

MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING OF THE SEA BRIGHT PLANNING/ZONING BOARD
TUESDAY, December 4, 2018, 7:30 p.m.

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

Call to Order

Chairman Cunningham called the meeting to order at 7:36 p.m. and requested those present to join in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Attendance Roll Call

Present: Cashmore, Cunningham, DeGiulio, DeSio, Duffy, Leckstein, Long, Smith, Bills, Wray

Not Present: Nott, McGinley

Also in attendance: Board Attorney Kerry E. Higgins, Esq.

Board Engineer David Hoder, P.E, P.P., C.M.E.

Board Secretary Candace B. Mitchell

Chairman's Opening Statement

Chairman Cunningham read the following Compliance Statement:

The Borough of Sea Bright, in compliance with the Open Public Meetings Act has provided the time, date and location of this meeting to at least two designated newspapers, published same in the Asbury Park Press, the official newspaper, filed it with the Borough Clerk and posted notice on the bulletin board in the Borough Office.

Approval of 11/13/18 Minutes

Vice Chairman DeSio offered a motion to approve the minutes, seconded by Boardmember DeGiulio, and approved on the following roll call vote:

Aye: Cashmore, Cunningham, DeGiulio, DeSio, Duffy, Smith, Bills, Wray

Nay: none

Not Present: Nott, McGinley

ITEMS OF BUSINESS

Memorialization of Resolution

RESOLUTION OF THE SEA BRIGHT PLANNING/ZONING BOARD
GRANTING SITE PLAN AND BULK VARIANCE APPROVAL

RE: Linda & Kevin Hirsch

10 Tradewinds Lane

Block 4 Lot 7.23

Sea Bright, New Jersey

WHEREAS, Linda & Kevin Hirsch (the "Applicant") made application to the Planning/Zoning Board of Sea Bright (the "Board") for property known as Block 4, Lot 7.23 on the Tax Map of the Borough of Sea Bright, also known as 10 Tradewinds Lane for site plan and bulk variances to construct a swimming pool and deck; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant sought bulk variances for side yard setback where 10 ft. is required and 5 ft. is proposed; both side yards where 25 ft. is required and 15 ft. is

proposed; lot coverage where 50% maximum is permitted and 56% is proposed; swimming pool in front yard; and

WHEREAS, Applicant has provided due notice to the public and all surrounding property owners as required by law, has caused notice to be published in the official newspaper in accordance with N.J.S.A. 40:55D-1 et seq. and, therefore, this Board has accepted jurisdiction of the application and has conducted public hearing on the matter at its meeting on November 13, 2018, at which time all persons having an interest in said application were given an opportunity to be heard; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant appeared and marked into evidence certain documents including the following:

- A-1 Jurisdictional packet
- A-2 Plot plan with handwritten markings
- A-3 Survey by Thomas Santry dated 10-2-06
- A-4 Elevation certificate
- A-5 Aerial view of subject property

WHEREAS, the Board considered the testimony and evidence presented and the Board makes the following findings of fact and conclusions of law:

1. The Applicant seeks to construct a swimming pool and deck in the R1 zone.
2. The property has two front yards, Tradewinds Lane and Ocean Avenue. As a result, the swimming pool is proposed to be located to the rear of the existing home, but in the technical front yard of the property on the Ocean Avenue side.
3. The Applicant sought bulk variances for side yard setback where 10 ft. is required and 5 ft. is proposed; both side yards where 25 ft. is required and 15 ft. is proposed; lot coverage where 50% maximum is permitted and 56% is proposed; swimming pool in front yard.
4. The Board reviewed the notices and had discussions with the Applicant regarding the requested variances. Variance for lot coverage and side yard setbacks were not specifically requested. Applicant testified that the "deck" was really an at grade patio. As such, the Board found that this would not require a side yard variance. To confirm, Applicant **STIPULATED** that the deck would be no more than 18" above ground.
5. Applicant also testified that the property had two front yards, thus the pool, while located in what the owners consider to be the rear yard, would be located in a technical front yard. Applicant **STIPULATED** that the pool will be set back a minimum of 25' from Ocean Avenue. The Board found that although this is technically a second front yard, the orientation of the home and the appearance from public view was that this was a rear yard. Due to the orientation of the home on the lot, the Board found it reasonable to locate the pool to the rear of the home, in the second front yard along Ocean Avenue.
6. Because the Applicant did not notice for a lot coverage variance, the Applicant **STIPULATED** that the plans would be amended to reduce the lot coverage to at or below 50%. As such, no variance is required.

7. The Applicant **STIPULATED** that revised plans reflecting the agreed upon and stipulated changes would be submitted to the zoning officer prior to the issuance of any permits.

8. Neighbor Janice Thorpe Sanders spoke in favor of the application.

9. The Board found that the variance to allow the pool to be located to the rear of the home in the second front yard could be granted without any negative impact on the zoning ordinance or zone plan. The proposal is not obtrusive and is warranted due to the layout and use of the property.

10. The Board found that the granting of the variances will have no substantial detrimental impact on the surrounding neighborhood.

11. After evaluating all of the evidence and testimony the Board found that the variance would have no negative impact on the zoning ordinance or zone plan and could be granted with no detriment to the neighborhood. The revised plans meet all bulk requirements with the exception of the pool in the front yard, to the rear of the home.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Planning/Zoning Board of the Borough of Sea Bright that the Application for site plan with the bulk variances as set forth above is approved in accordance with the plans submitted and marked into evidence, subject to the following conditions:

GENERAL CONDITIONS

1. The applicant shall submit proof of payment of all real estate taxes applicable to the property and payment of all outstanding and future fees and escrow charges, posting of all performance guarantees, if any, in connection with the review of this application prior to and subsequent to the approval of this application.

2. The applicant must obtain the approval of all necessary and appropriate governmental agencies and compliance with all governmental regulations, including but not limited to CAFRA, except those specifically waived or modified in this Resolution.

3. The applicant shall comply with all building, FEMA and fire codes including but not limited to, entrances and exits.

4. The accuracy and completeness of the submission statements, exhibits and other testimony filed with or offered to the Board in connection with this application, all of which are incorporated herein by reference and specifically relied by the Board in granting this approval. This condition shall be a continuing condition, which shall be deemed satisfied unless and until the Board determines (on Notice to the applicant) that a breach thereof.

5. All stipulations agreed to on the record, by the applicant.

6. In the event that any documents require execution in connection with the within approval, such documents shall not be released until all of the conditions of the approval have been satisfied unless otherwise expressly noted.

7. The Applicant shall pay to the municipality any and all sums outstanding for fees incurred by the municipality for services rendered by the municipality's

professionals for review of the application for development, review and preparation of documents, inspections of improvements and other purposes authorized by the MLUL.

8. The Applicant shall furnish such Performance Guarantees and/or Maintenance Guarantee as may be required pursuant to the MLUL and the Sea Bright Ordinances.

9. No site work shall be commenced or plans signed or released or any work performed with respect to this approval until such time as all conditions of the approval have been satisfied or otherwise waived by the Board.

SPECIFIC CONDITIONS

1. The plans will be revised to conform to the Stipulations on record.
2. The deck would be no more than 18" above ground.
3. The pool will be set back a minimum of 25' from Ocean Avenue, which is the second front yard.
4. The plans would be amended to reduce the lot coverage to at or below 50%.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Resolution memorializes the action taken by the Planning/Zoning Board at its meeting November 13, 2018; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Chairman and Board Secretary are hereby authorized to sign any and all documents necessary to effectuate the purpose of this Resolution; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board Secretary is hereby authorized and directed to cause a certified copy of this Resolution to be sent to the Applicant, the Borough Clerk, the engineer and the zoning officer and to make same available to all other interested parties and to cause notice of this Resolution to be published in the official newspaper at the Applicant's expense.

I certify the foregoing to be a true copy of a Resolution by the Sea Bright Planning/Zoning Board memorialized on December 4, 2018.

Candace Mitchell, Secretary
Sea Bright Planning/Zoning Board

Adopted on a roll call on a motion by Boardmember DeSio
And Seconded by Boardmember DeGiulio

Vote:

AYES: Cashmore, Cunningham, DeGiulio, DeSio, Duffy, Smith, Bills, Wray

NAYS:

NOT PRESENT: McGinley

Lance Cunningham, Chairman
Sea Bright Planning/Zoning Board

PBZB 2018-008 - New Application

Request for Preliminary and Final Site Plan approval and Use Variance Relief

Beachfront Joe, LLC
1084 Ocean Avenue
Block 15, Lot 2

Neither the applicant nor a representative of the applicant was in attendance.

Determination:

On a motion offered by Chairman Cunningham and seconded by Vice Chairman DeSio, the application was dismissed without prejudice, with the inclusion of a proviso stating that the applicant, if wishing to move forward on the application, must renew within 90 days to avoid filing new fees, and the applicant must notice.

The motion was carried on the following roll call vote:

Aye: Cashmore, Cunningham, DeGiulio, DeSio, Duffy, Leckstein, Long, Smith, Bills, Wray

Nay: none

PBZB 2018- 019 – New Application

Request for Development/Subdivision approval, with Bulk Variance Relief

MMJD Properties, LLC
26 Beach Street
Block 10, Lot 21

Vice Chairman DeSio stepped down from hearing this application due to a conflict.

Board Attorney Higgins verified the jurisdictional packet as complete and correct.

In attendance for the application were Kevin E. Kennedy, Esq.; Jeremiah J. Regan, A.I.A., Architect, NJ License No. AI-10726; and Craig Grant, the applicant.

Over the course of the hearing, Board Attorney Higgins entered the following exhibits into evidence:

A-1 Jurisdictional Packet

A-2 Narrative of Intent

A-3 Architectural Plan, entitled Addition Alteration, Grant Residence, 26 Beach Street, Sea Bright, NJ, Dated 4/5/18, revised 9/1/18, consisting of three (3) sheets, prepared by Jeremiah J. Regan, AIA, NJ License AI-10726

A-4 Plan entitled Minor Subdivision, dated 7/31/18, consisting of one (1) sheet, prepared by Charles Surmonte, P.E., P.L.S., NJ License No. 35885

A-5 First Technical Review, dated 10/1/18, prepared by Hoder Associates, consisting of three (3) pages

A-6 Photo taken by Mr. Grant, dated 12/4/18, showing proximity of existing structure to eastern boundary

A-7 Copy of Sea Bright Tax Map, portion of page 8

A-8 Copy of letter mailed and emailed to neighbors

A-9 Front Yard Setback Plan, dated 11/21/18, consisting of one (1) sheet, prepared by Charles Surmonte, P.E., P.L.S., NJ License No. 35885

A-10 Photo taken by Mr. Grant, dated 12/4/18, looking west

A-11 Photo, taken by Mr. Grant, dated 12/4/18, view looking east

A-12 Illustrated rendering of proposed structures, dated 12/4/18, consisting of one (1) sheet, prepared by Jeremiah J. Regan, AIA, NJ License AI-10726

Mr. Kennedy introduced the applicant, Craig Grant, who was sworn in to testify about the application. The subject property is located in the R-3 Zone. Mr. Grant is seeking approval for a minor subdivision with variance approval. The property is owned as an LLC, with Mr. Grant as 80% owner, and his son and daughter each as 10% owners. The existing lot is a 3,376 square foot, oversized lot. There is currently a single family home on the property, which is a permitted use in the zone. The applicant testified that the home is eighty-five years old, has an unstable foundation and balcony, and has not been elevated. He stated that the home is unusually placed on the lot, 0.9 feet off of the eastern side yard and 0.3 feet off of the rear yard.

The applicant proposes to demolish the existing home and subdivide the property into two lots, to be named Lot 21.01 and Lot 21.02. Each lot area would measure 1,688 square feet, where 1,800 square feet is the minimum lot size in zone. He seeks approval to build two single-family homes, each two and one-half stories, with two parking spaces each. Each house would be elevated with garage space underneath, and each dwelling would be 1,200 square feet in size. One house would be occupied by Mr. Grant and the other would be occupied by his grown children.

The applicant is seeking variance approval for each lot as regards lot area, rear yard setbacks, front yard setbacks, and building coverage.

The applicant testified that he had mailed a letter of inquiry to the owners of properties adjoining his property, asking whether either or both neighbors would like to sell a portion of their property to him, which would add to the applicant's property, in an effort to provide conformity to the 1,800 square foot standard. The applicant stated that he received no response to his letters of inquiry.

The applicant stated that the new lots would be consistent with the lot sizes in the immediate neighborhood.

Boardmember Comments and Questions:

Mayor Long commented that, to be accurate, there are lots on the south side of Beach Street which have frontage dimensions of 25 feet, as the applicant is proposing, but there are also lots on Beach Street which have 37.5 and 50 foot frontages. Mayor Long also stated that some older homes now have balconies that extend almost to the sidewalk due to bringing the structure up to date with flood laws, and this necessity should not dictate the master plan for the neighborhood. The Mayor asked why two structures are proposed instead of one 2-family home. Mr. Grant answered, for personal reasons.

Councilman Leckstein also asked why two homes are being proposed instead of one, and he agreed with Mayor Long that, since these houses are being built from scratch, there is no need to build the balconies so close to the sidewalk.

Public Comments and Questions:

John Egan, 27 Center Street, who stated that he lives directly behind the subject property, asked about the rear yard setbacks. What is required? Board Attorney Higgins answered that the required rear yard setback is 15 feet, and the variance proposed is a 2.9 foot setback to the deck, to cantilever 9.24 feet, with 11.2 feet to the actual house. It was explained that the architect will discuss this point.

Kevin Birdsall, 9 New Street, asked about the relationship between lot dimensions and total lot square footage. Attorney Higgins explained that lots are required to be at least 25 feet wide, 60 feet deep, and have a square footage of at least 1,800 square feet. Lots may be configured differently, as long as the dimensions and square footage meet those requirements.

Jack Sanders, 12 Center Street, stated, in support of the application, that the R-3 zone is not intended for multi-family uses and should not be permitted.

Attorney Adam Garcia, representing Brian Kelly of 30 Beach Street, a west-side neighboring property, objected to the application, stating that the new structures will result in substantial shading to the solar panels installed on the home next door.

John Taguer, 25 Center Street, was sworn in by Attorney Higgins. Mr. Taguer stated that he would like the project to be a little more conforming. He stated that the proposed structures appear to be three-story houses. He mentioned the shading problem and that the proposed structures are too large.

Professional Testimony:

Architect Jeremiah Regan gave his qualifications and was accepted by the Board as an expert witness. Mr. Regan explained the following about the application: In a flood zone, the first floor is not considered a floor. Technically two and a half stories, a 38 foot height, is allowed in the zone. The proposed buildings are 35 feet high and meet all flooding and fire requirements. There will be two parking spaces per house. One house will have three bedrooms. The other house will have four bedrooms. Front yard setback variances are needed, but the balconies are open. Rear yard setback variances are needed. A 2.9 foot deck variance is needed, although the project would be improving what is there now, which is closer to the property line. Regarding drainage and grading, the property is relatively flat. The property will be re-graded so that surface water will flow toward the front of the property. Materials used for the project will be FEMA-dictated for wind and flood-resistance. The look of the homes will fit in with the character of the neighborhood and is consistent with other lots on the street.

Attorney Kennedy stated that Mr. Regan is taking a non-FEMA-compliant lot and making two FEMA-compliant lots.

Boardmember Comments and Questions:

Councilman Leckstein stated that, if approved, a condition of approval needs to stipulate that the houses must look like the renderings in Exhibit A-12.

Boardmember Cashmore discussed the front and rear yard setbacks as being right up to property line, and the stairs come right up to the property line. He asked the architect what he can do to address the front and rear yard setbacks. Mr. Regan answered that the stairs are configured that way because they wanted to get the entryway above the flood plain. Mr. Cashmore asked whether the architect could make the house smaller. Mr. Regan answered that this is what the client requested. It would be possible to make the deck smaller, and the house could be made smaller.

Boardmember Wray asked for the definition of a cantilever. Attorney Higgins defined a cantilever, and Mr. Regan gave the dimensions of the cantilever. At Attorney Higgins request, Mr. Regan showed Exhibit A-3, page B-2, to the public and described the architectural plans.

Boardmember Duffy expressed concern over the front and rear setbacks.

Public Comments and Questions:

Janet Sanders, 12 Center Street, asked what constitutes a half-story. Mr. Regan explained that a half-story is half the square footage of the floor below and stated that the height of the houses is less than allowed.

John Taguer, 25 Center Street, pointed out that the first and second levels are shown on the plans as a square. He also stated that the square footage of the existing house is 1,800.

Jack Sanders, 12 Center Street, referring to Exhibit A-3, page B-2, asked what is the environmental impact of the lot coverage. Mr. Regan responded that the project is designed so that there is no impact at all. Mr. Sanders stated that the project will result in almost total lot coverage. Mr. Regan responded that the project is designed to meet FEMA requirements. FEMA regulations allow water to come into the building. Mr. Sanders asked whether flood studies were done. Mr. Regan didn't know of any. Mr. Sanders asked whether there is an environmental impact statement, regarding the height. Mr. Regan referred to the FEMA map as an answer.

John Higgins, 27 Center Street, was sworn in by Attorney Higgins. He stated that he has two concerns. The size and depth of the deck front to back, and the height of the buildings. He would like to see those dimensions smaller and shorter.

Board Engineer Comments:

Board Engineer David Hoder stated that the project will need to obtain outside approvals. He stated he does not have a big concern with the square-foot area variance. The applicant has pushed the limits of the front and rear setbacks. The front and rear setbacks are too close to the property line. An eight-foot deck is not needed. It can be smaller. Lot coverage should be no more than 42.8 %, and the applicant is asking for 60%.

Public Comments and Questions:

Courtney Davis, 24 Beach Street, was sworn in by Attorney Higgins. Ms. Davis stated that she is opposed to the application. She owns an adjacent property. She asked why the applicant is subdividing. She stated that the project is overblown and a bad idea. The additional house will have a significant impact on the neighborhood. She stated that the

additional parking permits issued will have a significant impact on Beach Street, especially since it is a one-way street. The new structures will impact her view. They are two very non-conforming units, impacting her investment. She stated that, though FEMA says it's OK, it is really not OK. The bulkheads are failing. If you're just going by what's on paper, you're not doing what's best for Sea Bright. The town needs to plan better going forward.

Jack Sanders, 12 Center Street, discussed concerns with building coverage.

Courtney Davis, 24, Beach Street, stated that the architect's rendering shows a shrub. There will be no shrubs with a three-foot space. There will be no room.

Determination:

Attorney Higgins addressed Attorney Kennedy, stating that the applicant has heard some concerns. Mr. Kennedy stated that they have appreciated hearing the concerns of the public and the Board. They would like to come back to the Board and see if they can answer some of the concerns. He requested no new notice requirement.

Councilman Leckstein offered a motion to carry the matter to January 22, 2019, seconded by Boardmember DeGiulio, and carried upon unanimous voice vote.

PBZB 2018-018, carried from 10/9/18

Request for Site Plan Approval and Use and Bulk Variance Relief

James Lobiondo
3 Osborne Place
Block 9, Lot 3

At this point in the meeting, Chairman Cunningham stepped down and recused himself as Board Chair for this application due a conflict presented by the location of property he owns that is within 200 feet of the below captioned property. Vice Chairman DeSio recused himself due to a professional conflict. Mayor Long and Councilman Leckstein recused themselves due a "D" variance which is sought by this application, creating a conflict as members of Council.

Boardmember John Duffy stepped in as Chairman, and, at 9:04 p.m. a recess was called before the application was heard. The meeting resumed at 9:15 p.m.

Board Attorney Higgins reviewed exhibits that had been entered into evidence at the 6/12/18 hearing:

- A - 1 Jurisdictional Packet (6/12/18 notice)
- A - 2 David Hoder letter, 9/8/17
- A - 3 Architectural Plans, 4/4/17
- A - 4 Tax Record Card
- A - 5 Photo, neighboring property, Ocean Ridge, 13 units
- A - 6 Photo, 5 Osborne Place, westerly 2-family property
- A - 7 Photo, Waterways, 22 townhomes

- A – 7B Photo, Waterways, 22 townhomes
- A – 8 Photo, subject property looking north, 2 units

Additionally, there were four exhibits presented on 6/12/18 by an objector:

- JS – 1 Photo, 5 Osborne, rear deck
- JS – 2 Photo, 5 Osborne, rear stairs
- JS – 3 Photo, 3 Osborne, looking south
- JS – 4 5 Osborne, rear stairs

Board Attorney Higgins entered the following new exhibits into evidence:

- A-9 Jurisdictional Packet (10/9/18 notice)
- A-10 Second Technical Review, dated 10/31/18, David J. Hoder, P.E., P.P, C.M.E
- A-11 Preliminary and Final Site Plan, 7 sheets, dated 9/27/18, rev. 11/15/18, by Brian S. Grant, Professional Engineer, NJ License # 24GEO4284500, Grant Engineering & Construction Group LLC

Attorney Higgins reviewed the history of the application. After an initial hearing on 6/12/18, the application was to be heard again on 7/10/18 and was carried to 9/11/18. The application was carried to 10/9/18, for which the applicant re-noticed, and was carried to 11/13/18. The application was then carried to 12/4/18.

In attendance for the application were: Thomas J. Hirsch, Esq.; Jeremiah J. Reagan, A.I.A., Architect, NJ License No. AI-10726; Brian S. Grant, P.E., C.M.E., C.P.W.M., Professional Engineer, NJ License # 24GEO4284500, Grant Engineering & Construction Group LLC; James W. Higgins, P.P, Planner; and James LoBiondo, property owner.

Mr. Hirsch presented his plan for presenting the application and listed the witnesses who will be testifying.

Engineer Brian S. Grant was introduced and sworn in to testify. He stated his educational and professional credentials, and was accepted by the Board as an expert witness. Mr. Grant presented Exhibit A-11, the site plan, revised 11/15/18.

Mr. Hirsch described the permissions sought by the applicant. The applicant seeks to construct three townhouses on a property in the R-3 zone, which is a conditionally permitted use, but the applicant does not meet all the conditions as set forth in the zoning ordinance. The applicant will seek variance relief for building coverage, lot coverage, rear yard setback, and for density. He will also seek site plan approval.

Mr. Grant stated that he had reviewed the Board Engineer's technical reviews and made improvements to the plan accordingly. He created a detention system for drainage, depicted on Exhibit A-11, sheet 3 of 7, which temporarily contains the water, allowing water to percolate into the sandy soil. Any run-off eventually flows to the curb on the street. He also explained that he raised the grading, as per the Board Engineer's review comments. The grading will be raised in the middle, and run-off will flow towards the street, aiding with drainage. The lighting plan, Exhibit A-11, sheet 4 of 7, was changed to

minimize outside spillage of light. There will be six-foot tall fencing on three sides of the property, as shown on Exhibit A-11, sheet 7 of 7. In regard to landscaping, the plans are in keeping with a beach environment, with three-foot tall boxwoods, six per side. There will be no big shrubs, in the interest of unencumbered pedestrian traffic. Complying with Monmouth County Soil Conservation guidelines regarding soil erosion, there will be construction fencing around the site to minimize soil coming off the site. Mr. Grant described all proposed set-backs, lot coverage, building coverage, and variance approvals required for the project and compared the requirements for a single-family versus a multi-family property.

Attorney Higgins commented that the property would require at least two street trees. Mr. Grant responded that there is no room in front for street trees, and a waiver has been requested.

Board Engineer David Hoder stated that the new plans, revised 11/15/18, look much improved to the original plans, though he hasn't thoroughly reviewed them yet as they were not submitted within ten days of the meeting. The revised plans addressed the concerns in his technical review. He stated that the configuration of the driveway prohibits the planting of street trees.

Ms. Higgins stated that Mr. Hoder will need to do another technical review and that he will need to look at the re-charge system.

Mr. Hoder stated that he will review the revised plans in detail and is good with what has been proposed regarding a waiver of street trees. Mr. Hoder stated that it would be a good idea for the Borough to have a tree ordinance.

There were no comments nor questions from the Board members.

Public Comments and Questions:

Jack Sanders, 12 Center Street, commented that this area is not intended for multi-family B uses in the master plan. Ms. Higgins asked Mr. Sanders to wait until the planner testifies to talk about zoning. Mr. Sanders stated this is single-family zoning. This project requires variances for front, rear, and side yard setbacks. The height complies. Ms. Higgins noted that the Board has taken note of what the deficiencies are. Mr. Sanders asked whether there has been an environmental study regarding run-off. Mr. Grant stated that there will be a re-charge system in place to mitigate run-off. Ms. Higgins asked whether there are any numbers regarding run-off. Mr. Grant answered that it is a standard, not site-specific, and that the data was not requested. He can provide data if requested. He explained that the plan will not create a "bathtub effect." It is designed to let water flow through. Mr. Sanders stated that the engineer cannot answer questions about water height and asked whether he had seen a flood study done for this area. Mr. Grant responded that the building is designed to the standards, and those standards are based on the FEMA map which is based on flood studies in conformance to the area. Mr. Sanders asked whether Mr. Grant could discuss whether the property will be able to accommodate the height of the water, wind velocity, duration, and rate of rise. Mr. Grant answered that the project will be built to standard.

Murphy Anderson, 8 Center Street, asked about the re-charge system. Mr. Grant explained how it works and that the goal is to minimize run-off.

Determination:

Attorney Higgins stated that the matter will be carried to the meeting on 2/12/19, with no further notice requirement.

CLOSING MATTERS

Meeting Announcement:

There being no other business before the Board, the Secretary made an announcement of the next meeting date, which is January 8, 2019.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 10:24 p.m. on a motion offered by Boardmember Bills, seconded by Boardmember DeGiulio, and approved upon a unanimous voice vote by the Board members.

Respectfully submitted,



Candace B. Mitchell
Board Secretary