

**EAST AMWELL  
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT - MINUTES  
Municipal Building – 7:30 PM  
July 12, 2011**

**Call to order and compliance with the Open Public Meetings Act**

The regular meeting of the Board of Adjustment was called to order at 7:30 PM on July 12, 2011 in the Main Meeting Room of the Municipal Building, 1070 Route 202/31, Ringoes, NJ by Chair Schroeder.

In compliance with the Open Public Meetings Act, the Administrative Officer announced this was a regularly scheduled meeting pursuant to the Annual Meeting Notice as published in the January 20, 2011 issue of the Hunterdon County Democrat, filed in the Township Clerk's Office, and posted on the Bulletin Board on July 6, 2011.

**Roll Call and Agenda Review**

**Present:**

Sherrie Binder  
Nancy Cunningham  
Gloria Frederick  
Gael Gardner  
Paul Gavzy  
Sue Posselt  
Kendra Schroeder – Chair  
Diana Garrett – Alt. #1 – *(arrived at 7:35 PM)*  
Anne Williams – Alt. #2  
Attorney Kevin Van Hise – *(filling in for regular Board Attorney Waterbury)*  
Engineer O'Neal  
Planner Slagle

**Absent:**

No one

**Presentation of Minutes**

A motion by Paul Gavzy, seconded by Gloria Frederick to approve the Board's 6/14/11 minutes was approved with no revisions noted.

**Presentation of Bills for Payment**

A motion by Paul Gavzy, seconded by Sue Posselt to approve the vouchers for payment as listed on the agenda was unanimously approved.

**Correspondence**

It was noted that the correspondence will be dealt with as it comes up over the course of the meeting.

**Applications to be Deemed Complete**

It was noted for the record that there were no applications listed on the agenda for completeness.

**Applications for Public Hearing – *(Continuation from 6/14/11 Meeting)***

**George A. Kotzias, Alethea Cleantech Advisors, LLC. - *(Everitt Property – 219 John Ringo Road)* –  
Use Variance/Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan Approval – B:3 L:1 & 2.02**

East Amwell Township Board of Adjustment Minutes – 7/12/11

Present for the public hearing was George Kotzias of Alethea Cleantech Advisors, LLC., Attorney Mark Peck on behalf of the applicant, Engineer Evan Hill of Innovative Engineering, Inc. and Planner/Sole Proprietor Tiffany Cuvillo.

Attorney Mark Peck explained this is a continuation of last month's public hearing and at that point Engineer Hill was wrapping up his testimony. Engineer Hill commented that based on the discussions at last month's meeting regarding the proposed landscaping they have revised their plan which was marked as **Exhibit A-3** (*consisting of 9 sheets of plans and 7 sheets of photo landscaping simulations*). He explained that the landscaping reflects that the trees will be 120' from the Rynearson driveway, the proposed access driveway off of Rosemont Ringoes Road will now be curved to help conceal the site and the shrubs previously proposed along Rosemont Ringoes Road will be replaced with a third row of trees as well as in the area behind the Everitt's existing dwelling and next to the access driveway off of John Ringo Road. Engineer Hill commented that the trees will all be 8' – 10' tall at planting and noted that they will work with the Township's Planner regarding the species of trees to be planted in order to create variation.

Ms. Cunningham asked how difficult it would be to have at least one of the species of trees be 9' at planting. Engineer Hill commented that if the Board imposes this requirement as a condition of approval they will comply. He noted that he would request this stipulation be limited to the buffer area along Rosemont Ringoes Road based on the topography of the site.

Ms. Posselt asked about the steep grade of the access driveway off of John Ringo Road. Engineer Hill stated that they have reviewed this and intend to use a geogrid product which will hold the gravel in place. He explained that the geogrid resembles a layer of plastic honeycomb looking material that gets rolled out in the subject area. Engineer Hill remarked that geogrid is commonly used for fire access lanes.

Ms. Cunningham asked about the drain to the left of the access driveway on John Ringo Road. Engineer Hill stated that there is a drain there that will not be impacted by their proposed solar facility. He explained it is part of the County's drainage system and they have submitted an application to the County who he believes will notify them accordingly of any concerns they may have.

Engineer Hill informed the Board that they had met with the Township's Fire Official Marty Alexander. He stated that the fire department will be fully trained on the layout of the solar facility and will have an Emergency Management Plan in place with a complete listing of emergency contacts. It was noted that the only suggestion Mr. Alexander had was to add additional gravel at the access driveway sites which Engineer Hill indicated would be no problem.

Ms. Frederick noted that in other areas where solar facilities have been constructed, the land selected was not as agriculturally prime as the Everitt land and she asked what is compelling about the Everitt parcel to take it out of agricultural use. Engineer Hill explained that his company has designed over 200 megawatts of solar facilities and they are designed on various sites including rooftops. He stated that the Everitt site is attractive because it is relatively buffered and isolated as it exists today and the topography will hide much of the solar and the site was larger than needed so the entire parcel will not need to be developed which allows for the farming activities to continue.

Engineer O’Neal asked how the panels and related support system is designed to withstand high winds. Engineer Hill stated that all of the electric components of the facility must meet the National Electric Code requirements (2008 edition). He explained that the detail of the electrical design is reviewed by the State of NJ and they must approve it prior to any building permits being issued. Engineer Hill noted the same applies to the structural design. He said their studies indicate that the subsurface soils can adequately support the posts and the racking system can withstand up to 100 mph winds. Engineer Hill explained that their system will not tie into the overhead power lines. He stated that their power will come out to an inter-connection point along John Ringo Road through underground wiring to a proposed new utility pole at the driveway access and then overhead wiring will go to the existing neighboring utility poles. Engineer Hill commented that once the power goes into the utility pole it becomes part of the distribution grid.

Ms. Frederick asked about the possibility of “over-generating” power. Engineer Hill stated they can’t over-generate. He explained that reports and studies have been done by the grid operator and owner, PJM (Pennsylvania, Jersey and Maryland) and all power generated must meet their guidelines.

Mr. Gavzy asked why the panels need to be 9’ tall and referred to a solar facility on Route 1 where the panels are much lower. Engineer Hill explained that if they install lower panels it will require the use of more surface/land area in order to meet the capacity of the facility they are proposing. He added that 9’ tall panels are fairly standard in the industry because they allow for additional safety measures such as wider spacing between rows.

Ms. Cunningham referred to Engineer Hill’s prior comments regarding why this site is appealing to them for solar development and remarked about the timing of their application stating the NJ Legislature amended the Code to include renewable energy as inherently beneficial in 2009 and asked if their company was involved with any of the Legislation. Engineer Hill explained that they were involved with “technical legislation” that recently came out known as the Impervious Cover Bill. Ms. Cunningham commented that the Township began working on its renewable energy ordinance in 2010 and adopted it on 2/10/11. She stated that this application was received on 2/14/11 which included site plans dated 1/13/11 and existing conditions plats dated 12/14/10 meaning that the application was being prepared months in advance of when the Township actually had an Ordinance. She added that Engineer Hill’s comments last month that “the Townships who have been proactive in establishing renewable energy ordinances are more appealing than those Township’s who don’t have an ordinance because developers then know what they’re dealing with” was perhaps misunderstood. Engineer Hill clarified that with or without the Renewable Energy Ordinance, they require a use variance. He noted that when they learned of the Township’s Ordinance they revised their proposed project to be more conforming. He added that it was to their benefit that the Township passed the Ordinance because then they had specific guidelines to follow.

Utility Electrical Engineer Expert John Dean came forward and provided the Board with his credentials which include: Electrical Engineering degrees, 25 years of employment with PSE&G on substation projects and his current employment with Innovative Engineering as their Electrical Engineering Manager. The Board accepted Mr. Dean as an expert to provide testimony on this application. He was sworn in and explained the PJM Transmission Tariff which require utilities to accept generation from non-utility generation such as renewable energy/solar. He stated that the process to get connected into the PJM grid includes the submission of an application and a plan and studies are done to ensure that their system can accept the proposed project—in this case it is a 3 megawatt facility. He noted that looking at

the impact and feasibility studies that were presented JCP&L cited some minor protective relay upgrades that needed to be done in order to allow the 3 megawatt facility to connect into the grid. Mr. Dean also noted that there is a stipulation that JCP&L can curtail the power if necessary to prevent overload conditions in the event of abnormal power outages. It was noted that the entire facility must be UL qualified according to the National Electric Code where if there is an outage on the grid, the solar facility must disconnect from the grid to ensure that it doesn't act as its own "island" of power.

Attorney Peck commented that at last month's meeting many members of the Board and the public expressed concerns over the safety of the site regarding the transformers and he asked Mr. Dean to address this. Mr. Dean explained that DC power comes off of each solar panel and it feeds into an inverter where it is converted to AC power. The AC power will be about 480 volts feeding into a utility transformer.

Attorney Peck asked about the life span of a transformer. Mr. Dean noted that he has seen transformers at PSE&G still in service after 80 years but remarked that the average lifespan is somewhere around 25 to 30 years with routine replacement performed after about 30 to 40 years. Ms. Binder asked if the old transformers still contain Polychlorinated Biphenyl (PCB's). Mr. Dean indicated that some of the older transformers might have PCB's but as of the 1950's it was no longer being used.

Chair Schroeder asked about JCP&L being able to take the entire solar facility off the grid if necessary. Mr. Dean explained that JCP&L will monitor and meter the facility at all times from a remote terminal, likely their Morristown Office, and will be able to monitor what the output of the solar facility is and will be able to "operate, trip and curtail" what is feeding into the grid if necessary. He remarked that this is all part of the required inter-connect agreement between the entities.

Ms. Frederick asked what Mr. Dean's expert experience is regarding solar facilities in respect to grid connections and installations. Mr. Dean indicated the largest problem is coordinating with the utility companies because lately they are so busy with solar projects.

Ms. Cunningham commented that at the Board's last meeting it was stated that the proposed site will be approximately 3 megawatts and can power about 300 – 375 homes and she asked Mr. Dean if he could verify this information. Engineer Hill answered for Mr. Dean and remarked that it depends on the size of the home, but generally speaking a 3 megawatt system will power 350 – 400 homes. Ms. Cunningham asked if having a substation in the area makes any difference. Mr. Dean indicated that if the substation was far away and it was loaded to capacity the utility company would indicate in their impact study that a new pole circuit would be required to make the connection to the grid. It was noted that the location of the Ringoes substation is beneficial to the proposed solar project. Attorney Peck commented that the location of the substation is not relevant to the merits of the application.

Mr. Gavzy asked if anything happens within the facility will it affect East Amwell in terms of increased power outages. Mr. Dean stated the proposed facility will not affect outages or reliability. He noted that in the event of an outage the solar facility automatically gets disconnected from the grid. Ms. Binder remarked that the Board was provided with testimony that the proposed site would stabilize the grid. Mr. Dean indicated that it will under normal conditions, but not during outages.

East Amwell Township Board of Adjustment Minutes – 7/12/11

Ms. Cunningham asked Mr. Dean if the power from the proposed facility will be used by homes in Ringoes. Engineer Hill clarified that his testimony indicated that the electric lines are like a water pipe. He explained the water is always there at your house and is available when you turn your faucet on. He stated it's the same with electricity—it is always flowing through the line and when there is a demand right next to the source you will utilize that source—it's a series circuit.

Attorney Van Hise explained that the inherently beneficial use and the use variance is not for the "panels." He stated, "That has already been decided by the Governing Body, that they are permitted on this site. The use variance is solely for whether or not this permitted use can also co-exist on the same property as a residential use." He further clarified that the Board is not actually being asked to determine whether or not the Township is going to benefit or the residents will benefit by the installation of the solar facility.

A motion by Gloria Frederick, seconded by Sherrie Binder to open to the public was unanimously approved.

Frances Gavigan of 123 Wertsville Road came forward and commented on the lifespan of the transformers and suggested a study be done to determine the age of the transformers in East Amwell and their ability to handle the capacity of the proposed solar facility in light of the recent power outages in the area. She also expressed concerns for possible power surges and asked what safeguards would be implemented. Mr. Dean remarked that he cannot specifically address JCP&L's infrastructure in this area but noted that if the infrastructure was too old or inadequate it would have been reflected in their impact and feasibility studies.

Robert Omara of 122 Boss Road came forward and expressed concerns for decreased property values due to the proposed solar facility. Engineer Hill remarked that he believes they have demonstrated that they have mitigated any aesthetic issues associated with the project through adequate landscape buffering and he noted it has been his professional experience that "passive" projects—projects that don't generate noise, traffic or pollution do not directly affect property values.

Toni Robbi of the Environmental Commission came forward and expressed confusion over how the power flows and asked for an explanation with regard to the voltage and phases of electricity. Engineer Hill explained that each one of the solar panels is producing approximately 235 watts of DC power with a maximum of 29.5 volts. He noted they typically string about 10 to 12 panels in a series which is designed for a 600 volt maximum capacity per inverter. Mr. Dean added that the proposed facility will be 12,500 volts/3 phase at the utility pole going into the existing 3 wires currently on the pole. Mr. Robbi commented that the testimony that this power will feed nearby homes is erroneous because no one connects to 12,500 volts. Engineer Hill explained the purpose of the transformers is to convert the 12,500 volts to something homeowners can use.

A motion by Gloria Frederick, seconded by Sue Posselt to close to the public was unanimously approved.

The Board took a 5 minute break from 9:05 PM – 9:10 PM.

Planner Tiffany CuvIELLO came forward and provided the following credentials: She is a licensed Professional Planner in the State of NJ and a member of the American Institute of Certified Planners. She has a Bachelors Degree from Rutgers and a Masters Degree from the University of PA. She has been practicing since 1995 and also teaches for the NJ Planning Officials certification classes. The Board accepted Ms. CuvIELLO as an expert to provide testimony on this application.

Attorney Van Hise commented that Planner CuvIELLO was sworn in at the Board's last meeting.

Planner CuvIELLO explained that the variances associated with the application are not related to the solar facility use itself but rather the design of the site as it relates to the proposed solar facility. She noted they are proposing a 2.9 megawatt solar generating facility on a 55 acre parcel. It was noted that only 16.2 acres of the lot will be used for solar development. Planner CuvIELLO commented that the proposed solar installation respects the property's existing environmental constraints and it is setback considerably from Rosemont Ringoes Road and John Ringo Road.

Planner CuvIELLO noted the following variances being sought and explained each in detail:

**D-1 Use Variance** – to allow 2 principal uses: The existing dwelling and the solar facility. She stated the ordinance does not permit two principal uses on one lot and the application purposes to do so. She clarified that the variance relates specifically as to whether or not these two uses can operate together without causing any detrimental impacts to the surrounding area, the zone plan or the ordinance.

**D-3 Variances** – to provide relief from the setback conditions: To be allowed to develop over the common lot line between Lot 1 and 2.02, to be allowed to develop within 68' of a portion of the Rynearson property line (a 200' span) where a 150' setback is required, to be allowed to develop within 133' of the existing Everitt home where a 300' setback is required and to be allowed to develop within 135' of the Everitt barn where a 150' setback is required.

Planner CuvIELLO clarified that what the Board must focus on is: Can the site and the use function with the Everitt's home remaining on the property and can the site function as intended by the Ordinance despite the variances. She further explained that in order for the Board to grant the requested variances they must find that the application satisfies the positive criteria—that special reasons exist for the granting of the variances: They meet the purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law or that the use is an inherently beneficial use *and* the negative criteria standard must be met—this means that the proposed application cannot cause a substantial detriment to the public good and that there is no substantial impairment to the zone plan or ordinance.

It was noted that the legislation has recently determined renewable energy to be inherently beneficial.

Planner CuvIELLO explained that because solar has been deemed an inherently beneficial use, the standard to obtain a use variance is much lower and the positive criteria is presumptively satisfied. She also noted that in the NJ Energy Master Plan a goal has been set that by the year 2020, 20% of the State's electricity demand is to be produced from renewable sources.

Planner CuvIELlo remarked that when a use is inherently beneficial and it meets the positive criteria, there is a test that “balances” the impact associated with the use called the SICA Balancing Test which outlines 4 criteria:

1. Identify what the public interest is and make findings on how compelling the public interest issue is
2. Identify the detrimental effects that will ensue from granting the variances
3. Determine whether there are any legitimate detrimental effects that can be reduced by imposing reasonable conditions on the variances
4. Balance the positive and negative criteria—the benefits of the solar against the potential impacts and how they have been mitigated

Planner CuvIELlo addressed the D-1 Use Variance component by first saying the potential impacts are not necessarily related to the aesthetic impact, but rather how the site and the use function together. She noted the proposed solar facility allows for ample room for the residential use to continue without interference—similar to a farmer performing agricultural activities on a parcel in which he also resides. She also stated that the proposed landscaping provides more than adequate buffering. Planner CuvIELlo remarked that solar is a long term temporary use that allows the parcel to revert back to its agricultural use at the end of its life. She stated the solar installation will not change the grade of the land and allows the Everitts to maintain their dwelling and farm their own land as well as other land in the community.

Planner CuvIELlo addressed the D-3 Variances saying the main area of concern is along the Ryneerson property line because Mrs. Ryneerson is the closest adjoining property owner. She stated that the Township’s Ordinance requires a 300’ setback to the residential use and 150’ setback to the accessory use. Planner CuvIELlo stated their application satisfies those setbacks from the Ryneerson home and barn except for the 200’ strip of land behind the Ryneerson home where they are proposing to be 68’ away from the property line in order to configure the 2.9 megawatt facility and she stated they are mitigating the impact because of the proposed landscaping.

With regard to the 0’ setback to allow for the development over the lot line, Planner CuvIELlo stated this is a technicality. She explained the lots are both owned by Mr. Everitt and the development of the land is similar to the continued farming of the property which exists currently. She indicated there is no impact between the two lots because it is essentially one site. Planner CuvIELlo commented that the remaining requested variances relate to the Everitt’s themselves and are not of any impact because the Everitt’s know what they are getting into—the solar will be 150’ from their dwelling and 135’ from their barn which is only 15’ less than what is required. She stated they believe they are adequately mitigating the impacts because of the landscape buffering and the difference of 15’ is minor since it’s an agricultural barn.

It was noted that the solar facility is internal to the site with a setback distance of 571’ from Rosemont Ringoes Road and 380’ from the property line of the closest resident of Rosemont Ringoes Road. Ms. Cunningham remarked that there are overhead power lines in this area which prevent the applicant from getting any closer to the road than what they are proposing. Planner CuvIELlo agreed but noted that if the power lines were not there, the Ordinance would allow the solar facility to be situated much closer to the roadway.

East Amwell Township Board of Adjustment Minutes – 7/12/11

Planner CuvIELlo addressed the loss of agricultural land due to the proposed application. She stated that the Ordinance allows solar on agricultural farms and indicated that this application allows for the parcels to revert back to farmland so there is no significant disturbance to the site and only 16 of the 55 acres are being used. Planner CuvIELlo also pointed out that because the parcel will be taken out of farmland assessment, the Township will assess the land at a higher tax rate and the owner will have to pay 2 years of roll back taxes.

In summary, Planner CuvIELlo stated they believe they meet the balancing test—that the compelling public interest is greater and that the positive outcome from granting the variances is greater than the potential impact.

Planner Slagle addressed some of the comments made by Planner CuvIELlo stating the inherently beneficial use does not necessarily apply to the dual use on the property. She explained that she doesn't believe that the relief of an inherently beneficial use for the solar panels automatically translates to the dual permitted uses. She added that the Township, through the Ordinance, has allowed solar facilities as a conditional use under certain circumstances and with certain provisions. Planner Slagle stated the Board must still review whether two uses on the site makes sense in terms of the well, the septic and the environmental constraints.

Ms. Cunningham asked if there is a pasture with horses around the barn on the Everitt property. Engineer Hill indicated that there is. Ms. Cunningham asked how close the solar panels will be to the pasture. Planner CuvIELlo stated the barn is closer to the panels than the pasture is.

Ms. Binder asked what the impact would be on the proposed solar facility if the setback on the Rynearson property line complied with the 150' setback requirement instead of the 68' requested setback. Engineer Hill stated, "It would make our system smaller...it's a fact that we have already made the system smaller than what we originally came in for. If you recall we originally submitted an application for a 3.5 megawatt system that was prior to your Ordinance being revised. We recently submitted revised plans to make the system smaller to more substantially conform—we believe we comply with the intent of the Ordinance."

Ms. Binder commented that Planner CuvIELlo stressed what a "small" variance/deviation this was and remarked that if it's so small then they should just get rid of it. Engineer Hill indicated that it would have a financial impact on their project if they were to comply with the 150' setback. Planner CuvIELlo added that they believe the impact to Mrs. Rynearson is minimal because there is still a 50' buffer and the 68' deviation is only for a small portion of the site. She explained pulling in the arrays results in a smaller facility and she stated, "The applicant has a desire to propose the 2.9 megawatt facility in this design. When we have a design that requires variances, we have to demonstrate to you why it makes sense...we're not asking to violate the entire intent of the Ordinance we're only looking at one small area and we think that...the benefit to the community to have that 2.9 megawatt facility is greater than putting this in 150' because you're still getting your enhanced landscape buffer—that is the burden of proof for the variance."

Ms. Cunningham commented that Planner CuvIELLO did not address any socioeconomic issues in terms of property values. Planner CuvIELLO remarked that the property values are not necessarily related to the variances. She noted that the proposed solar facility is a permitted conditional use and stated, “The impact on property values has been determined by your Governing Body not to be an issue because they are permitting this use.” Ms. Cunningham referred to a report submitted by the applicant’s which specifically states, “Property values will not be adversely affected as a result of this project” and she wanted to know what proof they had to support that statement. Engineer Hill noted the report was prepared to meet the checklist requirements and he indicated his statement in the report goes to the fact that impacts to property values are based on nuisance uses—high intensity uses. He noted the proposed solar facility is a passive use that will not generate any noise, traffic or pollution and has no adverse impact on any municipal services.

A motion by Paul Gavzy, seconded by Gael Gardner to open to the public was unanimously approved.

Larry Swanzer of 9 Rosemont Ringoes Road came forward with several pages of typed questions along with mounted presentation boards. Attorney Peck objected to the documentation based on its relevancy and the fact that the google earth printouts had been altered.

The Board took a break from 10:13 PM – 10:27 PM in order for Attorney Van Hise and Attorney Peck to confer on Mr. Swanzer’s presentation materials.

Attorney Van Hise explained that he reviewed Mr. Swanzer’s documentation with Attorney Peck and he has determined that due to the nature of the questions and the modifications to the mounted printouts he believes they are not proper for evidentiary purposes and will not be admitted. He noted that he explained to Mr. Swanzer the appropriateness of some of the questions and what goes to the variances being requested vs. the use of the site which is a technical difference but an important one.

Chair Schroeder noted that the public comment is limited strictly to questions of Planner CuvIELLO and her testimony.

Mr. Swanzer of 9 Rosemont Ringoes Road came forward and asked the following questions:

Why didn’t you choose industrial/commercial property? (Attorney Peck objected).

Why not use isolated farmland? (Attorney Peck objected).

How much work was done to find other sites with natural buffers? (Attorney Peck commented that the Planner played no part in choosing the site).

Why is grade A farmland being used? (Attorney Peck objected).

Mr. Swanzer also commented on the lack of screening from his property due to the topography of the land.

Frances Gavigan of 123 Wertsville Road came forward and suggested the applicant’s can eliminate the need for the 0’ setback on the common property line by bringing forth a minor subdivision/lot line merger application before the Planning Board. She also commented on the proposed buffering noting that the land in East Amwell is not flat and the proposed solar facility will not be shielded from adjoining property owners who live at higher elevations.

Toni Robbi came forward on behalf of the Environmental Commission and commented on the lots being sold at some point in the future and another dwelling being built. Planner CuvIELLO indicated what happens after the solar facility is decommissioned is no different than what could happen today if the solar project wasn't being proposed.

Charlie Sosena (the brother of resident Diane Harrington) came forward and indicated he has a number of comments to make which the Board advised will be better suited during the general public comment period.

Hugh McGee asked how a resident can get Exhibits marked into evidence. Attorney Van Hise explained that it depends on what the evidence is and the Board would have to make a determination as to whether or not it is acceptable as to be admitted into evidence. He noted that he recommends that if a member of the public has something to present they should share it with the Board's Secretary and Council (both the Board's Attorney and the Applicant's Attorney) ahead of time so that it can be reviewed.

A motion by Gloria Frederick, seconded by Gael Gardner to close to the public was unanimously approved.

Chair Schroeder noted for the record that this public hearing will be continued to the Board's 8/9/11 meeting.

There was some discussion on scheduling the Stahl property solar project for public hearing and the possibility of a special meeting. The Board was not amenable to a special meeting and Attorney Van Hise suggested the Stahl application be noticed for public hearing next month in order to meet the MLUL clock requirements, that the Board take jurisdiction and then carry the hearing until the September meeting so that the current Everitt application can be finished up next month.

#### **Old Business**

It was noted that there were no old business matters listed on the agenda.

#### **New Business**

It was noted that there were no new business matters listed on the agenda.

#### **Comments of the Board Members**

It was noted that there were no comments made by any of the Board Members.

#### **Attorney Comments**

It was noted that there were no comments made by Attorney Van Hise.

#### **Open to the Public**

A motion by Nancy Cunningham, seconded by Sue Posselt to open to the public was unanimously approved. Seeing no one come forward, a motion by Nancy Cunningham, seconded by Gloria Frederick to close to the public was unanimously approved.

East Amwell Township Board of Adjustment Minutes – 7/12/11

**Adjournment**

A motion by Nancy Cunningham, seconded by Sue Posselt to adjourn was unanimously approved.

The meeting adjourned at 10:59 PM.

---

Maria Andrews, Administrative Officer