

DENNIS TOWNSHIP CONSOLIDATED LAND USE BOARD

Regular Meeting – April 24, 2025 – 7:00 p.m.

Attendance: Walsh, Schwinn, Cowan, Saduk, McElvoy, Watson, Walters, Batastini, Fralinger

Applications:

**I & H BUILDERS – Block 226, Lot 20:** Located on Route 9 in a R3 (Residential) zone. Applicant seeking to construct a single-family dwelling on an existing undersized lot. Bulk variances from R-3 zoning requirements (lot area, lot frontage, lot width lot depth, front, side and rear yard setback, building coverage and impervious coverage).

**SAVKOV, NICOLE – Block 96, Lot 36.01:** Located on Route 83 in a VR (Village Residential) zone. Applicant is seeking to convert an existing farm property into a mixed-use retail/workshop; specifically through converting the existing 8,813 square foot barn into a retail and workshop space; converting the existing commercial building to a home office, and the existing 863 square foot barn into a storage space. The conversion of the 8,813 square foot barn is intended to be converted into 4,800 square feet of retail space with the remainder of the building being used as workshop space.

Walsh – call meeting to order.

Roll call –

Walsh – first application I & H Builders. Matter has been postponed at request of applicant. No further notice necessary.

Walsh – next matter Nicole Savkov. This matter has also been postponed until next month. No further notice necessary.

Walsh – next matter – work sessions/completeness review meetings.

Batastini – there are many different Boards that do not have completeness review meetings. This only is to determine if everything has been submitted to permit the Board to hear the matter. The completeness review is to identify from a checklist that the necessary documents have been submitted to allow the Board to make a determination on the application. Time periods remain the same. Batastini presented a form of motion that work session meetings are no longer necessary and that the Board attorney and engineer will be permitted to determine if and application is complete.

Watson – what happens if at the meeting the Board determines that items are missing and the application is not complete – does the Board have recourse?

Batastini – the Board always has the ability to request additional items or information; the application has to be complete in order to be heard. There was never such a checklist form

in the past but there is one now. If the information submitted is not sufficient, it's the applicant's fault.

Fralinger – applicant still would have the ability to request a waiver.

Watson – answers his question and is OK with moving forward without work sessions.

Batastini – Board has ability to not grant the waiver; thinks updated checklist will make it better.

Saduk – motion to do away with work sessions and leave completeness review to attorney and engineer.

Walsh – second.

Roll call – all in favor.

Walsh – next discussion – Hawks Ridge/Gibson Lane subdivision.

Batastini – asked if anyone is here on behalf of Hawks Ridge.

No one present on behalf of Hawks Ridge.

Fralinger – thinks he can handle it – asked to share screen – showed site plan. Believes that after subdivision was approved, Mark Gibson came back and proposed a fence along the property line and to the end of the lumber company parcel – described path of fence area. Initially had a double row of landscaping; came back and asked for 6 foot high fence as further screening. Request was granted. For whatever reason, Mark never removed landscaping. Developer is now requesting that landscaping be removed. Asked for administrative approval, along with Township, to grant the relief or does applicant need to come back to the Board and make the request. Due to grading, landscaping in areas would be difficult. There is also a swale and drain basin. Property owners haven't weighed in, put has letter from developer and owner of where trees are to be planted – both requesting no planting and that fence is enough screening.

Cowan – who is responsible for the fence?

Fralinger – owners of property where fence is installed.

Cowan – would like to hear from those property owners.

Walsh – wants to confirm that no room for plantings.

Fralinger – correct – fence is actually sitting higher than the middle of the roadway; developer installed the fence, but property owner is responsible for damage to the fence per language in the Resolution (#2020-06) – read applicable part of Resolution.

Walsh – thinks shrubbery would soften the look, asked Fralinger for his opinion.

Fralinger – solid vinyl fence, feels getting landscaping in area would be difficult and down the road may have problem with roots and the fencing and plantings may fall in right-of-way and end up being responsibility of the Township.

Walsh – makes sense to grant Fralinger administrative ability to handle.

Batastini – up to Fralinger, but asked if there is sufficient opinion from other property owners regarding trees; asked who is most impacted by this decision.

Fralinger – wanted to install fence to screen lumber yard from residential properties and that trees took time to grow.

Batastini – thinks it's a matter of re-noticing and have someone come in and advise that residents won't benefit from the trees or whatever.

Walsh – respects Fralinger's decision, but feels best to give involved residents a chance to speak on matter.

Cowan – feels residents should have input into what they will be looking at.

Watson – can't remember who suggested trees, but the fence is already there; can't remember if fence was in lieu of trees; believes residents should have input; also is there enough room.

Fralinger – narrow area; could possibly install landscaping behind fence; can't remember height decided for landscaping, but if 6 foot would take some time to reach that height. Could be some landscaping to break up fence, but evergreen trees aren't suitable in front of fence

Watson – thinks something would look better.

Batastini – what he's hearing is leave up to Fralinger and isn't a material change to involve residents.

Watson – motion to accept and leave up to Fralinger.

Walters – second.

Roll call – all in favor.

Walsh – Heidelberg Resolution.

Batastini – summarize Resolution.

Walsh – motion to approve.

Schwinn – second.

Roll call – all in favor.

Walsh – PM Pools Resolution.

Batastini – summarize Resolution.

Cowan – motion to approve.

Walters – second.

Rollcall – all in favor.

Walsh – Lindemon Resolution.

Batastini – summarize Resolution.

Watson – motion to approve.

Walters – second.

Roll call – all in favor.

Walsh – Resolution Reviewing the Applications Before the Zoning Board for 2024.

Batastini – summarize Resolution.

Walsh – motion to approve.

Wason – second.

Roll call – all in favor.

Walsh – Minutes of March 27, 2025 meeting.

Voice vote – all in favor.

Walsh – read bills into record.

Cowan – motion to pay.

Saduk – second.

Roll call – all in favor.

Walsh – asked Batastini if he wants to go into closed session at this time.

Batasini – no one else here but Board members and doesn't really need to be a closed session – just wanted to advise that Stoney Court is appealing the decision in Pierson matter.

Cowan – has question about Savkov application – are they taking property out of farmland designation?

Batastini – yes and they will have to pay rollback taxes.

Saduk – question about I & H application.

Batastini – they are coming in because of size of lot, coming in next month, they are reconsidering their plan.

Fralinger – lot dimension are pre-existing, R-3 zone, height of building is issue.

Batastini – doesn't want to get into any further discussion on the application at this time other than the applicant is reconsidering their plan.

Walsh – no further business – meeting adjourned at 7:49 p.m.