

**TOWNSHIP OF FRANKLIN
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
COUNTY OF SOMERSET, NEW JERSEY**

**REGULAR MEETING
June 7, 2018**

This Regular Meeting of the Township of Franklin Zoning Board of Adjustment was held at 475 DeMott Lane, Somerset, New Jersey and was called to order by Robert Thomas, Chairperson, at 7:30 p.m. The Sunshine Law was read and the roll was called as follows:

PRESENT: Laura Graumann, Donald Johnson, Bruce McCracken, Alan Rich, Robert Shepherd, Anthony Caldwell, Gary Rosenthal, Joel Reiss and Chairman Thomas

ABSENT: Cheryl Bergailo

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. Peter Vignuolo, standing in for James Kinneally, Zoning Board Attorney, Mark Healey, Planning Director, and Christine Woodbury, Planning & Zoning Secretary

MINUTES:

- **Regular Meeting –April 5, 2018**

Mr. Reiss made a motion to approve the Minutes as submitted. Mr. McCracken seconded the motion and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Mr. Rich, Mr. Shepherd, Mr. Caldwell, Mr. Rosenthal and Chairman Thomas

AGAINST: None

RESOLUTIONS:

- **Ananda Mandir, Inc. / ZBA-15-00024**

Chairman Thomas commented, for the record, that the attempt to make the Board's position clear and clarify things in the Resolution turned out very well, in his opinion. He noted, however, that he had one concern over the use of the word "members" throughout the ordinance. He stated that he had that concern because the subject organization continued to advertise on an internet website that people could pay \$50 and become a member. He then indicated that he thought it was the Board's intention that, in the Resolution, the word "member" referred to someone who was a practicing participant in the religious activities of the facility and not someone who was solicited to pay \$50 for a membership fee in order to use a banquet hall that was not a permitted use by that person. Mr. Shepherd concurred with that

opinion after watching the video of the two hearings where testimony was given. He added that the way in which the Resolution was written matches all of the concerns that were expressed in the meeting. He went on to explain that he was a little troubled by the idea that after the hearings presented a religious endeavor, that they were now advertising on the internet that for \$50 someone could become a member in order to use the banquet facilities as more of a social club use.

Mr. Healey indicated that he felt that the Resolution made the Board's intentions very clear, that the facility was approved as a religious place of worship and cultural center and needed to be used as such. He added that any intention on the part of the Applicant to use the facility as a banquet facility or any other type of commercial enterprise would be the subject of zoning violations and summonses.

Mr. Reiss made a motion to approve the Resolution as submitted. Mr. Johnson seconded the motion and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Mr. McCracken, Mr. Rich, Mr. Shepherd, Mr. Caldwell and Chairman Thomas

AGAINST: None

- **Gill Petroleum, Inc. / ZBA-17-00008**

Vice Chair Graumann made a motion to approve the Resolution as submitted. Mr. Caldwell seconded the motion and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Vice Chair Graumann, Mr. McCracken, Mr. Rich, Mr. Shepherd, Mr. Caldwell, Mr. Rosenthal and Chairman Thomas

AGAINST: None

- **SRI Ramanuja Mission, Inc. / ZBA-17-00017**

Mr. Reiss made a motion to approve the Resolution as submitted. Mr. Caldwell seconded the motion and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Mr. Rich, Mr. Shepherd, Mr. Caldwell, Mr. Rosenthal and Chairman Thomas

AGAINST: None

- **Francis E Parker Memorial Home / ZBA-18-00001**

Mr. Reiss made a motion to approve the Resolution as submitted. Mr. Rich seconded the motion and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Mr. Rich, Mr. Shepherd, Mr. Caldwell, Mr. Rosenthal and Chairman Thomas

AGAINST: None

DISCUSSION:

Vouchers:

- **Marriott Callahan & Blair – Tuan & NJ Chinese Community Center, Inc. - \$171.00**

Chairman Thomas made a motion to approve the Vouchers as submitted and all were in favor.

Extension of Approval:

- **New Jersey Tabernacle, Inc. / ZBA-13-00015**

Mr. Peter U. Lanfrit, Esq., Attorney, appeared before the Board on behalf of the Applicant, New Jersey Tabernacle, Inc. Mr. Lanfrit explained that the Application was approved by the Board in 2013. He stated that, under the Municipal Land Use Law, they have a right to request up to three (3) extensions of approval and they were requesting their third that evening. He indicated that the church was still in the process of gathering funds and, hopefully, they would be able to move forward to construct the church some time in 2018.

Mr. Reiss made a motion to approve the Extension of Approval. Vice Chair Graumann seconded the motion and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Vice Chair Graumann, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McCracken, Mr. Rich, Mr. Shepherd, Mr. Caldwell and Chairman Thomas

AGAINST: None

HEARINGS:

- **SURINDER & RANO SINGH / ZBA-17-00020**

Hardship Variance in which the Applicant was seeking a variance due to his going 1,070 sq. ft. over the previously approved impervious coverage at 3 Buell Street, Somerset; Block 83, Lot 1.04, in an R-20 Zone – **CARRIED TO JULY 5, 2018 – with no further notification required.**

DL 05/31/2018

- **KETAN PATEL / ZBA-18-00005**

Hardship Variance in which the Applicant was seeking a variance to construct a 25' x 30' paver patio at 15 Colgate Court, Somerset; Block 101, Lot 87, in an R-10 Zone.

Mr. Ketan Patel, Applicant, came forward and was sworn in. Mr. Patel indicated that when he bought his home, he was not aware of the zoning limitations. He went on to explain that he lived on a cul-de-sac and that his property was in the shape of a pizza slice, with the wider portion at the front of the property.

Vice Chair Graumann asked what was behind Mr. Patel's property. He stated that there was open space behind his property. He also added that the space in the rear of his property was down a hill and largely unusable. He testified that the portion of his backyard that he wanted to put a patio and some trees for privacy was the only space available that he could do so. The Vice Chair then asked Mr. Patel if he spoke to his neighbors, and Mr. Patel said he sent the required notice and also spoke to the neighbors to get their buy-in. He said that they were all comfortable with adding the patio.

Chairman Thomas then opened the meeting to the public. Seeing no one coming forward the meeting was closed to the public.

Mr. McCracken asked where his property was situated on Colgate and if the builder had provided any decks to the homes built there. Mr. Patel stated that they had a very small deck (6 ft. x 4 ft.) and that it didn't provide enough space away from the house to put a grill, for safety reasons.

Mr. Healey stated that when the homes there were built, they were built out to the maximum of 30% impervious, and there were variances approved for setbacks.

A motion was made to approve the Application. Mr. McCracken seconded the motion and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Vice Chair Graumann, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McCracken, Mr. Rich, Mr. Shepherd, Mr. Caldwell and Chairman Thomas

AGAINST: None

- **THE KOREAN BAPTIST CHURCH of AMERICA / ZBA-18-00002**

Mr. Peter U. Lanfrit, Esq., Attorney, appeared before the Board on behalf of the Applicant, The Korean Baptist Church of America. Mr. Lanfrit stated that the Application had been files on behalf of the church, which was an existing house of worship, located between Livingston St. and Elm St., and has frontage on the two streets. He noted that at the present time, there were three)3) existing structures on the property, one being the house of worship, the other was rectory and the third was a garage or out-building which was being used to hold youth classes. Mr. Lanfrit went on to testify that the Application was to connect the sanctuary building with the rectory, which was presently being occupied by the pastor, but would be converted to offices and classrooms. He noted that the connection that they were seeking to

construct was to provide a connection to the two buildings and to add a small restroom and a kitchen. Mr. Lanfrit also stated that because of the location of the property, they were required to appear before the Historic Committee, which they had done on two (2) separate occasions. He also stated that the Historic Commission did recommend the approval of the project. They were looking for Site Plan with (D)3 Use and Sign Variances approval in which the Applicant was seeking to construct a one-story addition, modify walkways, addition to parking lot, minor grading and a new sign at 46 Livingston Avenue, Somerset; Block 68, Lot 4, in an R-10 Zone.

Mr. Joshua Byun, Assistant Pastor, came forward and was sworn in. He noted that the church acquired the subject property about three (3) years ago. Mr. Byun stated that they conducted services at the church on Sunday mornings and Sunday afternoons as well as services on Wednesday evening. He testified that there were no other official services held at the property other than what was just stated. Including the children, Mr. Byun indicated that they had 90 members of the church at the present time, which was approximately the same number since they had been at the present location. Mr. Byun stated that if the Board granted approval, they would not be expanding the use of the property or adding additional services. He told the Board that they were just trying to utilize the property and buildings better. Mr. Byun then stated that there was a basement under the sanctuary, which was presently used for fellowship after the services. He indicated that the children were presently taking classes in the youth out-building, and that the Application would provide for proper classrooms connected to the sanctuary. He then testified that there was a Senior Pastor working with him at the church, who would occupy the proposed office space and that there were no other employees at that time.

Vice Chair Graumann asked Mr. Byun if there were any unofficial services, based on his previous testimony. Mr. Byun stated that there might be some seasonal revival services, held once or twice a year at most.

Chairman Thomas then opened the meeting to the public for questions of Mr. Byun.

Ms. Patricia Love, 393 Canal Road, Somerset, NJ, and also has a driveway at 20 Elm Street that would be affected by the proposed project. Ms. Love asked what would be the impact on the traffic flow on Elm Street. Ms. Love was told that her question did not pertain to Mr. Byun's testimony and that she would have an opportunity to ask that question to an upcoming witness.

Mr. Vincent Nicotra, 39 Franklin Street, Somerset, NJ, came forward. Mr. Nicotra indicated that he had property fronting on Livingston Street. He noted that the church had been great neighbors so far. He asked Mr. Byun what plans, if any, were there for growth and expansion. Mr. Byun said that they started the church in Metuchen/Edison area, where there was a larger Asian population than in Somerset.

Mr. Healey asked for clarification as to whether the sanctuary space was being enlarged, and Mr. Byun testified that it was not being expanded in any way. He told the Board and public that the main reason for the construction was to connect the main place of worship to the classrooms and would provide a lobby area and a bathroom. He added that it would allow the classrooms to function without having to go outside to access them.

Ms. Michelle Uska, 30 Livingston Avenue, Somerset, NJ, came forward. She stated that she lived right across the street from the church property and that they had been great neighbors.

Ms. Uska stated that her observations have shown her that the church has a very large property for such a small congregation and wanted to know if the property would be used for any other purpose in the future. Mr. Byun stated that they were not planning on renting any space to outsiders and that the reason for the space. He added that the reason for the space was so that their congregation could worship in two different areas since the older generation only speaks Korean and the younger generation only speaks English.

Mr. Art Toto, 45 Franklin Street, Somerset, NJ, came forward. Mr. Toto asked whether the facility would be able to be used for daycare. Mr. Byun indicated that they had no plans for daycare on the site, but deferred to Mr. Lanfrit regarding what would be allowed, per zoning.

Mr. Lanfrit indicated that he believed it would be permitted, but that they would have to come back before the Board and make application for that use on the property. He continued his testimony by saying that they only have permission to use the property for worship and classrooms.

Mr. Healey indicated that the ordinance was rather permissive when it came to accessory uses to a house of worship. He noted that daycare was one of the permitted uses that was commonly associated with a house of worship. That being said, Mr. Healey indicated that the Applicant was there before the Board that evening for several variances. He then stated that the Board has the discretion to not allow daycare on the property, and would have to come back before the Board if they ever wanted to add a daycare component to their use.

Mr. Toto asked how many cars there might be on the property at any particular time for services. Mr. Byun indicated that the first service on Sunday morning was at 11:00 a.m., with an average attendance of about 90 people, the largest service of the day. He said that they had two parking areas and that he didn't know of any time that there was not enough parking facilities on-site. Mr. Byun then noted that they only have about 40 people at the 2:30 p.m. Sunday afternoon service. He then indicated that the bible class on Wednesday night at 8:00 p.m. consisted of about 40 people attending. He told the Board and public that the members come from about 30 minutes away, so they usually come to the first 11:00 a.m. service and stay around until the 2:30 p.m. service.

Seeing no one further coming forward, the Chairman closed the meeting to the public.

Mr. Mark Yarrington, Architect, 676 U.S. Highway 202/206, Bridgewater, NJ, came forward and was sworn in. The Board accepted his qualifications. Mr. Yarrington stated that he was hired by the Applicant after they purchased the property. He noted some renovations were done to the existing sanctuary building. He then detailed the changes that had been made, including the internal reversal of locations of the entrance and the existing worship platform utilizing the architectural plans before the Board. Mr. Yarrington testified that all the changes to the building had the proper permits and were approved and completed. He also showed the various locations of the building and explained where the addition would be placed and how it would connect the rectory building and the sanctuary building. Mr. Yarrington then discussed how the rectory functioned when he first saw it had some offices on the first floor and some living areas on the second floor. He then discussed the proposed changes that the Applicant would like to make in the rectory, stating they would like to add some children's classrooms to the first floor, move the offices to the second floor and have adult meeting rooms on the third floor, all of which was allowed by code. Mr. Yarrington indicated that there was a "warming"

kitchen at the back of the rectory and would now be moved into the addition so that the existing kitchen could become a Christian educational classroom space. He then told the Board that the other key elements in the new addition would be a new entry reception area and men's and women's restrooms that were not there today. Mr. Yarrington noted that the new entry reception area would allow parishioners to go into the sanctuary or into the newly renovated rectory building with both entrances located on the same side of the building with access to the two parking areas. He did note that they also had the existing entry/exit door to the rectory building, which would remain and be maintained as an exit door only and would not be regularly used by the congregants. Mr. Yarrington also mentioned the side sanctuary door that was added as an exit door only as part of the previous renovations.

Mr. Yarrington then discussed the existing building materials on both of the buildings and what would be done to match the addition to those materials already in place, noting that they were going to have them match in style and color. Mr. Yarrington then discussed the elevation renderings shown from Elm Street as well as from Livingston Avenue. He noted that the new addition that would connect the two existing structures would be set back more toward the Elm Street side of the building. He then spoke about the addition of 10 windows that would be consistent with the style of window that was already in place on the existing rectory. Mr. Lanfrit then brought up a comment in one of the staff reports requiring a bathroom in the existing youth building. Mr. Yarrington agreed with Mr. Lanfrit's comments that they would include one if it were required. He also added that if they needed approval from the Board of Health for the "warming" kitchen, they would obtain it.

Mr. Healey then brought up a discussion regarding the requirements of the Historic Commission. Mr. Lanfrit indicated that the Historic Commission approved the building materials being proposed and what was being presented to the Board that evening. He also indicated that the Historic Commission wanted to see some plantings in the front of the building on the Elm Street side. Mr. Lanfrit then told the Board that the parking lot has minimal lighting and the Township had certain lighting requirements. He indicated that they did not presently meet the lighting requirements, but that the only time they were going to use the facility in the evening was on Wednesdays. In discussions with the Historic Commission regarding the lighting of the parking lots, Mr. Lanfrit testified that the Commission recommended that they not add any additional lighting to the parking lot. He indicated that the Pastor could provide testimony stating that the existing lighting was adequate to allow people to come into and out of the building safely. He then requested a waiver from the Board to not have to provide any additional lighting.

Chairman Thomas then opened the meeting to the public for questions of the Architect.

Mr. Zack Lichtmann, 37 Fiquin Street, Somerset, NJ, came forward. Mr. Lichtmann asked what the current capacity was of the structures on the property now compared to what could be accommodated after the addition was put on. Mr. Yarrington explained that there would be no notable difference in the amount of people the accessory garage building could hold as they were only increasing slightly the useable space there. He then drew the Board and public's attention to the rectory building, where the current office space might hold 1-2 people in each office, but would be able to accommodate 6-8 children in a classroom setting. Mr. Yarrington stated, however, that the children were theoretically accounted for since their parents would be in the sanctuary building at the same time they were in the classrooms.

Mr. Art Toto, 45 Franklin Street, Somerset, NJ, came forward again. Mr. Toto asked whether there were plans to expand the outbuilding. Mr. Yarrington indicated that it would only be changed slightly on the interior. Mr. Toto asked for more clarification on the building's use, and Mr. Byun stated that it would be used for bible studies or young adults and teenagers to gather as it had been for the past three years.

Mr. Vincent Nicotra, 35 Franklin Street, Somerset, NJ, came forward. Mr. Nicotra asked for clarification in the Applicant not providing enough parking to meet the requirements. Mr. Healey indicated that the 492 space requirement listed on the plans was incorrect, but was based upon the amount of worship area and assembly area. In doing the calculations, Mr. Healey indicated that they required 192 parking spaces and were providing 40. He then explained to Mr. Nicotra that it was a frequent variance that places of worship ask for. A discussion ensued about the number of people and the activities on the site, with Mr. Lanfrit reiterating the pastor's testimony that nothing would be changing in that vein.

Ms. Robin Scutter, 43 Livingston Avenue, Somerset, NJ, came forward. Ms. Scutter asked what was going to happen to the full functioning kitchen in the basement below the sanctuary. She stated that the basement space had been used as gathering space and worship space by the last two churches that occupied the property. Mr. Yarrington indicated that there was a "warming" kitchen in the basement of the sanctuary. Mr. Healey indicated that because there was worship space and kitchen space in the basement, that space had already been taken into consideration in the parking counts.

Seeing no one further coming forward, the meeting was closed to the public.

Mr. Christopher A. Milek, Land Surveyor and Planner employed with Van Cleef Engineering, 32 Brower Lane, Hillsborough, NJ, came forward and was sworn in. The Board accepted his qualifications. Mr. Milek showed the Board a colorized aerial exhibit of existing conditions, showing the two buildings and the accessory structure. He then discussed the 40 parking spaces that were presently on-site on either side of the two main buildings and spoke about the lighting that was presently on the property to light the parking areas. He noted that two of those lights were Township street lights at the front and back of the property and that there was only one light fixture that belonged to the property on the side of the rectory building. Mr. Milek then discussed what the Applicant was proposing using a Site Plan exhibit. He showed the Board where the proposed addition would be on the property that fronted Elm Street as well as the proposed walkway in front of that addition that would connect the two parking areas. He noted that there were already two ADA parking spots on the sanctuary side parking area and the proposal was to leave those there, but update them to current standards. He noted that the addition would be replacing some green space and some concrete area as well as a small shed that would be removed to accommodate the new addition, adding 950 sq. ft. of impervious coverage. Mr. Milek then drew the Board's attention to some existing sidewalks, one coming up from Livingston Avenue and another walkway on the interior side of the sanctuary and an additional walkway on the Elm Street side of the property. He noted that all of those areas would no longer be needed so that they would be able to remove those, decreasing the impervious coverage on the property by 366 sq. ft., and replace those areas with grass. He stated that the net impervious coverage then would be 588 sq. ft. Mr. Milek then told the Board that there were three (3) existing trees that would have to be removed to accommodate the new addition. He noted, however, that they were planning to plant one new tree, either a shade tree or an evergreen, as well as some ground plantings between the new

addition and the new walkway as well as some bushes and shrubs near the new entrance. Mr. Milek then discussed the addition of a sign along Livingston Avenue and felt it would be more visible in that area because there was less vegetation there. He noted that the size of the proposed sign would be 36" x 48", with a total height of 84", and constructed of wooded posts and PVC material for the sign area that looks much like painted wood. Mr. Milek added that the sign would not be illuminated in any way, and the Historic Commission recommended the approval of the proposed sign, both in materials used and location.

Vice Chair Graumann asked about the impervious coverage percentages noted in Mr. Healey's Planning report. She then asked Mr. Milek if any of the impervious coverage reductions were reflected in the numbers listed in that report. Mr. Milek indicated that those numbers did not reflect the reductions discussed, and the total impervious coverage would be at 76%, which was an increase of 2% from what already existed on the site. Mr. Lanfrit then indicated to the Board that they would have to discuss with the Township Engineer to find out if there would need to be some storm water management improvements to deal with the extra 2% of impervious coverage. He added that if it were to be required, they would do so with the use of a dry well or something of that nature.

Mr. Healey asked about the meetings the Applicant had with the Historic Commission regarding the proposed sign. Mr. Healey stated that he thought the commission wanted them to utilize wood posts with a wood sign, and Mr. Lanfrit indicated that they had met again with the Historic Commission to show them the PVC material that looked like wood and would wear better. He told the Board and public that Historic Commission then approved that material at their second meeting and was what they were presenting to the Board that evening.

Mr. Milek stated that he had reviewed all of the staff reports that were generated as a result of the Application. Mr. Healey asked for clarification of the Township Engineer's comment regarding the elimination of lighting on the site. Mr. Lanfrit indicated that there was existing building lighting that used to be illuminated, but at the request of the neighbors, they had not been turning those on, but there was no plan to remove them. He then requested that the Board not ask the Applicant to add any additional lighting on the site as he felt it would destroy the character of the church and also the character of the neighborhood. Mr. Milek then testified that they would be able to comply with all of the other comments in the reports and would work with the Township Engineer to determine if there was a need for additional storm water management on the site. He added that all of the changes that would be made as a result of any staff comments were minor, technical issues that would not significantly alter what the Board and public was being presented that evening.

Mr. Milek then discussed the fact that the property had two frontages and basically had no building envelope because of the front yard setbacks. He noted that the addition they were proposing was set back in line with the sanctuary building and that they were not exacerbating any of the setbacks that were currently in place. Mr. Milek then indicated that there was a distance of 19.9 ft. from the front portico. Mr. Milek then stated that should the Board approve the Application as presented, that such approval would not detrimentally affect the zone scheme or zone plan. He also stated that he didn't feel the Application would have any negative impacts on the adjoining neighbors or the neighborhood.

A Board member asked about the removal of three (3) trees on the site, with only the replacement of one(1). Mr. Lanfrit stated that they would be contributing to the Township's tree fund.

Chairman Thomas then opened the meeting to the public for questions of Mr. Milek.

Ms. Robin Scutter, 43 Livingston Avenue, Somerset, NJ, came forward. Ms. Scutter stated that since the Applicant purchased the property, a very large pine tree had been removed from the grassy area on the Livingston Avenue side of the property, two trees were taken down from the parking lots and a couple of pear trees came down during one of the snowstorms on the Livingston Avenue side of the property. Since there were multiple trees on the property that used to act as softeners to the structures on-site and there seemed to be adequate space to add trees, she wondered whether more trees and landscaping could be added to the property. Mr. Lanfrit stated that they would look into the possibility of adding more trees and ground plantings on the property and would work with Mr. Healey to find some appropriate locations on the site. For the record, Mr. Healey stated that the Historic Commission had the very same recommendation and would be an appropriate condition of the Board's approval..

Mr. Raymond Hills, 49 Franklin Street, Somerset, NJ, came forward. Mr. Hills was concerned with the parking situation and was concerned for that problem if the membership of the church increases in the future.

The Chairman told Mr. Hills that the portion of the public hearing was to question Mr. Milek's testimony and that he would have an opportunity for comments at the end. He then closed the meeting to the public.

Since there were no other comments from the Board and no other testimony to be presented, Chairman Thomas then re-opened the meeting to the public for comments.

Mr. Raymond Hills, 49 Franklin Street, Somerset, NJ, came forward and was sworn in. Mr. Hills stated that he was concerned with the parking situation from the past two churches who occupied the building as well as for that same problem if the membership of the church increases in the future. He indicated that people used to park in front of his garage and in front of driveways along Franklin Street and Livingston Avenue.

Mr. Vincent Nicotra, 35 Franklin Street, Somerset, NJ, came forward and was sworn in. Mr. Nicotra wanted to let the Board know that in the village of East Millstone there were approximately 300 residents and four (4) churches, so on Sundays, the parking situation can become a problem. He also indicated that people would continue to come even if the church did not have enough parking by parking along the neighboring streets. He then complimented the Applicant for keeping to the historic nature of the area with the material choices of both the addition and the sign.

Ms. Patricia Love, 20 Elm Street, Somerset, NJ, came forward and was sworn in. Ms. Love indicated that Elm Street was very narrow and didn't even really allow for two (2) cars to pass each other. She noted that when the Catholic church was there, there was only one-way driving on that street on Sundays to accommodate for the parishioner's drive movements. She then stated that that changed at some point and felt that it was a safety hazard for it not to be designated one-way on Sundays

Ms. Priscilla, 33 William Street, Somerset, NJ, came forward and was sworn in. Ms. Priscilla indicated that she agreed with Ms. Love that the one-way on Elm Street on Sundays created a positive impact in the neighborhood. She stated that she had to call the police to get someone out of her driveway when the last church residing on the property and did not want to have the same problems again.

Mr. Healey made a statement to the public that restoring the one way flow on Elm Street was not in the purview of the Zoning Board and would have to be brought to the Township Council.

Seeing no one further coming forward, the meeting was closed to the public by Chairman Thomas.

Mr. Lanfrit gave his closing summation regarding the Applicant's sensitivity to the surrounding area and those items discussed that evening.

Vice Chair Graumann made a motion to approve the Application, providing the parking lot lighting relief and also requiring that the Applicant meet with Mr. Healey to discuss and come up with a reasonable landscaping plan that would include additional trees and shrubbery to soften the impact of the church frontage. Also included would be to not allow daycare or rentals of the buildings. Mr. Healey stated that the variances requested were outlined in his memo and then clarified some of the calculations, noting the 19.9 ft. front yard setback and 333 sq. ft. reduction in impervious coverage to come to 76.8%. The motion was seconded and the roll was called as follows:

FOR: Vice Chair Graumann, Mr. Johnson, Mr. McCracken, Mr. Rich, Mr. Shepherd, Mr. Caldwell and Chairman Thomas

AGAINST: None

WORKSESSION/NEW BUSINESS

MEETING ADJOURNED

A motion was made to adjourn the meeting at 9:15 p.m. Mr. Caldwell seconded the motion and all were in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathleen Murphy, Recording Secretary
June 22, 2018