

**BOROUGH OF FAIR LAWN
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
Regular Meeting
of December 18, 2006**

Following are the minutes of the Fair Lawn Zoning Board of Adjustment's regular meeting held on **Monday, December 18, 2006.**

Vice-Chairman Douglas Charipper called the regular meeting to order at 7:40 p.m. and declared that the meeting was being held in accordance with the Open Public Meeting Law.

Roll Call: Present were: Mr. Karas, Mr. Nakashian, Mr. Newman, Ms. Spindel, Mr. Charipper, Mr. Salerno, Mr. Sacchinelli, Mr. Blecher, Mr. Diner and Mr. Meer.

Absent was: Mr. Levy had a meeting and could not be present.

Also in attendance were Bruce Rosenberg, Board Attorney; David Spatz, Zoning Board Planner; Karen Kocsis, Court Reporter; Ann Peck, Assistant Zoning Officer and Carol LoPiccolo, Zoning Board Clerk.

Mr. Charipper announced the following adjournments:

Commercial Old Business:

1. Application #2006-018, Sebastian E. Lentini (McDonald's)
37-01 Broadway, Block 2320, Lots 10-12, Zone B-2/R-1-3
Amendment to approved use/site plan approval requires site plan approval as per RGO Section 125-6. **This application was carried to January 22, 2007.**
2. Application #2006-038, 37-10 Broadway, LLC (Zap Lube)
37-02/37-10 Broadway, Block 2201, Lot 2, Zone B-2
The placement of a billboard sign on the property located at 37-01 through 37-10 Broadway, Block 2201, Lot 3. The billboard requires a use variance as the service is provided at another location RGO Section 125-57(d)(1). **This application was carried to January 22, 2007.**
3. Application #2006-077, United Cerebral Palsy of Hudson County, Inc., NJ
5-17 & 5-19 River Road, Block 5401, Lot 10, Zone R-1-3
Proposed are two, one-family group home dwellings on one lot requires a Use Variance as per RGO Section 125-17 – only one dwelling per lot is permitted. **This application was carried to January 22, 2007.**

Residential Old Business:

1. Application # 2006-078, Vladimir Taran and Sergey Zavrazhnoz
17-42 Hunter Place, Block 2803, Lot 15, Zone R-1-2
Existing lot is 6,574.7 s.f. where 7,500 s.f. is required. The proposed expansion would have existing side yard setbacks of 5.9' and 6.1' where 12' is required. Would have existing front yard setback of 26.2' where 30' is required. Would increase the impervious coverage from 35.9% to 36.6% where only 35% is permitted as per RGO Section 125-12 Schedule of area, yard and building requirements. **This application was carried to January 22, 2007.**
2. Application #2006-086, Bella Stavitsky
3-16 28th Street, Block 3310, Lot 17, Zone R-1-3
Existing lot is 4,000 s.f. where 6,500 s.f. is required. The existing deck is 6.30% coverage where 5% is permitted. The existing deck has a side yard setback of 2' where 8' is required as per RGO Section 125-12 Schedule of area, yard and building requirements. **This application was carried to January 22, 2007.**

Residential New Business:

1. Application #2006-103, Gaetano and Carolyn Ruggiero
64 Harristown Road, Block 6901, Lot 4, Zone R-1-3
Existing corner lot frontage of 90.67' x 80.02' where 75' x 100' is required. The proposed addition would have existing front yard setbacks of 18.50' and 23.07' where 25' is required. The new garage would have a 33' front yard setback where 35' is required as per Section 125-12 Schedule of area, yard and building requirements.

Fees totaling \$88.00 have been paid and there is proof of service.

Edward Esse, Architect, came forward and was sworn in and was accepted as an expert. Gaetano and Carolyn Ruggiero were also sworn in.

Mr. Esse: "Presently there is a 1 family home and they would like to build a second story over the existing home to provide for 2 extra buildings and would like to build a garage. Due to topography issues, the property slopes down, and if we tried to keep it within the front yard setback, it would slope down too far. This is an undersized lot width. This lot is a hardship due to the topography."

Mr. Charipper: "Can you describe the pictures?"

Mr. Esse: "They show our house and the surrounding properties and this fits in with the neighborhood."

Mr. Charipper opened the meeting to the public within 200' and the general public. Mr. Harvey Rubenstein: "What is the height of the house and the garage?"

Mr. Esse: "The height of the building is 28' and the garage will be 14'."

Mr. Charipper closed the meeting to the public.

Mr. Newman made a motion to approve this application. Mr. Meer seconded the motion.

VOTE: Mr. Karas, Mr. Nakashian, Mr. Newman, Ms. Spindel, Mr. Meer, Mr. Salerno and Mr. Charipper - YES.

APPLICATION APPROVED.

Residential Old Business:

1. Application #2006-089, David & Elizabeth Kurilla
39-05 Kramer Place, Block 1705, Lot 5, Zone R-1-3
The proposed addition would increase the existing impervious coverage from 51.8% to 58.8% where 35% is permitted. Would have existing side yard setbacks of 9.1' and 8.7' where 10' is required. The proposed pavers to the property line where 4' is required as per RGO Section 125-12 Schedule of area, yard and building requirements.

Charles Whelan, Architect, and David and Elizabeth Kurilla came forward and were all sworn in.

Mr. Whelan: "We were here in October and listened to your questions and comments and we now have a revised proposal. The existing project is a 6,500 s.f. lot and the property has a split level with a pool in the backyard and the pool creates a hardship. The Kurillas want to expand their kitchen and provide easier access to the rear yard, provide a larger bedroom and family room. There was a solarium in the rear yard before, and we have replaced that with an extension that is smaller; we are proposing to remove existing concrete paving around the pool; we previously proposed paving on the east side of the house and has now been removed; and we've reduced the size of the shed. We've added an overhang over the front stoop. I looked at the Cox book and I think the pool has created the hardship."

Mr. Whelan read from the Cox book.

Mr. Whelan: "The Kurillas want to modernize their house as their neighbors have, but the pool prevents them from doing so. The existing is 19.3% building

coverage and the building will be 23.2%. We feel that this is a much better solution than adding a second level. They need to increase their living space which required enlarging the footprint. The negative impact of the impervious coverage will not be seen by the neighbors. The Kurilla's bought the home with the pool there and please take this into consideration and this will have zero impact."

Mr. Charipper: "What is the increase in impervious coverage?"

Mr. Whelan: "The existing is 46.38% in impervious coverage and are now proposing 47.7%."

Mr. Newman: "Mr. Rosenberg can you opine on the case law that Mr. Whelan cited?"

Mr. Rosenberg: "The Board can balance this particular site and the impervious coverage taking into consideration the in-ground pool."

Mr. Newman: "I think the applicant did a good job coming back with these changes."

Ms. Spindel: " I appreciate the changes that you've made."

Mr. Meer and Mr. Charipper agreed.

Mr. Charipper opened the meeting within 200' and the general public. No one came forward. Mr. Charipper closed the meeting to the public.

Mr. Meer made a motion to approve this application and Mr. Nakashian seconded the motion.

VOTE: Mr. Karas, Mr. Nakashian, Mr. Newman, Ms. Spindel, Mr. Meer, Mr. Salerno and Mr. Charipper - YES.

APPLICATION APPROVED.

2. Application #2006-101, Ronald and Mariafe Yu
4 Harlow Crescent, Block 2814, Lot 13, Zone R-1-2
The proposed addition would have an existing front yard setback of 27' where 30' is required as per Section 125-12 Schedule of area, yard and building requirements.

Fees totaling \$88.00 have been paid and there is proof of service.
Ronald and Mariafe Yu came forward and were both sworn in.

Mrs. Yu: "There is a small hardship - the street curves at the front yard and the front yard setback is existing."

Mr. Charipper: "Would this fit in with the neighborhood?"

Mrs. Yu: "Yes."

Mr. Diner: "What is the square footage of the deck?"

Mr. Karas: "I don't see anywhere on the plans what is being installed."

Mr. Charipper: "It's on page 2."

Ms. Peck: "The deck is under 5%."

Mr. Charipper opened the meeting within 200'. No one came forward. Mr. Charipper opened the meeting to the general public. Mr. Harvey Rubenstein, 26 Rutgers Terrace came forward: "I don't understand this application."

Ms. Peck: "It is for a rear yard addition and the front yard is non-conforming."

Mr. Newman made a motion to approve this application. Ms. Spindel seconded the motion.

VOTE: Mr. Karas, Mr. Nakashian, Mr. Newman, Ms. Spindel, Mr. Salerno, Mr. Meer and Mr. Charipper – YES.

APPLICATION APPROVED.

3. Application #2006-102, Blair Seidler and Jennifer Broekman
18 Beekman Place, Block 3807, Lot 9, Zone R-1-3
Existing lot is 6,352 s.f. where 6,500 s.f. is required. Lot frontage of 25' where 65' is required. The proposed construction would create a third story where only 2 ½ stories are permitted. Would have an existing front yard setback of 11.9' where 25' is required as per Section 125-12 Schedule of area, yard and building requirements.

Ms. Spindel recused herself from hearing this application.

Jennifer Broekman and Blair Seidler came forward and were both sworn in. Fees totaling \$88.00 have been paid and there is proof of service.

Mr. Seidler: "We need to modernize the home and extend our bathroom and add a 4th bedroom. Based on constraints of the location in Radburn, we can't make any changes park side of the house and can't extend the side where there is room

because we would block our neighbor. We can only go up. There is already 1 discrepancy from a previous front addition done by the previous owner. There is precedence at 15 Bedford Place which has 2 bedrooms and a bathroom on the 3rd floor."

Mr. Charipper: "Do you have photographs?"

Mr. Seidler: "Yes."

Mr. Karas: "This presently is a 2 1/2 story house and you want to make a 3rd story and the foot print of the building will not change and the height?"

Mr. Sidler: "Correct."

Mr. Newman: "Are there houses in Radburn that were originally built with a 3rd story?"

Mr. Seidler: "No."

Mr. Charipper opened the meeting within 200'. Suzanne DeGeronimo came forward: "This is a permanent addition and I didn't see anything on the plans that addressed the bulk of the house and I am in objection to this application."

Mr. Hayden and Mr. Louis DeGeronimo also came forward and objected to this application and felt there were other ways to expand the house and this would not fit in with the character of the neighborhood.

Mr. DeGeronimo presented photos that were marked as **Exhibit Objector A-1**.

Mr. DeGeronimo: "There are no original houses in Radburn that were built with a 3rd story."

Mr. Salerno: "The architectural committee of Radburn approved this?"

Ms. Broekman: "Not yet."

Mr. Nakashian: "When did Radburn become a historical site?"

Mr. DeGeronimo: "In 1972. I can tell you that typically the Radburn Association denies an application with a 3rd story."

Mr. Salerno: "Are you involved with the lawsuit against Radburn?"

Mr. DeGeronimo: "I don't understand the question."

Mr. Harvey Rubenstein, 28 Rutgers Terrace: "What will the height be for the building?"

Mr. Seidler: "24' is existing and that will not change."

Mr. Charipper closed the meeting to the public.

Mr. Seidler: "Of the four properties on this block, the DeGeronimo's property has changed the most on this block and does not fit in with the neighborhood."

Mr. Newman: "I think we have a unique neighborhood and this has existing non-conformities with the exception of the 3rd story, and this is an undersized lot and there have been a number of homes that have been expanded to include a 3rd story."

Mr. Newman made a motion to approve this application and Mr. Salerno seconded the motion.

VOTE: Mr. Karas, Mr. Newman, Mr. Salerno, Mr. Meer & Mr. Charipper - YES.
Mr. Nakashian and Mr. Sacchinelli - NO.

APPLICATION APPROVED.

There was a 5 minute recess taken. The meeting resumed at 9:05 p.m.

4. Application #2006-104, Adolph and Thecla Everett
0-102 Blue Hill Avenue, Block 1110, Lot 24, Zone R-1-3
The proposed 4' fence in the front yard setback where 3' is permitted as per Section 125-38.A.

Mr. Adolph Everett, 0-102 Blue Hill Avenue came forward and was sworn in. Fees totaling \$88.00 have been paid and there is proof of service.

Mr. Everett: "I came before this Board in June and wanted to put up a 6' fence around the corner lot and was denied and I am now seeking a 4' fence."

Mr. Charipper: "What is unique about your property."

Mr. Everett: "I have a side yard with no privacy."

Mr. Karas: "Attached to your application you show two fences which look to be a 4' fence with 1' fence with lattice."

Mr. Everett: "No I would like it to look the same. My fence would be a 4' solid fence."

Mr. Karas: "The current fence will come down and not impede onto Blue Hill Avenue as the current one does?"

Mr. Everett: "Correct."

Mr. Newman: "This will not impose any site problems with you pulling out of your driveway?"

Mr. Everett: "Not at all."

Mr. Charipper opened the meeting to the public within 200'. No one came forward. Mr. Charipper opened the meeting to the general public. Mr. Harvey Rubenstein, 26 Rutgers Terrace: "How far back from the corner would you be now?"

Ms. Peck showed the survey to Mr. Rubenstein.

Mr. Charipper closed the meeting to the public."

Mr. Newman made a motion to approve this application. Ms. Spindel seconded the motion.

VOTE: Mr. Karas, Mr. Nakashian, Mr. Newman, Ms. Spindel, Mr. Salerno, Mr. Meer and Mr. Charipper - YES.

APPLICATION APPROVED.

5. Application #2006-105, Janice A. Pessar
321 Plaza Road North, Block 3717, Lot 12, Zone R-1-3
Existing lot is 2,804 s.f. where 6,500 s.f. is required. Existing lot frontage of 50.12' where 65' is required. The proposed removal of existing screen porch to be replaced with a two story addition and new front porch would have existing front yard setbacks of 14.40' where 25' is required. Would have existing rear yard setback of 13.16' where 20' is required. Would increase the existing building coverage from 29.8% to 30.4% where 25% is permitted. Would increase the impervious coverage from 47.6% to 48.1% where 35% is permitted as per Section 125-12 Schedule of area, yard and building requirements.

Ms. Janice Pessar, 321 Plaza Road North came forward and was sworn in and fees totaling \$88.00 have been paid and there is proof of service.

Ms. Pessar: "I have an existing porch and I would like to demolish it and replace it with another porch and would not be increasing the footprint. There is a slight increase in building and impervious coverage due to the landing being put in."

Mr. Newman: "Can you clarify the site plan."

Ms. Peck described the site plan.

Ms. Pessar: "This has already been approved by Radburn."

Mr. Charipper opened the meeting to the public within 200' and the general public. No one came forward. Mr. Charipper closed the meeting to the public.

Mr. Meer made a motion to approve this application and Mr. Charipper seconded the motion.

VOTE: Mr. Karas, Mr. Nakashian, Mr. Newman, Ms. Spindel, Mr. Salerno,
Mr. Meer and Mr. Charipper - YES.

APPLICATION APPROVED.

6. Application #2006-106, Robert and Judith Wilkes
21 Godwin Avenue, Block 3813, Lot 18, Zone R-1-2
The proposed second story addition would have an existing side yard setback of 8.53' and 9' side yard setbacks where 12' is required as per Section 125-12 Schedule of area, yard and building requirements.

Mr. Charipper recused himself from hearing this application.

Ms. Judith Wilkes, 21 Godwin Avenue, came forward and was sworn in. Fees totaling \$88.00 have been paid and there is proof of service.

Ms. Wilkes: "I would like to put a bedroom over the existing garage. This is not creating a variance and have an odd-shaped property that cuts into the corner."

Mr. Meer: "Will this change the outward appearance of the home?"

Ms. Wilkes: "It will maintain the existing roof line."

Mr. Meer opened the meeting within 200' and the general public. No one came forward. Mr. Meer closed the meeting to the public.

Mr. Nakashian made a motion to approve this application and Mr. Sacchinelli seconded the motion.

VOTE: Mr. Karas, Mr. Nakashian, Mr. Newman, Ms. Spindel, Mr. Salerno,
Mr. Sacchinelli and Mr. Meer - YES.

APPLICATION APPROVED.

Commercial Old Business:

1. Application #2006-100, Omnipoint Communication, Inc.
33-02 Morlot Avenue, Block 2410, Lot 49-56, Zone R-1-2
The proposed antenna flagpole requires a use variance as per Section 125-57.D.(d)[1] use variance.

Mr. Charipper asked if any of the Board Members had a conflict with this application and belonged to the V.F.W. No members had a conflict.

Joseph O'Neill, Attorney for the applicant came forward: "At the previous meeting we put on 3 witnesses and tonight we will be putting on our Planner.

Timothy Kronk, Licensed Professional Planner came forward and was accepted as an expert.

Mr. O'Neill: "You've reviewed the application?"

Mr. Kronk: "Yes and I have reviewed the Master Plan and have visited the property and took part in a balloon test. The subject property is the V.F.W. post in a R-1-2 zone. The proposal is for the installation for a flagpole camouflage flagpole at 62'. At the base is the equipment cabinet on a 4' x 17' concrete pad. There would be a fence structure. We could modify the application to eliminate the board on board fence and will match the exterior of the building. We do require a D-1 Use Variance. The Borough of Fair Lawn has a CA zone which permits cellular use, but there is not one near this application. We also need a D-6 variance for height. There are also front yard and side yard setbacks."

Mr. Kronk presented a zone map which was marked as **Exhibit A-3**.

Mr. Kronk: "One of the modifications that I have made is a yellow square which designates the area of the coverage issue. This shows what zones fall into this coverage and what does not. It only encompasses 2 zones of R-1-1 and R-1-2 and does not reach a CA zone. Those 3 CA zones, this locator has located on 2 of those zones already."

Mr. Kronk passed Exhibit A-3 to the Board.

Mr. Kronk presented an aerial photograph of the area dated 4/16/03 and was marked as **Exhibit A-4**.

Mr. Kronk depicted the area.

Mr. Kronk: "To the southwest to the property is a water tank that is 200' tall and falls within the search area and could be used, but the Borough has not made this available. The only other non-residential buildings in the area are the V.F.W. and the Junior High School, but the JRHS had no interest in leasing any space. Boards should use the SICA balancing test here. The Supreme Court has said that the carrier must have the FCC license and the carrier has to prove the particular suitability to the location. The RF engineer testified that Omnipoint is experiencing gap issues. By locating this flagpole, the gaps would be eliminated. This site is suited and there are no more intense zones in the search range. We have no more intense zones. 60' is the lowest height that I have ever heard of. Most are all at least 150' structures. We realize we are in a residential area."

Mr. Meer: "The turn around circle that goes 208 North to Morlot Avenue West - would that be a suitable site?"

Mr. Krank: "That would be a suitable question for the RF Engineer."

Ms. Spindel: "What is the balloon test?"

Mr. Kronk: "I will explain that later."

Mr. Kronk: "I do believe we meet the statutory criteria. This use does not have any negative impacts and will be an unmanned facility. The technicians will only visit every 4-6 weeks. This will not impact any traffic or parking. This is an installation and will be in compliance with the FCC regulations. The only negative impact could be visibility. We did a balloon test in October 10 of this year a 3' red weather balloon was put up at 60' and then viewed from different areas and a computer simulation was done."

Photos depicting the balloon test were marked as **Exhibit A-5, Exhibit A-6, Exhibit A-7 and Exhibit A-8.**

Mr. Kronk: "There are no antennas or equipment that would be visible."

Mr. Kronk presented a photo of an existing flagpole in Randolph at 140' in a residential zone and was marked as **Exhibit A-9.** The nearest residence is 100' away. There are already 2 locators on there with 3 being added."

Mr. Kronk: "The only impact would be visibility and we are sensitive to the area and did not come in with a cell tower and this is the best option for this location. We have balanced the positive against the negative. This is a promotion of the general welfare and clearly meets the special reasons on a suitable location. The carrier is presenting a minimal application. There is no substantial detriment here. I do believe the Board can approve this application without any detriment to the Master Plan. All the permitted zones have been used by this carrier. This

application is the least intrusive means. The building is a very low structure, so in perspective to the wood poles in the area, this would not alter the skyline."

Mr. O'Neill: "Are you familiar with the CA zones?"

Mr. Kronk: "Yes, and there are residential zones near those CA zones and those poles are much higher."

Mr. Newman: "The rescue squad does not abut any residential properties. In step 3 of the SICA balancing, you haven't offered any photos in regard to the equipment compound. Could you provide closer photos of the views?"

Mr. Kronk: "Yes."

Mr. O'Neill: "We offered to put up a wall with shrubs and we could provide a computer simulation of that."

Mr. Newman: "Can you bury any part of the equipment cabinet?"

Mr. O'Neill: "Previous testimony stated that it could not be put underground and that would create a larger visual impact."

Mr. Newman: "What about putting the equipment location behind the building?"

Mr. O'Neill: "That is used for parking and then we would lose some spots and would create some problems with ingress and egress."

Mr. Kronk: "That would also cause a substantial change in the size of the cables."

Mr. Meer: "What about an alternate site as the clover leaf area?"

Mr. O'Neill: "We will have to look into that, but there are considerable limitations in that type of site."

Mr. Karas: "Referring to A-9, that flagpole in the photograph - what is the diameter of the flagpole?"

Mr. Kronk: "I will get that information."

Mr. Karas: "Do we have any photographs of the site itself?"

Mr. Kronk: "Exhibit A-6."

Mr. Karas presented photos of the VFW building depicting the site that were marked as **Exhibit B-1 through B-4**.

Mr. Charipper: "If we are having a hearing and a Board Member wants to present photos, they should be shown to the Board Members."

Mr. O'Neill: "My engineer already testified to the location of the pole."

Mr. Nakashian: "What is the structural integrity of the pole?"

Mr. Kronk: "The site engineer will address those requirements."

Mr. Charipper: "We may not have time to open the meeting to the public."

Mr. Rosenberg: "What about a special meeting?"

Ms. LoPiccolo: "January 29 or February 8."

Mr. Newman: "I would like to see the Board have our own RF Engineer to evaluate the technical aspects of the application."

The Board agreed.

Mr. Rosenberg: "You have indicated about alternate sites, I would ask that you produce some documentation to show this investigation."

This application has been carried to Monday, January 29, 2007.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Variance Extension:

1. Brian Behan and Robert Schaefer
23-33 Berkshire Road, Block 3222.01, Lot 5
Request for extension of variance granted November 1, 2004 for a 5' x 32' rear yard addition with a side yard variance of 4.71' where 10' is required. Extension granted November 17, 2005 with Resolution dated December 19, 2005.

Mr. Meer made a motion to grant this extension and Mr. Charipper seconded the motion.

VOTE: All in favor - YES.

Resolutions

1. Application #2006-091, Francesco and Dina Paradiso, 7 Wyman Court, Block 1108, Lot 13, Zone R-1-3 – Addition.
2. Application #2006-092, Marilyn and Marshall Wilen, 3-18 Alyson Street, Block 5406, Lot 19, Zone R-1-3 – Addition.
3. Application #2006-093, Nadine and Raymond Misko, 5-03 Lyons Avenue, Block 5626, Lot 8, Zone R-1-3 – Addition,
4. Application #2006-094, Issa Huzien, 46 Pomona Avenue, Block 6904, Lot 17, Zone R-1-3 – Addition.
5. Application #2006-095, David and Lisa Barbieri, 39-29 Romana Drive, Block 1207, Lot 19, Zone R-1-3 – Addition.
6. Application #2006-096, Keith and Grete Meerholz, 13-21 Sunnyside Drive, Block 3601, Lot 11, Zone R-1-2 – Porch and Addition.
7. Application #2006-081, Franklin and Michele Castro, 12-23 Edward Street, Block 5606, Lot 8, Zone R-1-3 - Addition.
8. Application #2006-098, Eloy Huamanchumo, 14-10 6th Street, Block 5725, Lot 8, Zone R-1-3 – New house and garage.
9. Application #2006-099, Eileen & Gerald Griparich, 37-10 Victoria Road, Block 2518, Lot 25, Zone R-1-2, Addition.
10. Application #2006-097, Susan Tate and Joe Potanovic, 32-02 Nicholson Drive, Block 2512, Lot 30, Zone R-1-2 – Addition, Porch and Driveway

Mr. Newman made a motion to accept these Resolutions and Ms. Spindel seconded the motion.

VOTE: All Eligible - YES.

Vouchers

1. Karen Kocsis in the amount of \$350.00 regarding the November 20, 2006 meeting.
2. Bruce Rosenberg in the amount of \$180.00 regarding special meeting for November 16, 2006.

Mr. Spindel made a motion to approve these vouchers and Mr. Newman seconded the motion.

VOTE: All Present - YES.

CORRESPONDENCE/ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

Ms. LoPiccolo: "Does the Board have an objection to their phone number being distributed to council members?"

Mr. Charipper, Mr. Newman and Mr. Salerno and Mr. Nakashian did not want their phone numbers being distributed.

Minutes

1. Minutes for the November 16 and November 20, 2006 meetings.

Mr. Charipper made a motion to approve these minutes and Mr. Newman seconded the motion.

ADJOURN

Mr. Blecher made a motion to adjourn this meeting and Mr. Charipper seconded the motion.

VOTE: All Present - YES.

TIME: 10:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol LoPiccolo
Zoning Board Clerk