record by Mr. Leckstein. Mr. Falco moves to memorialize, seconded by Mr. Byock.

Yes: Mr. Bucco, Mr. Byock, Mr. Falco, Mrs. Friedman, Mr. Phillips, Mr. Phelps

No: None

Abstain: None

Mrs. Friedman moves to accept the minutes of the May 27, 2015 Public Meeting, seconded by Mr. Phillips, and on voice vote all members approve.

Meeting adjourned.





