

CINNAMINSON ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, September 3, 2025
Cinnaminson Municipal Building, 1621 Riverton Road, Cinnaminson, NJ 08077

Mr. Bednarek called the meeting to order and led the flag salute. He read the Sunshine and Public Statements.

Sunshine Statement: Please be advised that proper notice of this meeting has been given in compliance with the Sunshine Law in the following manner: written notice has been mailed to the Burlington County Times and Courier-Post newspapers and published in the January 21, 2025 editions. Written notice has been posted on the official bulletin board of the Township of Cinnaminson at least 48 hours prior to the meeting, filed with the Township Clerk and mailed to those persons who requested notice and who paid the required fee.

Public Statement: This meeting is a judicial proceeding. Any questions or comments must be limited to issues that are relevant to what the Board may legally consider in reaching a decision, and decorum appropriate to a judicial hearing must be maintained at all times.

Roll Call

Present: Mr. Devlin, Ms. Galosi, Ms. Stasko, Mr. Trampe, Ms. Woodman, Mr. Bednarek;
Alternates: Mr. Anninos, Ms. Sherlock
Absent: Mr. Neely

Also Present: Mr. Strobel, Solicitor; Mr. Clark, Engineer; Mr. Slachetka, Planner; Mr. Minton, Zoning Officer; Mrs. Russell, Board Secretary

Mr. Bednarek read the Board's Policy: The Board's policy is not to commence hearing a matter after 10:00 p.m., but instead to adjourn the matter to the next regularly scheduled meeting. Any matters still being heard at 10:00 p.m. may be completed that evening or may be adjourned to the next regularly scheduled meeting, at the Board's discretion.

Applications

Case 25-7-2 Black Marker Properties, LLC; Block 3507, Lot 4; 137 Park Avenue; R3 Zone
Construction of 737 sq ft second floor addition to residential home; bulk variance relief sought for preexisting, non-conforming conditions: minimum lot width of 57.5 feet where 75 feet is required; minimum side yard setback of 8.6 feet where 12 feet is required; minimum aggregate side yard setback of 21.4 feet where 30 feet is required.

Mr. Kevin Diduch, Attorney for the Applicant, explained the location of the property and the variance relief sought for preexisting non-conforming conditions. The purpose of the application is to add a second story to the dwelling that would include two bedrooms and two bathrooms, and would not expand the footprint of the dwelling. Specific variance relief sought under section 525-27(A) of the municipal code, for minimum lot width where 75 feet is required and 57.5 is existing; side yard setback, on west end of property, where 12 feet is required and 8.6 feet exists; and minimum aggregate side yard setback where 30 feet is required and 21.4 feet exists.

Mr. Diduch introduced the witnesses, Mark Reitsma, Applicant and managing member of Black Marker Properties LLC, owner of the property, and Keith Peacock, Architect for the project. Mr. Reitsma and Mr. Peacock were sworn by Mr. Strobel. Mr. Peacock described his educational and work experience for the

Board. Mr. Bednarek accepted Mr. Peacock as an expert witness.

Mr. Diduch introduced Exhibit A-1, Site Overview Plan, and explained the location of the lot, the zone and its relationship to the neighboring homes and area. He introduced Exhibit A-2, Footprint Plan of the house, and explained the footprint of the building will be unchanged, with demolition of interior walls to allow for reconfiguration and construction of a stairway, addition of a second floor and addition of a porch across the front to create a more aesthetic appearance and keeping with the houses in the neighborhood. Mr. Peacock stated the finished building will be approximately 1400 sq ft.

Mr. Diduch explained the criteria used to satisfy the requirements needed for flexible “c” (2) variance, proving the variances are needed and advance the purpose of the Municipal Land Use Law (MLUL) under purposes a., d., i., and m.

- a. it is an appropriate use of residential development
- d. is not inconsistent with surrounding area of 3 bedroom, 2 bath-style homes. Mr. Diduch introduced Exhibit A-3 Google Earth map of the surrounding area showing two-story homes in the direct vicinity of the property
- i. the addition of a second floor is good civic design, building up rather than out
- m. a more efficient use of land by reusing and improving the land by building up rather than building from scratch

Mr. Diduch summarized the benefits of granting variances outweigh the detriments, and his belief that the project offers no detriments to the area especially with the end result in comparison to the homes in the surrounding area. He stated that approval of the variance would not substantially impair the intent and purpose of the zone as the R-3 does allow for second story homes.

Mr. Diduch referenced Mr. Minton’s letter inquiring about stormwater runoff, and does not anticipate any additional runoff traversing to neighboring properties. The finished home will have appropriate gutters and down spouts. Mr. Strobel reviewed the testimony given by Mr. Diduch and asked Mr. Reitsma if he adopts those as his own regarding the criteria given and stormwater runoff. Mr. Reitsma indicated his acceptance and confirmed that there would be no detriment to neighboring properties. Mr. Diduch added the permitting process would be followed and all plans and designs would be adhered to. Mr. Peacock explained the overall roof footprint does not change the overall impervious space and would maintain the same amount of stormwater capture with the down spouts and gutters.

Mr. Strobel asked Mr. Peacock to provide testimony regarding the proposed porch. Mr. Peacock explained there is an existing stoop and the proposed porch will provide a more welcoming front to the building and will protect the façade. There will be a roof over the porch where none currently exists over the stoop. He testified the porch will be 7’ deep and 35’ wide and will be constructed of concrete. Mr. Peacock explained a railing is not required due to the grade, but landscaping will be provided as a natural barrier. Mr. Bednarek asked if the house is sewer or septic. Mr. Reitsma stated it is septic and believes it will accommodate the increased flow from additional bathrooms. Mr. Reitsma stated that there will be an inspection process and any issues with the septic system would be governed by the permitting process. Ms. Galosi asked if it was well water or city water, which Mr. Reitsma could not confirm. Mr. Bednarek asked Mr. Peacock to describe the exterior materials to be used. Mr. Peacock testified there will be new vinyl siding on the entire house, new asphalt shingles on the roof and shutters on the windows.

Mr. Bednarek invited the Board’s Professionals to offer comment or ask questions. Mr. Slachetka, Planner, and Mr. Bryan Clark, Engineer, were sworn by Mr. Strobel. Mr. Clark did not review the application. Mr. Slachetka asked if the properties on either side could be acquired for the purpose of adding to the house. Mr.

Diduch explained they could not and the non-conforming setback conditions to the property were pre-existing. Mr. Slachetka asked if there was a practical reason to reduce the footprint of the house. Mr. Diduch confirmed there was not.

Mr. Bednarek asked if there would be separate utilities or entrances for the upstairs, or plan for the second floor to be apartments. Mr. Diduch testified it would be a single-family dwelling. Mr. Trampe asked about the available parking. Mr. Reitsma explained there is an existing detached garage used for storage, and a driveway and parking area behind the house.

Comments of the Board

There were no comments from the Board.

Hearing Open to the Public

Mr. Bednarek opened the hearing to the public and since there were no comments or questions from the public, closed the hearing to the public.

Mr. Strobel asked if all relief requested was for existing conditions. Mr. Bednarek explained the only change in the footprint is the front porch, which will come out further than currently exists, but does not require relief from the setback. Mr. Strobel confirmed the relief sought is for preexisting lot width, side yard setback west and aggregate side yard setback.

Determination

Motion by Ms. Galosi, second by Mr. Trampe to approve the application subject to approve the application granting relief for the preexisting non-conforming conditions of lot width, side yard setback west and side yard aggregate, will remain a single family home with no separate entrances, all new siding and roof, subject to standard conditions and building approvals.

Mrs. Russell stated the public notice was reviewed and found to be sufficient and timely.

Roll Call:

Those voting in favor:	Mr. Devlin, Ms. Galosi, Ms. Stasko, Mr. Trampe, Ms. Woodman, Mr. Bednarek; Alternate: Mr. Anninos
Those voting against:	None
Those abstaining:	None
Those recusing:	None
Those absent:	Mr. Neely

**Case 25-6-1 McDonald's Real Estate Company; Block 2102, Lot 46.01; 100 Route 130;
BD Development Zone**

Subdivision of existing lot into two lots, where proposed lot 1 is approximately 34,142 square feet with existing 3,271 square foot fast-food restaurant and drive-thru; proposed lot 2 is approximately 55,727 square feet with existing gas station and automotive service station; d(1) use variance sought to permit gas station and automobile service station on lot 2 where same may not be permitted in zone and/or d(2) use variance approval for expansion of non-conforming use; bulk variance and/or design waiver/exception sought: (lot 1) 34,142 square foot lot size where 40,000 square feet is required; (lot 1) lot width of 150' where 200' is required; front yard setback (lot 1) 40.9' and (lot 2) 2.7' where 50' is required; side yard setbacks of (lot 1) 2' and (lot 2) 13.5' where 35' is required; rear yard setback (lot 1) 0.8' where 35' is required; parking stalls of 8.9'x17.9', 8.9'x18.4', and 9.8'x17.9', whereas 10'x20' are required; minimum aisle width (90 degrees) of 23.6' and 24.9' whereas 25' is required; minimum aisle width (60 degrees) of 17.6' whereas 20' is

required; to permit existing accessory structures in front yard, side yard or within 20' of property line

Danielle Kinback, attorney with Prime, Tuvel and Miceli, representing the applicant, McDonald's Real Estate Co., identified the location of the property, its size and situation in relation to the gas station that shares the existing property with the McDonald's restaurant and the existing improvements to the site. She described the relief sought for minor subdivision approval to create two lots from the existing one lot, to allow for McDonalds to purchase the leased property, and for both businesses to operate and function more independently.

Ms. Kinback explained the bulk variances requested due to the configuration of the existing site improvements and use variance approval as the existing gas station is not a permitted use. She referred to the public notice published and mailed to property owners.

Ms. Kinback introduced Jeff Beavan, Engineer with Bohler Engineering, and Planner, Creigh Rahenkamp. Mr. Beavan and Mr. Rahenkamp were sworn by Mr. Strobel. Mr. Beavan described his educational and professional qualifications. He was accepted as an expert witness. Mr. Beavan presented the following exhibits:

Exhibit A-1 – subdivision plan

Exhibit A-2 – aerial view of the site and surrounding area

Using Exhibit A-2, Mr. Beavan pointed out the site location, current businesses and neighboring properties and described its consistency with businesses along the commercial corridor. Using Exhibit A-1, he explained the existing site is 1.99 acres and the requested subdivision would create two properties, a 0.78 acre for the McDonalds Restaurant site and 1.21 acres for the gas station site, with the subdivision line based on the existing lease line. Mr. Beavan testified there would be no change in uses of the individual sites, and no physical changes proposed to the properties. He reviewed the parking compliance with the Township Code, with the gas station having 15 where 13 are required, and the McDonalds having 36 where 34 are required. Ms. Kinback explained the bulk variance relief sought relates to property lot lines and existing building improvements. She stated that McDonalds leases their portion of the property with plans to purchase if subdivision is approved.

Mr. Bednarek asked who owns the driveway at the back of the properties, behind the McDonalds with the pass through into the gas station. Mr. Beavan stated there would be no change to the existing driveway, and will remain with the gas station (lot 2). He stated there will be an easement from Branch Pike into the property with cross access over the gas station property. The maintenance issues of the driveway behind the McDonalds parcel was discussed. The driveway will remain the responsibility of the gas station. Mr. Bednarek asked if that will be part of the deed. Ms. Kinback explained the access easement between the two lots will be part of the deed. Mr. Bednarek stated that maintenance responsibility must be defined.

Mr. Bednarek asked if there were plans regarding the old car wash located on the gas station lot. Ms. Kinback stated that McDonalds is not responsible for maintenance issues on the gas station site. She stated that McDonalds has met their property's maintenance requirements and the property owner's consent was given for the subdivision. Discussion continued with regarding the intent of McDonalds to purchase the property once subdivided. Ms. Kinback testified while it is the intent, it is not required as part of the subdivision process under MLUL. The matter of the unpaid taxes was discussed. Ms. Kinback stated payment of back taxes would be a condition of approval and once subdivided, McDonalds would have their own separate tax bill. She is confident that payment of taxes would not be an issue for McDonalds. She further stated that the subdivision cannot be perfected and no permits can be issued without final approval.

Ms. Stasko asked about the dumpsters and parking on McDonalds site. Ms. Kinback stated that all parking and dumpsters were contained within the McDonalds site and there are no proposed changes to the site or to the use. She stated that testimony would be provided as the gas station's non-conforming use and requirement of a variance.

Mr. Slatechka asked if certain conditions could be applied to the gas station lot, including the need for driveway improvements, as that lot is part of this application. The Board could apply certain conditions for improvements on the gas station lot as part of the "d" Variance relief requested as a non-conforming use. Ms. Kinback reminded the Board that she represents McDonalds solely, therefore, cannot agree to conditions imposed on the gas station. She was not opposed to working through the matter. Mr. Bednarak expressed the difficulty with the property owner not being present to speak to the gas station property issues. Discussion continued as to the violations that could be addressed through code enforcement and the possibility of designating the gas station as a property in need of development.

Mr. Beavan continued describing the bulk variances requested on the McDonalds parcel (lot 1) to include lot size of 34,102 square feet where 40,000 is required; lot width of 150' where 200' is required; front yard setback of 37.11' where 50' is required; to permit an accessory structure within the permitted side yard setback for trash enclosure; to permit parking size less than 200 square feet, width less than 10' and length less than 20'; to permit parking 4.4' to side property line where 5' is required. He described the bulk variances requests on the gas station parcel (lot 2) to include to permit structure within the permitted from yard setback of existing gas station canopy 2' from right of way where 50' is required; to permit a structure within the permitted side yard setback where 35' is required; to permit parking size less than 200 sq ft width less than 10' and length less than 20'; to permit interior aisle width less than 25' for 90 degree angled parking stalls.

Mr. Beavan testified as to the conditions being preexisting. Ms. Kinback explained no changes are proposed but some of the setback relief sought is due to the new lot lines. Ms. Stasko asked for clarification as to the relief sought for the gas station side. Mr. Beavan explained the setbacks on the gas station side for existing non-conformities on the frontage and eastern side which are not subject to the new subdivision.

Mr. Bednarek asked for clarification if this relief is being sought for the applicant, McDonalds, or property owner and asked if the consent from the owner allows this. Mr. Strobel stated this is within the scope of what is anticipated in dividing the lines, any existing non-conforming conditions would continue. Ms. Kinback explained that while nothing is changing physically, on paper these setbacks will now exist. The history of similar property subdivisions within the Township, for financial reasons, were discussed. Any changes to the gas station site would require them to come back before the Zoning Board.

Ms. Kinback introduced Creigh Rahenkamp, who explained his educational and professional experience. Mr. Bednarek accepted him as an expert witness. Mr. Rahenkamp reviewed the application and prior resolutions and historical aeriels. He accepted the testimony of Mr. Beavan. He explained this is a financial subdivision to allow McDonalds to own and operate independently of the other property. He explained the gas station was in place by 1963 and that Gino's Restaurant began in 1965. There is a history of non-conforming existence prior to the code being adopted. Explained the use variances required in 2001 when McDonalds replaced Boston Market and Resolution 2001-16 required a use variance for the drive thru and order box and a variance to allow for 3 uses, but did not establish the status of the gas station, whether it was a continuing non-conforming use or if a use variance had been granted. He does not believe a new use variance was granted, but the resolution did allow for three uses including the now defunct car wash. The ordinance was amended and McDonalds has since been before the Planning Board for various issues.

Mr. Rahenkamp testified as to the d(1) non-conforming use requested for the gas station as part of the subdivision, allowing for efficient management and use of land between public and private sectors, by allowing two businesses to divorce and McDonalds to be a good neighbor and to allow for more efficient administration for both individual parcels. He stated the proposed changes have no impact on the neighborhood. The McDonalds, located in the BD zone, within the commercial corridor, as a separate lot serves the overall function of the zone and is consistent with the intent of where planning and zoning are heading.

He explained the lot is 86,000 sq ft where 40,000 sq ft is the minimum lot size required. He stated the lot could not be divided down the middle due to the existing site improvements and uses on both lots. While lot 1, McDonalds, is an undersized lot, it conforms to the lease area, which they have been responsible for and want to own. Lot 2 will be oversized as they will maintain ownership of the "tail" portion of the property controlling the access from the rear of the property. Mr. Rahenkamp suggested this is an appropriate application as there are no changes to the uses or exterior lot lines, and bulk variances sought are for existing conditions, with no new relief other than the lot size. Ms. Stasko asked if the current lease is the same exact property they are using, not less or more. Mr. Rahenkamp and Ms. Kinback confirmed it is the same lot. Mr. Trampe asked for confirmation that it will be an identical lot to be purchased by McDonalds and Ms. Kinback confirmed it will be. Mr. Strobel asked if there is a contract, Ms. Kinback has not seen the contract but believes it is in effect.

Mr. Clark referenced the completeness review submitted on August 15, 2025. He explained the seven comments regarding minor subdivision related to NJSA and Administrative Code as to the details of preparing a minor subdivision plan that would need to be met as a condition of approval. Mr. Bednarek stated those comments would be included in the resolution.

Michael Minton, Zoning Officer, provided testimony as to the conditions of the gas station property. He expressed there is a benefit to dividing this property. He suggested it could be made a condition of approval that there be no outstanding ongoing code violations with the gas station property. Mr. Minton reported there has been contact with the property owner in writing and he recommended the administrative offices conduct a review of the maintenance issues. He will meet with the owner to address the issues and the access off Branch Pike. Ownership of the access off Branch Pike and the interest of the neighboring properties of Due Amici Restaurant and the day care were discussed. It was determined the property is owned by the Georgetti family.

Hearing Open to the Public

Mr. Bednarek opened the hearing to the public.

Alfred DiPaolo, 2120 Church Road, Cinnaminson – Mr. DiPaolo was sworn by Mr. Strobel. Mr. DiPaolo expressed concern that the owner was not present to agree to the conditions or state their willingness to maintain the property better than it currently is. They will benefit by being able to sell one of the two new lots and may not take acceptance of the maintenance issues. Mr. Bednarek explained the Board shares his concerns and explained that a condition can be placed on the subdivision that all of the Township's maintenance concerns will be addressed for final approval. The Township would need to work with Code Enforcement going forward to keep the issues in check.

Angela Georgetti – Ms. Georgetti was sworn by Mr. Strobel. Ms. Georgetti asked if there would be any improvements to the lot. Ms. Kinback stated there would be no change. Ms. Georgetti expressed concern with the configuration of the McDonalds property, explaining that entering off Route 130, there are two lanes, left is drivethru and right is marked for thru traffic. She stated there is no way to exit the McDonalds

without going onto the gas station property. She reported that her parent's property has been negatively impacted by the redevelopment of Branch Pike and does not want to see any further negative impact. She is not opposed to the subdivision. Her family has been approached by the Township to maintain the easement area which has not been maintained by the gas station. She stated the area has significantly changed in use since its original creation as an easement after Cinnaminson redesigned Branch Pike, with the easement becoming a cut through to Branch Pike from Route 130. She requested the easement be cut off and returned to the Mrs. Georgetti. Mr. Bednarek asked for clarification regarding the use of the easement to exit McDonalds. Ms. Kinback showed the traffic circulation on Exhibit A-1, where traffic crosses over the tail piece of the property to exit to the easement. Ms. Georgetti expressed concern that the easement is not being maintained and that the McDonalds does not function without using that easement or entering the Sunoco area. Ms. Stasko asked how far the easement extends. Ms. Georgetti explained the property does not go beyond the day care center. She explained the location of the properties in relation to the easement. Mr. Bednarek explained that it is not within the Zoning Board's jurisdiction to close off or amend the easement, and should it be closed off, McDonalds would still function using the Route 130 access. Ms. Georgetti stressed how the use of the easement has changed since the reconfiguration of Branch Pike and is now used more like a public road. Additionally, the easement is not being maintained and is the responsibility of the grantee. Ms. Stasko asked who the grantee is and Ms. Georgetti stated it is the property owner of the gas station and McDonalds. Ms. Kinback stated McDonalds is not a party to the easement. Ms. Georgetti stated the area behind the nursery school is nearly impossible to keep clean and is not due to McDonalds. Since the nursery school is used both privately and publicly by Cinnaminson Township with a play area in the back of the school, she asked if the Board would keep the best interest, safety and welfare of the existing businesses in consideration with any development requests for the gas station. She asked if a berm or landscape planting could be required to keep the trash from coming onto the nursery school property. Mr. Strobel explained that should there be any application for development of the gas station property, they would need to come back before this Board and she would be noticed. He explained the issues she brings up are beyond the consideration of this Zoning Board to grant in relation to the application. Mr. Bednarek explained the jurisdiction of the Zoning Board is to grant relief for situations where property setbacks and such do not conform to existing rules. The Board neither makes nor enforces the rules, but rather adjusts the rules because there are specific requirements. Code Enforcement would enforce issues with maintenance. The suggestion that all property maintenance issues be resolved prior to final approval was further discussed.

Hearing Closed to the Public

Since there were no further comments or questions from the public, Mr. Bednarek closed the hearing to the public.

Mr. Clark asked if the owner of gas station is responsible for maintaining the easement, could that be included as condition of approval. Ms. Kinback explained since the Township is not a party to the easement, they could not enforce the private agreement, but could enforce violations of the Township Code. Mr. Slachetka suggested that the Board may impose conditions as to safety and hazardous conditions on the easement. Ms. Kinback stated the Township cannot enforce the easement but can enforce safety and maintenance. Mr. Minton reiterated the underlying property maintenance issues with the gas station will be a condition of final approval. Mr. Trampe asked if both properties would be inspected as part of the approval. Mr. Minton stated this is a typical part of this type of transaction.

Comments of the Board

Determination

Motion by Mr. Trampe, second by Mr. Devlin to grant the use variance approval for expansion of non-conforming use; bulk variance relief and/or design waiver exception sought for 34,104 sq ft (lot 1) where

40,000 sq ft is required; lot width of 150' (lot 1) where 200' is required; front yard setback of 40.9' (lot 1) and 2.7' (lot 2) where 50' is required; side yard setback of 2' (lot 1) and 13.5' (lot 2) where 35' is required; rear yard setback of 0.8' (lot 1) where 35' is required; parking stalls of 8.9'x17.9', 8.9'x18.4', and 9.8'x17.9' where 10'x20' are required; minimal aisle width 90 degrees of 23.6' and 24.9' where 25' is required; minimal aisle width 60 degrees of 17.6' where 20' is required; permit existing accessory structure in front yard, side yard or within 20' of property line; condition there be no outstanding code enforcement violations for final approval; all property taxes to be paid up to date; minor subdivisions requirements noted by Pennoni as follows:

1. per NJAC 13:40, existing conditions and subdivision plans must be signed and sealed by a Professional Land Surveyor only. Demolition and site plan must be a stand-alone set signed by the Professional Engineer.
2. Existing improvements should be removed and only show the proposed subdivisions with existing and proposed easements and setbacks, property corners either found, set or to be set in compliance with NJSA 46-26A, the Title Recordation Law.
3. Parking requirements shall conform to the parking requirements for the uses proposed on that lot. The applicant indicates that each lot will conform to the applicable parking requirements for the use located on that lot.
4. As the surveyor's monument detail does not comply with NJAC 13:40 and NJSA 45-26A, the Title Recordation Law, and is not required, it should be removed from the plan.
5. The source of the bearings must be provided.
6. Closure reports and metes and bounds descriptions for each proposed lot must be provided by a Professional Land Surveyor.
7. Certifications per the Title Recordation Law must be added to the plan. They can be slightly revised to conform to the Municipal Land Use Law as this is a Minor Subdivision; all standard conditions apply.

Roll Call:

Those voting in favor: Mr. Devlin, Ms. Galosi, Ms. Stasko, Mr. Trampe, Ms. Woodman, Mr. Bednarek;
Alternate: Mr. Anninos
Those voting against: None
Those abstaining: None
Those recusing: None
Absent: Mr. Neely

Resolutions

Resolution 2025-08

Block 3403.03, Lot 5.11 – 5 Smethwycke Drive

Motion by Ms. Galosi, seconded by Ms. Woodman to adopt Resolution 2025-8

Roll Call:

Those voting in favor: Mr. Devlin, Ms. Galosi, Ms. Stasko, Ms. Woodman, Mr. Bednarek;
Alternates: Mr. Anninos, Ms. Sherlock
Those voting against: None
Those abstaining: Mr. Trampe
Those recusing: None
Those absent: Mr. Neely

Approval of Minutes – July 2, 2025 Regular Meeting

Motion by Ms. Galosi, second by Ms. Woodman to approve the minutes of the July 2, 2025 Regular Meeting. Minutes were approved by those Board members eligible to vote.

Correspondence

Mrs. Russell advised there was not any correspondence to discuss.

Meeting Open to The Public

Mr. Bednarek opened the meeting to the public and since there were no comments or questions, closed the meeting to the public.

Mr. Minton advised the Board of applications that have been filed that may come before the Board in the coming months.

Discussion Items - None

Comments from the Board

There were no comments from the Board.

Adjournment

Motion by Ms. Woodman, seconded by Mr. Devlin to adjourn the meeting. The voice vote of the Board was unanimous in favor of adjournment.

Prepared by:



Beverly G. Russell, RMC
Board Secretary

Approved: October 1, 2025