



**TOWNSHIP OF RIVER VALE
PLANNING BOARD
November 21, 2005
REGULAR MEETING
MINUTES**

ADEQUATE NOTICE STATEMENT:

A Regular Meeting of the River Vale Planning Board was called to order at 8:05 p.m. The following statement was read: "This is a Regular Meeting of the Planning Board of the Township of River Vale. I am informed by the Clerk that adequate public notice has been provided by mailing notice to the Pascack Valley News/Post Review and The Record, by posting notice on the bulletin board in the Municipal Building, and by filing a copy of the notice to all persons who requested the same and prepaid the cost fixed by the Board".

=====
The Planning Board saluted the flag.

ATTENDANCE:

Members Present:	George Shalhoub	Secretary
	George Paschalis	Mayor
	Chris Wahmann	Vice-Chairman
	Robert Menville	Council Pre.
	Bruce Carillo	
	Mark Ericksen	
	Norman Goldman	
	James Hanna	
	Kenneth H. Koons	Chairman
	Maria Sapuppo	Alternate #2

Also Present:	Paul Kaufman, Esq.	Board Attorney
	Arthur Lorenzo, P.E.	Board Engineer
	Michael Hakim	Board Planner

Absent:	Eric Anderson	Alternate #1
----------------	---------------	--------------

MINUTES:

October 17, 2005 - Chairman Koons moved for approval of the Minutes dated with corrections as noted by Mr. Hanna. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hanna and carried unanimously.

DISCUSSION:

Master Plan - Mr. Koons reviewed from the last meeting and asked the Board Members to forward their comments on the 33 items contained in the memo of 7/6/05 to Mr. Hakim. This is also on the website, and/or copies would be forwarded if necessary to any Board Members.

RESOLUTIONS FOR APPROVAL:

1. Schmidt, 765 Orangeburgh Road, Block 202, Lot 21 - Minor Subdivision - A motion to approve the Resolution deemed as read was made by Mr. Koons and seconded by Mr. Menville and was carried unanimously.

2. Paul Kaufman, Esq. - Defense of lawsuit filed by River Vale Developers - A motion to approve the Resolution deemed as read was made by Mr. Koons and seconded by Mr. Hanna. There was no discussion. On roll call vote, Mr. Shalhoub, Mr. Wahmann, Mr. Menville, Mayor Paschalis, Mr. Carillo, Mr. Goldman, Mr. Ericksen, Mr. Hanna, and Mr. Koons voted yes.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1. Crecco's Pizza Café, 655-D Westwood Avenue - Amended Site Plan Application - Matthew Keshishian, Esq., 136 Merit Drive, Oradell, NJ, represented the applicant, as applicant's new attorney. He understood his client was before the Board several times, and requested he be sworn in for the record. Jeff Nigro, 70 Foltim Way, Congers, NY 10920, a representative of Jeff Bridges, Inc., was sworn in. He complied by giving Notice to the persons within 200' and published in The Record. Mr. Kaufman did not receive a copy of the Notice, which was then handed to Mr. Kaufman.

The Attorney questioned his client. Mr. Nigro stated it will be a restaurant providing a variety of foods, such as salads, paninis, wraps, espresso and pizza. He is a co-owner of the café. They added café to the name, Crecco's Café. He entered into a Lease with the landlord and did not know seating was not allowed, and he is here today to request seating for 24. With seating he would be able to have the various customers as opposed to standing out in the street in cold weather. He went into this thinking he had seating, and there was a misrepresentation as to what he was getting. Mr. Koons commented it was a question of the number of parking spaces and number of seating, and they were supposed to take a few tables out. Mr. Kaufman

asked how many seats they were proposing, and how many there were originally. It was 32 originally; now it is 24. Based on that, they said they would now have enough parking spaces. Mr. Kaufman requested the calculation for the record. Mr. Nigro stated 30 parking spaces are in the shopping center, and 24 is the accurate number of seats, per Mr. Lorenzo.

Mr. Lorenzo was sworn in. The applicant's share was 12, based on the area they are occupying in the building, based on the 30 spaces. If they eliminated two tables, they could get down to 16. Mr. Kaufman asked if it was his opinion that 24 seats would comply with the parking requirements, and Mr. Lorenzo responded yes. So it would be 24 seats and 16 spaces. Mr. Carillo asked if they had enough power etc., and they responded yes. No further questions.

The matter was open to the public for questions of the witness. Robert Brown, owner of Block 2206, Lot 17, directly behind the building, had concerning questions of the applicant pertaining to parking. Mr. Lorenzo answered, with clarification by Mr. Kaufman as to calculations, and national parking standards and models. Mr. Lorenzo agreed. There were no further questions

Jay Kim, Vice-President of Joseph Lee, Inc., Landlord, came forward and was sworn in. Mr. Kim confirmed the belief of the client regarding parking. Mr. Kesheshian asked, and Mr. Kim commented they had no objection to the 24 seats. There were no further questions of Mr. Kim, and there were no other witnesses. Richie Klosemeyer was also present on behalf of the applicant.

The matter was opened to the public for comments. Robert L. Brown was sworn in, adjacent property owner. His objection was that the required parking for that building has been reduced, to allow the building to be built, but would only allow retail. If a restaurant were approved, giving a variance for more seating than there is parking for, then he objects, because he has the property adjacent to them behind their property, and because his store owners can travel out to Westwood Avenue. There is no provision to allow them to go through his property and exit out onto Westwood Avenue, and they would use his parking lot. He objected to any easement. Mayor Paschalis commented he did not think they were requesting that now. Mr. Kaufman asked

if he had any problem today with people shopping in their center and parking in his center, and Mr. Brown said he did. Mr. Kaufman asked what he was doing about that. He then said he is not having the problem today, but is concerned they may do that. Mr. Kaufman indicated he is assuming this problem. This is all presumptuous. Mr. Brown said he was objecting to this possibly happening. Mr. Kaufman extended questions to Mr. Lorenzo and Mr. Nigro. He described the ordinance, and 10 parking would be required. Mr. Brown asked, and there would be no opening to the back. Mr. Kesheshian felt the objection was between Mr. Lee and Mr. Brown; it was not relevant. Mr. Kaufman advised he has the right to make the objection and for the Board to consider this. A motion to close the hearing was made by Mr. Koons, seconded by Mr. Menville and carried.

Ms. Sapuppo spoke in favor of the application. A motion to approve and accept the applicant for the Crecco's Café as presented to the Board, limited to 24 seats as amended. Mayor Paschalis added applicant's signs would have to conform to the signs already there. The motion was seconded by Mr. Goldman. Mr. Kaufman advised the motion was to approve the application, limited to 24 seats and all signs conforming to existing signage. Mr. Kesheshian agreed. On roll call vote, all members with the exception of Mr. Wahmann voted yes. Mr. Wahmann voted no. Mr. Lorenzo advised that the plans should be revised accordingly to show the amended seating.

2. JPE Contractors, Cleveland Avenue, Block 1510, Lot 22-Preliminary Major Subdivision - Mr. Shalhoub recused himself and stepped down from the dais as he is a property owner within 200' and was provided with notice of the hearing.

Mr. Strasser represented the applicant. Mr. Kaufman advised they may or may not want to continue, as the new Ordinance, if adopted, may have an affect on their application, and they may have to revise their application. The First Reading on the Ordinance is 10/24/05. Mr. Strasser expressed they were prepared to conclude their application that evening. Mr. Kaufman did not recall the application commencing, and the applicant's attorney said it had not. Applicant's attorney stated it is a variance-free application, with two waivers. Mr. Kaufman asked for a copy of the Board Engineer's review letter. Attorney Strasser advised the letter was dated 9/12/05, and they

were prepared to address and meet all the requirements thereof. The witnesses were Mr. Paterno, the owner of the property, and Mr. Fox was the engineer.

John Paterno, 12 Quail Ridge Road, Montvale, a builder, was the first witness and was sworn in. He owned the property, which he purchased two years ago, and was seeking to subdivide the property into three lots. The current two-family home would be demolished, and there would be three single family homes. To his knowledge, there are no variances. Mr. Kaufman cautioned the Board about relying on that statement, as he is not an engineer. Mr. Paterno was asked if he ever built in River Vale, and he said he built three homes. Mr. Kaufman asked him for the depth of the lot. Mr. Paterno looked at the plan, and answered it is about 323.49'. In your opinion as an experienced builder, is it a minor or major, and he answered a major. Mr. Kaufman questioned him as to the meaning of design waiver and if any waivers are required. Mr. Paterno responded there is a kink in two of the property lines, and the Borough Ordinances recommend a straight line, but he was not really certain if it was recommended or required. Mr. Koons noted there was a design waiver requested and recited the ordinance.

Matthew Fox, President of Canger Engineering Associates in Fair Lawn, NJ was called and sworn in. The subdivision plans, consisting of 10 sheets, set was dated 4/18/05, revised to 6/27/05 was prepared under his supervision. Mr. Fox described the plan and the reason for the revision was to eliminate the variance, and they requested a design waiver as a less severe impact on the property vs. a deficiency in lot width. Mr. Carillo had questions on the notes on the plan. Mr. Strasser noted Ord. 142209 (b) and (f), and the Board stated it was an old book. Mr. Fox commented the application does not request any variances but a design wavier for a couple of bends, very modest in nature. Mr. Strasser qualified Mr. Fox at Mr. Kaufman's request, since this was a new application. Mr. Fox gave his credentials, qualifications and extensive experience, and was accepted. Mr. Kaufman noted the last revision date appeared not on the cover sheet, but on Sheets 2, 6, 8 and 10. Mr. Fox stated that was correct and they were known as the plan sheets. Mr. Fox was accepted.

Mr. Strasser continued with his questioning of Mr. Fox. He described the entire plan set, sheet by sheet, which was marked A1, continuing per sheet as A1A, etc.

(RVPB 11/21/05 Minutes)

A1B, which was page 2, there was a revision date of 6/27/05, entitled Preliminary Subdivision Plat. A1C was Storm Drain and Misc. Details, revised to 5/18/05 on the 8th revision. A1D was _____, A1E was the Water Details, dated 4/18/05. A1F was the Soil Moving Sections, last revised 6/27/05. A1G was the Tree Removal Plan, last revised 6/27/05. A1H was the Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, revised to 6/27/05. A1I was _____, dated 4/18/05, and A1J was the Drainage Plan, revised to 6/27/05.

Mr. Strasser referred to Sheet 2, which Mr. Fox described. They proposed dwellings with a cul-de-sac, meeting the bulk requirements and meeting the road profile, with a storm drain to collect the water and no increase in runoff, utilities provided, provided a key map. He described drainage, which would not go onto adjoining properties and the runoff would be directed to storm drains or seepage pits. There would be berms at end of the proposed roadway on a slope of 3 to 1. The requirements for lot area is 18,000 sq. ft., and they meet the requirements, also for lot frontage, width, side yards, rear yards, building coverage, and height. The design waivers are for the non-radial lines and bends in the property line. These were small bends in the line to conform to the lot width requirement. Mr. Wahmann questioned the survey and subdivision plat. This would not affect the lot size. Mr. Strasser continued. Mr. Fox stated it meets the requirements of the RSIS.

The letter of Schwanwede Hals was addressed in detail. Mr. Fox advised they are prepared to demonstrate calculations and would be happy to show plantings on the plan. He referred to A1B, which, instead of 175204F, it is now 142209 B & F, and the plan would be revised. Mr. Fox was asked if there was any downside from an engineering point of view for the lots in between the lots to have bends, and he indicated no. He also served the Fire Dept. Police Dept. and Shade Tree with copies of the plan, and no responses were received by applicant.

Mr. Strasser wanted to move on to soil moving, but Mr. Goldman noted The Board never has it at the same time and usually has a separate hearing. Mr. Kaufman advised it is not done simultaneously, and the Board likes to do it separately. Mr. Strasser had no further questions of Mr. Fox. There would be sufficient turning radius. Mr. Goldman asked about Lots 22 and 22.01. Mayor Paschalis asked if

there was a traffic study. Mr. Fox stated they are adding one family. One additional dwelling wouldn't warrant a traffic study. Mr. Carillo stated they are putting a street right across an existing person's driveway. Mr. Fox stated there are no requirements in the ordinance for this. They have a landscaping plan on Sheet 9 of 10, including plantings on Cleveland Avenue to shield headlights. Mr. Strasser stated applicant would not be adverse to working with the property owner across the street to shield any headlights. Mr. Kaufman asked if it were possible to subdivide the property into two lots. Mr. Fox said it would be the frontage from Cleveland to the back. Mr. Kaufman indicated how they could have one lot to the West or one lot to the South. He asked if they could use the proposed cul-de-sac, subdivide and conform to 14209F. Mr. Fox indicated he could, but has not been requested of same by the applicant. Mr. Kaufman commented it is because he wants three lots. He asked if it were possible to subdivide the property into two lots and not have bends. The only reason to have bends is to manipulate the lot lines to have 18,000 sq. ft. Mr. Fox added it was also for the lot width. Mr. Kaufman commented also he is manipulating lot width and asked what is the hardship to the applicant if there were two lots without design waivers. Mr. Fox could not testify to hardship; the applicant would be more suited to answer the question.

The matter was open to the public for questions of the witness. George Shalhoub, 522 Cleveland Avenue, had questions regarding the existing garage. He showed a survey which differed from the applicant's measurements. Mr. Fox indicated he would have to review this; it is a site plan, and he is confident his boundary survey is correct. Mr. Kaufman advised that it was not in evidence. Mr. Shalhoub asked why they assumed they could have a bend in the property line when the ordinance requires straight lines. Mr. Fox outlined his reasons for asking for consideration from the Board. Mr. Shalhoub questioned Lot 23 and noted it becomes a corner lot. The ordinance states it is a mandatory 45'. Mr. Fox stated it is not their property, and they cannot seek a variance on an adjoining property. Mr. Shalhoub asked for landscaping plans, and Mr. Fox provided details. Mr. Shalhoub asked if he would be willing to plant additional plantings on his property, as he presently looks into virgin woods.

Joe Natale, his property being behind where all the water will go, Block 1510, Lot 6 came forward. Mr. Fox explained they designed a stormwater collection system. Mr. Natale noted there is a 15' drop in the rear. Mr. Kaufman asked for Mr. Lorenzo's opinion, and he agreed with Mr. Fox, that post development runoff is less than the pre-development runoff, due to seepage pits. They received the EIS. Their findings are that the soils are perfectly adequate for the type of detention system they propose to install and do not see any adverse elements or other environmental issues. Mayor Paschalis asked if he put this in writing. Mr. Lorenzo said he noted in his letter they received the EIS. Mr. Kaufman asked if there were any peculiar conditions that would create any hardship conditions. He indicated he would say no.

Steven Garbarino, 529 Cleveland Avenue, directly across from the proposed site, asked on plans previously submitted, he had dimensions of 26' from curb to curb, and if that still existed. The response was yes. There were no further questions for the public.

Mr. Strasser asked Mr. Fox with regard to the size of the property and design waivers sought, if he saw the enforcement of the side lines as being impractical. He responded yes, in terms of lot area and lot width. The lots were constructed to satisfy the bulk requirements, lot area and width, and it would be impractical to create the lots without the bends in the particular locations. Would one be able to see these lot lines. No, they are 5 and 6 degrees, and he feels that bends in the lines do not create any hardship for adjoining property owners as well. Mr. Strasser asked if he has seen that ordinance in many municipalities. Mr. Fox responded no. Mr. Kaufman commented that does not invalidate the ordinance. Mr. Fox said it is a design waiver. It is not part of the bulk schedule. Mr. Kaufman and Mr. Strasser had a brief discussion, and he would accept his testimony that the literal enforcement of the ordinance goes beyond his expertise.

Mr. Fox could not say for sure if that was or was not the case. Mr. Kaufman clarified his question that if they had two lots and drew a straight line would it conform. Mr. Fox said he could only testify as to the plan before him, because he would have to go back and measure lot depth and width. Mr. Kaufman asked if he was a planner and Mr.

Fox said no. Mr. Kaufman asked Mr. Lorenzo to review the ordinance to see if the literal enforcement of the full ordinance would be impractical. Lot lines should be straight for the full depth of the lot with no exceptions. Mr. Lorenzo stated it can be accomplished and would not be impractical.

Mr. Koons asked Mr. Fox if he doesn't have the power to apply for a variance for an adjoining lot, how does he have the authority to create a non-conformity on an adjacent property. Mr. Fox said his opinion was it would not be created until an application was made for Lot 23. Mr. Strasser read from Judge Harris' decision as to Lot 23.

Lorraine Stanley 410 Cedar Lane, asked if they did a study of other lots that have less than 120'. Mr. Fox stated he looked at other layouts with the applicant, and they felt that this was the best layout. Mr. Fox stated the applicant is not disobeying any law and is trying to make the lots comply. Mr. Kaufman commented an applicant does not have to explain why they are making an application and has the right to apply for a variance.

Mrs. Sapuppo asked about the seepage pits, Mr. Lorenzo commented there should be no problem. Mr. Lorenzo stated he was very uncomfortable with the detention systems protruding into the streets, and asked if there was any way to pull it back so it is entirely in the easement. Mr. Fox responded it could be reconfigured. It is a standard system, but if there is an issue, he did not see why they could not reconfigure it slightly to alleviate that. Mr. Lorenzo would also like to see the junction box. Mr. Fox stated the point is well taken, and they will address the issue; he did not think it would have an impact on the design and would still conform to RSIS. They could even enlarge it to include another 48' pipe. Mr. Kaufman said he understands there will be changes to the drainage system. Mr. Fox stated the engineer indicated he would like to see it out of the traveled right-of-way. Mr. Kaufman asked where it would be. Mr. Fox explained. Mr. Kaufman asked Mr. Lorenzo if he needed to see it before action is taken. Mr. Lorenzo did not as long as it is submitted as a revision.

The matter was open to the public for comments on motion of Mr. Menville and second by Mr. Wahmann. Stan Sabin, 526 Cleveland Avenue, was sworn in. He is the owner

(RVPB 11/21/05 Minutes)

of Lot 23 in question, and stated to allow this builder to put in a road and make his lot a corner lot would create a hardship. Additionally, Cleveland Ave. is a narrow street, and to allow another street to come in is not safe. This builder does not have a hardship.

Steven Garbarino, 529 Cleveland Avenue, was sworn in. Anyone coming out of the proposed cul-del-sac would create a dangerous situation. It is a busy road. People use it as a cut through. It creates a huge hardship and condition for himself and Mr. Sabin. Having a road directly face his home, and he and his wife have worked two jobs to be able to live in River Vale, he doesn't think it is fair to him. His children have gone to the schools. He doesn't want to move. The applicant is a builder and lives in another town. After he builds and moves out, Mr. Sabin and he will be stuck with these homes. These lots can be cut in half without variances. He would be more than happy to say yes to that. It is not a benefit to the town. Everyone that has come up has said it is a hardship for him.

Mr. Shalhoub, 522 Cleveland Ave, was sworn in and stated this is not a variance-free application. The line is a variance. The placement of the road goes directly against the open space ordinance, which states it should be 45' and creates another variance. Also they are going to put more traffic on Cleveland Avenue. He thinks there would be four variances. There is more than enough room for two lots without variances, and he would strongly urge the Board to deny the application.

Joe Natale, 333 Perry Place, was sworn in. The Town spent a lot of money keeping Cedar Place and Cedar Lane safe. His property, which is presently woods, will no longer be woods and will undergo flooding. Two houses are fine for this builder. Once he builds he is gone, His property is flooded. They work hard for their homes and have to clean up after a new house. It is 30' from the property line and is wrong. He hopes the Planning Board does the right thing. There were no further members of the public. The matter was closed to public on motion of Mr. Menville and second by Mr. Wahmann.

Mr. Strasser gave a closing statement. Currently there is a two family, and this is a three lot subdivision. Applicant met code requirements. He quoted Judge Harris. He recalled testimony of Mr. Fox. This application meets

(RVPB 11/21/05 Minutes)

the Code requirements of the Township of River Vale and has gone through great lengths to resolve the issues and respectfully requests the Planning Board approve the application as submitted.

Mr. Kaufman asked if the Board wanted to vote tonight. Mr. Koons asked if Mr. Strasser is looking for the opportunity to provide additional documentation. Mr. Strasser stated no, if the Board were inclined to give an approval, he would submit additional items necessary. Mr. Koons stated so there is no request for additional time to submit drawings, and Mr. Strasser responded no.

Mr. Kaufman asked Mr. Koons what he wanted him to do, and Mr. Koons asked him to tell the Board what the law says. Mr. Kaufman read from the MLUL 40:55D-21A and the standards for the waiver. If one of the sections of the ordinance are impracticable, there are undue hardships to the applicant. Mr. Hanna asked if they could place a fire hydrant at the beginning of the street in the first 50' on the right hand side, because that is where the fire trucks come from. The one indicated is in the wrong place. Mr. Strasser had no objections. Mr. Goldman proposed that the Board carry this to the next meeting to have the Board's traffic study the applications, since the applicant did not know the distance to Nelson Court. Mr. Kaufman to carry you would need the consent of the application. Mr. Strasser noted there was extensive questioning of the application which was deemed as harrassment, and they would not consent to an extension. To request a traffic study would create an undue hardship. Mr. Kaufman stated basically, the applicant will not extend.

Mr. Koons stated to Mr. Strasser he is all concluded, and he rested. There were no other questions from members of the Board.

Mr. Carillo made a motion to deny the application on the grounds that he does not believe the applicant has met his burden of proof for the waivers. The motion was seconded by Mr. Menville. On roll call vote, all members voted yes. Mr. Shalhoub was recused.

The Board took a recess from 10:50- 11:00 p.m.

3. Durie Properties, Orangeburgh Road, Block 601, Lot 10- Soil Moving Permit - Adjourned to 12/19/05 at request of applicant;

4. River Vale Developers, Parcel 17-C, Stanley Place - Adjourned to 12/19/05 at request of applicant;

5. Nazzaro, 283 Cedar Lane, Block 1602, Lot 11 - Adjourned to 12/19/05 at request of applicant;

6. GSX Builders (Kern Property), 380 Cedar Lane, Block 1505, Lots 32 & 32.01 - Subdivision - Mr. Jacobs of Jacobs and Bell, Esq. represented the applicant and recalled the history of the property. About five years ago the Kern Family sold off a lot to the easterly land, and in the course of that application to take off one lot, it was determined that two lots merged together, and we had two houses on one lot, and they had to get a minor subdivision to have the two houses on separate lots. At that time, they indicated they would be coming in in the future years with a subdivision for three lots so the Board would be aware. They are now coming before the Board in a major subdivision to create three building lots, with five variances, three of which are not created by the subdivision. There are existing non-conformities in terms of lot width and side yard set back, and both deficient in lot width. Lot 32.01 is deficient in lot area. Ms. Sapuppo indicated it is also lacking in lot width, etc., and Mr. Jacobs stated they are non-conformities. He had a contract builder, and was asked if he had a planner. Mr. Kaufman's opinion was when seeking variances you should offer planning testimony.

At that time Mr. Jacobs called Gary Sather, 34 Woods Road, Chester NY, who was sworn in. He is the principal stockholder of the contract purchaser, the applicant. He constructed a house to the East on Spring Street several years ago. His contract is contingent upon getting this subdivision. Mr. Jacobs asked him to describe the houses. They will be similar in size, 4,500 - 5,000 sq. ft., of stone and stucco, could be \$1.3 to \$1.5 million in today's market.

The matter was opened to the public for questions of Mr. Sather. Lorraine Stanley, 410 Cedar Lane, did not understand the macadam area. The response was that it would be removed.

Ron Jacobs, adjoining property owner, Lot 30.01, has enjoyed privacy and only sees a marginal number of trees along his property line and was wondering if they were going to do more. Mr. Jacobs stated at this point there is no plan to provide further landscaping than what is shown. None of the trees along the property line would be removed. Ron Jacobs asked if more could be planted. Mayor Paschalis suggested this could be taken up with the planner. There were no further questions of Mr. Sather.

Chris Lantelme, Civil Engineer and Land Surveyor, was sworn in, qualified and accepted. He prepared the plans and stated the recitation by counsel was accurate. Mr. Jacobs stated they are not proposing any improvements on Cedar Lane. Mr. Koons recalled in the history of this application, the Board requested curbs and sidewalks on Cedar Lane and would be looking for same on this application. Mr. Jacobs inquired as to a contribution to any sidewalk fund, but there was none. Mr. Goldman commented he was also not in favor of this without curbs and sidewalks. Mr. Koons commented their planner could take this up. Mayor Paschalis moved for Mr. Hakim to do a study of this, seconded by Mr. Carillo and carried unanimously. Mr. Jacobs said they would hold off on a planner until after Mr. Hakim's report. Mr. Kaufman advised Mr. Hakim would be reporting on their planner's testimony and presentation.

Mr. Carillo commented this is an incomplete application as it is. They should prepare a general description of what is going on and how it would affect the neighbors. Mr. Kaufman said the planner must give testimony as to the positive and negative criteria.

Mr. Jacobs requested it be carried to 12/19/05, provided they get their planning report, and if not ready, they would call the Board. Mr. Kaufman announced the matter was carried to the 12/19/05 meeting with no further notice required.

7. Blue Hill Estates, 719 Orangeburgh Road, Block 202.01, Lots 9 & 15.01 - Subdivision Sketch - Adjourned to 12/19/05 at request of applicant;

Closed Session Discussion: None

(RVPB 11/21/05 Minutes)

Payment of Invoices: None

Adjournment: On motion made, seconded and carried, the meeting was adjourned at 11:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary R. Verducci, Paralegal
Recording Secretary