

MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PENNSAUKEN

A public meeting of the Zoning Board of Adjustment of the Township of Pennsauken, in the County of Camden, in the State of New Jersey was held on the above date via Zoom Video Communications. Chairwoman Butler called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M. and led the flag salute. Roll call disclosed the following members present: Paul Hoyle, Lysa Longo, Lou Morales, Shirley Butler, Darlene Hannah, Diane Piccari, Patrick Olivo and Duke Martz. Acting Solicitor Steve Boraske, Esq., Planning and Zoning Coordinator, Gene Padalino and Secretary Nancy Ellis were also on the video call.

The Chairwoman announced that the meeting was being held in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act, notice has been sent to two local newspapers, and also posted on the Bulletin Board in the Municipal Building.

HEARINGS:

ANTHONY MOTA - Seeking a use variance to permit a tattoo shop in a C-1 zone where it is not a permitted use and any other variances and waivers that may be required by the Pennsauken Zoning Board. Premises located at 3827 A Marlton Pike, Block 5832, Lot 2 in Zoning District C-1.

Mr. Anthony Mota, 8921 Wyndam Road, Pennsauken came forward to testify and was duly sworn by the Solicitor.

Mr. Mota testified that he would like to open a tattoo shop. He will provide the service to his clients by appointment only, especially now during the pandemic for the safety of his clients and himself. Mr. Mota further testified that he will be the sole proprietor of the tattoo shop, his hours of operation will be from 11:00 AM until 6:00 PM, Monday thru Friday and on Sunday and the shop will be closed on Saturday. He will provide signs for social distancing in the shop, he consults with his clients via Zoom video calls and there is parking in the rear of the building for his clients.

Upon query, Mrs. Butler was informed by the applicant that he is the sole owner and operator of the business. However, he may hire one other person in the future. The applicant further informed Mrs. Butler that he has been tattooing professionally for 10 years and although there were other properties he considered in Pennsauken, this location is close to where he currently works and it is convenient for his clients.

Upon query, Mrs. Longo was informed by the applicant that he will paint inside the shop, divide the space up into a waiting area with a front counter and he will install curtains in the rear where he will do the tattooing. There are existing bathrooms at the shop as well.

Upon query, Miss Hannah was informed by the applicant that if he is approved by the Zoning Board, then the NJ Health Department will inspect the facility. The applicant further informed Miss Hannah that he currently works at the tattoo shop on Route 38 and he is a licensed and certified tattoo practitioner.

Upon query, Mr. Hoyle was informed by the applicant that the adjacent units and the apartment above his unit are currently vacant and he isn't sure what the landlord is doing with the units. The applicant further informed Mr. Hoyle that he will follow the same proposed protocol after the pandemic is over.

Upon query, the applicant informed Mr. Martz that he proposes no more than one sign in the window of the shop, there are exiting lights in the window and there is a parking area in the rear of the building. The applicant further informed Mr. Martz that the space is 650 square feet, he will have a customer waiting area with a counter with displays of available tattoo styles on the walls as well as laminated sheets of tattoo artwork that can be sanitized. There will be an 8' x 8' space as a buffer between the waiting area and the tattooing area and he will install a curtain for privacy as well.

Upon query, Miss Piccari was informed by the applicant that there is a bar across the street from the shop and it is not a residential area. Miss Piccari was informed by the applicant that he will check with the landlord regarding cleaning the front of the building and possibly painting it.

Upon query, Mr. Morales was informed by the applicant that no one currently occupies the apartment unit above the shop.

Upon query, Mr. Olivo was informed that no one else but his client is allowed in the tattooing area with him. All others must stay in the waiting area. The applicant further informed Mr. Olivo that he will not do body piercing.

Upon query, the Solicitor was informed by the applicant that he believes the property is suitable for the proposed use because there isn't much modification needed to the property, the property is in a commercial zone and the proposed use is complimentary to the other businesses in the area. The applicant further informed the Solicitor that he will run his business with higher standards. There will be nothing negative from having the tattoo shop at the site. There will be no nudity, profanity or loud music from the site. The property is near where he was before for his former clients' convenience. The applicant agreed that he will get proper approvals for signage, the taxes on the property will be up to date and he also stated that he doesn't have any problem with the neighbors.

The meeting was open to the public. There being no one who wished to speak, the meeting was closed to the public.

The Solicitor made the following factual findings: This is an application for a use variance to permit a tattoo shop in our commercial C-1 Zone whereas tattoo shops are not permitted in the C-1 Zone. The applicant is Anthony Mota and the subject property is 3827 A Marlton Pike, Block 5832, Lot 2. To approve the application, the board must grant a D Variance, a Use Variance as permitted by the land use law and by our township code. For the Use Variance, the applicant has to show both the positive and negative criteria necessary, which the board is familiar with. For the positive criteria, the applicant has to show that the subject property is particularly suited for the proposed non permitted use and that by granting the application it will advance the purposes of the land use law or that denying the non-conforming use would result in an undue hardship on the applicant. We had testimony from the applicant as to why the property is ideal or particularly suited for the proposed tattoo parlor use. The applicant indicated that the interior does not require much modification, that it's suitable giving the surrounding uses and it will benefit the surrounding uses and community in some ways. It also happens to be near the applicant's former location which is ideal and suitable for the applicant and his customers. Any positives of the application have to outweigh any detriment or any negative. The applicant has to show that the benefits of the application outweigh any negatives and if the variance can be granted without substantially impairing the township master plan or zoning code and without substantial detriment to the public good. As far as the master plan, here we have what is clearly a commercial use that isn't expressly permitted in our C-1 Commercial Zone, but it seems that type of use that would be permitted or typically suitable in a commercial zone and the detriment for the public good relates to the negative impact on the adjacent property owners or neighbors. The board should consider the positive and negative criteria, weigh it out and determine whether the applicant is entitled to the use variance relief. Some conditions were discussed by the board. The applicant has to secure any and all other outside agency approvals, particularly for this use, the Board of Health and some type of license or approval is likely necessary and he must demonstrate proof that he has obtained the approvals as well as securing any permits for signage and confirming that all unpaid taxes and fees are paid and up to date. Therefore, we're looking for a motion to grant the use variance and our code requires when granting a use variance to grant a site plan waiver as well. Because, ordinarily a use variance requires site plan review. So, we need to motion to grant a use variance with a site plan waiver with the conditions stated.

Mrs. Longo motioned to accept the fact finding. Miss Piccari seconded.

Mr. Martz motioned to grant the use variance and site plan waiver with the conditions imposed. He stated that he believes the applicant has experience and parking at the site shouldn't be an issue, he has off street parking. Mr. Martz further stated that the property is located in a commercial zone and it seems the applicant will attract a good crowd of people at the site. Mr. Hoyle seconded. Roll call: Paul Hoyle, Lou Morales, Lysa Longo, Shirley Butler, Darlene Hannah, Diane Piccari and Duke Martz-Aye. None Opposed.

JORDANO HERNANDEZ - Seeking 48.4 feet of relief from the front yard fence setback requirement of 20 feet for a 4' vinyl fence. Applicant is also seeking 5 feet of relief from the side yard setback requirement of 5' and also seeking 5' of relief from the 5' setback requirement from the dwelling of the house for a (7.2 x 7') shed and any other variances and waivers that may be required by the Pennsauken Zoning Board. Premises located at 2805 Cove Road, Block 5014, Lot 2 in Zoning District R-3.

Mr. Jordano Hernandez, at 2805 Cove Road came forward to testify and was duly sworn by the Solicitor.

Mr. Hernandez testified he would like to install a 4-foot, white picket fence in the front of his house because most of his property is in the front of his home. He lives on Cove Road and cars speed by his house and he needs the fence to keep his three-year-old daughter safe in his yard. Mr. Hernandez further testified that his neighbors have no problem with him installing the fence, he will install the fence himself and he believes it will beautify his home. The applicant further stated that he wants to keep his daughter and as well as his dog safe in the yard. Mr. Hernandez stated he also wants to install a 7.2' x 7' prebuilt shed he purchased from Home Depot. The shed will be installed on top of a wood base that will be on cinder blocks and the shed is a grayish color that will match his house.

Upon query, Miss Piccari was informed by Mr. Hernandez that he will install the fence down one side of his property and across the front and install a gate in front of his driveway.

Upon query, Mrs. Longo was by the applicant that he would like to install a "cathedral" style white picket fence.

Mr. Martz stated he doesn't have an issue with the applicant installing the shed. However, he suggested that the proposed fence be installed at least 2 feet back on his property away from the sidewalk and install low bushes and flowers in front of it so it doesn't look like a fortress.

Upon query, the applicant informed Mr. Martz that his back yard is very small and really can't use it. Most of his property is on the side and in the front and he is truly afraid for his daughter to play in the yard without having a fence to keep her safe.

Mr. Olivo commented he has safety concerns with the fence having points on top of it.

Upon query, Mr. Hoyle was informed by the applicant that his neighbors have no issue with him installing the fence on his property. The applicant further stated he has called the police in the past and put signs up to slow the traffic on Cove Road and it didn't help

Mr. Morales commented he's not sure if it's a good idea to put a fence all the way up to the sidewalk.

Mrs. Longo suggested moving the fence back from the sidewalk and put bushes in front of it.

Upon query, Mr. Morales was informed by the applicant that he does have a driveway with an apron.

The meeting was open to the public.

Mr. Gerald Pride, 2801 Cove Road came forward to testify and was duly sworn by the Solicitor.

Mr. Pride testified that he is the applicant's next-door neighbor and has lived at his house on Cove Road for almost 20 years. Mr. Pride further testified that he believes Mr. Hernandez needs the fence for safety, he believes the fence will look nice and it will be an asset to the neighborhood.

Mr. Rich James, 2728 Cove Road came forward to testify and was duly sworn by the Solicitor.

Mr. James testified he lives diagonally across the street from Mr. Hernandez. Mr. James stated that Mr. Hernandez bought the abandoned property and has done a good job fixing it up. Mr. James further stated that there are speeding cars and trucks on Cove Road and he believes Mr. Hernandez needs a fence to protect his child and pet.

There being no one else who wished to speak, the meeting was closed to the public.

The Solicitor made the following factual findings: This is an application for bulk variance relief. The applicant is Jordano Hernandez and the subject property is located at 2805 Cove Road, Block 5014, Lot 2 in the R-3 zoning district. The applicant is seeking several bulk variances to permit two improvements to the property. The applicant is seeking 48.4 feet of relief from the front yard fence setback requirement of 20 feet for a 4' wooden fence and the applicant is also seeking 5 feet of relief from the side yard setback requirement of 5' and also seeking 5' of relief from the 5' setback requirement from the principal dwelling setback requirement for an accessory structure, a 7.2 x 7' shed. The applicant is seeking three variances, one to permit the location of the front yard fence and two variances to permit the location of the proposed accessory shed. The applicant testified that the shed is a prefabricated shed from Home Depot. To approve the application, the board would have to grant three C-3 bulk variances, which is permitted by the land use law and by our township code. A C Variance can be granted as either a hardship variance, when the board determines due to the shape, conditions and the existing features and improvements of the property, deviation from our code requirements is warranted to relieve the hardship on the

applicant of having to comply with our code requirements. There was testimony that this property does seem to have some unique characteristics. The applicant testified that he has a smaller back yard than any one of his neighbors. He has the smallest back yard and as far as the shed variances, there was some comments from the board members and the applicant's testimony that the shed really cannot be located anywhere else on his property or that will comply and meets the side yard setback requirement and the setback requirements from the principal dwelling for an accessory structure. The board can consider that the shed variances and perhaps the front yard fence variance as a C1 hardship variance. The board could also consider the variance as a C2 substantial benefit variance, which the board knows can be granted when deviation from our code requirements would advance the purpose of our municipal land use law. Such as improving the overall visual esthetics of the property. There was testimony from the applicant and from the members of the public that the fence will be a visual improvement. Another purpose of the land use law is promotion of safety, security and the general welfare of the public. Based on the testimony of the applicant and the neighbors, the fence variance could secure the property and provide safety for the applicant's daughter and the board could consider those purposes and any other purpose of the land use law that may be advanced by permitting the front yard fence, constructed where the applicant has proposed. However, the board has to consider the negative criteria. The benefits have to outweigh the detriment, in this case the variance cannot cause an impairment or substantial negative impact on adjacent properties or the public good. We had testimony from the applicant's neighbors, at least the neighbors that appeared tonight that they were in favor of the application and also the variance cannot substantially impair the intent or purposes of the municipal land use law, zoning plan or zoning ordinance. The relief for the front yard setback is a substantial amount of relief from our code requirement that fences have to be setback 20 feet from the front building line. Therefore, the board needs to balance whether the positive criteria, the benefits of the application, improving the appearance of the property and safety outweigh any detriment. The only condition discussed by the board was whether the fence needs to be setback from the front property line, the sidewalk and the public right of way. It is recommended that there be a separate vote for the variances for shed and a separate vote for the variance for the fence.

Miss Hannah motioned to accept the fact finding. Mr. Morales seconded.

Miss Hannah motioned to grant the variance for the shed. She stated because of the size and shape of the applicant's lot, the shed can't be placed in any other location. She further stated that the shed will be an improvement to the property. Mr. Longo seconded. Roll call: Paul Hoyle, Lou Morales, Lysa Longo, Shirley Butler, Darlene Hannah, Diane Piccari and Duke Martz-Aye.

Miss Piccari motioned to grant the variance for the fence with the condition that the fence is place 2 feet back from his front property line. Miss Piccari further stated that she believes the applicant needs the fence because there is a lot of traffic on Cove Road and the fence will provide safety for his children. Mrs. Longo seconded. Roll call: Paul Hoyle, Lou Morales, Lysa Longo, Shirley Butler, Darlene Hannah, Diane Piccari-Aye. Duke Martz Opposed.

REGINO AND MARGANTA BRITO-Seeking 12 feet of relief from the rear yard setback requirement of 30 feet in an R-3 to permit the installation of a 16.4' x 18.7' rear roof attached to the house over an existing patio and any other variances or waivers that may be required by the Pennsauken Zoning Board. Premises located 6614 Woodland Avenue, Block 5828, Lot 8 in Zoning District R-3.

This application was continued to the hearing on December 2, 2020.

ANTHONY CLARK, ACJC PROPERTY MANAGEMENT, LLC-Seeking a use variance to permit the parking/storage of trucks and containers on a vacant lot in the R-3 zone where it is not a permitted use and any other variances or waivers that may be required by the Pennsauken Zoning Board. Premises located on Deraus Avenue (vacant lot) Block 1005, Lot 3 in Zoning District R-3.

Mr. Joe Bennie, Esq. came forward to represent the applicant and stated that his clients have owned and operated a landscaping business on Haddonfield Road in Pennsauken since 2007. They are under contract to purchase the vacant property located on Deraus Avenue for the storage of 2 trucks and 2 containers. They will beautify the property and they would like to stay in Pennsauken.

John Clark, 311 Monroe Avenue, Cherry Hill, NJ came forward to testify and was duly sworn by the Solicitor.

Mr. Clark testified that he and his brother are co-owners and partners in their landscaping business on Haddonfield Road and they would like to expand their business and stay in Pennsauken. Mr. Clark testified that they propose to purchase the vacant property on Derosse Avenue to store 2 trucks and 2 excess dumpster containers on the lot. The containers will be dropped off at job sites and once the containers are filled, they will be taken directly to the landfill in Pennsauken. The empty containers will then be brought back to the lot to be stored. Mr. Clark testified that the containers will not be taken back to the storage lot with trash in them and it is a state law that the containers remain at the job site until they can go directly to the landfill. Mr. Clark testified that the proposed property is adjacent to the NJ Transit Station and there has been illegal dumping on the lot. They will beautify the property by cleaning it up, landscaping it and they will also maintain it. Mr. Clark further testified that the property is surrounded by the NJ Transit tracks on one side, a petroleum facility in the rear of the property and a residential neighborhood is across the street from the property.

Upon query, Mrs. Butler was informed by the applicant that the hours of operation will be from 8 AM until 4 PM. The landfill closes at 3:30.

Upon query, Mr. Morales was informed by the applicant that the size of the dumpsters are 10 cubic yards to 30 cubic yards.

Upon query, Mr. Butler was informed by Mr. Clark that the goal is to have the dumpsters out at job sites and 2 vehicles to transport the containers. They do not propose to have more than 2 trucks at the property on Derosse Avenue. All of their landscaping trucks will continue to be stored at their property on Haddonfield Road.

Upon query, Miss Hannah was informed by the applicant that they looked at other properties in Pennsauken and they had buildings on them. They need an "open-air" property.

Upon query, Mr. Hoyle was informed by the applicant that the property is very deep. The trucks will be parked on the lot approximately 75 feet back from Derosse Avenue. Mr. Clark further informed Mr. Hoyle that the property is located on the corner of Derosse Avenue and River Road and the lot size is 1.46 acres.

Upon query, Mrs. Butler was informed by the applicant that they don't plan to expand this part of the business. He and his brother will be the only two employees, owners and operators of the container business.

Upon query, Mr. Morales was informed by the applicant that they tried to purchase the property behind their landscaping business on Haddonfield Road. However, it didn't work out.

Upon query, Miss Piccari was informed by the applicant that the trucks may or may not be used daily. It depends on the weather and the trucks will probably be used more in the summer months than in the winter months.

Upon query, Mr. Martz was informed by the applicant that the property is dilapidated and they will beautify it. Derosse Avenue is a heavily traveled road and it is more commercial/industrial in character with some homes on the other side. There will be no more illegal dumping on the property. They will clean it up, plant bushes and trees install a fence around it and install security cameras. It will be an improvement to the area. The applicant further testified that the use of the property will be very low impact. The trucks are medium sized work trucks.

Mr. Anthony Clark, 313 Monroe Avenue, Cherry Hill, NJ came forward to testify and was duly sworn by the Solicitor.

Mr. Clark testified that the trucks they will be using and storing at the proposed lot are medium sized and no larger than a tow truck. Mr. Clark further stated that the only time they will be on Derosse Avenue is when they have to make a right or left onto River Road.

Mr. Martz commented that he believes that security cameras on the lot will benefit the neighbors.

The meeting was open to the public.

Dr. Sharon Hunter-Nikolaus, 27 Franklin Avenue, Merchantville, NJ came forward to testify and was duly sworn by the Solicitor.

Upon query, Dr. Hunter-Nikolaus was informed by the applicant that there will no environmentally impact on the site. There will be nothing stored on the property other than 2 trucks and 2 empty containers.

Mr. Frank Hillman, 428 Derosse Avenue came forward to testify and was duly sworn by the Solicitor.

Mr. Hillman testified he lives directly across the street from the site, he is in favor of the application and he believes the improvements will be good for the neighborhood.

Cinthia Samuels-Bundy, 7360 Pleasant Avenue came forward to testify and was duly sworn by the Solicitor.

Ms. Bundy testified that she is concerned that the proposed lot won't be able to be used for a residential property in the future and by using the property as proposed will diminish the residential character of the neighborhood and area.

The applicant stated that they are not looking to expand. Mr. Clark also stated that he and his brother are former Pennsauken residents and they are firemen for Pennsauken Township. They are looking to be good neighbors and clean up the area.

The Solicitor commented that if the applicant was looking to expand the business in the future, they will have to come back to the Zoning Board for approval.

Ms. Claudia Bryman, 1025 Derousse Avenue came forward to testify and was duly sworn by the Solicitor.

Ms. Bryman testified that she lives on Derousse Avenue and the whole area is industrial in character and not residential. Ms. Bryman further stated she is not in favor of the application and she believes the proposed use of the property is not a benefit to the area.

Upon query, Miss Hannah was informed by the applicant that he and his brother have a signed contract to purchase the property.

There being no one else who wished to speak, the meeting was closed to the public.

The Solicitor made the following factual findings: This is an application for a Use Variance to permit the parking/storage of trucks and containers on a vacant lot in the R-3 zone whereas the proposed use of the vacant lot for the storage of the trucks and containers is not permitted per the development regulations it is not one of the permitted uses in the R-3 Zone. The applicant is ACJC Property Management, LLC. They are the contract purchaser of the property which is designated as Block 1005, Lot 3. To approve the application, the applicant requires a D1 Use Variance as permitted by the municipal land use law and our code. This board can grant a deviation to permit a non-permitted use in a zone in special circumstances and for special reasons. To obtain a Use Variance, the applicant has to satisfy and provide evidence and testimony to satisfy the positive and negative criteria as the factors are known under the land use law. For the positive criteria, otherwise known as special reasons, the applicant can demonstrate proof of special reasons generally in three categories (1) where the proposed use is inherently beneficial to serve the public good such as a school, hospital or a public housing facility or (2) where the property owner would suffer undue hardship if they were compelled to use the property in conformity with permitted uses in the zone and (3) where the use promotes the general welfare or other purposes of the municipal land use law and the site is particularly suitable for the proposed use. For the negative criteria, the applicant must show that the variance can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and that granting the variance will not substantially impair the purpose of the township zoning ordinance and the township master plan. We had testimony tonight about the lot being suitable for the proposed use, it's a larger lot such that the proposed use could be carried out in such a way that it would have less of an impact than if the use were carried out on a smaller residential lot. The site works for the applicant's business and the lot is currently unimproved. The testimony from the applicant and some of the members of the public was that cleaning up the site, securing it and using it for this purpose, although not permitted is an improvement over the vacant use which is allowing for some problems to occur in the past. As far as the negative criteria, there was testimony from members of the public regarding traffic and overall, the non-residential character of the proposed use in a residential neighborhood that public detriment aspect of the negative criteria is really concerned about the impact on adjacent property owners and neighbors. We had neighbors, nearby property owners and interested parties who are both for and against the application. Part of the testimony from Dr. Hunter-Nilolaus, Mr. Hillman, Mrs. Bundy and Mrs. Bryman so the board can consider the impact on adjacent properties based on the testimony by the applicant and the comments from the members of the public and interested parties. As far as the second aspect of the negative criteria, whether or not there is substantial impairment of our zoning plan or the township masterplan, again that's a question for the board to consider and look at, the surrounding uses, the character of the neighborhood and whether or not the proposed use is really going to be incompatible with the character and types of uses that the governing body has determined are appropriate for the R-3 Zone. The board has to weigh the positive and the negative criteria, if the applicant has presented sufficient

evidence to satisfy the board that the positives of the application, of the development of the property for the permitted us outweigh the negatives and if the applicant is entitled to the Use Variance relief. The condition of approval is that the applicant return to the board for site plan review and approval where the board may address things such as the lot coverage, parking, etc. to the extent that those site plan considerations are implicated and also the applicant will also make sure the applicant and the owner of the property will ensure that any unpaid taxes or any outstanding interest of the property are satisfied, as required by the land use law.

Mrs. Longo motioned to accept the fact finding. Miss Piccari seconded.

Mr. Martz motioned to grant application with the conditions stated as well as the applicants agree to avoid driving their trucks with containers on Derosse Avenue. Mr. Martz stated the property will be enhanced and the proposed use will be low impact to the surrounding area and although the property is located in a residential area, it's been vacant for years. Mr. Martz further stated that the applicants are already business owners in town and their property on Haddonfield Road is well maintained and a beautiful place. Miss Piccari seconded. Roll call: Paul Hoyle, Lou Morales, Lysa Longo, Shirley Butler, Diane Piccari and Duke Martz-Aye. Darlene Hannah Opposed.

CORRESPONDENCE:

None

MINUTES:

It was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed to approve the meeting minutes from October 21, 2020 and November 4, 2020.

RESOLUTIONS:

Z-2020-25 - granting **CHERYL HILL**, 5 feet of relief from the front yard setback requirement of 25 feet for a 12.5' x 6' deck on front of house. Premises located at 8406 Sheppard Road, Block 1617, Lot 10 in Zoning District R-3

Z-2020-26 - granting **PATRICIA SORIA** 14 feet of relief from the front yard fence setback requirement of 20 feet for a 6' vinyl fence. Premises located at 4436 Burwood Avenue, Block 5916 Lot 3 in Zoning District R-2.

BILLS:

It was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed to pay the following bills:

Florio, Perrucci, Steinhardt & Cappelli-Legal Services for Leroy Young-**\$425.00**

Florio, Perrucci, Steinhardt & Cappelli-Legal Services for Scott Nolte-**\$425.00**

Florio, Perrucci, Steinhardt & Cappelli-Legal Services for Lorraine Kelly-Agalar-**\$425.00**

Florio, Perrucci, Steinhardt & Cappelli-Legal Services for Joe H. Ngov-**\$850.00**

Florio, Perrucci, Steinhardt & Cappelli-Legal Services for Bryan Bennett-**\$510.00**

Florio, Perrucci, Steinhardt & Cappelli-Legal Services for Wilkins Garcia-**\$340.00**

Florio, Perrucci, Steinhardt & Cappelli-Monthly Retainer-**\$1,134.67**

COORDINATOR'S REPORT:

Mr. Padalino announced there will be an additional Zoning Board meeting on Monday, December 28, 2020 in order to catch up on applications before the end of the year.

There being no further business; it was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed to adjourn the meeting at 10:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted:



Nancy L. Ellis, Board Secretary