

# **EXHIBIT A**

**FILE****RESOLUTION****BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT OF THE TOWNSHIP OF TEANECK****ZB-2015-61**

---

**IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF:****RED REAL ESTATE ASSOCIATES, LLC  
764 NEW BRIDGE ROAD (BLOCK 1001; LOT 6.01)**

---

**WHEREAS**, Red Real Estate Associates, LLC (hereinafter, the "Applicant" or "Owner") maintaining offices at 270 Sylvan Avenue, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, is the Owner of 764 New Bridge Road (the Property"). The Property is more specifically designated as Block 1001 Lot 6.01, is located in the R-TH Residential Townhouse District of the Township, and contains 2.29 acres (99,752 square feet); and

**WHEREAS**, the Applicant has submitted an Application for Preliminary and Final Site Plan Approval, a Use Variance, and related variance relief for the construction and operation of mixed use development consisting of nineteen (19) residential units of which eighteen (18) are one (1) bedroom units and one is a two bedroom unit as well as 10,931 square feet of ground floor retail space; and

**WHEREAS**, the Property is located at the intersection of New Bridge Road (C.R. 49) and River Road (C.R. 41) and is currently improved with various commercial and residential structures all of which would be considered to be in aged and dilapidated condition; and

**WHEREAS**, the Applicant previously obtained several previous approvals, the latest of which was for a retail branch bank building with a drive-thru pursuant to an application for Preliminary and Final Site Plan Approval with Variances and Waivers which was granted approval by the Township of Teaneck Zoning Board of Adjustment on March 6, 2014 as Appeal

ZB-2013-52 (hereinafter "Prior Approval"); and

**WHEREAS**, in order to undertake the Development, the Applicant sought various permits and approvals from the Board. The initial relief sought, and relevant ordinance sections, can be summarized as follows:

- 1) §33-17 - Site plan approval required;
- 2) §33-24(p)(1)(b) - Townhouses & Apartments are permitted, but only for inclusionary affordable housing purposes; Retail and Apartments (not inclusionary) are not permitted uses in the zone;
- 3) §33-24(p)(4)(a)(3)[i] – permitted front setback of building to a public street setback is 35 feet; proposed front setback of building to a public street curblin setback is 10 feet (1 foot to the right of way);
- 4) §33-24(p)(4)(a)(4)[i] - permitted front setback of building to property line is 35 feet; proposed front setback of building to property line is 10 feet. (1 foot to the right of way);
- 5) §33-24(p)(4)(a)(8)[ii] – required buffer shall be a minimum of 5 feet adjacent to other property lines, including the public street; proposed distance to the right of way is 1 foot;
- 6) §33-24(p)(4)(a)(10) – 94 parking spaces are required; 75 parking spaces are proposed;
- 7) §33-24(p)(4)(b)(1) – Permitted number of residential units per acreage is 17 units; 19 residential units are proposed;
- 8) §33-24(p)(4)(b)(2) [ii] - Maximum permitted lot coverage is 42,732.36 sq. ft (45%); proposed lot coverage is 55,172.22 sq. ft (58.1%);
- 9) §33-24(p)(4)(b)(3) - Maximum permitted height is 35 feet or three stories, whichever is lesser, measured from the lowest grade to the midpoint of any sloping roof with a pitch of at least 6 on 12, or to the top of the roof in all other cases; proposed height of the building is 45 feet;
- 10) §33-24(p)(4)(b)(4) - 6 residential units permitted per structure; 19 residential units proposed per structure;
- 11) §33-24(p)(4)(b)(5) - maximum allowed length of building is 170 feet; proposed length of building is 195 feet;
- 12) §33-24(p)(4)(b)(6) - no building shall contain more than two dwelling units in a straight unbroken row, and the exterior wall of each such building shall include a setback or break with a depth of not less than four feet after every two dwelling units; proposed

building contains 10 units in a row on each side of the building with a proposed façade setback of 1.6 feet;

13) §33-28(b)(6)(c) - Not more than two driveways, each of not more than 30 feet nor less than 20 feet in width, shall be permitted for each 300 feet of frontage on a public street; proposed driveway entrances on New Bridge Road are 15 and 18 feet wide;

14) §33-29(b)(2) - maximum permitted wall and fence height combination is 6 feet; proposed combined wall and fence height is 16 feet (12 foot wall and 4 foot fence);

15) §33-18(c)(5)(i)(2) – required minimum setback to property is 20’; minimum setback to property line mark proposed is 5’

16) §33-18(c)(5)(i)(2) – required minimum setback to parking area is 20’; minimum setback to property line mark proposed is 5’

17) §33-18(c)(5)(e)(2) – maximum total front wall sign area permitted is 1 ½ per linear foot of building frontage (292.5 sf); total proposed front wall sign area is 266.65 sf;

18) §33-18(c)(5)(e)(2)(i) – maximum total side wall sign area permitted is 50% of the permitted signage on the front façade; proposed total side wall sign area is 64 sf; and

19) §33-18(c)(5)(e)(2)(iii) – maximum total sign area permitted for directional sign is 2.5 sf; a total of six (6) directional signs are proposed totaling 4 sf each;

20) §33-18(c)(5)(i)(2) – minimum setback from property line and parking area required for freestanding sign is 20’; proposed setback for freestanding sign is 5’.

**WHEREAS**, during the course of the hearings several amendments to the Application were made by counsel on behalf of the Applicant and were testified to by Applicant’s professionals. The plans were revised accordingly to reflect certain required revisions. To that end, certain of the requests for relief were also modified and amended during the hearing and were reflected on revised plans and exhibits prepared for the hearings all as herein described; and

**WHEREAS**, the Applicant has filed for said approvals and public hearings were held on February 25, 2016, April 7, 2016, and May 5, 2016 (the “Hearing”, “Public Hearing” or “Hearing Dates”) wherein sworn testimony was heard and considered on behalf of the Applicant and other interested parties; and

**WHEREAS**, at said public hearings, the Applicant was represented by counsel, Louis L. D'Arminio, Esq. or Jennifer Knarich, Esq., of the Law Firm of Price Meese Shulman & D'Arminio, PC, (collectively, "LD/JK") who adduced the testimony of the following individuals:

1. Gil Rivera, Vice President of Development, Kamson Corporation ("Rivera");
2. John M. Montoro, A.I.A., The Montoro Architectural Group ("Montoro");
3. Andrew L. French, PE, French & Parrello Associates ("French");
4. Justin Taylor, PE, PTOE, LEED AP, Principal, Dynamic Traffic ("Taylor");
5. Joseph Burgis PP, AICP, , Professional Planners, Burgis Associates ("Burgis");

**WHEREAS**, at said public hearings the Applicant presented the following Exhibits:

- A-1 Aerial Photograph, Subject Property;
- A-2 Sheet 8 of 16 of Site Plan Colorized, prepared by French;
- A-3 Architectural Rendering prepared by Montoro;
- A-4 Full Site Plan set with two colorized pages;
- A-5 Handout regarding structure height;
- A-6 Board demonstrating materials utilized on Property;
- A-7 Site Plan, dated November 2, 2015, revised January 27, 2016;
- A-8 Traffic report, prepared by Taylor and dated October 15, 2015;
- A-9 Parking analysis chart;
- A-10 Blade sign design prepared by Montoro;
- A-11 Revised Engineering Plans, dated March 23, 2016;
- A-12 County Planning Board Review, dated February 24, 2016;
- A-13 County Planning Board Review, dated April 14, 2016.

**WHEREAS**, witnesses for the Board presented the following Exhibits:

- B-1 Refusal of Permit, dated October 13, 2015;
- B-2 Refusal of Permit, dated April 6, 2016;
- B-3 Health Department Review, dated February 22, 2016;
- B-4 Teaneck Fire Department Review, dated February 23, 2016;
- B-5 Traffic Review by Stonefield Engineering and Design, dated April 5, 2016;
- B-6 Planning Review by Phillips Preiss Grygiel, LLC, dated February 22, 2016;
- B-7 Engineering Review Letter(s) by Board Engineer, various dates.

**WHEREAS**, the legal standard to be applied in this matter are as follows:

**USE VARIANCE**

To obtain a use variance, an applicant must demonstrate that there are “special reasons” for the grant of the variance and that there will not be substantial negative impact if the variance is granted. N.J.S.A. 40-55D-70d. The “special reasons” are often referred to as the “positive criteria” and can be demonstrated if the use carries out purposes of zoning or the refusal to allow the project would impose an undue hardship upon the applicant. In addition, “special reasons” exist if the proposed site is particularly suited for the proposed use. Medici v. BPR Co., 107 N.J. 1, 4 (1987).

### **BULK VARIANCE RELIEF**

Under the Municipal Land Use Law (MLUL) bulk variances may be granted by a demonstration of the positive and negative criteria:

(c)(1) Where: (a) by reason of exceptional narrowness, shallowness or shape of a specific piece of property, or (b) by reason of exceptional topographic conditions or physical features uniquely affecting a specific piece of property, or (c) by reason of an extraordinary and exceptional situation uniquely affecting a specific piece of property or the structures lawfully existing thereon, the strict application of any regulation pursuant to . . . this act would result in peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties to, or exceptional and undue hardship upon, the developer of such property . . . [or] (2) where in an application or appeal relating to a specific piece of property the purposes of this act . . . would be advanced by a deviation from the zoning ordinance requirements and the benefits of the deviation would substantially outweigh any detriment.

No variance or other relief may be granted under the terms of this section . . . without a showing that such variance or other relief 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.

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, by the Board that it does hereby make the following findings of fact and conclusions based thereon:

1. That all of the recitals hereinabove set forth are incorporated by reference. That all of the exhibits and documents produced by the Applicant, Members of the Public, or the Board are herein incorporated whether specified herein or not.

2. The within Resolution is not intended to reiterate the entire record before the Board which is incorporated herein and made a part hereof. It is intended to provide an overview of the record and testimony as well as the decision of the Board and the reasons therefore. The entire record made before the Board is incorporated here and made a part hereof.

**EVIDENCE ADDUCED IN THE APPLICATION**

3. LD/JK provided an overview of the Application and an overview of the history of prior Applications regarding the Property as well as an overview of the Property and the various conditions. LD/JK made the Board aware of a prior, recent, appeal regarding the Property, including the Prior Approval. It was proffered by the Applicant that variances that were previously granted under the terms of the Prior Approval were still in effect despite the alterations in the Site Plan and the different Application. The Board rejected this contention and requested that the Applicant provide proofs as to all requested variances without reference to the Prior Approval. The statements of LD/JK were not testimony but they did provide a valuable context for the Application and factual statements made by LD/JK were confirmed by other witnesses during the course of the public hearings.

4. Rivera provided an overview of the existing conditions of the Property and the Application. He testified that he was an employee of Kamson Corporation (“Kamson”) and that the Applicant was a subsidiary of Kamson. He gave the board the benefit of his knowledge about the

history of prior applications and approvals upon the Property. He identified the Property on Exhibit A-1 and described the existing structures on the Property and the Property configuration. He testified as to the unique topographic conditions which impact the design of the development and “drive” some of the design and use choices.

5. Rivera testified that the Application consisted of nearly 11,000 square feet of retail and 19 “loft-style” residential units. Parking is located to the east and west side of the building and circulation is created between these two parking areas. Ingress and egress is provided by River Road and New Bridge Road as depicted on the various Exhibits, as amended. All units are one bedroom except for one, which is a two bedroom.

6. Montoro testified to the architectural elements and design of the Project, and its specific layout to meet the intent of the ordinance. He testified as to the design of the building and the “covered sidewalk” in front of the retail facing New Bridge Road with façade breaks and offset materials to complement the frontage and bring a “streetscape feel” to the facade. He testified as to the design and layout of the building and each of the units in the Building and how the roof was designed to be a gable to tie in with the adjacent residential buildings/be aesthetic in nature, verses a conforming flat roof; thereby causing the height variance requested. Integral cross gables were “designed in” with the various complementary finishes and façade steps to add interest and break up the frontage which meets the intent of the ordinance. He testified as to the materials proposed for use in the building and referred to material samples that were marked into evidence. He testified that the layout and presentation was designed to minimize the impact on adjoining property owners and that the elevations further assure that limited portions of the building are visible to the neighbors on Cottage Place; noting that the rear elevation topmost floor was at the same elevation of those properties. Building mechanicals were also screened from Cottage Place due to the roof design.



He testified as to the signage and the required signage variances and that the building would be fully sprinklered. Specifically regarding signage, there is one sign proposed on each side of the building for the residential portions of the development while there are “blade” signs proposed for each of the retail tenants to provide the location with an almost “turn of the century” aesthetic.

7. Montoro testified that the Applicant would comply with the Township’s Affordable Housing Requirements. In dialogue with the Board Planner, Richard Preiss, PP, Montoro testified about the Township’s affordable housing needs. Preiss testified that the Property is required to generate 2 affordable housing units and that he would be satisfied with 2, one-bedroom, units included on the Property. As an alternative, Preiss indicated that he would accept the Applicant providing 2 units elsewhere in the Township. He rejects the idea of a contribution in lieu of the inclusion or construction of affordable units.

8. French testified as to matters of engineering concern. He also described the existing conditions on the Property and the surrounding uses. He testified that there were 37 parking spaces on the west side of the structure and 38 parking spaces on the east side of the structure for a total of 75 parking spaces. A calculation pursuant to zoning ordinance requires 94 parking spaces. Parking is “mixed” and there is no reserved parking for either the residential or retail uses. Landscaping will be provided in accordance with the Landscape Plan, including landscaping and sidewalks along New Bridge Road.

9. French testified to the height variance required and explained that the proposed height is 36.5’ to the midpoint, which is nearly conforming, however, variance relief is necessary due to the pitched roof which will provide a true residential feel with nesting gables. Further, the HVAC units will be screen and hidden from view.

10. French testified that the French Brook is contained in an existing culvert under New

Bridge Road. A landscape retaining wall of 4' or less is located on the east side of the building, north of the parking area. Landscaping will be provided between the wall and parking area. The rear (south) property line will have a significant retaining wall that will run the length of the Property at a maximum height of 12'. This rear retaining wall will also contain a 6' stockade fence along the southern property line as specified by the applicant.

11. French testified as to lighting, trash removal and drainage on the Property. Deliveries would be made in the drive aisle to the rear of the structure and a sidewalk would be installed to assure that people using doors that face the drive aisle do not open the doors into parked vehicles.

12. French testified that he would comply with the requirements of the Board Engineer.

13. Taylor testified as to traffic flow and traffic patterns in the area. The Applicant proposed, in discussion with the County, a "right turn in/right turn out" traffic configuration with regard to the westernmost driveway on New Bridge Road and a "right turn out only" traffic configuration with regard to the easternmost driveway on New Bridge Road. A two way driveway provided access to the site at River Road. However, left turns out of this driveway were limited during peak traffic hours. Overall, Taylor testified there is safe and controlled access via County road ingress and egress.

14. Taylor made various traffic recommendations based on studies of existing and proposed conditions. Present traffic was measured during morning and afternoon peak hours to create a baseline. Once a baseline was established, trip generation manuals were consulted as to the additional traffic from the 19 proposed units and the retail space. Based on these factors, it was determined that the traffic generated from the site did not lessen the existing level of service.

15. Taylor testified that a parking variance was required. The ordinance requires 5

spaces per thousand for retail and 2 spaces per one bedroom unit and 3 spaces per two bedroom unit. This equates to a total parking requirement of 94 parking spaces. He testified that this was a mixed use development and required a different analysis and he relied on a publication that focused on "shared parking". Based on this, 67 spaces were required for the Property and 75 were provided. A chart reflecting this analysis was marked as A-9.

16. Taylor also testified as to site layout and traffic circulation, aisle width and loading areas. He indicated that certain parking spaces on the western parking areas adjacent to the New Bridge Road entrance would be better utilized if they were designated for employee parking. Ultimately, he testified that there was sufficient parking and adequate traffic circulation for the proposed development.

17. Burgis testified as to all matters of planning concern. He testified that there are numerous notable features of the Property that impact the manner in which the Property can be developed and how the design is implemented. The site dimensions are unusual as a long, narrow lot with over 750 feet of road frontage and an average depth of only 87 feet. This dramatically impacts the ability to place a building on the Property and provide for parking. Another significant issue is the topography. The rear, or southern, portion of the site is significantly raised from the New Bridge Road elevation and is approximately 14' higher than the developable, front, portion of the Property. This creates a slope (or "drop") of approximately 60%. This also impacts the locations of the structures and parking on the Property and creates the need for fences at the top of the slope.

18. Burgis testified that the Property and the structures were in poor condition and the site was in need of redevelopment and the Project would benefit the condition of the Property. Burgis testified that one of the other challenges on the Property was traffic circulation. Existing circulation was undefined and had numerous driveways and curb cuts.

19. Burgis testified that the design proposed several significant improvements to the use of the Property. The first is the elimination of the poor, random building configuration with a singular, uniform aesthetically pleasing design. The second is improving traffic circulation and parking. The third is providing landscaping (407 plantings – which includes 82 shade ornamented trees, 94 evergreen trees and 231 shrubs).

20. Burgis testified as to the development of the area and the Projects impacts. . He noted that the R-TH Zone permitted townhouses and apartments only when associated with affordable housing and that the Master Plan seeks to balance redevelopment in a manner that does not adversely impact traffic circulation, population density, safety, environmental concerns and similar matter. He testified that the occupancy of the Project would have a minimal impact on the community and that traffic safety and the aesthetics of the Property were enhanced. The requisite affordable housing is being provided in accordance with the Township Planner's direction. The development bolstered retail offerings in the community.

21. Variances were required as to *N.J.S.A.* 40:55D-70d(1) and d(5) as well as Bulk Variances specified herein. Burgis testified that “special reasons” existed for the granting of the “d” variances in that the Property is particularly well suited for the proposed development, and advance numerous purposes of zoning, most notably the increased aesthetics of this gateway project Bulk Variances are governed by *N.J.S.A.* 40:55D-70(c)(1) or (c)(2) which requires a demonstration of hardship due to the Property or that the benefits of the granting of the variances outweigh any detriments. Burgis testified as to all of the standards with specificity and applied the standards to all elements of the proposed development, noting that many of the variances become subsumed with the use itself (see below).

22. The foregoing is not intended to be a complete record of all testimony presented

during the Application and the full record is incorporated herein and made a part hereof.

**NOW THEREFORE**, be it resolved that the Board hereby grants the requested Site Plan Approval, “D” Variances, Bulk Variances and waivers based on the following findings:

- A. The Applicant has satisfied the requirements of the Site Plan Ordinance.
- B. The Applicant has demonstrated entitlement to the requested “D” Variances. The Applicant has demonstrated that the proposed development is particularly well suited for the Property and that there is no negative impact for the granting of these variances. In particular, this location is the gateway to the Township which would greatly benefit by the aesthetic improvement. The proposed mixed use development with retail tenants on the first floor complements the housing and provides the economic engine to construct the project. As a result, the project as proposed will create a “Main Street” feel with a full streetscape that will be supported by the housing above as well as service the passing motorists and surrounding neighborhood.
- C. At the conclusion of the Application, after various amendments during the course of the Application, the Applicant was seeking the following variances and design waivers:
  1. Use Variances
    - a. §33-24(p)(1)(b) – Retail & Apartments are not permitted, Townhouses and Apartments permitted but only for inclusionary a affordable housing purposes; Retail and non inclusionary apartments are not permitted uses in the zone (*N.J.S.A.* 40:55D-d(1));
    - b. §33-24(p)(4)(b)(1) – Permitted number of residential units per acreage is 17 units; 19 residential units are proposed (*N.J.S.A.* 40:55D-d(5));

2. Incorporated Relief:

- a. §33-24(p)(4)(b)(3) - Maximum permitted height is 35 feet or three stories, whichever is lesser, measured from the lowest grade to the midpoint of any sloping roof with a pitch of at least 6 on 12, or to the top of the roof in all other cases; proposed height of the building is 36.5 feet ((N.J.S.A. 40:55D-d(6)).
- b. §33-24(p)(4)(b)(4) - 6 residential units permitted per structure; 19 residential units proposed per structure;
- c. §33-24(p)(4)(b)(5) - maximum allowed length of building is 170 feet; proposed length of building is 195 feet;
- d. 33-24(p)(4)(b)(6) - no building shall contain more than two dwelling units in a straight unbroken row, and the exterior wall of each such building shall include a setback or break with a depth of not less than four feet after every two dwelling units; proposed building contains 10 units in a row on each side of the building with a proposed façade setback of 1.0 feet;

3. Setback Relief:

- a. §33-24(p)(4)(a)(3)[i] – permitted front setback of building to a public street setback is 35 feet; proposed front setback of building to a public street curblines setback is 10 feet (1 foot to the right of way);
- b. §33-24(p)(4)(a)(4)[i] - permitted front setback of building to property line is 35 feet; proposed front setback of building to property line is 10 feet. (1 foot to the right of way);
- c. §33-24(p)(4)(a)(8)[ii] – required buffer shall be a minimum of 5 feet adjacent to other property lines, including the public street; proposed distance to the right of way is 1 foot;

4. Parking : §33-24(p)(4)(a)(10) – 94 parking spaces are required; 75 parking spaces are proposed;

5. Lot coverage: §33-24(p)(4)(b)(2) [ii] - Maximum permitted lot coverage is 42,732.36 sq. ft (45%); proposed lot coverage is 55,172.22 sq. ft (58.1%);

6. Site Plan Variances

- a. §33-28(b)(6)(c) - Not more than two driveways, each of not more than 30 feet nor less than 20 feet in width, shall be permitted for each 300 feet of frontage on a public street; proposed driveway entrances on New Bridge Road are 15 and 18 feet wide
- b. §33-29(b)(2) - maximum permitted wall and fence height combination is 6 feet; proposed combined wall and fence height is 18 feet (12 foot wall and 6 foot fence);

7. Sign relief:

- a. §33-18(c)(5)(i)(2) – required minimum setback of sign to property line and parking area is 20'; minimum setback to property line mark proposed is 5'
- b. §33-18(c)(5)(e)(2)(iii) – maximum total sign area permitted for directional sign is 2.5 sf; a total of six (6) directional blade signs are proposed totaling 4 sf each.

D. The Board finds that all variances are warranted and are granted under the terms of *N.J.S.A.* 40:55D-70(c)(1) and (c)(2) and (d). Use relief was discussed above. As for the bulk relief, there is no question that the Property is challenged by significant topographic hardship and hardship as to configuration and the Applicant has satisfied the requirements of (c)(1). Additionally, the Applicant has demonstrated entitlement to the Ordinance based on (c)(2) as a result of the topographical constraints due to the rear slope, the shape of the property in terms of its narrowness, and the location of the property at a major intersection.. There is no negative impact to the zoning ordinance, the zone plan or the Master Plan.

E. Affordable Housing. The Applicant shall be required to provide 2 affordable housing units either within the development. Or in the alternative, the Applicant may provide 2 units elsewhere in the Township. A contribution to a fund will not be

considered an option or be permitted.

F. In granting the above approvals, the Board finds that the following conditions are appropriate:

1. The within Approval is conditioned upon the Applicant obtaining all necessary approvals from all Local, County and State agencies of applicable jurisdiction.
2. The Applicant shall comply with all comments contained in all reports of the Township professionals.
3. The within Approval is conditioned upon the Applicant entering into a Developer's Agreement with the Township. The Developer's Agreement shall contain the applicable conditions of this resolution.
4. Construction shall be in accordance with the survey and plans submitted.
5. Any HVAC and generators must be in compliance with Township Code and manufacturer's instructions as to placement and testing.
6. A sufficient and proper refuse removal area and recycling program must be provided pursuant to Township Code;
7. Installation of sidewalks, curbs and driveway aprons in accordance with Township regulations and building codes to the Township Engineer's satisfaction.
8. Applicant will ensure all rear exit doors from retail units will have unrestricted clearance to open fully, specifically a three-foot wide area with curb and sidewalk.
9. Applicant agrees to enter into a Maintenance Agreement with a third-party



vendor as to removal of snow to be taken off-site during the applicable winter season.

10. Compliance with all the codes of the Township and particularly the fire sub-code, as well as compliance with all ordinances and regulations of the Township of Teaneck and any and all other requirements of governmental authorities having jurisdiction over same including the engineer's recommendations above set forth, all unless otherwise revised and continuing review by the Zoning Official.
11. The applicant shall provide, upon completion, an updated or "as-built" survey to the Zoning Official.

Accordingly, a majority of the Board voted to approve the application as presented.

Motion was made by: Mulligan  
 Motion was seconded by: Frisch

Roll Call to Approve:

	Yes	No	Absent	Abstain	Recuse
Barta					
Frisch	x				
Green					
Honis					
Mermelstein	x				
Meyer					
Mulligan	x				
Rehman	x				
Rosen	x				
Senter	x				

Accordingly, a majority of the Board voted to approve the application as presented.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of the Resolution adopted by the Zoning Board of Adjustment at its meeting held on May 5, 2016.

*Anne Senter*

Anne Senter, Chair

Date: 7/7/16