

Mount Laurel Township Zoning Board of Adjustment
Regular Meeting Minutes
November 1, 2023

Opening

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Gray at 7:00 p.m.

The Pledge of Allegiance and Moment of Silence led by Chairman Gray

The Open Public Notice was read by the Board Secretary

Roll call was taken by the Board Secretary

Attendance

Members: Chairman Gray, Mr. Blum, Mr. Francescone, Mr. Holmes, Mr. Kramer, Mr. Sharp, Mr. Desai, and Mr. Bhankharia Board Professionals: Ashton Jones, Board Planner; Drew Pavlick, Board Engineer; Michael Angelastro, Board Traffic Engineer, Mr. McVey, Fire Marshal and Ron Cucchiaro Esq., Board Solicitor Staff: Suzanna Baskay, Board Secretary

Absent

Vice Chair Andersen

Review of Board Procedures by Chairman

Announcements

Minutes

10/4/2023 motion to approve by Mr. Sharp, second by Mr. Holmes. All voted affirmatively.

Resolutions

Resolution R-2023-ZB23, Earl and Deborah Dion, Application no. ZB23-C-18, Mr. Sharp made a motion to approve, Mr. Holmes seconded, all members voted affirmatively and the motion was carried.

Resolution R-2023-ZB24, Martha Santucci, Application no. ZB23-C-19, Mr. Sharp made a motion to approve, Mr. Holmes seconded, all members voted affirmatively and the motion was carried.

Resolution R-2023-ZB25, Kushi Labs, Application no. ZB23-D-16, Mr. Sharp made a motion to approve, Mr. Holmes seconded, all members voted affirmatively and the motion was carried.

Resolution R-2023-ZB26, Higher Leaf, Application no. ZB23-D-17, Mr. Sharp made a motion to approve, Mr. Blum seconded, all members voted affirmatively and the motion was carried.

Board Professionals were sworn

- All those who testified during the hearing were sworn in prior to their testimony.
- All Those who offered expert testimony were accepted as experts by the board.

Chairman Gray, made a motion to go into closed session to discuss matters falling within the attorney-client privilege.

The board secretary read resolution no. ZB-CS-2302 authorizing the Zoning Board to go into closed session. Mr. Sharp seconded. All in favor vote. All voted affirmatively. The recording was stopped and the courtroom

was emptied. Mr. Francescone made a motion to go into open session, Mr. Sharp seconded. Roll Call Vote. All voted affirmatively and the meeting was resumed.

Petitions before the board

1. **Interstate Outdoor Advertising**, ZB23-D-13, 100 Pike Rd., Block 205 Lot 5, I- zone. This applicant is seeking Use variances from Mount Laurel Township Ordinance section 154-84 to allow a prohibited billboard, 154-56 to allow a second principal use, and 154-92.7 to allow a sign height of 90 feet where 11 feet is allowed as well as bulk variances from sections 154-84 to allow changeable copy, sign adjacent to Route 295 and unshielded illumination, and various bulk variances from sections 154-92.2 for setbacks, 154-92.3 double-sided angle, and from 154-92.7 for base, location, and overall size.

Witnesses Sworn

Robert Korkuch P.E., P.P.; Jeffrey Gerber, President and COO of Interstate Outdoor Advertising, Justin Taylor, P.E. and Traffic Engineer, Tiago Duarte, Lighting Engineer and John McDonough

Exhibits Entered

A-1, Aerial Photo; A-2, Billboard Exhibit Plan; A-3, DOT Permit renewal for Hartford Rd., A-4, Crane Exhibit 12 pages; A-5, Power Point/types of copy ; A-6, Sign Visibility Study; A-7, Lighting Exhibit

Andrew Bayer, Esq. represented the applicant, summarized the application, and requested variances. Mr. Bayer noted that the issue of Res Judicata has been raised due to a denied application in 2009. He stated that the sign in the 2009 denial was a static sign and his position is that this sign is a digital sign and therefore is substantially different. He stated that there is also a change in the angle of the billboard as well as a slight change in the location. He noted that the township has since allowed billboards in 2 other locations referring to the Catalyst signs.

Mr. Korkuch's Testimony

Presented Exhibits A-1 and A-2. He described the proposed billboard location and the surrounding uses and conditions. He noted the proposed heights and width of the billboard. The billboard face is 14 feet high and 48 feet wide. The top of the billboard is 90' above the ground and the ground is 22 feet higher than the roadway. He said that on the deed, the property boundary included Pike Road. It is his understanding that Pike Road is not part of the property so the setback of 2.8 feet shown on the plan is from the right of way of Pike Road and not from the property boundary.

Mr. Cucchiaro asked what the setback is from the property line and not the right of way.

Mr. Korkuch responded that the way the deed is written, the setback would be 52.8 feet from the boundary line, however, he believes that 2.8 feet is the correct measurement. He continued his testimony. He stated that exhibit A-2 shows an elevation of 77.2 then slopes up where Pike Road is located. He noted the ladder shown on the plan is all the way to the ground however it will actually stop about 12 feet above the ground.

Chairman Gray stated that on the 2008 plan the sign looks to be in a very similar spot.

Mr. Korkuch responded that it is slightly changed due to a right of way.

Mr. Sharp asked why 2.8 feet from the line and not further in.

Mr. Korkuch responded that there are 2 reasons, 1 is the proximity to Rt. 295 and second is an easement through the property for a gas transmission line. Additionally, they are very limited on space that actually fits the criteria they are looking for.

Mr. Cucchiaro noted that the CME report says that the foundation structure appears to be outside of the easement area. However, the overhang appears to go into the easement area. He asked if that is permitted by the terms of the agreement.

Mr. Korkuch replied that the agreement does not prohibit the overhang.

Mr. Gerber's Testimony

Mr. Gerber stated that he was the Deputy Attorney General for New Jersey and was assigned to DOT council. In particular, he counseled the outdoor advertising section which regulated all outdoor advertising signs in NJ. He then joined a law firm. After leaving that firm he joined Interstate Outdoor Advertising where he oversees all outdoor advertising sign development. He stated that he was involved in the 2008-2009 application before the Zoning Board. He stated that those signs were the same size as the proposed signs and in a very similar location. The difference is the digital vs static sign. There is no vinyl used and the messages change instantaneously. They are used not only for public service messaging but also for municipal events and municipal messaging including emergency messaging. He said there are people on call 24/7 who can override the advertising on the sign within a minute for emergency messaging. Mr. Gerber testified that there are 2 major reasons for the section of a site. First, the signs need to be on a major transportation corridor, which Rt. 295 is and second it must be a commercial or Industrial zone. Both are requirements to obtain a state permit. Additionally, they make sure there is no impact on any residential area. He added that in addition to the digital technology which they did not have at the time of the prior application, they also chose to come back to the board because they are aware that the township has recently approved other digital signs on Rt. 295 and Rt. 73 he believes this shows a change of perspective. He stated that the Federal Highway Administration did a study on digital signage and came to the conclusion that it did not cause any negative traffic impacts. Mr. Gerber noted digital signs on the South Jersey Transportation Authority Expressway and on the Turnpike. Stating that they are government owned property. He said their primary responsibility is safety and if there were a safety issue we would have heard about it by now. He noted they are involved in 60 digital signs in Chicago. Mr. Gerber stated that they have applied for a NJDOT Outdoor Advertising Permit for this location. He stated the criteria that must be met for that permit and that the NJDOT will do an analysis and if they find a traffic safety concern they will deny the permit. In this case, the DOT has approved the application. Mr. Gerber testified that the sign renderings submitted to the board show the signs after the vegetation is trimmed however, they cannot get a DOT permit to trim the vegetation until after the Zoning Board approval. He said they need the sign to be 90 feet high to be properly visible from the North and South sides of Rt. 295. Mr. Gerber introduced Exhibit A-4 and said, using a crane, they took photographs from behind where the sign is proposed. They then drove up and down Rt. 295 to explain why the 90 foot height is necessary. He went through all 12 pages explaining the view and distance from the sign each page shows. Mr. Gerber used this exhibit to explain and show why the tree trimming is necessary, explaining that the sign would not be commercially viable without the tree trimming. He noted there is no tree removal proposed only trimming. He said a licensed arborist will do the work and that the work is only allowed between October and March 15th. He stated that the sign will overhang the Colonial Pipeline easement and that it will not interfere with regular maintenance, if for any reason it is necessary, the head of the sign could be removed for easement maintenance.

Chairman Gray asked Mr. Gerber if any pictures were taken from the residential development.

Mr. Gerber replied that the residential on the other side of the Turnpike but that is the back of the sign and no one from behind the sign will see it. Digital signs focus the light on the roadway. Mr. Gerber explained that the display will stay for 8 seconds and change instantaneously and will not be more than 23 foot candles above ambient light levels at a distance of 250 feet. With exhibit A-5 Mr. Gerber showed some different types of advertising and messaging the sign will have. Ten percent of the available messaging time is set aside for

emergency messaging. The municipality is guaranteed at least one 8 second spot per digital minute which is 8 – 8 second slots. He said the applicant is willing to agree to a condition of approval that there will be no gentlemen's clubs or cannabis or otherwise inappropriate or offensive advertising on the sign. In the past, if the township deemed something inappropriate the applicant would remove the copy. Mr. Gerber said the V shape allows the sign to be read by motorists while being placed further from the road.

Chairman Gray stated that 35 million people use that road a year and not all are interested in Township messaging.

Mr. Gerber replied that is correct but it is in the township's interest to warn people of road conditions, amber alerts and other messaging of interest to others.

Chairman Gray noted that the previous application went to the Third Circuit Court of appeals. Both traffic safety and aesthetics were issues.

Mr. Gerber replied that he recalls being in the hearing and there were aesthetic concerns however, from his perspective, the main concern was traffic safety.

Chairman Gray stated that the courts did find that the Township does have an interest in aesthetics value and it is mentioned in the opinion. He asked Mr. Gerber if there had been any change in the Township Municipal Land Use Ordinances to permit the billboards or reduce the Townships bar of them.

Mr. Gerber replied that there has not been a change in the Ordinance but he thinks it is a material change that the Township has allowed digital billboards on Rt. 295 and Rt. 73.

Chairman Gray noted that they were redevelopment zones done through the Planning Board.

Mr. Gerber replied that from his perspective it is one arm of the government vs. the other.

Chairman Gray noted that as part of the redevelopment the billboard company provided the Township with an EMS building, he believes it was 3.5 million dollars as part of the special redevelopment.

Mr. Gerber said he is aware that was proposed but he does not think it is complete.

Chairman Gray stated that there are no signs complete.

Mr. Francescone reiterated that the other billboard applicant agreed to provide the EMS station and things like that as part of the whole redevelopment plan.

Mr. Desai said that since the denial of the previous application, according to the records of the NJ State Police, Department of Transportation, accidents on Rt. 295 have increased year after year. He asked what the reasons are they want the board to approve the application.

Mr. Gerber responded that their traffic expert will address traffic issues however his experience from traveling Rt. 295 for 20 years is that the traffic volume has tripled in volume. He stated that in his 35 years in this business no one has ever told him that a sign caused them to have an accident.

Mr. Desai noted that a report does not say a sign caused an accident it says inattentive driving.

Mr. Sharp asked if non-profits are able to advertise for free. Stating that the other approved billboard did include advertising for non-profits.

Mr. Gerber replied that it is up to the township how they would like to allocate their free 8 seconds slot.

Mr. Kramer asked if there is a limit on the amount of information in a frame.

Mr. Gerber replied, yes, there is only so much a person can read in the time allowed.

Mr. Cucchiaro asked if the State approval takes local zoning into consideration.

Mr. Gerber replied that the State approval does not, however they cannot build without local approval.

Mr. Cucchiaro commented that the 3rd Circuit Court of Appeals opinion on the denial of the 2008 application stated that "preserving the natural beauty of the township was a legitimate goal of the ordinance". So part of what the board is entitled to look at is aesthetics. Mr. Cucchiaro asked if the trimmed trees will grow back and if there is a maintenance plan.

Mr. Gerber replied that the DOT issues a 5 year permit so the trees can be continually cropped and requires notification to the DOT prior to doing any work. After the 5 years there is another review.

Chairman Gray asked how low the trees will be cut.

Mr. Gerber replied that he does not know, however, if the DOT allows them to cut the trees lower they will lower the sign. The tree trimming will be done on 500 feet of either side of the sign per DOT regulations. Mr. Gerber further stated that he has heard from numerous townships that the digital sign is an aesthetic improvement over the static vinyl signs.

Chairman Gray asked if there were other spots along 295 that would not require so much tree trimming.

Mr. Gerber replied that there are but those spots have other issues that prevent them from being viable options.

Mr. Taylors Testimony

Mr. Taylor submitted exhibit A. He testified that his responsibility was to review the features of the billboard and its viewability. He stated that our eyes are constantly moving and taking in information. When you stop on something of interest for a fraction of a second it is called fixation. A number of fixations is called a dwell. He said there was a 2006 study done by the National Transportation Safety Board to determine what type of fixation could create a crash or near crash incident. They determined that more than 2 seconds of continuous viewing away from driving had the ability to create these crashes or crash activities. In the early 2010's the Federal Highway Administration did another study in response to the use of digital billboards and the traffic concerns around them. What they found was that people focused on the digital billboard for about .4 of a second and the average dwell time of a digital billboard was about 1 second. He said the fixations that they found were no different than changing a radio station. Something you do passively during the act of driving. He said billboards are put in what is called the cone of vision, which has 2 parts. The center is a 40-degree cone from where you are driving, 20 degrees on either side. This is where traffic signs and signals are placed. You see them without taking your eyes off the road at all. The second part is the additional 20 degrees to either side called the paraphernal side. There the ability to read is diminished but the ability to recognize movement and changes in light are just as good as the rest of the visibility. He said if you are to look at the billboard, you technically still have your eyes on the road and are able to see brake lights or a change of lane. Mr. Taylor introduced A-6, a site visibility study. This is the cone of vision study done from both the North and South bound sides of Rt. 295. He noted the different distances studied and the results shown in the report. He said at 1,000 feet you cannot read it but may see the image. The billboard remains in the cone of vision on the northbound side for another 775 feet translating to 8.1 seconds at the posted 65 MPH. At 75 MPH the review time is 5 to 6 seconds. That leaves plenty of time for the public to view the 8-second display. In the same analysis in the Southbound direction, the billboard comes into view at about 900 feet and remains in the cone of vision for another 540 feet for a read time of 5.7 seconds. Based on the report Mr. Taylor said the billboard would not create any type of safety concern. Mr. Taylor noted other studies have been done comparing the crash rates before and after the installation of digital billboards that found no statistical difference. In his opinion, if the billboards are installed the highway will continue to operate the way it does today. Mr. Taylor said the studies he is quoting are 5 studies over about 2 years in Minnesota, Ohio, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, and Virginia.

Mr. Desai said that according to NewJersey.com, state police data shows that in 2022, in Mount Laurel, there were 126 crashes and 32 resulted in injury and asked Mr. Taylor where he came up with only 3 crashes.

Mr. Taylor said the statistic is .3 crashes per million vehicles, not 3 crashes. He explained the math used to calculate crash rates.

Chairman Gray noted that the applicant had reached 1.5 hours and poled the board whether to continue or not. The board chose to go another hour and then reevaluate. The chairman called for a break.

The meeting was reconvened.

Mr. Gerber reiterated that DOT only allows tree trimming 500 feet on either side of the sign.

The board, Mr. Gerber, and Mr. Taylor review Exhibit A-4 noting the visibility from the noted distances noting that the views are accurate if the 500 feet of tree trimming is done.

Mr. Sharp stated that if the average dwell time for a billboard is about 1 second and if the billboard changes once in that time, the total dwell time is now 2 seconds within a 5 second period.

Mr. Taylor corrected that 2 seconds he mentioned earlier is 2 seconds of continuous fixation away from driving. The fixations the study shows are not 1 second but .4 seconds. So .4 seconds to look at the sign then back to the road. Mr. Taylor said that we are constantly doing this while driving, reading many different kinds of signs.

Mr. Sharp said he believes that is distracted driving.

Mr. Taylor disagreed noting the 2006 Federal Highway Safety Administration study showing the threshold for creating a driving issue is a 2 second distraction, not a few tenths of a second. This is the reason for more push buttons in cars. It takes a fraction of a second to change the radio or cruise control etc.

Mr. Sharp asked if the sign would be safer at 60 feet than 90 feet.

Mr. Taylor said he does not believe so.

Mr. Holmes asked how that is relative to the application for these billboards.

Mr. Taylor replied that he uses those studies as a foundation to conclude that digital billboards do not create a safety issue. The .4 seconds average fixation falls well below the 2 seconds safety threshold.

Mr. Holmes stated that Mr. Taylor is quoting federal government studies but there are private studies out there also.

Chairman Gray said there is some disagreement in the private studies regarding the distractive effect of the advertising. That was one of the core findings in the 3rd circuit case.

Mr. Taylor said he looks to the federal government for guidance when it is available.

Chairman Gray stated that the township's master plan says they do not want billboards along those corridors and it has been reviewed recently and not changed.

Mr. Bayer stated that the governing body allowed a redevelopment plan allowing digital billboards on Rt. 295 and Rt. 73 showing a mixed policy.

Mr. Cucchiaro asked if that is a mixed policy or was there a specific decision by the governing body that individual properties that satisfy the eligibility criteria under the local redevelopment and housing law might be appropriate, and a decision that the appropriateness didn't extend along the other portion.

Mr. Bayer said those are land use issues and we are talking about safety issues.

Chairman Gray stated that that does not address the aesthetics or tree's.

Mr. Bhankharia asked if there is a post installation study and if it doesn't work it can be tweaked.

Mr. Taylor replied that the NJDOT Outdoor Advertising Permit requires renewal every year. If there are concerns the permit will be revoked.

Mr. Cucchiaro asked Mr. Taylor what his involvement was in the Simoff Engineering Traffic Safety report that was submitted to the board.

Mr. Taylor replied that they reviewed the information and concurs with the findings. They also did their own analysis. They verified the utilization of the methodology.

Mr. Cucchiaro said that the Simoff report talks about the existing crash rates in a particular portion of Rt. 295 within view of the proposed billboard. He asked Mr. Taylor to quantify what that meant and what portion of the roadway was looked at.

Mr. Taylor responded that the NJDOT publishes their crash rates by milepost sections. Exhibit A-6 shows the 2020 crash area ranging from mile post 41.8 to 42.2 as well as the 2018 and 2019 data.

Mr. Cucchiaro asked who determines that stretch of road as relevant.

Mr. Taylor replied that typically, they start from 1,500 feet to 1,000 feet from the billboard and narrow it down to the area where there is an influence potentially for the billboard.

Mr. Cucchiaro asked if the 1,000 feet is an industry standard.

Mr. Taylor comes from the FHWA study of where they started tracking eye movements. They also look at it from the legibility of the text.

Mr. Cucchiaro stated that it just says view, not read in the study.

Mr. Taylor technically what we are speaking about is within the area of influence of the billboard. Potentially you could see the billboard further but it is not interacting with the crash rate.

Chairman Gray stated that on page 3 of that report, they came to a different conclusion as to how long the billboard can be seen. The report says it is visible for 4.2 seconds whereas Mr. Taylor said 8 seconds.

Mr. Taylor replied that the report is not based on the crane test and anticipated clearing. That is one reason he revisited this and prepared his own report.

Chairman Gray said that the underlying data is now not correct in the report so how can you rely on t he conclusion when it is double the visible time.

Mr. Taylor said he could rely on the foundation. He agreed with the Simoff report methodology at the time the report was prepared. The fact of the crane test further clarified what we are proposing.

Mr. Cucchiaro asked if the FHWA studies referred to have been codified and if there has been an expression of a preemptive effect or anything on the local ordinances.

Mr. Taylor replied that it was published by the FHWA.

Mr. Cucchiaro asked if there is, generally speaking, a disagreement with whether the objective that is being sought is still relevant or is this something site specific. He said it seems a lot of the testimony would be equally relevant to any number of places on the highway.

Mr. Taylor replied he agrees with that statement. The way people view these billboards and the science behind that is relevant along all highways.

Mr. Duarte's Testimony

Mr. Duarte submitted Exhibit A-7. He stated that, unlike traditional static billboards, the digital billboard has diodes. He explained how diodes come together to create the display. He said the manufacturer provided the light levels associated with typical operation. He superimposed the light levels on the aerial photo submitted and described the light levels at specific distances as the exhibit shows. He stated that the center of the sign, or 83 feet from grade, is the maximum light level, and at 500 feet from the sign, there is zero impact on the ambient light. He said there is zero light level impact on the residential use to the south. He noted the significant grade change from the proposed sight to the residential properties and testified that the grade change further screens the residential properties. Mr. Duarte stated that the Outdoor Advertising Agency of America provides industry standards for light levels. The 0.3 foot candles at 250 feet shown here is the industry standard. That industry standard is established on an all white copy, which is the brightest possible setting. These billboards would have contrasting colors, which will diminish that light level. Mr. Duarte

explained that the billboards have a photocell monitor similar to a cell phone which monitors the ambient light conditions and will throttle down the light on overcast days and at night. He said the typical operating power during the day is about 7,500 nits as a measure of brightness. At night that will go down to a maximum of 300 nits. He said an iPhone 14 has a screen brightness rating of between 800 and 1,200 nits. A television screen is between 500 and 1,000 nits.

Mr. Desai asked if the foot candle calculation was submitted to DOT as a requirement for a permit. Mr. Duarte said it was not, however, if there is a complaint they would go out and test it.

Chairman Gray noted that on the exhibit, the visibility is shown to 1,000 feet, double the 500 feet Mr. Duarte mentioned.

Mr. Duarte responded that the visibility is at 1,000 which is different than measurable foot candles.

Chairman Gray asked if the billboard would be visible from the residential uses at night.

Mr. Duarte responded yes, it would be visible depending on where you are but it would not be a measurable light impact. Similar to seeing a streetlight from several hundred feet away, you can see it but it is not a measurable light source.

Mr. Cucchiaro asked if the self regulating standards are in literature anywhere.

Mr. Duarte responded yes, the Outdoor Advertising Agency of America has standards and the manufacturers he has worked with all had the same set of numbers for light levels.

Mr. Cucchiaro asked where are those numbers.

Mr. Duarte responded that it goes by sign size so for a sign 14 x 48, 0.3 foot candles measured on all white copy, at 250 feet over ambient light levels is the standard.

Mr. Cucchiaro asked if the DOT looks at lighting are they reviewing it solely from a safety perspective or do they also look at what impact the level of lighting may have on aesthetics?

Mr. Duarte responded it is his understanding that it is from a safety perspective.

Mr. Bayer noted that the New Jersey Sports Authority, which was the Meadowlands Commission, adopted the 0.3 foot candle standard.

Chairman Gray stated that aesthetically, people who live in that new development are going to be able to see a changing sign from their bedroom.

Mr. Duarte responded in his opinion they would not. At 1,000 feet there is no measurable light level. He said the LED's are directional in nature and intended to emit the image forward. When you get into that 70-degree angle different parts of the sign will be visible and in some cases, it will look like part of the sign is off. Additionally, the sign will be 30-35 feet higher than the homes.

Chairman Gray noted that this is a stretch of 295 that is not lit, so at night when there is a sign that is going to be changing it will draw someone's attention to see what changed.

Mr. Cucchiaro asked if there would be any light spillage onto adjoining lots.

Mr. Duarte said no.

Mr. Cucchiaro asked what the municipal standard is for foot candles.

Mr. Duarte replied that parking lots are required to have a minimum of 0.5-foot candles.

Mr. Cucchiaro asked if the IES has a lighting standard

Mr. Duarte said they were utilized in the foundation of the Meadowlands Commission standards.

Mr. Bayer noted the time at 9:55 and said his next witness will take some time.

Chairman Gray took a short break.

Chairman Gray reconvened the meeting stating that Mr. Bayer has said indicated that he has significantly more testimony than time will allow tonight. However, he wants to give the public a chance to speak since they have been waiting and he opened the public portion of the meeting.

Harriet Insler, Witherod Ct. was sworn in. Ms. Insler stated that the overhead signs on the highways give amber alerts and traffic and weather warnings. She believes that billboards are a distraction and that statistics of any kind can be skewed. She said the trees are beautiful now and will look awful when trimmed. She moved here because of the aesthetics and the last thing we need is a billboard flashing. She asked the board to deny the application.

Seeing no one else, Chairman Gray closed the public portion

Chairman Gray made the official public notice that this application is being carried to the December 6, 2023 Zoning Board hearing as is the next application on the agenda for Outdoor Advertising, ZB23-D-10, Pleasant Valley Ave.

Mr. Bayer consented to carry both applications to the December 6, 2023 Zoning Board hearing.

Mr. Cucchiaro stated for the record that the 2 applications would be carried to December 6, 2023, at 7:00 pm in the Mt. Laurel court room. There will be no additional notice and the application documents are available for view in the township offices.

Adjournment:

Chairman Gray called for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Blum moved the motion Mr. Holmes seconded, All voted in favor and the meeting adjourned at 10:04 pm.

Adopted on: December 6, 2023

Suzanna Baskay
Suzanna Baskay, Secretary
Zoning Board of Adjustment