

**MINUTES OF THE
MENDHAM BOROUGH JOINT LAND USE BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
Tuesday, March 19, 2024- 7:30PM
Garabrant Center, 4 Wilson Street, Mendham, NJ.**

CALL TO ORDER/FLAG SALUTE

The regular meeting of the Mendham Borough Joint Land Use Board was called to order at 7:30 p.m. and the open public meeting statement was read into the record.

ROLL CALL

Mayor Glassner – Absent	Mr. Egerter – Present
Ms. Bushman – Present	Ms. Garbacz – Present
Councilman Sullivan – Absent	Mr. Molnar –Present
Mr. Smith – Present	Ms. Traut – Alternate 1 -Present
Mr. Sprandel – Present	Mr. Kay- Alternate 2- Absent
Mr. D’Urso– Present	Mr. Barker – Alternate 3 - Present
	Mr. Pace – Alternate 4 – Present

Also Present: Mr. Ferriero – Board Engineer
Mr. Germinario – Board Attorney
Ms. Caldwell – Board Planner

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Smith noted that on page 5, the word round should be ground and Mr. D’Urso asked that the ceiling height of the ground floor apartments should be noted as 7.5 feet in the minutes.
Motion by Mr. Egerter, seconded by Mr. Smith and unanimously carried by voice vote to adopt the minutes of the February 20, 2024, Joint Land Use Board Regular Meeting, as revised.

Roll Call:

In Favor: Ms. Bushman, Mr. Smith, Mr. Sprandel, Mr. D’Urso, Mr. Egerter, Ms. Garbacz, Ms. Traut, and Mr. Pace.

Opposed:

Abstain: Mr. Molnar.

Motion Carried

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairman D’Urso opened the meeting to the public for questions and comments on items not included on the agenda or any pending applications.

There being none, the public session was closed.

RESOLUTION

10-23 Rachna Mathur-Rohit Reddy
32 Gunther St.
Block 301 Lot 28

Mr. Germinario summarized the Rachna Mathur-Rohit Reddy application, and the conditions outlined in the resolution. Mr. Smith made a motion to memorialize the resolution and Mr. Egerter seconded.

Roll Call:

In Favor: Ms. Bushman, Mr. Smith, Mr. Sprandel, Mr. D'Urso, Mr. Egerter, Ms. Garbacz, Ms. Traut, and Mr. Pace.

Opposed:

Abstain: Mr. Molnar.

Motion Carried

The resolution follows.

BOROUGH OF MENDHAM JOINT LAND USE BOARD

RESOLUTION OF MEMORIALIZATION

Decided: February 20, 2024

Memorialized: March 19, 2024

IN THE MATTER OF RACHNA MATHUR and ROHIT REDDY

"C" VARIANCE APPLICATION

BLOCK 301, LOT 28

APPLICATION NO. JLUB #10-23

WHEREAS, Rachna Mathur and Rohit Reddy (hereinafter the "Applicants") applied to the Borough of Mendham Joint Land Use Board (hereinafter the "Board") for the grant of a variance pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70c (hereinafter the "Variance") by application dated 9/1/23; and

WHEREAS, the application was deemed complete by the Board, and a public hearing was held on 2/20/24; and

WHEREAS, the Board has determined that the Applicant has complied with all land use procedural requirements of Chapter 124 of the Ordinance of the Borough of Mendham, and has complied with the procedural requirements of the Municipal Land Use Law, N.J.S.A. 40:55D-1, et seq., including without limitation, public notice pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-12; and

WHEREAS, the Board makes the following findings and conclusions, based on the documents, testimony and other evidence comprising the hearing record:

1. The property which is the subject of the application consists of 0.5943 acres located in the ½ Acre Residence Zone, improved with a two-story wood frame dwelling and one story wood frame garage.

2. The improvements to the subject property for which the Variance relief is sought comprise construction of a covered porch addition on the front of the house as well as a rear addition that includes an access ramp, resulting in 2775.3 sq. ft. of building coverage and 5190.5 sq. ft. of lot coverage. Since the proposed building coverage of 10.7% exceeds the maximum allowed of 9.4%, and the proposed lot coverage of 20% does not exceed the maximum allowance of 20%, "C" variance relief is required only for building coverage.

3. The Applicant has submitted the following documents that depict and/or describe the improvements for which the Variance relief is required:

- Architectural/Site Plans, consisting of four sheets, dated 8/23/23, prepared by Thomas A. Robinson, RA

4. In support of the application, the Applicant has submitted the following documents, which are part of the hearing record:

- Land Development Application, dated 9/1/23, prepared by Rohit Reddy
- Site Inspection Form
- Zoning Officer Denial of Application, dated 7/21/23
- Tax Map
- Checklist
- Certificate of Paid Taxes and Utility Fees, dated 9/5/23
- Survey, dated 8/14/13, prepared by Louis R. Puopolo, III, PLS
- Aerial photographs
- Letter, dated 12/6/23, prepared by Ryan Smith, PE, PLS

- *Topographic Plan, dated 11/12/23, prepared by Christopher J. Aldrich, PLS*

5. *The Board's planning and engineering professionals and/or consultants have submitted the following reports concerning their reviews of the application, which are part of the hearing record:*

Paul Ferriero, PE, CME, dated 1/8/24 and 2/13/24

6. *Borough officials and/or agencies have submitted the following reports concerning their reviews of the application, which are part of the hearing record:*

ECCOST Environmental Commission, dated 1/30/24

7. *In the course of the public hearings, the Applicants represented themselves, and the Applicants presented their own testimony, which testimony is part of the hearing record.*

8. *The documentary evidence and the testimony of the Applicant adduced the following facts:*

The proposed addition to the dwelling would provide a bedroom and bath for Ms. Mathur's elderly mother, who has medical and mobility issues and lives with the Applicants from time to time. A wheelchair accessible ramp and front porch are also proposed, as well as a separate entrance for Ms. Mathur's mother. The improvements will not result in creating an independent second living space in the dwelling. Regarding the lot coverage, the Board Engineer's report indicates that the figures provided on the architectural plans are inconsistent and that additional coverage related to the connection of the proposed ramp to the driveway may be required.

9. *Based on the hearing record, the Board has made the following findings and conclusions relative to the Variance relief sought by the Applicant:*

The Board finds that the proposed improvements for which the Variance is required promote the general welfare, and thus the purposes of the MLUL, by providing temporary housing for an elderly, handicapped person. The Board further finds that no significant detriments are associated with the granting of this Variance.

Therefore, the grant of the Variance is warranted pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70c(2), because the benefits of the deviation will substantially outweigh the detriments.

The Board further finds that this relief can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and that the granting of this relief will not substantially impair the intent and purpose of the zone plan and/or the zoning ordinance.

10. *In summary, the Board hereby grants a total of 1 "C" Variance in connection with this application.*

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, *that the Board does hereby approve the application and grant the Variance requested by the Applicant, as described hereinabove, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70c(2).*

This approval is subject to the following conditions, which shall, unless otherwise stated, be satisfied prior to the issuance of a zoning permit for the improvements requiring Variance relief.

1. *The existing and proposed lot coverage tables on sheet 1 on the architectural plans do not appear to add up to the numbers provided elsewhere on the plan. Clarification is required.*

2. *The architectural plans must be signed and sealed by the architect.*

3. *An approval signature block for the Board Chair, Secretary and Engineer needs to be added to the first plan sheet.*

4. *The proposed ramp does not appear to connect to the driveway. A minor amount of additional coverage may be required and the final figure should be presented to the Board.*

5. *Although the increase in impervious surface does not exceed the threshold for minor development which would require stormwater management, the Applicants have agreed to install a dry-well to accommodate the increased lot coverage, the design of which shall be approved by the Board Engineer.*

6. *All application, escrow and inspection fees shall be paid in full and current at the time of issuance of zoning permits and construction permits. Engineering inspection fees will be paid out of the Applicant's escrow account, and the Applicant will replenish said account to the extent required to pay for said inspection fees.*

7. This approval is subject to all other approvals required by any governmental agency having jurisdiction over the subject property.

8. This approval is subject to the payment in full of all taxes and assessments due and owing to the Borough of Mendham and/or any agency thereof.

9. Pursuant to Ordinance Section 124-22, the Variance relief granted herein shall expire within one year of the memorialization of this Resolution unless the construction or alteration of the improvements requiring Variance relief has actually been commenced during that time period, provided that the running of the one-year time period shall be tolled during the pending of any appeal of the Board's decision to the Borough Council or to a court of competent jurisdiction.

The undersigned does hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of the Resolution adopted by the Borough of Mendham Joint Land Use Board memorializing the action taken by the Board at its meeting of 2/20/24.

Lisa Smith
Board Secretary

HEARING

18-23 West Main 21, LLC
21 West Main St.
Block 301 Lot 40

Present: Mr. Malman – Attorney
Mr. Byrne – Architect
Mr. Smith – Engineer
Mr. Weichert – Applicant
Mr. Keller – Engineer, Traffic Expert
Mr. McDonough- Planner

Mr. Molnar certified to have listened to the recording of the 2-20-24 meeting in order to be able to vote on this application.

Mr. Malman explained that this is the second public hearing on this application. Mr. Malman noted that Mr. Byrne, Mr. Smith gave testimony. Mr. Sprandel wanted Mr. Byrne to explain that with the design of the interior stairwell it made it unnecessary for an exterior fire escape. Mr. Byrne, still under oath, explained that the building currently has a partially enclosed stairway at the back of the building that goes from the ground parking lot level to the third floor. Mr. Byrne noted that as part of the renovation and reconstruction of the building, there is access to all the apartments from the interior stairway and because the building will be sprinklered there is no need for the 3rd floor fire escape. Mr. Byrne noted that the sprinkler system gives relief on the travel distance to an exit. Ms. Garbacz asked if the sprinklers will be on all levels including the basement. Mr. Byrne stated that was correct. Mr. Egerter asked that now that the exterior stairwell does not go to the third floor, the only way for the third floor to get to the second floor is the interior stairwell. Mr. Byrne stated that was correct. Mr. Sprandel asked if Mr. Ferriero would review. Mr. Ferriero explained that the construction code official and fire official will review. Mr. D'Urso questioned if it is acceptable for the third floor to only have the interior stairwell to exit. Mr. Bryne stated that it was and there are 4 interior stairwells, one for each apartment. Mr. D'Urso asked if the basement apartments need a second egress. Mr. Byrne stated that was correct. Mr. D'Urso asked if that was because the building was being sprinkled. Mr. Byrne explained that residential only need one means of egress which is typically the front door. Mr. D'Urso asked Mr. Byrne to identify the height of the ceiling in the basement units. Mr. Byrne stated that the finished height will be approximately 7'5". Mr. D'Urso stated that he felt it was much less because he could touch the ceiling. Mr. Byrne explained that the height is less in the front of the building because the slab is not flat. Mr. D'Urso noted again that he touched the ceiling. Mr. Byrne noted that they will

meet the code. Mr. Byrne stated that they will have to drop the floor because the slab is not in good condition. Mr. D'Urso asked if they could do what is necessary to make it 7.6. Mr. Byrne stated he would. Ms. Garbacz where is the access to the front portion of the stairs for the basement apartments. Mr. Byrne stated that there would not be access to the stairs from the basement level. Mr. Molnar asked if there would be additional AC units. Mr. Bryne stated that there would be but an evaluation and noted that the size of the building has not changed so the tonnage would most likely stay the same but there may be more smaller units. Mr. Molar asked if there were going to be mini splits. Mr. Byrne stated that there wouldn't be. Mr. Molnar requested a landscape screening to block it from the street view. Mr. Byrne differed to the project engineer. Mr. Malman asked if there were any further questions for Mr. Byrne, there being none, Mr. Malman called Mr. Smith who was still under oath. Mr. Smith stated that there were minor changes to the plan based on the Board, Engineer and Planners' suggestions at the last meeting. Mr. Smith explained that the location of the dumpster by switching it with parking spot number 12 in the back. Mr. Smith stated that Sheet #5 shows the parking spaces were updated. Mr. Smith noted that they located the existing area light in the parking lot and that it will be removed. Mr. Smith explained that thy will be going with the new lighting plan which is now Sheet #5 that shows 3 pole mounted LED lights with shields that comply with the current lighting ordinance and as a condition of approval will revise the plans to show the optional 35 kelvin color temperature that is in the proposed lighting ordinance. Mr. Smith noted the planners comment that the poles do not have protective barriers and request a design waiver because bollards would be an eye sore. Mr. Ferriero suggested shifting the light fixture near stall 11 a couple of feet so that it is on the stripe that divides the parking stalls. Mr. Ferriero also suggested shifting the light fixture between 2 and 13 between the stacked stalls. Mr. Smith explained that there is a tree there and didn't want to remove it. Mr. Ferriero agreed.

Chairman D'Urso opened the meeting to the public for questions and comments. There being none, Chairman D'Urso closed public comment.

Mr. Keller was sworn in and qualified as an expert Engineer specializing in parking analysis.

Mr. Keller noted that based on the Borough code, the project requires 21 parking spaces because of the proposed EV parking space where 15 are proposed. Mr. Keller explained that the building is mixed use and creates the opportunity to share parking among the different uses. Mr. Keller prepared a shared parking analysis dated November 3, 2023, and performed additional calculations to address items in Mr. Ferriero's review letter. Mr. Keller explained that shared parking is the use of a parking space for two or more individual uses without conflict because of different demands for different uses at different times of day. Mr. Keller noted that in Mr. Ferriero's review he stated that tandem spaces cannot be shared. Mr. Keller stated that the 3 pairs of tandem spaces will be assigned to 3 of the 2-bedroom apartments. Mr. Keller explained that the 3 two-bedroom apartments and the 3 pairs of tandem parking spaces were removed from the shared parking analysis because they cannot be shared. Mr. Keller noted that the other 9 spaces would not be reserved and would be on a first come first serve basis. Mr. D'Urso asked for a revised Table one. Mr. Keller submitted a revised parking analysis dated March 6, 2024, which was marked Exhibit A9. Mr. Keller noted the analysis has 2 one-bedroom and 1 two-bedroom apartments. Mr. D'Urso asked if the analysis removed 6 spaces and revised the calculations for the remaining 9 spaces. Mr. Keller stated that was correct. Mr. Keller explained that based on the Borough Code the 2 one-bedrooms each require 1.8 spaces and the two-bedroom requires 2 spaces which total 5.6. Mr. Keller the other 769 sq ft. Commercial space is being calculated as retail which requires 6 per 1000sq. ft. and 4 per 1000sq ft for the office, a potential shortfall of up to 5 parking spaces on site during the 10am hour on a weekday. Mr. Keller noted that there is parking in the front of the building and on the opposite side of the street that would make up the short fall. Mr. Keller explained that during the overnight hours when the office and retail are closed there would be ample parking for residential use. Mr. Keller stated that based on the data there will be sufficient parking available for the uses on site. Mr. Sprandel asked if they were able to find the actual parking requirements for the Weichert office. Mr. Keller stated that the space will be smaller and may not always be a Weichert office and the Borough Code only notes office. Mr. D'Urso noted that the Code identifies different numbers of spaces needed for medical and insurance. Mr. D'Urso stated that he was there 4 times and there was a minimum of 4

cars each time and this is an office that has weekend activity. Mr. Keller noted that the existing parking includes residence of 2 apartments as well as Weichert. Ms. Garbacz asked if there are plans to restructure Weichert because there are about 40+ agents that are assigned to that location and she brings it up because of the parking. Mr. Sprandel said that knowing that would be real numbers instead of a table. Mr. Malman noted that the business has changed since Covid. Ms. Traut asked if the calculations are based on post Covid and the fact that more people work from home more frequently. Mr. Keller stated that since he used the newest calculations, he feels the numbers have been adjusted. Ms. Caldwell asked if there was a study done using the existing use of the existing apartments and offices. Mr. Keller noted that he has made 2 visits, one on a Sunday around noon and the parking lot was empty and stopped just before this meeting at 6:45pm and there were 3 cars in the lot. Mr. Keller stated that he does the calculations based on published data, not on-site visits. Mr. D'Urso asked if there is a difference between a standard office and a real estate office. Mr. Keller stated that an office is broad enough and that the number of parking spaces required has dropped since Covid. Mr. Ferriero asked if there should be some use restrictions appropriate for the office and retail spaces. Mr. Ferriero stated for example a medical/dentist's office where there are a lot of staff and turnover would require a lot of parking or a coffee shop for the retail, or a gym that holds training would require a lot of parking. Mr. Ferriero stated that there are some uses that would create an issue. Mr. Keller noted that having a lower intensity use is a valid point. Mr. D'Urso noted that with 40 employees, having a sales meeting would be a significant difference from ongoing office operations. Mr. Keller differed to Mr. Weichert since it is more an operational question. Ms. Traut asked if there is a margin of error in the way the spaces are calculated. Mr. Keller stated that there may be some offices that need more and some that need less, which is why the average peak rate is being used.

Chairman D'Urso opened the meeting to the public for questions and comments. There being none, Chairman D'Urso closed public comment.

Ms. Bushman asked how many parking spaces are required and how many are needed. Mr. Keller stated that 21 parking spaces are required and are providing 15.

Mr. Malman requested a 5-minute recess.

Mr. Weichert Jr. was sworn in.

Mr. Weichert Jr. stated that the company has several hundred offices across the country. Mr. Weichert Jr. explained the current operations have changed. Mr. Weichert Jr. noted that the proposed application will reduce the size of the offices by around 60% and the reason is that less sales associates use the office space. Mr. Weichert Jr. explained that there is 1 full-time and 1 part-time employee and the agents are independent contractors that are not 9-5 employees. Mr. Weichert Jr. stated that they would be willing to restrict certain high volume uses such as medical/dental offices, restaurants and coffee shops. Mr. Germinario asked if the applicant was willing to make those restrictions as conditions of approval. Mr. Malman stated that these restrictions can be conditions but would like to be able to come back and revisit if circumstances change. Mr. Germinario stated that the applicant is offering the restrictions if approved but not offering deed restrictions. Mr. Malman agreed. Mr. D'Urso asked if the work process changed and there is no longer desk time required for the sales associates. Mr. Weichert Jr. explained that there is a policy called Opportunity Time where an associate can come in and answer the phone if someone calls, they have the opportunity to develop a working relationship with that customer. Ms. Garbacz asked how often there are office meetings and are they in person. Mr. Weichert Jr. stated there are meetings once a week and try to do them in person but if there is a mandatory meeting and feel parking is insufficient, the meeting will be held elsewhere. Mr. Egerter asked how many associates are in that location. Mr. Weichert Jr. stated that there are 40 but they are independent contractors. Ms. Traut asked where the sales associates direct clients to park. Mr. Weichert Jr. stated that there are rarely clients coming into the office and if they do, they would be directed to park in the available parking in the back or on the street. Mr. Malman asked if there are any issues with parking with the current operation. Mr. Weichert Jr. stated there was not. Mr. D'Urso noted that the applicant was offering 1 affordable housing unit and would they be willing to offer 2. Mr. Weichert Jr. noted that the Borough code requires 15% of residential units which would be 1. Mr. Malman stated that one unit is fair and complies with the ordinance and requests variance relief. Mr. Malman noted that the Planner will

justify that 1 affordable unit is fair. Mr. D'Urso asked if they would consider 2 units because that would be a benefit to the Borough. Mr. Weichert Jr. noted that there are different levels of affordable housing and the with the extensive cost of renovations, they would have to balance revenue and expense so if 2 units were provided could the units be moderate instead of low or low low income. Mr. D'Urso stated that a moderate would be a positive. Mr. D'Urso asked Ms. Caldwell if this was allowed, and she stated that it was because the requirements average out over the entire municipality.

Chairman D'Urso opened the meeting to the public for questions and comments. There being none, Chairman D'Urso closed public comment.

Mr. McDonough was sworn in and qualified as an expert Professional Planner.

Mr. Malman requests that Mr. McDonough go through his planning testimony to justify the variance and keep in mind that Mr. Weichert Jr has agreed to 2 moderate income units.

Mr. McDonough explained that the mixed use is permitted in the zone and the reason for the variance relief is for the density and parking. Mr. McDonough stated that the parking variance can be granted without any adverse impacts on site, or the surrounding areas as testified in the parking study. Mr. McDonough noted the number of positives including the 2 moderate income units. Mr. McDonough noted that this project is for 6 dwelling units in a building that is 14,636 sq ft which is not far off from an application that was granted last year at 13 West Main Street which has 3 units on a lot half the size of this application. Mr. McDonough stated that this is a retrofit of an existing space. Mr. McDonough explained that when looking at density relief you look at if the site can accommodate the relief that the applicant is seeking and has adequate capacity that would be associated with the added density. Mr. McDonough noted that the positive criteria would be multiple purposes of zoning advanced, one of which is the promotion of the general welfare because it provides a transitional use on a transitional lot and provides a variety of uses in appropriate location according to the needs of all NJ citizens including a diversity of housing types and inclusionary affordable housing for moderate incomes. Mr. McDonough summarized other positive criteria that would permit the Board to approve this application.

Ms. Caldwell asked with the addition of the second affordable unit what is your experience with the impact of parking. Mr. McDonough stated that moderate income is in line with market rate units and the parking demand would be similar in his opinion. Mr. D'Urso asked Mr. McDonough's experience with tandem parking. Mr. McDonough stated that these spaces are self-managed and will be designated to 3 units and the other 9 spaces will be first come first serve. Ms. Bushman asked if the applicant would consider a historic sign for the building similar to what the Black Horse has. Mr. Weichert Jr. said he will be ok with that.

Chairman D'Urso opened the meeting to the public for questions and comments. There being none, Chairman D'Urso closed public comment.

Mr. Malman summarized the application explaining that the compromise for the 2 affordable units is good for the Borough and will work with the project. Mr. Malman noted that the adaptation and reuse of the building, which is historic, is important. Mr. Malman stated that the additional units will be good for the downtown shops.

Mr. Germinario stated the conditions of approval as follows:

1. The entire building is to be sprinklered including the basement apartment.
2. Basement ceiling will be no less than 7.5'.
3. DCA application for 3 residential units if necessary.
4. Lighting plan to be revised to show 3500 kelvin temperature.
5. Design waiver for the lighting protective barriers.
6. The lighting pole currently behind space 11 will be shifted between spaces 11 & 10.
7. Use restrictions against medical/dental offices, restaurants and coffee shops.
8. Two affordable units which will be designated moderate income.
9. Historic Sign be installed.

Mr. Sprandel made a motion to approve the application with conditions as outlined in the Resolution and was seconded by Mr. Molnar.

Roll Call:

In Favor: Ms. Bushman, Mr. Smith, Mr. Sprandel, Mr. D’Urso, Mr. Egerter, Ms. Garbacz, Mr. Molnar, Ms. Traut, and Mr. Pace.

Opposed:

Abstain: Mr. Barker

Motion Carried

DISCUSSION

Stormwater Compliance

Ms. Caldwell explained that the NJ Department of Environmental Protection Model Ordinance for Stormwater Control is consistent with the Master Plan. Mr. Smith made a motion to memorialize the resolution and Mr. Egerter seconded.

Roll Call:

In Favor: Ms. Bushman, Mr. Smith, Mr. Sprandel, Mr. D’Urso, Mr. Egerter, Ms. Garbacz, Mr. Molnar, Ms. Traut, Mr. Molnar, Mr. Barker and Mr. Pace.

Opposed:

Abstain:

Motion Carried

The resolution follows.

**BOROUGH OF MENDHAM JOINT LAND USE BOARD
RESOLUTION FINDING MASTER PLAN CONSISTENCY**

IN THE MATTER OF MASTER PLAN CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION ORDINANCE NO. 04-2024 ORDINANCE OF THE BOROUGH OF MENDHAM, IN THE COUNTY OF MORRIS AND STATE OF NEW JERSEY, ADOPTING A NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION (NJDEP) MODEL ORDINANCE FOR STORMWATER CONTROL

WHEREAS, the Joint Land Use Board (the "Board") has reviewed the proposed Ordinance No. 04-2024 and has received input from the Board Planner concerning same, and has discussed the Ordinance at its public meeting of 3/19/24; and

WHEREAS, based upon its review and that of the Board Planner, the Board has determined that the proposed Ordinance is consistent with the Master Plan and promotes the goals and objectives of the plan.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board does hereby find and determine that proposed Ordinance No. 04-2024 of the Borough of Mendham, in the County of Morris and State of New Jersey, adopting a New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) Model Ordinance for Stormwater Control, is consistent with the Mendham Borough Master Plan and with the planning goals and objectives of the Borough. The Board Secretary is hereby directed to advise the Borough Council of said determination by the Board.

The undersigned does hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of the action taken by the Joint Land Use Board at its regular meeting of 3/19/24.

Lisa Smith, Secretary

ADJOURNMENT

There being no additional business to come before the Board, Motion was made by Mr. Smith, and seconded by Mr. Molnar. On a voice vote, all were in favor. Chairman D'Urso adjourned the meeting at 9:10PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa J. Smith

Lisa Smith
Land Use Coordinator