

**Borough of Highlands
Zoning Board of Adjustment
Regular Meeting
February 2, 2012**

Mr. Braswell called the meeting to order at 7:38 p.m.

Mr. Braswell asked all to stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. Cummins read the following statement: As per requirement of Public Law 1975, Chapter 231. Notice is hereby given that this is a Regular Meeting of the Borough of Highlands Zoning Board of Adjustment and all requirements have been met. Notice has been transmitted to the Asbury Park Press and the Two River Times. Notice has been posted on the public bulletin board.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Mr. Fox, Mr. Britton, Mr. Kutosh, Mr. Knox, Mr. Gallagher,
Mr. Braswell, Mr. Cervantes

Absent: Ms. Ryan, Mr. Connelly

Also Present: Carolyn Cummins, Board Secretary
Greg Baxter, Esq., Board Attorney
Robert Keady, P.E., Board Engineer

**ZB#2011-5 Metro PCS, NY
Block 106.1 Lot 1 – 1 Scenic Drive
Approval of Resolution**

Mr. Kutosh offered the following Resolution and moved on its adoption:

2/2/12

**RESOLUTION APPROVING USE AND BULK VARIANCES
AND GRANTING PRELIMINARY AND FINAL SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR
METRO PCS NEW YORK AT
EASTPOINTE CONDOMINIUM AT 1 SCENIC DRIVE**

WHEREAS, the applicant, METRO PCS NEW YORK, LLC is the contract lessee of property at the Eastpointe Condominium location at 1 Scenic Drive, Highlands, New Jersey (Block 106, Lot 1); and

WHEREAS, the applicant has filed an application to construct wireless telecommunications antennas and supporting equipment on the roof of the existing condominium, together with site plan approval; and

WHEREAS, all jurisdictional requirements have been met, and proper notice has been given pursuant to the Municipal Land Use Law and Borough Ordinances, and the Board has jurisdiction to hear this application; and

WHEREAS, the Board considered the application at a public hearing on January 5, 2012; and

WHEREAS, the Board heard the testimony of CHRISTOPHER OLSEN, expert in RF design and optimization; ROBERT W. TOMS, Engineer with MTM Design Group; and DAVID KARLEBACH, Professional Planner; and

WHEREAS, no objectors or questioners appeared; and

WHEREAS, the applicant submitted the following documents in evidence:

- A-1 Variance Application (11 pages); includes affidavit of property owner, FCC Wireless Telecommunications Bureau Radio Station Authorization, disclosure statement, statement of principal points and requested variances, and W9 request for taxpayer I.D.
- A-2 Site Plan Review Application (2 pages)
- A-3 11/4/11 Architectural/Engineering plans by Lou Moglino, Architect, and Robert W. Toms, Structural Engineer, with MTM Design Group, Inc. (3 pages)
- A-4 12/5/11 FCC compliance report by Daniel J. Collins, of Pinnacle Telecom

**Borough of Highlands
Zoning Board of Adjustment
Regular Meeting
February 2, 2012**

Group (covers site FCC RF compliance assessment and report)

- A-5 Photo simulations (6 in total) prepared by David Karlebach
- A-6 Radio frequency report by Christopher Olsen, of Airwave Solutions, Inc., dated 12/7/11
- A-7 Prior resolutions of the board for antenna locations on Eastpointe:
 - A) 7/2/98 for Omnipoint
 - B) 9/3/98 for Sprint Spectrum
 - C) 2/7/02 for Cingular Wireless
 - D) 6/20/02 for AT&T Wireless PCS, LLC
 - E) 1/6/05 for Nextel
 - F) 4/7/05 for New York SMSA d/b/a Verizon Wireless
- A-8 FCC declaratory ruling dated 11/18/09
- A-9 Monmouth County Planning Board letter dated 12/27/11; and

WHEREAS, the Board additionally marked into evidence, after the close of the hearing and for purposes of the record and for resolution compliance, the following exhibits:

- A-10 1/5/12 Structural report by Robert W. Toms, of MTM Design Group, Inc.;
- A-11 One sheet supplementing Exhibit A-3, revised 1/3/12 by Robert W. Toms; and

WHEREAS, the Board marked into evidence the following exhibits:

- B-1 Board Engineer review letter dated 12/28/11 by Robert Keady; and

WHEREAS, the Board, after considering the evidence and testimony, has made the following factual findings and conclusions:

1. The applicant is the contract lessee of property located in the MF District.
2. The property is approximately 4.97 acres, housing a 15-story residential condominium building.
3. The current height of the building is approximately 145 feet. The height of the applicant's proposed tallest antenna is 148 feet, 10 inches, which will not be the highest existing antenna on the Eastpointe roof. The applicant seeks a use variance for height, as well as use, since the borough ordinance only permits a height of 35 feet.
4. The proposed antennas and cabinets will be unmanned, and require minimal service calls (approximately once every 4 to 6 weeks).
5. No new trenching will be needed.
6. The antennas will be off-white in color and, therefore, blend in with the existing antennas on the roof.
7. There will be a total of six antennas. Two of the antennas will be 15 feet above the roof level. Two of the antennas will be on frame at the rear, and approximately 14 feet 4 inches above the roofline. The remaining two antennas will be toward the front, on a ballasted frame, and only 6 feet above the roofline.
8. The condominium is a concrete building. The applicant obtained core samples from the site and undertook ground-penetrating radar. According to the applicant's engineer, ROBERT TOMS, the platform is structurally sound, will be on two low steel beams, posting over concrete columns. No other cellular provider will be using the same column in the area being used by this applicant for location of its equipment cabinets.

**Borough of Highlands
Zoning Board of Adjustment
Regular Meeting
February 2, 2012**

9. The building will sustain the additional weight of the additional antennas being installed by this applicant, as well as the equipment cabinet. See Exhibit A-10.

10. There will be no noise created, and there will be no impact on the tenants. The applicant will, therefore, meet DEP requirements on this issue.

14. There will be four equipment cabinets, the highest of which will be 6 feet 3.5 inches above the platform (the platform being 3 feet above the roof level). There is a fifth lightweight cabinet being installed as well.

15. The addition of the applicant's antennas and cabinets will not have any adverse effect on the other cellular service providers. In the unlikely event that a problem does arise, the applicant will take reasonable steps to resolve those problems with the other provider(s).

16. This site has already been developed for wireless telecommunication facilities for multiple providers. As a result, there is no change to the use.

17. There will be no additional building undertaken, nor any affect on the impervious area on the site.

18. There is very little in the way of municipal services to be employed. There will be electric and phone service.

19. The applicant has satisfactorily proven that it has a gap in service, which gap is required to be cured under the applicant's FCC license, and will be covered if its application is granted. At that time, there will be full coverage along the Route 36 corridor, and additional service throughout the borough, and to a greater degree than would have been the case on the proposed site at the Stewart's Root Beer property.

20. The public interest requirement of Sica has been met, since the applicant has obtained an FCC license.

21. The property is particularly suited for this use, since it is centrally located in the service gap, allows the use of an existing structure, serves a major corridor (State Highway 36), and already has several telecommunication uses on site.

22. There will be no increase in population or employment. There will be no use of water or sewer. There will be no traffic caused by granting the application. This application, therefore, is for a benign use. There will be no noise, dust, fumes, odors or the like.

23. In addition, the passersby, as well as residents, have already become acclimated to the site and the antennas thereon. There is very limited visibility to the north, which has a steep wooded embankment. As a result, you won't even be able to see the antennas from that direction. This application, therefore, provides the least intrusive method of installing cellular antennas within the borough and, therefore, there are virtually no detrimental effects of this application.

24. The Board would typically consider possible mitigating factors; though, with the antennas being painted the same color as the existing area on the roof, there is no need for such a requirement here.

25. The positive criteria far outweigh the negative criteria of this application when you consider the public service being provided and the fact that there will be a safe and secure wireless telecommunication provided. In addition, the property (Eastpointe) has already been developed for the co-location of wireless telecommunication facilities.

26. The applicant's RF emission study satisfied the Board that, on approval, the applicant will make the equipment and panels compliant with FCC standards for RF emissions.

**Borough of Highlands
Zoning Board of Adjustment
Regular Meeting
February 2, 2012**

27. In a worst case scenario, the overall RF level is only 1.2108% of the FCC MPE limit and, therefore, is well below the 100% reference for compliance (see page 11 of Exhibit A-4; report by DANIEL J. COLLINS).

28. The Board finds that there will be no impact on the borough's comprehensive zone plan or its master plan.

29. The proposed use will not be a substantial impairment to the intent and purpose of the zone plan and zoning ordinance.

WHEREAS, the application was heard by the Board at its meeting on January 5, 2012, and this resolution shall memorialize the Board's action taken at that meeting;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Zoning Board of Adjustment of the Borough of Highlands that the application of METRO PCS NEW YORK, LLC for the installation of wireless telecommunications antennas and equipment on the roof of Eastpointe Condominium at 1 Scenic Drive (Block 106, Lot 1), as shown on the application and plans marked in evidence, be and is hereby approved for the required use and height variances, and preliminary and final site plan approval is hereby given, subject to the following conditions:

1. The applicant's equipment shall be removed when it is no longer needed or used.

2. Once the time to appeal this decision has expired and no one has successfully appealed the board's decision, and the applicant has requested and obtained the required building permit(s), the applicant shall withdraw its pending appeal in the case of Metro PCS v. Highlands Zoning Board of Adjustment, Superior Court of New Jersey, Docket No. L-4669-11.

Seconded by Mr. Fox and adopted on the following roll call vote:

ROLL CALL:

AYES: Mr. Fox, Mr. Britton, Mr. Kutosh, Mr. Knox, Mr. Gallagher, Mr. Braswell

NAYES: None

ABSTAIN: None

**ZB#2011-3 McGavin, T.
Block 35 Lot 1, 18 Valley Ave
Approval of Resolution**

Present: Tracy McGavin

Mr. Braswell spoke of Mr. Baxter's memo on recent issues with regard to this application. He then suggested that the Board amend the language in the Resolution to add a variance for the steep slope. He is confident that the technical steep slope on the property will not be an issue.

Mr. Keady explained the technical steep slope disturbance and variance needed.

The Board discussed this steep slope variance.

Mr. Baxter on paragraph 14 on page 5 remove sentence that the board was not able to determine if there was a steep slope problem or not. We need to take that sentence out. Then since we are no longer deferring this to the Construction Official, the next sentence need to be modified also. It reads "keeping in mind that the applicants engineer certified that there is no a violation of the ordinance". Maybe we should say something that there is a technical variance needed for the steep slope and the board is satisfied that the proposal is an improvement to the existing slope and therefore it's not an issue to the proposed construction. Then page 8 item D we will remove that.

Mr. Gallagher offered the following Resolution and moved on its adoption:

2/2/12(revised)

**Borough of Highlands
Zoning Board of Adjustment
Regular Meeting
February 2, 2012**

**RESOLUTION APPROVING BULK VARIANCES
FOR MC GAVIN AT 118 VALLEY AVENUE**

WHEREAS, the applicant, TRACY MC GAVIN, is the owner of a single-family home at 118 Valley Avenue (Block 35, Lot 1), Highlands, New Jersey; and

WHEREAS, the property owner filed an application to install a new in-ground swimming pool in a portion of the yard fronting on North Peak Street; and

WHEREAS, all jurisdictional requirements have been met, and proper notice has been given pursuant to the Municipal Land Use Law and Borough Ordinances, and the Board has jurisdiction to hear this application; and

WHEREAS, the Board considered the application at public hearings on December 1, 2011, and January 5, 2012; and

WHEREAS, the Board heard the testimony of the applicant, TRACY MC GAVIN; and

WHEREAS, the applicant submitted the following documents in evidence:

- A-1: Variance application (3 pages);
- A-2: Zoning Officer denial notice dated 8/18/11;
- A-3: Survey by Thomas Finnegan dated 11/10/94;
- A-4: Pool grading plan by Michael T. Cannon dated 7/14/11;
- A-5: Pool specifications by Interpool dated 4/28/03;
- A-6: 4-page newsletter by Allan Block Landscapes;
- A-7: Guide and design detail booklet by Allan Block Landscaping;
- A-8: 12/14/11 Wall Plan and Detail by Michael T. Cannon;
- A-9: 12/14/11 Pool Grading Plan by Michael T. Cannon.

AND, WHEREAS, the following exhibit was also marked into evidence:

- B-1: Board Engineer review letter dated 11/3/11;
- B-2: Board Engineer's revised review letter dated 12/28/11.

AND, WHEREAS, no persons appeared in opposition or to ask questions about this application; and

**Borough of Highlands
Zoning Board of Adjustment
Regular Meeting
February 2, 2012**

WHEREAS, the Board, after considering the evidence and testimony, has made the following factual findings and conclusions:

1. The applicant is the owner of a single-family home located in the R-1.01 Zone.
2. This lot is an irregularly-shaped triangular lot, the point of which is at the intersection of North Peak Street and Valley Avenue.
3. The front of the home is on Valley Avenue, and the swimming pool is proposed to be in the rear of the home, which would actually front on North Peak Street.
4. The property is sloped, running southerly from North Peak Street to Valley Avenue.
5. The applicant proposes to construct an interlocking block wall around the swimming pool, which will be a maximum of ten feet in height. The top of the wall, however, will be at grade level on the North Peak Street side of the property.
6. There is currently nothing but woods on the North Peak Street side of the property.
7. As a result of the installation of the swimming pool, the property will have to be re-graded, and the wall will need to be sloped (i.e., it will not be the same height at all location).
8. The board and Board Engineer expressed concern about whether there would be a need for geogrid supports extending behind the new wall, to hold it in place. In response to those inquiries, the applicant presented proof (Exhibit A-8) from her engineer, Michael T. Cannon, which evidence satisfies the board's concern that the proposed wall can be constructed in the location shown without the wall or any supports crossing the property line.
9. Because of the irregular (triangular) shape of the property, the property has two front yards and limited locations within which to put any accessory uses. The proposed location of the swimming pool is the only reasonable location for that type of use on this property.

**Borough of Highlands
Zoning Board of Adjustment
Regular Meeting
February 2, 2012**

10. The property owner currently has 6-inch wide French drains and a 2-foot high stone wall behind the house, which holds up the hill.

11. The applicant testified that, when constructing the pool, they will go through the yard. As a result, there will be no need to close off either North Peak Street or Valley Avenue during construction.

12. At the initial hearing, it appeared that the current wall along North Peak Street was approximately one foot over the property line, which encroachment needed to be removed as part of the proposal. As a result of the applicant's further documentation and the Board Engineer's revised review letter, the board is now satisfied that the wall and geo-grid are now within the property, such that there is no longer an issue.

13. Since the new wall on the North Peak Street side of the house will be at grade/street level, fencing will be required on top of the wall. That fencing shall be constructed of a material and at a height in conformance with Highlands borough ordinances.

14. At the initial hearing, the board had concerns about whether the disturbance/improvements would violate Section 21-84B of the borough ordinances, which pertain to steep slopes and slump blocks. In response to those concerns, the applicant's engineer, Michael T. Cannon, provided a certified statement on his pool grading plan (A-9) stating that "The overall slope of the yard is less than 35% and is not regulated by the steep slopes ordinance Section 21-84B." In the Board Engineer's revised review letter, and at the second of the two meetings, the engineer raised questions as to the calculations. Though the board determines that there is a technical violation of the steep slope ordinance, the board is satisfied that the applicant's proposal is an improvement to the existing slope and, therefore, is not a detriment to the proposed construction.

15. The applicant seeks a variance for a front yard setback on the North Peak Street side of the property of 10.2 feet (7.8 feet originally) from the right-of-way line to the pool, where a minimum of 35 feet is required by ordinance. The applicant was initially seeking a variance to permit an accessory structure (swimming pool), which will have an aggregate ground floor area of

**Borough of Highlands
Zoning Board of Adjustment
Regular Meeting
February 2, 2012**

41% of the ground floor area of the principal structure, where 30% is permitted by ordinance. However, the variance is no longer necessary, as the pool area has been reduced below 30%.

16. The Board finds that the applicant has met the positive and negative criteria required under the Municipal Land Use Law. The proposed new swimming pool with Allan block wall will not be a substantial detriment to the intent and purpose of the zone plan and zoning ordinance. Swimming pools are permitted accessory uses.

17. The Board is empowered to grant these bulk variances pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55d-70c(1), as the property has an irregular shape and topographic conditions which support the relief requested by the applicant. In addition, N.J.S.A. 40:55d-70c(2) also permits the granting of this application because the purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law will be advanced in that the benefit of the deviations requested (location and size of swimming pool) substantially outweigh any detriment. Since there were no opposing witnesses, and the board had no unresolved concerns with the application, the board finds no detriment in granting this application.

WHEREAS, the application was heard by the Board at its meetings on December 1, 2011, and January 5, 2012, and this resolution shall memorialize the Board's action taken at that meeting;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Zoning Board of Adjustment of the Borough of Highlands that the application of TRACY MC GAVIN to install a new in-ground swimming pool in the portion of her yard fronting on North Peak Street in accordance with her submitted plans (Exhibit A-4) is hereby approved; and a variance is hereby granted for the location of the swimming pool being a 10.2-foot front-yard setback from North Peak Street, where 35 feet is required.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this approval is subject to the following conditions:

A. Neither street (North Peak Street nor Valley Avenue) shall be closed off because of the pool and wall construction.

**Borough of Highlands
Zoning Board of Adjustment
Regular Meeting
February 2, 2012**

B. Fencing shall be installed on top of the new wall on the North Peak Street side of the property in conformance with the fence requirements of the Highlands Borough Ordinances.

C. None of the construction, new wall, fencing or any interior paths on the property shall extend beyond the property line.

Seconded by Mr. Kutosh and adopted on the following roll call vote:

ROLL CALL:

**AYES: Mr. Britton, Mr. Kutosh, Mr. Knox, Mr. Gallagher,
Mr. Cervantes, Mr. Braswell**

NAYES: None

ABSTAIN: None

Resolution Awarding Professional Engineering Services Contract

Mr. Baxter explained that the engineers contract that is on the table is a revised contract which is identical to last year's contract.

Mr. Gallagher questioned the last page of the contract he wanted to strike paragraph 3.

Mr. Baxter read the paragraph on the last page about the 10 day notice of termination of the contract.

Rob Keady – its part of the standard of agreement.

Mr. Baxter stated that we should delete the entire last page and also the contract should be with Rob Keady not T & M.

Mr. Gallagher offered a motion to table this approval of the engineers contract, seconded by Mr. Fox and approved on the following roll call vote:

ROLL CALL:

**AYES: Mr. Britton, Mr. Kutosh, Mr. Knox, Mr. Gallagher, Mr. Cervantes,
Mr. Braswell**

NAYES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ZB#2011-4 Louco, LLC

Block 63 Lot 19.01 – 231 Bay Ave

Hearing on New Business

**Present: Henry Wolf, Esq.
Louis Dakoglou, Applicant
Richard Stockton, P.P.**

Conflicts: Ryan Britton and Robert Knox stepped down for this application

Mr. Baxter stated that he has reviewed the public notice and publication and finds it to be proper; therefore the board has jurisdiction to proceed.

**Borough of Highlands
Zoning Board of Adjustment
Regular Meeting
February 2, 2012**

Mr. Wolff stated that Gimpi's was a restaurant that closed 10 years ago. The building has deteriorated and needs repairs. He wants to get restaurant up and running and have the residential units upstairs up and running. The applicant is here for a use variance.

The following documents were marked into evidence this evening:

- A-1: Zoning denial letter dated 9-22-11;
- A-2: Handwritten letter from Mr. Dokaglou dated 9/27/11 Appealing denial along with a consent form from Mr. Comanis;
- A-3: Variance Application dated 12/22/11 with revised affidavit;
- A-4: Architectural Plans by L. Doran consisting of one page dated 1/18/12;
- A-5: Survey by W. Doran & Sons dated 9/17/03;
- A-6: Photo of trash enclosure;
- A-7: Photo of rear of restaurant with stockade fence;
- A-8: Photo;
- A-9: Photo;
- A-10: Photo of Cedar Ave side;
- A-11: Photo of Bay Ave Main entrance;
- A-12: Photo of previous free standing sign;
- B-1: Board Resolution dated 6/4/09 for subject site;

Louis Dakoglou of 77 Center Ave, Atl. Highlands, NJ was sworn in and stated the following during his testimony and response to questions from the :

1. He is the Principal of Louco, LLC and the contract buyer of 231 Bay Ave.
2. It's a property with good bones and needs a lot of love and care. He wants to reopen a restaurant and two residential units upstairs.
3. He is proposing an Italian Restaurant with evening hours of 4pm-10pm.
4. The first floor has four walls and needs wall, electrical and plumbing.
5. The roof sprinkler system he needs to get it back to code to operate restaurant.
6. He spoke of hood system for the kitchen.
7. He has experience running restaurants.
8. About 100 seats will hold in restaurant.
9. There are about 16 parking spots on site.
10. He does not have a liquor license and not intending to. It will be BYOB.
11. There are residential units on the second and third floors.
12. He currently operates Zoey's in Atlantic Highlands.
13. He will operate the proposed new restaurant.
14. The third floor residential – he described how they would have access to unit.
15. The door on Cedar side should open in and not out. The Board wants door moved to different location for residential units. The Board would prefer access to rear for customers, move residential door to parking lot and leave Cedar door as an Emergency door.
16. No change in square footage of restaurant.

Mr. Baxter – bulk variance for old approval were 85% lot coverage, 1.8 foot setback for Cedar, 14.3 feet setback on Bay Ave, and 4.4 feet setback.

Mr. Dakoglou continued his testimony as follow:

17. There is a spot on site for garbage and it will not take up a parking spot. There will be 16 parking spots.
18. Fence in rear to left can be removed.
19. He described the photographs that were all marked into evidence.
20. The stockade will stay and the fence in front will be fixed
21. Signage would like a free standing sign but will comply ordinance requirements.

Mr. Keady – ordinance design standards has no size requirements for signs. Parking, two spaces required for each residential unit and one spot for every four seats in the restaurant. So 25

**Borough of Highlands
Zoning Board of Adjustment
Regular Meeting
February 2, 2012**

parking spots are required. There is a parking deficiency ordinance where the applicant would pay a onetime fee for each parking spot not provided.

Mr. Braswell asked if there were any questions from the public but there were none.

Richard Stockton of 17 Avenue D, Atlantic Highlands, NJ was sworn in and stated the following during his testimony and response to questions from the board:

1. He briefly described his professional and education as a license Professional Planner and the board accepted him.
2. He reviewed the zoning permit application, tax map, current zone map, land use regulations as well as the goals and objectives of the Master Plan.
3. He personally inspected site and took the photographs that were previously marked into evidence.
4. Subject ___ is 50 ft. wide by 200 ft. in depth. It's a three story structure that was a restaurant on the first floor and residential units up stairs. The rear lot is asphalt paved parking lot with 13 spaces.
5. The neighborhood is primary 85.7% residential within 200 feet of the site.
6. The B-2 and R.202 Zone is split on Valley Street
7. He spoke about the master plan goals and objectives. It's good to improve business properties and it's redevelopment of a commercial property.
8. He believes that this meets the goals and objectives of the Master Plan by restoring a rundown commercial building on the main street.
9. The proposed is in conformance with MLUA – cleaning and remodeling enhances the neighborhood.
10. Positive criteria, it's a hardship to owner because of the zone change because it was in a business zone but it's not today.
11. Negative criteria – the building consist today they are not constructing a new building and the intent and purpose of the zone have changed.
12. Suitability of lot – it has been developed years ago for this use which he further explained.

Mr. Braswell asked if there were any public questions but there were none.

Lighting – Mr. Dakoglow will use existing lighting.

Discussion about no site plan needed and the need for the applicant to get a zoning permit for the sign.

Board briefly discussed application.

Mr. Gallagher offered a motion to approve the use and bulk variances with conditions as discussed, seconded by Mr. Kutosh and approved on the following roll call vote:

ROLL CALL:

AYES: Mr. Fox, Mr. Kutosh, Mr. Gallagher, Mr. Cervantes, Mr. Braswell

NAYES: None

ABSTAIN: None

Review of the 2011 Zoning Board Annual Report

Mr. Britton and Mr. Knox returned to the meeting table.

Mr. Gallagher offered the following 2011 Zoning Board Annual Report be approved:

2011 ZONING BOARD ANNUAL REPORT

Prepared by Carolyn Cummins, Board Secretary

Date: January 25, 2012 Revised

ZB#2010-2 Metro PCS NY, LLC

**Borough of Highlands
Zoning Board of Adjustment
Regular Meeting
February 2, 2012**

**Block 106.1 Lot 1
1 Scenic Drive**

The Zoning Board approved the application for the installation of wireless telecommunication antennas and equipment on the roof of the Eastpointe Condo's located at 1 Scenic Drive. The board granted the required use variance and height variance and preliminary and final site plan approval.

Resolution dated 2/2/12

Seconded by Mr. Fox and approved on the following roll call vote:

ROLL CALL:

**AYES: Mr. Fox, Mr. Britton, Mr. Kutosh, Mr. Knox, Mr. Gallagher,
Mr. Cervantes, Mr. Braswell**

NAYES: None

ABSTAIN: None

Approval of Minutes:

Mr. Fox offered a motion to approve the January 5, 2012 Zoning Board Minutes, seconded by Mr. Kutosh and approved on the following roll call vote:

ROLL CALL:

**AYES: Mr. Fox, Mr. Britton, Mr. Kutosh, Mr. Knox, Mr. Gallagher,
Mr. Cervantes, Mr. Braswell**

NAYES: None

ABSTAIN: None

Mr. Gallagher offered a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Kutosh and all were in favor.

The meeting adjourned at 9:08 P.M.

Carolyn Cummins, Board Secretary