

**1600 Shore Road
Northfield, New Jersey 08225
Telephone (609) 641-2832, ext. 127
Fax (609) 646-7175**

June 3, 2021

Notice of this meeting had been given in accordance with Chapter 231 Public Law 1975, otherwise known as the Open Public Meetings Act. Notice of this meeting had been given to The Press of Atlantic City on March 29, 2021, posted on the bulletin board in City Hall, filed with the City Clerk, and posted on the city website, stating the date, time and place of the meeting and the agenda to the extent known. Digital copies of the application documents, exhibits, and the Planning Board Engineer's report have been uploaded onto the city website as well.

This **REGULAR** meeting of the Northfield Planning Board was held on Thursday, June 3, 2021. Pursuant to N.J.S.A. 10:4-8(b), this meeting was live-streamed using Zoom conferencing service. The meeting is also being held in-person with limited seating available due to Covid-19 social distancing parameters. Public attendance was by reservation only.

City of Northfield Planning Board is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86292394875?pwd=TURQbXZlYlA0SmVheFBrbVI2U1FLUT09>

Meeting ID: 862 9239 4875

Passcode: 999999

One tap mobile

*+13017158592,,86292394875#,,,,*999999# US (Washington DC)*

Dial by your location

+1 646 558 8656 US (New York)

Meeting ID: 862 9239 4875

Passcode: 999999

Find your local number: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86292394875?pwd=TURQbXZlYlA0SmVheFBrbVI2U1FLUT09>

The meeting was opened by Chairman Richard Levitt at 7:05 p.m. with the reading of the Sunshine Law and the roll call with the following members present or absent as noted:

Peter Brophy
Mayor Erland Chau
Joseph Dooley
Dr. Richard Levitt
Chief Paul Newman
Henry Notaro
Dan Reardon
Ron Roegiers
Derek Rowe

Clem Scharff
Jim Shippen
Councilman Paul Utts
Joel M. Fleishman, Esq.-Planning Board Solicitor
Matthew Doran, PE, PP-Planning Board Engineer

Robin Atlas, Board Secretary, read the following statement:

As you may know, Governor Murphy issued a new Executive Order, No. 242, which eased restrictions on face coverings in indoor public spaces, under certain conditions, effective May 28th. The order permits employers to impose stricter requirements regarding face coverings in indoor settings, which, in the best interests of our employees and visitors, the City of Northfield has opted to do. Therefore, the City of Northfield will continue to require face coverings in our indoor public spaces. Nothing is changing from our practice prior to the effective date of EO 242 and visitors are made aware of this decision with signs at the entrances to the building.

Due to social distancing requirements related to Covid-19, there are limited seats for in-person attendance by members of the public this evening. For this reason, this meeting is also being presented simultaneously as a remote public meeting, live-streamed, using Zoom conferencing service, and in accordance with the Governor's Executive Orders and the Open Public Meetings Act. Zoom meeting participants can dial in by telephone and listen to the proceedings, or they can access the meeting using a web-browser, and be able to view and listen. Instructions on how members of the public could reserve one of the limited seats, as well as how they can access Zoom have been made available on the municipal website and were published in The Press of Atlantic City May 24, 2021.

For those participating on Zoom, all participants will be 'muted' upon entry to the meeting. Web-browser participants will not be able to share their screens or see the camera-view of anyone other than the host, which is the City of Northfield. Zoom participants wishing to exercise their right to participate during the public comment portion of the meeting should wait until the specific announcement is made to open the public session. At this time, one by one, any telephone users will be asked to identify themselves and will be unmuted to permit commentary. For web-browser participants, comments or questions can be submitted using the chat function and will not be acknowledged outside of the designated public-comment portion of the meeting; chat users must also provide name and address for the record in order to be heard. Any written comments submitted in advance will be read aloud and addressed during the public comment portion of the meeting.

There was one application on the agenda this evening from Learning Edge Academy Inc. for Block 75 Lot 33 at the address of 234 Ridgewood Drive. The application was for a major site plan with variances. The attorney for the applicant was Christopher M. Baylinson, Esq. of Perskie Mairone Brog Barrera & Baylinson of Linwood, NJ.

Mr. Baylinson addressed the Board and said Learning Academy is an advanced daycare which prepares kids for learning and they offer regimented instruction. The Property is located in the C-B zone and the academy is a permitted use. They were initially going to use the existing building, but it is not big enough and the project deserves a new building and a new face.

Dr. Levitt swore in the professionals. They were Vince Orlando, engineer and planner, Steve Fenwick, architect and planner, and Elizabeth Palmer, who owns and operates the academy with her husband.

Mrs. Palmer was originally a health and physical education teacher, she has a degree in Psychology, has an MBA in education, and has been involved with childcare since 1999. She said Northfield has a great need for these services as kids are falling behind and there has been a push for early childhood learning. The academy will serve children from 6 weeks of age to 12 years old in self-contained classrooms according to age and will prepare them to enter public school with an edge. The school caters to working people and is open from 6:30 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. Monday to Friday. They provide interactive learning using the latest research and techniques and provide convenience for the parents. Research has shown that their children test higher than average children.

Mrs. Palmer continued by saying the Galloway Township facility is packed to capacity and is larger than the projected Northfield site. The Galloway academy has been in operation since 2006 and it remains full to capacity and they were recently approved for a site in Egg Harbor Township. The classrooms provide a higher level of service than regular daycares and they make sure the children are grouped strategically by age. By providing a school-type setting, they are able to tailor the programs by age and allow them to learn from both the adults and from each other. The times are flexible and depend on when parents work. Everyone is not dropped off and picked up at the same time and the children are not there for a set amount of time. It depends on the parent's needs and work schedule. Drop off times are staggered and the parking lot will not be overloaded. The teachers are staggered as well. The heaviest drop of time is in the morning and the pick-up time is from 2:00 p.m. to closing. They try to provide as little impact to surrounding areas as possible.

Mrs. Palmer said Covid-19 has opened their eyes to many issues and they have a lot of safety measures in place. Their doors are equipped to automatically take temperatures and know if you are wearing a mask or not. The doors lock automatically and they have a very sound security system. The Palmer's take pride in what they do. They will have a fenced-in outdoor play area which is attached to the building. This area will have security cameras. They want to obtain the original footprint of the building. They also have obtained DOT approval from the state thanks to their Engineer. They want to conform and blend in with other buildings on Route 9. There will be no entrance on Route 9 and curb cuts are engineered for traffic flow. They have an App system in place for parents to check-in their children if they are in a hurry. There are approximately 16 employees on site and they are scheduled using a flexible schedule to accommodate the children. There is no discrimination and the policy is first come, first qualified. There will be 29 parking spaces and they expect to use two-thirds of the parking at any one time. Parents are in a hurry to go to work and then to get home to make dinner. They aren't parked there for long.

Mr. Roegiers clarified that the academy was open only Monday to Friday and there is no 24-hour service. He also clarified that this is a preparatory transitional school open to kids in any town, not just Northfield. Mrs. Palmer verified that is the case. Dr. Levitt verified that this is a state licensed facility and Mrs. Palmer said it was. Dr. Levitt asked if it was similar to creative learning. Mrs. Palmer said it is similar. Dr. Levitt had questions about the traffic flow on site and the entrance on Route 9. Mrs. Palmer said the academy, fronting on New Road, has store front windows for aesthetic purposes. There is no entrance to the building on Route 9. Vehicles can enter the site from Route 9 or Ridgewood Drive. Dr. Levitt said it is nice to see new commercial construction.

Mr. Baylinson called Steve Fenwick to testify. Mr. Fenwick, of Fenwick Architects in Linwood, said he completed the architectural plans and designed the building. Mr. Fenwick displayed Exhibit A-1 which

showed the floor plan. He pointed out the controlled access vestibule entrance that opens to the reception area. There are ten classrooms of various sizes suited to age and needs. The building is 8700 sf and is a one-story building. The school has a student licensing capacity of 153 students. The turf play area has access from the building and is fenced in and controlled.

Mr. Fenwick displayed Exhibit A-2 which is an artist's rendering. Mayor Chau asked if there was any simultaneous pick up and drop off of students. Mrs. Palmer said parents can walk their children in to the building. There is no massive drop off and pick up due to staggering drop off and pick up times. Mayor Chau asked if they anticipate needing professionals to assist with safety. Mrs. Palmer said no. They use their own employees. She added that there is no back up of traffic. It never happens because there are no set times to come and go. Mayor Chau asked how many kids is the maximum. Mrs. Palmer said 153 kids at this site which is lower than Galloway. The maximum number of students at the Galloway school is 200 students. She added that the peak drop-off time is usually 8:30 a.m. and there may be ten cars at the maximum. Mayor Chau commented that Route 9 is a busy street and he asked about an emergency evacuation. Mrs. Palmer said they deactivated a few parking spaces near the trash receptacle as a meeting place. They also have fire drills and the staff are trained to exit the building in less than 59 seconds. She has had only one emergency evacuation in all her years in business and there is a plan in place. These activities happen away from Route 9. Chief Newman asked about pageants and events that attract a lot of parents at one time. Mrs. Palmer said this can occur at events like graduations, but they allow a limited number of guests. They usually rent out another site for events such as this and have a sit-down meal. There may be Halloween parades and Holiday parties. No one is allowed to enter the building without ID. Mr. Roegiers clarified that traffic flow is in and out from both New Road and Ridgewood Drive and they have DOT approval for this. Mr. Baylinson said he would rather Vince Orlando handle traffic flow questions and he introduced him.

Vincent C. Orlando is a licensed planner and engineer in New Jersey and he is with Engineering Design Associates, P.A. in Ocean View, NJ. He displayed Exhibit A-3 which is the site plan. He said the applicant wants the building to be close to Route 9 for presence and curb appeal. They are going to use the footprint of the current building. He said Mrs. Palmer instructs her clientele about traffic circulation and explains to them how to enter the site and the building. He said there is a strict routine here. There is dual ingress and egress and that is important to make the traffic flow work at the site and it takes the burden off the local roadway. The plan is that anyone dropping off will use Ridgewood Drive. A one-way system would have involved U-turns. Mr. Roegiers asked if they have a drop off lane. Mr. Orlando said they wanted two-way traffic and they have approval from the DOT. The key element is that the clients know what to do and it is repetitious. There are no set times for drop offs which helps with traffic flow and cars won't be waiting in line to drop off their children. Mr. Dooley clarified that if a vehicle exits on Route 9, they can turn either left or right. Mr. Orlando said that is correct. Mr. Orlando noted that the staggered drop off and pick up times will allow for a maximum of ten cars on the site at one time. Dr. Levitt had concerns with cars entering from Route 9 and then having to cross the outgoing lane from cars entering from Ridgewood Drive. Mr. Orlando said they won't be using the Porte-cochere. Mrs. Palmer said there is a dedicated drop off lane and parents have been instructed through an orientation. They understand what to do. Dr. Levitt said he understands that, but what about the cars entering from Route 9? Mrs. Palmer said they know they can't drop off their children. They would have to park their car and escort the child inside. There is no possibility that they can use the drop-off area. Dr. Levitt said they will need signage. Mrs. Palmer said this is all documented in the handbook given to the parents.

Mrs. Palmer said there would be signage about no drop off in the Porte-cochere area. Mr. Brophy said Ridgewood Drive is only 100 ft. from the Route 9 entrance and he thought the parents who want to use the Porte-cochere drop off should be instructed to use that entrance. Mrs. Palmer said if parents want to use the Porte-cochere drop off, they must enter from Ridgewood Drive. They would also have the option to park and escort the children.

Mr. Orlando discussed the parking field. He said clients and teachers park on the east side of the lot. He pointed out the trash enclosure and the loading and unloading area. He said there will be UPS and water delivery drop off, but there will be no large truck deliveries. There are two curb depressions to handle hand truck deliveries.

Mr. Orlando discussed buffering. The Palmer's want a very safe and secure site. There are a number of large trees near Lot 32. The entire lot has fencing. There is 5 ft. wrought iron fencing. It is 3 ft. for the first 20 ft. and then the fence is 5 ft until it becomes 3 ft. again. There is existing vegetation and pine trees. There will be an undisturbed 20 ft. buffer and this sits on the property line. They aren't going to touch it, but they will maintain it. They will add Arborvitae to fill in the gaps. They will need a variance for buffering of 12.5 ft. where 15 ft. is required. This is adjacent to Lot 1. Dr. Levitt noted that Lots 1,3, and 32 all have single-family homes and the buffering variance is in the back.

Mr. Orlando discussed shrubbery and lighting. He said the lighting will be down projected and shields will be used so that the lights will not affect the surrounding homes. The lights will be time controlled and will not use a photo cell. They will be turned off at night and they will have only incidental safety lights at night.

Mr. Orlando discussed the other variances in addition to the buffering variance. They will need two front yard setbacks as the property is a corner lot. It is a better alternative to have the building located in the current footprint and they are using the current setback. They are not increasing the setback, but since they are demolishing the building, they will need a variance. The Ridgewood Drive setback is proposed to be 20 ft. where 50 ft. is required and the New Road setback is 21.5 ft. where 50 ft. is also required. Mr. Baylinson commented that if they moved the building back to comply, they would be closer to the residential properties. Mr. Orlando said they will need a variance for driveway width. They have a 9 ft. deficiency. The driveway requirement is 100 ft. and their driveway will be 91 ft. He noted that they can't place the driveway in any other area due to the constraints of the site itself.

Mr. Orlando discussed the sign variances. There is an existing free-standing sign and they will be using that sign and will be keeping it in the exact location. It will be a new sign and they need a variance since it will be 15.6 ft. in height. Dr. Levitt asked why it is necessary to obtain a variance for only 6 inches. Mr. Orlando said they can eliminate the 6 inches and will therefore not need the variance for height. They will still need a variance for sign area since 32.1 sf is permitted and 74 sf is proposed. Dr. Levitt discussed the digital portion of the new sign and informed Mrs. Palmer of the Ordinance requirements. She said they will fully comply. Dr. Levitt said the sign will need to be dimmed at night and cannot produce excessive glare. Mr. Scharff said 50 nits is the maximum. Mrs. Palmer agreed they will conform and the sign will have no movement or scrolling and no waving motions. She added that they will beautify the base of the sign for aesthetics. Dr. Levitt said he had concerns about the sign being in the setback area. It was decided that the applicant would add a variance request for the freestanding sign being in the setback where 15 ft. is required and 5 ft. is proposed. Originally the setback would have been 0 ft. Mr. Fenwick said the sign will be similar to Tilton Market's sign. They will be rebuilding the inside of the sign,

but the existing sign will remain. It was discussed that the sign can be considered a new sign. Mr. Doran said the standard is 50%. If they are changing the sign over 50%, it is considered a new sign. Mr. Baylinson said they are changing the sign by adding a digital element. Mrs. Palmer said it will be nice to let people know when they are enrolling. Mr. Fleishman agreed this would help her business. Mr. Fleishman agreed that the sign setback should be added to the variance list and Mr. Baylinson said he is good with that.

Mr. Orlando discussed variance justification. He said this application could be a C1 or C2 variance application, but he is leaning towards a C2 variance as certain purposes of land use law is advanced. He read through the language and beneficial purposes such as this will benefit the general welfare of the community, promote adequate light, air, and open space. They are at 21.9% building coverage both existing and proposed and this is below the requirement. Overall coverage is also below the requirement at 62.4% where the maximum is 80%. Land Use law supports commercial development that meets the needs of NJ citizens and this is an appropriate use of the site. The architectural plans are aesthetically done using good materials and the site will be enhanced with a new building and landscaping. Two front yards provide a unique situation and they are efficiently using the land. Mr. Baylinson added that the variances can be granted without detriment to the public good which is the negative criteria required. There are no detriments due to the uniqueness of the site and no detriments to the zoning plan or to the neighborhood. They have reviewed all of Mr. Doran's comments.

Dr. Levitt asked about the justification for the 24 ft. driveway as opposed to a 25 ft. driveway as required. Mr. Orlando said they would have to take the foot from the play area or the sidewalk. Mr. Doran added that the standard is 24 ft. Dr. Levitt asked how many feet the sign is from the cartway. Mr. Orlando said about 1 ft. Dr. Levitt said it is also 6 or 7 ft. from the curb line. He had concerns about that. Mr. Baylinson suggested the digital sign will be changed once on a daily basis. Mrs. Palmer had no problem with that. She said she will alert the sign company and had no problem changing the sign once a day. Dr. Levitt still felt it was too close to the cartway. Mrs. Palmer added that she will change the sign only at night. Mr. Doran said it would be impractical to move the sign. Dr. Levitt asked about the building mounted sign. Mr. Orlando said it complies. Mr. Baylinson agreed and said they meet the requirements for that.

Dr. Levitt asked the Board for questions. Chief Newman asked about what type of 6 ft. fence surrounds the play area. Mr. Orlando said it is a wrought iron fence with fabric screening so that air can pass through. The fabric is on the inside. Chief Newman asked about bollards. He had concerns about cars entering the play area. Mr. Baylinson said Mrs. Palmer had concerns with concrete curb stops because children can trip over them. Mr. Orlando agreed to some decorative bollards.

Mr. Doran referred to his report concerning items that haven't been discussed yet. He noted that the plan should be revised to show the sight triangle at the intersection of Rt. 9 and Ridgewood Drive as well as each driveway. Mr. Doran recommended that two soil borings should be performed in the drainage area to assure proper content and permeability of the soil. They agreed to add detail for the lighting and to show the shielding on the plan. They agreed to supply a detail for the façade sign for the Building Department. The maximum for the façade sign is a vertical dimension of 5 ft. and the sign shall not project more than 18" from the building. Mr. Doran added that there is a requirement for bonding for the buffers and a performance guarantee for any offsite improvements before they sign the plan and start work. They agreed to all of Mr. Doran's comments and will comply with all details in the report.

Dr. Levitt opened the public session. There was no one present who wished to speak and there was no one on Zoom who had any questions.

Mr. Scharff said he felt that the sign is in the sight triangle. Mr. Orlando stated that it was not. Mr. Scharff said it is 5 ft. from the cartway. Mr. Scharff said he is talking about from Ridgewood Drive looking south. Mr. Orlando said they are moving the driveway to the south. The existing sign is in the sight triangle, but with the new cartway, it will not be. Dr. Levitt clarified that Mr. Scharff is talking about cars on Ridgewood Drive approaching New Road. When drivers look south for traffic traveling north, will their view be obstructed. Mr. Doran said the DOT has already approved the driveway. Dr. Levitt asked if they had access to the plans. Mr. Orlando said yes, they did. Mr. Doran suggested that they add the DOT sight triangles to the plan. Mr. Scharff said they are adding a digital sign to the freestanding sign and he didn't feel it was safe with a busy Wawa across the street. He felt they shouldn't add a digital sign. Mr. Scharff asked about the size of the digital portion of the sign. Dr. Levitt said it is 3 ft. by 6 ft. Mr. Baylinson said the digital sign is 18 sf. Mr. Scharff said the building is currently utilizing 5 to 6 individual uses and now there will be one. He questioned the need for a sign that big on a busy state road. He suggested reducing the sign somehow and he felt they had enough signage. Mr. Baylinson said they want to keep the signage as proposed and want to be easily identified on a state highway. Mr. Scharff said he couldn't agree to it. Dr. Levitt suggested if it is dim enough and doesn't change and they are sure it is not in the sight triangle he felt ok with it. Mr. Baylinson said they will work with Mr. Doran and will keep a stagnant message throughout the day. Mayor Chau asked about the cost of the project. Mr. Baylinson said it is a guess. Mr. Fenwick suggested a figure in the low 2 millions. Mr. Baylinson said they can move the sign back 5 ft. Mr. Orlando agreed and said they will move the sign to the other side of the drainage pipe. Mr. Baylinson summarized and said the sign will be setback from the street 5 ft. and will be on the other side of the drainage pipe toward the building. Mr. Brophy asked if neighbors had been properly notified. The Board Secretary said yes.

Mr. Doran and the attorneys reviewed the variances, waivers, and conditions.

The first vote was for the Design Waivers. They were as follows:

1. Curb Radius-15 ft. required; 8 ft. proposed
2. Driveway Width (Design Criteria)-25 ft. required; 24 ft. proposed
3. Parking Setback-20 ft. required; 15 ft. proposed
4. Driveway Location-100 ft. from intersection required; 91 ft. proposed
5. Street Trees-Waiver from three trees on site and street trees

Mayor Chau made the motion and Mr. Roegiers seconded. The roll call vote was as follows:

Mayor Chau-yes
Mr. Dooley-yes
Chief Newman-yes
Mr. Roegiers-yes
Mr. Rowe-yes
Mr. Scharff-yes
Mr. Shippen-yes
Councilman Utts-yes
Chairman Levitt-yes

Mr. Notaro-No vote as Alt. #1-9 voters present
Mr. Brophy-No vote as Alt. #3-9 voters present
Mr. Reardon-No vote as Alt. #4-9 voters present

The motion carries.

The second vote was for Major Site Plan, Four Variances, Three Conditions
The Variances were as follows:

1. Buffer Width-15 Ft. Is required; 12.5 ft. is proposed
2. Front Yard Setback (2)
 - Ridgewood Drive-50 ft. is required; 20 ft. is proposed
 - New Road-Rt. 9-50 ft. is required; 21.5 ft. is proposed
3. Overall size of freestanding sign-32.1 sf is permitted; 74 sf is proposed
4. Setback of the freestanding sign-15 ft. is required; 5 ft. is proposed (from 0 ft.)

The Conditions were as follows:

1. Applicant agrees to install a sign in the Porte-cochere area stating there will be no dropping off of children when accessing the property from Route 9
2. Digital signage must comply with the City's Code regulations. The digital message may only be changed one time per day
3. Decorative bollards will be added to the parking spaces adjacent to the playground area
4. Applicant will plot the DOT sight triangle on the plan
5. Freestanding sign will be moved 5 ft. from the property line instead of the proposed 0 ft. and the sight will be at a height of 15 ft. which is conforming. Originally proposed to be 15 ft. 6 in.
6. Agree to all other conditions in Matt Doran's report

Mayor Chau made the motion and Mr. Rose seconded. The roll call vote was as follows:

Mayor Chau-yes
Mr. Dooley-yes
Chief Newman-yes
Mr. Roegiers-yes
Mr. Rowe-yes
Mr. Scharff-yes
Mr. Shippen-yes
Councilman Utts-yes
Chairman Levitt-yes
Mr. Notaro-No vote as Alt. #1-9 voters present
Mr. Brophy-No vote as Alt. #3-9 voters present
Mr. Reardon-No vote as Alt. #4-9 voters present

The motion carries.

Dr. Levitt welcomed the Palmer's to Northfield and wished them every success with their venture and said their project looks like a nice aspect for our city.

Ari Frangias and his Engineer, Jason Scullo were present for an informal discussion concerning a proposed project in Northfield. Dr. Levitt said this is not a formal application and the information discussed is off the cuff information only and a future application will not be affected or restricted by any information discussed tonight and there are no obligations. Mr. Fleishman said the applicant is also not bound by anything discussed here and this is an equal playing field which will foster open discussion.

Mr. Scullo briefly described the project. He said there will be no changes to the site. It will be a take-out ice cream shop and the site is ideal for this. The site is small with a u-shaped driveway. They would like to get some feedback from the Board to see if there is anything the Board may find problematic. Mr. Doran asked if it is an allowed use. Mr. Scullo said it would be a conditional use. Dr. Levitt said such conditions would refer to sizes and numbers of tables and parking. Mr. Scullo said there will be no seating inside. Customers would walk in and will be served a finished product over the counter which the patrons would take outside. They would like to have tables and benches outside. Dr. Levitt asked if there was any window take out and Mr. Scullo said no. Mr. Doran commented that if they don't meet all the conditions, they would require a soft "D" variance and they must convince the Board that the use fits. Mr. Scullo read the Ordinance and compared their situation to the Ordinance. Dr. Levitt said they would need a D3 variance for conditions they do not meet.

Mayor Chau asked about signage. Mr. Scullo said Mr. Frangias learned a lot from the previous application and they were messaging back and forth about signage. There is an existing sign between the driveways and it is close to Route 9. They want to refurbish the sign and instead of internally lighting the sign, they would like to use downward goose-necked lighting to make it look more high-end. Dr. Levitt commented that there are a lot of vacancies along Route 9. Mr. Brophy commented that there are two A-frame structures on the property and he asked if they were separately owned. Mr. Scullo said they are separately owned and there is an existing easement and they share the driveway. Dr. Levitt commented that it is a flag lot. Mr. Brophy questioned whether the owner of the house in the back would have a problem with the application. Mr. Scullo said the driveway is wide. Mr. Dooley asked about the parking. Mr. Scullo said there are 14 parking spaces. Mr. Shippen asked how the parking ratio would be determined if there are no tables. Mr. Scullo said they talked about that. Usually, it is one parking space for three seats. That would equal 42 people that would be standing in line at full capacity. They don't expect anything like that. Dr. Levitt asked if the store would be year-round or seasonal. Mr. Frangias said he figures to operate 6 months of the year. Mr. Scullo said Mr. Frangias is a Northfield resident. Dr. Levitt said to get your application in if you want to make the next meeting. Mr. Frangias said he realizes he will probably lose this summer. Mr. Scullo said everyone likes ice cream. Mr. Frangias said he has a business in Galloway and Brigantine and he really wants to have a business in Northfield. Dr. Levitt said it is a small but unique building and there are not a lot of uses suitable for it. Mr. Fleishman added that the variance would be a "D"3 and they will need to convince the Board that it is well suited for the use and that would be part of positive criteria. The Fire Chief will be weighing in big for access purposes and their opinion will be a big consideration for the Board. Mr. Scharff asked if they knew how old the building is. Mr. Roegiers said the building has been there for at least 50 years. Mr. Brophy said he believes the A-frames were built in the early 1970's by Mike Blizzard, a news photographer. He said he lived in the A-frame building in the back. Mr. Scharff added that it is a unique

idea and it would be nice to keep a semi-historic building that has been there a long time. Dr. Levitt said it is very 'Jersey' and Mr. Fleishman said it is 'more Vermont'.

Dr. Levitt closed the meeting at 8:59 p.m. with a motion from Councilman Utts and a second from Mr. Shippen.

Respectfully submitted,

Robin Atlas

Robin Atlas, Secretary to the Board