

**Borough of Highlands
Planning Board
Regular Meeting
April 13, 2006**

Mr. Stockton called the meeting to order at 7:43 P.M.

Mr. Stockton asked all to stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. Stockton made the following statement: As per requirement of P.L. 1975, Chapter 231, notice is hereby given that this is a Regular Meeting of the Borough of Highlands Planning Board and all requirements have been met. Notice has been transmitted to the Courier, the Asbury Park Press and the Two River Times. Notice has been posted on the public bulletin board.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Mr. Manrodt, Mr. Mullen, Mayor O'Neil, Mr. Bahrs, Mr. Urbanski, Mr. Schoellner, Mr. Gilson, Mr. Stockton, Mr. Harrison, Mr. Cefalo, Mr. Kovic

Absent: None

Also Present: Nina Light Flannery, Borough Clerk
Jaclyn J. Flor, P.E., Acting Board Engineer
Jack Serpico, Esq., Board Attorney

**PB#2006-1 Fleming, Daniel – Request to Reschedule P.H. to 5/11/06
Block 26 Lot 12 – 127 Highland Avenue**

Mr. Stockton stated that the Board received a written request from the applicant's attorney Michael Irene requesting a postponement of the public hearing to May 11, 2006. They further request that an announcement be made so that the applicant does not have to renotice to property owners.

Mr. Manrodt offered a motion to approve the request to postpone the Fleming Hearing to May 11, 2006 with no further public notice to individuals, seconded by Mr. Urbanski and approved on the following roll call vote:

ROLL CALL:

AYES: Mr. Manrodt, Mr. Mullen, Mayor O'Neil, Mr. Urbanski, Mr. Schoellner, Mr. Gilson, Mr. Cefalo, Mr. Stockton

NAYES: None

ABSTAIN: Mr. Kovic, Mr. Bahrs, Mr. Harrison

Mr. Stockton announced that this public hearing has been rescheduled for May 11th, 2006.

**PB#2005-4 Roslansky, Patrick
Block 11 Lots 16.02 & 19 – 91 ½ Portland Road
Approval of Resolution**

Mr. Mullen offered a motion to move on the adoption of the following Resolution:

**RESOLUTION EXTENDING THE TIME TO PERFECT THE MINOR
SUBDIVISION
GRANTED TO PATRICK ROSLANSKY AND ROBERT D. & MAUREEN
BIELITZ FOR BLOCK 11, LOTS 16.02 & 19**

WHEREAS, the applicants referred to above are the owners of the above mentioned lots, which lots are located in the R-1.03 Zone; and

WHEREAS, the applicants have applied for a Minor Subdivision with variances that was granted with conditions by the Board on August 11, 2005; and

WHEREAS, the Board adopted a written Resolution confirming the foregoing on September 8, 2005; and

WHEREAS, the MLUL requires the minor subdivision to be perfected within 190 days from the date the written Resolution was adopted by the Board unless there are extenuating circumstances that effectively prevent the perfection of the subdivision; and

WHEREAS, the applicants could not reasonably comply with the conditions of the approval before the expiration of the 190 days referred to above which would have been on or about March 17, 2006; and

WHEREAS, the applicants have requested an extension of the time within which to perfect the minor subdivision pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-47g.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Planning Board of the Borough of Highlands, for good cause being shown, that the application for an extension of time to perfect the minor subdivision is hereby granted for a period of 60 days from March 17, 2006, pursuant to the statute set forth above.

Seconded by Mr. Kovic and adopted on the following roll call vote:

ROLL CALL:

**AYES: Mr. Kovic, Mr. Mullen, Mayor O'Neil, Mr. Bahrs, Mr. Urbanski,
 Mr. Gilson, Mr. Stockton, Mr. Cefalo**

NAYES: None

ABSTAIN: None

**Highlands Board of Education
Long Range Facility Plan – Resolution**

Mr. Urbanski offered the following Resolution and moved on its adoption:

BOROUGH OF HIGHLANDS PLANNING BOARD

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has received from the Highlands Board of Education, the District's Five Year, Long Range Facilities Plan for the period of 2005 to 2010, under cover letter dated January 12, 2006, from Scott E. Mihalick, AIA, an Associate with the District's architectural planning firm SSP Architectural Group; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board pursuant to N.J.S. 40:55D-31b, is required to review all long range facilities plans prepared by the school district or board pursuant to the Educational Facilities Construction and Financing Act (i.e. N.J.S. 18A:7G-1 et al.), for the purpose of reviewing the extent to which the long range facilities plan is informed by, and consistent with, the land use plan element and the housing element contained within the municipal master plan and to further determine whether the prospective sites for school facilities contained in the long range facilities plan promote more effective and efficient coordination of school construction with the development efforts of the municipality.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Planning Board of the Borough of Highlands, assembled in public session on March 9, 2006, that the following findings and determinations are hereby adopted by the Planning Board:

1. The Board finds that it has the jurisdiction to act upon the review of the Specifications and the Plans pursuant to the Municipal Land Use Act of the State of New Jersey.
2. The Planning Board finds that the plans and specifications submitted are informed by and consistent with the land use and housing elements of the master plan of the Borough of Highlands.
3. The Planning Board does further find that prospective site(s) for school facilities contained in the plan promote the effective and efficient coordination of school construction with the development efforts of the Borough of Highlands.

Seconded by Mr. Mullen and adopted on the following roll call vote:

ROLL CALL:

AYES: **Mr. Kovic, Mr. Mullen, Mayor O'Neil, Mr. Bahrs, Mr. Urbanski,
Mr. Gilson, Mr. Cefalo, Mr. Stockton**

NAYES: **None**

ABSTAIN: **None**

**PB#2005-2 Johnson, William
Block 40 Lot 5 – 78 Navesink Avenue
Unfinished Hearing**

Mr. Stockton stated that the Board received a letter from Martin McGann dated April 10, 2006 which request that this matter be carried to the June 8th meeting.

Mr. Manrodt offered a motion to grant the request to postpone the public hearing to the June 8th meeting with the understanding that this is the last adjournment, seconded by Mr. Urbanski and approved on the following roll call vote:

ROLL CALL:

AYES: **Mr. Manrodt, Mr. Kovic, Mr. Mullen, Mr. Urbanski, Mr. Gilson,
Mr. Cefalo**

NAYES: **None**

ABSTAIN: **None**

**PB#2006-2 Branin, Gary
Block 48 Lot 3 – 39 Cornwall Street
Hearing on New Business**

Mr. Serpico stated that he has reviewed the public notice and he finds it to be in proper form therefore the board has jurisdiction to proceed on this matter.

Present: **Gary Branin
Mike Letteri, Esq.
James Goddard, Surveyor**

Conflict: **Mr. Gilson & Mayor O'Neil**

Mr. Letteri made a request to the board that Mayor O'Neil recuse himself from this application in light of some personal problems that the applicant and himself have had in the past.

Mayor O'Neil stepped down to accommodate the applicant's request.

Mr. Letteri – this property is located in the R-2.02 Zone. This is an uncomplicated erect straight forward application for some relief from the requirements of Ordinance O-99-11, known as the flood plain ordinance. He explained that in 2004 the Zoning Board granted the applicant two bulk variances, a rear yard and area coverage to construct an attached two-story garage with storage space on top of the garage. The resolution prohibits the garage from being used as living space. The applicant has constructed and completed the attached two-story garage, which he then shows a photograph (Exhibit photo board which was previously marked into evidence by the Zoning Board) of the completed garage. The applicants family is growing, their second child is on the way. The Zoning Board recently approved various bulk variances permitting the applicant to build a second story to provide three bedrooms for their children as well as a master bedroom suite. This approval is subject to relief being obtained from the Planning Board for meeting the flood plain requirements. The necessity was generated by Dave Gilson, FEMA Flood Plain Administrator which is in his letter dated January 27, 2006 which stated that the applicants project must conform to FEMA regulations regarding elevation. They are here tonight to obtain relief from meeting those regulations. In addition to the flood plain ordinance he is also in receipt of two letters from T & M Associates concerning various aspects of the flood plain ordinance including the granting of variances.

Mr. Serpico explained that the issue that is before the Planning Board is the relief from the flood plain ordinance.

Mr. Letteri - a (c) variance would be required since the lowest floor of the dwelling is below the base floor elevation, which is pre-existing. If the board grants the relief we are also asking that the board include this bulk variance.

Mr. Stockton stated that with regard to the flood ordinance is must be in place for a reason and he has questions with regard to when relief is granted is there an impact to the borough for granting relief.

Mr. Serpico explained that you would have to look at the impact to the borough and you have to look at the impact upon the flood plain ordinance, but to his knowledge there is no limitation on the quantities of this type of situation that can come before the board.

Mr. Mullen – can we get the benefit of the Flood Administrators point of view on that matter.

Mr. Gilson stated that he will testify about the program itself and if the program is altered in any way to give anybody relief that there is consequences to the program.

Mr. Serpico – the borough is going to have to call Mr. Gilson as a witness in this case and the applicants attorney will have the opportunity to cross examine.

Mr. Serpico swears in James Goddard, Land Surveyor.

Mr. Letteri begins to question Mr. Goddard.

Mr. Goddard stated the following during his testimony and response to questions from Mr. Letteri and the board:

1. He stated that he is a licensed Land Surveyor and then described his professional back ground. He works for himself and his company name is Land Controlled Services which is located in Long Branch, NJ.
2. He has prepared a Flood Elevation Certificate for the applicant which was then marked as **Exhibit A-1.**
3. The zone that the property would fall in under the flood insurance rate map is B-9 and the elevation is the base elevation which is 11-feet above sea level. So any thing below elevation 11-feet above sea level would be considered below the base flood elevation.
4. If the ordinance requires that any substantial improvement of any residential structure as set forth under 21-126 of the ordinance shall have the lowest flood elevated at a minimum of 1-foot above the base flood elevation. Then the applicant would have to bring his finished floor elevation to above 12-feet.
5. On the elevation certificate he indicated the following elevations and described them:
 - * Top of bottom floor (including basement and enclosure) he has 4.2-feet.
 - * Top of the next higher floor which is the first floor of the existing dwelling is at 7.8-feet, which is under the 12-feet flood elevation.
 - * Bottom of lowest horizontal structural member (V zone Only) is N/A because it is not in the V-zone.
 - * Attached garage (top of slab) is at 5.2-feet.
 - * Lowest elevation of machinery and or equipment servicing the building is at 7.8-feet which would be the furnace and such forth.
 - * Lowest adjacent (finished) grade (LAG) is 4.2-feet.
 - * Highest adjacent (finished) grade is 4.8-feet.
 - * Number of permanent openings (flood vents) within 1 ft. above adjacent grade is 7.

* Total area of all permanent openings (flood vents) in C3.h square inches is 1848 square inches of openings.

6. He then stated that he prepared the survey for the applicant dated 2/14/06 which was marked as **Exhibit A-2.**
7. The elevation of the garage floor slab with relationship to the crown of the road is the top of the curb would be roughly 4.10 so the crown of the road would be within one tenth of that.

Mr. Stockton asked if there were any members of the public who had any questions for the witness; there were none.

Mr. Letteri then called Mr. Gary Branin up to testify.

Mr. Serpico swears in Gary Branin, Jr.

Mr. Branin stated the following during his testimony and response to questions from Mr. Letteri and the Board:

1. He described the amount of flood vents on the property that on the house itself there is two on the garage side, three on the other side, there is two on the back part of the building which he showed them. He stated that the flood vents are about the size of a block. They are open all of the time and are not blocked off.
2. Mr. Letteri was correct in stating that the purpose of he and his wife wanting to build the second floor addition was to provide bedrooms for their growing family.
3. The original resolution from the Zoning Board permitted the construction of the garage which has been completed and the current Zoning Board resolution permitting the second floor addition is condition upon the Planning Board granting certain relief. The Zoning Board Garage Resolution prohibits any residential use of the garage. He does not intend to use the garage for any residential use. The second floor of the garage is storage space and there is no residential use on the garage second floor.
4. What good and sufficient cause for requesting the flood relief is that his family is growing and it was a tight quarter with two bedroom downstairs and a small kitchen and one bathroom and a small dining room and living room. They are looking to upgrade and they need the space in the upstairs of the structures for bedrooms because they have a child and another on the way. The space is very much needed for his family.
5. When he received approval to build the attached garage and the only reason that they didn't frame the attachment was because to roof lines needed a little more attention and was in the range of ten to fifteen thousand dollars and they pay that and have to just rip it off again to do the second story on the existing dwelling.

6. If he raises the existing bungalow then you would walk into the roof line of the existing garage, so then he would have to raise the roof of the garage or the second floor of the garage. That would take away from the look of the building which is aesthetically pleasing.
7. When he made the plans for the garage he was not aware that he had to comply with flood regulations.
8. His neighbor did work and did not have to comply with flood regulations.
9. The foundation for the attachment of the garage was approved.
10. His plans for the second floor addition are going to retain the same architectural style and design features of the garage.
11. The cost of lifting the existing structure would diminish the money that he has for the second story addition, so he would not have the money to put the second story on if required to raise the building.
12. Being required to raise the structure would be an exceptional financial hardship.
13. He then reviewed the plans for the project and described them to the board. This addition will increase the size of the kitchen, the dining room, provide a half of bathroom downstairs and the front of the existing structure would stay the same which is the living room and make a den and the front porch will be covered. The main part of the project is the second floor addition which will provide three bedrooms for the children and the master bedroom and bath, laundry room.
14. The foundation will not be changed.

Mr. Letteri stated that he feels that good and sufficient cause for granting the flood relief can be defined as bedrooms for a growing family.

Mr. Branin continued his testimony as follows:

15. He wants to have a variance from having to raise the first floor another 4.16-feet above the existing. Raising the house would be a hardship to him. He was going to raise the foundation of the back part of the building one foot.
16. The roof line if required to raise would not be aligned which he further described to the board.
17. The first floor in the back of the house will be raised to 8.8-feet and the boiler room there is a design that would have the mechanics at 12.8-feet.
18. He then described where the water came to in the flood of 1992 which was just below the top of the porch.
19. He will comply with all of the flood vent requirements.
20. He then responded to the items under Section 21-124D which are items for the board to consider in granting flood relief.

Mr. Serpico stated that perhaps an expert may be required to speculate as to what is going to happen in the future.

Mr. Branin continued his testimony as follows:

21. He does except his homeowners insurance to go up but he is not sure about how the flood insurance works. If his flood insurance rates are raised it does not matter he will still build the proposed.

The Board explained to the applicant that there could be a substantial increase in his insurance premiums.

Mr. Letteri stated that he does not believe that out of the eleven considerations under Section 21-124D he believes that items 4, 5, 6, 10 and 11 are not applicable to this application.

The Board requested to review the Board Engineers Review letter dated April 12, 2006.

Mr. Letteri stated that they have no problem with paragraphs one and two, number three has been deleted, he understand about the C Variance and he indicated that the if approved he requested that the c variance be granted as well. The applicant talked about flood proof construction techniques and has stated that he wants to provide as much safety as he can. Paragraph 6 stated that any approval be subject to the applicant obtaining a jurisdictional determination to verify any permitted requirements since the property is located in a CAFRA zone and constructed below the flood hazard requirements. He does not believe that this would require any CAFRA permits. They would be willing to obtain a letter from CAFRA if required to do so. He stated that he is now through with presenting his application.

Mr. Stockton asked if there were any questions from the public.

Jason Scott of 40 Cornwall Street stated that he approves of the application.

Gary Branin, Sr. of 97 Valley Avenue asked the applicant if before the plans were drawn up two years ago did the applicant have a conversation with the Zoning Officer in town.

Mr. Serpico advised the applicant not to answer that questions because it goes to a here say response.

There were no further questions from the public therefore the public portion for questions was closed.

Mr. Manrodt asked for the cost of construction for the proposed.

Mr. Branin stated that it was about \$80,000.

Mr. Manrodt – what is the current market value.

Mr. Branin stated that he had an offer for sale in the amount of \$450,000.

Mr. Letteri stated that he has no further witnesses.

Mr. Stockton stated that the Board is now going to call for Mr. Gilson to provide information about the FEMA Program and the regulations that go along with that.

Mr. Serpico swears in David Gilson, Borough Administrator/FEMA Representative/Flood Administrator.

Mr. Gilson stated the following during his testimony and response to questions from the Board:

1. He will be testifying in the capacity of the Certified Flood Plain Manager of the Borough of Highlands.
2. He is familiar with the rules and regulations of the program as it applies to this project.
3. He stated that he will go through the National Flood Insurance Program Description prepared by the Federal Emergency Management Agency which was marked as **Exhibit B-1:**
4. He then refers to certain section in Exhibit B-1 and stated the following:
 - * Page 3 -The Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 requires flood insurance on all grants, loans for acquisition or construction of buildings within the Special Flood Hazard Areas and Highlands in one of them.
 - *Page 16 – The community is required to adopt a flood plain management ordinance which was done by Ordinance O-99-11.
 - *Page 17 – Suspension of Communities flood insurance is not available to property owners if town is put on suspension for violating program. If the community continuously grants flood relief variances it could trigger a violation.
5. His reviews are based on reviewing elevation certificates and the proposed plans for the project and he will deny applications based on the BFE. We encourage the applicant to raise the improvement.
6. Substantial Improvement is based on fair market value which he described. He believes that \$100.00 a square foot is a fair amount for a cost of the improvement in determining if the improvements exceed 50% of the market value. He made his determination based on giving the applicant a \$500,000 market value of the property and

based on the square footage of the proposed addition @ \$100 a square foot the addition is estimated at \$479,000. FEMA considered any other construction on the property as a substantial improvement like the garage in this application.

7. By the town granting flood relief if the borough is put on suspension every homeowner that has flood insurance gets a \$50.00 fee tacked on to there premium. Anybody that has a federally backed mortgage that had a stipulation in the mortgage that they are required to have flood insurance, they can't get it. No federal monies will be given to the town to do anything while the town is on suspension. This program is about getting the houses out of the flood plain.
8. The Borough has a new policy that no development applications will be reviewed without flood plain.
9. If the Borough were suspended the government would deny funds to the municipality to do repairs on their own infrastructure because it would be subject to no monies being issued to the town.
10. FEMA does perform monthly audits and they review the new construction and any variances granted.
11. Special questions can be sent to FEMA for guidance if something was acceptable to them or not and that was already done in this situation. He had a meeting with FEMA with regard to this specific project and another project in town to assist him in making a determination and they determined along with him that he was correct in denying this application.
12. Yes a special question can be asked of FEMA from the board.
13. The language in the ordinance was created by the Borough but FEMA has a model ordinance.

The Board takes a brief recess at 9:47 P.M. and returned at 9:55 P.M.

PB#2006-3 Catsaros, Gregory
Block 14 Lot 3.01 – 30 Grand Tour
Hearing on New Business:

Mr. Stockton advised Mr. Kennedy, Esq. and the applicant Mr. Catsaros that the Board will not be able to reach this application this evening. This matter will be carried to the next planning board meeting.

Mr. Serpico stated that he has reviewed the public notice and finds in to be in proper form therefore the board can take jurisdiction and announce the new meeting date with no further public notice.

Mr. Kennedy stated that on behalf of the applicant they are granting the board a time extension to act on this application to May 11th, 2006.

Mr. Stockton announced to the public that this matter has been carried to May 11, 2006 and no further public notice will be given.

Mr. Mullen offered a motion to carry this matter to the May 11, 2006 meeting, seconded by Mr. Schoellner and all were in favor.

**PB#2006-2 Branin, Gary
Block 48 Lot 3 – 39 Cornwall Street
Continuation of Public Hearing:**

Mr. Stockton asked if there were any questions for Mr. Gilson.

Mr. Letteri then questioned Mr. Gilson about his testimony and Mr. Gilson responded as follows:

1. FEMA can suspend a municipality for failure to adopt an ordinance that meets or exceed the minimum NFIP requirements and the Borough of Highlands did adopt an ordinance.
2. Yes, the borough's flood plain ordinance does contain provision for granting relief from the flood plain requirements.
3. He did previously testify that by the board granting variances from the flood ordinance that can cause the town to be suspended from the program.

Mr. Letteri stated that he believes that Mr. Gilson is being a little more than a little disingenuous when he says to the board "hey if you give this applicant a variance and let him build then we are in danger of being suspended from this program". That is not correct, if Mr. Gilson or any other FEMA officer did not do their job and site a violation to someone wishing to build in violation of the FEMA requirements than the Administrator is not doing is his job, the program is not being administered correctly, that may cause a suspension.

Mr. Gilson – absolutely not, you do not understand the ordinance.

Mr. Letteri continued to question Mr. Gilson and Mr. Gilson stated the following:

4. Since he has taken over as Flood Plain Administrator the Planning Board has not granted any variances for flood plain relief.
5. The pre-existing condition of the structure is in violation of the flood ordinance.

6. If the board grants the flood relief than part of the addition would be out of the flood plain.

Mr. Stockton asked there were any questions from the public, there were none.

Mr. Letteri stated that he rests his case.

The Public Portion was closed for questions.

Mr. Stockton asked if there were any comments with regard to this application; there were none.

The Public Portion was closed on this application.

Mr. Letteri stated that the Board heard enough testimony to render a decision on this application.

Mr. Manrodt stated that he would like to have more information on this application with regard to what if the board grants a flood relief variance.

Mr. Bahrs stated that in order to grant a variance, we need good and sufficient cause and the reason of a growing family is too much like a generic reason for granting relief.

Mr. Kovic stated that a portion of the addition will be above the flood area and he feels that there is some flood proofing being done by the applicant.

Mr. Urbanski expressed his opposition to granting this flood relief which he further described.

Mr. Mullen – this is our first case and he feels that we need to have very strong reasons for either or supporting or denying this application and he does feel that the applicant has presented testimony this evening that convinces him that the board should grant relief for flood plain because he built the garage in accordance with the flood plain requirements, all this time the borough has a flood plain ordinance in effect and the applicant knew what those flood ordinances are. He chose to design a house that doesn't meet the flood ordinances for the addition and he hasn't taken any issue with the flood administrator's call that this is a substantial improvement and therefore it must comply. He hasn't stated that it isn't substantial, he has stated that it is substantial and the reason that he is asking for relief is it seems to be a self created issue. This is a hardship that the applicant created by not following the flood ordinance.

Mr. Manrodt stated that he would like to put a vote off until the next meeting to have more time to think about it.

Mr. Kovic stated that he would vote in favor of this application because he feels that the applicant may have been wrong on a few items but he didn't think that the applicant received proper guidance from the borough officials.

Mr. Kovic offered a motion to approve this application but there was no second on this motion.

Mr. Manrodt offered a motion to adjourn the hearing to have more time to look into FEMA and obtain more information and carry this to the May Meeting, seconded by Mr. Harrison.

Mr. Letteri stated that the applicant will consent to granting the board a time extension on this matter.

Mr. Mullen wanted to know the steps that will be taken on this matter for the adjournment.

The Board discussed requesting more information from FEMA by way of requesting it in writing and directed the Board Attorney to send a letter to FEMA.

Mr. Manrodt amended his resolution to adjourn this hearing to the next meeting and directed the Board Attorney to send a memo to FEMA requesting more information, seconded by Mr. Harrison and approved on the following roll call vote:

ROLL CALL:

AYES: **Mr. Manrodt, Mr. Kovic, Mr. Mullen, Mr. Bahrs, Mr. Urbanski,
 Mr. Schoellner, Mr. Stockton, Mr. Harrison, Mr. Cefalo**

NAYES: **None**

ABSTAIN: **None**

The Board discussed with Mr. Letteri the fact that the May Agenda was so busy and that this matter should be carried to the June 8th meeting.

Mr. Stockton advised the public that the Board has carried this public hearing to the June 8th Planning Board Meeting and no further public notice will be given.

Mayor O'Neil returned to the meeting table.

**PB# 2005-5 LoBello, Ellen – Request for Extension of Time to Perfect Subdivision
Block 57 Lot 21 – 27 Valley Street**

Mr. Stockton stated that the Board received a written request for time to perfect the subdivision.

Mr. Mullen offered a motion to approve the request for an extension of time to perfect the subdivision, seconded by Mr. Urbanski and approved on the following roll call vote:

ROLL CALL:

AYES: **Mr. Manrodt, Mr. Kovic, Mr. Mullen, Mayor O’Neil, Mr. Bahrs,
Mr. Urbanski, Mr. Schoellner, Mr. Gilson, Mr. Stockton**

NAYES: **None**

ABSTAIN: **None**

**Review & Make Recommendations to Borough Clerk RE: Zoning Ordinance
Amendments:**

Mr. Stockton stated the Planning Board will review this at the May Meeting.

Approval of Minutes:

Mr. Mullen offered a motion to approve the March 9, 2006 Minutes, seconded by Mr. Kovic and all eligible members were in favor.

Communications:

Letter from M. McGann RE: Mintzer subdivision RE: Block 91 Lot 13.01

Mr. Mullen stated that the Board Secretary requested that the board discuss this memo regarding why the Mintzer Deeds can not be signed off at this time.

Ms. Flor explained to the board the need to flip flop the driveway.

The Board reviewed the following Letters but no action was required:

3/10/06 Letter from T & M Assoc. RE: Roslansky – Block 11 Lot 16.02/19

3/8/06 Letter from MCPB RE: Osborn Block 58 Lot 26

3/10/06 Letter from Borough Clerk RE: Broderick Road Vacation Request

Mayor O’Neil offered a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Manrodt and all were in favor.

The Meeting adjourned at 10:29 P.M.

CAROLYN CUMMINS, Board Secretary