

## **BOROUGH OF DEAL**

### **PLANNING BOARD/BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MINUTES**

**January 2, 2020**

A regular meeting of the Planning Board/Board of Adjustment of the Borough of Deal was called to order by Chair Richard Cummings.

Richard Cummings asked everyone to salute the flag.

Michael Egan read the sunshine law, in conjunction with the "Open Public Meeting Law", p.l. 1975 C231, the notice required by this statute has been satisfied as per a resolution passed on December 5, 1997 at 8:00 P.M. at Borough Hall at a regular meeting of the Planning Board, Borough of Deal, Monmouth County, New Jersey. This meeting is a judicial proceeding. Any questions or comments must be limited to the issues of what this Board may legally consider in reaching a decision and decorum appropriate to a judicial hearing must be maintained at all times.

Roll Call of those present: Mandy Cohen, Nicole Cohen, Richard Cummings, Richard Fetaya, Kathleen Jannarone, Irwin Levine, David Simhon.

Those Absent: Ruby Antebi, Sam Cohen, Max Zeevi.

A motion was made by Richard Cummings and seconded by David Simhon that the minutes of the December 5, 2019 meeting be adopted.

Moved by: Richard Cummings

Seconded by: David Simhon

#### **ROLL CALL VOTE**

Those in favor: Cummings, Fetaya, Jannarone, Levine, Simhon

Those opposed: None

Those absent: Antebi, Sam Cohen, Zeevi

Those not voting: Mandy Cohen, Nicole Cohen

The first item on the agenda is the Annual Re-Organization of the Board.

Kathleen Jannarone made a motion to appoint Richard Cummings as Chairman to the Planning Board/Board of Adjustment, seconded by David Simhon.

#### **ROLL CALL VOTE**

Those in favor: Mandy Cohen, Nicole Cohen, Richard Fetaya, Kathleen Jannarone, Irwin Levine

Those opposed: None

Those absent: Ruby Antebi, Sam Cohen, Max Zeevi

Those not voting: Richard Cummings

Richard Cummings made a motion to appoint Kathleen Jannarone Vice-Chair to the Planning Board/Board of Adjustment, seconded by David Simhon.

#### **ROLL CALL VOTE**

Those in favor: Mandy Cohen, Nicole Cohen, Cummings, Fetaya, Levine, Simhon

Those opposed: None

Those absent: Antebi, Sam Cohen, Zeevi

Those not voting: Kathleen Jannarone

Richard Cummings made a motion to appoint Erik Anderson Board Attorney to the Planning Board/Board of Adjustment, seconded by Kathleen Jannarone.

**ROLL CALL VOTE**

Those in favor: Nicole Cohen, Mandy Cohen, Cummings, Fetaya, Jannarone, Levine, Simhon,  
Those opposed: None  
Those absent: Antebi, Sam Cohen, Zeevi  
Those not voting: None

Kathleen Jannarone made a motion to appoint Michael Egan, Board Secretary to the Planning Board/Board of Adjustment, seconded by Richard Cummings.

**ROLL CALL VOTE**

Those in favor: Mandy Cohen, Nicole Cohen, Cummings, Fetaya, Jannarone, Levine, Simhon,  
Those opposed: None  
Those absent: Antebi, Sam Cohen, Zeevi  
Those not voting: None

Richard Cummings made a motion to Adopt Resolution 20-01 for the Board’s meeting nights as the First Wednesday of each month at 7:30pm with the following exception that the October meeting be the First Thursday of that month. seconded by Mandy Cohen.

**RESOLUTION 20-01**

**WHEREAS**, in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act, Chapter 231 P.L. 1975, it is necessary for the Planning/Zoning Board of Adjustment of the Borough of Deal, as a public body to post and maintain a schedule of the regular meetings of the public body to be held during the years; and,

**WHEREAS**, the Planning/Zoning Board of Adjustment of the Borough of Deal will maintain the following regular meeting dates from February 2020 to January 2021.

**REGULAR MEETINGS** will be held at Borough Hall, 190 Norwood Avenue, Deal NJ in the Court Room at 7:30PM as follows:

**February 5, 2020**

**March 4, 2020**

**April 1, 2020**

**May 6, 2020**

**June 3, 2020**

**July 1, 2020**

**August 5, 2020**

**September 2, 2020**

**October 1, 2020**

**November 4, 2020**

**December 2, 2020**

**January 6, 2021**

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Planning/Zoning Board of Adjustment of the Borough of Deal, County of Monmouth, State of New Jersey that it does hereby adopt the meeting schedule of the Planning/Zoning Board of Adjustment as noted above.

Moved by: Richard Cummings

Seconded by: Mandy Cohen

**ROLL CALL VOTE:**

Those in favor: Mandy Cohen, Nicole Cohen, Richard Cummings, Richard Fetaya, Irwin Levine, David Simhon

Those opposed: None

Those absent: Ruby Antebi, Sam Cohen, Max Zeevi

Those not voting: Kathleen Jannarone

The second item on the Agenda is 40 Monmouth Drive, Block 68, Lot 2, Jack and Jacqueline Sakkal. This application was carried from the December 5<sup>th</sup> meeting for revisions to the plan. Attorney for the applicant, Jessica Sweet.

Enter into evidence:

A-6 Variance Plan/Pool Plan by East Point Engineering, Engineer Marc Leber, revised 12/17/2019.

B-2 Engineering review letter by Leon S. Avakian, Inc, revised date December 26, 2019.

B-3 Planning Board Affidavit signed by Nicole Cohen, dated 1/2/2020.

B-4 Planning Board Affidavit signed by Mandy Cohen dated 1/2/2020.

Jessica Sweet, we were here last month with a plan and after receiving some feedback from the Board, we went back to the drawing board and made some revisions. So last month we were here requesting impervious coverage of approximately of 44% and we were able to reduce it to 39.2 %. We reduced the size of the pool from 30 foot long x 20 feet wide, we reduced it to 20 feet x 27.5 feet, we reduced the setback variance, previously we were asking for 25 feet on the western side yard setback and 20 feet to the eastern side. With reducing the size of the pool, there is a setback 22.5 on the Eastern side yard and 25 feet in the Western side yard. This is an undersized yard in this zone. With eliminating the impervious, we are talking about the side yard setbacks variances. I call Marc Leber, Engineer.

Marc Leber, last time we were here we had a slightly larger pool, there was some excess coverage by the carport. We brought the overall coverage down to 39.2%, so we are slightly under 40%. We are asking for 22.5 feet on one side of the pool and 25 feet on the other. This is a classic narrower lot situation and there is no detriment to the neighbor as it is an inground pool and is not perceptible to the neighbors.

Kathleen Jannarone, you were able to reduce the pool by 2 and half feet, did you try to make it a little smaller to avoid the variance?

Marc Leber, you are left with a pool that is very small. If we met the setbacks, we would be left with a pool that is 15 x 20 which is very small.

Jessica Sweet, we are here for a C1 hardship variance. The driver of the hardship is the lot size.

Nicole Cohen, it is not an average size property so why should it have an average size pool? It should have a smaller pool in my opinion.

Jessica Sweet, is there any substantial detriment to the neighbors?

Marc Leber, what is the detriment? The neighbor is a family member.

Jessica Sweet, would granting the hardship variance cause any substantial impairment to the zoning plan or the zoning ordinance of the Borough.

Marc Leber, No, we have come back with a plan that is improved and frankly I didn't expect this much back and forth because I thought this was a much better plan.

Jessica Sweet, did you look to see if you could move the pool closer to the house.

Marc Leber, we are trying to maintain a pool patio and the minimum pool patio to have chairs. If you can't do at least three feet, you can't have a patio. I don't like putting pools close to the house.

Erik Anderson, Mr. Levine asked me a question about hardship. He was under the impression that it was a personal hardship. That is not what case law says. They are looking for a variance under C1. Case says this in regards to C1 variance. Reads from the Municipal Land Use Law describing a C1 variance. There is a similar case in Lang versus Zoning Board of Adjustment of North Caldwell. The lot was narrower, the issue was, the Board actually granted the pool. Ultimately the New Jersey Supreme Court said just building the pool creates the hardship, that is not accurate, the property creates the hardship because it is automatically is non-conforming.

Richard Cummings, this pool meets the hardship.

Jessica Sweet, in this case, we are proposing a pool 27.5 long and 20 feet wide. We conform to the rear yard side setback. This lot is 50% of the width permitted.

Marc Leber, I do not feel there is any detriment at all. We have reduced it with a better plan. This is not an excessively large pool. The reason we did not do 20x25, you still need a deep end and a shallow end. We are trying to maintain some shape to keep it practical.

Jack Sakkal, we wanted the pool at least 10 feet from the house. I don't want the kids walking out of the house into the pool.

Marc Leber, how does reducing the pool 2.5 feet improve whatever perceived detriments there are. It appears that reducing the pool, the only detriment is to the owner.

David Simhon, there may be future applications on different lots.

Marc Leber, those different lots may have different circumstances. There is no detriment to anyone but the owner. By taking away 30 inches from this pool, the only detriment is to the owner. How is anyone around the property going to be impacted or how is the impact being minimized if we give you back 30 inches.

Richard Cummings, any comments from the audience? None.

Jack Sakkal, we are going to hire a landscape artist.

Erik Anderson, for your consideration, if we allow this pool to be built, are we going to be creating a substantial detriment to the community and the other is would you be harming how are Zoning Ordinances work by allowing the variance.

Jessica Sweet, this is a unique condition that impacts this property and the surrounding properties are much more conforming in terms of width than this property. This is exactly what the C1 variance was intended to address.

David Simhon makes a motion to accept the application subject to a Landscaping Plan approved by our Engineer. Mandy Cohen seconds the motion.

Moved by: David Simhon

Seconded by: Mandy Cohen

**ROLL CALL VOTE:**

Those in favor: Mandy Cohen, Richard Cummings, Richard Fetaya, David Simhon

Those opposed: Nicole Cohen, Kathleen Jannarone

Those absent: Ruby Antebi, Sam Cohen, Max Zeevi

Those Abstaining: Irwin Levine

The third item on the agenda is 19 Woodford Road, Block 52, Lot 9, Henry Abadi. Applicant is proposing a two-story addition to the rear of the dwelling and second story addition to the southwest corner at the front of the building. Attorney for the applicant, Jennifer Krimko.

Enter into evidence:

A-1 Plot Variance Plan by Charles Surmonte, Engineer dated 3/1/2019 with latest revision date of 12/17/2019.

A-2 Survey of Property by Charles Surmonte dated February 19, 2019.

A-3 Architectural Plans by W. Lerman Architecture, Wayne Lerman, Architect dated February 5, 2019.

A-4 Google Earth Street view photos of subject property and surrounding street views.

A-5 Colorized rendering street view of subject property

B-1 Engineer review letter by Leon S. Avakian, Inc. dated August 26, 2019 with a revision date of December 27, 2019.

Jennifer Krimko, what you have existing on the lot is a house that has a total of 1891 square feet of living space. Under anyone's standards that is a smaller house for the Borough of Deal. What we are proposing to do is to do a first-floor addition to the rear of the house and add a second floor over the existing porch on the front of the house. We are not bringing it any closer to the street, we are just building up over what's there. The total addition is approximately 1500 square feet so the total habitable space of this house when it's done will be average too small for Deal, will be 3455 square feet. The houses around it are much bigger. Even with the 1500 square feet we are only adding 688 square feet to the footprint, so the total footprint of the building is 2179. There was an error by our Engineer and made a mistake on the plans and Avakian did not catch it. The building coverage is not what you see on the plans or what you see in the letter. Building coverage in the R2 zone is based on the principal structure only and Chet, the Engineer did was include the garage structure and what Matt Marino did was use Chet's numbers. When you look at just the principal building, the existing building coverage is 18.41% and the proposed is 26.9%. The ordinance contemplates a 18,750 lot, we have an 8,100 square foot lot. Our lot is 43.2% of what the minimum required is. You look at what variances are being created. We are going up in building coverage but the building coverage is being added to the back of the house. The footprint is to the back so no impact to the street. You look at the frontage, the structure is staying where it is there is an enclosed porch, we are just building on top of it. You look at the side yard setback, the existing side yard is where it is, we are just building on top of it. You look at the building height, the peak of the roof goes east to west, so the height of it is facing the street. A5 is the color rendering and it shows the peak is closer to the street, so the height of the house goes to the back with the side sloping down so the visual to the street is less imposing. This property existing is way over coverage at 48.1%, what we are proposing to bring the coverage down by a full percentage, you get a more attractive house, less imposing from the street and ethically pleasing. I call Charles Surmonte, Engineer. I indicated that the lot is 60 feet where it is 150 feet is required. Is it true that you made a mistake on your calculation?

Charles Surmonte, apparently yes.

Jennifer Krimko, you agree with my recalculation of the building coverage and we are only seeking 26.9%.

Charles Surmonte, if the garage is not included in the coverage calculation, you are correct.

Jennifer Krimko, with the impervious coverage, we are reducing it down from 48 plus or minus down to 47% and since we are reducing over what is existing, we are not proposing any drainage structures.

Charles Surmonte, we are not proposing any, we are reducing coverage and would like to request that we not have to get any storm.

Jennifer Krimko, but if Mr. Avakian feels it is necessary, we would comply with it. We would put in drywells or something of the like.

Charles Surmonte, Yes.

Richard Fetaya, could you go over front yard setback. What is the average?

Jennifer Krimko, I believe it is 44, it is existing at 39.9 and we are going to be at 39.5. We are measuring to the front porch because there is going to be living space on top of it. It is going to remain an existing screen porch. The whole size of this house is smaller than what the

ordinance contemplates a first floor to be in Deal on a conforming lot. You have a young family and wants to have bedrooms, small ones for their kids, to live here and they are doing their best to fit in the footprint to not to be any detriment to anybody around them. They are investing in a house that is dilapidated. I think it is a very reasonable solution to modernize this house.

Richard Fetaya, what about the garage?

Jennifer Krimko, we are not touching it. It will be maintained safely.

Richard Cummings, any comments from the audience? None.

David Simhon makes a motion to accept the plan as submitted. Richard Fetaya seconds the motion.

Moved by: David Simhon

Seconded by: Mandy Cohen

#### **ROLL CALL VOTE:**

Those in favor: Mandy Cohen, Nicole Cohen, Richard Cummings, Richard Fetaya, Kathleen Jannarone, Irwin Levine, David Simhon

Those opposed: None

Those absent: Ruby Antebi, Sam Cohen, Max Zeevi

Those not voting: None

The final item on the agenda is 15 Poplar Avenue, Block 13, Lot 11.01, Natalie Vilinsky. Applicant is proposing a new dwelling, pool, cabana and tennis court. Attorney for the applicant, John A. Giunco. Note: Board member Irwin Levine steps down from board.

Enter into evidence:

A-1 Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan by Matrix New World, David G. Eareckson, Engineer, dated June 26, 2019.

A-2 Architectural Plan by CDZ Architects, Cathy Zukerman, RA dated 8/21/2019.

A-3 Architectural Plan by CDZ Architects, Cathy Zukerman, RA, revised 12/11/2019.

A-4 Color Rendering of subject property street view.

A-5 Enlarged Color Rendering of subject property street view.

A-6 Outbound and Topographic Survey Plan by Clearpoint Services dated 12/2/2015 with a revision date of June 29, 2017.

A-7 Stormwater Management Report by Matrix New World Engineering, David Eareckson, PE, dated June 26, 2019.

A-8 Geometry Plan by Matrix New World Engineering dated 6/26/2019, with a revision date of 12/23/2019.

A-9 Aerial Google Map photo of subject property dated 9/3/2019.

A-10 Copy of Survey of property and filed with County of Monmouth dated 2/17/1953.

B-1 Engineer review letter by Leon S. Avakian, Inc, dated September 4, 2019.

John Guinco, there are several neighbors who have retained counsel and request the Board to have them present themselves.

Erik Anderson, it has come to our attention that S&B Pool Co. services the applicants pool. Chair Richard Cummings works for that company. Would that render you unable to be impartial?

Richard Cummings, I don't think so but it is up to you guys.

Erik Anderson, can you be fair? Can you be impartial?

Richard Cummings, yes.

Erik Anderson, the fact that you work for a company that services the applicant will have no impact on what you do on this application.

Richard Cummings, yes.

Erik Anderson, Mr. Giunco, do you have any objection of staying on the dais?

John Giunco, No. We discussed with the clients and while they know the company, they do not know any of the employees.

Michael Convery, attorney for Richard Dweck, we do not have a problem as long as you can remain impartial and rule on the application.

Richard Stone, attorney for the Chamblins, we have no problem as long as you can remain unbiased.

Erik Anderson, this application has noticed a potential use variance. If a use variance is involved, the individuals who could sit would change. Commissioner Simhon would have to step down because you would then be acting as a zoning board capacity and not in a planning board capacity. We want to get this procedurally correct. We will allow the applicant to make their presentation to the board and the objectors will have their rights to cross examine, present their case and the end of all the evidence, a determination will be made as to whether or not a D variance is indeed implicated and at that time we will make a decision as to what members would sit to render a decision. Do we have all council on board with this?

Michael Convery, yes.

Richard Stone, I am waiting for John, any other comment?

John Guinco, I would just say that our application did not apply for a use variance nor was it identified by any consultants to the board in any of the reports.

Erik Anderson, in fairness to the applicant. The applicant is not necessarily claiming the use variance by the application, but the objectors believe that

John Guinco, if I may, the objectors discussed with us at the last meeting that they had a potential use variance because of the existence of a driveway that serves an adjoining property created by an easement approved by the Borough of Deal.

Erik Anderson, we are not going to get into the merits. We just need to limit it to involves that it involves the use of the easement.

Michael Convery, the purpose of proceeding is for the efficiency of time rather than raising this issue and having this decision be made at the front of the application that we would allow Mr. Giunco to proceed to put his application forth and then we, in our direct opposition case would bring up the implication of the D variance requirements and then John would rebut and then at that point we would deal with that issue after the case was put forth.

Richard Stone, If I understand, all the members will be sitting because it's a combined board and there will not be a decision at the beginning of the application as to whether they are sitting on a zoning board or a planning board. At some point based upon what board it is someone will leave the Board. I represent the adjoining property owner and the easement is the subject of my concern. Whether it is a zoning board or planning board doesn't make much difference to me but I am concerned from my observation it should be determined at the beginning of the application and not the end.

Erik Anderson, based on informal discussion about three minutes ago, that is what we agreed to.

Richard Stone, I defer to the other two attorneys and yourself.

Erik Anderson, we have a lot of witness's being paid to be here a second time and what is the most economic use of the volunteer board's time and the public has come out. I would recommend that we start giving testimony today. The other option is to have the Commissioner step down and battle over whether or not a use variance is implicated but to get to that point I think you would need to have testimony from the people in this room. I would recommend we proceed

Kay Jannarone, I agree.

Michael Convery, just to preserve the jurisdictional position, right now we are not waiving our rights.

Erik Anderson, right now, the objectors are not waiving their jurisdictional objection as to what Board hears this.

John Guinco, attorney for the applicant. We have an application before you. What we did after the last meeting where a couple of comments and had an opportunity to listen to the objectors, tried to eliminate some of their objections. What had occurred, we had some roof decks, an Ordinance was adopted and the client elected to rather than argue what was submitted, our client suggested to remove them. My client has lived on this property for a while and wants to relocate the house to the East, and moving out of the direct yard of neighbor Mr. Dweck and on the easterly side is the pre-existing easement that was mentioned it's now showing on the plan it's not disturbed or affected and it's a non-exclusive easement, so it can be used by either party, however our clients are proposing their own driveway so that it would not be used and that driveway is on the easterly side, runs alongside Mr. Dweck's driveway. I call David Eareckson, an expert in civil engineering. Please present your credentials.

David Eareckson, I have a Bachelor of Science from NJIT, I have been practicing for 20 years in New Jersey. I am licensed in New Jersey. Board Accepts.

John Guinco, can you first describe your exhibit for the board.

David Eareckson, this is an image from Google Earth, subject property is outlined in red. We prepared this to show the unique features of this property. The existing driveway comes up the East side, to the West of this house is the stream, Poplar Brook, there is nothing West of it, to the North is also Poplar Brook and the house sits well back since this is a Flag lot. The two variances we are requesting is lot width, for the flag lot width and the second one is lot frontage. The driveway that we are talking about from the neighbor comes up the easterly property line, cuts onto this property and serves as a parking lot in the back of that lot. That easement has been filed with Monmouth County, it was actually approved by the town before it was filed, that driveway that exists in that easement, we are not proposing to change at all.

David Simhon, that driveway is used by the home owner to the East.

David Eareckson, that is correct.

David Simhon, is that how they have to enter to their property?

David Eareckson, they have two separate areas to enter, they have main entrance that comes up in a circular around the front of the building and then this one comes around to a parking area that is behind the building. There is a floodway from Poplar Brook on this property that cuts right through the house as shown on DEP maps. We propose to demolish the existing house and driveway except for the shed in the back. We decided to shift the house to the East so we could meet the setback requirements and move the house away from the neighbor that it was so close to. We decided to put the pool in the back because that was the best place for it. We do not need any variances for the pool or cabana. My client wants a tennis court. With this uniquely shaped lot the only place left for it is to the west of the house.

John Guinco, why didn't you put it in behind the pool?

David Eareckson, it can't go behind the pool because it won't meet the minimum setback requirements back there at it would actually stick into the stream. We chose this location because it is the only location it could go and there is nobody to the West. This tennis court does not affect anyone to the west because of the stream. It's close to this property line which was like the house before but it is lower than the house. This tennis court is smaller than regulation.

John Guinco, are there any site constraints in the rear such as flood water?

David Eareckson, there is two separate issues from the stream. One is the floodway itself; we have placed the house outside of the floodway. The existing house is in the floodway. Part of this property is in the flood zone; we have designed this house to be out of the flood zone. We elevated the ground around it. We did put the tennis court and pool in the floodway.

Richard Cummings, will the elevation impact the neighbors?

David Eareckson, it will not. DEP would not issue a permit if we did. We need the permit.



Nicole Cohen, what is the tennis court made of?

David Eareckson, it is a clay court. It is a very stable material. The tennis court is at a level 12.

Richard Stone, the easement have both property owners have access. How many parking spaces do you have in the application?

David Eareckson, three.

Richard Stone, you have 9 bedrooms, 9 bathrooms and only three parking spaces?

David Eareckson, that is correct.

Richard Stone, our concern is that if there is overflow parking, that they not park in the easement. I want a commitment that no one will park there.

John Guinco, my client will give that.

Michael Convery, what you propose is you are removing the house from the floodway and the flood zone. What are you putting into the floodway?

David Eareckson, the tennis court.

Michael Convery, so your plan while it removes the house, puts the tennis court in the floodway. Will the tennis court have chain-link fencing around it?

David Eareckson, yes. We have not submitted to the DEP yet. We wanted to see if the Board is okay with it first.

Michael Convery, was there ever any plan to design a smaller home than would fit everything outside of the flood zone?

David Eareckson, you mean everything including the tennis court?

Michael Convery, right now there is an existing house in the floodway, so your applicant makes the site better by removing the house, but there are additional things that go back into the floodway.

David Eareckson, only the tennis court.

John Guinco, I call our professional planner, Andrew Janiw to go over the filed map from 1953 (A-10).

Andrew Janiw, there have been slight modifications over the years. The house is still where it was in 1953. The map shows the same dimensions. There is a large note on the bottom of the map, this map is hereby approved by the Borough of Deal, and consent is given that the same be filed in the office of the Clerk of the County of Monmouth, dated February 17, 1953.

John Giunco, in your design, are we substantially in compliance with the constraints that were issued in this approval in 1953 as to easement and to the setbacks?

Andrew Janiw, with the current application? Yes. The easement is unaffected.

Richard Fetaya, our decision would be based on NJDEP?

John Guinco, all our conditions have to be approved by the DEP, so if we don't satisfy them, we don't satisfy the condition.

David Simhon, wouldn't it be a better use of the property to put the parking where the tennis court is going to be?

David Eareckson, it's interesting that I can have a tennis court in the flood but I can't have a parking lot. Because of the monetary damage. A tennis court gets flooded, it dries out, a car gets flooded, it's ruined.

Richard Cummings, any questions for the Engineer from the public. None.

Kenneth Chamlin, neighbor objector, at the present time is it your understanding that the home is used exclusively as a summer residence?

David Eareckson, I don't know.

Kenneth Chamlin, is that relevant as part of your presentation earlier tonight?

David Eareckson, it doesn't matter to my Engineering design.

Kenneth Chamlin, does it not have any implication to the three parking spots concerned.

David Eareckson, not really, I don't know what the owner's intent is, they have 5 children.

John Guinco, the ordinance requires three parking spaces and we are providing that.

Erik Anderson, due to the lateness of the meeting and the Court reporter, we will carry this to the March 4<sup>th</sup> meeting without further notice.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted.

---

Michael W. Egan

Planning Board Secretary