

**KINGWOOD TOWNSHIP
BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT**

**May 13, 2015
MINUTES
7:30 PM**

M.L. Haring, chairperson, called the meeting to order, at 7:30 pm.

PRESENT:

D. Hewitt	C. Ostergaard, alt
M.L.Haring	D. Pierce, atty
P. Stepanovsky	J. Laudenbach
B. Wilson, sec	T. Ciacciarelli
C. McBride	T. Decker, eng
L. Frank	C. McGroarty, planner

ABSENT:

In order to ensure full public participation at this meeting, all members of this Board, and members of the public are requested to speak only when recognized by the Chair so that there is no simultaneous discussion or over- talk, and further, all persons are requested to utilize the microphones which are provided for your use by the Township. Your cooperation is appreciated.

The 48 hour requirements of the Sunshine Law have been met. Notice of this hearing has been advertised in the Democrat. Copies of this notice were posted in the Kingwood Township Municipal Building and filed with the Municipal Clerk. The Board of Adjustment proceedings close at 10:30 pm.

MINUTES:

The April 8, 2015 minutes was approved with a motion by D. Hewitt, seconded by C. McBride. On roll call to vote.

**Aye: L. Frank, C. McBride, J. Laudenbach, D. Hewitt,
P. Stepanovsky, T. Ciacciarelli, M. L. Haring**

Abstain: None

Absent: None

RESOLUTION:

None

NEW BUSINESS:

Delaware River Tubing- BL6, L21 – Use and Bulk Variance, Preliminary/Final Site Plan
Michael Hoffman, from Lanciano & Assoc., LLC, is the attorney representing DRT.

David Pierce - Mary Lou – he has reviewed the Affidavit of Publication and Service. He noted that there is one typographical or error in the notice. It had the date of the meeting correct as May 13, 2015. The day of the week noted was Tuesday instead of Wednesday. The applicant submitted proof of mailing of a notice, and an additional letter to all the notice recipients advising them that the date was correct, but the day of the week should be Wednesday. Notices were posted at both doors at the township building yesterday to alert people who might show up on Tuesday. Mr. Hardcastle was here last evening in case anyone appeared so that they would be informed that the meeting was today. In addition, the address of the Municipal Building was incorrect but that is on the form posted on the township website and is not an error by the applicant. It's his opinion that the errors in the notice are not severe enough to void jurisdiction for the Board to open the hearing, but it's ultimately the Boards determination as to whether it feels comfortable doing that and if it does the applicant is proceeding at its own risk.

Mr. Hoffman – just for the record **EXHIBIT A-1** in their application is the affidavit of publication. **EXHIBIT A-2** – Certified mail receipts which Mr. Pierce has reviewed. **EXHIBIT A-3** – Letter from Mr. Hoffman to the people within 200 feet pointing out the error in the notice, pointing out the correction and confirming the address of the Municipal Building, this was sent by ordinary mail and in addition they FedEx it in a manner that it would be dropped off at their door and didn't require a signature – non of the ordinary mail came back as refused.

C. McBride made a motion to accept Mr. Pierces recommendation to exercise jurisdiction and open the hearing, seconded by J. Laudenbach. On roll call to vote.

**Aye: L. Frank, C. McBride, J. Laudenbach, D. Hewitt,
P. Stepanovsky, T. Ciacciarelli, M. L. Haring**

Abstain: None

Absent: None

D. Pierce – One other thing before we begin the presentation, P. Stepanovsky has indicated that he is acquainted with friends with one of owners of a property within 200 feet of the applicants property. They're not best friends but they are acquaintances. He (David) does not believe that this rises to the level of a conflict of interest that would require Peter to recuse himself. Everybody here knows a lot of different people in the township but he wants to place that on the record and if the applicant has any objection to that make that noted now and they can address it.

Mr. Hoffman – No objection.

Mr. Hoffman stated that they are pressed for time because they need to open in the middle of June for their season. He's going to move rather quickly and not speak as much. He's going to present various witnesses and the first will be their professional engineer to talk about the site plan; the second will be Mr. Troutman to talk about traffic; Mr. Kurtz will talk about the site in terms of environment and Mr. Crance who is the principal of DRT (applicant) and also Mr.

Battimelli who owns the parcel and their professional planner Miss McKenzie.

Gregory Crance and Mateo Battimelli were sworn in by David Pierce.

C. McBride – Mr. Pierce, Mr. Decker gave us a significant amount of information on this, when will we be reviewing this, at the end of the testimony or before.

D. Pierce – He would suggest at the end of the testimony or at the end of various points of the testimony. For instance, now we will have testimony about the site plan and it might be appropriate to review that at the end of the engineers testimony. Questions about the operation might be best held until after Mr. Crance and Mr. Battimelli have provided testimony. He would suggest that you have at least some testimony from the applicant before you dive into those issues.

Mr. Hoffman – Each of his professionals will address point by point.

C. McBride – Madam Chairperson, he would like to know if we have the right expertise on the BOA and the Engineer and the Township Planner to address any of the issues like traffic, waste-water and any of the other issues that Mr. Decker brought up in his letter.

D. Pierce certainly believes that Tom as a licensed professional engineer has reviewed 100's of these types of applications and he's fully familiar with the waste-water and storm-water regulations and how to engineer for those and the traffic as well.

C. McBride – OK.

Eric Rupnarain, professional engineer, was sworn in by David Pierce. He stated that he's been a licensed PE since 2003, gave his educational background, is licensed in NJ and Pa., has testified before many Boards in NJ and has qualified as an expert in excess of 100 times.

M.L. Haring – He's accepted as an expert.

E. Rupnarain – **EXHIBIT A-7 / Sheet 1** – Engineering **Cover Sheet** depicts general information- who the owner and applicant is and where the project is located. There's a typo error on Sheet 1 noting Sheet 2 as the **Demolition Plan**—but it's actually the existing conditions. **EXHIBIT A-8/Sheet 2 – Existing Conditions**, shows the project location, existing physical features on the site and some topography on the property. Along the northerly section of Route 12 is where the existing Arties Tavern is located. The southeasterly corner of the tavern is within the existing DOT right-of-way for Route 12. Also, behind Arties Tavern is shown the existing paved parking area as a solid line that extends from Route 12 in the easterly direction and runs into the property and around the back of the tavern and exits back onto Route 12 on the westerly section. The existing paved driveway access is located in that area and ingress and egress to Arties. The existing pavement runs towards the rear of the property. This entire area here is all parking and there's a two way exit onto Route 12 that's located on the westerly side of Arties.

C. McBride – Previously we used a pointer on the map. This is very hard to relate from this angle. Yes, that would be better.

E. Rupnarain pointed out the existing location of the well and septic on the site - shown on **EXHIBIT A-9/Sheet 3 – Site Plan**,

Mr. Hoffman explained, for expediency purposes, that they changed **Sheet 3** in the right hand quadrant for the parking area – looks like 179 spaces and was originally depicted as 187 spaces and the aisles ran more south. They switched it so the aisles run east-west, they need some spaces and they'll explain why through the testimony, it's based on review letters and concerns regarding erosion. Referring to **EXHIBIT A-9/SHEET 3**.

E. Rupnarain handed out hard copies of the revised sheet. (**EXHIBIT A-9/SHEET 3**)

E. Rupnarain described **EXHIBIT A-9/SHEET 3** starting with the tavern in the center and going counter clock wise around the site. He pointed out the existing Arties Tavern, parking for Arties immediately to the rear has been striped and also the parking in this section of the parking lot has been striped. The remainder of the parking has not been striped along the westerly edge and the area to the south. (It's all paved hard surface parking that could be utilized for Arties as needed) Route 12 is a one lane in the westerly direction and two lanes in the easterly direction. The traffic normally enters Arties through the easterly entrance and they can also enter Arties through the westerly entrance. Most enter Arties through the easterly entrance travel up the pavement around the back and exit along the westerly entrance. Both driveways are ingress and egress. The map shows where the existing septic is located for Arties (southwesterly corner of the tract)

and the existing well. The proposed DRT will not impact the existing well or septic system. The operation does not require generation or connection to the existing well for any of it's water needs nor septic for sanitary needs. The applicant is proposing to utilize the existing grass field to the rear of the paved parking area, and also the area to the east which is vegetated for parking purposes and some staging of the equipment and buses that are used for DRT. They show approximately 179 parking spaces and access will be provided from an existing stone area right off of the existing pavement. Access to the field will be delineated and it's not demarcated presently but their proposal is to mark this area using traffic cones to limit entering the field for parking purposes to that area. Traffic, cars, patrons to DRT will park in this section of the parking lot. Showed where they will stage the operation. They will be alternating/staging the area where cars will be parked to minimize the impact to the vegetative surface. The darker spaces represent where the buses will be staged when not in operation. The buses will be on this property during their operation from June through September. All the equipment, buses etc. will be removed from the site at the end of the season. To the north of where the buses are – these are the boats also used by DRT. They are proposing 14 portable toilets of which 1 will be ADA accessible - (placed to the north of the property). They are submitting a proposal to the Health Department even though currently there are no health restrictions or requirements for portable toilets. Once this parking area fills up (one showing 179 spaces) then they will utilize the westerly parking area (102 spaces). In talking with the applicant they feel that the westerly parking area would be used primarily for the weekends. Exiting from the two parking facilities

will be delineated by using cones so everyone knows where they're supposed to travel. They met with the HCSCD and what they have requested, and the applicant has agreed to do, is to install a stabilized exit to minimize tracking of mud on the pavement and highway. At the close of the season the applicant will inspect the property and the fields and re-establish the vegetation where needed within two weeks at the end of the DRT season. That would leave about two months of growing for the vegetation to re-establish itself. The map shows depictions of tents and storage areas. In the front adjacent to the paved area they have the kayak and raft storage area and the customer waiting and bus pickup which will take them to the river. They also show tube storage areas in the back and several other tents that are depicted on the property for various uses that DRT will have. The tents are all portable and at the end of the season they will be removed and taken off the site. The buses that will pick up the patrons and take them down to the river will enter the site through the easterly entrance and exit from the westerly driveway on to Route 12. Jay Troutman, traffic expert, will testify regarding access and circulation on this facility.

M.L. Haring – the buses where they're parked in the staging area to pick up patrons – are they actually parked in the parking spaces for Arties?

E. Rupnarain – No, the staging area that he referred to earlier is in the open field. DRT has 11 or 12 buses and on a weekday basis they do not expect to have all the buses in operation.

M.L. Haring – What she is referring to is right below where it says kayaks.

E. Rupnarain – Right now that is the only access that they have in circulating through the property.

M.L. Haring – There needs to be an alternate pick up spot if all those spaces were utilized for a big event at Arties.

Mr. Hoffman – Madam Chair, from the review letters we see that as an issue and a couple other things. If Mr. Rupnarain could just explain this part of the site plan and he (Mr. Hoffman) will interject at that point and discuss some of the issues and Madam Chair's comments.

E. Rupnarain noted a portion of the property that has no vegetative screening whatsoever along Route 12 and they are proposing to plant a double row of evergreen trees about 6 to 7 feet tall.

E. Rupnarain stated that there's an existing non conformity that's not going to change by the applicant and that's the section of Arties that exists within the right of way line. The ordinance requires a 100' setback and clearly they're in the right of way. They're not adding to the building and it's not going to be exasperated in any way but requires a variance from the Board.

Mr. Hoffman – It's in the right of way but it's on the grass area literally, not in the roadway.

E. Rupnarain – It's in the vegetative shoulder of the highway.

E. Rupnarain stated that they are planning to utilize the existing shed located on the property and that requires a variance because it's going to be used as the office space for DRT and is going to become a second principal use or principal building on the site. He pointed to the location of the shed on the map. This property is located within the scenic overlay zone (Planners letter) which requires a 240' front setback line and within that setback there are no improvements or structures that are allowed within that zone, so what the applicant is proposing, the 240' setback puts them at approximately this location (pointed to map) – there's a dash-line you can see on the plans and that is the 240' setback and they are proposing parking in that area and the existing storage shed will be located in that area. The parking area requires a variance for front setback.

Mr. Hoffman for the record the 240' scenic overly encompasses half the parcel, correct.

E. Rupnarain, Correct.

E. Rupnarain believes he's identified all the variances required.

Tom Decker, besides the variances we also have buffers, pavement required for parking area etc. are we going to get into those as well? So, the variances that were just identified are not all of the variances and relief the applicant is seeking.

Mr. Hoffman, correct.

C. McBride – so effectively the shed becomes an office building, correct?

Mr. Hoffman, correct.

C. McBride – so doesn't an office building of that nature need electricity, water etc.?

Mr. Hoffman, correct. The issues he sees that Board members identified here is this shed or office as he has seen the pictures and will mark them for the Board. It looks like a shed but has a window air conditioning unit, several windows, a door and has been used as an office.

C. McBride, so we cannot refer to it as a shed, it doesn't have a tractor in it, it has people working a business, an office.

Mr. Hoffman, correct. It's a structure and we have to address it the same.

C. McBride, so when will you address the requirements that an office building has to have.

Mr. Hoffman , we're doing that at the moment. The issues obviously are this- concern to the use of con-age to show the path of the vehicular traffic; issues regarding the surrounding borders whether or not there's enough vegetation there.

E. Rupnarain stated that the property drains in several directions and this section of the property drains down towards the highway- this section, a portion of it, drains towards the rear and then

the front portion here drains towards the highway. What they've done as part of the re-configuration of this parking lot, they wanted to locate the actual aisles that will see most of the traffic and would have most of the impact on vegetation when it's being used for parking to run not perpendicular to the contours, but to run along the contours. What it does as cars drive down the aisles, more or less, following the contour, in this case, you can't follow the contour exactly. Normally, where you typically have the aisles going parallel to the contours it creates a terracing effect. The grass areas are going to be the least impacted on the site. The most impact will be on the aisles and parking area and main access to and from the parking area. By this plan change any erosion and potential effect on any properties will be mitigated because the existing vegetation along the perimeter and within the parking stalls themselves will serve as an interceptor to prevent sedimentation from washing or eroding the property. The grade on the parking for 179 cars, to the eastern side of the parcel runs south north generally. The other parking for 102 spaces, the grade runs east west generally.

Mr. Hoffman stated that they discussed silt fencing - (wooden with the fabric) that sometimes you see on construction sites or in a agricultural setting. They want to use the silt fencing to delineate the use that DRT is going to engage in from that of a tavern and further to mark the aisle ways and flow of traffic to delineate between vehicles and pedestrians. It's not on the plan but they will submit another plan.

E. Rupnarain stated that silt fencing is typically used on construction sites where there's massive amounts of soil disturbance. With the amount of silt fencing they're proposing he has no concern whatsoever that sediments will leave the property.

Mr. Hoffman stated that all the parking is supervised significantly by DRT employees and Mr. Crance will talk further about that. The other discussion that they had, and certainly make this a condition, is the striping issue, if they're seeking a variance from any bituminous surface and they'll want to park on this existing grass area given the agricultural endeavors of the owner of the parcel who will speak to that. What was discussed with Mr. Rupnarain was placing the striping, of the width of each parking spot, on the silt fencing so that the driver can see where they are supposed to maintain the width of their car within that boundary. So instead of the striping on the ground they'll be striping on the silt fencing. They're looking for a 9 foot width as opposed to 10 feet. They're going to make sure that when the operation ceases for the day the cars are gone and this will be done by individuals and signage. You cannot use the parking for DRT for the use of the tavern. The tavern patrons have to park in the bituminous concrete area.

Mr. Hoffman – Your thoughts (Mr. Rupnarain) on the 9' vs 10' parking spaces.

E. Rupnarain stated that normally most other ordinances within the State of New Jersey and other municipalities that he has practiced in and prepared commercial site plans – typical requirements are 9'x18' for the most part, our ordinance is a little bit more conservative with the 10'x20' requirement. They believe that someone coming, parking and going to be gone from the site for 3 to 4 to 5 hours and then coming back is more than adequate for this type of parking needs. They are seeking a design waiver from the ordinance for that particular requirement. They feel their design is adequate.

D. Hewitt asked - Employees how many and where do they park?

Mr. Hoffman stated that the silt fencing will be there prior to season and will be removed at the end because the owner of the property intends to grow hay there and he will testify to that.

Mr. Hoffman asked Mr. Crance the number of employees supervising the site and where do you anticipate them to park.

Mr. Crance stated that on weekdays, in the parking lot, 1 to 2 employees.

M.L. Haring – How many total employees do you have?

Mr. Crance stated the following: **Total employees weekdays - 20 to 25.**
Total employees weekends - 55 to 60
Employee cars weekdays - 10 to 15
Employee cars weekends - 20 to 25

Mr. Crance stated that there always will be an attendant for the parking and no cars will be parked by themselves and wandering around the fields.

Mr. Hoffman – The parking is orchestrated.

Mr. Crance – Yes – 100%.

Mr. Crance stated that last year the employees parked along the westerly edge of the pavement and he imagines that this year it would be the westerly edge of the overflow parking lot but it has not been discussed. All the employees will not be situated on this parcel, some will be by the rivers edge, hot dog stand, bus drivers moving around, ticket booth, person by the tubes and one person in the parking lot. Approximately 15 employees on this parcel on a weekday. The number would increase for the weekends.

C. McBride – He don't think we're concerned as much about the number of employees as where the employees are out in the field or parking. You have already told us and gotten a variance for another lot where you're prohibited from having any vehicles parked, so they would have to be up here, so we need to see how many people you're going to be having there and you can't use the paved area for that.

Mr. Crance stated that there will be less cars than there are employees because some employees are dropped off.

Mr. Hoffman stated on the next plan they will depict where the employees would park at a peak time, where they have 55 to 60 on weekends and holidays and the number of cars the employees would have at a peak time.

D. Hewitt – He didn't see anything.

C. McBride – Mr. Pierce/Mr. Decker is there a formula that is used for a business that has 50 employees - how many cars they would have?

D. Pierce stated that it's generally based on the size of the building or employees.

T. Decker, right, or in the case of the tavern. The taverns parking is required to be one space per 3 seats in the tavern. That one space per 3 seats already builds in the factor of kitchen staff and employee parking, so typically when your looking at a parking demand for a site and what the standards are it's usually built in there. It's the same thing with a church that requires one space for every three seats in a church and that takes into account the pastor, Sunday school, Sunday school teachers and things like that. This use, as far as he knows, there are no standards for this type of facility. Mr. Troutman will correct him if he's wrong when it's his turn.

T. Decker stated that he does have some questions regarding some of the testimony that was provided. With regards to the parking, the outer loop – the travel way, every car that enters either one of those parking lots is going to travel through that area, correct?

E. Rupnarain – Correct.

T. Decker – as proposed, OK. Including the buses at time of storage at the end of the day and the morning when there leaving?

E. Rupnarain – Correct.

T. Decker – The boats that are shown there, there are trailers I assume that will be dropped off.

E. Rupnarain – Yes.

T. Decker – So that loop road and the aisles are going to experience the most amount of disturbance from vehicular traffic, correct?

E. Rupnarain – Correct.

T. Decker – Does the applicant ever have group buses come to the site?

Mr. Crance – Yes.

T. Decker – And where would they park?

Mr. Crance – Usually a group bus typically comes on a weekday and at this time it's not on the map because some of the stuff wasn't discussed recently. He would assume it would be on the western north side of the overflow parking because typically there wouldn't be any cars over there.

Mr. Hoffman stated they will depict the group bus parking on the new plan.

T. Decker asked Mr. Crance if the former shed now office – how long has that been on the site?

Mr. Crance – That was brought last June – so almost a year.

T. Decker – And that came from your other site at the roller rink?

Mr. Crance – Yes.

T. Decker – Were there permits issued for it?

Mr. Crance – No.

T. Decker – Now I have more that goes back to the silt fence and soil erosion. Thank you very much.

Mr. Hoffman stated that he will address the shed/office.

T. Decker asked how high is the silt fence?

E. Rupnarain – In this particular case they're looking at something that's 12-18" high and 24" wide.

T. Decker – So something that people can step over, trip over or whatever.

E. Rupnarain – Something that allows you to see over.

T. Decker stated that orientation of the existing contours on the plan, it doesn't show very well. He doesn't know if they can pull up the existing features.

Mr. Hoffman – If the Board agrees that the silt fence should be a greater height, they'll certainly do that at the recommendation of the professionals.

T. Decker – The contours by the easterly parking lot are going in a up-down orientation, correct?

E. Rupnarain – Correct.

T. Decker – When you place silt fence on a construction site, how do you usually set silt fence?

E. Rupnarain – On a construction site you would typically face them toward the contour.

T. Decker – So, basically the alignment that those contours have is basically where you would put silt fence on a construction site to intercept silt.

E. Rupnarain – Typically.

T. Decker – So, going down the middle of those parking aisles where you're proposing to put the silt fence is actually more perpendicular to the contours than it is along the contours.

E. Rupnarain – Correct.

T. Decker – So, it's ability to capture any of the silt sediment is negated because the flow is actually going parallel to the silt fence.

E. Rupnarain – There's some truth to what your saying. However, you have to keep in mind the sediment that we expect this property to generate is not or close to what a construction site would generate. The silt fence will be perpendicular to the contour. If you were to look further to the northeast and southeastern part of the property the contours are now running more or less diagonally to the parking area.

Mr. Hoffman – And for the record, the gradation is kind of like a crescent moon – north to south, top to bottom. We would be capturing more of the runoff this direction from Route 12 and the rear. They can't pitch it directly to the contour so they picked the concern for the driveway here and the right of way of Route 12. They don't believe there's a significant erosion issue from DRT.

C. McBride – You testified earlier that you speculated that the flow of the waste-water would be in a certain direction. Did you observe that at any point since this business was in operation last year.

E. Rupnarain – Last year, No.

C. McBride - So, you have no photographs or evidence that shows that the flow of the water is going to go the way you think it is and it's not going to get re-routed by car tracks or anything like that.

E. Rupnarain – That's correct.

C. McBride – So, when the water goes across the area where the buses are stored for a period of time during the week or they may be stored for several days if it's stormy weather and it then combines with oil and all that kind of stuff, then it becomes waste-water at that point. What does the silt fence have to do with that if there's oil, antifreeze or anything like that in it.

Mr. Hoffman – May I refer that question to Mr. Kurtz, our Environmental Professional?

T. Decker – I would think it would be appropriate for environmental.

E. Rupnarain – His opinion and testimony is based on the field data that his office has acquired through the site.

C. McBride – But you could have had data because this business was opened last year.

E. Rupnarain – That's correct.

C. Crance – They're open typically 95% of the time in nice weather and if they see a storm coming in advance they won't even open. He has never seen any run off, off the grass or the driveway or any soil erosion at all. The only times it's ever rained with cars there is when they get caught when it rains in the middle of the day and there's nothing they can do about that. There's no servicing of the buses on the property and where the buses sit is very flat.

M. Battimelli – He observed the day to day operation of Delaware River Tubing and didn't see any soil erosion on to the black top at all. There really isn't anything to notice, the water is going to flow where it flows and if the dirt was mixed into the water, yes, he could see sediment but when it's raining there's water everywhere. No ponding, it's pretty dry. He sees no erosion from the water run off. He was surprised there was hardly any ruts just some grass that got killed from the cars in the aisle way that kept driving on it and like Greg said when it's raining they weren't operating. Before Greg starts up they are going to be harvesting some hay. There's hay everywhere where the blacktop isn't, from the rear of the tavern to the rear of the property. They're going to try to harvest the hay when they can. He will do the harvesting himself. They've owned the parcel about 4 or 5 years and have harvested hay every year.

D. Hewitt – Why was the silt fence not proposed around the exterior driveway which is getting the most traffic.

E. Rupnarain – As part of the revision there will be actually two rows of silt fence to the exterior drive. The dash lines represents the driveway that will have silt fence along the entire stretch.

T. Decker – Again, with regards to the silt fence. Typically, on a construction site, it's used when ground is opened up and keeps sediment from going off the site. However, it's also policed by the HCSCD on a regular basis. They go out and make sure the silt fence is still buried 6 inches into the ground, the stakes are in properly and it's standing up right. His concern is, how do we police this? How does this get policed? How is the township assured the silt fence is going to be maintained properly etc.? The town doesn't have the resource to go out and inspect every few weeks to make sure it's in place and he's not sure if it's HCSCD intent as well. The other question is your taking down the fence every year and putting it up every year. How is that going to be evaluated every year to make sure the fence is being put where it's supposed to be placed and the parking spaces don't start growing or re-orientated or relocated on different parts of the property. One of reasons why ordinances have required pavement in parking is to delineate those areas so you don't have to police them as much, and they don't grow without you really knowing it, and to provide stability for the ground etc. His concern is, yes, it's a seasonal operation but it's a permanent seasonal operation, this will be like this every year if the variances are approved. So, he just wants to caution the Board that this is something that is not just built and we leave it alone, it's gonna require some kind of annual inspection at the beginning of the year, at the end of the year and perhaps during the season to make sure that things are being maintained.

M.L. Haring – If the land is not prone to erosion is the fencing mandatory, is it necessary?

T. Decker – He was out at the site on March 31st and he could tell exactly where the loop road is because non of it was vegetated. That was March and now where going into the new tubing year that's not going to get any better. Those are his concerns.

M.L. Haring – Now, those were where the driveway was around the property.

T. Decker stated he has a bunch of pictures that was included in his letter. You can see some area out in the parking area where there's some erosion and where you exit the loop road on to the driveway coming out where they're proposing stone and stone going in. He has that concern that it's going to be a maintenance issue.

M.L. Haring – So, it's going to be a matter if the Boards going to require it.

T. Decker – There's no stability at all of the ground being proposed. He understands the desire to maintain it as a farm but they're also looking at an intense seasonal use, as well, for a three/four month period on a permanent basis.

Mr. Hoffman – 10 week plus or minus.

C. McBride – In your experience aren't these silt fences temporary?

T. Decker – Yes.

C. McBride – So, in theory what we're doing is we're making this semi permanent where people who are near to the property and there was construction going on there, lets say there was a variance to put another building up, the fence would be put up and would eventually be taken down and gone permanently.

T. Decker – Correct.

C. McBride – So, in this case it's going to be there every year and effectively it's going to look like a rat maze with all of the different paths that intend to be carved out. Is the intent of these fences to be there on a permanent basis in the construction industry?

T. Decker – No, there only supposed to be used temporarily during construction and replaced and repaired at the direction of the SCD when they make their routine inspections or by our office in town.

C. McBride – So, even if there was a concern about erosion that would constitute a need for these fences, it would be a permanent need for them and they're not designed to be a permanent fixture.

T. Decker – Correct.

C. McBride – Would you consider that even though the business is seasonal that the effect of the

intense business, in the 10 to 12 weeks, may constitute that if it's going to be put up there temporarily it should be up there permanently.

T. Decker – That's for the Board to determine.

M. L. Haring – Then you can't farm the land.

T. Decker – That's true. If it's up there permanently you wouldn't be able to farm the land.

J. Laudenschlager – Would improvements to the loop road with maybe gravel.

T. Decker – It would certainly help especially since that is the main drive that goes around. You also have when vehicles are going in to parking places you're turning your wheels and that creates erosion on the ground as well. There was discussion about 10x20 parking spaces vs 9x18. Many towns have the 10x20 requirement, in this case he would be hesitant to go to the 9' width only because there is no delineation out there, there's no striping and there is no control, whereas, a regular parking lot has striping and there's control, and 9x18 spaces work in a paved parking place because you have that delineation. He understands that there's going to be parking attendants but there's still somebody's idea of nine feet vs ten feet, and spacing between cars is two different things, and he knows he's gone to fields like this before and as much spacing as he can get between the car next to him he's going to take. Those are his concerns, but he really has concerns about the erosion of the loop, particularly the loop road and turning movements within. They may not be open on a rainy day but the ground is still going to be wet the next day. Some kind of stabilization within the travel way, whether it's gravel, grass pavers, something that would control erosion. Temporary parking is good for fairs, things like that that where you're going to restore immediately after. This is going to be a long term thing. He's concerned about stability, it's really up to the Board, but that's his advice.

Mr. Hoffman - The silt fencing is a temporary condition plus or minus 10 weeks.

E. Rupnarain – What the applicant is going to do is that they're going to have to get an annual certification from the HCSCD. What they'll do (HCSCD) is if there in the neighborhood they'll stop in check all the erosion measurements and make sure it's up and functioning. If there's a complaint they'll come out and do their normal inspection. That is part of the HCSCD approval. What the applicant can do at the end of the year, the district will perform an inspection as necessary to make sure of the restoration as required to maintain the hay fields. They can have the district inspect at that point in time after it's seeded and if they find it's acceptable the applicant is ready to proceed the next year. If additional seeding for stabilization is necessary then the applicant will have to take measurements to insure the vegetation restoration is completed in accordance with HCSCD regulations.

Chuck McGroarty for David Banisch – So, what happens, what's the consequence if your in violation, do they shut you down, do they have the authority to shut you down or do they fine you?

E. Rupnarain – Actually the district can do both. They (HCSCD) can issue a stop work or cease and desist order. The applicant can be stopped from utilizing the facility.

Chuck McGroarty – But at that point your done for the season, so whats gained by that.

E. Rupnarain – Certainly the applicant will do everything that he can to make sure he don't get to that point. The district didn't seem to be terribly concerned about any potential erosion. They just wanted the applicant to do certain things which was included on the plan – restoration measures at the end of the season.

David Pierce – He would like to put one thing in perspective for the Board and that is that the conversation and testimony is focusing on maximizing the current owners use of the property. It's great, it's wonderful that Mr. Battimelli farms it and raises hay, and that should be able to continue. However, he is choosing to make an application to allow this tubing operation on the property. The Boards focus should be on making sure the Board is satisfied, if it grants an approval, that the operations of the tubing business takes care of all the issues the Board is concerned about. The Board should not be concerned about whether Mr. Battimelli can continue to raise hay on the property or not, he is simply attempting to maximize his use and return of the property. The Boards focus should not be on adjusting this to make sure that Mr. Battimelli can continue to hay it. The Boards focus should be on the impacts and the new eras-ion of the impacts proposed.

L. Frank asked if there are any parking lots in town bigger than this?

Mr. Crance – There maybe, but he's not aware of all the different parking lots.

L. Frank – This is a pretty big lot here and you testified that basically your business is parking. Is this going to change the tax status on that lot?

David Pierce stated that he doesn't know if it's farmland assessed or not at this point, and it's really not germane to this application.

Mr. Battimelli stated that the land is not farmland assessed.

Mr. Crance stated that the whole parking lot would be utilized approximately 16 days of the season.

Mr. Hoffman stated they would put the silt fencing where the Board wants it or don't want it.

M.L. Haring – Mr. Crance, last year were you afforded the opportunity to use this whole tract for parking?

Mr. Crance – He's not sure he understands the question.

M.L. Haring – The way we see this 8 acres and all the parking, did you have use of all of that as

we see it. Did you have use of it all last year?

Mr. Crance – Yes.

Mr. Hoffman – To be clear – both the west side and the east side that we're proposing here.

Mr. Crance – Yes, we only used the west side a few times when they needed to on the overflow. Normally they stay on the east side.

M.L. Haring – Only because there were a couple of weekends when she was going to Frenchtown where there was so many cars they were actually parked in the grass between the building and highway and buses were waiting to come in. It was great hot 90 degree day. That's why she was wondering if they would see that again with the layout that he has for the parking now.

M.L. Haring – Between the bar and grill and the highway, right in front of the building. If there was such an influx of customers are you prepared to turn them away?

Mr. Crance stated he is prepared to turn them away and he has decided to adjust his pricing and marketing to taper off and not get so much of a crowd. He will get less customers and a little less revenue, less impact, that is the goal.

T. Decker asked how many parking spaces could the field over at the Frenchtown Roller Rink fit in. How many cars could you park?

Mr. Crance – The total number of parking spaces was roughly 300 spots.

T. Decker – And they had an off site location, correct?

Mr. Crance – Yes.

T. Decker – The parking spaces shown are they the same or fewer?

Mr. Crance – They are about the same.

D. Pierce appreciated Mr. Crances comments and stated that there are many other reasons to have the parking spaces paved or graveled. It will be the Boards decision.

D. Pierce is not commenting on the pluses or minuses of it. He just wanted to make sure that the Boards focus was on dealing with the impacts of the tubing operation rather than focusing on an effort to preserve the ability to hay the field because that's simply to benefit the property owner.

Mr. Hoffman stated that if this Board determines that the use of planting of the hay cannot co-exist with the parking and the tavern obviously they'll follow that determination and adjust accordingly.

D. Pierce – Mr. Hoffman you're not in any way going to limit the ability of Board members, our professionals or interested parties in the audience to ask questions related to this application. If you can't get it done in two meetings because of that, that's an issue with the application itself and it's going to be.....

C. McBride, so he wants to ask a question. Mr. Crance brought up a couple of issues about traffic, so he just wants to ask a question - when you bring your traffic people up are they talking about traffic on and off on Route 12 or are they going to talk about traffic inside the property or is traffic inside the property part of the site plan.

Mr. Hoffman it's one flowing condition.

C. McBride – The reason why he brought that up is because we just had a discussion with Mr. Crance about the overflow parking and denying access, but Mr. Crance doesn't have any idea if the car that is pulling up is coming in to have a cocktail or is coming in to ride down the river, so he's concerned that we brought that up now, this is the appropriate place to talk about it and then just with the layout of this oval and the person coming in to come into the place to go into the restaurant is faced with the back end of a bus on a Saturday afternoon.

Mr. Hoffman – The two issues that he hasn't spoken about yet is this office and these three buses queuing on the surface that exists that's used for tavern parking. He does have a consideration to discuss with his client about proposing a revised site plan that would remove this condition right here with the three buses queuing by way of bringing a pathway here so there would be complete divorcing of the buses from the tavern parking. Mr. Rupnarain will talk about storm-water management gravel issues.

E. Rupnarain - Many ordinances the way it's defined gravel can be considered as an impervious surface and DOT does not recognize gravel as an impervious surface. If they start adding gravel throughout the entire parking lot, the main travel aisle, if they exceed the impervious surface the applicant will be required to implement certain stronger measures. Those measures would include, storm-water detention, water quality treatment, remove solids from runoff which would take up more of the existing space. There are only a couple areas where that can be built on the site. Designing in the front would be better than designing in the back because in the back if the system fails the water has no place to go other than someone else's property. The other part of the property is off limits because of the well and septic system.

Mr. Hoffman- They would have appropriate signage directing the buses off of the bituminous parking. As proposed they don't believe those two uses will conflict on one another. Because the buses are heavy they would propose gravel for the bus traffic off the bituminous surface, correct.

E. Rupnarain – Correct.

Mr. Hoffman – They can do gravel and stay out of storm-water management in terms of total coverage and for the cars they would use a similar feature as this giving a constructive structured stabilized exit.

Mr. Crance will have a person at the ingress directing traffic.

T. Decker – Question - one consideration that he has looking at this was separating the buses from the parking lot and that is rather than doing what they're suggesting have the buses pull off so they go around that outer loop and pick people up just before that gravel exit into the parking area. That pulls them completely out of the parking lot except on their exit. If there's a concern about the buses interacting with the patrons coming in that's no different than what the situation was at Frenchtown Roller Rink where there was a common drive going into the site. You could have patrons peel off of that drive and go directly into the parking lot rather than going around the loop. It would be his recommendation that with bus traffic on this loop some stabilizing material be used on this common way

C. McBride – Mr. Rupnarain, if you look where the buses are settled here and parking - the buses have to go around that loop at least once to get to the parking area, so the buses are going to have to go by on that loop to get where they are stored, correct?

E. Rupnarain – That would only be used once a day.

C. McBride – So, the last phase of people are going out on their ride and there's like four bus loads of them, bus load one goes down and drops the people off at the drop off area, which we have buses only area for, come back up because the way it was designed and told on this Route 29 access, was all the equipment was going to be down there. They would come back up here and there might still be people coming in but the bus has no place to go because they don't have to go back down to pick up people for awhile and they can't be staying on Route 12 and they can't be staying at the other area because it's crowded down there. He thinks there's a flow issue here.

P. Stepanovsky – Mr. Crance why are buses parked in the east parking lot rather than the west parking lot?

Mr. Crance – For security purposes, but if you want them parked in the back in the west parking lot they can do that as well.

P. Stepanovsky – for him it would be a lot more correct if you put them on the east side because you're not going to use them all the time. The west would give you more parking spots.

Chuck McGroarty – Do the buses exit on that tracking pad at the base?

Chuck McGroarty – So, at that tracking pad then the bus will continue south through the parking lot, correct, to get out?

Mr. Crance – Yes.

Chuck McGroarty – What if there's cars parked there?

Mr. Crance – Those two or three parking spots would be removed or coned off.

Chuck McGroarty – So, your Site Plan would be revised to show that parking area to be striped out, eliminated.

Mr. Crance – He doesn't have an answer to that.

Chuck McGroarty – If he's a customer of the tavern and he parks there, then someone comes and tells him he can't park there because he's in the way of the buses.

Mr. Crance – They will address that any way the Board sees fit.

E. Rupnarain – The exit on to the pavement those parking areas will be temporarily striped non parking areas.

Mr. Hoffman – The apartments, if there are apartments, how many, if not, what is on that second floor of the structure.

Mr. Battimelli stated it has one unit, one apartment and right now they're using it as an office.

T. Decker – Question, there's a part of the ordinance that there's a maximum percentage of the lot area that can be parking, drives etc. and that's 30%. Do you have a percentage for the amount of this property that's encompassed by parking?

Mr. Hoffman – As proposed.

T. Decker – As proposed?

E. Rupnarain – He does not have that number right now.

T. Decker – The plans that were submitted he had scaled some areas and came up with about 45% - it's off by 15% so that would be a variance request that he assumes they would be looking for.

T. Decker – There's also a requirement for parking areas to your adjacent property lines and that would also be a variance.

Mr. Hoffman – Correct.

M.L. Haring there will be a quick 5 minute break.

M.L. Haring – We'll resume our meeting please.

Mr. Hoffman – Madam Chair – if it pleases the Board he would like to offer up his professionals to sit down with Mr. Decker and any other professionals, as the Board feels necessary.

M.L. Haring – That's totally Mr. Deckers discretion.

Mr. Hoffman - If he would welcome us so that they could have a give and take on the site plan and please the Board. He thinks that's the quickest way to cut to the chase under the circumstances, if he can accommodate them.

T. Decker – It's a difficult position to be in because there are so many items of the ordinance that require relief that he would be hesitant to meet with them and agree to anything and then come in and the Board not agree with.

C. McBride – He would object. He would not feel comfortable with that, there are too many items here.

T. Decker stated he would feel uncomfortable giving them any guidance, even if they came to an agreement with Chucks office and himself there's so much. We're not talking about an application where there in general compliance but they have some tweaks that they want to do and want to run it by us. There is very little of the ordinance that is actually being complied with with the application and he would be hesitant, he can't speak for Chuck, but he would be hesitant to give them any type of direction or agreement.

M.L. Haring informed Mr. Hoffman that at this point the Board and the professionals have given them enough input that they would have a pretty good idea of what the Board is looking for.

Mr. Hoffman – It was an offer to facilitate and he understands Mr. Deckers concerns they're certainly not precluded from a phone call and email.

T. Decker – He's certainly available but he don't want to find Chuck or himself in a position where we lead them down a garden path or hold them to a higher standard then the Board might without knowing what variances or relief the Board would grant.

Mr. Hoffman – He'll stipulate to this, if it's even necessary, and Mr. Pierce can comment on this, if at any point of time when his professionals speaks to the Boards professionals and a Board professional gives their opinion and then the Board doesn't follow it, he'll stipulate that that's without prejudice to any appellate process. He'd rather get this done with the least amount of effort and please the Board and the community than to litigate. At any point of time a Board professional expresses an opinion to his professionals and it doesn't follow through with the Board that's without prejudice to the Board.

T. Decker – He has a fairly lengthy letter and that's one of the reasons because there were a lot of questions and he wanted to get them out there for everybody ahead of time and for the applicant to address them as they feel comfortable.

Mr. Hoffman – The reason that the offer was intended was to discuss the path of the buses and flush that out and get that straight.

T. Decker – Obviously he would need to look at a plan but some of the concerns he has are the turning movements for the bus and he'd have to see that with the turning movements on a plan.

M.L. Haring asked Mr. Battimelli what the seating capacity is at Arties.

Mr. Battimelli – Approximately 50 to 60 in the dining room.

M.L. Haring – The total projected.

Mr. Battimelli – Between the dining room and bar area approximately 100 seats anticipated.

T. Decker – The plans state there are 70 seats for the existing tavern and an additional 80 seats can be utilized when live bands are performing at the site.

M.L. Haring – So that would be 150 and presently there are 60 parking spots.

T. Decker – They're saying and again it goes by the one space per three seats, so at 150 they would need 50 spaces, and their table they have 64.

Mr. Hoffman – And the ADA would be inclusive in the 64.

M.L. Haring – That's why she disagrees with the way they have the three buses within the parking lot with a notation, no parking in this area during tubing hours.

Mr. Hoffman – The direction is obvious they have to move those buses out of there.

Mr. Battimelli stated that he's opened during the week from two (2) pm to midnight, Saturday and Sunday from noon to two (2) am. Their earlier hours are very weak they don't have any lunch crowd, it's more in the evening when people come home from work.

T. Decker – How long have you been opened?

Mr. Battimelli – A month and a half.

T. Decker – He thinks he's in the middle of a couple of questions he has for the applicant. One was the coverage for the parking area and if they're over the 30% and if they would be seeking a variance for that – likely the answer was yes. Similarly, a variance for the buffers around the parking area in accordance with the ordinance, that's where they left off.

Mr. Battimelli stated that the general condition of the trees, shrubs and brush on the westerly border of the parcel is not continuous, there are some trees and they are more than four feet in height. He stated that it is dense and covers about 50%. He stated that tree quarters of the northern border is dense evergreens greater than four feet. 80% to 90% of the eastern side is covered with tall evergreen trees.

T. Decker – Are those trees on your property or the adjacent properties?

Mr. Battimelli – He believes there along the property line.

Mr. Hoffman – Straddling the property line would be the fair characterization?

Mr. Battimelli – Yes.

Mr. Battimelli – They did plant a bunch of trees around the driveway and building. In the front they put some evergreens along the driveway, more trees on the eastern side of the middle lane and in the back area with more evergreens to screen that from the highway.

Mr. Hoffman – He has pictures taken about 10 days ago by Mr. Crance and they Mr. Hoffman, Battimelli and Crance will run through them real quick.

EXHIBIT A-10

- a. Backborder (back side of property)
- b. Back left border -Northern property line. (pretty dense)
- c. Back left neighbor. (back left side)
- d. Back left border facing left.(back corner)
- e. Back lot border (northern border)
- f. DRT across Rte 12 (eastern side of building upper driveway on east side)
- g. Facing Arties from tube storage (westerly border- natural tree line in middle of the property)
- h. Facing Arties (across Rte 12 facing eastern side of building)
- I. Facing back border (office structure- shows antennae used for communication with buses)
- j. Facing back lot from Arties parking. (standing behind office facing tree line)
- k. Facing front of property Arties entrance. (taken from the back close to tubing)
- l. Facing left border from center.
- m. Facing left neighbor (looking from western corner)
- n. Facing left neighbor. (across the street to the east of building)
- o. Facing property (across from Rte 12 – eastern side of tavern)
- p. Facing right border. (far eastern property line)
- q. Facing right neighbor.
- r. Facing right neighbor (2) (standing in middle of the parking lot)
- s. Facing Rte 12.
- t. Facing tube storage.
- u. Left neighbor. (shows nearly half of auxiliary lot)
- v. Parking lot field.
- w. Rte 12 facing Arties.(shows entrance where the driveway comes in)
- x. Rte 12 facing exit (western side of tavern)
- y. Rte 12 facing office.
- z. Rte 12 facing parking. (front of building)

T. Decker – There was one of the far back left-back left neighbor. That's the back left neighbors house. Looks like the house is to the right. The reason he brought it up is if you can see the house from the site, the house can see the site and you're operating in the summer and that's

when most people will be outside, so that may be a location that needs some supplemental buffer planting. The other vegetation that you're looking at isn't on their property and their responsibility is to provide a buffer on their property and it's a 50' buffer. (northwest corner)

M.L. Haring – Okay-it's 10:30.

P. Stepanovsky – Why are you making this driveway all the way around the property like that instead of going straight back.

P. Stepanovsky – You could really cut a lot of ground out if you went straight back and around.

C. McBride – Since there's going to be a lot of re-working done to this, we're going to see a brand new diagram next month, and he thinks there's still a lot of issues that the Board hasn't gotten to yet. He thinks there's question about ADA parking spaces. ADA parking spaces for their part of the business. Where are they going to be? They have to be on hard surfaces, portable toilets you say are going to be ADA, is there going to be a hard path going back to them. Any wheelchair access has to be on hard surfaces. You can't wheelchair on the bumpy ground.

Mr. Crance – Typically they call ahead, but when it comes to wheelchairs, wheelchairs cannot go on the river.

C. McBride – Don't forget not only are we talking about people going on your rides but they may be employees. You have to be neutral too whether or not they can get on to your boat because they may want to be an employee.

Mr. Crance – We'll address all those issues.

C. McBride – One of the things he's seeing here and based on the number of people you get per vehicle he don't think the Board is going to accept using the small parking spaces. You gotta go with the larger parking spaces. The parking spaces in the paved area have to all be marked and be regulation size and conform with Mr. Deckers recommendations about ADA, in both your part of the lot and the restaurant part of the lot and be all marked down and taken into account and spaces that are going to be lost, if your going to have access paths you gotta consider them to be permanently lost.

Mr. Hoffman – The other hot spot issue is the office and they'd like to get approval that would allow for an office if they can get the certificate of occupancy for bringing in electric, water, sewer if necessary and we need two exits etc. But in the alternative if they can't that done on the phase construction overtime, they obviously can't get that done before this season. If they can't get it done or don't want to it afterwards. The alternative to this we use electric registers so they would have a generator which they'll have testimony on, it's very quiet. They would generate electric to say some concession stands where people can take tickets. The other thing is maybe some portable structure that would be taken away at the completion of the season that they would deliver electric to but not necessarily water. Those are the two alternatives they are contemplating to the shed/office. They are asking the Board to approve them for an office there

as long as they can meet code, but if they can't they'll fall to one of those alternatives. A portable structure to serve as the office or stands with generate electricity to it or run electricity to it so they can use their electric cash registers.

C. McBride – Mr. Crance has pointed out that there has been an issue with leaving stuff out on that piece of property over the winter that shouldn't have been left there. Another piece of property that we heard a variance on that has items on it which had the same condition. We want to know if we're gonna give you a variance with a condition that nothing is gonna be on there, and if you can't conform with the variance the Board gave you already you'll have to build a better trust, if we approve, that that these conditions are going to be fulfilled.

Mr. Hoffman – He'll speak to Mr. Pierce, in between, to give you the added level of assurity with compliance, some affidavit that satisfies Mr. Pierce in language and topic that Mr. Crance would submit, either at the beginning or the end of the season, in terms of swearing to compliance and if he hasn't complied he's running the risk of hurting himself.

D. Pierce – Just a couple of issues. The first thing is the applicant has raised the possibility of having a special meeting. We haven't been able to find one but he wanted to see if they still wanted to pursue it because now would be the best time to poll the Board.

M.L. Haring asked the secretary if there was any date that they all agreed on.

B. Wilson stated she threw the paper away.

D. Pierce thinks the best date was June 9th which is the night before the next regular meeting. The problem is, if any Board member can't make it they wouldn't have the time to read the transcript. He wanted to raise that issue to make sure it wasn't something to do. He don't know that they're going to finish this at the June 10th meeting, we haven't even gotten through the site plan portion of it and there's still issues out there. Does the Board want to talk about a special meeting after that.

M.L. Haring – It doesn't sound like anyone's interested.

D. Pierce – The next thing is when you submit the revised plan it has to be here, at the township, at least 10 days before the hearing. The public is going to need a chance to review because we're talking significant changes. The professionals need a chance to review that. This is an application not only for a variance, but if the variance is granted for site plan approval as well there are a number of areas shown on this plan, tents, rafts, kayaks, storage supplies, there needs to be a lot more detail about those because if you don't know what the details are we've approved anything if an approval is granted and they can expand that contract it. We need the sizes of those facilities, the height, the dimensions, what's going to be there, the closures, more details.

M.L. Haring – Like right now it shows 10 tents. What do you need 10 tents for.

D. Pierce – And what are the sizes of the tents.

T. Decker thinks it also would be helpful to have the pedestrian traffic flow shown on there.

M.L. Haring – We would be assuming without it being indicated.

T. Decker – When you park the car where do you go from there, at that point, until you get on to the bus, so we can look at foot traffic etc. to the site.

M.L. Haring – The hearing is adjourned until June 10, 2015 and the applicant will re-notice.

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC:

John Mathieu asked about testimony next month and was told by David Pierce that there will be. He was told the hearing is adjourned to next month and the hearing hasn't been opened to the public yet and that would be hopefully next month. John Mathieu made the suggestion that the comments be permitted to cover the contents of the hearing.

Mr. Hoffman stated that anybody from the community that wants to reach out to his office to raise a concern or address an issue can certainly call or email him or Mr. Hardcastle.

John Mathieu made the suggestion if the applicant currently or in the future plans on having a fueling station put on the property for the buses. Another thing he would suggest that the applicant address, at some point, any plans to do anything on the property other than tubing, would they want to have on a rainy day games, rides etc. Is this only for tubing. Those are his two concerns.

COMMUNICATIONS/REPORTS:

Kingwood Township Minutes for February 18 & March 9, 2015 (Regular) & March 9, 2015 (Special Meeting).

Memo: Environmental Commission, dated May 1, 2015 – Re DRT – BL6, L21.

ADJOURNMENT:

C. McBride made a motion to adjourn, seconded by L. Frank. All in favor. Meeting adjourned at 10:49 pm.

Barbara Wilson
Secretary

