The Board of Adjustment of the Township of Denville held its regular scheduled meeting on Wednesday, December 7, 2011. The meeting was held in the Municipal Building, 1 St. Mary's Place and commenced at 7:00 P.M. Chairperson Kevin Scollans presided.

Secretary Probasco read NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING.

ROLL CALL: Present: Kevin Scollans, John Murphy, Roger Spiess, Arthur Korn, Sean Ryan, Frank Passucci
Absent: James Rodimer, Sally Dankos, Tom Dolan
Prof. Present: Larry I. Wiener, Esq., William Denzler, PP, John Ruschke, PE

MINUTES:
October 19, 2011
Motion to adopt the minutes as submitted was made by Mbr. Korn, seconded by Mbr. Ryan and unanimously approved by all Members present and able to vote.

November 2, 2011
Motion to adopt the minutes as submitted was made by Mbr. Korn, seconded by Mbr. Ryan and unanimously approved by all Members present and able to vote.

PURCHASING:
Motion to pay voucher(s) submitted by William Denzler & Associates, (dated November 2, 2011) subject to the availability of funds, was made by Mbr. Korn, seconded by Mbr. Murphy and unanimously approved by all Members present.

Motion to pay vouchers submitted by Larry I. Weiner, (dated November 9, 2011) subject to the availability of funds, was made by Mbr. Korn, seconded by Mbr. Murphy and unanimously approved by all Members present and able to vote.

Motion to pay vouchers submitted by Hatch Mott MacDonald, (dated November 7, 2011) subject to the availability of funds, was made by Mbr. Korn, seconded by Mbr. Murphy and unanimously approved by all Members present and able to vote.

PROFESSIONAL COMMENTS:
John Ruschke, Township Engineer had no comments.
William Denzler, Township Planner had no comments.
Vice Chr. Murphy referenced it was Chr. Scollans last meeting as a zoning board of adjustment member. On behalf of the board, Vice Chr. Murphy presented a plaque to Chr. Scollans in acknowledgement and appreciation of his dedicated service since 2004. Thanks were made to Chr. Scollans for his work on the board and well wishes for his future as a council member. Chr. Scollans voiced appreciation to the entire board for their efforts and good work. Stated that he has enjoyed working with the board and that it has been a privilege to serve with everyone.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:
BA/PSP/FSPV 11-06: Karter S. Israni
Block 60207, Lot 298
Rockaway Avenue

Chr. Scollans announced to the public that the public hearing for this application would be adjourned. The board attorney announced that the applicant would need to notice to any of the questionable property owners in the previous legal notice. The public hearing for this application will be rescheduled after the January 4th, 2012 reorganization meeting.
December 7, 2011

BA 11-22: Tammy Baldwin
Block 60903, Lot 204
7 Hardman Terrace

Tammy L. Baldwin (7 Hardman Terrace) and Dan Encin, Principal of Mendham Design Architects were both present and sworn in. The applicant, Tammy L. Baldwin, is proposing to construct an addition requiring bulk variance relief for lot area, front, rear and side yard setbacks. Ms. Baldwin stated that the existing detached garage on the subject property is in a state of disrepair and requires replacement. Stated that a hardship exists due to the undersized lot size and wishes to make the property consistent with the other homes in the neighborhood.

Chr. Scollans opened to the professionals for comment.

Bill Denzler, Township Planner commented that the building addition is in a two acre zone where the existing lot is substantially undersized at approximately 4,300 sq. ft. Any improvements on the property would require variance relief for setbacks. The variances associated with the application include front, rear and side yard setbacks. Stated that the proposed is not substantial and will not overwhelm the lot itself. Mr. Denzler saw no substantial detriments to the surrounding property owners based upon the proposed improvements.

John Ruschke, Township Engineer commented that from an engineering perspective the proposed was minor and that the only improvement on the property would leave only 5’ from the corner of the structure to the property line and voiced caution be used to avoid encroachment.

Larry Weiner, Esq. agreed that due to the close proximity of the dwelling to the property line, that the applicant might want to have an easement with the neighbor to allow maintenance of the dwelling to avoid trespassing. The Township Engineer confirmed that an easement with the neighbor would be ideal.

Chr. Scollans opened to the board members.

Mbr. Spiess commented that his concerns had already been voiced regarding the building and maintenance of the structure. Mbr. Spiess stated that the proposed was in character with the neighborhood and he commented it would be an improvement. Assuming that the neighbors are on board Mbr. Spiess didn’t see a problem with it.

Mbr. Korn commented on visiting the property and stated he was leaning towards approving the request but inquired about varying setbacks on the application versus the planning report. Mr. Denzler responded that the ROW on Hardman Terrace is 20’ requiring adjustment of front yard setback. Confirmed to Mbr. Korn that it would be adjusted accordingly for the board attorney's incorporation into any resolution of approval.

Mbr. Ryan commented that he was out to the property and was in favor of the application. Mbr. Passucci commented on the 5” of roof as it relates to drainage going on someone else's property. Stated that this was addressed and that the proposed will clean up the area and be in favor of the application.

Mbr. Murphy commented on going to the property and the gutter going 5” on the neighbor's property. Commenting on building to the property line for emergency access and suggested improvement of the pathway on the left side of the home. For the best interest of the applicant with the locations of the kitchen, window box, etc. and the neighbors, as well as for emergency access.

Chr. Scollans concurred with the fellow board members and voiced a minimum of 3’ on each side of the home being ideal to allow a ladder being put up and to prevent infringing on the neighbors property. Despite the recommendation, voiced being in favor of the application.

Chr. Scollans opened to the public and seeing none, closed the public portion of the hearing.

A motion to approve this application was made by Mbr. Spiess, seconded by Mbr. Ryan and unanimously approved by all members eligible to vote.

Roll Call:

Ayes – Spiess, Ryan, Murphy, Passucci, Korn, Scollans

BA/PSP/FSPV 11-24: Rockaway River Country Club
Block 50002, Lot 4
39 Pocono Road

Richard T. Sweeney, Esq. (Laddy, Clark & Ryan) represented the applicant, Rockaway River Country Club. Applicant proposes to construct an addition on existing golf pro shop building, requiring use variance relief for expansion of a non-conforming use and includes reconfiguration/improvements to the ingress/egress driveways and a partial roadway/right of way realignment. Richard Sweeney, Esq. spoke to the orange hash mark denoting the existing clubhouse and the brown reflects the existing pro shop. The application is driven by the pro shop, which is old and requires modification. The proposed second story will be dormered for offices to enable the first level more space to accommodate merchandise. The driveway is currently to the south of the existing location by approximately 30’. Relocating to improve visibility issues. The proposed parking lot has been redesigned to eliminate congestion and provide separate areas for drop off of golf clubs and stacking of golf clubs away from the entrance way. Reconfiguration will include adding an island with landscaping and resurfacing, along with an additional entrance/exit point from the parking lot. The existing ROW is as it is in the Master Plan and the referenced Dedication was past tense and was previously dedicated. Will go to the
governing body in the future to (1) to vacate the one small piece of property in the front and (2) to rezone as consistent with the Master Plan.

Chr. Scollans suggested Mr. Sweeney speak to the multiple entrances. Mr. Sweeney stated that there is an entrance on Pocono Road used primarily by staff and deliveries. The second entrance further north on Pocono Road near the paddle tennis courts primarily used by maintenance staff. The proposed additional driveway will disperse some of the traffic to eliminate the concentration that currently exists.

Michael Ferguson, General Manager of Rockaway River Country Club (127 Blue Mountain Lake, East Stroudsberg, PA) was present and sworn under oath. Mr. Ferguson has been in this position for five and one half years. Using a colorized site plan (Exhibit A-1), Mr. Ferguson testified that the existing pro shop is old and not a functional use of space. The parking lot is unsafe and requires revamping.

Don Terry, AIA (15 Strong Drive, Kinnelon) was present and accepted as a professional witness. Using the existing floor plan of the pro shop (Exhibit A-2) with three photographs on the top showing the front, rear and sides of the building. The existing facility has a 1,300 sq. ft. retail area in the front with rear golf club storage in the rear along with a small office. Spoke to the existing cross-flow of circulation with the golf clubs being transferred into the roadway area with vehicular traffic.

Using the proposed floor plans of the pro shop (Exhibit A-3) shown using the existing footprint. To minimize the size of the building a story and one half is the proposed addition to the existing building for the functions that are not essential for the first floor. The second floor would consist of work rooms, a small bathroom and the golf pro’s office. Proposed small 6’ wide deck would serve as a staging area for removal and return to storage for the golf bags to the golf carts.

The elevation of the proposed building (Exhibit A-4) to include gabled roofs and low roof lines was shown. The view from the clubhouse south side. The east side elevations are mislabeled. The view from the north side reflects the deck area in the back. The west side reflected in the top drawing (Exhibit A-5) shows the view from the golf course. The west side is shown in the top drawing and the north side is shown on the bottom drawing. The building is shown in a creamy yellow with an asphalt roof. There are four decorative light fixtures on the building similar to the existing lighting. Additional lighting includes recessed lighting. There will be no flood lights.

Chr. Scollans opened this portion of the public hearing to the professionals.

Bill Denzler, Township Planner inquired if there would be additional noise from the outdoor staging area. Don Terry responded that there will be significantly less noise with the improvements, insulated fence for acoustics along with the heavy landscaping. Exterior lantern type lighting. Example of a cast iron looking fixture (Exhibit A-6) lantern, with candelabra bulbs that will be on the façade of the building. Recessed lighting on the porch.

John Ruschke, Township Engineer had no architectural questions for the architect.

Chr. Scollans opened this portion of the public hearing to the board members.

Mbr. Korn inquired about the roof and siding appearance. Mr. Terry indicated that they would be the same material as existing. Mbr. Korn had no further questions. Mbrs. Ryan and Passucci had none. Mbr. Murphy inquired about the overhang. Mr. Terry responded that there is a 6’ covered deck but that the impervious coverage increase on this project is zero. Mbr. Murphy stated that the pro shop looks quite a bit larger than existing and inquired about the fence. Mr. Terry testified that from the ground elevation, the fence would be approximately 9’ above. The solid fence starts at about 7’ after it leaves the deck. Bill Denzler, confirmed that a 7’ fence would require a variance as it would exceed the 6’ maximum. Mr. Terry stated that it would be left to the board but that the purpose of the 7’ fence is to serve as an acoustical barrier. Mr. Sweeney stated that it would be amended and left up to the judgment of the board regarding the height. Mbr. Murphy spoke to the entrances to the parking lot and moving the entrance much further north than proposed. Talking to the safety issues and commenting that less entrances would seem safer than more. Mbr. Sweeney indicated that the Mr. Walker and Mr. Richter would address these items. Mbr. Murphy had no further questions. Mbr. Spiess had no questions.

Chr. Scollans had no questions and opened this portion of the hearing to the public for questions.

Dr. Robert Miller (6 Old Boonton Road) was present and deferred his question on whether a traffic study had been performed to the testimony of other professionals.

Chr. Scollans asked for other members of the public, and seeing none. Closed the public portion of the meeting.

Marc G. Walker, PE (15 Barton Road, Mountain Lakes) was present and accepted as a licensed professional engineer. Using the existing site layout drawing (Exhibit A-7), Mr. Walker began his
testimony of the existing conditions. The left side of the sheet is Pocono Road, the bottom is Old Boonton Road. Commented on the odd shape of the property line. There was a proposed vacation and road dedication in the 1970’s. The gray area shows the area to be vacated and the hashed area reflects the area previously dedicated. Mr. Walker indicated it was almost half one acre of land. Will be requesting a vacation of the triangular piece of the property from the Council in the future. Richard Sweeney, Esq. referenced the prior Planning Board resolution and Deed (Exhibit A-8) and distributed same to the board members. Septic system is also in the right of way. The entrance shift of location approximately 40’ to the north.

Proposed creates a sight distance increase from 215’ to 390’ just by relocating the entrance 40’. Mr. Walker continued testimony regarding traffic and parking. Valet parking for large groups and circular driveway to allow car parking. The driveway makes sense based upon the location to the front door and the access to the site. Number of parking spaces will not change on the site. Additional trees proposed to be added in the parking lot area along with hedge along the edge of the parking lot. Landscape plan was submitted to the board with the application. Spoke to the proposed parking lot lighting. Existing pole with a spot light that shines out to the parking lot and another on the maintenance shed. Currently poorly lit parking lot area. Increase in the lighting proposed but still under the ordinance for lighting. Proposed lighting of 15’ in height, decorative fixtures that shine downward using a high pressure sodium that gives a softer orange lighting instead of bright light. Light in the island near walkway and out by roadway. Sidewalks of 4’ proposed in the island to be used during the day to get from the pool, etc. across the roadway. Proposed new septic system to service the pro shop intended for employee use only. Seven pro shop employees. In between the tee and fairway on the first hole instead of disrupting the existing soil and potential root damage to get to the pump house.

Mr. Walker addressed the concerns referenced in the Township Engineer’s report dated November 29th, 2011. Slight impervious coverage but sufficient area exists for percolation. No additional drainage basin is required. Handicapped parking spaces (Exhibit A-9) for a total of 6 with signage. Proposed entrance sign of 3’6” by 8’ (Exhibit A-10). Light fixture for parking area of high pressure sodium light, constructed on a pedestal approx. 2.5’-3’ concrete pedestal (Exhibit A-11). Sight distance requirements (Exhibit A-12) based upon ASHTO requirements 25’ of sight distance. Existing vegetation may be selectively cut to maintain the sight distance. Removal of the vegetation is outside of the ROW on club property.

Mr. Sweeney spoke to cost considerations and proceeding with a multi-phased project and two different approaches. Choice to proceeding as one phase or if multi-phased, applicant will return to appear before the board for approval of the phases.

Chr. Scollans asked for professional comments of proceeding in phases versus all in one phase.

John Ruschke, PE commented that it would be best to have the applicant proceed now with public if it is to be a multi-phased.

Larry Weiner, Esq. stated that the applicant would proceed with approval as one phase but the applicant will need to appear before the board if the opt to proceed in multiple phases. Richard Sweeney, Esq. agreed that the applicant would be fine with this.

Bill Denzler, PP inquired if the freestanding sign would allow sufficient sight distance. Mr. Walker stated it would. On the new entrance/exit drive, Mr. Denzler inquired about the stop bar causing a back up of traffic during large functions. Mr. Walker responded that north to south traffic is minimal. In a case where there is a back-up of cars, they would be in the parking lot and not in the road way. Inquired about the parking lot lighting. Mr. Walker responded that there will be enough from what exists today, providing adequate safety requirements and pleasing the neighbors.

John Ruschke, PP inquired about grading and drainage of the driveway. A small ditch ends to the north of the driveway must be filled. Mr. Walker stated that there is no freestanding water issue in this area.

After a brief break, Chr. Scollans opened the public hearing for this application to the board members.

Mbr. Spiess inquired about the traffic flow and multiple driveways. Mr. Walker responded that there are not any one-way access points. Pocono Road will primarily serve employees and deliveries. Old Boonton Road provides main access to the clubhouse, golf, pool, tennis and main function parking lot. Northerly entrance will be used by those traveling north to south. The only one-way is from the parking lot to the clubhouse. All entrances will be two-way traffic. There is a maintenance entrance further north, not shown on the map that is used to access the maintenance building or paddle hut.

Mbr. Korn inquired of the professionals about widening of the main entrance. Mr. Ruschke deferred to applicant’s engineer to testify. Mr. Walker spoke to large events arrivals in dribs and drabs and that the entrance can easily handle this flow from Old Boonton Road without backing up to the roadway. Upon exiting there is any type of traffic flow back-up, it would occur within the parking lot itself and not on the roadway. Mbr. Korn inquired about headlights, foliage and the residents. Mr. Walker testified that the exit is on a slope and agreed to an evergreen hedge along the ROW as a condition of approval to mitigate. Mbr. Korn inquired about sufficient parking in the lot and Bill Denzler responded sufficient. Mbr. Korn inquired about sight distance if
exceeding 25 mph. Mr. Walker responded to a traffic ticket and did not have sight distance detail for faster speeds. Mr. Denzler replied from a planning perspective that the sight distance is sufficient and due to the curves in the road, it would be difficult to travel faster. Explaining that designs are based upon the posted speed limits and that this is adequate. Chr. Scollans commented on not speculating. Mbr. Korn commented on having two entrances and exits a good thing.

Mbr. Ryan stated he questions had been answered.

Mbr. Passucci inquired about proposed improvement of the traffic flow. Mr. Walker indicated that the changes would improve traffic flow for both the golf activities during the day, as well as evening events.

Mbr. Murphy commented that the applicant is a victim of their own success and voiced concern regarding the multiple access points for such a small parking lot. Disagreed with Mbr. Korn that four entrances/exits will be confusing and sought further clarification on the advantage of the north exit. Mr. Walker stated no objection to paving the paddle court drive. Stating that this will relieve the traffic pattern in the curve area of the road by minimizing the number of trips on the curved portion of the road. Mbr. Murphy voiced mixed feelings about weighing the advantage to the club versus the advantage to the neighbors. Mr. Walker explained that moving the driveway north will increase the traffic in front of Dr. Miller’s driveway. In addition, it would eliminate the clubhouse feel by having the members enter to an empty parking lot. This will provide a more formal entry with an island versus the non-specifically marked entrances. Additional signage is not necessary. The sight line from the second entrance would be over 300’ where the sight line on the curve will be 390’.

Chr. Scollans concurred with Mbr. Korn and liked the setup of the entrances and commented on the real need for the new entrance from a traffic and safety standpoint. Further commenting on the enhancement of the entrance and understanding the neighbor’s concern. Voicing that anything that can be done for Mr. Miller’s driveway be taken into account. The roof surface area on the new clubhouse regarding the runoff. The existing area around the clubhouse is already paved. There will be a roof leader system that discharges in multiple points onto the hard surface area. The water will sheet flow off to the lawn area and percolate into the ground.

Chr. Scollans opened the public hearing to the public for questions.

Dr. Robert Miller (Lot 10) was present and indicated that most of his questions had been asked by the board members. Spoke to a blind spot from the east side being much worse than the west side and inquired about the entrance being improved. Mr. Walker spoke to what alternatives exist and the impacts of ingress and egress on Dr. Miller’s driveway. Relocating the driveway beyond Mr. Miller’s driveway would create more traffic past the resident’s driveway. Mr. Miller spoke the blind spot, visibility and the cars coming closer to his driveway. Mr. Walker spoke to the existing condition of the road. The light is shining away from the street and away from Mr. Miller’s house. There is a distance of 65’ from the entrance to the center of the driveway. Mbr. Sweeney spoke to the multiple access points providing an opportunity to disperse the traffic instead of clogging up one spot. Mr. Walker spoke to the roadway requiring an engineering solution from the township for multiple areas of the road. Mbr. Murphy inquired about the distance from Mr. Miller’s south side curb to the club’s entrance curb. Mr. Walker stated 20’ distance. Mbr. Murphy inquired about the old versus new entrance as it relates to the ROW and how much the entrance is coming eastward as it appears to be 20’. Mr. Walker responded to the curvature of the road and the shifting of the entrance. Mr. Walker stated there is 25’ from the existing sign and the stop bar.

There was some discussion regarding the bulge of land in front of Mr. Miller’s driveway, regarding and the concern of adding landscaping to further exacerbate the sight line. Mr. Miller did not agree with the grading of the road being the sight line issue and agreed that the hedges would make the situation worse. Stating the high bulge in the road would require a bulldozer but the grading of the property being the issue. It was decided that the township engineer and the applicant’s engineer could meet to determine a compromise for improving the intersection. For the record, Mr. Walker stated that there is nothing that the applicant can do to improve the sight distance from the resident’s driveway. Mr. Ruschke confirmed that they recognize that the applicant’s representation would be to improve the shoulder and that it’s not going to be perfect. Chr. Scollans agreed that being a good neighbor to alleviate the resident’s concerns without breaking the bank would be appreciated. Voicing that this is an engineering issue that should be addressed by both sides to ultimately result in accommodating the resident. Mr. Walker and Mr. Sweeney responded that the applicant would look at it and see what can be done.

Bruce Alatary (40 Old Boonton Road) was present and inquired if consideration had been made to moving the building left and away from the road. Mr. Walker spoke to screening between the golf course and parking area. Mr. Alatary inquired about the cost of a pressurized sewer main. Chr. Scollans interjected. Larry Weiner, Esq. inquired about the purpose of the line of questioning. Mr. Alatary referenced the cost of trenching. Chr. Scollans stated that anything that the applicant does will be in compliance with the state regulations and outside the prevue of the board. Mr. Alatary inquired about the light fixtures and Mr. Walker responded. Mr. Alatary had no further questions.

Chr. Scollans opened to members of the public and seeing none, closed the public portion of the hearing.
Christopher Richter, PE, PP (111 HQ, Plaza, 4th Floor, Morristown) was present and accepted as a professional witness by the board. Spoke to the special reasons and proposed use of the R1 zone, (single family) and that a golf course is not a permitted use in the zone. Spoke to positive criteria of health and safety through improvement of the sight distance, traffic patterns and pre-existing conflicts of pedestrians, golf carts and vehicles. The pro shop is outdated and doesn’t fit the aesthetics of the club and stated that there is no negative criteria and nothing proposed will intensify the existing non-conforming use.

Chr. Scollans opened the public hearing to the professionals.

Bill Denzler, Township Planner had no further questions. Mr. Denzler concurred with the testimony given and the expansion of the non-conforming use.

John Ruschke, Township Engineer had no questions on the testimony.

Chr. Scollans opened the public hearing to the board members.

Mbr. Spiess had none.
Mbr. Korn referenced trees and inquired about street trees. Mr. Richter deferred to the engineer.
Mbr. Ryan had no questions.
Mbr. Passucci had none.
Mbr. Murphy recommended the applicant go before the governing body regarding the club being exempt from Residential to become Parks and Recreational use.

Mr. Richter deferred to the engineer. Mbr. Ryan stated that he was satisfied with the remaining.
Mbr. Passucci had none.
Mbr. Murphy recommended the applicant go before the governing body regarding the club being exempt from Residential to become Parks and Recreational use.

Chr. Scollans commented on the proposed being an enhancement to the property. Stating that it may pose some hardships for the neighbor’s and hope that a compromise can be attained to find an agreeable resolution. In the case of an impasse regarding Dr. Miller’s sight distance, the applicant requested that the driveway remains at the existing driveway and that they are able to proceed with the rest of the project. Chr. Scollans asked the professionals for their comments. Bill Denzler, PP stated that the driveway as it exists today does not present a planning issue and that this would not change. John Ruschke, PE stated that if it cannot be agreed upon that the applicant should have to come back to the board. Dr. Miller provided his comments and stated that he would appreciate if the applicant could improve the bulge as a favor to him. The board attorney stated that the solution would require involving the municipality whether it includes fixes to the roadway, signs or brush clearing.

Bruce Alatary (40 Old Boonton Road) was present and spoke to bellying up to remove the pedestrians and cyclists by creating a multi-use path along the road on the golf course property.

Michael Mulligan (38 Old Boonton Road) was present and commented that the travel speeds exceed 25mph and that there is a great deal of pedestrian traffic on that road.

Richard Sweeney, Esq. provided prior resolutions (Exhibits A-13) for inclusion in the board file.

The board members provided their comments prior to a motion being made.

Mbr. Korn commented that he liked the application, the improvement to the golf course and the club entrance is a bonus. Support the engineer’s meeting to improve Mr. Miller’s sight line even if it will not be perfect.
Mbr. Ryan stated that he agreed with Mbr. Korn and that the proposed improvements would be good.
Mbr. Passucci thinks the clubhouse and improvements are a great idea and likes the idea of reverting back to the original driveway if a compromise isn’t possible.
Mbr. Murphy commented on the application being good and having no problem with the proposed pro shop or the parking lot. Mbr. Murphy voiced being overall in favor of the entrance and stated that speeding on Old Boonton Road is not the problem of the golf course. Mbr. Murphy commented that asking the applicant to bulldoze a mound is over and above being a good neighbor and should be taken up with the township. In favor of the application as it stands.
Mbr. Spiess pointing being sympathetic with Dr. Miller but agreed with Mbr. Murphy that while it’s gracious of the applicant to agree to sit down, but that the positive outweighs the detriment. Mbr. Spiess is in favor of the application.
Chr. Scollans voiced being in favor of the application and being understanding of Dr. Miller’s situation. Stating that both parties need to work together for the best compromise possible.

Mbr. Spiess made a motion and requested an overview of the suggested conditions. Larry Weiner, Esq. stated there would be no spot or flood lights on the site. All onsite lighting shall be to the approval of the township engineer and shall be inspected post construction and shall not create a nuisance to the neighbors or vehicular traffic. Lighting will be routinely shut-off by 10pm with the exception of special events from time to time. In addition to anything referenced in the engineering and planning reports, the applicant shall make an effort to address the concerns that were testified to tonight regarding sight distance, site access and accessibility of Dr. Miller driveway located at 6 Old Boonton Road, Lot 10. The purpose being to see if it’s feasible to enhance the sight distance and/or the vehicular safety access from Dr. Miller’s home to Old Boonton Road. If this cannot be accomplished it will be reported back to the board. Same shall be in consultation with the board’s township engineer.
A motion to approve this application was made by Mbr. Spiess, seconded by Mbr. Korn and unanimously approved by all members eligible to vote.

Roll Call: Ayes – Spiess, Korn, Murphy, Passucci, Ryan, Scollans

NEW BUSINESS
Mbr. Korn referenced the comments that were distributed to the board members tonight for the Council be reviewed and expanded upon at the next meeting. Mbr. Murphy commented that the comments from Chr. Scollans and Bill Denzler would be trimmed down and the appropriate list will be presented in the future.

Motion to Adjourn.

Denean Probasco, Board Secretary

Date Approved: January 4, 2012