

CHATHAM BOROUGH ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
February 22, 20237:30 p.m.

Chairman Michael Cifelli called this Regular Meeting of the Chatham Borough Zoning Board of Adjustment to order at 7:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers. Mr. Cifelli stated that adequate notices for this Regular Meeting were given as required by the Open Public Meetings Act.

Attendance was taken:

Names	Present	Absent
Michael Cifelli, Chrmn.	X	
Frederick Infante	X	
Jean-Eudes Haeringer		X
Joseph Treloar	X	
David DeGidio		X
Peter Hoffman, Vice Chrmn.	X	
Curt Dawson	X	
Christopher Tarnok		X
Joseph Barrette	X	
Patrick J. Dwyer, Esq.	X	

Also present:

Kendra Lelie, P.P., AICP, LLA

Robert Brightly, P.E., Engineer for the Board

Public Comment

There was none.

Resolutions

Application ZB 22-018

Deaton

11 Inwood Circle

Block: 95 Lot: 29

Minimum Rear Yard Setback

Maximum Lot Coverage

Maximum Building Coverage

Attorney Dwyer summarized this application which proposed improvements to a single family home. Variances were needed. Being satisfied with the testimony, the Board granted the variances. Chrmn. Cifelli made a motion to approve this resolution memorializing the Board's approval of this application. Mr. Dawson seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken:

Mr. Dawson	-	yes
Mr. Infante	-	yes
Mr. Hoffman	-	yes
Chrmn. Cifelli	-	yes

The resolution for Application ZB 22-018 was approved.

Application ZB 22-016

Stienstra

49 Van Doren Avenue

Block: 75 Lots 7 & 8

Minimum Side Yard Setback

Minimum Rear Yard Setback

Maximum Building Coverage

Minimum Rear Yard Setback for Garage

Attorney Dwyer summarized this application which was seeking variance relief for a single family home that is situated on a corner lot. The lot is triangular in shape and is narrow. The Board approved the variances. Mr. Treloar made a motion to approve this resolution confirming the Board's approval of this application. Mr. Infante seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken:

Mr. Dawson	-	yes
Mr. Infante	-	yes
Mr. Hoffman	-	yes
Mr. Treloar	-	yes
Chrmn. Cifelli	-	yes

The resolution for Application ZB 22-016 was approved.

Application ZB 22-022

Singh

86 Orchard Road

Block: 17 Lot: 1

Maximum Building Coverage

Rear Yard Setback

Attorney Dwyer summarized this application which proposed improvements to a single family home on a corner lot. The lot was narrow. After listening to the testimony, the Board approved this application. Chrmn. Cifelli made a motion to approve this resolution memorializing the Board's approval of this application. Mr. Infante seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken:

Mr. Dawson	-	yes
Mr. Infante	-	yes
Mr. Hoffman	-	yes
Mr. Treloar	-	yes
Chrmn. Cifelli	-	yes

The resolution for Application ZB 22-022 was approved.

Returning and New Applications

Cjrmn. Cifelli announced the following applications will be heard tonight, time-permitting:

Application ZB 22-019: 350 Main Chatham, LLC – 350 Main Street

Application ZB 22-023: Droge – 130 Washington Avenue

Application ZB 22-024: Curtis – 14 Dellwood Avenue

Application ZB 22-019

350 Main Chatham, LLC

350 Main Street

Block: 79, Lot: 12

Minimum Side Yard Setback

Floor Area Ratio

Building Height

Off Street Loading

Off Street Parking

Steve Azzolini, Esq., attorney for the applicant, came forward. He explained that 350 Main LLC owns the property at 350 Main Street. Cornerstone LLC is the entity who will be operating at this property.

Chrmn. Cifelli reminded Attorney Azzolini that 6 Board members are present tonight. 5 affirmative votes are needed to grant the “D” variance. Attorney Azzolini indicated he would like the applicant to proceed.

Attorney Azzolini introduced Steven Raz, owns both entities – 350 Main LLC and Cornerstone LLC.

Attorney Azzolini stated that tonight’s application is for the renovation of 350 Main Street. The property has been used as a single family home since the 1920s. The applicant wants to re-purpose the building for his own office use as an executive search firm. Mr. Raz is also constructing an addition to the rear of the existing building. Mr. Raz bought this building in 1922.

Attorney Azzolini noted the applicant will be removing the existing side porch and front landing of the house. A new front porch will be constructed.

Attorney Azzolini reported that the application has been reviewed by the Borough Historic Preservation Commission (HPC), since the building is deemed a contributing structure. The HPC gave a favorable written report. This report should be in the Board members’ packets.

Attorney Azzolini stated that the original plans proposed a parking space in the front yard. The HPC did not like this proposal, and asked that it be changed. The applicant has since made that change. The Board engineer, Mr. Brightly, indicated he has received the changed plans.

Steven Raz, the applicant, was sworn in to testify.

Attorney Azzolini confirmed with Mr. Raz that Cornerstone will be the only operating entity on the subject site. Mr. Raz explained his company does executive searches with bio-technology and pharmaceuticals. His business was previously in the Mack-Cali building in Parsippany. During the past year, with Covid happening, his employees worked remotely. He would now like to bring his employees back in the office for a couple of days a week. Mr. Raz testified that none of his clients visit the Cornerstone site.

Mr. Raz explained why he chose this site. It's at a pleasant location, and is close to Chatham's downtown. The train station is close for his employees. He felt 350 Main Street will give his employees a home-office feel, rather than the sterile atmosphere of Mack-Cali. Mr. Raz testified that his 8 employees will be coming to the Chatham site two, maybe three days a week. Not all on the same days. Cornerstone will pay for the town parking permits for the employees.

Mr. Raz recalled that many architects, except for Mr. Klesse, had advised him to tear down the existing building. Mr. Raz would like to leave this building in better condition than he had found it. Mr. Raz explained the proposed work spaces as well as an exercise room for his employees.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked Mr. Raz why he didn't pick one of the more corporate buildings on the eastern end of Main Street. Mr. Raz answered that he wanted his business to be away from the corporate sterile feel. His goal is to maintain the property as it exists now.

Mr. Treloar asked if any thought to planting native plants, instead of an invasive species.

Mr. Raz answered that he hadn't been involved in those conversations, however he will accept any recommendations to improve the property and not plant invasive species.

There were no further questions for Mr. Raz.

Lisa DiFranza, civil engineer for the applicant, was sworn in. Ms. DiFranza submitted her professional credentials to the Board. The Board accepted them.

Attorney Azzolini asked Ms. DiFranza to discuss the current conditions of the subject house, what is bring proposed, and what variances are being sought.

Ms. DiFranza put both the existing and proposed conditions on the easel.

Ms. DiFranza testified that the property is 30 feet deep by 147 feet, thereby measuring 7644 sq. ft. The existing building is a 2 ½ story dwelling, and is currently vacant. Ms. DiFranza pointed out a 10 ft. wide driveway existing on the westerly, left hand side.

Ms. DiFranza testified that 6 trees will be removed. 3 to four trees are hazardous, but in springtime this condition will be verified. The backyard is currently overgrown. Ms. DiFranza described the buildings on either side of the applicant's building.

Using the plans on the easel, Ms. DiFranza reviewed the proposed conditions. The driveway will be moved to the right-hand side of the property. A new parking lot will be created at the rear of

the house. A new front porch will be constructed, running along the front of the house. Five parking spaces will be created in the rear. One parking space will be handicap accessible. A small retaining wall will be on each side of the property. A self-service drywell will be installed for water run-off from the additional impervious coverage. A garbage collection area will be created at the rear of the building to hold two trash containers. Ms. DiFranza pointed out where the handicap parking space will be located. A new entrance to the building will be created between the new addition and the existing structure.

Ms. DiFranza confirmed with Chrmn. Cifelli that the employees will be looking into obtaining parking permits for the municipal parking lot on Center Street.

Answering an inquiry from Mr. Infante, Ms. DiFranza reviewed the parking arrangements of the neighboring buildings on either side.

Ms. DiFranza reviewed the landscaping plan. Six trees will be removed. Ten new trees will be planted by the applicant. Three of the trees will be deciduous, three will be evergreens. She reviewed the planting locations. Landscaping will be installed at the rear of the property, in the northwest corner. A new fence will be installed along the rear property line. An existing fence will be removed. The new fence will be 6 feet high.

Mr. Infante confirmed with Ms. DiFranza that a residential zone exists behind the applicant's property. On either side of the applicant's building are businesses.

Ms. DiFranza reviewed the side yard measurements on either side of the applicant's building. With the new front porch, the front setback will be 16.4 feet. The right side yard is confirming. Ms. DiFranza stated that there will be enough room for the new driveway.

Ms. DiFranza testified that the building height will meet Borough regulations. The maximum height allowed is 35 feet. The existing height is 49.1 feet. Proposed height is 30.1 feet. Two stories are permitted.

Attorney Azzolini pointed out that a height variance is needed for the proposed 3 stories on the new structure.

Ms. DiFranza noted that a variance is needed for FAR. The applicant is proposing 2672 sq. ft. A variance for loading is required. Ms. DiFranza testified that this will be low impact business with regard to deliveries to the site. Any Fed-Ex or mail deliveries will run up to the front door, using an existing pathway.

Ms. DiFranza testified that a variance is needed for minimum off-street parking. Eleven parking spaces are required for office use. The applicant is proposing a total of 6 parking spaces. Two spaces will be designated for electric vehicles. The applicant will receive one credit for the EV spaces.

Attorney Azzolini confirmed with Ms. DiFranza, that Ms. Lelie, the Board Planner, had pointed out an additional variance would be needed for the rear yard buffer of 15 feet. The applicant is providing 4.1 feet, where the parking is located.

Ms. DiFranza testified that a variance is needed for access. The Borough requires the driveway to be 10 feet from the property line. The new driveway will be 2 feet from the property line.

Ms. DiFranza noted that the Board Planner had brought up that a variance is needed for the required 15 feet buffer along the rear. She pointed out if the required buffer was installed, the 3 parking spaces in the rear would have to be eliminated. Some landscaping will be planted in the back with the proposed 6 ft. wall. The setback will be 4.1 feet to the parking spaces. Zero feet to the fence.

Ms. DiFranza brought up a variance that Ms. Lelie believed was needed for the maximum square footage for the new building.

Attorney Azzolini suggested that the applicant's architect address that situation.

Attorney Azzolini brought up the questions raised in the Board Engineer's letter reviewing the application. He asked Mr. Brightly if he had any further questions for Ms. DiFranza.

Ms. DiFranza informed Mr. Brightly that she will provide him with the requested survey. Also, information will be provided regarding the well-head situation with regard to this site. The proposed construction will be well over 1,000 feet from any Borough well.

Ms. DiFranza explained the typical maneuvering pattern that employees' vehicles will follow in the applicant's parking lot.

Ms. DiFranza stated that revisions will be made to the plans regarding stormwater management.

Ms. DiFranza testified that the applicant will comply with Borough signage regulations. Mr. Raz and his experts are willing to work with the Borough Sign Committee on this matter.

Mr. Brightly confirmed with Ms. DiFranza that there is no defined walkway to the entrance.

Ms. DiFranza answered that from the ADA parking space, a 4 ft. wide striped aisle will exist. Ms. Lelie had suggested a curb will be installed. Ms. DiFranza explained that the applicant would rather not have a curb installed back there because a snow plow would probably damage it.

Chrmn. Cifelli confirmed with Mr. Raz that a dumpster will not be installed in the rear.

Mr. Barrette asked if a decent snowstorm were to occur, how would the snow be plowed on the property without causing damage to neighboring properties.

Mr. Raz answered that if a substantial snowstorm occurs, his employees will work remotely at home. Snow will be trucked out so as not to impact the neighbors.

Chrmn. Cifelli confirmed with Mr. Raz that he currently owns the property. Mr. Raz pointed out, however, at this point in time he and his employees are working out of their homes.

Mr. Treloar reviewed the landscaping plans with Ms. DiFranza. Mr. Treloar gave some planting suggestions.

Mr. Infante asked what will happen to the driveway on the left hand side of the property.

Ms. DiFranza answered that the existing driveway will be removed and replaced with grass. Also, the existing curb cut and driveway apron will be removed.

Mr. Brightly asked for information on the proposed lighting for the site.

Ms. DiFranza testified that there will be one light pole, 12 ½ feet tall at the rear of the property. The wall-pack against the new building will be mounted at 15 feet. Along the east side of the building, additional wall-packs will be installed along the walkway.

Mr. Treloar asked how much of the proposed lighting will spread to the homes on Ward Place.

Ms. DiFranza explained that the point for point analysis shows zero foot candles at the property line. The existing pole light will be turned off at 10 p.m. If need be, the proposed rear light will be turned off at 10 p.m.

Ms. Lelie suggested that the pole not be 12 ½ feet high, so a design exception will not be needed. Ms. DiFranza said she and the other experts will work on that.

With regard to this design exception, Ms. DiFranza explained that there is some light spillage on the west side, along the common driveway, which is in the business district. However, this situation can be further tweaked.

Ms. DiFranza informed Ms. Lelie that the applicant is willing to take the wall-pack at the rear, however lighting still has to be provided for the safety of the employees.

Mr. Brightly asked how much light reflection will come off that building. He had concerns about the wall-pack. Ms. DiFranza discussed moving this wall-pack with Ms. Lelie.

Mr. Hoffman confirmed with Ms. DiFranza that the 12 ft. lamp in the parking lot is shining downward.

Mr. Brightly questioned what would be the color temperature of this light. He recommended going with the maximum 3,000 K.

Ms. DiFranza agreed that she and the other professionals will work with the Board on that matter.

Mr. Barrette had concerns about what impact the lighting would be on the Ward Place neighbors at the rear.

Mr. Raz stated that he will try and balance the safety he needs for his employees and any unnecessary lighting impacting the neighbors.

Ms. DiFranza discussed some engineering concerns raised by Ms. Lelie.

Ms. DiFranza testified that she and the applicant's professionals will work with the Borough regarding tree replacements.

Ms. Lelie suggested the analysis of the trees could be done in the springtime with an arborist. A reasonable solution could be reached at that time. Mr. Raz said he would be willing to make a donation to any tree funds of the Shade Tree Commission.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked if there could be natural screening at the rear of the property.

Attorney Azzolini explained there is not enough room for natural screening between the applicant's property and the neighbor's property behind. That is the reason the 6 foot fence is being proposed.

Ms. Lelie and Ms. DiFranza discussed the proposed retaining walls. The walls would be 2 to 2 ½ feet at the most. Ready-Rock will probably be used. Ms. DiFranza felt a geo-grid would not be needed.

The public had no questions for Ms. DiFranza.

The Board had no further questions for Ms. DiFranza.

At 9:05 p.m. a break was taken in the meeting.

At 9:20 p.m. the meeting resumed.

Attorney Azzolini called Timothy Klesse, the architect for the applicant, to come forward.

Mr. Klesse was sworn in to testify. He submitted his credentials to the Board. The Board accepted them.

Attorney Azzolini asked Mr. Klesse to explain the proposed design and the intentions for these proposals.

Mr. Klesse testified that he is familiar with the subject site. He is also acquainted with the Borough Historic Preservation Commission (HPC). Mr. Klesse had consulted with Mr. Greener, the Chairman of the HPC about this site. He pointed out that the buildable area for this site is in the front.

Mr. Klesse stated that he had to make decisions on how to modify and add on to this house. The house is currently in disrepair. Currently the home has aluminum siding. The screened-in side porch was added to the home at a later date and sits 4.4 feet from the property line.

Mr. Klesse stated a decision was made not to keep this screened-in porch. He pointed out that the left side of the property does not have enough room to fit a driveway. It's very narrow. To drive on this existing driveway, a motorist would have to run over on some of the neighbor's property.

Chrmn. Cifelli confirmed with Mr. Klesse that the removal of the side porch would improve the conditions of the side yard. When the driveway is moved to the right side, a side yard setback results, measuring about 16.6 feet. This will fit a driveway on the right side.

Mr. Klesse stated that the reason for the proposed front porch was "because it made sense" to add it to the building. Also, the scale of the building will drop. He noted that the existing portico was not part of the original home. It was added later on.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked how deep the proposed front porch would be.

Mr. Klesse answered 8 feet.

Mr. Klesse pointed out how the proposed driveway will run and the location of the back parking area. He testified that the aluminum siding will be removed. He felt that the wood underneath the siding will be fine. Mr. Klesse will also deal with the insulation that had been put on the house.

Mr. Klesse submitted Exhibit A-1: Recent renderings of the proposed building. The windows on the second floor will remain the same. The proposed rear addition will have similar material to the original 1912 building. Mr. Klesse discussed the glass link that will be constructed in the middle, which will deal with the circulation of the building.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked if the proposed front porch contributed to any of the variances being sought.

Attorney Azzolini answered that the porch contributes 50% to the FAR because the porch is open.

Mr. Klesse explained why the proposed parking gets pushed to the back, the house can't be pushed forward.

Mr. Klesse put Sheet BOA-2 on the easel. He explained how he calculated the FAR for this application as a business use. The basement was included.

Mr. Klesse believed the proposed stair tower is not really building mass. It will serve as a glass link between the old building and the new building. He reviewed the calculations for the first, second floors and the attic area.

Mr. Klesse submitted Exhibit A-3: A revised FAR calculation that he had completed on 12-20-22 and had sent to the Zoning Official.

Mr. Klesse reviewed the letter of approval from James Greener, Chair of the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC). Mr. Greener felt that the proposed plans, if approved, would bring down the boxy mass of the building.

Mr. Treloar asked for more information on the staircase for the proposed addition. Will a clear material be used?

Mr. Klesse answered that decision hadn't been made on that yet.

Chrmn. Cifelli and Mr. Klesse discussed the FAR calculations for the first and second floors of the addition. Mr. Klesse reviewed the flow and habitable space of each level of the addition, and how it contributed to the FAR.

Ms. Lelie pointed out that the grading of the addition goes down in the rear, so the proposed half-story will not be seen. It will not be seen as a true third story.

Mr. Klesse pointed out that the proposed building will be 1 ½ feet lower than the original building.

Attorney Dwyer asked how much is the slope from front to rear.

Chrmn. Cifelli believed the slope measured about 4 ½ feet, from the front to the back.

Attorney Dwyer asked the square footage of the proposed addition. Mr. Klesse broke down the numbers.

Mr. Klesse testified that the existing aluminum siding will be removed. The wood will be replaced. The existing chimney will remain. He pointed out the rear elevation that makes the building look three stories. Mr. Klesse described the windows in the new wing.

Mr. Barrette had concerns about the effect these proposals would have on the residential homes behind, on Ward Place.

Mr. Klesse stated that from the back face of the new building, to the property line, will be 53 feet. However, he couldn't figure out what the distance would be from the property line to the adjacent house.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked if the topography of the properties behind the applicant's lot is known. Does the slope continue downward?

Mr. Klesse answered that a gradual slope exists going downward. As a result, the applicant's proposed 6 feet fence will actually appear more like 8 feet.

There were no further questions for Mr. Klesse.

Alex Dougherty, the applicant's planner, was sworn in to testify. He is representing McDonough Associates. Mr. Dougherty submitted his professional credentials to the Board. The Board accepted them.

Attorney Azzolini asked Mr. Dougherty to give the Board his opinion of the application tonight, the legal justifications for the variances being sought.

Regarding the "D" variance, Mr. Dougherty stated that consideration has to be given of whether the site can accommodate the proposed addition. Mr. Dougherty stated he has gathered photo exhibits and maps. He submitted this material as Exhibit A-5. This exhibit also consisted of 6 slides, maps and drone shots.

On Slide 2 of Exhibit A-5, Mr. Dougherty pointed out the two residential lots behind the applicant's building. He believed the proposed addition will be seen from a space on the open parking area on Ward Place.

Mr. Dougherty pointed out that the applicant's plans will be taking a pre-existing non-conforming use and making it zone compliant.

Mr. Dougherty described the existing conditions shown on Slide 5. There is "a tight fit" with the chimney and existing driveway. Therefore, the driveway will be moved. The proposed front porch will be a plus over the existing stoop. The new porch will provide historic appropriateness to the building.

Mr. Dougherty noted that the FAR is slightly over the allowable, by roughly 1,000 sq. ft. due to the proposed staircase. Some side yard relief is being sought for the setbacks. Zero loading space is being proposed for this site. No visitors will be coming to this site.

Mr. Dougherty reviewed the proposed parking situation. He stated that there is no need for retail commercial activities to visit and utilize the applicant's site.

Mr. Dougherty pointed out where the bike rack will be located.

Mr. Dougherty described the route the snow plows will take to clear the new driveway and parking area. No snow will be pushed into the EV charger or the proposed fence at the rear. Mr. Dougherty testified that the site will function efficiently. He described the proposed drive aisle. It will accommodate the site. This business will be a "low intensity" use and will be safe-regulating.

Mr. Dougherty testified that the applicant and his professionals will accommodate as much foliage and vegetation to the rear as possible. No height variance is needed. Appropriate vegetation can be planted at the rear to soften the screening for the neighbors.

Mr. Dougherty testified that if the proposed half-story were to be eliminated, an odd appearance would result, because of the topography of the subject property.

Mr. Dougherty stated that the applicant has gone over every detail with the HPC before presenting their plans to the Zoning Board. He reviewed the positive goals in the Master Plan that this application has fulfilled. Mr. Dougherty testified that the site will function safely when these plans are in place. The new massing of the building will be in scale with the neighborhood surroundings. Mr. Dougherty testified that relief can be granted without detriment to the public good. He did not believe the proposed lighting will produce an adverse impact. The statutory criteria has been met.

Chrmn. Cifelli confirmed with Mr. Dougherty and Mr. Raz that there are no plans to use this building in a residential capacity, whether as a mixed or as a residential capacity. No plans are being submitted to use this building as a residence. Chrmn. Cifelli also confirmed that the pre-existing non-conformance is being abandoned.

Attorney Azzolini agreed, stating that the plans will bring the property more into conformity.

Chrmn. Cifelli concluded that with the abandoning of any residential use of this property, it will be brought into full conformity to the B-1 Zone.

Mr. Brightly, the Board Engineer, referred Mr. Dougherty to the property on the left, Lot 13. How many parking spaces are behind that lot? Is that a commercial lot?

Mr. Brightly confirmed with Mr. Dougherty that the applicant's property will be operating similar to this neighboring property.

Attorney Azzolini had no further witnesses.

Attorney Azzolini summed up the application. He stated that Mr. Raz is very excited to bring his business to Chatham. Reasonable upgrades will be done to the building, and the building will be in line with the surrounding properties. The proposals will bring the property into conformity.

The Board had no further questions for the witnesses.

The public had no questions or comments on the application.

Board discussion began. Chrmn. Cifelli pointed out the difficulty of filling local office buildings these days, especially after the pandemic. This application will help this issue. Also, not much bulk will be added from a streetscape view. The design is modest. The proposed porch will be functional. Chrmn. Cifelli felt the proposed FAR will not be out of control, plus the building is in the B Zone. Mr. Treloar agreed with Chrmn. Cifelli's points. He was glad to see an EV charger being installed. Mr. Hoffman noted that the house with the proposed plans will become a functioning business in the business zone. The proposed lighting seems reasonable. Planning testimony was satisfactory. Mr. Hoffman believed that the applicant doesn't have to return to the HPC for their approval of certain details; however, the applicants should listen to the HPC's

suggestions and take them into consideration. Mr. Barrette felt the design was very thoughtful. Mr. Infante felt the proposed architecture will “class up” that area. Mr. Dawson agreed with the earlier comments. He liked the design.

Chrmn. Cifelli Moved to approve Application ZB 22-019: 350 Main Street, LLC with the following conditions:

- 1) The applicant will abandon any residential use of that property and will become subject to the B1 Zone regulations
- 2) The applicant must work with the Borough professionals regarding the lighting situation to eliminate any need for design exemptions
- 3) No language should be put in that the applicant needs the HPC’s approval on certain details; however, any architectural recommendations will be listened to by the applicant and his experts
- 4) The applicant will follow any recommendations made by the Borough Engineer regarding stormwater on the property.

Mr. Treloar seconded the motion with the four conditions.

A roll call vote was taken:

Mr. Dawson	-	yes
Mr. Infante	-	yes
Mr. Hoffman	-	yes
Mr. Treloar	-	yes
Mr. Barrette	-	yes
Chrmn. Cifelli	-	yes

Application ZB 22-019: 350 Main Street, LLC was approved.

Chrmn. Cifelli announced that the remaining applications from tonight’s meeting will be carried to the March 22, 2023 Zoning Bd. of Adjustment meeting.

The meeting minutes of the February 22, 2023 Zoning Bd. of Adjustment meeting will be reviewed at the next meeting.

At 10:43 p.m. the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted:

Elizabeth Holler
Recording Secretary

