

REGULAR MEETING

**Lebanon Township Planning Board
Municipal Bldg 530 West Hill Road Glen Gardner, N.J.**

June 4, 2013

The 870th Regular Meeting of the Lebanon Township Planning Board was called to order at 7:03 p.m. by Chairman Gary MacQueen. Present were: Mr. Milkowski, Mr. Schmidt, Mr. Gerlich, Mr. Piasecki, Mr. Rich, Ms. Bleck, Mr. Weiler, Mr. McKee, 1st Alternate Laul, 2nd Alternate Skidmore, Attorney Gallina, Planner Bolan and Engineer Risse.

Notice of this meeting was published in the "Annual Meeting Notice Schedule" adopted by this board on January 15, 2013, faxed to the Hunterdon Review, Hunterdon County Democrat, Express Times, Courier News, Star Ledger and posted on the bulletin board in the Municipal Building on May 29, 2013.

The Chairman will announce that the Board will go into Executive session at this time and ask for a motion.

Motion by Ms. Bleck and seconded by Mr. Schmidt to go into Executive Session at 7:06 p.m. Unanimously approved. The following board members were excused do to a conflict of interest: Mr. Piasecki, Mr. Gerlich and Mr. Weiler. The public also left the meeting room.

WHEREAS, Section 7(b) of the Open Public Meetings Act L. 1975 C .231 NJSA 10:4-12(b)(8) permits the exclusion of the public from Planning Board Meetings where certain matters are to be discussed; and

WHEREAS, the Lebanon Township Planning Board is desirous to meet to discuss litigation;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Lebanon Township Planning Board of the Township of Lebanon, Hunterdon County, New Jersey that this Board met in Executive Session.

The Chairman will announce that the board will return to the Regular Meeting to continue with Regular Business and ask for a motion.

Motion by Mr. Rich and seconded by Ms. Bleck to close the Executive Session at 7:13 p.m. and return to the public portion of the meeting. Unanimously approved. Mr. Gerlich, Mr. Piasecki and Mr. Weiler returned to the board along with the public.

PRESENTATION OF MINUTES: Executive Session May 7, 2013

Motion by Ms. Bleck and seconded by Mr. Laul to approve the minutes as presented. Unanimously approved by those eligible to vote.

Regular Meeting May 7, 2013

Motion by Mr. Piasecki and seconded by Mr. Gerlich to approve the minutes with a minor correction. Unanimously approved.

NEW BUSINESS:

Odins Raven, LLP
11 Litton Road
Flemington, N.J. 08822

Block #51 Lots #14.07 & 19
Lilac Lane & Sharrer Road R 1½

PUBLIC HEARING

1 Lot Subdivision/Merger & Variances

Engineer Wayne Ingrams of Engineering & Land Planning of Clinton, N.J. was present to represent the applicant. Engineer Ingrams informed the board that their Attorney Walter Wilson was unable to be present this evening. Attorney Gallina announced that all the notices are in order and the board can proceed with the public hearing. The following items were marked into evidence: **A1**-Taxes Paid, **A2**-Affadavit of Proof of Service, **A3**-Notice to Property Owners & Utilities, **A4**-Certified List of Property Owners & Utilities, **A5**-POD Slips, **A6**-Notice in Newspaper. Ms. Glashoff informed Attorney Gallina that the applicant has not received the official certification from the newspaper, but that she included the cutout from the newspaper for this hearing.

Engineer Ingram was sworn in. Engineer Ingram made a presentation to the board. Engineer Ingram said the property at present consist of 2.75 acres. There is a dwelling, inground pool and a shed on the property. There is also a small parcel Lot #19 consisting of .45 acres which at one time had a small house on it. The following item was marked into evidence: **A7**-Sheet #2 of Plan prepared by Wayne Ingram, dated February 25, 2013 and revised on April 17, 2013 & May 9, 2013. Engineer Ingram stated they would like to subdivide off of Lot #14.07 1.17 acres leaving a total of 1.58 acres. Then merge the 1.17 to the .45 to create a building lot consisting of 1.62 acres for Lot #19. Both lots would be conforming to the R 1½ zone. Engineer Ingram said they have done soil testing on both lots for septic systems. They also have performed a wetlands investigation on the property. There are state open waters along the frontage essentially just by the road side ditch which has no buffer associated with them. Located on Lot #19 is a stream, a tributary to the Spruce Run which is lined with walls and there are no wetlands associated with it. The retaining walls are 3' high on each side of the stream. As you go further northeast on the property there is a low lining

Lebanon Township Planning Board
June 4, 2013
Page 2

area with wetlands that is associated with it. Engineer Ingram said they have plotted the 100' line stream corridor per the Ordinance along with the 300' stream buffer for a C1. Engineer Ingram said there is an exemption with DEP which allows you to construct a minor project which doesn't disturb more than an 1 acre of land or create more than a ¼ acre of impervious coverage. As long as they stay a minor project and stay 25' off the embankment and not be in a floodplain. Engineer Ingram said they have complied with all three of those conditions, and the purposed new dwelling has been placed closer to the road.

Engineer Ingram said there are a couple of variances associated with this application. Both lots are conforming to lot area. Lot #14.07 being a corner lot needs 200' of frontage on Lilac Lane and 200' on Sharrer Road. Lot #14.07 meets the frontage on Lilac having 290' but believes they only have 170' on Sharrer Road creating a variance. Also, the inground pool on Lot #14.07 doesn't meet the rear yard setback of 50' only having 36.3' creating another variance. That concluded Engineer Ingrams testimony.

Chairman MacQueen asked if the board had any questions of Engineer Ingram. Mr. Milkowski asked about the existing bridge that is shown with the driveway going up to the proposed dwelling. Engineer Ingrams said it is a pipe culvert. Mr. Weiler asked if there were any repercussion with the Highlands since you are changing the lot line. Engineer Ingrams said since it is a minor project there isn't a problem and explained to the board the reasons for how they meet the exemption. Attorney Gallina asked who owns Lot #19. Engineer Ingram said the lot is in an estate of Charles Zawatski and being handled by Kathy Parkington. Engineer Risse asked if they have made application to the DEP for a wetlands interpretation and did they intend to. Engineer Ingram said no. They would wait until someone was interested in purchasing the lot and then go for a presence absence in proximity to the development instead of a LOI. Mr. Rich asked Planner Bolan if all that made sense to him and can the board rely on what they have told us. Planner Bolan said he believed so, but the exemption from the Highlands. Planner Bolan said he was not sure about it because of it being a re-subdivision. Planner Bolan asked if they were going for Exemption #2 or #4. Engineer Ingram said he wasn't sure. Planner Bolan asked if they have applied for the exemption. Engineer Ingram said no, at the present time applying for the exemption can take from 180 days to 1 year. Mr. Schmidt asked if Lot #19 before being merged is in the buffer. Planner Bolan said yes. Mr. Schmidt said that Highlands said that you can build on an existing lot, but this lot without being merged is it completely in the buffer. Planner Bolan said yes. So it is unbuildable without taking land from the other lot per Mr. Schmidt. Engineer Ingram said to try and get approvals to build on the .45 acres would be impossible without the merger. Chairman MacQueen asked about the variances being requested. Mr. Rich had a question for Planner Bolan and wanted to know how we rely on these setbacks, also the channel that was mentioned that contains the stream that requires a buffer. Planner Bolan deferred to Engineer Ingram. Engineer Ingram stated that the buffer is a stream buffer which is the 300' buffer. The wetlands basically start from where the walls come up, the ground feathers out in the low lining area. The wetlands follow closely to the topography of the area. Engineer Ingrams continued to outline for the board the area with the wetlands.

Mr. Schmidt asked if Engineer Ingram knew how old the walls are. Engineer Ingrams said 50-60 years old. Engineer Ingram said you would not be allowed to build those walls today. This whole area has been maintained as lawn and is considered a disturbed area. The buffer is a 300' since this is a C1 stream corridor. Mr. Rich said that 300' would wipe out the entire property. Engineer Ingram said the reason why this is possible is as long as they remain a minor project and the development is under an acre. There is an NJDEP rule which states you do not need to apply for a permit if you are doing a development in a pre-disturbed area greater than 25' from the stream and keeping it a minor project. Mr. Rich wanted to know how do we verify that asking Planner Bolan the question. Planner Bolan did not know. Mr. Rich said that is a big assumption. Planner Bolan agreed. Engineer Risse said there are permits by rule under the flood hazard regulations. Engineer Risse stated you can get a jurisdictional determination recommendation from the DEP acknowledging that you meet the permit by rule. There are three different tiers.

Mr. Schmidt asked if this stream flows into the Spruce Run Creek. Engineer Ingram said it is a tributary and a C1. Planner Bolan asked Engineer Ingram for the conditions again by rule. Chairman MacQueen asked Engineer Risse for his comments. Engineer Risse said they are creating their own variance regarding the lot line. It looks like a creative way of creating a building lot per Engineer Risse with all the environmental constraints it's pending a lot of DEP approvals and being in compliance with DEP rules. Engineer Risse noted if the delineation is not correct that could change things drastically as to the viability of proposed Lot #19. Engineer Risse said he would like to see an LOI or a presence absent letter with a defined footprint approved before any building permits are issued. Attorney Gallina noted that other than a C1 Variance the board can approve a C2 Variance which is a hardship variance. Attorney Gallina read into the record the definition of a C2 Variance. A C2 Variance is also known as a planning variance. During the discussion, Mr. Rich said that they can conform and asked if we are not obligated to have them conform instead of adjustments so they don't conform. Attorney Gallina said you have to consider the merits to the variance requests. Mr. Rich said he hasn't heard any. Engineer Ingram explained to the board the reasoning for the variances versus having two conforming lots. The board continued to discuss this issue at length. Planner Bolan stated that in his opinion there should be 200' of frontage on Sharrer Road for Lot #14.07 since it is a main road in the area. Planner Bolan said he didn't know what the rationale for the variance would be. Engineer Ingram proceeded to explain the rationale for the variances.

Lebanon Township Planning Board
June 4, 2013
Page 3

At the conclusion of the board's discussion, Chairman MacQueen opened the hearing to the public for questions. Paul Kropp of 32 Sharrer Road had questions. Mr. Kropp said he lives directly across the road from the property in question. Mr. Kropp said it is a credibility issue referring to the comments about an existing lot 19 of .45 acres with a driveway, stream and a residence. Chairman MacQueen reminded Mr. Kropp to ask questions of the testimony given. Mr. Kropp asked Engineer Ingram why he would say those things are there when they are not. Engineer Ingram said there is a giant concrete foundation, an old stone driveway. Mr. Kropp said someone removed it recently because it is gone and it has been grown over for a very long time. At this point, Attorney Gallina interjected stating that Engineer Ingram would be happy to show Mr. Kropp since it is on the plans. Engineer Ingram said the plans were not sealed by him but a licensed land surveyor. Chairman MacQueen asked Engineer Risse if he has been to the property. Engineer Risse said he is familiar with what use to be on the property. Engineer Risse there use to be a sort of a house before the owner went into a nursing home. It was declared in habitable about 5 years ago. Engineer Risse said he thought that the township had the house taken down. Mr. Kropp said he didn't have any additional questions. Chairman MacQueen asked Engineer Ingram if he wanted the pictures marked into evidence. The response was yes. The following was marked into evidence: **A8-4** photos, view of proposed Lot 19, photo of existing dwelling dated winter, 2013 and existing pool.

Mr. Matt Parish of 3 Lilac Lane had questions of Engineer Ingram. Mr. Parish referred to the comment of the wetlands area ending at the stone wall and wanted to know how they came to that determination. Engineer Ingram said they had a wetlands scientist do a wetland delineation. There are wetlands that diverse from the stream for about 100' showing on the plan the area he was referring to. Mr. Parish was concerned with runoff on his property. Mr. Parish referred to the plan showing the area that is extremely wet and you would sink. Engineer Ingram explained that they are showing the house moved up front on the property because people in general want a back yard. Also, they would not be building the house. At the conclusion of Engineer Ingram's response to Mr. Parish's questions, Chairman MacQueen asked if there was anyone else from the public to ask questions of the Engineer. There were none. Chairman MacQueen opened the hearing to the public for testimony. Mr. Kropp of 32 Sharrer Road was sworn. Mr. Kropp said there is a sign on a tree by the stream that states Brook Trout stocked by State of New Jersey. Mr. Kropp said if he had had the opportunity to purchase the .45 acres he would have donated it so it would stay pristine. Mr. Kropp said he did not think that the property was ever intended to be for a home. The whole area is wetlands. Mr. Kropp referred to when he had to put in a new well and the problems associated with it because the ground is too wet. Mr. Kropp referred to the comment by Mr. Parish that when you walk out into that field you sink in the mud. Mr. Kropp expressed concern regarding a septic system on the new lot because of the property is so wet. At the conclusion of Mr. Kropp's testimony, John Dovidauskas of 28 Sharrer Road was sworn in. Mr. Dovidauskas said he lives across the road from the property in question. Mr. Dovidauskas said that every time they had a heavy rain, the water engulfed Charlie's property and that is what made the house deteriorate. Mr. Dovidauskas also expressed concern over water running down on his property and also his neighbors. Mr. Dovidauskas said he has lived their 16 years and knows how bad it gets with heavy rain.

Mr. Laul asked if the bridge got covered after a heavy rain. Mr. Dovidauskas said it was a mess especially after Hurricane Irene and said that was what totally destroyed Charlie's house. After that storm it totally separated the walls in the house and that is why it was torn down. Ms. Glashoff said she had been at Charlie's property before Hurricane Irene with Committeeman Weeks and at that time could not understand how anyone could live there. Mr. Dovidauskas said the water issue is terrible and putting a new structure will only makes things worse for everyone else down stream. Engineer Ingram responded stating that they have no intentions of building anywhere near where the old structure had been. The new structure will be 15' higher in grade. Engineer Ingram said that being down grade, you will have much higher ground water conditions. Mr. Matt Parish 3 Lilac Lane. Mr. Parish referred to the comment by Engineer Ingram about the basement in the existing house being dry. Mr. Parish stated that he was in the house after Hurricane Irene and in the basement, there was white mold on the floor which was about 4" off the floor. Engineer Ingram said that was from the horrible leaking roof. Engineer Ingram stated their was an oil tank leak that was a considerable sum to remediate and take care of. Mr. Parish referred to the inground pool and the fencing is no longer there and it is unsafe. Engineer Ingram said he wanted to see what the determination was by the board regarding the pool.

At the conclusion of the public comments and statements, Chairman MacQueen asked for a motion to close. Motion by Ms. Bleck with Chairman MacQueen interjecting and asked a question of Engineer Risse. Chairman MacQueen asked when building a new house and with all the new rules and regulations, referring to a Stormwater Management Plan, the water that is on that property coming off the roof and driveway isn't it to be contained within the property. Engineer Risse said on Sheet 3 of the Plan a future drywell is to catch the roof runoff. Engineer Ingram said it wasn't practical to have a drywell but they plan on two feet of gravel and have some storage there. Engineer Ingram said when they remove the old foundation and old driveway and when they develop this property there won't be a problem. Mr. Piasecki asked if the impervious coverage isn't an issue then the ground water is an issue. Engineer Ingram said that they will make sure that ground water isn't an issue and they will end up with a net zero impervious coverage. At this point Chairman MacQueen asked for a second to close the public portion of the hearing. Mr. Rich seconded the motion. Unanimously approved.

Lebanon Township Planning Board
June 4, 2013
Page 4

At this time the board discussed the issues. Ms. Bleck asked Engineer Risse about the report from the H.C. Board of Health and wanted to know if Engineer Risse had seen a septic design for the new lot. Engineer Risse said no. Mr. Gerlich noted that the Highlands will need to sign off and they will need DEP approval. Mr. Laul expressed his concerns, Mr. Milkowski made a comment regarding changing the lot line to square it up more. Mr. Piasecki said the neighbors comments were persuasive and didn't feel this was going to work. Mr. Rich noted this was not a building lot because there were too many issues. Mr. Skidmore agreed with Mr. Rich and Mr. Piasecki. Mr. McKee didn't like the configuration because there are too many issues for a building lot. Mr. Weiler felt the configuration was not good and agreed with Mr. Rich. Engineer Ingram asked if the board would reopen the hearing. Motion by Ms. Bleck and seconded by Mr. Milkowski to reopen the public portion of the hearing. Engineer Ingrams said they tested for 2 new septic systems, one being for the existing dwelling. Engineer Ingrams said he had the design done but hasn't submitted it to the County Board of Health. Chairman MacQueen asked if the board had comments. Mr. Gerlich said he didn't have a problem with the pool or the frontage on Sharrer Road for the existing dwelling. Mr. Gerlich said there are two big if's, the Highlands and the DEP with wetlands. Mr. Laul was concerned if this could create another Little Brook Road issue. Mr. Milkowski said he wasn't enthused about the design offered. Mr. Milkowski said what if you took and flipped where the new septic is to be located and pull the lot line back towards where the original lot line was to make the lot almost the way it was and give the space to the new lot in order to get the acreage right. Then the septic would be higher than where it is to be located now. It would give it a more uniformed configuration then what is there now. Mr. Milkowski said it would be more desirable and in a higher ground area. Mr. Piasecki said the neighbors are very persuasive and did not feel it was going to work and didn't know if the addition to the property was the solution. Mr. Rich said it is not a buildable lot, there are too many environmental concerns. Mr. Rich said he was not in favor of any variances and if the board ever approved it he would be in favor of a conservation easement. Mr. Rich said he would prefer to see these lots merged together. Mr. Skidmore said he agreed with Mr. Piasecki and Mr. Rich. Mr. McKee said he didn't like the configuration, too many issues for a building lot. Mr. Weiler agreed with Mr. Rich.

During the discussion, the board agreed that they should do a site inspection of the property. Engineer Ingram said with all the feedback they would be willing to make alterations to the plan along with not having any variances. Chairman MacQueen asked for a motion to reopen the public hearing. Motion by Ms. Bleck and seconded by Mr. Milkowski to reopen the public portion of the hearing. Mr. Gerlich voted no. Everyone else voted yes. Engineer Ingrams said wherever the board would like the lot lines drawn they will do. Chairman MacQueen asked if the County Board of Health has seen the results of the soil logs. Engineer Ingram said no, but they will make them available to the County. Chairman MacQueen asked Mr. Milkowski to draw on the plan his thoughts to where the new lot lines could be. Mr. Milkowski stated we need to work something out for the best for everyone and this is just a suggestion. Mr. Schmidt said he would not vote in favor of this application because it is a train wreck. Attorney Gallina said if he meets the ordinances they are entitled to an approval. Attorney Gallina said it is up to Mr. Schmidt on how he wants to vote. Mr. Schmidt said because of all the wetlands and wet areas on the property even if they can do this legally. Mr. Schmidt said he would like to see DEP rule on this first. Chairman MacQueen the DEP could be a condition of approval. Chairman MacQueen asked Engineer Risse if the DEP or the township responsible for the ground water recharged areas. Engineer Risse said it depends on what kind of wetland permits are needed. Engineer Ingram said they are not purposing any wetland permits. They will be getting a grading permit or a soil conservation permit. Engineer Risse said if they only need a line verification but if their line turns out not to be correct, then they would have to do a transition area averaging plan then the stormwater would kick in at the DEP level.

Chairman MacQueen asked if the board had any additional questions of Engineer Ingram. There were none. Chairman MacQueen opened the hearing up to the public. Mr. Parish said if they put a septic in the area that they were discussing with moving the house, the area is extremely wet. Mr. Parish said he will be smelling septic all the time. It was noted that the topography lines show it to be a higher area. Mr. Parish said he understood that the board would like to do a site inspection of the property. Ms. Bleck agreed with Mr. Rich that a conservation easement would have to be established. Ms. Bleck said she was concerned with runoff. Chairman MacQueen asked for a motion to close the public portion. Motion by Mr. Rich and seconded by Mr. Schmidt to close the public portion of the hearing. Unanimously approved.

At this time the board discussed doing a site inspection. Ms. Glashoff stated that to keep under a quorum not more than 4 board members could go together at one time. At the conclusion of the discussion, all were in favor of a site inspection. It was noted that Planner Bolan and Engineer Risse have already been to the property. Planner Bolan said he has only walked along the street and not on the property. Engineer Ingram said he gives permission for the board to do a site inspection. Attorney Gallina noted for the public that the applicant does not have an issue with the board doing a site inspection of the property. In speaking with Engineer Ingram a revised plan without variances will be forthcoming. Chairman MacQueen said in his opinion if the lot can not be reconfigured then it will be just one lot. Chairman MacQueen asked Ms. Glashoff when could the applicant be scheduled to come back. Ms. Glashoff offered July 2nd. Everyone agreed. Attorney Gallina announced that the continuation of this public hearing will be heard on July 2nd at 7:00 p.m.

Chairman MacQueen announced that the board will take a recess at this time. Board recessed at 8:55 p.m.

Lebanon Township Planning Board
June 4, 2013
Page 5

Chairman MacQueen reconvened the meeting at 9:06 p.m. The next order of business is under Items For Discussion:

a. Review Ordinance on Livestock – Planner Bolan

Chairman MacQueen asked Planner Bolan to look into a few things after the last meeting. At this time he turned the discussion over to Planner Bolan. Planner Bolan said he started with the Agricultural Waste Management Field standards which is now the NRCS. These standards go back to the late 1970's which is no longer in use, but it had a nice table to follow. Planner Bolan handed out a guideline from the Cooperative Extension Center on "Housing and Space Guidelines for Livestock" which he found after is memo was distributed. Planner Bolan said in his memo he refers to the Agricultural Experiment Station which has published a manual titled "Agricultural Management Practices for Commercial Equine Operations" which includes the following standards for a Pasture Regime under Farm Stocking Rates. Planner Bolan reviewed for the board the following recommendations that can serve as a guideline based on restricting the number of horses and time allowed for turnout in order to maintain 70% or higher vegetative cover in the pastures. Planner Bolan said he looked at the USDA & NRCS standards and he found that they have changed their approaches on these standards. Referring to the Ag Experimental Station and what they did for Equine Operations is it is broken down into manure handling, pasture, how they feed, dry lot feeding and quantity of pasture. Also quantity of pasture is based on manure handling. Planner Bolan said he looked at other websites that deal with small farms and hobby farms.

Referring to the handout on housing and space guidelines, he looked at New Jersey, New York and Pennsylvania and then extended it to New Hampshire which is the table you have tonight. Planner Bolan said the standards are all over themap. Planner Bolan said he looked at the Clinton Township Ordinance which he had worked on back in 1993 when he worked for Clinton Township from 1988 to 2007. When putting this in an ordinance you have to consider how it will be administered in an ordinance. In the Clinton Twp. Ordinance the standards pertain to farm animals as a principle use not an accessory use which would be an additive to a residential lot. It is the same standard as farmland assessment, which you need 5 acres for farming and 1 acre for the house and buildings which means you need 6 acres. If you have a 2 acre lot, then 1 acre would be for the house. In referring to the chart in his memo, it is based on pasture for an animal with turnout time. Planner Bolan said when thinking about making any changes you have to consider the different zones in the Township which are RC, R5, R3, R1½ and R15. The R3 is referred to as Rural Residential and the R1½ and R15 are referred to as Residential. Only in the RC & R5 are they referred to as Rural Agricultural. The Board of Adjustment had asked if this is a customarily incidental use in the R 1½ zone. At this point Planner Bolan asked if the board had any questions. Mr. Piasecki referred to the Clinton Township ordinance stating that he didn't see exclusive of 1 acre for a dwelling unit. Planner Bolan said livestock is a permitted use and the livestock standards are listed as a principle use if there are no other uses on the property then the 1 acre for a dwelling unit would kick in. Ms. Bleck said after the last meeting she drove around the township and found properties with less then 5 acres with barns and animals. Ms. Bleck asked Mr. Milkowski and Mr. McKee how many times has this issue come up and has it been a problem. Mr. Milkowski said this is the first time it has come up but it looks like we will have to address it. Mr. McKee agreed that this hasn't been an issue. Ms. Bleck expressed concern on how to deal with it. Mr. Milkowski said this is why the Township Committee turned this issue over to the Planning Board. Chairman MacQueen said now that this has opened up it could create problems for many people. The board is going to have to give this a lot of thought on how they want to handle this per Mr. Milkowski. Planner Bolan said we will need to address all farm animals not just one.

The board continued deliberating this issue. In conclusion, Planner Bolan will work on putting something together for an upcoming meeting.

PRESENTATION OF BILLS & REPORT:

a. John Gallina, Esq.	\$1,776.25
b. Michael Bolan, PP	\$1,728.00
c. Bayer/Risse Engrs.	\$ 875.00
d. H.C. Planning & Zoning Admin.	\$ 30.00
Total:	\$4,409.25

Motion by Mr. Gerlich and seconded by Ms. Bleck to approve the bills for payment. Unanimously approved.

CORRESPONDENCE:

- a. Memo from Fair Share Housing Ctr/dated 5/14/2010
- b. Memo to Zoning Officer

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

Doug & Annette Lemenze asked to address the board. Mr. Lemenze wanted to know what the board was going to do and noted that the discussion was on 3 acres and under that you would not be allowed to have any farm animals. The board said that nothing is carved in stone. Mr. Lemenze asked if this discussion

**Lebanon Township Planning Board
June 4, 2013
Page 6**

would be continued at the next meeting. Chairman MacQueen said no, there is too much on the agenda. Chairman MacQueen said that Planner Bolan will be working on this and will bring something back to the board two meetings from now and if the board comes up with any ideas they will give them to Ms. Glashoff who will forward them on to Planner Bolan. Chairman MacQueen said this is not an easy project and we now have a problem and have to decide how to fix the problem.

Being no further business to come before the board, nor comments from the public, motion by Ms. Bleck and seconded by Mr. Rich to adjourn the meeting at 9:55 p.m. Unanimously approved.

CHAIRMAN GARY MACQUEEN

GAIL W. GLASHOFF, PLANNING BOARD CLERK