



**BOROUGH OF ALPHA
LAND USE BOARD**

1001 East Boulevard
Alpha, New Jersey 08865

REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

Borough of Alpha Municipal Building
October 19, 2022, 7:00 PM

1. CALL TO ORDER and PUBLIC NOTICE

2. ROLL CALL

Mr. Cartabona, Mr. Dragotta, Ms. Dalrymple, Mayor Dunwell, Mr. Fey, Mr. Fritts, Mr. Gable, Mr. Schwar, and Mr. Seiss.

3. RESOLUTIONS

➤ **RESOLUTION 2022-07**

**FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS AND RESOLUTION
REGARDING THE APPLICATION OF DANIEL AND TRICIA SHOUDT
FOR VARIANCE APPROVAL FOR BLOCK 23, LOT 8 (737 SCHLEY
AVE), ZONE R-4**

➤ **RESOLUTION 2022-08**

**FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS AND RESOLUTION
REGARDING THE APPLICATION OF STERNER OUTDOOR
ADVERTISING/PRISM HOLDINGS FOR VARIANCE APPROVAL
PURSUANT TO NJSA 40:55D-70(D)(1) AND NJSA 40:55D-70(C) FOR
BLOCK 200, LOT 1, ZONE I**

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

➤ Regular Meeting Minutes of 9/21/22

5. OLD BUSINESS

6. NEW BUSINESS

- **CONSISTENCY REVIEW DETERMINATION OF ORDINANCE 2022-10
AN ORDINANCE OF THE BOROUGH OF ALPHA TO AMEND CHAPTER 410
OF THE CODE OF THE BOROUGH OF ALPHA, ADDING A CONDITIONAL
USE FOR WATER STORAGE TANKS**

7. CORRESPONDENCE

8. PUBLIC COMMENT

9. EXECUTIVE SESSION (As Needed)

10. NEXT MEETING

- November 16, 2022

11. ADJOURNMENT

Application #: 2022-04

Approved: _____

**RESOLUTION 2022-07
BOROUGH OF ALPHA
LAND USE BOARD**

**FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS AND RESOLUTION
REGARDING THE APPLICATION OF
DANIEL AND TRICIA SHOUDT
FOR VARIANCE APPROVAL FOR
BLOCK 23, LOT 8 (737 SCHLEY AVENUE), ZONE R-4**

The Land Use Board of the Borough of Alpha, in the County of Warren and State of New Jersey, upon motion of _____, seconded by _____, adopts the following findings of fact, conclusions and resolutions:

Findings of Fact:

1. Applicants, **DANIEL AND TRICIA SHOUDT**, have applied for variance relief to allow for the construction of a residential addition to an existing single family residential dwelling.

2. Variance relief is required with respect to the following standards:

a. **§410-21 Schedule of Area, Yard, and Building Requirements – Minimum Lot Area**

The Applicant proposes a lot area of 6,210 square feet whereas 9,375 square feet is required. This is an existing non-conformity and the applicant proposes no changes to the existing non-conforming condition.

b. §410-21 Schedule of Area, Yard, and Building Requirements – Maximum Lot Depth – Schley Frontage

The Applicant proposes a lot depth along Schley of 138 feet whereas 125 is the maximum permitted lot depth. This is an existing non-conformity and the applicant proposes no changes to the existing non-conforming condition.

c. §410-21 Schedule of Area, Yard, and Building Requirements – Maximum Street Line – Frace Frontage

The Applicant proposes a street line of 138 feet along the Frace Street frontage whereas 60 feet is the maximum permitted. This is an existing non-conformity and the applicant proposes no changes to the existing nonconforming condition.

d. §410-21 Schedule of Area, Yard, and Building Requirements – Maximum Building Line - Frace

The Applicant proposes a building line of 138 feet for proposed Lot along the Frace Street frontage whereas 75 feet is the maximum permitted. This is an existing non-conformity and the applicant proposes no changes to the existing non-conforming condition.

e. §410-21 Schedule of Area, Yard, and Building Requirements – Minimum Front Yard -Frace

The Applicant proposes a front yard of 7.5 feet along the Frace Street frontage whereas 25 feet is the minimum required. This is an existing non-conformity and the applicant proposes no changes to the existing setback.

f. §410-21 Schedule of Area, Yard, and Building Requirements – Minimum Side Yard (any)

The Applicant proposes a side yard of 1.7 feet whereas 10 ft. is the minimum required.

g. §410-21 Schedule of Area, Yard, and Building Requirements – Maximum Lot Coverage (Building / Total)

The Applicant proposes a lot coverage of 39.90% whereas 25% is the maximum permitted.

3. On September 17, 2022, the applicant appeared before the Land Use Board for a completeness determination. The applicant was represented by William Edleston, Esq. As an initial determination, the issue of whether this type of application required site plan approval was

discussed. Attorney Gruenberg advised the Board that despite ordinance language that was unclear, the Municipal Land Use Law does not authorize the requirement of site plan review under the circumstances. Specifically, N.J.S.A. 40:55D-37(a) provides:

NJSA. 40:55D-37. Grant of powers; referral of proposed ordinance; county planning board approval.

- a. The governing body may by ordinance require approval of subdivision plats by resolution of the planning board as a condition for the filing of such plats with the county recording officer and approval of site plans by resolution of the planning board as a condition for the issuance of a permit for any development, except that subdivision **or individual lot applications for detached one or two dwelling-unit buildings shall be exempt from such site plan review and approval**; provided that the resolution of the board of adjustment shall substitute for that of the planning board whenever the board of adjustment has jurisdiction over a subdivision or site plan pursuant to subsection 63b. of this act. (emphasis added.)

Accordingly, the application was noted to be for “c” variance relief. The Board Engineer, Timothy O’Brien’s completeness and technical review correspondence was reviewed by the Board. Mr. O’Brien recommended that the application should be deemed complete in light of the legal interpretation provided by Attorney Gruenberg.

A motion was made by Mr. Seiss to deem the application complete. Motion seconded by Mr. Dragotta. Roll Call: Ayes: Mr. Cartabona, Mr. Dragotta, Ms. Dalrymple, Mayor Dunwell, Mr. Fey, Mr. Schwar, and Mr. Seiss. Nays: None. Absent: Fritts, and Gable.

4. On September 17, 2022, it was found that the applicant had provided appropriate proof of service and publication of the notice of hearing and that the Board had jurisdiction to proceed with the hearing on the application.

5. Sworn testimony under oath was provided by Tricia Shoudt and Christopher Nusser, P.E., P.P. The following exhibits were marked into evidence:

Exhibit B-1 Board Engineer Report of August 15, 2022

6. Ms. Tricia Shoudt testified that the proposed expansion of the existing home is to accommodate Ms. Shoudt's family due to Ms. Shoudt being her grandmother's primary caregiver. They would like to put a second story onto the home which would house bedrooms and a full bath. They would also like to connect the house to the detached garage. There will be a staircase to reach the second floor where the laundry room will be located as well as a half bath. There will be no additional kitchen facilities or separate entrances. They also will agree as a condition of approval that the home would never be used for a two-family other than just the addition living quarters for her grandmother. Attorney Edleston also stated that they will agree to a deed restriction. There will be three bedrooms on the second floor and a single master bedroom on the first floor with handicap access.

Mr. Cartabona had questions about the existing bathroom and confirmed that the current two bedrooms will be converted to one master bedroom.

7. The matter was opened to the public for questions of Ms. Shoudt. None were received.

8. Sworn testimony under oath was received from Christopher Nusser, P.E. and P.P. Mr. Nusser's credentials were reviewed by the Board and he was an expert Professional Engineer and Professional Planner.

Mr. Nusser displayed and described the variance plan dated 7/22/22 to the board. The proposal is to add a second story and to fill the gap between the garage and the existing home. There are several existing nonconforming conditions outlined above. The property has existing constraints which cause the applicant an undue hardship upon which to construct the improvements while strictly complying with the zoning ordinance requirements. Mr. Nusser states that given the existing nonconformities, it is constraining to the property to be able to meet the standards. The setback lines as they are shown on the plan are very narrow. Meeting those are not possible and they are staying within the existing footprint of the house set for that addition between the garage and the existing home. They are extending the line of the existing home and then in the forward section the line of the garage, which is maintaining what is already an existing setback. For the garage to meet the current requirements it would need to be demolished and reconstructed causing a large hardship for the homeowner to undertake in order to comply with the existing requirements. Mr. Nusser also states that the reason behind the request is more than appropriate, and they are not asking for something that is outsized for the neighborhood. It is his opinion that there is no substantial detriment to the public good and there will be no substantial impairment to the zone plan and the zoning ordinance. The applicant agreed to comply with the terms of the Board Engineer's review correspondence which was marked as Exhibit B-1.

Upon questioning, Mr. Nusser clarified that the existing 2.9 foot setback and 1.7 foot setbacks would not be worsened and that there is no planned expansion of the combined structure so that would cause a further encroachment on any sides of the structure. As to parking, Mr. Nusser confirmed that the current driveway remain and will be able to accommodate parking on site.

9. The matter was opened to the public for questions of the witness. None were received.

10. The matter was opened to the public for testimony and presenting of evidence in connection with the application. None was received.

11. A motion to close the public hearing was made by Mr. Seiss. Motion seconded by Mr. Dragotta. Roll Call: Ayes: Mr. Cartabona, Mr. Dragotta, Ms. Dalrymple, Mayor Dunwell, Mr. Fey, Mr. Schwar, and Mr. Seiss. Absent: Mr. Gable and Mr. Fritts.

12. A motion was made by Mr. Cartabona to approve the Shoudt Application #2022-04, Block 23, Lot 8 subject to conditions. Motion seconded by Mr. Schwar. Roll Call: Ayes: Mr. Cartabona, Mr. Dragotta, Ms. Dalrymple, Mayor Dunwell, Mr. Fey, Mr. Schwar, and Mr. Seiss. Absent: Mr. Gable and Mr. Fritts.

Conclusions:

1. The Board finds that the applicant has established the necessary “positive” and negative” criteria for the granting of the requested variances from the provisions of the ordinance pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70(c)(1). The Board finds that the applicants would suffer an undue hardship if strict adherence to the ordinance was enforced given the unique size, shape and configuration of the lot and particularly the unique topographical conditions of the property, narrowness of the lot and location of the home lawfully existing on the property in relationship to the property lines. The granting of the variances requested is due to the unique circumstances affecting this particular property.

2. The applicant has also established that the variances can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and will not substantially impair the intent and purpose of the zone plan and zoning ordinance. The granting of the variances improves the neighborhood scheme.

3. Consequently, applicant is entitled to the requested variances subject to conditions.

Resolution:

RESOLVED, that the Applicant, **DANIEL AND TRICIA SHOUDT**, is granted the variances as set forth above subject to the following conditions:

A. The terms of this approval are to be strictly in accordance with the plans, testimony, and representations presented at the public hearings, and the same are incorporated into this resolution by reference. Applicant shall perform the work in accordance with the plans submitted in connection with the application and as to be revised subject to the Board's professionals' approval as set forth above and in the review correspondence.

B. Applicant shall obtain any and all other necessary governmental approvals, including, but not limited to Warren County Planning Board approval, Upper Delaware Conservation District approval, and Highlands Board approval if required.

C. Applicant shall comply in all respects with the Board Engineer review correspondence dated August 15, 2022, marked as Exhibit B-1.

D. Applicant shall provide a Deed Restriction maintaining the property as a single family residence and prohibiting the use of the property as a duplex without further relief from

the Board to the satisfaction of the Board Engineer and the Board Attorney.

E. Applicant shall maintain a positive balance in its escrow account to reimburse the Borough for its professional expenses in the review of this application and compliance with this approval.

ALPHA BOROUGH LAND USE BOARD

APPLICATION 2022-04

SECRETARY: _____

APPROVAL DATE: _____

BLOCK: _____ 23 _____ LOT: _____ 8 _____

VOTE:

Ayes:

Nays:

I certify that this is a true copy of a resolution adopted by the Land Use Board of the Borough of Alpha, Warren County, on October 19, 2022, to memorialize the Land Use Board's action on September 17, 2022.

DONNA L. MESSINA, Secretary

Eligible to vote: Mr. Cartabona, Mr. Dragotta, Ms. Dalrymple, Mayor Dunwell, Mr. Fey, Mr. Schwar, and Mr. Seiss.

Application #: 2022-04

Approved: _____

**RESOLUTION 2022-08
BOROUGH OF ALPHA
LAND USE BOARD**

**FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS AND RESOLUTION
REGARDING THE APPLICATION OF
STERNER OUTDOOR ADVERTISING/PRISM HOLDINGS
FOR VARIANCE APPROVAL PURSUANT TO
NJSA 40:55D-70(D)(1) AND NJSA 40:55D-70(C) FOR
BLOCK 200, LOT 1, ZONE I**

The Land Use Board of the Borough of Alpha, in the County of Warren and State of New Jersey, upon motion of _____, seconded by _____, adopts the following findings of fact, conclusions and resolution:

Findings of Fact:

1. The applicants, **STERNER OUTDOOR ADVERTISING/PRISM HOLDINGS** submitted this application seeking approval of variances for the property located at Block 200, Lot 1 (Route 78) which is considered Conrail Railroad right-of-way (Norfolk Southern RR Property). The subject property is located in the Borough's I - Industrial Zoning District. The applicant is requesting a use variance and various bulk variances to construct an outdoor

billboard sign. The Applicants previously received approval memorialized in a Resolution for Application 207-03 adopted on March 19, 2008 “ (“Prior Resolution”) for relief for use variances pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70(d)(1) and (d) (6); bulk variances pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70(c)(1) and (2) and preliminary and final site plan approval permitting an outdoor billboard sign. That sign was never constructed and the applicant is now proposing a sign it contends is consistent with that prior approval. The applicant has been advised that the prior approval had expired necessitating relief from this Board.

2. The applicant seeks the following relief:

A. Preliminary and final site plan approval;

B. A d(1) variance to permit a use or principal structure in a district restricted against such use or principal structure;

C. A d(6) variance to permit the height of the structure to be 50 feet where 20 feet maximum is permitted which is more than 10 feet or 10% of the maximum height standard.

D. Relief pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70(c) from the following bulk standards:

- i. Max. Sign Area (sq. ft.) 250 permitted, 1,000 per side (2,000 both sides) proposed
- ii. Max. Height of Sign Face (ft.) 10 permitted, 20 ft. proposed
- iii. Max. Width of Sign Face (ft.) 25 permitted, 50 each side proposed
- iv. Min. Setback to Any Property Line (ft.) 50 required, Face 1: 6.90, Face 2: 22.30 proposed

3. On May 18, 2022, the matter was entertained for purposes of completeness. A motion was moved and seconded to deem the application.

4. On August 17, 2022, the applicant was found to have provided appropriate proof of service and publication of the Notice of Hearing and the Board was deemed to have jurisdiction to proceed with the hearing.

5. The applicant was represented by William Edleston, Esq. Sworn testimony under oath was received from the following witnesses: Gerry Besko, managing partner for Sterner Outdoor Advertising.

6. The following exhibits were marked into evidence during the hearing process:

Exhibit A-1: Packet of materials submitted by applicant

Exhibit B-1 Engineering Completeness and Technical Review dated April 14, 2022

7. Attorney Edleston provided an overview of the application and stated that the applicant was essentially seeking a reapproval of what was previously approved in 2007, granting a use variance to allow a billboard on the eastern side of Route 78 just before the Pohatcong border. The applicant is essentially relying upon the proofs and findings of fact and conclusions of law set forth in that resolution.

8. Sworn testimony under oath was received from Mr. Gerry Besko of Sterner Outdoor Advertising. Mr. Besko is a managing partner with the firm. Sterner Outdoor Advertising specializes in the building of sign boards additionally known as billboards. In 2007 the previous partner of Norfolk Southern Railroad and their signboard contractor CBS moved forward with a variance request before this board. The request was granted and around 2008 the construction official was given notice the permits can be issued for the sign. In 2009, the project was deferred due to a recession and Norfolk Southern, the owner of the right-of-way, parted ways with CBS. Subsequently, CBS was sold off. In approximately 2014, Norfolk Southern approached Mr. Besko to move forward with construction of this signboard. The applicant approached our construction official at that time and submitted engineering to the Borough and permit requests. He was then told that they need to apply with their full engineering packet to move forward. Sometime in spring of 2018 a full engineering packet is submitted for the review of the

construction official. In October of 2018 the construction official informs Mr. Besko that he can no longer issue the permit because too much time had passed and relief was required from this Board. The applicant essentially seeks a reapproval. He also stated that whenever they are approached to build a signboard such as this, they always consider residential impact. This particular site has minimal residential impact.

Mr. Besko submitted an aerial view rendering of the area marking the location and distance of the closest residential area as well as a set of engineering prints showing the size of the sign and a survey, marked as Exhibit A-1. The proposed sign does not differ in any way from the original proposal made in 2007. He describes the sign as a 20-foot tall by 50-foot-long display, double-sided sign structure with an overall height of 50 feet. He further states that the sign is 50 feet because they need to stay a certain amount of feet above the railroad bed; however, they are slightly above that for visibility reasons. The sign will be illuminated with a solar package. Access to the sign in the event of maintenance will be via Norfolk Southern's Second Avenue access site.

Attorney Gruenberg asked about how the sign will be illuminated. Mr. Besko stated LED light fixtures. Attorney Gruenberg stated that this is a little bit different than the original proposal. This was cleared up when Mr. Besko stated that this is not a digital-type board or anything flashy. These are just led light fixtures and the lighting would not spill over into any neighboring areas or be a nuisance. Attorney Gruenberg asked about the LED lighting and confirmed that there are no moving parts or digital-type illumination to the proposed LED-type lighting.

There could be many types of businesses that might utilize this sign for advertising, such as car dealerships with an emphasis on regional or local businesses. It would not be used for

advertising of illegal nature. Mr. Besko reviewed the resolution and agreed to adhere to the conditions set forth therein with the clarification as to LED lighting.

The applicant agreed to make compliance with the Board Engineer's report a condition of approval.

9. The matter was opened to the public for questions of the witness. None were received.

10. The matter was opened to the public for public comment or testimony. None was received.

11. Motion to close the public hearing made by Mr. Seiss. Motion seconded by Mr. Dragotta. Roll Call: Ayes: Mr. Dragotta, Ms. Dalrymple, Mr. Fey, Mr. Schwar, and Mr. Seiss. Absent: Mr. Gable and Mr. Fritts. Not eligible to vote: Mr. Cartabona, and Mayor Dunwell.

12. Motion made by Mr. Schwar to approve Sterner Outdoor Advertising Application #2022-01, Block 200, Lot 1 subject to conditions. Motion seconded by Mr. Seiss. Roll Call: Ayes: Mr. Dragotta, Ms. Dalrymple, Mr. Fey, Mr. Schwar, and Mr. Seiss. Absent: Mr. Fritts, and Mr. Gable. Ineligible to vote: Mr. Cartabona, and Mayor Dunwell.

Conclusions:

13. The applicant seeks reapproval of the Board's granting of relief pursuant to the Resolution for Application 207-03 which granted the relief requested. The Board has reviewed the detailed prior resolution, findings of fact and conclusions of law contained within that resolution and adopt those findings as though fully set forth herein at length.

14. The Board notes that the only distinction between the prior proposal and the present is in the nature of lighting. Previously, condition 3 of the Resolution for Application 207-03 required the following:

“d. The sign shall remain as proposed, to wit: externally illuminated by floodlights, only, and shall not be altered, including same not being converted to an LED sign without subsequent application to, review and approval by this Board.”

The applicant clarified that while the sign will remain externally illuminated, the lighting shall be LED external illumination. The applicant confirmed that there are no moving parts or digital-type illumination to the proposed LED-type lighting.

15. The application otherwise being fully conforming to the Borough of Alpha ordinances, the applicant was found to be entitled to Preliminary and Final Site Plan Approval subject to conditions.

Resolution:

RESOLVED, that the Applicant, **STERNER OUTDOOR ADVERTISING/PRISM HOLDINGS** are granted the relief as set forth above, subject to the following conditions:

A. The terms of this approval are to be strictly in accordance with the plans, testimony, and representations presented at the public hearings, and the same are incorporated into this resolution by reference.

B. Compliance with the Board Engineer's Review correspondence marked Exhibit B-1 as clarified during the testimony.

C. Compliance with the Board's Prior Resolution of Approval for Application 207-03 attached hereto with the clarification that the sign will be externally illuminated with LED lights. There shall be no digital illumination or moving lights without the need for returning to the Board for further relief.

D. Applicant shall obtain any and all outside governmental agency approvals including but not limited to Warren County Planning Board, Upper Delaware Conservation District, Warren County Board of Health, NJ Highlands Approval to the extent required.

E. Applicant shall perform the work in accordance with the plans submitted in connection with the application and as to be revised subject to the Board's professionals' approval as set forth above and in the review correspondence.

F. Applicant shall maintain a positive balance in its escrow account to reimburse the Borough for its professional expenses in the review of this application and compliance with this approval.

BOROUGH OF ALPHA
LAND USE BOARD
APPLICATION #2022-04

SECRETARY: Donna L. Messina

APPROVAL DATE: _____

BLOCK 23, LOT 8

VOTE:

Ayes:

Nays:

I certify that this is a true copy of a resolution adopted by the Land Use Board of the Borough of Alpha, Warren County, on October 19, 2022, to memorialize the Board's action on August 17, 2022.

Dated:

DONNA L. MESSINA, Secretary

ORDINANCE 2022-10

AN ORDINANCE OF THE BOROUGH OF ALPHA TO AMEND CHAPTER 410 OF THE CODE OF THE BOROUGH OF ALPHA, ADDING A CONDITIONAL USE FOR WATER STORAGE TANKS

WHEREAS, water storage tanks have been a permitted use in the industrial zone in the Borough of Alpha for decades; and

WHEREAS, the Borough water utility currently has a water storage tank in the industrial zone approximately 100 feet tall; and

WHEREAS, upon recommendation of the Borough Engineer the Borough wishes to improve water system pressure for fire protection and water quality purposes for the health and safety of its citizens, and

WHEREAS, said recommendations of the Borough include increasing the height of water towers to improve, among other matters, water pressure.

BE IT ORDAINED, by the Borough Council of the Borough of Alpha, that the Code of the Borough of Alpha, specifically Chapter 410, is being amended as follows:

410-20D (3) Water storage tanks for provision of potable water and fire protection services.

The bulk requirements schedule, or appendix related to § 410 shall be amended to incorporate recommended changes and is reflected on the attached page hereto.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that all ordinances or portions of ordinances which are inconsistent with this Ordinance shall be repealed as to their inconsistencies only. The various parts, sections and clauses of this Ordinance are hereby declared to be severable so that if any part, sentence, paragraph, section or clause of this

Ordinance is adjudged unconstitutional or invalidated by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remainder of this Ordinance shall not be affected thereby. This Ordinance shall take effect immediately upon final passage and publication as required by law.

NOTICE

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the foregoing was introduced and passed on first reading at the meeting of the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Alpha, held on the 11 day of October 2022 and that said Ordinance will be taken up for further consideration for final passage at a meeting of the Mayor and Council to be held at this meeting room in the Municipal Building of the Borough of Alpha, Alpha, New Jersey, on the 25th day of October at 7:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as said matter can be reached, at which time, and place, all persons who may be interested therein will be given an opportunity to be heard concerning the same. A copy of this Ordinance has been posted on the bulletin board where public notices are customarily posted in the Borough Municipal Building

Donna L. Messina, Municipal Clerk

*Witness my hand and seal of
the Borough of Alpha this 11
day of October 2022.*

ALPHA CODE
 Schedule of Area, Yard and Building Requirements
 Borough of Alpha, Warren County, New Jersey
 (cont'd)

Zone and Primary Permitted Uses	Minimum Lot Size								Minimum Yard Size				Maximum Percentage of Lot Coverage	Maximum Height		
	Interior Lots				Corner Lots				Front Yard (feet)	Any Side Yard (feet)	Total (Both Side Yards) (feet)	Rear Yard (feet)		State	FEET	
	Area (square feet)	Maximum Depth of Measurement (feet)	Street (feet)	Building Line (feet)	Area (square feet)	Maximum Depth of Measurement ⁴ (feet)	Street (feet)	Building Line (feet)								
AH Affordable Housing	See Text															
B-1 Business Zone Retail stores and shops	15,000		100	100					25	15	30	25	35		2	35
B-2 Business Zone Small retail stores and offices	11,000		75	75					25	25	130	130	30		2	35
B-3 Business Zone	7500		50	50					15	10	20	35	35 ²		2	35
Industrial Zone Primary Use	2 acres	400	200	200					75	50	100	75	30		2/3	
Industrial Zone Conditional Use	10,000	100	100	100					20	40	20	20	50		1	30

* Minimum lot areas must be measured within the maximum distance of the front street right-of-way prescribed in this column.
 1 Measured from any abutting street.
 2 uses including but not limited to office, manufacturing, laboratories, etc., shall be permitted to a maximum height of 2 stories and 43 feet as noted in the schedule.
 3 Can be reduced by 6 1/2 feet for an open-sided front porch.
 4 Buildings containing a warehouse or distribution use shall be permitted a maximum height of 1 story and 43 feet. Portions of the building containing other ancillary
 5 For buildings containing a warehouse or distribution use, height of building shall be measured from the finished floor elevation for those portions of the building with loading docks.