August 26, 2026
Franklin Township Land Use Board
Special Meeting

The following Land Use Board Members were present:
Mr. Balough, Mr. Corde, Mr. Ferri, Mr. Onembo, Mrs. Payne, Mr. Scibricia, Ms. Lorenc.

Professionals present: Mr. Schneider, Mr. Ingram, Beth McManus.

Co-Chairman Gary Corde asked for a moment of silence in Memory of Chairman Henry Meltzer and gave a message about his history and years of service to several organizations in Franklin Township. Board Attorney Rich Schneider spoke about his memory of Henry over the years, he will prepare a resolution in the recognition of Henry's long service. Other members of the board and public also recognized Mr. Meltzer and his dedication to Franklin Township.

The Board accepted Joe Sciortino's letter of resignation.
Attorney Schneider gave oaths to new members John Ferri, David Sbriscia and Kim Lorenc. Attorney Schneider stated that they are eligible to vote on application after reading the transcripts or listen to the audio files of previous meetings and they can participate tonight. They need to certify that they read the transcripts once this matter comes to a vote.

Approval of May and August minutes:
Motion by Mrs. Payne, seconded by Mr. Onembo to approve the minutes of May 27 and June 24, 2026. Motion carried by Roll Call: Ayes: Mr. Balough, Mr. Corde, Mr. Onembo, Mrs. Payne.

Mr. Schneider introduced Beth McManus in place of Planner Jim Kyle for tonight's meeting. Mr. Schneider also indicated it is his understanding that neither the applicant or the interested party represented by Mr. Simon are intending to present any "traffic testimony" this evening. There is no reason to have the traffic professional present tonight.

<u>380 Bloomsbury Road LLC Application</u>-continuation for preliminary site plan approval
Mr. Schneider stated that Mr. Peck has a recall of one witness and will proceed with his architect. Attorney Simon stated he has a number of experts to present tonight.

Mr. Schneider discussed the need to have an additional meeting and it needs to be discussed and determined.

Attorney Peck introduced himself on behalf of the applicant. He made a statement in memory of Henry Meltzer also.

Mr. Peck stated they are here to continue their application for preliminary major site plan approval at this time to construct an 817,068 sq. ft. warehouse building inclusive of 8,000 sq ft of office space on approximately 113 acre property located at 3890 Bloomsbury road also know as Blk . 58, Lot 1. They were previously heard on April 22, May 27 and June 24. The property is in the township's industrial zone district where warehouses are permitted uses, they are not seeking any variances, not pilot or special treatment. Fully conforming application with zoning ordinance and industrial zone regulations and this application is of right.

Mr. Peck reviewed what was heard at the June meeting. Mr. Wilks was recalled back at this time. He was reminded he was still under oath. Mr. Peck discussed the DEP permit that was previously in question. Mr. Wilks indicated that permit has been resolved as of August 19th, they were issued a flood hazard area individual permit essentially demonstrating compliance with the state regulations on stormwater management and acknowledging the regulated feature that exists on the property and ultimately providing mitigation plan that is providing an enhanced feature than what is there today. Mr. Wilks stated the permit is valid until 2031. The permit authorizes the construction of the warehouse application that is before the board today. There are no other DEP permits necessary. The permit that was received was marked as Exhibit A-5. It was provided to the Board and Mr. Simon at this also. There were no questions by the board regarding the permit.

Mr. Robert Simon, Herold Law, representing Skylands Preservation Alliance addressed the applicant and board at this time. Mr. Simon said he did receive the permit today and did not have much time to review it. He stated the way he reads the permit, does Mr. Wilk agree that it verifies the flood hazard elevation proposed and authorizes from the DEP standpoint the warehouse construction/relocation/stabilization and environmental uplift of the on site regulated feature and riparian zone. Mr. Wilk replied yes. Mr. Simon also stated that the permit is subject to various submissions. Mr. Wilk agreed. Mr. Simon asked Mr. Wilk if he understands that as stated both regulations and expressly in the permit that the permit does not obviate the local flood plain administrator's responsibility to ensure compliance with the local flood damage prevention ordinance and the minimum NFIP standards. Mr. Wilk stated he did not know that. Mr. Simon asked him if he read the permit. Mr. Wilk said yes but he did not draw that conclusion. Mr. Simon said does it not state on the first page "this approval does not obviate the local flood plain responsibility to ensure

all development occurring withing their communities special flood hazard area is compliant with the local flood damage prevention ordinance, and minimum NFIP standards, regardless of any state issued permits. FEMA requires communities to review and permit all proposed construction or other development within their SFHA in order to participate in the NFIP". Mr. Wilks stated he sees that and all the permits say that, he was referring to he does not actually know what that means. Mr. Wilks said as an engineer, he sees that on every permit, but he has not seen something after this permit with regard to the local flood plain administrators responsibility ever affect one of his applications. Mr. Simons asked if he has seen this on other permits, Mr. Wilks concurred he has. Mr. Wilks asked if he had any experience with an local flood plain administrators to ensure that all development occurring in their community special flood hazard area is compliant with the local flood damage ordinance and minimum NFIP standards. Mr. Wilks said he has never seen any additional action come from that statement. Mr. Wilk was asked what he thought that statement means. Mr. Wilk said he would be making an assumption. Mr. Simon stated that the A-5 permit does not make any findings of the project satisfying the municipalities groundwater, limestone formation, subsurface flow or geologic stabilities standards. Mr. Wilk said that that the permit does not specifically acknowledge that it was all part of the DEP's review and part of the application. Mr. Simon asked where in this permit does it say that the project satisfies the municipality's ordinance standards regarding groundwater, limestone formation, subsurface flow or geologic stability. Mr. Wilks said it does not say that in the permit. He was asked if he was aware of any statute or regulation or administrative code provision that provides that the issuance of a FHA individual permit obviates independent review of those topics by any municipality in the state of NJ. Mr. Peck interrupted and stated that Mr. Simon is getting at local approvals that are outside, this is a different approval than the DEP, and wouldn't this just be, to the extent it's not already covered by Mr. Ingrams review, getting them to this point, wouldn't any subsequent municipal certification be the subject of a separate municipal proceeding or application, so he does not know why they are going down this road. Mr. Simon stated that it is required, Mr. Peck has stated that this is a fully compliant application, according to him and that it is subject, it sounds like, the applicant is making an application for preliminary site plan approval, there is an ordinances that requires a whole bunch of things, including issues that he went over as part of this reviewing boards obligation to review and consider, based on competent evidence before deliberating and voting on an application with preliminary site plan approval. Mr. Simon is asking the witness, whether this permit introduced as A-5, makes any finding with regard to any of those regulations. Mr. Wilk commented, "you're asking me if it has anything to do with local ordinances, and the answer would be no, it is a state requirement". Mr. Simon stated, then you would agree that there is no condition in this A-5 permit that specifically contemplates or evaluates karst

sensitivity, deep excavation impacts or potential changes to subsurface flow. Mr. Wilks said in A-5 there is no mention of that. Mr. Simon asked with regards to what this permit permits, does the proposed 30 plus foot excavation for the new stream channel extend below the seasonal high ground water table. Mr. Wilks said he would have to look at the logs for that location, it is variable all over the site. Mr. Simon asked if he know whether the 30 ft. excavation for the new stream channel extends into bedrock. Mr. Wilks said he does not have the logs in front of him, he would have to assume it is possible, but he cannot answer without the logs. Mr. Simon asked could dewatering alter groundwater gradience beyond the property boundary. Mr. Wilks said in a broad question like that it could. Mr. Simon asked if what measures, if any, are in place to prevent collapse or lose of fines into subsurface voids during excavation of this new stream channel. Mr. Wilks said there will be an erosion control plan established, that is part of the erosion control permit. Mr. Simon asked if the risk of inducing sinkhole formations during deep excavation been evaluated at this point. Mr. Wilks said it has been considered in the design. They have realized it is a possibility and measures have been taken to avoid impacting as much potentially kart geology as possible. He said the impact from karst is trying to make sure that water is not pushed into it. They have been strategic with the design to minimize the amount of water that gets infiltrated back into the ground. The basins are all lined to prevent water from going back into the ground, the channel itself is underlined with clay to prevent water from finding its way back into the ground. Mr. Simon asked when the permit talks about environmental uplift, what specific ecological performance criteria define that uplift in the design. Mr. Wilks stated that is documented in the application provided to the board. Mr. Simon asked if that criteria is required by the DEP or is that independently determined by you and the design team. Mr. Wilks said it is based off of criteria the DEP evaluates. He explained how things are evaluated and it is all documented in the DEP application, that was submitted to this board also. Mr. Simon asked if any pre and post development ecological functional analysis been completed. Mr. Wilks said yes it is in the DEP filing. Mr. Simon asked if the new riparian zone depend on engineered soils, liners or groundwater augmentation. Mr. Wilks said the intent is for it to be clay, there is existing clay and the intent is to use as much needed material as possible. The new stream will be lined with clay and native stone that is prevalent in the soils. Mr. Simon asked if the design for the combination of clay and native stone was submitted to the board. Mr. Wilks said yes it is a component of how you arrive to the flood hazard area that has to be documented. You model the exact surface that you intend to install. Mr. Simon referred to A-5 and asked Mr. Wilks if there is any condition that is set forth in the permit, preconstruction conditions, special conditions, riparian zone mitigation conditions or standard conditions that you or the applicant's design team take issue with. Mr. Wilks said not to his knowledge. Mr. Simon said the permit identifies various plan sheets, on pages 8 &9, they include plan sheets that

appear to have revision dates as late as May 28, 2026. Have all those plan sheets including the updated plan sheets been submitted to the board. Mr. Wilks said they have not, they started this process at the same time and the way NJ works, they go before different agencies and they all have different comments. Traditionally they collect them all and respond at one time but because there is a clock on the DEP perspective they had to address their comments before they came back to address all the comments from the board so the intent would be, on the next round of submissions, they would incorporate everything from the DEP application to the township set. Mr. Simon asked if Mr. Wilks knew what the last date they submitted plans to the board. Mr. Wilks said 10 days prior to the last hearing a few updated sheets were submitted. Mr. Simon asked when he expects a full set of plans will be submitted to the board so it will be available for review. Mr. Wilks will have to speak with the applicant, at this time there was not intent to revise the townships set to reflect the DEP set until after the hearings. Mr. Simon stated they are submitting A-5 that was based on certain plans that were submitted to the DEP that have not been submitted to the board.

Mr. Simon continued to ask questions regarding items on the permit. Asked about proposed channel. Discussed de watering activities. Mr. Simon asked what measures are in place to prevent collapse . Mr. Wilk indicated that is part of an approved plan. He explained how it was designed and what was in place to prevent water from going back into the ground.

Mr. Simon stated that when the permit talks about environmental uplift, what performance criteria is met. Was it DEP requirements? Mr. Wilk said it was in the report provided to the board and provided information that is in the DEP application.

Mr. Simon asked about pre functionality. Mr. Simon asked how the new riparian zone was going to be created. Mr. Wilk responded.

Mr. Simon asked if there is any condition set forth in the permit whether pre-construction, etc....that the design team take issue with? Mr. Simon stated that the permit identifies various plan sheets. They include plan sheets that appear to have rev dates as late as May 28, 2026. Have all those plan sheets including updated plan sheets been submitted. Mr. Wilk said they have not. He explained the process and how it was handled. Mr. Simon asked what the last date they submitted to this board. Mr. Wilk said 10 days prior to the last meeting. Mr. Simon asked when a full set of plans will be submitted to the board for review. Mr. Wilk will need to talk to his client. Mr. Simon stated that submitting A-5 based on certain plans submitted to the DEP but not the LUB. Mr. Wilk stated that the May 28th

date is about one plan, he would have to go through each plan to see if there is something materialistic different from that plan than what is in front of the township. All of the revisions that were made minor in detail, a lot of quantifications of areas, refined calculations on hydraulic models that this board has no comments about, everyone of the plans they would be happy to share with the approved plans from the state from whomever. Mr. Simon asked the board to ask the applicant for updated plans that were submitted to the DEP. Mr. Corde asked for updated plans with the explanation of changes. Mr. Wilk reviewed the process of plan submittals with the DEP. Mr. Peck stated that they will provide them.

Public Comments-

1. Barbara Cochrane; She asked about DEP permit process and public comment period by the DEP. She wanted to know why it wasn't published. Mr. Wilk addressed her questions.
2. Board member Mr. Onembo asked about local flood ordinance and submission to Township Engineer. Jim O asked if the information was submitted to Mr. Ingram. Mr. Wilks addressed the information that was submitted to the DEP and the information that is not under scrutiny on the local level, however, they will provide and they do not think that anything will change the intent of what has already been permitted. Mr. Onembo asked if Mr. Ingram has reviewed in relation to the local ordinance that Mr. Simon referred to. Mr. Ingram stated that they will have to provide the additional information for review but the ordinance is geared towards floodplain issues, they do not have a floodplain where they are developing, everything is within the stream corridor, it's just for the relocation . There is no FEMA regulated floodplain that they would be in violation of or is applicable. They will review it. Mr. Peck stated they will provide all that information.

Witness for the applicant Architect Claudio Breda was sworn in. Claudio Breda provided his credentials. Mr. Breda was accepted as an expert in the field of architecture. He is employed by Ware Malcom.

Mr. Peck asked if he was familiar with the proposal and the architectural plans, which he indicated he was. Mr. Breda reviewed the architectural plans that were submitted to the board. He gave a review of the building to be used as a warehouse/distribution center. It is considered a cross dock facility which he explained the theory. There are 84 dock doors on northside, 66 on south and 48ft high. Mr. Breda referred to the plan that was on display and reviewed the logistics of the building. The Office space was indicated on the plan and the electrical room. It has a standard roof plan and drains

north and south. As required by the state of NJ it is ready to accommodate future solar panels. No solar panels are being installed at this time. It has exterior downspouts. He reviewed the north elevation. There will be concrete wall panels in 4 different colors, White and 3 shades of gray to minimize the impact of the building. The corners are where offices are located. The building is 40 ft. high to the structural membrane of the roof. The length of the building is 1296 ft. and 680 ft. deep. Further layouts and elevations were reviewed. There will be 1 sign on the building now above the main entrance. There will be a monument sign at the roadway and the facade sign. An exterior rendering was shared. The architectural drawings were marked as A-6.

Mr. Schneider read from Planner James Kyle's report regarding the monument sign. Mr. Onembo stated he is interested in the entrance way for trucks and monument sign.

Ms. Lorenc asked about snow load design for the roof. Mr. Breda said designed according to the state of NJ standards for snow loads.

Mr. Balogh asked about the solar application. Mr. Breda stated solar will not immediately be installed.

Mrs. Payne asked how many doors on the north side accepting delivery. Mr. Breda said 84 and 66 on south side taking deliveries away. Mrs. Payne asked what the plan was for the office set aside. Mr. Breda stated that was set aside as a "maybe" for offices.

Ms. McManus asked for the size of the façade sign. Mr. Breda stated it is less that the 10% per ordinance and will comply. It is not illuminated. Mr. Breda said there are exterior lights proposed on the building to meet the light safety requirement, no architectural uplighting for decoration purposes.

Mr. Schneider said when the engineer testified he deferred the mechanical equipment location to the architect. Mr. Breda showed that they are being proposed on the roof and will not be seen given the height of the building. Mr. Breda reviewed the roof aesthetics.

Mr. Corde asked what the decibel level will be at the closest house. Approx 32 decibels. They are not for cooling just air circulation and heating.

Mrs. Payne asked what the solar plan use was for. Is it a community solar plan or for the building. He said it is future and specifics are unknown at this time.

Public Comment was resumed at this time.
Mr. Simon asked when Mr. Breda was retained? Mr. Breda stated since 2021.
Mr. Simon asked if the design of building changed since 2021. Mr. Breda stated they have not changed drastically. The square footage and volume has not changed. The docks are the same. Mr. Simon asked if the orientation of the building in terms of where offices are, vs, loading docks, properties changed. Mr. Breda said no. Mr. Simon asked if he has participated as the architect since 2021. Mr. Breda no, since 2022 he participated in this site plan. Mr. Simon asked since 2022 what aspects did he participate with. Mr. Breda collaborated with Mr. Wilk on planning the site so it operates in the most sufficient way. They are employed by same employer. Mr. Simon asked if he reviewed everything submitted or did he just focus on elevations and floor plans. Mr. Breda said yes just elevations and floor plans, he did not review any other plans. Mr. Breda did review the local ordinance to see what was permitted or not permitted on the site. Mr. Breda believes it is permitted on the site. Mr. Simon referred to the use table of the zoning ordinance, did he review any other parts of ordinance. Mr. Breda said only what is applicable for this specific site. Mr. Simon asked if he reviewed max height of building before or after design of plans, Mr. Breda said yes before. Mr. Simon asked if he recalled what it said about height. Mr. Simon asked about average grade. He asked Mr. Breda what the average grade would be between existing grade and finished grade. Mr. Breda said it will be slightly higher. Mr. Breda deferred to Mr. Wilk. Mr. Breda said the building is 48 ft to ridge of the building. Mr. Simon asked about setback review and buffering requirements. Mr. Simon asked how was that addressed. Mr. Simon asked if he worked on other warehouse projects for Safavieh. Mr. Breda said he has not, others in his office have. Mr. Simon asked if he has designed other warehouse projects in NJ. Mr. Breda said yes 100's in the tri-state area. In NJ 50+ . Some in Franklin, Somerset, New Brunswick, along NJ Turnpike. Mr. Simon asked if they were for multiple users or a particular user. Mr. Peck objected to questions about tenants. Mr. Simon said he is questioning the witness experience designing a building for one tenant, for example if he designed for one user and is supposed to be for logistic purposes, he is asking about the design of this building with approx. 150 dock doors, are the others designed in NJ for one user how many dock doors for those users. Mr. Breda said 20-150 dock doors, none in NJ for one user. Mr Simon asked what the largest number of dock door has he designed for one user. Mr. Breda explained single loaded docks and cross loaded. Single loaded use the same doors for incoming and outgoing. His largest design of a single loaded building is 120. Mr. Simon asked what the most dock doors designed for a single loading building. Mr. Breda said 120 dock doors for a single tenant was in Pa. Mr. Peck objected to this line of questioning. Mr. Simon explained his line of

questioning. Mr. Corde said the board will get back to the loading docks and asked if the questions could he kept to the architect testimony. Mr. Simon continued to explain his line of questioning and why he was asking these questions. Mr. Simon asked if he ever designed a cross dock building for a single tenant with more than 120 dock doors. Mr. Breda said not personally. Mr Simon continued the questioning on warehouse logistics and what he has designed. Mr. Peck maintained his objection to this continued line of questioning as this is irrelevant. Mr. Corde agreed and asked the witness if the dock doors were specified by the customer or did he come up with the number himself. Mr. Brenda stated they were driven by their client. Mr. Simon asked what the basis was to why there are 84 dock doors on one side and 66 on the on the other side. Mr. Brenda stated that was designed for maximum flexibility. Mr. Simon asked what he meant, Mr. Corde stated this was testified at the first meeting and will be further addressed by the board. Mr. Corde said he could ask one more question on this subject. Mr. Simon asked has Mr. Breda ever designed a cross dock building for a single tenant with more than 120 total dock doors. Mr. Breda said personally no he has not, but his firm Ware Malcolm has done many that exist. Mr. Simon asked about the mechanical, Mr. Breda said it is just for heating and ventilation. Mr. Simon asked what the max number is for heating and ventilation Mr. Breda said approximately 6 which is typical for this building but it is unknown at this time.. Mr. Simon asked how the location of the solar impacts the mechanical placement. Mr. Breda said they could put them anywhere, there is no impact. Mr. Simon asked about the solar panels and if he knew how much they would protrude. Mr. Peck said this is pure speculation and it only exists because the state of NJ requires it and they would have to come back before the board. The solar panels will not be seen if they were put on . They will be about 1 ft above the ridge and behind parapet walls. Mr. Simon asked a few more questions about the height and solar application. Mr. Schneider said the only requirement is the roof be structurally available for solar panels, if the solar panels are allowed to be granted by zoning they will be granted, if they require a minor or major site plan they will come before the board and there is no point of debating visual impacts of solar panels at this point.

Mr. Simon asked about lighting and the lights over the egress doors for safety. Mr. Breda said they are for light safety requirements. He indicated there will be no lights over the loading docks. Mr. Simon asked when the dock door is opened at night will there be interior light seen. Mr. Breda said yes if it is opened at night. Mr. Simon asked if lights will be shielded. Mr. Breda said yes, they are illuminated for someone to walk outside the door. Mr. Simon asked if there any other lighting for purposes of circulation or other pedestrian activities. Mr. Breda said only what is depicted on the drawings, no other

lighting. Mr. Simon asked if any color or architectural renderings were done as seen from the pubic roadway or common property lines shared by residential properties. Mr. Brenda said no. Mr. Simon asked if he has done that on other applications for proposed warehouses. Mr. Breda said yes. Mr. Simon asked about tree removal and if Mr. Breda was involved in any of that. Mr. Breda was not and he does not know anything about tree heights proposed. Mr. Simon asked about the windows and if residential properties be able to see the lights on inside. Mr. Breda said yes if they are on during the night. Mr. Simon asked if the locations of windows were considered when the building was designed if they would be facing any residential properties. Mr. Breda said they were not and the windows do not open and close, the loading dock doors open and close.

Mr. Simon asked Mr. Breda if he signed and sealed the plans. Mr. Breda said yes and they were provided to the board and they are the same as submitted to the board dated 12/19/2025. The elevation sheet is dated 12/3/2025. Mr. Simon asked what provides cooling for the building. Mr. Breda said no cooling in the warehouse, only in office area. Mr. Simon asked if any sound studies have been performed on any of the HVAC or ventilation systems. Mr. Breda stated no they have not been performed. Mr. Simon asked if there are back up generators. Mr. Breda said yes there is one generator outside the electrical room. Mr. Simon said there is an area identified as the electrical room, he asked is there any other location in or outside the building electrical equipment. There is a transformer outside the electrical room and a generator 2-3 feet outside the electrical room on a concrete pad. Mr. Simon asked about the water tank design. Mr. Breda stated he did not design it, it is for the fire suppression system.. Mr. Simon asked about the elevation of the lights above the door will be. They are standard life safety doors and the lights are directly above them per code. Mr. Simon asked if the building could be used by more than one tenant. No it cannot be. Mr. Simon asked if he reviewed the ordinance table that deals with development on karst terrain. Mr. Breda said no. Mr. Simon questioned Mr. Breda regarding compliance with ordinance provisions regarding development on karst terrain. Mr. Breda said he did not. Mr. Simon asked if any review for compliance related to development on karst terrain. Mr. Breda said he has not, and no one has that he is aware of. Mr. Simon said a comment was made about the dock doors and not sure about outbound or inbound side, Mr. Simon asked if when designed was it determined what inbound doors and outbound doors would be located. Mr. Bardet said no they were just given direction for maximum flexibility. Mr. Simon asked who made the decision of the size. Mr. Breda stated his client gave them the information for the size and dock doors.
Mr. Corde asked if there is a feature in the architectural design where if a number of dock doors were eliminated, could a feature be put in place where a future expansion

could happen in that location, like put a dummy door in place for what could be a future dock door. Mr. Breda said technically yes there would be knockout panels. There is no structural issues.

Mr. Simon asked where the structural columns are located. Mr. Breda showed on the plans, typically they are HSS columns which are square. Mr. Breda explained where and how they are placed.

Mr. Onembo asked about the dock doors. Are the doors going to be operational on all docks or will there be a closure there for the doors to become functional. Mr. Breda said yes all doors will be operational.

Public Comments-
Laurie Wanarski – asked about the location of the electrical room. Is it facing away from the road towards the woods. Mr. Breda said yes facing the woods.

Rick Canale – asked has an electrical study been done because they loose power a lot. Have they spoken with JCP&L about the demand they will need. He asked how the warehouse was going to be heated. It will need to be electric or propane. Mr. Breda said they will work with JCP&L. The heat will be supplied by electric or propane. Mr. Breda said if they go for natural gas they provide it to the residents.

Mr. Lippens – asked about the solar panels. How many panels? What can they do for the township to keep quality of life for the children. What benefits do you bring. How much energy will you use?

Dillon Glagola- will warehouse be used as a data center? Mr. Corde explained the questions have to be asked only about architectural design for the application before the board.

Kyle Horvath - asked what the kw of generator is and fuel type. Mr. Breda stated not determined yet.

Public comments closed.

Mr. Peck stated subject to clarifying questions who would the board like to bring back they are done. Mr. Peck said if the board has specific questions or concerns let them know. Mr. Onembo would like a rendering of the entrance to the site, a lot of different

things were discussed and he would like a good understanding of what the entry will look like. Mr. Corde would like rendering of colorized elevations of building. Mr. Peck deferred these items to the next meeting. He said they will provide a drawing of the entryway and a sign next meeting. Mr. Corde would like to discuss the dock bays, he feels the community would like them reduced and he would like to see a number more representative of this applicants use. Mr. Peck stated he would like to bring information to the next meeting.

Mr. Onembo asked what the construction timeline is. It was stated 1.5-2 years and they still need County approvals.

Mr. Simon asked they provide renderings from the common property lines showing the visual impacts to the surrounding residential properties.

Mr. Schneider stated to Mr. Peck that subject to recall additional witnesses and provide those items that the board has suggested and whether you agreed to, that is your decision, Mr. Schneider understands that at that point in time that his case is complete on direct. Mr. Peck agreed. Mr. Simon made 2 comments, if the applicant is coming back to the next meeting to provide testimony, whether it's the monument sign, renderings, dock doors, etc. certainly they would want the applicant to complete their case before he commences their case, if the board decided we will do it out of order, it is up to the board, his first witness is a geologist speaking about the karst and the ordinance.

Discussion on when the next meeting would be took place. It was the consensus to hold it October 14th. It will be held at the elementary school at 7 pm. There will not be any further notice.

It was decided to cancel the September meeting at this time. October 1st meeting is to be determined.

Motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Onembo, seconded by Mr. Corde and carried by all in favor.

Submitted by;
Kelley Smith
LUB Secretary