

**LAND USE BOARD MINUTES**  
**June 3, 2015**

The Tewksbury Township Land Use Board met in a regularly scheduled meeting on the above date in the Municipal Meeting Hall, 60 Water Street, Mountainville, New Jersey. The meeting was called to order at 7:36 p.m.

Present: Blake Johnstone, Mary Elizabeth Baird, Shaun Van Doren, Bruce Mackie, Ed Kerwin, Michael Moriarty and David Larsen, Alt. #4.

Also present: Daniel Bernstein, Land Use Board Attorney, William Burr, Land Use Board Engineer and Shana Goodchild, Land Use Administrator.

Absent: Dana Desiderio, Robert Becker, Ed D'Armiento, Alt. #1, Kurt Rahenkamp, Alt. #2 and Glenn Stein, Alt. #3.

There were four (4) people in the audience.

**OPEN PUBLIC MEETING ACT STATEMENT**

Mr. Johnstone opened the meeting by announcing that adequate notice of the meeting had been provided by posting a copy thereof on the Police/Administration Building bulletin board, faxing a copy to the Hunterdon Review and the Hunterdon County Democrat, and filing with the Municipal Clerk, all on January 8, 2015.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Those present stood and pledged allegiance to the American flag.

**CLAIMS**

Mr. Johnstone asked the Board if there were any questions or comments regarding the following claim to which the response was negative. Mrs. Baird made a motion to approve the claims listed below and Mr. Moriarty seconded the motion. The motion carried by the following roll call vote:

1. Bernstein & Hoffman – Attendance at 5-6-15 LUB meeting, invoice dated May 7, 2015 (\$375.00)
2. Bernstein & Hoffman – Land Use Board Escrow – Marquardt/Fortier (B39, L27), invoice dated April 30, 2015 (\$750.00)
3. Banish Associates, Inc. – Land Use Board Escrow – Marquardt (B39, L27), invoice #P15-24452 (\$568.00)

Roll Call Vote:

Those in Favor: Mrs. Baird, Mr. Van Doren, Mr. Mackie, Mr. Moriarty, Mr. Kerwin, Mr. Larsen and Mr. Johnstone

Those Opposed: None

## **CORRESPONDENCE**

A motion was made by Mrs. Baird and seconded by Mr. Moriarty acknowledging receipt of the following items of correspondence. All were in favor.

1. Memorandum dated May 28, 2015 from Chief Holmes re: LUB Appl. No. 15-04, Block 45, Lot 4.
2. Memorandum dated May 15, 2015 from Chief Holmes re: LUB Appl. No. 15-03, Block 51, Lot 59.
3. A letter dated May 28, 2015 from William Burr re: LUB Appl. No. 15-04, Block 45, Lot 4.
4. A letter dated May 28, 2015 from William Burr re: LUB Appl. No. 15-03, Block 51, Lot 59.
5. A notice from Chester Township Planning Board regarding a public hearing for the adoption of an Amendment to the Master Plan to include the Housing Element and Fair Share Plan.

## **MINUTES**

- December 17, 2014

The minutes of December 17, 2014 were approved as submitted by motion of Mr. Van Doren and seconded by Mrs. Baird. All were in favor. Mr. Moriarty abstained.

- December 17, 2014 Executive Session

The minutes of December 17, 2014 were approved as submitted by motion of Mr. Van Doren and seconded by Mrs. Baird. All were in favor. Mr. Moriarty abstained.

- January 7, 2015

The minutes of January 7, 2015 were approved as submitted by motion of Mrs. Baird and seconded by Mr. Van Doren. All were in favor.

## **ORDINANCE REPORT**

Mr. Mackie reported on an ordinance from Readington Township which adjusted the boundaries on the zoning map for the Wal-Mart parking lot. Mr. Mackie had no comment and didn't feel the ordinance was relevant to Tewksbury.

## **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Mr. Johnstone asked the public if there were any questions or comments regarding anything not on the agenda. There being no comments or questions, Mr. Johnstone closed the public participation portion of the meeting.

## **RESOLUTIONS**

- **Resolution No. 15-08** - Puri, Appl. No. 15-06, Block 32, Lot 7.08  
*Eligible to Vote: Mr. Van Doren, Mr. Becker, Mr. Mackie, Mr. Kerwin, Mr. D'Armiento, Mr. Rahenkamp, Mr. Stein and Mr. Larsen*

Mr. Van Doren made a motion to approve the following resolution. Mr. Kerwin seconded the motion. The motion carried by the following roll call vote:

LAND USE BOARD

TOWNSHIP OF TEWKSBURY  
APPLICATION # 15-06  
RESOLUTION #15-08

WHEREAS, NAVNEET PURI has applied to the Land Use Board of the Township of Tewksbury for permission to install a swimming pool, patio, driveway extension and parking area on her residential lot which is located at 40 Still Hollow Road and designated as Block 32, Lot 7.08 on the Tewksbury Township Tax Map, which premises is located in the Highlands (HL) Zone, and

WHEREAS, the application was presented by Professional Engineer and Professional Planner Wayne J. Ingram, P.E., P.P. of the firm of Engineering & Land Planning Associates, Inc. and Reeva Puri at the May 6, 2015 Land Use Board meeting, and

WHEREAS, the application was reviewed by Land Use Board Engineer William H. Burr, IV, P.E. of the firm of Maser Consulting, P.A., and

WHEREAS, the Board, after considering the evidence and testimony presented by the applicant and Mr. Burr, has made the following factual findings:

A. The Subject Property.

1. The 6.36 acre subject property is irregularly shaped. It has two *legs* leading to Still Hollow Road. The southern *leg* has a width of 35 feet and is improved with a gravel driveway 10-12 feet wide leading from the road to the garage. The southern *leg* extends 366.50 feet to the main portion of the lot. This *leg* has the appearance of a flag mast for a flag lot. The northern *leg* is 196.01 feet wide and also

extends 366.50 feet to the main body of the lot. The northern *leg*, as well as most of the lot, is encumbered with a conservation easement.

2. The adjoining property to the east has access through the applicant's driveway.

3. The lot is improved with a single family dwelling which was built in 2013. The home is set back about 468 feet from the road. The home has a rear yard setback of 273.32 feet, but is only set back about 60 feet from the conservation easement.

B. The Proposal.

4. The applicant proposes to install a 20 feet by 40 feet in-ground swimming pool in back of her home. Additional improvements will include a pool deck, a pool equipment pad, patio, pavers, and a paver walk leading to a deck landing.

5. The applicant proposes to extend the driveway in order to permit easier access into and out of the side entry garage. The driveway would be widened in front of the home to provide a parking area for guests.

6. The applicant proposes to erect two (2) pillars at the end of the southern *leg* approximately 380 feet from the road.

C. Requested Variances.

7. As noted in factual finding 1 herein, the subject property contains 6.36 acres, while the minimum lot size in the HL Zone is 12 acres.

8. The subject property is grandfathered under 706f2 of the Tewksbury Township Development Regulations Ordinance (DRO). Pursuant to Section 706f, the maximum lot coverage for the property in question is 5%. The site presently has 4.5% lot coverage which would be increased to 5.8% for the proposed construction.

9. Section 719B.f permits gates and pillars not to exceed 8 feet tall to be located at the main entry drive to any residential property. The proposed pillars are about 380 feet from the front of the property.

D. Justification for Variances.

10. The requested variances are justified under N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70c(2) by advancing the following purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law under N.J.S.A. 40:55D-2:

“c. To provide adequate light, air and open space;” *by keeping the driveway area which is shared with adjoining Lot 7.07, which is located between the legs of the subject property, open, and placing the pillars a distance from the adjoining lot.*

h. To ... to promote the free flow of traffic;” *by the driveway extension which will permit easier access into the side entry garage and providing a parking area for guests near the home.*

g. To provide sufficient space in appropriate locations for a variety of ... recreational ... uses ... both public and private;” *by permitting the construction of a swimming pool, patio, and related improvements in the only location on the property where it is permitted.*

11. The benefits from the deviations substantially outweigh any detriments.

12. The requested relief can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and without substantially impairing the intent and purpose of the zone plan and zoning ordinance of the Township of Tewksbury.

NOW, THEREFORE be it resolved by the Land Use Board of the Township of Tewksbury on this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of June 2015 that the application of NAVNEET PURI be approved in accordance with a plan titled: “PURI POOL 40 STILL HOLLOW

ROAD BLOCK 32 LOT 7.08 SHEET 11 TEWKSBURY TOWNSHIP, HUNTERDON COUNTY, NEW JERSEY” prepared by Engineering & Land Planning Associates, Inc., on March 17, 2015 and last revised on April 15<sup>th</sup>, 2015, consisting of four (4) sheets, subject, however, to the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall install permanent surveyor’s markers adjoining the swimming pool and patio area which will designate and identify the conservation easement area. The type of markers, the number, the placement, and the installation are subject to the approval of the Land Use Board Engineer, prior to any construction or site disturbance taking place. The markers shall permanently remain on the property. The plans shall be revised to show the markers.

2. Prior to any construction or site disturbance taking place, the applicant shall have a snow fence installed to protect the conservation easement area. It shall not be removed until all construction and site disturbance has taken place. The type of snow fence, location, and the installation is subject to the approval of the Land Use Board Engineer.

3. Compliance with all swimming pool ordinances and regulations.

4. The applicant shall comply with all rules, regulations, ordinances and statues of the Federal, State, County and local municipal governments that may apply to the premises. The applicant shall submit a letter to the Land Use Administrator certifying compliance with the aforementioned rules, regulations, ordinances and statutes.

5. This resolution and the issuance of permits are conditioned on the applicant paying all escrows and fees.

6. The variance shall be utilized within one year of the date of this memorialization resolution. If it is not utilized within one year, this approval shall become void and have no further effect.

7. Pursuant to the testimony, the installation will not change the grading of the property, nor encroach within the conservation easement area.

8. Conditions recommended by Land Use Board Engineer William H. Burr, IV, P.E. in his report of May 1, 2015, as modified by the Land Use Board:

“TECHNICAL REVIEW:

1. The applicant and its professionals should describe in detail the proposal including an overview of the proposed improvements, materials, etc. *See factual finding 4-6 herein.*
2. The applicant and its professionals should provide testimony to support the proposed lot coverage variance. Can any existing or proposed lot coverage areas on the property be reduced in size or eliminated as a way to decrease the amount of coverage on this property? What is the purpose of the expanded driveway areas? *See factual finding 5 herein. The testimony disclosed that there are no areas on the property where lot coverage can be removed. The expanded driveway areas offer easier access to the side entry garage. The driveway bump out in front of the home is to provide parking for guests.*
3. In an effort to mitigate the increase in stormwater runoff from the proposed improvements, the applicant has provided a drywell system to capture and infiltrate the runoff from the pool and patio area. In total, the proposed drywell system has been sized to handle a total of 3,398 S.F. of lot coverage which equals the increase in runoff being proposed from existing conditions. While I have no issues with the conceptual design of this stormwater management system, I do have the following comments regarding the plans and corresponding calculations/construction details:
  - a. The drywell detail on Sheet 4 indicated that “The drywell system stores the difference in volume between the 4.5% and 5.8% impervious coverage during a 3” rain stored from all new impervious surfaces.” While this rationale is sound, it does not appear that runoff from the proposed driveway extensions will be captured in the drywells. Additional inlet(s) will be added to the plan to capture runoff from the driveway extension areas to the approval of the Land Use Board Engineer.

- b. The construction detail for the rip-rap protection should be revised to reflect the invert elevation.
- c. Soil tests will need to be performed to confirm adequate soil conditions to allow for the installation of the drywell system as proposed. This issue could be addressed as a condition of any Board approval.

*The applicant's engineer and planner agreed to these provisions.*

- 4. I would recommend the plans be revised to clarify and label the proposed patio areas and lawn/landscaped areas so that it is clear what improvements are being proposed as part of this application. Furthermore, I would recommend the applicant's engineer check the lot coverage calculations to ensure that all patio areas have been included in the calculations. *This was agreed to.*
- 5. The application form mentions that the "project proposes the addition of a pool and associated features including patios, retaining walls, driveway extensions and a basement walkout." Where is the basement walkout proposed? *The applicant will be installing a new exterior basement doorway at the northwest end of the rear of the home at grade.*
- 6. A conservation easement exists to the rear of the existing dwelling and the improvements are proposed to extend very close to the limits of this easement. The conservation easement contains language that prohibits the alteration of the terrain, contour or topography of the lands or which would result in the destruction or removal of any trees, vegetation or other natural features. Testimony should be provided to clarify that the proposed improvements can actually be constructed with no disturbance to the existing conservation easement? There appears to be a discrepancy with the elevation/grading of the southernmost retaining wall nearest the easement. *A snow fence will be installed along the conservation easement adjoining the location of the proposed swimming pool and patio prior to any site disturbance. After construction, an As Built Survey shall be submitted to the construction official, Land Use Board engineer, and Land Use Administrator. The applicant shall place permanent markers within the easement area adjoining the location of the swimming pool and patio which are subject to the approval of the Land Use Board engineer.*
- 7. The plans call for an "Existing treeline to be removed" in the rear yard area adjacent to the conservation easement, but does not indicate how many trees and what size trees will need to be removed to allow for the installation of the pool. The applicant should provide testimony to clarify if any new trees are proposed to be planted to offset this tree removal? *Underbrush shall be removed but not trees.*
- 8. The plan calls for driveway pillars (4 ft. tall) to be constructed along the driveway at the end of the "flag stem" driveway, near the southwest corner of adjacent Lot 7.07. DRO Section 719B.f. states "Gates and pillars shall be permitted, not to

exceed eight (8) feet in height and located only at the main entry drive to any residential property. If located on a designated scenic road, the design of such gates and pillars shall be subject to the review and approval of the Scenic Roads Commission.” The Board should whether the proposed pillars meet the intent of the ordinance since they do not appear to be proposed at the main entry drive to the property. *The Board found that the pillars were located in an appropriate location. See factual finding 10 herein.*

9. The applicant should clarify whether there is any other exterior lighting proposed as part of this application. If so, the applicant should provide information to confirm that there will not be any undesirable effects to the surrounding properties in accordance with DRO Section 632. *The applicant does not intend to install up lights or flood lights. Low voltage landscaping lights along the pathways are proposed. The lighting shall comply with Section 632 of DRO. The lighting shall not cause sky glow or glare on other properties or public roads. The lighting is subject to the approval of the Land Use Board engineer.*
10. I would recommend the applicant submit additional photographs showing the areas where the improvements are proposed to be located so that the Board has a clear understanding of the proposal. *The applicant submitted additional photographs at the public hearing.*
11. A Grading and Surface Water Management Plan (GSWMP) will need to be submitted to the Land Use Administrator for review by the Township Engineer prior to the Construction Permit application. This GSWMP must comply with Chapter 13.12 of the Township Code of Ordinances. *The applicant agreed to this requirement.*

9. There shall be no gates within the pillars. With the exception of their location, the pillars shall comply with the terms of the DRO.

10. No lighting on pillars.

11. The applicant shall file a deed restriction to the approval of the Land Use Board Engineer and the Land Use Board Attorney requiring:

The submission of a Grading and Surface Water Management Plan, required in condition 8.11 herein, to the approval of the Township Engineer. The plan is to be implemented to the approval of the Township Engineer. The facility shall reduce the effective storm water runoff from the site to that produced by 5% lot coverage. The

facility shall be permanently maintained in accordance with the NJDEP Best Management Practices and any subsequent revisions and successor regulations.

13. No trees shall be removed.

Roll Call Vote

Those in Favor: Mr. Van Doren, Mr. Mackie and Mr. Kerwin

Those Opposed: None

➤ **Resolution No. 15-09** – Amended Policy Decision

Ms. Goodchild noted that the resolution was originally adopted in 2012 however the attachment references the former Zoning Officer Randall Benson. The amended resolution would reference our current Zoning Officer Dennis Allen.

Mr. Van Doren made a motion to approve the following resolution. Mrs. Baird seconded the motion. The motion carried by the following roll call vote:

*Land Use Board Policy  
Regarding the Installation  
of Minor Accessory  
Structures on Residential  
Lots with Access  
Through an Easement,  
Right-of-Way, or Private  
Road Rather than  
Access through to an  
Approved, Improved  
Public Street.*

LAND USE BOARD  
TOWNSHIP OF TEWKSBURY  
RESOLUTION #15-09  
(Amendment to Resolution No. 12-25)

WHEREAS, N.J.S.A 40:55d-35 provides in part:

**“Building lot to abut street.** No permit for the erection of any building or structure shall be issued unless the lot abuts a street giving access to such proposed building or structure”

AND, WHEREAS, a planning variance may be granted under N.J.S.A. 40:55D-36 permitting structures on said lots lacking frontage on an improved, approved public street, and

WHEREAS, Rick and Krista Geoffrion who reside in a residence at Block 32, Lot 22.05 and David Feigley who resides in a residence at Block 33, Lots 12.01 and 13 on parcels with access through an easement or private road rather than a public street, and

WHEREAS, Rick and Krista Geoffrion sought permission from the Zoning Officer to install a fence on their residential lot, and

WHEREAS, David Feigley sought permission to install a generator on his residential lot, and

WHEREAS, a question arose as to whether the structures could be approved without the applicants obtaining a planning variance under N.J.S.A. 40:55D-36, and

WHEREAS, the Zoning Officer referred the matters to the Land Use Board, and

WHEREAS, the Geoffrions and David Feigley appeared at the December 5, 2012 Land Use Board meeting, and

WHEREAS, the Board determined that the proposed fence and generator did not necessitate an application under N.J.S.A. 40:55D-36, and

WHEREAS, the Board wished to establish a policy whereby the existing Land Use Administrator and existing Zoning Officer together could grant waivers from

N.J.S.A. 40:55D-36 for applications for minor accessory structures on residential lots which would have no discernable impact on emergency service or other access, and

WHEREAS, the Board asked its counsel to prepare a policy statement, and

WHEREAS, the Board's counsel has prepared the attached policy statement which is attached to this resolution, and

WHEREAS, the Board had found the policy statement to be appropriate.

NOW, THEREFORE be it resolved by the Land Use Board of the Township of Tewksbury on this 3rd day of June, 2015 that the Board adopt the attached policy statement.

Roll Call Vote

Those in Favor: Mr. Van Doren, Mrs. Baird, Mr. Mackie, Mr. Moriarty, Mr. Kerwin, Mr. Larsen and Mr. Johnstone

Those Opposed: None

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

- Fritz  
Appl. No. 15-03  
Block 51, Lot 59  
Side Yard Setback Variance  
**Action Deadline – 8/25/15**

Robert Boak, attorney, was present representing property owners Brian and Lisa Fritz for their request for a side yard setback variance to retain an existing shed.

Brian and Lisa Fritz, 11 Honeyman Road were sworn in by Mr. Bernstein.

Mr. Fritz explained that he and his wife purchased the property in June of 2004. Prior to the closing it was discovered that the shed was over the property line so the former owner moved the shed several feet and the Township performed a certificate of occupancy inspection prior to the closing. When asked by Mr. Boak if he thought that the issue with the shed had been resolved, Mr. Fritz responded in the positive. When asked by Mr. Boak to describe the property, Mr. Fritz explained that it is very steeply sloped in the rear of the house; there are very limited level areas on the lot. He noted that if the shed was

moved to a conforming location it would be behind the house and not functional. When asked what is stored in the shed, Mr. Fritz responded lawnmowers, yard equipment and children's toys and bikes. When asked about the neighborhood, Mr. Fritz explained that it is a heavily wooded area and noted that the side of the property with the shed is buffered from the neighboring lot by trees and evergreens.

When asked by Mr. Burr if there is an advantage to having the shed in its current location, Mr. Fritz explained that it is at the end of the driveway which makes it easier to get items in and out of the shed. When asked about existing lights on the shed, Mr. Fritz responded in the negative and noted that the shed does not have electrical service.

When asked by Mr. Bernstein the size of the shed, Mr. Fritz responded 15 feet x 20 feet. When asked if the shed is .9 feet from the property line, Mr. Fritz responded in the positive. When asked if a permit was sought from the construction office, Mr. Fritz responded in the negative. Mr. Bernstein suggested that a condition of approval be that the applicants apply for a zoning and construction permits.

When asked by Mr. Moriarty if the shed is on a concrete slab, Mr. Fritz explained that it is on footings near an existing retaining wall.

When asked by Mr. Van Doren why it took almost two (2) years to apply for the variance, Mr. Boak noted that he was slow getting around to making the application.

There being no additional questions from the Board, Mr. Johnstone opened the meeting up to the public. There being no questions or comments from the public, Mr. Johnstone closed the public portion of the meeting.

Mr. Johnstone noted that he is familiar with the property and feels that Mr. and Mrs. Fritz have done an excellent job with renovating the house and opined that the shed has no impact on the neighbors due to the wooded buffer.

There being no additional questions or comments, Mr. Van Doren made a motion to approve the application with the conditions that there be no lighting on the shed and that the applicant apply for proper zoning and construction permits. Mr. Moriarty seconded the motion. The motion carried by the following roll call vote:

Roll Call Vote:

Those in Favor: Mrs. Baird, Mr. Van Doren, Mr. Mackie, Mr. Moriarty, Mr. Kerwin, Mr. Larsen and Mr. Johnstone

Those Opposed: None

- Nicholson  
Appl. No. 15-04  
Block 45, Lot 4  
Fence Variance

**Action Deadline – 7/16/15**

Brandon Nicholson, 194 Lamington Road, was sworn in by Mr. Bernstein.

Mr. Nicholson explained that he modified existing pillars, removed an old fence and installed a new six (6) foot high cedar fence. He noted that the fence was installed without knowing that there is a fence ordinance in place that limits the fence height to four (4) feet. He noted that he installed the fence to keep his children from wandering into the busy roadway.

When asked by Mr. Johnstone if the fence is located 30 feet from the centerline of the roadway, Mr. Nicholson responded in the positive. When asked if the new fence was installed in the same location as the previous fence, Mr. Nicholson responded in the positive but noted that the new fence is longer.

Mr. Burr noted that in reviewing the plan submitted it appears that part of the fence is located within the County right of way. Mr. Burr suggested that the variance be conditioned on the County approving the location. Mr. Van Doren noted that Ms. Desiderio’s wall is outside of the County right of way. When asked if he would agree to have the County sign off on his fence location, Mr. Nicholson responded in the positive.

When asked by Mr. Moriarty if the pillars are on concrete pads, Mr. Nicholson responded in the positive.

When asked by Mr. Mackie what he will do if the County will not approve the location, Mr. Nicholson explained that he will modify the fence.

There being no additional questions from the Board, Mr. Johnstone opened the meeting up to the public. There being no public questions or comments, Mr. Johnstone closed the public portion of the meeting.

Mr. Johnstone didn’t have an issue with the fence however he agreed with Mr. Burr that the approval should be conditioned on the applicant gaining the necessary approval from the County.

Mr. Van Doren made a motion to approve the application subject to County approval and the applicant obtaining all necessary permits for the fence and pillars. Mr. Moriarty seconded the motion. The motion carried by the following roll call vote:

Roll Call Vote:

Those in Favor: Mrs. Baird, Mr. Van Doren, Mr. Mackie, Mr. Moriarty, Mr. Kerwin, Mr. Larsen and Mr. Johnstone

Those opposed: None

**ESCROW CLOSINGS**

➤ New Cingular (B17, L2.01) - \$848.75

Mr. Van Doren made motion to close the above referenced escrow account and return the balance to the applicant. Mrs. Baird seconded the motion. The motion carried by the following roll call vote:

Roll Call Vote:

Those in Favor: Mrs. Baird, Mr. Van Doren, Mr. Mackie, Mr. Moriarty, Mr. Kerwin, Mr. Larsen and Mr. Johnstone

Those Opposed: None

**BOARD DISCUSSION RE COAH AND HIGHLANDS**

Mr. Van Doren noted that the Land Use Board will be asked to provide comments on COAH and Highlands Land Use Ordinance. He explained that the Township has to file its COAH paperwork with the courts by July 6, 2015; the Housing and Fair Share Plan will have to be amended by December 6, 2015 to comply with the Supreme Court decision. When asked about the Supreme Court decision, Mr. Van Doren explained that the growth share methodology has been disregarded because the Supreme Court has indicated that it was not in the Fair Housing Act. He opined that if the legislature would amend the Fair Housing Act to include growth share then municipalities would be compliant. Mr. Van Doren explained that Tewksbury is planning to join other municipalities in hiring a Rutgers professor who previously worked for COAH in the previous rounds. He noted that the builders have suggested that Tewksbury should have an obligation of 440. Mr. Van Doren explained that each vicinage will have a judge assigned that will hear the COAH cases; it is unknown at this point who the judge is for the Somerset, Hunterdon and Warren vicinage. When asked by Mr. Johnstone why the Assemblymen and Senators for these towns are not helping, Mr. Van Doren noted that those legislators are in the minority.

Finally, Mr. Van Doren noted that he read an article in the Star Ledger about the suburbs getting a “mansion makeover”, the article referenced a community in Virginia where a builder bought two (2) dozen homes valued at \$450,000 each; each home was demolished and replaced with one (1) million dollar homes. Mr. Johnstone reported similar practices in Westfield, NJ. Mrs. Baird noted that it has happened in Tewksbury with small homes either being demolished entirely or modified so drastically that the original home is unrecognizable.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:11 p.m. by motion of Mr. Van Doren and seconded by Mr. Mackie. All were in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Shana L. Goodchild  
Land Use Administrator