

Minutes of a Regular Meeting of the Verona Board of Adjustment on Thursday July 13, 2017 beginning at 7:00 P.M. in the Verona Community Center, 880 Bloomfield Avenue, Verona, New Jersey.

**Roll Call:**

Present: John Denton, Vice Chairman, Ed Conlon, Larry Lundy, Louis Russo, Sean Sullivan, Michael Zichelli, Pat Liska, Alt#1, and Coleen D'Alessandro, Alt #2

Also present: Michael Piromalli, Esq. and Thomas Jacobsen, Township Construction Code Official

Absent: Daniel McGinley, Chairman, Louis Russo

Tardy: John Denton, Vice Chairman, and Larry Lundy

Secretary read the notice of Open Public Meetings law and called attendance.

Mr. Sullivan started the meeting, as acting chair being both the chairman and vice chairman were not in attendance.

Mr. Sullivan called the meeting to order at 7:07 PM. He leads the Pledge of Allegiance. He then explains to the Applicants that the Board can grant variances, but the burden is on the Applicant to prove special reason or any undue hardship. Mr. McGinley states the Applicants shall offer sworn testimony on their application and the Board will rule based on the evidence presented. He reports the variance, if granted, will be memorialized at the next regular meeting.

**Application:**

**Case 2017-11: Brian & Kristen Kistner, 31 Derwent Avenue  
Block 1704 Lot 31**

Mr. Piromalli offers proof of service is in order.

Brian and Kristen Kistner, homeowners, are sworn in.

Mr. Kistner explains to the Board that he and his family are looking for permission to build a front porch on their existing single-family residence. They initially looked at putting on the front porch so that they would not need variances. That layout did not work as it pushed the end of the porch over 2 feet and in front of the front windows. They are trying to keep with the look of other houses on their street. They wanted a nice size porch that they could enjoy with their children. The porch is in on one side by the garage and the other side is in line with the existing house and not going any closer to the side yard line. The porch is an open porch. He also stated that they had support from all their neighbors for this.

Mr. Sullivan explained it looks like many applications they see just those are normally straight back and up and this is straightforward. Mr. Conlon questioned the only variance needed is for side yard setback. Mr. Jacobsen confirmed yes and that it was not passed the house line. Mr. Zichelli asked if they spoke to their neighbors that the project effects. Mr. Kistner explained he spoke to Volpe's that live next to them, they noticed them personally and spoke about the project. He said they were in full support of the project but they were not at the meeting that night.

It was put on record that Mr. Lundy had arrived and was in attendance of the meeting.

**Public Comments / Questions: None**

Mr. Conlon motioned case 2017-11 be granted; Mr. Liska seconded the motion.

All votes aye. Application granted.

Mr. Lundy abstained from voting as he came in to the meeting in the middle of testimony.

### **Board Business: Reorganization**

Chairman and Vice Chairman

Mrs. D'Alessandro nominated Dan McGinley for Chairman and John Denton for Vice Chairman.

There were no other nominations.

Mr. Conlon seconded the nomination. All votes aye to approve reappointment of Chairman and Vice Chairman.

Resolution to reappoint Board Attorney:

Mr. Piromalli on behalf of Robert Gaccione, accepted nomination and reappointment.

Mrs. D'Alessandro nominated and motioned for the resolution to be approved. Mr. Lundy seconded the motion. All votes aye.

Resolution to appoint Board secretary:

Mr. Conlon nominated and motioned for Kelly Lawrence to continue as Board Secretary. Mr. Lundy seconded the motion. All votes aye.

### **Resolutions: from June meeting**

Resolution for Osher, 19 West Lincoln Street; Mr. Liska motioned the resolution be approved; Mr. Lundy seconded the motion. All votes aye; Mr. Conlon and Mrs. D'Alessandro abstained from voting as they were not present at the June meeting. Resolution memorialized.

Resolution for Cerle, 37 Depot Street; Mr. Liska motioned the resolution be approved; Mr. Lundy seconded the motion. All votes aye; Mr. Conlon and Mrs. D'Alessandro abstained from voting as they were not present at the June meeting. Resolution memorialized.

### **Minutes:**

Minutes from the June 2017 regular meeting. All votes aye, minutes approved; Mr. Conlon and Mrs. D'Alessandro abstained since they were not present at the June meeting.

Mr. Piromalli questioned if any case that served notice for 7 pm meeting time and would like to proceed with only six Board members to let the Board know.

Mr. Trevenen, attorney, approached the Board and offered that his client, Saraceno Properties, 110 Fairview Avenue, would be ok with proceeding with only 6 Board members. He just needed a few minutes for his Court reporter to set up.

### **Application:**

**Case 2017-10 Saraceno Properties, Inc, 110 Fairview Avenue  
Block 2702 (127) Lot 7**

Mr. Piromalli offered proof of service was in order.

Cal Trevenen, attorney for the applicant, started his opening to the Board. He explained he would have three witnesses to present testimony to the board. He explained the application was for a subdivision of a property to create a fully conforming residential property but before the Board because of the existing lot has a non-conforming use building on it. The applicant is asking to subdivide a large undeveloped grassy area of the lot. This application is deemed an

intensification of nonconformity even though the subdivision is going in the right direction with zoning and the supporting the master plan. The variance that puts them before the zoning board is a "D-2" expansion of non-conformity even though not expanding the building. With the subdivision, three parking spaces need to be moved. They feel the three spaces are not necessary however if the board deems they are they have them moved to different location on the property. The only medical use in the building is not classic medical but more psychiatrist, psychologist type medical use. The applicant agrees to condition if board deems necessary to put no medical use with traditional medical doctor. The owner of the property, Sal Saraceno, 100% shareholder was in audience.

Mr. Conlon questioned the three spots not being planned to be replaced. Mr. Trevenen explained that the three spaces are shown on the plans to be replaced however; the area can be used better and hoping to show that the spaces are not needed. Mr. Conlon asked if that would increase deficiency in parking. Mr. Trevenen agreed that it would and if determined they would put back the spaces.

Mr. Trevenen called Steve DeMattheis to testify. Mr. DeMattheis was sworn in. Mr. DeMattheis testified he is the property manager and houses his own real estate business on site. Mr. DeMattheis explained that his business had three employees for a low intensity business that procure real estate to develop. He has two office staff one full time and one part time. Full time works five days per week from 9 am to 2 pm and the part time worker is two days per week Monday and Thursday 9 am to 1 pm. He does not usually have customers to the office as most are on site meetings. He also explained he has known Sal the owner for 18 years. He explained that he helped him when he purchased the property 9 years ago to upgrade the offices and fix up the property to bring in tenants. The first space that was done was his own and he used that to show potential tenants what could be done. Also in the building is Ralph Powell Title Company that is an independent operator. A therapist works in school system during day and sees people at the office from three to 6 pm during the week. There is a general practitioner psychiatrist and a gentleman that develop music for things like Monday Night football in the building as well. There is a therapy office on other half of building that has 1 therapist seeing 1 patient at a time during the day till 3 and then a few others join later that see people till 8 at night. There is one other transport company in the building. They sought low intensity businesses to put in the building. He explained that there were 24 available parking spaces on site. He testified that maximum he has seen utilized on full tenancy time is 12 to 14 spaces; he has never seen a full lot.

Exhibit A-1 is presented that is a photo of the parking lot taken on Tuesday July 11 depicting parking occupancy at around 12 noon. Mr. DeMattheis went through all the spots and who uses them.

Mr. Piromalli questioned if there was assigned parking spots. Mr. DeMattheis explained that in the open area, it is first come first serve and in another area, there are five parking spots with signs.

Mr. DeMattheis explained they are also looking to enclose an area for the dumpster with a door that the tenants can access to put garbage out to help with raccoon problems. This area would not impact the parking spaces at all it would be in the existing dumpster area. He also explained that the reason to subdivide is that there is area unused and it makes no sense to expand the building. They are of unused would be great for building single-family residence. There is no plan to disrupt the steep slope of the property with any of the work being done. He also explained that in the rear of the property is a railroad track. In the back over the tracks is a storm water inlet that fills with water and tracks down the property to the street. He stated that he goes

periodically to clean it out to help with the water runoff. They are proposing to move it over so not to effect the potential house.

Mr. Piromalli put on the record that Mr. Denton was now present at the meeting.

Public Questions for Mr. DeMattheis:

Robert Endres, 97 Fairview Avenue

Mr. Endres questioned the water run-off from the property with the intensity of the property and the change in impervious coverage. He explained he lives at the corner of Kenwood and Fairview and his property gets a lot of water run off that effects his property because of the applicants property run off. Mr. Trevenen explained that there would be someone addressing the runoff and water drainage later. He also explained that the increase in coverage is due to the subdivision and making the lot smaller.

No more public questions – closed

Mr. Trevenen called George Gloede to testify as a professional engineer. Mr. Gloede was sworn in. Mr. Gloede explained to the board his back ground, qualifications and experience before boards as a licensed professional engineer. The Board accepted him as an expert in the field of engineering.

Mr. Gloede reviewed the plans that were part of the application. He explained that this was a minor subdivision plan. The existing property is 49,349 square feet. On site, there is an existing commercial building that is 5,246 square feet. There is also existing 23 parking spaces and a garage. They are going to remove the garage and put in a dumpster enclosure. He pointed out shown is existing storm sewer that runs from the back of property through lot 7.01 and ties into Fairview Avenue off site and there is a catch basin. Steep slope shown in two areas behind the building and to the southwest corner. He explained there would be no disturbance to steep slope with the development of the new lot and the existing building. He also testified that the new proposed lot 7.01 in R-100 zone is totally conforming with 100 feet frontage and 18,767 square feet area, which is over the minimum required. With that subdivided off it still leaves 26,608 square feet for lot 7. He explained that three parking spaces would be removed with the creation of the new lot. These three spaces are seldom or never used and by not replacing them would give more area to relocate a storm sewer closer to the lot line and also provide more planted buffer between the commercial and residential lots. He explained it would be better to put the buffer more on the residential lot.

Mr. Trevenen explained that the buffer ordinance was mentioned in the department review adjacent residential that are existing. Here they are creating the residential space and the commercial is already existing and feel it would be better to have that buffer be on the residential coming in.

Mr. Zichelli questioned this and would rather the buffer be on the lot with commercial than put on the adjacent. Mr. Trevenen believed more faith in the residential to do and maintain ad it would create more of a double buffer with some on both property. However, if board deemed it be they would do full buffer on the commercial.

Both Mrs. D'Alessandro and Mr. Sullivan asked if the previous witness Mr. DeMattheis would be involved with the planning of and developing of the residential property. Mr. DeMattheis stated he would not be involved.

Mr. Conlon asked Mr. Piromalli as council what the board can do in regards to the buffer and giving responsibility of the buffer. Mr. Piromalli explained in creating a conforming lot it is to the Board discretion as to where they want the buffer and it could be included on a condition that the buffer be on the residential lot with review of the plan by the landscape committee. Mr. Trevenen stated they had no problem with that.

Mr. Gloede continued that he had reviewed the comments from Mr. Helb, Township Engineer, they took care of most from his initial review and will comply with all his comments. He also mentioned the comments from the environmental commission and that steep slope was already discussed in testimony.

Mr. Liska asked based on testimony heard about the water flow on the property if it was possible to make some inlets to help. Mr. Gloede stated that he could take first two catch basins or manholes and change them no problem. Mr. Conlon agreed that with the way water flows off the second mountain that anything they could do to help would be good.

Mr. Jacobsen questioned that if the Board deemed it necessary to put the buffer on the commercial side would they lose 1 or 2 parking spaces. Mr. Gloede explained it would be close because of one corner but could do combination of both buffer and space and wrap around to have little go over to other lot. Mr. Jacobsen also questioned the condition of the retaining wall on the proposed residential lot. Mr. Gloede stated it was an old wall but visually looked to be in good shape.

#### **Public Questions for Mr. Gloede:**

Robert Endres, 97 Fairview Avenue

Mr. Endres asked if the soil was ever tested on the property, being an oil company once was on the property. Mr. Gloede stated he did not know. Mr. DeMattheis stated that the property has phase I & II investigations done and no contamination was found.

Mr. Endres stated the catch basin in the back of the property was put in when the Linwood apartments were built and he goes up to clean it out because it affects his property and he has never found it cleared out. Mr. DeMattheis stated he clears it out about once every 6 months.

Public closed

Mrs. D'Alessandro wanted to clarify if the landscape buffer is put on the commercial side they are challenging to move or use three proposed parking spots. Mr. Trevenen stated that yes if greater interest in buffer zone and if based on testimony board deemed the three spaces unnecessary that yes could use entire line for sufficient buffer zone. Mr. Piromalli stated that there is a parking variance and that option to eliminate three spaces and limit medical uses as conditions. He continued that it was up to the Board and that he agreed with Mr. Trevenen it would be difficult to put the buffer those parking spaces in question.

Mr. Trevenen called on Mr. Michael Kauker to testify as professional planner. Mr. Kauker was sworn in. He explained his background to the board including his schooling, licensing and experience testifying before boards. The Board accepted him as an expert in the field of planning.

Exhibit A-2 7-3-17 was marked in. Mr. Kauker stated the photo exhibit 4 various locations about the property, an aerial conditions map and surrounding land uses. He went on this is a pre-existing non-conforming use in an R-100 zone. This is a D-2 use variance that differs from the traditional as this created as result of redirection of lot areas. In the photos, show around the

property is residential single family home adjacent to undeveloped area and across the street are single-family homes and the high school. To the other side is vacant town property and multi-family properties above and behind.

He explained the application is a two-lot subdivision. Proposed lot 7.01 is 18,788 square feet and lot 7 is 26,606 square feet. Minimum lot size in R-100 zone is 12,000 square feet. Both lots are over the minimum lot size required. The pre-existing use to remain as it has been for 100's of years. The variances needed both D and C variances many are pre-existing to the building and are not changing. He cites the raspberry case intensification of D-2 variance. There is no change to the building or intensity of the building. The subdivision has no impact on balance of property; it will still be large enough to support the building and use. The use has existed for number of years as it is and with exception of moving a few spaces, it is not changing. The C variances that are required are for front yard setback, side yard setback, rear yard setback and improved lot coverage. The setbacks are all existing as there is no change to the building proposed. The improved lot coverage will change due to the reduction of the lot size not changing what is covered. He also discussed front yard parking as the parking spaces needed to be relocated due to the subdivision and if those spots are deemed necessary by the board. Also mentioned is commercial vehicles in a residential zone; vehicles are for pre-existing non-conforming commercial use.

**Public Questions: None**

Mr. Trevenen ended his witnesses.

**Public comments:**

Robert Endres, 97 Fairview Avenue

Mr. Endres stated he was very concerned with water runoff from the property. If the board allows this, the coverage of the property will go up a significant amount. There is already issues with the way the water runs down and pools on Fairview Avenue. Once the other lot is developed, the coverage and runoff will be more.

Mr. Piromalli offered to condition drainage plan to be reviewed and approved by Township Engineer to make sure storm water is adequately addressed.

Public comments closed.

**Board Discussion:**

Mr. Sullivan explained see the intensification of the property by making area residential next to it. There are concerns with water on the property and with moving parking spaces. There have not been any complaints of the parking.

Mr. Conlon stated he has driven by couple of times an day and there is never a full lot and never saw more than four cars at t a time. The drainage he felt goes with the circumstances of the property existing He felt with new house and changes to drainage for existing it may better the situation and condition for it to be addressed. Mrs. D'Alessandro agreed. Mr. Conlon asked if it could be conditioned what type of medical use is allowed.

Mr. Lundy stated he felt that the buffer zone on the residential side would allow for better improvements on both properties.in the drainage system. He also felt leaving the parking spaces would be good as if ever sold and there is intensification of the uses.

Mr. Piromalli offered that condition could be put for engineer to review the drainage easement on the residential lot and a requirement by resolution on both properties. Ordinance protects residential from new commercial coming in but in this case the residential is being created and can condition in deed of residential property for the buffer area.

Mr. Sullivan added it was a positive creating residential area. He also stated he would like them to keep the parking spaces in case they seek to expand the uses since they are already deficient.

Mr. Piromalli reviewed the possible conditions as follows:

Medical uses shall be limited to mental health professionals and therapists, landscaping plan submitted subject to review and approval of the landscape committee of the board, drainage plan shall be reviewed and approved by the township engineer, the proposed drainage easement will be submitted for review and approval of the Board attorney, proposed block lot will be approved by township assessor, subdivision will be perfected by map, and a note shall be added to the subdivision plat that the owner of the new residential lot will be responsible to maintain the buffer area between the lots.

Mrs. D' Alessandro questioned about the parking spaces if they will kept or allowed to remove. Mr. Piromalli stated it was agreed to keep the parking spaces as plan.

Mr. Lundy motioned for approval of case 2017-10 with conditions mentioned by council and testimony given; Mr. Zichelli seconded the motion.

All votes aye, Mr. Denton abstained as he entered the meeting in the middle of testimony. Application granted.

Board took 5 minute break.

**Case 2017-08: New York SMSA d/b/a Verizon Wireless, 378 Bloomfield Avenue  
Block 702 Lot 10**

Michael Stanzione, attorney for the applicant, came before the Board.

Mr. Piromalli offered proof of service was in order.

Mr. Stanzione explained the applicant was looking to put one antenna on the front parapet wall of a mixed-use building with an equipment compound in the rear of the building. The application is seeking use variance, front and sideyard setback variances.

Mr. Stanzione called his first witness, Ron Lukach, Piercon Solutions to testify as a Radio Frequency Engineer. Mr. Lukach was sworn in. He gave his background to the Board. The Board accepted him as an expert in radio frequency engineering.

Mr. Stanzione questioned if he had prepared the radio frequency reports and the coverage and capacity illustrations. Mr. Lukach explained he did and that they illustrate why the antenna is needed. Verizon Wireless is licensed by the FCC. The pictures show the number of bands, the network carriers in those bands, shows the current issues and the capacity once antenna built. He presented Exhibit A-1 7-13-17 that shows a map of Bloomfield Avenue and the 3 sites existing for Verizon Wireless. It shows two sites in Verona at 880 Bloomfield Avenue tower and 25 Prospect Avenue by Montclair Golf Course water tower and a third location in Montclair at 640 Bloomfield Avenue by Valley Road. The one at the Tower located at 880 Bloomfield location

covers all the way down Bloomfield Avenue is causing issue. Exhibit A-2 7-13-17 depicts same information with best server map and shows coverage from proposed overlapped. Exhibit A-3 7-13-17 graphs user traffic with Verona 2 site; it shows metric amount of data being used, capacity, trend and actual usage shown at busy hour data per day. It shows that it needs to offset this with another site on Bloomfield Avenue. Exhibit A-4 7-13-17 tells usage per distance away from site, percentage of usage and helps zero in best location to offset where there are splits or gaps in the area. He stated that this a great site due the gaps in certain frequencies and with the businesses in the area along Bloomfield Avenue along with the condominiums and apartments across Bloomfield from the location. Mr. Stanzione asked if he had prepared an emissions report as well. Mr. Lukach stated he reviewed and concurred with the emissions report that was prepared by Glen Pierson who he works with at Piercon. This report was included in the application packets. He summarized findings in the report that most importantly showed that in the worst case the maximum emissions found at 18 % which is 5.3 times lower than allowed. He explained these numbers are RF generated by any RF source and how would be from the proposed site. They run calculations and compare to which numbers FCC allows and regulates. There is a direct correlation between power out and gain, so they use worst case scenarios with effective radio power using worst-case numbers with what proposed for the location.

**Public Questions for Mr. Lukach:**

Robert Prout, 370 Bloomfield Avenue

Mr. Prout explained that he lived and owned a business at 370 Bloomfield Avenue and that he owned many properties all around that site. He questioned how far these frequencies would reach. He also questioned what studies are out there for people buying and renting in the perimeter of an antenna. He also questioned health effect of these people in the perimeter. Mr. Lukach explained that the frequencies are times below the limit allowed and the further out the further it goes down. Mr. Stanzione stated that Mr. Lukach was not accepted as a real estate expert and could not answer about real estate values or numbers. Mr. Stanzione also referenced case law that health standards are banned from questioning as long as meet FCC standards.

Eileen McGirr, 33 Lynwood Road

Mrs. McGirr questioned if any studies were done for Caldwell or Montclair and why Verona was chosen. Mr. Piromalli offered that they had adequately answered this question with testimony. Mr. Denton agreed that there was testimony to the gaps. Mr. Stanzione added that the gaps are identified in Verona.

Public questions closed.

Mr. Stanzione next called Frank Pazden as an engineer. Mr. Pazden was sworn in. He gave his background to the board. The Board accepted him as an expert in Engineering.

Mr. Pazden went over drawings submitted in the application. Z-2 is the overall site plan. It shows the site is a 2-story building with frontage on Bloomfield Avenue and parking in the rear. Proposed is a one small cellular antenna in the center of the building mounted in the rear of the front parapet wall. Also proposed is a fenced in equipment cabinet in the rear of the building. The antenna is for cellphone users and to help with the cellular gaps. The rear equipment is remotely monitored 24/7 and visited once every four to six weeks. Drawing Z-3 shows the compound enlarged with partial site plan and elevation at rear of building. The building is two stories in the front and lower in the rear. The property slopes down towards the front of the building and in rear steps down to lower roofline of 8 feet 9 inches. The compound will have a 6-foot fence, as the tallest equipment cabinet is under 6 feet. The height relative to the property line there is a 2-foot wall along property line and because of proximity it is counted along with the fence. The fence is at grade with the walkway and felt 6 ft. fence would best to block from view



of neighbors. He also explained that there was no generator on site it was a lag box to connect a temporary generator to similar to one used for residential home. This generator is not held on site and only used in emergencies. The generator is maintained off site. He also stated there was no lightning rod. He explained in regards to the Environmental Commission comments that there was no air-conditioning only small fans to keep equipment cooled. They comply with what is allowed by noise and are well under NJDEP regulations for emissions. He also responded to Jim Helb's comments from the Township Engineer office. He explained here was a small SUV that would come to site for maintenance purposes. There are no deliveries so no need for off street parking. For the fence, they are looking for variance for the fence because it is within 8 inches of the retaining wall. They feel there is no way to move it away further from the wall and if dropped the fence down to 4 feet in height it would leave equipment visible to neighbors. There is no sewer use by the site. They have approval from Essex County Planning Board.

**Public Questions for Mr. Pazden:**

Robert Prout, 370 Bloomfield Avenue

Mr. Prout questioned the size of the power line coming in to the property and since the property is landlocked what going to do about neighboring properties, they would need to go through.

Mr. Pazden explained that they would use same as existing now for any tenants in the building. They would be running from existing utility pole on Bloomfield Avenue and that would be up to the utility company to decide where they would tie in. They would run alongside of signage traverse along rooftop to compound.

Mr. Prout also asked about making the compound smaller to allow for turnaround area. Mr. Pazden stated they could look into making it maybe a foot smaller but still compact area.

Mr. Jacobsen asked if they had looked into putting the equipment in the basement like in other sites. Mr. Pazden said they initially looked into that however, there was not enough space for that.

Public questions closed.

Mr. Stanzione called upon his professional planner, Mr. Kronk. Mr. Kronk was sworn in. He gave the board his background and credentials. The board accepted him as an expert witness in planning as he had been accepted by the board before at previous time.

Mr. Kronk stated he had reviewed the application, the plans, the department comments, the town ordinances and master plan. He also visited the site and took photos. He found that the application did require a number of variances. A D-1 variance for use being antennas are prohibited in all zones in Verona. A few bulk variances needed; front yard setback that is existing to the building, sideyard setback that is existing to the building and fence variance due to the 6-foot proposed fence being too close to existing 2-foot retaining wall. The application proposes one cell antenna on the existing 22 feet high roof with the antenna at 26 feet in height. Also proposed enclosed equipment compound in the rear of the building. He explained that Verizon is FCC licensed and the RF currently as gaps in coverage. The gap is a capacity gap so height not an issue it is location of antenna that is needed. They found that this site is ideal to help with the current gaps found. The positives outweigh the negatives. There are no impact on township utilities. The only major impact is visually in the photos show simulation of what would be seen with the one antenna slightly above the parapet wall.

**Public questions for Mr. Kronk:** None

**Public Comments:** None

Mr. Stanzione concluded with his statement that his witnesses all outlined why this application show be granted. His first witness outlined the need for the antenna and that they met all FCC standards for radio frequencies. His second witness showed that the design of the site is least obtrusive. His third witness showed the positives outweigh the negatives for this application.

Mr. Sullivan stated the board has seen other similar and benefits of cellular antenna outweigh the negative. They have shown in numbers the gaps they have and capacity is being reached.

Mr. Piromalli there were no conditions that were recommended.

Mr. Lundy motioned case 2017-08 be granted with the conditions discussed; Mr. Sullivan seconded the motion.

All votes aye. Application granted.

**Board discussion in regards to final application of the night, case 2017-13 Kai Olderog, 23 South Prospect Street.**

Alan Trembulak, attorney for the applicant, was addressed by board. The Board was concerned with time of night and how long application would take to present their case. It was agree with Mr. Trembulak on behalf of the applicant and the Board to adjourn the application to the next following meeting, Thursday August 10, 2017 at 8:00 pm. No further notice was necessary for the applicant.

Meeting was adjourned at 10:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted  
Kelly Lawrence  
Board of Adjustments Secretary