

**MEMORIALIZING RESOLUTION OF THE
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT OF THE
TOWNSHIP OF FREDON
APPROVING THE APPLICATION
OF ANTHONY HARRINGTON AND PATRICK FLYNN
FOR VARIANCE RELIEF TO CONSTRUCT GROUND-
MOUNTED SOLAR PANELS ON
PROPERTY KNOWN AS BLOCK 1001, LOT 15.67**

**DECIDED: APRIL 14, 2015
MEMORIALIZED: MAY 12, 2015**

WHEREAS, Anthony Harrington and Patrick Flynn, with the address of 1 Windy Brow Manor, Fredon Township, New Jersey 07860 (hereinafter the “Applicant”) have applied to the Fredon Township Zoning Board of Adjustment (hereinafter the “Board”) for variance relief, as is more fully detailed below, to allow them to construct ground-mounted solar panels in the front yard of their property located at 1 Windy Brow Manor, which is also known and designated as Block 1001, Lot 15.67 on the Tax Maps of the Township of Fredon, along with related fencing and landscaping in accordance with a Variance Map prepared by Dykstra Associates, P.C., consisting of three sheets, with the latest revision date of February 23, 2015; Photo-Voltaic Array Plans prepared by James A. Clancy, P.E., consisting of nine sheets, with the latest revision date of November 17, 2014; and a Stormwater Impact Assessment, dated April 2, 2015, prepared by Dykstra Associates, P.C. (hereinafter collectively referred to as the “Approved Plans”); and

WHEREAS, the matter was heard before the Board at a public hearing of the Zoning Board of Adjustment on April 14, 2015; and

WHEREAS, it has been determined that the Applicant has complied with all of the procedural requirements, rules and regulations of the Zoning Board of Adjustment of

the Township of Fredon and that all required submissions and proof of procedural compliance have been filed with the Board; and

WHEREAS, the Zoning Board of Adjustment of the Township of Fredon hereby makes the following findings and conclusions based upon the evidence submitted to the Board at the hearing:

1. The Applicant was represented by Richard Valenti, Esq. Sworn testimony in support of the application was given by Anthony Harrington, Jason Dunn, Roger Anderson, and Mark Landgrebe. The Board accepted the qualifications of Mr. Dunn as a professional planner and landscape architect, of Mr. Anderson as an expert in solar design, and of Mr. Landgrebe as an expert in the design and installation of ground-mounted solar projects.

2. The Applicant proposes to construct a solar array field consisting of 10 rows of ground-mounted solar panels, which will be located within the front yard of the property. The panels as proposed will have a maximum height of four feet from the finished grade, and will be surrounded on their north and west sides by a five foot high fence and landscaping. The intent is to utilize the energy captured by the solar panels to provide power to the residential dwelling on the property, as well as a carriage house/garage and in-ground pool. The system proposed will have a capacity of 35 kilowatts (kW).

3. The application as submitted requires a number of variances. Although solar energy systems are permitted as an accessory use in the R-6 residential zone in which the property is located, the permitted capacity is limited to 15kW or 110% of the average of the three prior year's electrical energy consumption. Variance relief is required for the proposed 35kW system. In addition, pursuant to Ordinance Section 550-61, ground-mounted solar panel arrays are prohibited within the front yard, which would

also require variance relief. Similarly, pursuant to Ordinance Section 550-27E, accessory structures are not permitted in the front yard. In addition, relief is sought from the requirement of Ordinance Section 550-28A(4) which limits the maximum height of a fence in the front of a property to three feet, with a five foot fence being proposed, and from Ordinance Section 550-44H(2), which provides that fences within scenic corridors (this property is located within a scenic corridor) are to be no greater than 50% opaque, with a fence type proposed that is 100% opaque.

4. Mr. Harrington explained that the purpose of the Applicants in proposing the solar installation is to reduce their carbon footprint, to reduce their use of propane, and to be as “clean” as possible. The property, which is 6.022 acres, contains a main house, a carriage house/garage and a pool. The main house and the carriage house, which have separate electric meters, are approximately 4,000 square feet and 3,000 square feet respectively. The pool is to be converted to be heated by electricity. Although the proposed system, if permitted by the Board, would not be sufficient to provide all of the electricity for the property, it would go a long way toward doing so. Mr. Harrington stated that the 35kW system is proposed because the 15kW permitted by the ordinance is not even close to sufficient for purposes of this particular property. Mr. Harrington noted with reference to the ordinance alternative standard of 110% of the average of the three prior year’s electrical energy consumption that the Applicant had not lived on the property for that period of time, and that when he tried to obtain copies of the energy bills going back three years, JCP&L would not release them. He further noted that the prior owners did not live on the property fulltime, so that even if they were able to obtain all of those bills, they probably would not provide a realistic picture of the amount of energy needed for the property.

5. Much of the testimony and discussion at the hearing focused on the proposed location of the system in the front yard of the property. Mr. Harrington stated that the Applicant's goal was to design the system in a way where it would not be visible to neighbors and passersby. He indicated that he was very conscious of the fact that the property was situated in a manner where it was in effect the gateway to the subdivision and in a scenic corridor. Although it is a large lot, the Applicant contends that the combination of its physical attributes and the requirements for the system to function efficiently limit their options in siting the system in a location where the goal of effectively making it invisible to neighboring property owners and passersby can be achieved.

6. In terms of the needs of the system, there is insufficient space on the roof of the dwelling and carriage house to accommodate all of the panels. Moreover, the panels are required to be exposed to the sun, and the best orientation for maximum exposure to sunlight is a southern exposure. Only two roof sections would have this exposure, and portions of the panels located on the roof would (although permitted under the zoning ordinance) be visible to neighboring properties. According to Mr. Landgrebe, the location selected is the best orientation for maximum exposure to sunlight and because of that maximum exposure, the size of the system is actually minimized.

7. The property is a corner lot, which means that under the ordinance, it essentially has two front yards. In terms of orientation, the driveway access to the dwelling and carriage house/garage is from Windy Brow Manor. If that were the only front yard of the property, the proposed installation (with the exception of proposed evergreen plantings and perhaps a small section of the fence) would not be located in the front yard. The side of the property abutting Ridge Road (County Route 519) is also deemed to be a front yard under the ordinance, and the entire installation would be

located in that front yard. For a ground level installation, no conforming location on the property would be feasible. The area immediately to the south of the dwelling house and carriage house/garage is already devoted to the driveway, and an installation in that portion of the property not located on the driveway would be visible from the neighboring dwelling immediately to the south. Mr. Harrington indicated that splitting the panels into separate conforming locations would be inefficient, and that they would still be visible from off the property. Roughly one-third of the property paralleling the easterly sideline is wooded, and a conforming location in the southeasterly area of the property would lose exposure to the sun because of the existing trees, and would presumably require the removal of some trees. Moreover, any conforming ground level location near a property line could be problematical, because a neighboring property owner who wanted to conceal it from view could plant his or her own trees for that purpose, and those trees would also interfere with the exposure to the sun.

8. The dwelling house and carriage house/garage are located near the southerly boundary of the property, at the top of what is in effect a small hillside. The drop in elevation from that area toward Route 519 is as much as 35 feet. The area selected for the proposed installation is downslope from the house and garage, and is currently a non-manicured area of meadow grass. The Applicant would maintain the meadow grass and add landscaping and a fence. According to Mr. Dunn, based upon his analysis, the location selected, with the proposed landscaping and fencing, would not even be visible to someone walking along Route 519.

9. Although the discussion and analysis by the Applicant and the Applicant's professionals touched upon some of the characteristics of the property that might qualify the proposal for a so-called hardship variance pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70c(1), the Applicant's primary argument is that the installation would meet the criteria for variance

relief under N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70c(2). Under that section of the statute, a Board may grant variance relief if it finds that the grant of the variance would advance the purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law, and that the benefits of allowing the variance would substantially outweigh any detriment.

10. In arguing in favor of the application, the Applicant placed great reliance on the nature of the use proposed, noting, correctly, that a solar facility is specifically deemed to be an inherently beneficial use pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-4. The zoning ordinance effectively recognizes this, making it a permitted accessory use in all zones in the Township other than the Conservation Zone, which is essentially limited to open space. The deviations here are from the bulk standards attaching to this permitted use. The Board finds that based upon the nature of this inherently beneficial use, the grant of the application would advance the purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law, specifically, the purposes of promoting the general welfare and of promoting the utilization of renewable energy resources, thus satisfying the positive criteria for the grant of the requested variance relief.

11. The issue then is whether the application satisfies the negative criteria, which requires a finding by the Board that the benefit of allowing the use in the manner and location proposed substantially outweighs any detriment that would be caused. As noted in N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70c, the fact that a proposed use is an inherently beneficial one is not dispositive of a decision on a variance under this section of the statute.

12. In a sense, the entire application is driven by the request for a 35kW facility instead of the required 15kW or lesser. It is not clear whether a conforming 15kW facility could be located entirely on roof areas, but it does seem clear that a smaller ground level installation would not be workable in any conforming area of the property for the same reason that the proposed installation would not be workable. Moreover,

even if the solar panels for a 15kW facility could be located entirely on a rooftop, that would not preclude the Applicant from pursuing variance relief, because the rationale for a variance under N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70c(2) is that a particular application offers a better alternative than would strict conformance with the requirements of the zoning ordinance. The expressed goals of the Applicant in pursuing this application, which the Board agrees are notable ones, are to maximize their use of clean, renewable energy, and to do so in a manner where there would be no detrimental visual impact on neighboring properties.

13. The Applicant points out that the 15kW standard is uniform throughout the Township, so that installations of equal size could be permitted, depending upon the zoning district, on conforming lots of one acre, as well as a six acre plus lot such as this. Because the installation proposed will take up less than 2% of this lot, the Applicant argues that the property is more than capable of accommodating the larger than permitted facility proposed here. This may be true insofar as the impact on the lot where a facility is located may be concerned, but it does not necessarily follow that there would be a lesser impact on neighboring properties. Moreover, since the use with a 15kW installation is permitted throughout the Township, by the Applicant's logic, there would be entitlement to variance relief for a larger scale facility on any lot substantially greater in size than one acre. The Board is not willing to go that far. The key to accessing the negative criteria, as it is with any variance, is whether there is a negative impact on neighboring properties, and on the Zone Plan and Zoning Ordinance.

14. Under the facts here, the Board finds that there is no substantial detriment. The solar energy use, even with the increased kW, is a low intensity one in terms of its impact on surrounding properties. It does not require water or sewer, it does not generate traffic or odors, and although it is not completely silent, it will be required to comply with all applicable noise regulations. The only conceivable impact of any significance on

neighboring properties would be a visual one. Under the facts here, the Board is satisfied that the proposed installation, with the conditions set forth below, will not have a visual impact of any great significance. The proposed location is actually further away from the dwellings on the adjacent lots to the east and the south than an installation located in a conforming location would be. It also allows the Applicant to install the system without having to remove any trees. In this sense then, as to those properties, there is clearly a benefit in locating it on the northerly portion of the lot. While the proposed location is nearer to Route 519 than would be a conforming one, because of the topography of the property, as well as the landscaping and fencing proposed, its visibility will be limited and, according to the Applicant, it should not be visible at all to anyone walking along Route 519. Worth noting also are the difficulties caused by the fact that this is a corner lot, which severely limits the area of the property that is not technically in the front yard. The orientation of the dwelling house is toward Windy Brow Manor, and if that was the only front yard, the proposed solar array field would not be located in it. In short, again subject to the conditions set forth below, the Board agrees with the Applicant's assertion that this is the best location on the property.

15. The Board also finds that granting the relief requested here will not substantially impair the intent and the purpose of the Zone Plan and Zoning Ordinance. The 15kW and front yard prohibition standards evidence an intent to limit the impact of this use, which is permitted everywhere (other than the Conservation Zone) in the Township, on neighboring properties, and the Board finds, as discussed above, that in this particular application with the conditions imposed by the Board there is no impact of any meaningful significance. Similarly, with regard to the Master Plan and the scenic corridor designation of the area in which the property is located, the Applicant's ability to

limit the impact similarly limits any detriment to or undermining of their expressed goals and objectives.

16. These reasons all justify the grant of variance relief to allow the 35kW installation rather than the 15kW maximum permitted by the ordinance, to allow the installation to be in the technical front yard, and the somewhat redundant variance here of allowing these accessory structures in the front yard. The final two ordinance deviations proposed are a five foot fence instead of the three foot maximum permitted in the front of a property, and the 100% opaque fence that is proposed instead of the 50% opaque ordinance limitation. Obviously, the whole purpose in proposing this particular fence is to minimize the impact of the proposed installation anywhere off of the property, and if anything, it enhances the application. The proposed deviations are relatively minimal, and have no detrimental off-site impact. Under the circumstances, the Board finds with regard to these two deviations, as it found with regard to the other three variances granted herein, that the purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law will be advanced by the grant of these variances, and that the benefits of granting them will substantially outweigh any detriment. The Board further finds that all of the variance relief requested herein can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and will not substantially impair the intent and the purpose of the Zone Plan and Zoning Ordinance.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Zoning Board of Adjustment of the Township of Fredon, County of Sussex, State of New Jersey, that the application of Anthony Harrington and Patrick Flynn to construct a solar facility on their property, with 35kW capacity instead of the 15kW limitation as set forth in Ordinance Section 550-61E; to allow the system to be located in the front yard in violation of Section 550-61E; to allow accessory structures to be permitted in the front yard in violation of Section 550-27E; to allow a maximum fence height of five feet in the front yard instead of the three

foot maximum permitted by Section 550-28A(4); and to allow the fence to be 100% opaque rather than the 50% limit set forth in Ordinance Section 550-44H(2) is hereby granted subject to the following terms and conditions:

1. The Applicant shall comply with the Approved Plans submitted in connection with this application, except to the extent the Approved Plans are required to be modified to comply with the terms of this Resolution.

2. The Applicant shall comply with all representations made to the Board during the course of the hearing, all of which are specifically incorporated into this Resolution by reference.

3. The solar panels will be no higher than four feet above ground level.

4. The Applicant shall be prohibited from selling any of the energy generated by the installation for off-premises use; the electricity generated by the installation shall be used on the subject property only.

5. The installation shall utilize low-glare panels as testified to by Mr. Landgrebe, to the satisfaction of the Board Engineer.

6. The Applicant shall submit a landscape plan to the satisfaction of the Board Planner and Engineer, and the landscaping ultimately installed shall be subject to their inspection and approval.

7. The Applicant shall explore with the Board Engineer the feasibility of adding additional fencing and/or landscaping to totally surround the solar array field. It is understood that the Applicant shall not be required to install any additional landscaping or fencing that will inhibit exposure of the solar panels to the sun.

8. The Applicant shall demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Board Engineer and/or Board Planner that the solar array field, with the added landscaping and fencing, shall not be visible to anyone walking along Route 519.

9. The Applicant will comply with all applicable electrical codes with required signage as determined by the Board Engineer.

10. The Applicant shall meet with the Emergency Management officials of the Township to discuss the disconnection of the system in the event of an emergency, and if required by those officials, shall make adequate provisions for such disconnection.

11. The Applicant shall comply with Sections 4e, 4g and 10 of the March 31, 2015 report of the Board Engineer, a copy of which is attached to and specifically incorporated in this Resolution by reference.

12. There shall be no site lighting for security relating to the proposed installation.

13. The installation shall comply with all applicable noise codes and regulations.

14. The Applicant shall obtain approval from any other governmental agencies with jurisdiction relating to the property.

15. All fees, taxes, escrows and other monies due to the Township of Fredon shall be paid in full.

16. The Applicant shall comply with all rules, regulations, statutes and ordinances of the United States of America, State of New Jersey, County of Sussex and the Township of Fredon.

SO RESOLVED, as aforesaid:

AYES: 4

NAYS: 2

ABSTENTIONS: 0

The foregoing is a true and correct copy of the Resolution of Memorialization of the Fredon Township Zoning Board of Adjustment made pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-10(g) and adopted at a regular meeting assembled on May 12, 2015 memorializing the Resolution of Intent of the Fredon Township Zoning Board of Adjustment at a regular meeting assembled on April 14, 2015.

FREDON TOWNSHIP ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

BY: _____
Lori Schutte

**MEMORIALIZING RESOLUTION OF THE
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT OF THE
TOWNSHIP OF FREDON
APPROVING THE APPLICATION
OF WARREN BROWN AND NICOLE RYBA-BROWN
FOR AN INTERPRETATION ALLOWING A
MOTHER/DAUGHTER HOME ON
PROPERTY KNOWN AS BLOCK 1601, LOT 13.24**

**DECIDED: APRIL 14, 2015
MEMORIALIZED: MAY 12, 2015**

WHEREAS, Warren Brown and Nicole Ryba-Brown, with the address of 11 Farm Creek Road, Newton (Fredon Township), New Jersey 07860 (hereinafter the “Applicant”) have applied to the Fredon Township Zoning Board of Adjustment (hereinafter the “Board”) for an interpretation of the zoning ordinance pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70b that their proposed mother/daughter home to be constructed at 11 Farm Creek Road, which is also known and designated as Block 1601, Lot 13.24 on the Tax Maps of Fredon Township, is a permitted use in the R-4 zone district in which the property is located, or in the alternative, if the interpretation is not granted, for a use variance to allow the proposed mother/daughter home, in accordance with certain plans entitled “Plot Plan, Sewage Disposal System & Soil Erosion Control Plan”, prepared by Dykstra Walker Design Group, dated October 28, 2014, and consisting of two sheets; and a “Foundation Plan and First Floor Plan”, prepared by MVA Architects, consisting of one sheet, and dated January 12, 2015 (hereinafter collectively referred to as the “Approved Plans”); and

WHEREAS, the matter was heard before the Board at a public hearing of the Zoning Board of Adjustment on April 14, 2015; and

WHEREAS, it has been determined that the Applicant has complied with all of the procedural requirements, rules and regulations of the Zoning Board of Adjustment of the Township of Fredon and that all required submissions and proof of procedural compliance have been filed with the Board; and

WHEREAS, the Zoning Board of Adjustment of the Township of Fredon hereby makes the following findings and conclusions based upon the evidence submitted to the Board at the hearing:

1. The Applicant was represented by Angela Paternostro-Pfister, Esq. Sworn testimony in support of the application was given by Warren Brown and Nicole Ryba-Brown (named on the application form as Nicole Brown), and by Kenneth Dykstra, whose qualifications as a licensed Professional Engineer, Professional Planner and Land Surveyor were accepted by the Board.

2. The Applicant desires to construct a residential dwelling on the subject property. The residence would be for both the applicants and for the parents of Mrs. Brown. The Zoning Officer determined that the proposed dwelling would be a two-family dwelling, and that because two-family dwellings are not permitted in the R-4 residential zone district in which the property is located, a use variance would be required. The Applicant thereafter filed an application with the Board for an interpretation of the zoning ordinance pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70b that the proposed dwelling would actually be permitted in the zone, and in the alternative, in the event the Board did not agree with that interpretation, for a use variance pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70d(1) to allow it as a use in the zoning district.

3. The proposed dwelling as depicted on the Approved Plans is a substantial one. It is essentially a one-story dwelling with a loft and basement. The central portion is intended to function as a kind of a hub for entertaining and family gatherings. The left

hand portion (as one faces the front entranceway) is an in-law suite that includes two bedrooms, a study area, a sitting area, a kitchen, laundry facilities, and a bath. Part of the central area and the right hand portion of the dwelling would be for Mr. and Mrs. Brown, and contains a kitchen/breakfast room, dining room, family room, three bedrooms, and laundry and bath facilities. There will be a single front entranceway on the first floor. Upon entering the entrance hallway, one would turn left to enter into the portion of the dwelling occupied by Mrs. Brown's parents, and turn right into the portion occupied by the Applicant. There is no dividing wall or partition dividing the dwelling house into two separate units. A septic system for a five-bedroom dwelling has already been approved, and, pending the outcome of this application, the Applicant is ready to build.

4. The Applicant stipulated that all occupants of the dwelling house would be related by blood or marriage. There is one heating unit with multiple zones. There is also one utility line and one water source for the entire dwelling. There is a fire wall depicted on the plans essentially running through the middle of the dwelling unit. The Applicants agreed, assuming that the fire separation wall is not required by applicable Code, that they would remove it and submit a final plan so providing. The Applicant was asked about rooms shown on the plans as studies, and whether they could be used as bedrooms. The Applicant noted that those rooms do not have closets, and that they were intended to function as offices they could work out of while at home (both of them currently work in New York City).

5. The Board notes that it is not uncommon for aging parents to move in with their children. It can be a difficult question to determine whether these so-called mother/daughter living arrangements qualify as single-family residences. Even where, as here, it is clear that all of the occupants are members of the same family, there can be a concern that at some point in the future, when the present occupants move out, the

dwelling can be converted into a two-family residence. That is of particular concern with a dwelling like the present one, where there are separate kitchens.

6. Detached single-family residential dwellings are a permitted use in the R-4 Residential Zone. (Interestingly, pursuant to Ordinance Section 550-65A, “Roomers and/or boarders limited to two in the aggregate per family dwelling unit, but only if such dwelling unit is occupied by the owner of the same”, are permitted as accessory uses.) The ordinance in Section 550-19, under “Dwelling Unit Types”, defines a single-family detached residence as a free standing building which contains one dwelling unit and has no common walls with other units, and a “two-family dwelling” (duplex) as “a double house consisting of two separate single-family dwelling units under one roof, each complete in itself, with a closed partition between, with independent means of ingress and egress in front and rear, and with separate sewer, water and other utility services”. A “family” is defined as, among other things, persons related by blood or marriage living together as a single housekeeping unit, and single housekeeping units are defined as separate areas “containing separate sanitary facilities and/or cooking facilities”.

7. The proposed living arrangements here contain attributes of both a single- and two-family residence. Whether the living arrangements will actually function in that manner or not, there clearly is the capability here for separate housekeeping units because there are separate sanitary facilities and cooking facilities. Nevertheless, under all of the facts, the Board finds that the proposed dwelling here is a permitted detached single-family residential dwelling. Clearly, the four intended occupants meet the definition of a “family” under the ordinance, since they are all related by blood or marriage. There will not be a closed partition between the two living areas, although there can be independent means of ingress and egress from the basement. What is determinative to the Board is that there are not separate sewer, water and other utility services. To the contrary, as

noted above, there will be a single heating unit, a single utility line and a single water source.

8. The Board accordingly finds, subject to compliance with the conditions set forth below, that the proposed dwelling house constitutes a single-family detached residential dwelling within the meaning of the ordinance, and therefore grants the interpretation requested by the Applicant. Because the interpretation is granted, the application in the alternative for variance relief is moot.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Zoning Board of Adjustment of the Township of Fredon, County of Sussex, State of New Jersey, that the application of Warren Brown and Nicole Ryba-Brown for an interpretation of the zoning ordinance pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70b to allow the proposed residential dwelling as depicted in the Approved Plans and described in the testimony as a permitted use in the R-4 Residential Zone District is hereby granted subject to the following terms and conditions:

1. The Applicant shall substantially comply with the Approved Plans submitted in connection with the application, except to the extent modified by the terms of this Resolution. The Applicant shall also comply with the representations made to the Board during the course of the hearing, all of which are incorporated into this Resolution by reference.

2. The residential dwelling is to have only one heating unit, one water source and one utility meter. Occupancy is to be limited to a "family" as defined by the Ordinance.

3. If permitted by applicable codes, the fire separation wall on the main level and in the basement is to be removed. The Applicant shall submit revised plans to the approval of the Board Engineer, confirming their removal, or in the alternative, documentation sufficient to the Board Engineer to demonstrate that the fire separation wall is required by code.

4. The entranceway to the portion of the dwelling that is to be occupied by Mrs. Brown's parents will be increased in width to 48 inches.

5. The Applicant shall obtain approval from any other governmental agencies with jurisdiction relating to the property.

6. All fees, taxes, escrows and other monies due to the Township of Fredon shall be paid in full.

7. The Applicant shall comply with all rules, regulations, statutes and ordinances of the United States of America, State of New Jersey, County of Sussex and the Township of Fredon.

SO RESOLVED, as aforesaid:

AYES: 5

NAYS: 1

ABSTENTIONS: 0

The foregoing is a true and correct copy of the Resolution of Memorialization of the Fredon Township Zoning Board of Adjustment made pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-10(g) and adopted at a regular meeting assembled on May 12, 2015 memorializing the Resolution of Intent of the Fredon Township Zoning Board of Adjustment at a regular meeting assembled on April 14, 2015.

FREDON TOWNSHIP ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

BY: _____
Lori Schutte