

**EAST WINDSOR TOWNSHIP ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES OF September 28, 2017**

The meeting of the East Windsor Township Zoning Board was held on Thursday, September 28, 2017, in the East Windsor Township Municipal Building, 16 Lanning Boulevard, East Windsor, New Jersey, 08520. Zoning Board Chairperson Shelley Shifman called the meeting to order at 8:00 p.m.

STATEMENT OF ADEQUATE NOTICE

Pursuant to the Sunshine Law, a notice of this meeting's date, time, place, and agenda was mailed to the news media, posted on the Township bulletin board, and filed with the Municipal Clerk.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Mr. Bailey, Ms. Berdzik, Mr. Cosenza, Mr. Illuminate, Ms. Shifman, Mr. Primiano, Mr. Rago

Members Absent: None

Professionals and Staff Present: Allison Quigley, Zoning Board Secretary
Gregory Corcoran, Board Attorney
Richard Preiss, Township Planner
Daniel Dobromilsky, Township Landscape Architect
A. Maxwell Peters, Township Engineer

APPOINTMENTS

REPORTS/CORRESPONDENCE/ANNOUNCEMENTS

PUBLIC FORUM

Chairperson Shifman opened the meeting to the public. There being no public comment, the public forum was closed.

MINUTES

June 22, 2017

MOTION TO APPROVE MINUTES MADE BY: Ms. Berdzik

MOTION SECONDED BY: Mr. Primiano

ROLL CALL

AYES: Mr. Bailey, Ms. Berdzik, Mr. Illuminate, Ms. Shifman, Mr. Primiano
NAYES: None
ABSTAIN: Mr. Cosenza, Mr. Rago

APPLICATIONS/PUBLIC HEARING

EWT File #ZB17-001 Old Trenton Donuts Inc.
325 Princeton-Hightstown Road
Block 3, Lot 10
Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan with Bulk and Use
Variances

Mark Shane, Esq. of Shane & White is representing Old Trenton Donuts LLC, who has filed an application regarding the subject property located at 325 Princeton Hightstown Road, also known as Block 3, Lot 10. Mr. Shane introduced his witnesses present tonight; Thomas Thill, John Rea, Creigh Rehankamp, and Michael Marinelli. Mr. Corcoran swore in Mr. Shane and the applicant's witnesses.

Chairperson Shifman asked Greg Corcoran, Board Attorney, to swear in the Board's professionals: Richard Preiss, Township Planner; A. Maxwell Peters, Township Engineer; and Daniel Dobromilsky, Township Landscape Architect. Mr. Corcoran swore the professionals in.

Chairperson Shifman announced that Board Member Mr. Cosenza had arrived and was eligible to participate in tonight's hearing.

Mr. Shane stated that at their last public hearing, they presented their application to take the existing gas station at 325 Princeton Hightstown Road and renovate the existing building to a Dunkin Donuts. Mr. Shane introduced Michael Marinelli of Menlo Engineering, the project engineer. Mr. Shane stated that Mr. Marinelli had testified as an expert witness on this application at the previous public hearing. He asked Mr. Marinelli to review his testimony from last time.

Mr. Marinelli referred to the previously entered Exhibit A-1 titled "Getty Gas Station Conversion – Existing Conditions Exhibit," dated June 22, 2017. Mr. Marinelli stated that the site currently has an existing gas station and two bay garage with vehicles parked throughout the site. He stated that the applicant is proposing to renovate the garage building into a Dunkin Donuts and to dress up the site with new landscaping, curbing, and other improvements. Mr. Marinelli stated that he previously testified that this application was seeking relief for additional impervious coverage that was due to the additional paved areas being added to improve site circulation. He stated that the site is currently serviced by septic and well with a septic field in the rear of the site, but due to construction on an adjacent site across Route 535, the applicant would be able to tie into the main water and sewer systems once available. He stated that there is an existing JCP&L substation directly adjacent to the south of the site with a cross access easement that they are working on obtaining. Mr. Marinelli stated that there had been discussion on parking on site. He stated they are providing more spaces that is required by the ordinances and they had previously agreed to convert one of the two proposed ADA parking spaces to a regular parking space for additional parking for customers. Mr. Marinelli stated that there was also discussion previously on the requested setback variance regarding the proposed gas station canopy. He stated that while technically they are requesting a variance to permit an accessory structure within the setback of the site, the canopy was taller would not present any visual barriers. Mr. Marinelli stated that there was also discussion about the lighting levels under the gas station canopy, and while the area is at

a higher lighting level, it was necessary for safety purposes. Mr. Marinelli stated that they were also requesting other various relief from existing nonconforming conditions mostly relating to lot size and landscape buffer requirements and the lot is significantly undersized. The applicant is also requesting a variance for canopy signage, as the ordinance allows a sign that is 10% of the façade but they are requesting a sign at 11%. They are also proposing to relocate the existing monument sign within the property boundaries, but they would need a variance for that as well as the sign would be 7.5 feet from the property line where a 12 foot buffer is required.

Mr. Preiss asked Mr. Marinelli why they were proposing a lighting intensity of 24 foot candles beneath the gas station canopy, when lots of other similar sites and uses have been using levels closer to 10 or 15 foot candles. Mr. Marinelli stated that he believed 20 to 25 foot candles was the standard for the industry. He stated that he would defer that to the owner of the site to determine if that could be lowered. Mr. Preiss asked Mr. Marinelli if additional parking spaces could be added in the existing septic field once the site has been hooked up to public water and sewer. Mr. Marinelli stated that would be possible, but that would increase the impervious coverage on site. Mr. Shane asked Mr. Preiss how many spaces he would like them to add in that area. Mr. Preiss stated that it was up to the discretion of the Board and that he raised the issue because the Board expressed concerns about the parking being adequate during the last hearing. Mr. Marinelli suggested a land banked parking solution, where spaces could be delineated in that area but land banked until such time they are necessary.

Mr. Shane called his next witness to testify, Matthew Glasso of Ramoco Fuels. Mr. Shane asked Mr. Glasso to explain his employment and his relation to the project. Mr. Glasso stated that he is a project manager with Ramoco Fuels and GJA Construction. He explained that GJA Construction previously removed the older fuel tanks from the subject site in 2015 and he worked on the job at that time. He is also familiar with the gas station operations on site. Mr. Shane asked Mr. Glasso how many employees would be working for the gas station during any shift and Mr. Glasso told him one. Mr. Shane asked Mr. Glasso what the hours of operation are and Mr. Glasso stated that they are from 5:00 AM to 11:00 PM and that was not expected to change. Mr. Shane asked Mr. Glasso if he was familiar with any failure of the existing septic system on the site and Mr. Glasso stated that he was not. Mr. Shane asked Mr. Glasso when gas deliveries are made to the site and Mr. Glasso stated that those deliveries are done in the early afternoon. Mr. Glasso indicated that the fuel trucks did not have any issues with navigating around the site. Mr. Shane asked Mr. Glasso if they had any control over when the fuel deliveries are made. Mr. Glasso stated that they have direct control and can tell the drivers when to come to the site, as they work for Reddy Rathnaker, who is the sole owner of the corporation that owns the site.

Mr. Shane called his next witness to testify, Reddy Rathnaker of Ramoco Fuels. Mr. Rathnaker was sworn in by Mr. Corcoran. Mr. Preiss asked Mr. Rathnaker how many times a week fuel deliveries were made to the site. Mr. Rathnaker stated that it was based on necessity but at least every three days. Mr. Preiss asked Mr. Rathnaker if he would be willing to delineate the fuel delivery times if that was made a condition of any approval and Mr. Rathnaker stated that was fine.

Mr. Shane called his next witness to testify, Kaushik Patel of Old Trenton Donuts Inc, the applicant. Mr. Patel stated that he owned 33 different Dunkin Donuts locations, including two

others in East Windsor. Mr. Shane asked Mr. Patel what kinds of deliveries are made to a Dunkin Donuts site like the one being proposed. Mr. Patel stated that every morning at about 3:00 AM a small 12 foot box truck delivers the donuts and baked goods for the day. Also, once a week a delivery is made of cups and other paper goods, and that takes place either in the morning or early afternoon. He stated that the paper goods delivery was done from a single truck that was servicing multiple locations in the area, so he cannot directly control when the paper goods delivery is made but he can make a request. Mr. Shane asked Mr. Patel how many employees would be working at the Dunkin Donuts. Mr. Patel stated three employees would be on site. Mr. Shane asked Mr. Patel how long each delivery takes. Mr. Patel stated that the daily donut delivery takes about five minutes and the paper goods delivery each week takes about five to ten minutes. He stated that the paper goods delivery is very quick, as the store's order is already assembled on a dolly so the delivery personnel just have to take the single dolly and put it inside of the rear door. Mr. Preiss asked Mr. Patel how large the truck that delivers the paper goods is and Mr. Patel stated that the truck is about 25 to 30 feet long. Mr. Shane asked Mr. Patel if the paper goods delivery truck would block traffic while on site. Mr. Patel stated that would not be an issue, as the delivery does not take long at all. Mr. Preiss asked Mr. Patel how employees would get to the site for work. Mr. Patel stated that they would drive or carpool. He stated that he owns another Dunkin Donuts facility about two miles away which has about 40 parking stalls, so they will have an agreement that employees of this store can park at the other store and be brought over the new store for their shift. Mr. Dobromilsky asked if there were any other deliveries to the Dunkin Donuts besides the two Mr. Patel described and Mr. Patel stated there were not.

Mr. Preiss asked Mr. Patel how long a customer would typically be parked for if they were getting coffee. Mr. Patel stated that the average turn around time is two minutes, but they expect that to get even shorter as Dunkin Donuts introduced online ordering through their phone application that allows customers to place their order and pay in advance so their order is already ready and waiting for them when they arrive. Mr. Preiss asked Mr. Patel how long customers generally sit inside for. Mr. Patel stated he would estimate about five minutes.

Mr. Shane called his next witness to testify, Kamlesh Shah of KSD Architects, the project architect. Mr. Shane asked Mr. Shah to go over his licensure and education for the Board. Mr. Shah stated that he has been a licensed architect in New Jersey since 1993 and has testified as a professional witness in over 100 municipalities in New Jersey. Chairperson Shifman accepted Mr. Shah's credentials.

Mr. Shah entered into evidence Exhibit A-3, titled "Proposed Floorplan," dated January 25, 2017. Mr. Shah stated that this is a one store building measuring about 1,500 square feet that currently exists on site. The building would be completely renovated for the Dunkin Donuts use, with a front area for customers to line up to be served, a future seating area, one ADA compliant bathroom, and a storage area in the rear of the building. There would also be a small addition on the rear of the building for a refrigerator and freezer unit. Mr. Shah entered into evidence Exhibit A-4, titled "R-2 Rendering," dated January 25, 2017. Mr. Shah stated that the building is currently brick painted white. The applicant is proposing to complete the renovations with natural brick on the bottom of the façade and hearty planks on the top. The windows would be replaced with aluminum glass window fixtures and canopies with gooseneck lighting. There would be three façade signs each identifying the Dunkin Donuts. Mr. Shah entered into evidence Exhibit A-5,

titled “R-1 Rendering,” dated January 25, 2017. Mr. Shah stated that this rendering shows the overall building. He stated that the Dunkin Donuts signs would be their traditional corporate colors but more subdued shades to make the overall look softer. Mr. Shah directed the Board to a submitted document titled “Sheet SK-2” dated January 25, 2017, and revised on January 30, 2017. Mr. Shah stated that this plan shows the elevations of the building on all four sides. Mr. Preiss stated that in the renderings it appears that there are additional lights underneath the canopies. He asked if those lights were necessary. Mr. Shah stated that they weren’t necessary but they did light up the sidewalk. Mr. Preiss asked what color the bollards would be in front of the store and Mr. Shah stated that they would be brown to match the façade. Mr. Preiss asked why this design was chosen for the site. Mr. Shah stated that because the building is so small he felt that if too many features were added it would look even smaller and more cluttered, so they tried to keep it simple. Mr. Preiss stated that there had been some discussion regarding the architecture of the nearby Dunkin Donuts store in Robbinsville Township and asked the applicant if they would be willing to make the design of the building more like that location if that is what the Board desired. Mr. Shah stated that if that was what the Board wanted they would work with them. Mr. Preiss asked Mr. Shah if the applicant would be willing to restyle the façade signage to be more consistent with the other signage in the R-O zone if the Board desired. Mr. Shah stated that they would be willing to work with the Board but the signs that are proposed are using corporate colors and logos that make the site more easily identifiable, especially at such a busy intersection.

Mr. Dobromilsky asked Mr. Shah where the utility equipment and HVAC equipment would be located. Mr. Shah stated that there would be one small condenser unit in the rear of the building but the HVAC equipment would be internal to the building. Mr. Dobromilsky stated that the area in the rear of the building is tight so there are no opportunities to screen those from sight. He stated that those items weren’t shown on the elevations but they would make a big impact on a small building. Mr. Dobromilsky asked if there would be a light fixture about the exit door in the rear and Mr. Shah indicated that there would be. Mr. Dobromilsky stated that they were not shown on the elevations and asked if it could be a gooseneck fixture to match the rest of the building. Mr. Shah stated that he would see if they could do that.

Mr. Dobromilsky asked Mr. Shah if he had designed the gas station canopy. Mr. Shah stated that he did not. Mr. Dobromilsky asked if there were any options to have the canopy match the building. Mr. Shah stated that he would defer to the owner on that question. Mr. Dobromilsky asked Mr. Shah if the footprint of the canopy was bigger than the footprint of the building. Mr. Shah stated that was accurate. Mr. Preiss asked Mr. Shah how many signs would be on the canopy and Mr. Shah stated one. Mr. Preiss asked Mr. Shah how the sign would be lit and Mr. Rathnaker stated that it would be lit internally. Mr. Preiss asked Mr. Shah if the bollards in the gas station area could be changed from yellow to the same brown as the bollards in front of the building. Mr. Shah stated that he would have to check OSHA requirements and make sure that is permitted but had no issue with that change.

Mr. Primiano asked Mr. Shah why the design had taken a residential approach vs. a more modern approach similar to other buildings in the area. Mr. Shah stated that he is familiar with the area and there are other buildings with similar styles in that area as well. He stated that they wanted to keep the building design simple as to not overwhelm such a small structure. Mr. Primiano stated that he thought the design could have been made more modern to align better with the area and it

might eliminate some issues such as utility equipment screening. Mr. Shah stated that they did not want to redo the whole structure, just renovate it, but they are open to the Board's suggestions. Mr. Primiano asked Mr. Shah if he had any renderings of the site from across the abutting streets to give a better perspective of the overall site. Mr. Shah stated that he did not have a rendering like that tonight but he could provide one. Mr. Preiss stated that he has seen other sites where the gas station canopy was brought in a little on each side to reduce the footprint and reduce the setback encroachment. Mr. Shah stated that he did not design the canopy so he wasn't sure if that was feasible. Mr. Cosenza asked Mr. Shah what the height of the building was and Mr. Shah stated about 17 feet. Mr. Cosenza asked how tall the canopy is and Mr. Shah stated about 18 feet. Mr. Cosenza asked how the lighting on the building would be illuminated. Mr. Shah stated that the façade signage would be externally lit and the monument sign is a light box. Mr. Cosenza stated that he would think channel letters might be more attractive for the monument sign. Mr. Cosenza asked Mr. Shah if they would be willing to make it a condition of any approval that the hearty plank could not be substituted for vinyl and Mr. Shah stated that they would agree to that. Mr. Cosenza asked if the canopy signs would be illuminated and Mr. Shah stated that they would not be. Mr. Cosenza asked where the LED lights would be as indicated in the submission documents. Mr. Marinelli stated that the LED lights would be on the monument sign for the gas price display. Mr. Cosenza asked Mr. Marinelli what the color temperature of the canopy lights would be. Mr. Marinelli stated that they are 5000k. Mr. Cosenza suggested that maybe it should be a warmer temperature to match the warmer colors of the building. Mr. Primiano stated that he thought it be important that the Board remain consistent regarding the LED light displays for gas stations, as he recalled an application came before the Board in 2013 requesting a similar sign. Mr. Preiss stated that since that application, a new ordinance was adopted regulating the LED signage specifics. Mr. Shane stated that the LED sign they are proposing is in compliance with the ordinance standards.

Mr. Shane called his next witness to testify, Scott Kennel of McDonough and Rea Associates, the project traffic expert. Mr. Shane asked Mr. Kennel to go over his licensure and experience for the Board. Mr. Kennel stated that he graduated from NJIT and has been in the traffic engineering field for over 35 years. He stated that he had been accepted as an expert witness in over 150 municipalities in New Jersey. Chairperson Shifman accepted his credentials.

Mr. Kennel stated that he reviewed the site and summarized his findings in his report dated May of 2014. He took into consideration the existing use and the proposed use based on the size of the building and utilized traffic generation standards from the Traffic Institute of Transportation Engineers, the Mercer County Engineering Department, and the New Jersey Department of Transportation. Mr. Kennel stated that during the AM peak hour the site would experience about 70 to 75 vehicles visiting the site. During secondary peak hours in the afternoon and on Saturday morning, the site would see about 50 to 55 vehicles visiting the site. Mr. Kennel stated that due to the nature of the proposed use, this use wouldn't generate new traffic coming to the area, but rather would capture customers from the existing traffic stream that goes through that intersection. Mr. Kennel stated that during the AM peak hour, 3,000 vehicles travel through that intersection on average.

Mr. Kennel spoke regarding parking. He stated that the applicant is proposing 14 parking stalls with 1 ADA parking stall. He stated that if every employee on site drove and parked on site, there

would still be ten stalls available for customers. He stated that, in his opinion, since this use is a high turnover use that sees customers leave the site after five minutes, the parking is adequate. He also stated that he reviewed the site plan and he believes the onsite circulation plan is safe and efficient. He also stated that the onsite circulation is adequate for deliveries while supporting customer circulation.

Mr. Preiss asked Mr. Kennel if he believed the new circulation plan would function better than the current site. Mr. Kennel stated that he thought so. Mr. Preiss stated that he is concerned regarding the parking stall on the north side of the site, and thought that may block the access driveway if someone is backing out of the site. Mr. Kennel stated that spot would be designated for employee parking to mitigate that issue. Mr. Dobromilsky asked Mr. Kennel where the predominant flow of traffic to the site would be coming from. Mr. Kennel stated that during the AM peak hour traffic predominately traveled westbound along Route 571. Mr. Dobromilsky asked Mr. Kennel how a car traveling westbound on Route 571 would access the site. Mr. Kennel stated that they would take a left turn at the signalized intersection onto Route 535 and they would access the site from Route 535. Mr. Dobromilsky asked if someone could enter the site from the driveway if another car was fueling at the first pump station. Mr. Kennel stated that wouldn't be a problem. Mr. Dobromilsky asked Mr. Kennel if he believed anyone would try to make a left turn from Route 571 to access the site while traveling westbound. Mr. Kennel stated that he didn't think that would happen. Mr. Dobromilsky stated that he was concerned that those in a rush in the morning might try to parallel park by the chiller unit in the rear of the site to run in and grab their coffee. Mr. Kennel stated that he didn't think people would do that as it's not near an entrance. Chairperson Shifman stated that she found that area to be concerning too. Mr. Cosenza suggested adding landscape to that area to reduce that risk. Mr. Dobromilsky stated that there were a few opportunities on site to better define the drive aisles by adding landscaping rather than paving some areas. Mr. Kennel stated that they could explore those options.

Mr. Primiano asked Mr. Kennel if they were proposing to restrict the ingress or egress driveways at all. Mr. Kennel stated that they are not proposing any restrictions. Mr. Primiano asked if they would restrict traffic from trying to turn westbound onto 571 or northbound onto Route 535. Mr. Kennel stated that those roads are self-regulated and he didn't that restrictions would be necessary but that the application has to go before Mercer County for approval so the issue would be discussed then.

Mr. Primiano asked Mr. Rathnaker how long a fuel delivery takes. Mr. Rathnaker stated that a fuel delivery takes about fifteen minutes. Mr. Primiano asked if they would still offer diesel fuel on site and Mr. Rathnaker stated that they would. Mr. Primiano asked if a tractor trailer would be able to access the site for diesel fuel. Mr. Rathnaker stated that it was possible, but not likely as they are not going to have the specialized high speed fuel pumps for the larger trucks, so it would take a long time to fuel them. Mr. Primiano stated that he would be concerned that a larger truck would enter the site for fuel service and gridlock the entire site. Chairperson Shifman agreed that would be an issue and suggested that the applicant consider restricting which types of vehicles they would service.

Mr. Bailey asked Mr. Kennel if his traffic analysis would include any impacts due to the new construction taking place across Route 535 from the subject site. Mr. Kennel stated that his report

did not include a level of service analysis for the intersection so the new construction was not considered.

Mr. Illuminate asked Mr. Rathnaker if any air pumps were being proposed on site. Mr. Rathnaker stated that they would have two air pumps at two parking stalls in the rear of the site.

Mr. Shane called his next witness to testify, Creigh Rahenkamp of his own employment, the project planner. Mr. Shane asked Mr. Rahenkamp to go over his licensure and experience for the Board. Mr. Rahenkamp stated that he has been licensed in New Jersey as a planner since 1995 and he earned his Bachelor's degree from University of Pennsylvania. He stated that he has testified in front of over two hundred municipalities in New Jersey as an expert witness. Chairperson Shifman accepted his credentials.

Mr. Rahenkamp stated that he had reviewed the plans and wanted to testify regarding the use variance and the expansion of the nonconforming use on site. He stated that historically we have seen the pairing of car service shops and retail fuel sales but recently these uses have been decoupled and gas stations are being paired with convenience stores and fast food chains instead. Mr. Rahenkamp stated that due to the small size of the lot, larger convenience stores like Wawa or Quikcheck couldn't go here, but the Dunkin Donuts is a smaller footprint that works well with the site. Mr. Rahenkamp stated that while the Dunkin Donuts is not a permitted use in the zone, it is a rational response to keep the gas station existing by coupling it with a new and more modern use. Mr. Rahenkamp mentioned that recently, the appellate court rendered a decision in a similar matter recently and the finding by the judiciary was that the pairing of gas and food or convenience stores are technically a single use. He stated that this has been up for debate in lots of towns but this decision establishes that this can be considered a single use.

Mr. Rahenkamp stated that this proposal is necessary for the revitalization of an existing condition in dire need of attention and aesthetic improvements and that the need for aesthetic improvements can be the basis of granting a use variance. Mr. Rahenkamp stated that the variance could also be granted because bringing in this conjoined use would make the site more viable and would allow the gas station to continue to serve citizens in the area. Mr. Rahenkamp stated that the Board should also consider that this is a unique parcel and that this is a use that would fit well on this site. He stated that the site is bound by existing structures on either side, so there's not opportunity to increase the lot and because of that the lot can never be utilized for one of the primary uses in the R-O Zone. Mr. Rahenkamp stated that he did not see any detrimental impacts of this variance at all, in terms of circulation, traffic, or zoning. He stated that this would revitalize the site and would be supportive of the businesses and consumers in the area.

Mr. Primiano asked Mr. Marinelli and Mr. Shah if it would be possible to do something with the canopy, such as connecting it to the building or putting it on an angle to make it more in proportion with the building. Mr. Shah stated that he was not sure how building and fire regulations would come into play if they did that. He stated that currently because the footprint of the building is staying the same this is just considered a renovation. By adding the canopy to the building, the footprint of the building would be increased significantly and would be considered new construction. Mr. Kennel stated he would find that detrimental to traffic flow onsite, as vehicles would have to

turn more than 90 degrees to get to the fuel pumps. Mr. Primiano stated that he has seen other sites get creative with this and he would like to see if there were any other options considered.

Mr. Peters stated that the applicant is proposing an overall site lighting intensity of 3.7 foot candles where the ordinance only permits 1.0 foot candle, so that should be reviewed. He also stated that the canopy lighting level is at 24 foot candles, so that should be looked at as well.

Chairperson Shifman stated that due to the outstanding issues on the application, the application would be carried until October 19th, 2017 without further notice required.

MOTION TO CARRY THE APPLICATION TO OCTOBER 19, 2017 MADE BY: Mr. Cosenza

MOTION SECONDED BY: Mr. Primiano

ROLL CALL

AYES: Mr. Bailey, Ms. Berdzik, Mr. Cosenza, Mr. Illuminate, Ms. Shifman, Mr. Primiano,
Mr. Rago

NAYES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

CERTIFICATION OF SECRETARY

I, undersigned, do hereby certify;

That I am the Zoning Board of Adjustment Secretary of the Township of East Windsor Zoning Board of Adjustment and that the foregoing minutes of the Zoning Board of Adjustment, held on September 28, 2017, constitute a true and correct copy of the minutes of the said meeting.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed my name of said Zoning Board of Adjustment this 15th day of February, 2018.

Allison Quigley, Board Administrative Secretary
East Windsor Township