

BRIDGEWATER TOWNSHIP
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
Virtual Online Meeting
Tuesday, September 15, 2020
—MINUTES—

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER:

Chairman Sweeney called the Virtual Online Meeting to order at 7:30 pm.

ANNOUNCEMENT: For the duration of the Corona virus Health Emergency, the Municipal Complex is closed to the public and meetings will be held digitally, connected by conferencing software provided by RingCentral.com. Members of the public are invited to view meetings live using RingCentral webinar, which also allows them to “raise a hand” and contribute when they are invited to do so during public portions of the meeting. Instructions for Virtual online meeting:

1. Download RingCentral meetings on preferred device: <https://www.ringcentral.com/apps/rc-meetings>
2. At the advertised start time of the meeting, enter: <https://webinar.ringcentral.com/j/1491496701> into your browser. **This method allows listening & participation*

Please note: You may also join via telephone: Dial: +1(773)-231-9226, Webinar ID: 1491496701 **telephone access allows only listening and not participation.* If you would like to make a comment, text 1(908) 912-4247 with name, contact information and comment for the Board and it will read into the record.

2. OPEN PUBLIC MEETING ANNOUNCEMENT:

Adequate notice of this meeting has been given in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act N.J.S.A. 10:4-6. On July 30, 2020, proper notice was sent to the Courier News and the Star-Ledger and filed with the Clerk at the Township of Bridgewater and posted on the bulletin board in the Municipal Building. Please be aware of the Zoning Board of Adjustment policy for public hearings: No new applications will be heard after 10:15 pm and no new testimony will be taken after 10:30 pm. Hearing Assistance is available upon request. Accommodation will be made for individuals with a disability, pursuant to the Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA), provided the individual with the disability provides 48 hours advance notice to the Planning Department Secretary before the public meeting. However, if the individual should require special equipment or services, such as a CART transcriber, seven days advance notice, excluding weekends and holidays, may be necessary.

3. SALUTE TO FLAG:

4. ROLL CALL:

Donald Sweeney- present	Jeff Foose - present
Evans Humenick- present	Daniel Ahern- present
John Fallone - present	Donna Kelly - present
Dawn Gutschall- present	Andrew Fresco- present
Pushpavati Amin- present	Gary LaSpisa - absent
James Weideli - present	

Others present: Board Attorney Steven Warner, Esq., Board Planner Scarlett Doyle, PP and Land Use Coordinator Zuzana Karas (Board Engineer William Burr, IV, PE was absent.)

5. MINUTES FOR APPROVAL:

November 20, 2018 Regular Meeting (pending)	August 6, 2019 Regular Meeting (pending)
August 20, 2019 Regular Meeting (pending)	September 17, 2019 Regular Meeting (pending)
November 19, 2019 Regular Meeting (pending)	December 17, 2019 Regular Meeting (pending)
January 21, Regular & Reorg. Meeting (pending)	February 18, 2020 Regular Meeting (pending)
June 16, 2020 Virtual Meeting (pending)	July 7, 2020 Virtual Meeting (pending)
July 21, 2020 Virtual Meeting (pending)	August 4, 2020 Virtual Meeting (pending)

6. MEMORIALIZING RESOLUTIONS:

None.

7. HEARING AND DELIBERATIONS:

JOHN & SARAH SCHNYDERITE- 259 CANDLEWICK LANE

Block 435 Lot 3

#20-004-ZB- VARIANCE- Front Covered Porch

Applicants John and Sarah Schnyderite appeared before the Zoning Board having submitted an application for variance relief pertaining to front-yard setback requirements. The property is known as 259 Candlewick Lane, Block 435, and Lot 3 on the Tax Map. Variance relief was sought for a proposed front-yard setback of 44.5 feet, whereas the existing front-yard setback exists at 50.4 feet, being that the minimum required in the R-40 Zone is 50 feet. (This pursuant to Section 126-325, the Schedule of Requirements of the Land Use Ordinance.)

The Board reviewed the following in advance of the hearing : (a) A report from the Board Planner, Scarlett Doyle, P.P., and Board Engineer, William Burr, IV, P.E., dated September 9th, 2020; (b) Plans prepared by Daniel Fortunato, R.A., dated August 9th, 2019, last revised June 30th, 2020, same consisting of one (1) sheet;(c) Survey prepared by Timothy B. Johnson, P.L.S., dated March 18th, 2016, last revised March 17th, 2020, same consisting of one (1) sheet; and (d) A copy of the Form #3E-A, Variance Application and supporting documents. The applicants also submitted three (3) photographs of porches in the neighborhood similar to the porch they are proposing to construct.

Applicants John and Sarah Schnyderite, were duly sworn according to law, along with the board professionals. Mr. Schnyderite testified that they are seeking to remove the existing concrete front stoop to then replace it with one which would be fully covered. This structure is proposed to have a length of 12 feet, width of 5.9 feet, and a height of 13’10”. He explained that the dilemma they are facing is that the proposed front porch would, however, encroach into the required front-yard setback by 5.5 feet (44.5 feet, whereas 50 feet is required).

Discussion continued pertaining to the September 9th, 2020 Review Memorandum prepared by Ms. Doyle, the Board Planner, and Mr. Burr, the Board Engineer. Mr. Schnyderite testified that the proposed porch would be consistent with other porches within the neighborhood. He continued to explain, referencing Exhibit A-3, photographs of neighboring dwellings, which displayed similar covered front porches. Exhibit A-4 was also used to show the applicants existing dwelling (without the proposed porch). Mr. and Mrs. Schnyderite confirmed the photographs where all taken recently and accurately depict the property as its current state today.

Mr. Schnyderite continued to explain that the property survey does not show a stoop because the porch was constructed prior to the applicants' purchasing the property in 2015. During discussion pertaining to the need for a covered porch, Mr. Schnyderite testified that it would provide shelter for his children while waiting for the bus and a safe/dry location for packages and deliveries. In addition, it would also improve the aesthetics of the exterior of the dwelling, particularly as viewed from the right-of-way. Mr. Schnyderite explained that the variance relief is only necessary because the applicants are covering the stoop. He further explained that, given the location of the lawfully constructed dwelling, it is impossible for the applicants to construct a conforming covered front porch without violating the front-yard setback requirements. The applicants stipulated, as a condition of approval, to complying with all the comments and recommendations set forth in the September 9th, 2020 Review Memorandum.

During questioning, the applicants were asked whether the addition would be consistent with the overall look of the exterior of the dwelling. Mr. Schnyderite testified that the applicants are currently renovating the home and, once the porch is constructed, the entire dwelling will be re-sided. He further explained that the architectural style, materials, and color of the exterior of the porch would all be substantially similar to the exterior of the dwelling.

No member of the public commented on, or objected to, the application following the testimony given.

During deliberation the Board expressed the many benefits of granting approval on the application. The Board recognized that the relatively modest detriment associated with the location of the porch would be substantially mitigated by the conditions stipulated by the applicants. As to the substantial detriment of the negative criteria, the Board found that the proposed development would not be substantially out of character with the other dwellings in the neighborhood. This was based, in part, on the photographs introduced by the applicants of neighboring dwellings with covered porches similar to what was being proposed. Furthermore, the front porch would improve the view of the property from the right-of-way. The Board also weighed in on the fact that no member of the public objected to the application. As to the substantial impairment of the negative criteria, the Board found that the bulk variance requested was relatively modest and certainly would not rise to the level of constituting the property to be re-zoned. As such, the Board found that the applicants had satisfied the negative criteria for the requested front-yard setback variance relief.

The Board, in favor of granting the front-yard setback variance, identified the necessary conditions of approval:

1. Any and all outstanding escrow fees shall be paid in full and the escrow account shall be replenished to the level required by Ordinance within 30 days of the adoption of a Resolution, within 30 days of written notice that a deficiency exists in the escrow account, prior to signing the site plan and/or subdivision plat, prior to the issuance of a zoning permit, prior to the issuance of construction permits, and prior to the issuance of a temporary and/or permanent certificate of occupancy, completion or compliance (whichever is applicable);
2. The front porch shall remain an open porch that is, not enclosed by walls, glass, screens or otherwise, except for columns or railings which are at least 50% open;
3. The exterior of the porch shall be substantially similar in architectural style, materials, and colors to the balance of the exterior of the existing dwelling;
4. The applicants, if necessary, shall revise the plans to demonstrate that the proposed porch will not interfere with existing underground utility lines and same shall be subject to the review and approval of the Township Engineering Department;

5. The applicants shall, at the time of the application for a building permit, provide a grading plan limited to the area of disturbance to assure against adverse drainage effects, and same shall be prepared by a licensed surveyor. The grading plan shall be subject to the review and approval of the Township Engineering Department;
6. The Applicants shall comply with the Construction Mitigation Measures set forth in Section 126-243.1 of the Ordinance;
7. The applicants shall submit a Compliance Report for a simple variance and the Compliance Report shall be submitted prior to the signing of the plans and prior to the issuance of a building permit;
8. The applicants shall not be required to execute a Developer's Agreement;
9. Once the applicants have satisfied all of the conditions and requirements set forth in the Compliance Report, the Applicants shall provide nine (9) copies of the approved plans for distribution to the Construction Official, Engineer, Planner, Tax Assessor, and others as required;
10. The variance relief granted herein shall expire by limitation unless the construction or alteration of any structure or building, pursuant thereto, shall have been actually commenced within one (1) year from the date of the adoption of this Resolution, pursuant to Section 126-73(B) of the Land Use Ordinance;
11. The applicants shall comply with any and all other outside agency permit and approval requirements in accordance with the law.

The Chairman asked for a Motion from the Board.

Motion for approval by Mr. Weideli and second by Ms. Guttschall

AFFIRMATIVE: Mr. Sweeney, Mr. Humenick, Mr. Fallone, Ms. Guttschall, Ms. Amin, Mr. Weideli and Mr. Foose

ABSENT: None

NOT ELIGIBLE: Mr. Ahern, Ms. Kelly, Mr. Fresco and Mr. LaSpisa

DENIED: None

T-MOBILE NORTHEAST, LLC– 1222 Washington Valley Road

Block 623 Lot 12

#20-011-ZB-Variance

Edward W. Purcell, Esq., of Price Meese Shulman & D'Arminio, P.C., explained the applicant is back since being carried from the August 4th, 2020 meeting. Mr. Purcell re-advised the board that the applicant is seeking preliminary and final major site plan approval with variance relief for the construction of a 125-foot-tall temporary ballast mount tower. This proposed tower will serve as a temporary location for the existing T-Mobile telecommunications facilities presently located on an existing PSE&G utility tower, which is proposed to be replaced. He further advised that T-Mobile must be relocated from the PSE&G pole by January 1, 2021. After a period of approximately one to two years during which PSE&G will be replacing the existing utility tower, T-Mobile's equipment will then be relocated from the proposed temporary tower to a permanent location on the PSE&G replacement tower. Mr. Purcell noted that the Planning Board recently approved a temporary tower similar to this application, including a three-year sunset provision

such that, after a period of three years, the temporary tower would be required to be removed in the absence of further Planning Board approval.

Francis Boschulte, RF Manager of Piercon Solutions, LLC, was duly sworn according to law. Providing her qualifications, she was accepted by the Board as an expert in the field of RF engineering. Ms. Boschulte introduced into evidence, as Exhibit A-16, a report entitled, "Independent Radio Frequency Report Regarding a Proposed Wireless Communications Facility, Site ID: NJCLT57A," dated October 30th, 2019. Ms. Boschulte advised that there was an error on the legend of Exhibit A-16 and that the correct site ID should be NJCLT57, rather than NJCLT53.

During questioning regarding the coverage gap that would be created through the elimination of the existing tower, Ms. Boschulte explained that there is a significant difference between providing reliable service and optimal service. She confirmed the applicant is simply seeking to provide reliable coverage via this application. Referencing Exhibit A-16, she described other regional wireless telecommunication facilities, and how their involvements offer reliable coverage. Ms. Boschulte testified that, without the existing site, the resulting coverage gap would result in a significant degradation in service for the area. She explained that industry standards generally consider the drop call rate when determining whether there is a coverage gap. Due to phones being used for much more than just making phone calls, particularly during the COVID-19 pandemic, the coverage gap would be unfavorable to many. On questioning as to whether customers had made complaints about existing coverage, Ms. Boschulte explained that the tower is currently operating and, therefore, no coverage gap presently exists. The concern would, however, arise once the tower is removed, since users would notice a decline in service. Questions were raised regarding the number of customers expected to be affected by anticipated coverage gap, Ms. Boschulte advised that she was unaware of the specific number. Ms. Boschulte did mention a school nearby, implying that coverage would be noticeably impacted in that location.

On questioning as to how long the proposed temporary tower would be necessary, Ms. Boschulte estimated it would take between one to two years for PSE&G to replace the utility pole. Once replaced, the applicant could then relocate onto the replacement pole. Ms. Boschulte testified that the minimum height necessary for T-Mobile's antennas on the proposed tower, providing proper coverage with limited service gaps, would need to be 119 feet. She explained that the proposed antenna would be located at 124 feet and that the 5-foot difference in height between the pole and the antennas is solely due to the temporary tower having a standard height of 125 feet. During questioning as to whether the height of the tower could be reduced from 125 feet, Ms. Boschulte explained that she had not done an analysis to see how a reduction in height would impact the coverage provided by the tower. She further explained that the replacement tower does not provide the same level of coverage as the existing tower and, instead, provides less coverage than what currently exists.

During questioning as to whether alternative technologies could be used, Ms. Boschulte testified that alternative technologies, such as Distributed Antenna Systems ("DAS"), is not an acceptable means of preventing a coverage gap from the loss of the existing tower. She elaborated that because DAS (1) is not as reliable, or as robust, as a macro cell tower, (2) does not provide e911

location services to emergency responders, (3) has a limited coverage range, (4) is a wired network capable of disruption and failure from falling tree limbs, accidents, and power outages, and (5) has no battery backup. She elucidate that DAS also cannot be provided in building coverage because the coverage radius is limited.

Questioning as to whether there are alternative sites that could be investigated, Ms. Boschulte testified that no other towers and/or tall structures exist in the area that could be used for such a temporary relocation of the antennas. Ms. Boschulte further testified that she reviewed the Ordinance and Zoning Map and determined that the placement of a temporary facility in a zone where such a facility would be permitted, or conditionally permitted, would locate the facility too far from the area where coverage is required. Inquiries as to whether the water tower on Mount Vernon Road would be suitable was posed, Ms. Boschulte testified that, that location had not been evaluated. The reasoning was due to being too far from the existing site to provide the same level of coverage.

A member from the public addressed the board to question the applicants proposed height of the base for this temporary tower? Mr. Cottrell testified that the base would be 3 feet tall, and the proposed tower is 122 feet tall, resulting the overall structure to be 125 feet tall.

Timothy Kronk, P.P., of TK Design Associates, was duly sworn according to law, after providing his qualifications. He was accepted by the Board as an expert in the field of professional planning. Mr. Kronk introduced into evidence, as Exhibit A-18, a report entitled "Visual Analysis for T-Mobile Northeast LLC NJCLT57A Bridgewater, NJ," prepared by TK Design Associates, dated October 2nd, 2019. Mr. Kronk also introduced into evidence, as Exhibit A-19, a letter from Sabrina Bordin-Lambert of T-Mobile, advising that T-Mobile will be permitted to relocate back onto the PSE&G transmission tower once the replacement tower is constructed.

Due to Mr. Kronk's significant experience in the wireless industry, he was accepted by the Board to provide anecdotal evidence regarding his experience with temporary ballast mount towers during Super Storm Sandy. Mr. Kronk advised that he was aware of numerous temporary ballast mount towers that were installed prior to Super Storm Sandy and were able to withstand such a storm.

Mr. Kronk described the property as consisting of 3.3 acres, located in the R-50 Zone, which extends from Washington Valley Road to Papen Road. He explained that the property is 2,383 feet long and runs parallel to the existing PSE&G right-of-way. Mr. Kronk testified that the property is presently used by the Martinsville Fire Company and, aside from the building, driveway, and wooden poles, is mostly wooded. He explained the applicant is proposing to construct a 125 foot tall ballast pole with antennas mounted at 120 feet and a footprint of 20 feet by 20 feet. Mr. Kronk further explained that the applicant is proposing eight (8) antennas in four (4) sectors for a total of two (2) antennas per sector.

Mr. Kronk testified that the applicant is seeking d(1) use, d(6) height, and bulk variance relief. A d(1) use variance is required due to a wireless communications facility use not being permitted in the R-50 Zone. A d(6) height variance is required due to the Ordinance imposing a 35 foot height

limitation in the R-50 Zone and the proposed temporary tower would be 125 feet high. Lastly, a bulk variance relief is required for the proposed setbacks from the property line and for the proposed fence height. He explained that the Ordinance requires that the tower be set back from the nearest property line by at least 120% of the tower height (here, 150 feet) pursuant to Section 126-341.5(G)(2). The proposed tower will be located 44.1 feet and 77.6 feet from the property lines. The bulk variance is due the fence having a height of 9-feet-2-inches (including a 3 foot high ballast and a 1-foot-4-inch stabilizer stand). Mr. Kronk testified that the maximum permitted fence height is 8 feet, pursuant to Section 196-2.B.4 of the Ordinance. He explained that the fence was initially proposed to be a chain link fence, but that the applicant had stipulated to replace the fence with a board-on-board style of the same height.

During questioning as to whether the Board should consider the standards applicable to a conditional use, Mr. Kronk explained that, while here the use is not permitted, such that the standards are not directly applicable, they nevertheless provide guidance to the Board as to what may be reasonable conditions. Mr. Kronk stated that the bulk and d(6) height variance relief would be subsumed within the d(1) variance relief, if the Board decided to grant them.

Mr. Kronk testified that the FCC recently confirmed that the proper test for a prohibition of service claim under Section 253 of the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996. This clarified that an action “materially inhibits” a carrier’s ability to provide any service it desires to provide in the method in which it provides it, including increasing the level of existing service and densifying its network. He stated that the applicant is seeking to provide reliable service by constructing a temporary tower to replace the existing tower on which the applicant’s antennas are located. Mr. Kronk further explained that the applicant had also demonstrated the strong need for the proposed tower under the more rigorous “substantial gap” analysis.

Mr. Kronk reviewed the visual analysis for the site and concluded that the proposed temporary ballast mount tower will have a very minimal aesthetic impact on the surrounding areas given its location on the property and the existing visual impact created by the existing PSE&G transmission facilities.

Mr. Kronk testified that that the standards for granting d(1) use and d(6) height variance relief are the same and stated that the applicant had satisfied those standard. Mr. Kronk testified that the applicant is licensed by the FCC to provide personal wireless service and that its activities “promote the general welfare” pursuant to the holding in *Smart SMR of New York, Inc. v. Borough of Fair Lawn Board of Adjustment*, 152 N.J. 309 (1998). Mr. Kronk confirmed that the proposed site is “particularly suited” for the anticipated 125 foot, temporary, ballast mount monopole. Particularly since there are no other conforming sites on which the tower could be otherwise located. He testified that no other sites or structures are available for the applicant to co-locate on within the requisite service area. Mr. Kronk asserted that this property is particularly suited, from a planning perspective, mainly due to its closest non-residential site to the existing PSE&G tower.

With regards to the negative criteria and the balancing test set forth in *Sica v. Wall Twp Board of Adjustment*, 127 N.J. 152 (1992), Mr. Kronk first identified the public interest at stake as an important and weighty one. He emphasized that maintaining reliable wireless service for the

residents of Bridgewater Township is crucial. Mr. Kronk stated that there would be very little detrimental impact associated with the proposal because the property itself, while located in the R-50 Zone, is not used for residential purposes. It's also located adjacent to the existing PSE&G right-of-way and the PSE&G transmission towers and lines. Referencing Exhibit A-18, Mr. Kronk testified that, based on the photo simulations, there would be little visual detriment associated with the proposal. During questioning as to whether the view of the proposed tower will be more noticeable once the existing foliage is gone, Mr. Kronk responded that it depends on what views are considered. He reminded the Board that there is an existing tower and that the proposed tower will be similarly located, such that any existing visual detriment would not intensify.

Mr. Kronk also stated that the modest detriment associated with this proposal could be mitigated by imposing reasonable conditions on the applicant. Meaning such as requiring that the approval, if granted, sunset in two years, the proposed chain link fencing be replaced with board-on-board fencing, that the concrete ballast mount blocks be painted to match the proposed board-on-board fencing, and that the height of the antennas be reduced from 125 feet to 119 feet. Furthermore, Mr. Kronk balanced the Sica factors to determine whether the relief could be granted without causing substantial detriment to the public good or substantial impairment of the intent and purpose of the zone plan and zoning ordinance. Mr. Kronk stated that relief for the d(1) use and d(6) height variance relief could be granted without substantial detriment to the zone plan and zoning ordinance, because it is clearly the intent of the Ordinance to locate wireless communications facilities on non-residential properties. The Ordinance permits wireless communications facilities on municipal property and conditionally permits them in a number of non-residential zones. He noted that this property located in a R-50 residential zone, is used by the Martinsville Fire Company, a non-residential use. Mr. Kronk stated that, because there is no residential use on the Property, the proposed location of the wireless communications facility on the property generally complies with the goals and intent of the Ordinance.

Mr. Kronk testified that Section 126-199.3(B)(12) of the Ordinance permits temporary wireless facilities in the Township for up to 120 days and that, yet the applicant's temporary structure is proposed to be located on the Site for greater than 120 days. The inclusion of such provision demonstrates that the governing body, in adopting the Ordinance, was amenable to the concept of temporary towers in the Township. Mr. Kronk stressed that it is important to note that the Ordinance does not impose a minimum tower setback requirement from buildings and structures but rather only from property lines. As such, Mr. Kronk stated that the location of this temporary tower vis-à-vis the fire company building and PSE&G electric distribution lines does not impair the intent and/or purpose of the zone's plan or zone's ordinance.

As to the requested bulk variance relief for the nonconforming setback and the height of the proposed fence, Mr. Kronk testified that the requested relief for the nonconforming setbacks can be granted pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70(c)(1). He continued to explain that because the exceptional narrowness of the property makes it difficult, if not impossible, for the applicant to locate the temporary tower in a conforming location, such that it cannot be set back at least 120% of its height (150 feet) from any property line. Mr. Kronk stated that, given the configuration of the property and the intended purpose of the temporary tower to provide coverage similar to that which currently exists, the temporary tower cannot be located in a conforming location. He

further testified that, as such, the applicant is seeking variance relief for proposed setbacks of 44.1 feet and 77.6 feet from the property lines. Mr. Kronk stated that the unique conditions affecting the property would cause an “undue hardship” if the zoning regulations were strictly applied. Mr. Kronk further testified that the narrowness is “specific” to this property and this condition is not shared by all properties located in the R-50 zone. As to the negative criteria required for the requested relief, Mr. Kronk testified that granting the requested relief will not result in substantial detriment to the public good and will not impair the intent and purpose of the zones plan and zoning ordinance.

As to the requested relief for the excessive fence height, Mr. Kronk testified that same could be granted pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70(c)(2). He confirmed that the purpose of the Municipal Land Use Law (“MLUL”) would be advanced by granting the requested relief because the proposed 9’2” fence will provide significant screening. It would also be necessary for the use of the ballast mount system which, by not requiring any excavation or disturbance, promotes a desirable visual environment and the conservation of natural resources. Mr. Kronk further stated that constructing a fence, rather than installing landscape screening, is a better planning alternative. Due to the proposed tower being temporary and, once removed, any proposed landscaping would also have to be removed. Mr. Kronk further testified that the variance relief can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good. He explained that the temporary nature of this facility, the setback from the right-of-way, the use of board-on-board fencing to provide screening, and the existence of the PSE&G transmission lines and towers mitigate the modest detriment associated with the proposal. Mr. Kronk stated that the benefits of granting the requested relief substantially outweigh the modest detriment associated. Mr. Kronk stated that the temporary ballast mounted tower is a better planning alternative to a tower that requires excavation and ground disturbance. In conclusion, Mr. Kronk confirmed that the applicant had demonstrated an entitlement to the requested fence height relief pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70(c)(2).

During questioning as to whether the replacement tower being installed by PSE&G would be able to support the proposed antennas, Mr. Kronk testified that the replacement towers are “beefier” than the existing poles. He also explained that he is not aware of any structural failures associated with the replacement poles.

With the board still having questions regarding the possibility of using alternative technology and whether or not any alternative sites are available, the applicant was carried. The board and applicant felt it’d be best to re-address clearly, with supporting documents, to confirm the board inquiries.

The application was carried to October 6th, 2020 with no further notice requirements.

8. MEETING OPEN TO THE PUBLIC:

Members of the public wishing to make a comment to the Board on any matter not listed on the agenda were able to do so at this time. Please note that in accordance with the Municipal Land Use Law and case Law, any questions or comments about a pending application must be made at the hearing on that specific application.

(Ms. Roper, residing at 1202 Washington Valley Rd, wanted to address the board with some comments on the T-Mobile Northeast, LLC application. Chairman Sweeney advised all comments in relation to a pending application needs to be held until October 6th, 2020.

9. OTHER BOARD BUSINESS:

There was no other Board business.

10. EXECUTIVE SESSION:

There was no need for an Executive Session.

11. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Mr. Ahern and second by Ms. Amin to adjourned the meeting at approximately 11:15 pm.