

UPPER TOWNSHIP ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
 REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
 DECEMBER 14, 2023

The meeting of the Upper Township Zoning Board of Adjustment was held at Township Hall at 2100 Tuckahoe Road, Petersburg. The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m.

SUNSHINE ANNOUNCEMENT
SALUTE TO THE FLAG
ROLL CALL

Member	Attendance
James Burger, Alt #1	Present
Paul Casaccio, Chairman	Present
Sherrie Galderisi	Present
Tom Jackson Alt #2	Present
Richard Mashura	Absent
Lynn Petrozza	Present
Christopher Phifer	Present

Member	Attendance
Donald Rainear Alt #3	Present
Andrew Shawl	Present
Matthew Unsworth	Present
Hobie Young, Alt #4	Present

Also, in attendance were Jeffrey Barnes, Board Solicitor, Joseph Iudica, Substitute Board Engineer and Liz Oaks, Board Secretary and Zoning Officer.

APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 2, 2023 MEETING MINUTES

A motion to approve the minutes was made by Ms. Galderisi and seconded by Mr. Unsworth. In Favor: Burger, Galderisi, Jackson, Petrozza, Phifer, Shawl, Unsworth, Casaccio
 Abstain: Rainear, Young

Joseph Iudica and Liz Oaks were sworn.

TABLED APPLICATIONS

115 ROUTE 50 ASSOCIATES, LLC – BLOCK 549 LOT 3 – BA 12-2023

Applicant is seeking a use variance and preliminary and final site plan approval with variances for impervious coverage of 58.8% where 50% is required, tree preservation of 9.3% where 15% is required, accessory structure in a front yard, a sign of 80 sq ft where 32 sq ft is permitted and a 5 ft setback of a sign where 20 ft is required for an outdoor storage facility at 115 Route 50, Seaville, New Jersey.

This application has been tabled until further notice. The applicant will be submitting new plans and will re-notice when moving forward.

NEW APPLICATIONS

Bruenig, Robert – Block 453 Lot 171.02 – BA 17-2023

Applicant is seeking site plan approval to construct a 2,250 square foot garage where former approval was for a 20,000 square foot building. Proposed storage yard use is to be continued as the previous use variance was granted at 170 Route 50 in Petersburg.

Robert Bruenig, 4 Meadowview Lane, was sworn.

Andrew Schaeffer, Engineer with Schaeffer Nassar and Scheidegg at 1425 Cantillon Drive, Mays Landing was sworn as an expert.

Mr. Schaeffer – The application is to add a 2,250-sf building to an existing operating site. 400 sf of the building would be administrative office that they currently have in Millville. They are currently bringing in cans and trucks for storage. They obtained a use variance in 2002 BA 04-02. Submitted with application. They tabled the 2nd phase which was a 20,000-sf building and a large, paved parking lot. Now the proposed building is being downsized from 20,000 sf to 2,250-sf and parking to 5 spaces. The operation is not changing. The building is to maintain some of the equipment stored there. It is not a new use. Their original approval was for site plan and a use variance for storage.

Mr. Phifer requested the applicant to define maintenance. And how will oil disposal be handled. Is there a concern about any contamination on the ground.

Mr. Bruenig explained they would be maintaining the roll-off trucks and containers. Most of the work would be brake jobs and replacing hydraulic cylinders.

Mr. Schaeffer – The building is subject to all code inspections that will address some of the potential for spills that may require clean up kits on site. They understand this to be part of the process.

Mr. Casaccio – Questioned about well and septic.

Mr. Schaeffer confirmed the well and septic have been installed and have been approved by the department of health.

Mr. Barnes reviewed resolution BA 04-02 and listed the conditions of approval and asked the applicant if they were in compliance with all conditions.

Mr. Bruenig testified that they were in compliance.

Mr. Schaeffer also confirmed the property is in compliance.

Mr. Barnes – In the event that the applicant receives approval, it will have to be a condition of approval that what is in resolution BA 04-02 is satisfied.

Mr. Unsworth refers to photos submitted and stated that he doesn't believe the the landscaping is in compliance.

Mr. Bruenig – Argued that the photos do not show the area that was addressed. The sod was done. The irrigation was done. The white vinyl fence was done.

Mr. Schaeffer suggested an inspection be conducted by the township.

There was a discussion about the paving requirements.

Mr. Schaeffer – There was a phase one and a phase two. They tabled or otherwise withdrew the phase two portion which was for a much larger structure and the parking.

Mr. Barnes – If approved tonight, this application will be tied with the original resolution BA 04-02.

Mr. Schaeffer continued to explain the application. The container area they propose will house up to 140 roll off containers, that are 20' long, and in another area another 40 containers. They will have room for 12 box trucks, used for the roll offs, in a pick-up/drop-off area. No stacking is being proposed.

Mr. Unsworth – If the original application required a use variance due to no principal structure; does adding the structure make it a conforming lot.

Mr. Iudica – A repair garage is a conditional use in this zone.

Mr. Jackson questioned what area was to be paved.

Mr. Schaeffer explained phase 1 included the entrance and phase 2 would have included parking lot. Phase 2 was tabled. Phase 2 has been reduced in size.

Mr. Barnes rereads the conditions of the prior approval.

Mr. Young – The asphalt from phase 1 and landscaping not done.

Mr. Schaeffer – They did not agree to paving in phase 1.

There was a brief discussion of the conditions of the prior resolution.

Mr. Schaeffer – The applicant agrees to become compliant if he is deemed not compliant.

Mr. Phifer questioned why they would approve this if they were not already compliant from previous resolution.

Mr. Young – Expressed concern about paving, non-registered vehicles, landscaping, and trash.

Mr. Casaccio – No storage of non-registered, non-titled vehicles.

Mr. Schaeffer – Never agreed to paving. He believes given the nature of the proposed business it would only destroy it and would inevitably turn into crushed asphalt. Crushed asphalt is more realistic.

Mr. Barnes – If there had been concerns from the past conditions, the board would need to condition this application to clean it up.

There was a continued discussion about the agreement between the previous resolution and the potential resolution.

Mr. Schaeffer agreed to become compliant if deemed not compliant with the exception of asphalt throughout the entire site.

Mr. Barnes questioned how long it would take to construct the structure.

Mr. Bruenig – About 4 months.

Mr. Barnes suggested a condition that would require them to become compliant within 6 months or prior to obtaining the certificate of occupancy.

Mr. Schaeffer agrees to submit a site plan from the previous approval to the planning and zoning office.

Mr. Shawl – Questioned the stormwater system and septic.

Mr. Schaeffer – Originally the plan called for a structure of 20,000 sf which has been downsized to 2,250 sf. The septic was over designed. There is no impact to the stormwater. There will be a handicapped parking spot with path in concrete. And a concrete sidewalk to the front door. There is more parking than needed per ordinance. There will be no outside customers, only employees.

Mr. Iudica – Hours of operation should not be changed.

Mr. Bruenig agreed the hours would not change.

The meeting was open to the public.

Bill Bailey, 1221 Mt. Pleasant Road, was sworn. Mr. Bailey owns the property adjacent. He is opposed to the construction of this building. His wife runs a hair salon with residential. They have had nothing but problems with Mr. Bruenig. He does not comply with hours of operation. The trucks have been video taped at 3:00am. He added a diesel tank to fill the trucks. There were two wells across the street that maybe Mr. Bruenig can shed some light on. The parking that was supposed to have parking on north side was never done. He has stacked them up to four high. They've used chains to yank them out. The buffer is not what it was supposed to be. With such a large property why would the structure need to be so close to his property. This building would create more noise and be more of a nuisance. There have always been problems. He is not in favor of this application. He thinks the proposed use is excessive for the mixed-use zone.

David Mason, 166 Route 50, was sworn. Mr. Mason is located directly behind the property. He opposes the application, mostly due to noise. There are also trucks that are being stored near his property line and he is concerned about what is in them and what could possibly be leaking. The applicant has not been compliant on hours of operation. Some of the trash has blown into his yard. The fact that it is already a problem; adding to it would pose more problems and affect his quality of life. He has a ten acre farm that his parents have owned since 1983.

Mr. Unsworth – The original approval was for storage. Are you saying there is more than that going on?

Mr. Mason – They will drop a full dumpster with debris flying everywhere. Then they will go and get another dumpster which makes it a transfer station at this point. When there were trash trucks over the weekend and holidays, the smell was horrible.

Hearing and seeing no one else. The public portion was closed.

Mr. Bruenig – the two wells drilled are for a DOT project. He sold the trash business three years ago. It is strictly roll offs now. There is no trash affiliated with this business. The previous

business was more intense than what is proposed. The proposed location of the building is due to where the existing septic and well are located. Right now, they can't start until 8am on the barrier islands. Their drivers usually come in between 6:30 am and 7:00 am to do their route. They are strictly storing roll off storage containers and repairing them. They will be empty. Right now, there is one that has concrete in it. As of today, there are only 4 containers in the yard. In the summer there will be more. He is willing to shorten the work day to 6:30 am until 5:30 pm Monday through Friday and 7:00 am to 1:00 pm on Saturdays.

Mr. Bailey, previously sworn, expressed concern again that Mr. Bruenig will say one thing and do another as he did in the past. The repair of roll off containers will be extremely noisy. He does not understand why he didn't stay on his property across the street. Not only will they be on the same side of the street the structure will be right up along the property line near his property.

There was continued discussion about this application, the prior application and the effect on the neighbors. And what options may be possible.

After hearing the public comments and the board comments Mr. Bruenig has requested to table the application until the January meeting allowing him the opportunity to come up with some solutions.

Mr. Casaccio – This application for block 453 lot 170.02 will be continued to the January 11, 2024 meeting at 6:30 pm. No further notice on this application.

Paul Casaccio, Matt Unsworth, and Christopher Phifer step down for the next application due to conflict. Mr. Casaccio turns over the meeting to Mr. Shawl as substitute chairperson.

Jersey Shore Campground, LLC Block 548 Lots 15 and 20 – BA 26-2023

Applicant is seeking a use variance for the expansion of a non-conforming use to establish 196 additional campsites, a proposed clubhouse and pool at 76 & 84 Tyler Road in Seaville, New Jersey.

William Kauffman, Attorney for the applicant explains the application. Jersey Shore Campground located at 76 & 84 Tyler Road also known on the tax map as block 548 lots 15 & 20 are seeking a use variance for the expansion of a non-conforming use to add campsites. The property is in excess of 52 acres. The property is involved with the Ocean City Campground. They currently have 196 campsites. They are seeking a D(2) variance to allow the campground to expand by an additional 196 sites. It is a D(2) variance because the campground is a pre-existing, non-conforming use. They are not here this evening seeking site plan approval, only the use variance.

Vince Orlando, Engineer with Engineer Design Associates, 5 Cambridge Drive, was sworn as a professional.

Gary Ott, Principal of the Applicant, P.O. Box 544, Glenmoore, PA, was sworn.

Mr. Ott – He represents the applicant and agrees with Mr. Kauffman's opening statement. They have owned the campground since 2021. The first goal when they acquired the property was to eliminate the existing campers to have a fresh start. Some of the sites were in disrepair. They wanted to have empty sites during the rehabilitation. They have spent a lot of money and done a quality job on the rehabilitation. Each of the sites are identical. There is a group called "Good Sams", a website for campgrounds. They have received 10 stars on this site. Less than 1% can

achieve this in the United States. None of which are in the state of New Jersey. They aren't very large with 196 sites. They would add another pool, a bathhouse, a pavilion, and amenities. They still cater to the transient market rather than seasonal. Market research shows it can support the increase. Guests are a positive impact to Upper Township by patronizing local food and beverage establishments.

Mr. Orlando – Many campgrounds have become summer homes. However, Mr. Ott's focus is the transient guest. They pull up, hook up and enjoy the camping experience. They offer great sites. They have made some great improvements. The clubhouse, the pavilion, the water park. Providing a vibrant relationship with the community as well as an economic push to the community. Referring to the site map provided with the application he describes the site. They are primarily looking at the 21.84 acres to the south. They are seeking a use variance for a transient expansion of the campground. The site is located in the conservation zone, which allows for primitive camping. A primitive campground is one that does not include any sewer or water. This site is appropriate for this location. It is pre-existing. There is no impact on the community. The buffers are being met, however, as part of the use variance they would agree to supplement the buffer in certain areas, pursuant to the engineer. In the prior approval they were granted 40-50 stick-built units. At that time, they had trouble moving forward. They have not started and have agreed to eliminate the stick-built structures that were originally approved. They would instead use standard park model trailers.

Mr. Kauffman - The D(2) burden is not as high as a D(1). They still need to provide the positive and negative criteria.

Mr. Orlando – There are 3 purposes that he believes the board could consider under 40:55D-2:

1. g-To provide sufficient space in appropriate locations for a variety of uses including recreational, etc. The property in question has been a campground and expanding in this location. This particular site promotes this purpose.
2. i-To promote a visual environment through creative development, etc. This project the Ott's have started have greatly improved the visual impact from what it was when it was the Frontier.
3. c-To provide light, air, and open space. This property is well maintained and provides open space.

The negative criteria. There is no substantial detriment to the zone plan and zoning ordinance. The property is in the conservation zone which allows for primitive camping. He doesn't think the addition of sewer and water are so far off from what it was originally intended for. He believes there is no substantial detriment to the public good. The main access is from Route 50, with a secondary access on Tyler Road. He believes the neighborhood is advanced by the improvements. There is nothing that would be a negative impact to the master plan. The conservation zone would allow for a school but what is proposed is much less invasive. They are aware that this portion is for the use variance only, they are fully aware they must come back for site plan approval.

Mr. Jackson – What are the site sizes. How about other entrance.

Mr. Orlando – The sites are about the same size as the existing.

Mr. Ott - The Tyler Road entrance would be encouraged. There would be a gate with a code to enter.

Mr. Young – The septic are in the buffer area. Could that be addressed. Increase in traffic. He believes the use is there. He is impressed with what Mr. Ott has done so far.

Mr. Orlando – The septic is permitted in the buffer. But they could look at this when they come in for the site plan approval. Route 50 is State road and would have to be addressed with them. He added that the whole stretch of Route 50 needs to be looked at but the state is nearly impossible to get a hold of.

Mr. Burger – Mr. Orlando addressed any concerns he had with the stick-built structures and the buffers. Mr. Ott has done everything he said he would do and done it well.

Mr. Shawl asked for testimony regarding the positive criteria.

Mr. Orlando – The site is particularly suited for this development. It is adjacent to the existing, it is wooded, it is all uplands with no wetlands at all, and is conducive to cut paths through. There is a combination of hardwood and deciduous evergreen. The zoning chart shows they comply with all bulk standards. If you look at the conceptual design you will see they bring vehicles in from Route 50 and enter a one-way, circular pattern. They have tried to minimize the width of the streets. The site can accommodate the additional sites, the septic and maintain the buffers.

Mr. Kauffman reminded everyone that the site plan they see is conceptual. They will come back for site plan approval.

Mr. Rainear asked for clarification of which use variance will be required.

Mr. Orlando – The board can consider the D(2) or the D(3). He believes the best would be a D(2) the expansion of a non-conforming use.

Mr. Barnes – Campgrounds have always been D(2).

The meeting was open to the public.

Tom Jones, 211 Route 50, was sworn. Mr. Jones believes they have done a wonderful job. However, he opposes the expansion. This lot creates a buffer between the campground and his property. The campfires all summer long are so bad it is like a forest fire. His wife has lupus. They can't enjoy their property outside at all in the summer. He complains about the noise, people wandering on to his property between 10pm-midnight. His (adult) son found a 5–6-year-old child wandering. His son followed a trail with the child and found a family partying, which appeared to be his family, but he couldn't talk to them because they were all drinking. He claims a neighbor (Mr. Myer) did not receive notice. He believes when they came for their original approval, they said they wouldn't remove trees that they later did. He is not happy with the lack of proposed buffer. He suggests two single-family dwellings would be much less invasive.

Mr. Kauffman confirmed that Bruce Myers was sent a notice. Mr. Jones brings up some issues that are site plan issues. The site plan will be a separate application in the future.

Jon Grubb, 216 Route 50, was sworn. Mr. Grubb does not support the application. He has the same concerns as Mr. Jones. The smoke in the summer is excessive. Adding this many sites will make it terribly worse. People are walking through the streets, the woods, his property. He thinks the transient are less considerate.

Mr. Ott – They have security on duty. Quiet time begins at 10pm. No one has ever approached him about any of these issues. They did have a group of seasonal campers (10 people) they had to kick out. That isn't the type of camper they are looking for. They are very pro-active. If there are any issues in the future feel free to contact him directly.

Ms. Petrozza suggests a fence to avoid trespass.

Mr. Ott – He can look into this; however, he believes once the property is developed and establish a presence those problems will be eliminated.

Mr. Orlando – When we come in for site plan approval, we can look at fencing or additional buffers.

Mr. Rainear questioned the need for a traffic study.

Mr. Barnes – It is not in the ordinance.

Mr. Orlando – The DEP may require a study.

Mr. Barnes – The first notable change is the elimination of the stick-built structure granted in the prior approval. Tonight, is strictly for the use variance. They will come back for the site plan. You are not approving 196 sites if they cannot comply with other requirements. They will need to obtain all other outside approvals.

Hearing no one else and seeing no one else the public portion was closed, and the meeting was returned to the board for findings of fact.

Ms. Petrozza – The applicant, Jersey Shore Campground, LLC, come before the board regarding their property at 76 & 84 Tyler Road also known on the tax map as block 548 lots 15 and 20. The applicant is seeking a D(2) variance to allow the expansion of the campground. There has been testimony about the existing campground. Mr. Ott provided us with a synopsis of the whole campground since 2021. Mr. Orlando gave significant explanations and testimony about how the campground has been a benefit to the community. Visiting local businesses and creating an economic push for the area. There is no detriment to the area. He provided positive and negative criteria. The special reasons given were: 40:55D-2:

1. g-To provide sufficient space in appropriate locations for a variety of uses including recreational, etc. The property in question has been a campground and expanding in this location. This particular site promotes this purpose.
2. i-To promote a visual environment through creative development, etc. This project the Ott's have started have greatly improved the visual impact from what it was when it was the Frontier.
3. c-To provide light, air, and open space. This property is well maintained and provides open space.

The negative criteria has been met as the expansion is minimal and they have previously been granted approval by the zoning board that the campground is a suitable use for the site next door. There was testimony within 200' that brought up issues with the site plan. This application is strictly for the use approval. She is in favor of this application.

Mr. Jackson – The job they have done so far is commendable. This is initial approval only and will still need to come back for site plan approval.

Mr. Young – Concurs with Ms. Petrozza and Mr. Jackson. This application is a benefit to the community which outweighs any negative. There are no hotels in the area. He liked the presentation and what they are doing. It is a six-month impact. He does agree with the need to look at the buffer. He does not see any negative.

Mr. Burger – Believes the applicant will listen to the public comment and make adjustments to the site plan that they are able to do. He is in favor of the application.

Mr. Rainear – Given the fact that we will be given the opportunity to review the site plan in the future he has no problem with this application.

Ms. Galderisi – Between the completeness workshop and now they have shown their professionalism and ethics which is a positive. She believes they have shown the positive and negative criteria. The applicant is approachable and eager to work with the neighbors. She is in favor of the application.

Mr. Shawl – Concurs with his colleagues. In addition, we heard testimony from Mr. Orlando that the site can support the additional use. It is a desirable wooded environment that can be maintained with this design. The property can accommodate the additional sites while maintaining the buffers and traffic circulation within the site. We heard all bulk standards will be met. They have agreed to eliminate the stick-built structures from their future plans. There is no harm to the zone plan or zone ordinance. We heard testimony from the public saying that the campfire smoke was a nuisance. We heard traffic from the state highway should accommodate the additional sites from Mr. Orlando. We heard once the site was developed there would be less of a chance a camper may stray off the property. The campground has no problem to ask unruly guests to leave.

A motion to approve the application, was made by Mr. Jackson, seconded by Ms. Galderisi.
In Favor: Burger, Galderisi, Jackson, Petrozza, Rainear, Shawl, Young

Mr. Casaccio, Mr. Unsworth and Mr. Phifer have rejoined the meeting. Ms. Petrozza has left the meeting.

1. Jeffrey and Kathleen Dilks Block 567 Lot 28 – BA 27-2023

Applicant is seeking variance relief for lot size, lot frontage, lot width, side yard setback and total side yard setback to construct a one story, single-family dwelling with attached garage at 1729 Route 9 in Seaville, New Jersey.

After realizing who the applicant was; Mr. Casaccio excused himself and asked Mr. Unsworth to sit in as chairperson for this application.

Mr. Orlando, previously sworn as an expert.

Jeffrey Dilks, 2058 Route 9, Seaville, was sworn.

Mr. Orlando on behalf of Kathleen and Jeffrey Dilks. The property is block 567 lot 28. It is an existing undersized lot. There is an existing single-family home shown on sheet 2 of 2 of plans

submitted with application. The lot is 25,900 sf where 40,000 sf is required. This is a very simple application. Mr. and Mrs. Dilks would like to remove the existing single-family dwelling and construct a new single-family, one-story home in the location shown. The lot is long and narrow preventing them to comply with all of the setbacks. The existing front yard setback is 23', they propose 50'. The existing side yard setbacks are 1.8' on one side and 53' on the other side where 25' on either side with a total of 50' is required, they propose 20' on the northeast side and 29.5' on the southwest side with a total of 49.5'. So, while they do not meet the requirements it is a better alternative than the existing 1.8'. There will be new well and septic. They will be maintaining the curb cut along Route 9. There will be adequate parking on site. He believes the board can grant the variance under the C(2) criteria where the purposes of zoning are advanced. The property is well suited for residential development. The placement of the structure will provide for adequate light, air, and open space. There will be a better aesthetic because the existing is dated and in poor conditions. He believes there is no substantial detriment to the zone plan or zone ordinance. It is an existing undersized lot; it is a better alternative to reposition the home. There is no substantial detriment to the neighborhood. By upgrading the house, he believes it provides an overall benefit to the neighborhood. For these reasons he believes the board can grant the variances in question.

Mr. Young – Was there any available adjoining property to acquire?

Mr. Orlando – No, adjoining properties are developed.

Mr. Shawl – Is this a historic home?

Mr. Orlando – He doesn't know the age but it is not salvageable.

Mr. Dilks – The property is in terrible condition. He doesn't know how it could be fixed up to code.

Ms. Galderisi agrees with Mr. Orlando. The property is a tear down.

Mr. Unsworth – Status of the well and septic?

Mr. Orlando – There will be a new well in the front and new septic in the rear. Test pits have already been done. The site is adequate for on-site wastewater.

The meeting was open to the public. Hearing no one and seeing no one the public portion was closed and the meeting returned to the board for findings of fact.

Mr. Shawl – The applicant, Jeffrey and Kathleen Dilks, have come before the board for their property located at 1729 Route 9 in the Seaville section of Upper Township also known on the tax map as block 567 lot 28. The existing property is long, narrow lot. The existing residential house is dilapidated and needs to be replaced. The applicant proposes to tear down the existing and construct a new single-family, single-story home with new well and new septic. The proposed house is situated on the lot in a way to increase a current side yard setback of 1.8'. They need variance relief for lot size, lot frontage, lot width and side yard setback. We heard testimony that the C(2) variance would be appropriate. That the lot is well suited for residential development because there is an existing house on it and the surrounding dwellings are residential. The new single-story home will provide additional light, air, and open space to the

neighborhood and the proposed structure will be an aesthetic enhancement. The homeowner represented himself.

Mr. Jackson – Nothing to add.

Mr. Young – Nothing to add.

Mr. Burger – Nothing to add.

Mr. Phifer – He agrees with Mr. Orlando’s special reasons pursuant to NJ 40:55-D2 and he is in favor of the project.

Mr. Rainear – Nothing to add.

Ms. Galderisi – She is in favor of the project and believes it will enhance the community.

Mr. Unsworth – Concurs with his colleagues and adds there will be new well and septic that will improve the environmental impact on the lot. He is in favor of the application.

A motion to approve the application, was made by Ms. Galderisi, seconded by Mr. Phifer.
In Favor: Burger, Galderisi, Jackson, Phifer, Rainear, Shawl, Unsworth, Young

2. Michael Butterfield Block 559 Lot 21.06 – BA 29-2023

Applicant is seeking variance relief for lot area, lot frontage, lot width, front yard setback, along Argoe Drive, side yard setback, building coverage, impervious coverage, number of parking spaces with a use variance for the expansion of a non-conforming use, where retail is not a permitted use within the R2 zoning district to construct a building addition to connect the two buildings and continue business operation from one contiguous building and to construct a 30’x40’ storage building at 3075 Route 9 South in Seaville, New Jersey.

Due to the time this application has been continued until Thursday, January 11, 2024 at 6:30 pm. They have agreed to the tolling of the time. No further notice will be required.

Mr. Casaccio has returned to the meeting.

RESOLUTIONS

Luchese, Joe – Block 639 Lot 8 – BA 16-2023

A motion to approve the resolution was made by Mr. Shawl, seconded by Mr. Unsworth.

In Favor: Burger, Galderisi, Jackson, Phifer, Shawl, Unsworth, Casaccio

Abstain: Rainear, Young

Millevoi, Kenneth and Nancy – Block 454 Lot 7 – BA 24-2023

A motion to approve the resolution was made by Mr. Shawl, seconded by Mr. Unsworth.

In Favor: Burger, Galderisi, Jackson, Phifer, Shawl, Unsworth, Casaccio

Abstain: Rainear, Young

2024 Meeting Dates ZB SP 04-2023

A motion to approve the resolution was made by Mr. Shawl, seconded by Ms. Galderisi.

In Favor: Burger, Galderisi, Jackson, Phifer, Rainear, Shawl, Unsworth, Young, Casaccio

Rihl BA 08-2023 – Resolution Amendment

A motion to approve the resolution was made by Mr. Shawl, seconded by Mr. Jackson.

In Favor: Burger, Galderisi, Jackson, Phifer, Rainear, Shawl, Unsworth, Casaccio

Abstain: Young

BILLS

A motion to pay the bills as presented was made by: Mr. Unsworth, seconded by Ms. Galderisi.
All in favor.

Paul Casaccio leaves the meeting to allow Mr. Unsworth to discuss the search for the board engineer position.

Board Engineer Position

Mr. Unsworth explained there were two applicants to interview. The board secretary will reach out to the applicants to schedule a date.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by: Mr. Jackson, seconded by Ms. Galderisi.
All in favor. The meeting ended at 9:39 pm.

Submitted by,
Liz Oaks