

MUNICIPALITY OF MONROEVILLE

ZONING HEARING BOARD

FEBRUARY 2, 2022

MINUTES

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Jim Rosipal at 7:30 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND MOMENT OF SILENCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited and a moment of silence observed.

ROLL CALL

The Recording Secretary, Sharon McIndoe, called roll and the following were present: James Rosipal, Gary Grysiak, Larry D'Agostino, Michael Gaydos, Heather Wilkins, Bruce Dice and Paul Whealdon.

REORGANIZATION

Mr. Dice reported this is the time set for the Zoning Hearing Board to reorganize.

Whereupon, Mr. D'Agostino duly made a motion to appoint Mr. Jim Rosipal as Chairman and Mr. Gaydos seconded it. Upon a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Further, Mr. D'Agostino duly made a motion to appoint Mr. Gary Grysiak as Vice Chairman and Mr. Gaydos seconded it. Upon a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Furthermore, Mr. Grysiak duly made a motion to appoint Mr. Larry D'Agostino and Mrs. Wilkins seconded it. Upon a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There being no corrections, additions or deletions to the minutes of the Regular Meeting of December 1, 2021, a motion was duly made by Mr. D'Agostino to approve them, as submitted, and Mr. Grysiak seconded it. Upon a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

22-1-A

AARON BLUM

The applicant is requesting a variance from Section 210, Fences, of the Monroeville Zoning Ordinance No. 1443, as amended, to construct a six-foot-tall, solid fence in the front yard of the property that faces Griffin Road. The property address is 301 Longview Drive, Tax Parcel 543-H-178, and is a corner lot with two front yards in the R-2, One-Family Residential Zoning District.

Mr. Aaron Blum, the applicant, came forward to present his request. He reported they have two front yards because of a corner lot and requested a privacy fence because he has two young children. He explained he also wants to plant a Japanese Garden with Bonsai Trees and he wants to keep his property and children safe in that area.

Mrs. Diane Maschok, a resident of 1505 Griffin Drive, came forward to express her concerns. She explained her front yard is directly across the road from the proposed fence and she would have to look at it all the time. She showed photographs of her front yard looking out onto Griffin Road. She reported her neighborhood was built in the 1950s and everyone keeps their homes nice. She referred to Ordinance 1443 where it states that the purpose of the ordinance is for the beauty, safety, pleasant, attractive, health for residents. She reported the municipality allows for a four-foot fence in a rear yard and front yards with a variance, and it would have to be open fencing.

Mrs. Maschok showed another photograph of her front looking across the road at that property. She reported in her rear yard there is a house on Stepp Drive that has a six-foot solid fencing that goes the whole way to their back yard. She showed a photograph of what she sees looking out her windows which is a fence that goes completely up. She suggested the fence looks crappy after a while and she does not want to look at this fence out the front of her house. She explained that her street is a hill and the crest of it is at the top of her yard. She explained how people are afraid to drive on it in the snow but felt the crest of the hills is dangerous. She suggested a six-foot solid fence would obstruct the site view of his neighbors exiting the driveways. She felt there would be accidents on the road and it will look hideous. She suggested the property values would go down because no one would want to look at that fence.

Mrs. Maschok reported she has been there 54 years and there have been tons of young families that have raised families in their houses. She reported there has never been a problem with people putting six-foot high fences in their front yards. She could not understand why it is needed. She again stated it is a great neighborhood and everyone takes care of their properties.

Mr. Bill Gross, a resident of 222 Longview Drive, came forward to express his concerns. He reported his house is at the bottom of the hill facing up. He explained how he sits on his porch and enjoys the view to the top of the hill and he is opposed to looking at a six-foot fence. He felt it would be a deterrent to the neighborhood. He indicated he had nothing against the applicant and reported he raised three children with all of them running around the neighborhood with no problem but suggested the children have to be watched. He stated he did not want to look at this house. He reported how a lot of his neighbors do not like the fence on Stepp Drive but he cannot see it from his house. He would agree if the applicant wanted to install an open see-through fence but he disagreed with a solid fence.

Mr. Rick Atwood, a resident, came forward to express his concerns. He inquired whether the municipality had a site plan or a photograph of the location of the propose fence. He reported he lives next door to the applicant's property and his driveway follows the yellow line to the rear of his property. He suggested no one should have a say so about what you do on your property. He reported this fence would completely block him from getting out of his driveway because it blocks his line of sight for 300 to 500 yards going down the hill. He would not be able to get out of his driveway. He reported it looks like a small neighborhood but in the ten years that he has lived there Griffin Road has had a ton of traffic. He understood the concern for his children's safety. He was concerned with being able to see out of his driveway. Further discussion ensued.

Mr. Grysiak questioned the location of his house and Mr. Atwood answered he is located at 1506 Griffin Drive. He pointed out his driveway and the pine trees at the entrance. He again stated his concern is the safety of his children being able to pull out of the driveway. He felt certain the fence would be an issue.

Mr. Ron Maschok, a resident of Griffin Drive, came forward to agree with all the previous comments. He disagreed with a fence that high that close to the road and suggested a cyclone fence back by the house. He felt it just was not right.

Mr. Grysiak inquired whether there was anything from other neighbors. Mr. Whealdon reported he had one call but that person already gave her testimony.

Mr. Rosipal reported it was discussed previous to the meeting and the board has questions.

Mr. Atwood pointed out the one line he mentioned that would be an issue is the Water Authority's right-of-way and the main line goes where the proposed fence would be located.

Mr. Dice referred to the blue line on the drawing from the zoning hearing board and inquired whether the fence could be moved back. Mr. Blum answered affirmatively.

Further discussion ensued. Mr. Atwood pointed out his point of egress and suggested a location. He disagreed with the location of the blue or red line because he would not be able to see out of his driveway.

Mr. Grysiak inquired whether the applicant would consider a different type of fencing. Mr. Blum answered affirmatively. He explained he wanted the horizontal fence because it is standard for a Japanese Garden. He understood the concern for how it would look from the outside but he never intended for that to be the only thing on the outside of it. He suggested the illustration shows the fence out further than where he wants it closer to the road. He wanted to pull it back and put landscaping in front of the fence to soften it up and the portion facing Longview Drive could be a four-foot fence so people can look at the trees and he can see out over the land. He pointed out where he wants a six-foot fence. He addressed Mr. Atwood's issues.

Mr. Dice felt everyone wanted to work together and suggested the applicant meet with the neighbors and this could be continued until next month. He recommended the meeting take place in Mr. Whealdon's office so everyone could possibly come up with a drawing that is acceptable and something different than a solid fence. Further discussion ensued regarding the type of fence. Mr. Dice again suggested the applicant meet with the neighbors to try to work something out. He advised him that variances are difficult to get and a hardship has to be shown. He suggested if he could satisfy some of the neighbors the zoning hearing board might approve it but he doubted it currently. He stated it is in the applicant's best interest to meet with the residents to work out an understanding on another drawing and product.

Mr. Blum asserted he wanted to work with his neighbors. Mr. Atwood came forward with a suggestion that if he could make it a three-foot tall picket fence on the Maschok side of the property and his point of egress side it would handle his safety issues. Mr. Dice advised him to discuss it with the applicant.

Mr. Dice suggested the zoning hearing board table this matter until next month and not close the testimony.

Mr. Rosipal added the zoning hearing board rarely approves a six-foot solid fence in Monroeville. He explained it is not nice looking and there is a safety feature where the police and fire departments must be able to see into that yard. He suggested a four-foot fence with lattice on top

might be considered. He reported he did a site visit and traveled up Griffin Road to see the applicant's yard. He suggested the applicant move the fence toward his house and back from Griffin. Mr. Blum pointed out that area is his back yard and he would not have to get a variance. Mr. Whealdon agreed. He explained if the applicant brought the fence back parallel to Griffin Road to the corner of his house he could put a six-foot high solid fence with no variance. Mr. Blum asserted he would rather have a smaller fence that everyone approved. He again stated he would not need approval if it came to that. Mr. Rosipal concurred that he should meet with the neighbors to discuss the issue and try to come up a solution.

Mr. Dice advised that the next meeting is scheduled for March 2, 2022. Whereupon, Mr. Grysiak duly made a motion to table Application No. 22-1-A and Mrs. Wilkins seconded it. Upon a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously. Mr. Dice added the testimony would remain open.

#### 22-2-A

#### GLENWOOD CONDOMINIUMS

The applicant is requesting a variance from Section 210, Fences, of the Monroeville Zoning Ordinance, No. 1442, as amended, to construct a six-foot solid fence in the front yard of the property that faces Old William Penn Highway. The property address is 500 Lakewood Drive, Tax Parcel 977-E-393, and is a corner lot with two front yards, in the R-3, Multi-Family Residential Zoning District.

Mr. Norman Kovaly, the applicant, came forward to explain his request. He referred to the fence in question on Page 6 called the Hefner which is a six-foot solid fence but they are not located in the middle of the neighborhood. He showed the proposed color would be beige. He explained there are a few reasons why it was being requested. He referred to that stretch of Old William Penn and the location directly behind their community room and maintenance shop. He reported they store a lot of equipment and supplies back there. He pointed out the trees are dying and there are power lines above them and they do not want to replace them with trees. He stated it is 80 feet wide and 16 feet off of Old William Penn and they would like to remove the existing dying and dead trees and replace them with the six-foot tall fence. He reported it currently looks bad and they get a lot of complaints. He felt a fence there would be clean and neat and they are limited with what can be planted under the power lines. He referred to the second picture where it shows two trees already topped with the bottoms dying out. He indicated they are having problems and would like to have a clean straight line. He stated it is not in a neighborhood and is parallel to Old William Penn Highway.

Mr. Kovaly pointed out their bottom entrance way and this would clear the line of sight for access from Glenwood. He reported he has lived there for 30 years and this would clear up the problem. He pointed out the one single tree that is not dying that is doing the blocking would be removed. He stated if the fence is removed it would allow further sight distance up the road approximately 30 feet. He reported a stop sign is not merited because there has not been any accidents in the area.

Mr. D'Agostino referred to Picture No. 2 with the brick wall. He questioned whether the fence would be even with the wall once the trees are removed. Mr. Kovaly answered there would be a slight gap but it would be in line with it.

Mr. Gaydos inquired whether it would interfere with the fire hydrant and Mr. Kovaly indicated that is why they were leaving a gap between the brick wall and the fence. Mr. Gaydos asserted it would be in the middle of where the fence and the brick wall are located to allow for access. Further discussion ensued.

Mr. D'Agostino inquired about the existing fence in the back. Mr. Kovaly answered it is a wood privacy fence that has been there for 20 years and will be removed.

Mr. Grysiak questioned what was located across the street from Glenwood and Mr. Kovaly answered there are homes lining parallel with Old William Penn. He briefly explained the area and indicated they would clean it up.

Mr. D'Agostino inquired whether there were any complaints and Mr. Whealdon answered negatively.

Mr. Grysiak referred to the previous case and questioned whether the applicant considered choosing another style of fence or using a four-foot fence.

Mr. Kovaly reported the house across the street sits up so they look over everything. Mr. Grysiak contended it is still in their line of view. He explained this is a beautiful entrance way and a nice brick wall then they will put in a slab of vinyl. Mr. Kovaly asserted it would look cleaner and nicer than currently and it would enhance the aesthetics. Mr. Grysiak questioned whether one of the other style fences in the brochures would be more enhancing to go with the brick. Mr. Kovaly explained they like the solid fence because it is behind their workshop and they do not want people to look at what is behind it. Further discussion ensued regarding the type of fence. Mr. Rosipal referred specifically to the Bond Fence and stated there would be at least a four to five-foot high solid fence then the last foot would be lattice. Further discussion ensued regarding which fence. Mr. Kovaly stated the decision would be made by his board of directors. Mr. Rosipal explained the board is trying to avoid businesses and private homes from looking like forts. He asserted they are trying to make everything as neat as possible and request that the applicant adjust to it to make it look neater. Mr. Kovaly could not answer for the board.

Further discussion ensued. Mr. Kovaly explained how he would not want anyone to look at what they would have behind the fence. Mr. Gaydos inquired whether there would be any landscaping in front of the fence. Mr. Kovaly referred to Picture No. 1 and reported if approved they would put three flowering crab apple trees behind the fence. He stated he would not hinder the line of sight from pulling out of the entrance way and there would be nice flowering trees and a couple of small shrubs in the front. He agreed it is a cold fence but it is currently a nasty mess.

Mr. Grysiak reported a motion could be made to deny it but he could make a motion to continue if the applicant was willing to go back to the home owners' association and inquire whether something more aesthetically pleasing could be placed there. He pointed out the six-foot high solid fence is not appealing to the neighbors.

Whereupon, Mr. Grysiak duly made a motion to table Application No. 22-2-A to March 2, 2022 and Mr. D'Agostino seconded it. Upon a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously. Mr. Dice reported the record would remain open. Mr. Whealdon suggested more illustrations of what is proposed and sketches of landscaping in front of the fence.

22-3-A  
MANILLA GROUP, LLC

The applicant is requesting a variance from Section 207.8, Lot and Yard Requirements, of the Monroeville Zoning Ordinance, No. 1443, as amended, to permit off-street parking that will encroach approximately 20 feet into the required 30-foot front yard setback. The property is located at the intersection of Thompson Run Road and Frey Road, Tax Parcel 637-J-139, in the M-2, Industrial Zoning District.

22-4-A  
MANILLA GROUP, LLC

The applicant is requesting a variance from Table 308, Off-Street Parking Requirements, of the Monroeville Zoning Ordinance, No. 1443, as amended, to reduce the number of parking spaces from the required 15 to 10. The property is located at the intersection of Thompson Run Road and Frey Road, Tax Parcel 637-J-139, in the M-2, Industrial Zoning District.

Mr. Greg Banner from Key Environmental came forward representing the applicant. He gave a brief introduction of the applications. He reported the Manilla Group is proposing to develop a self-storage facility on property owned by John J. and Susan M. Sciarretti located at the intersection of Frey Road and Thompson Run Road. He gave a brief overview of the location of the property. He reported the property is zoned M-2 Manufacturing and 30 percent of the 4.15 acres is occupied by Thompson Run Creek on the west side of the property and a 100-year flood plain. He explained the width of the developable area within the property ranges from zero at the southern end to 235 at the approximate north/south midpoint with an average of 150 feet

Mr. Banner reported the property would be developed in two phases: Phase One would be five one-story, non-climate-controlled buildings with a total of 26,200 square feet. He explained Building One will be used for recreational vehicles, and boat storage; Buildings Two-Five will be garage-style; Building Six which is 100 by 100 feet or 10,000 square foot footprint will be three stories and climate controlled. He reported Monroeville has determined that the parking should be based on the warehouse use of Table 308, Off-Street Parking Requirements. He indicated that parking be provided at one space per 2,000 square feet of gross floor area. He pointed out for Buildings One-Five with 26,200 square feet a total of 14 spaces are provided as shown on the drawing and they are proposing 26 parking spaces. He explained they would be parallel spots which would be 10 feet wide and 20 feet long which would allow 15 feet of drive aisle space to get around them. He reported 15 parking spaces are required for the three-story climate-controlled building and the Manilla Group is proposing to reduce that by five or a total of 10 parking spaces. He explained six of the parking spaces for Building Six are in the front yard setback. He referred to Section 207.8 of Zoning Ordinance No. 1443 prohibits parking in the front yard setback and he requested a variance to allow the parking in the front yard setback. He reported Section 510.3, Variances, indicates the zoning hearing board can grant a variance provided that the following findings are made relevant in the case. He read the five items and reviewed why the applicant felt they are meeting those five items. He stated there are unique physical circumstances or conditions including the narrow dimensions of the developable portion of the property, the presence of Thompson Run Creek and its 100-year flood plain along the west side. He explained the area between the western side of proposed development and Thompson Run is a reparent buffer and he pointed it out. He explained reparent buffers are natural or manmade vegetative landscaped areas that filter

stormwater runoff prior to entering a stream. He reported maintaining the reparent buffer was stressed in the comments of the review of the land development plan. He pointed out the applicant is proposing to significantly increase the size of the reparent buffer the entire length of the west side of the project and it be landscaped with grass, shrubs and vegetation. He pointed out it would be from the southern to the northern side.

Mr. Banner reported the additional parking spaces needed for Building Six cannot be placed on the southwestern side of the site because it would reduce the proposed reparent buffer area. He proposed to have the spaces located in the front yard setback between the eastern drive aisle and Thompson Run Road and west of the PennDOT right-of-way. He explained parking spaces cannot be provided along the north side of Building Six because it could potentially block the people of Building Five from being able to park in front of their units and provide enough room for vehicles to pass.

Mr. Banner reported No. 2-while the property could be developed in conformance with the ordinances, Manilla feels it would be better to site the parking space in the front yard setback and maximize the reparent buffer area than to locate the parking spaces along the west side of the site because it would decrease the reparent buffer. He pointed out the parking spaces would also be located closer to Building Six.

Mr. Banner reported No. 3 – the unnecessary hardship was not created by the applicant. He stated the hardship is the narrow width of the developable portion of the property and the location of Thompson Run Creek and its 100-year flood plain on the west side of the site.

Mr. Banner reported No. 4 – the proposed parking spaces in the front yard setback are located along Thompson Run Road but will not affect the adjacent properties and he explained them. He reported the six parking spaces are not located within the right-of-way of Thompson Run Road and access to the site will only be available to lessees of the self-storage rental space. He stated the site will not be open to free public access. He asserted the proposed parking in the front yard setback will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood not impair the appropriate use or development of adjacent property and it will not be detrimental to the public welfare.

Mr. Banner reported No. 5 – the variance will afford relief and represents the least modification possible of the regulation in issue. He stated allowing parking in the front yard setback along Thompson Run Road will provide the necessary parking spaces for Building Six and preserve the proposed reparent buffer.

Mr. Banner then reviewed Application No. 22-4-C for Off Street Parking. He indicated it is a request to reduce the number of parking spaces. He reported Monroeville determined the parking for the three-story climate-controlled Building Six should conform to the requirements for warehouses which requires that parking be provided at 2,000 square of gross floor area. He stated 15 parking spaces would be required for Building Six which is 30,000 square feet on three floors. He reported this request is to reduce the 15 parking spaces to 10 or a reduction of five. He explained the primary reason is because the self-storage facilities are not the same as warehouses regarding parking spaces. He stated warehouses have constant site visits but self-storage facilities generate very little traffic. He reported the trip generation analysis prepared for the project estimates that the maximum peak hourly traffic to the entire site will be two trips in the a.m. and three trips in the p.m. so it is unlikely that even ten parking spaces will be occupied at one time.

He reviewed the five items of concern for the site: One, Unique physical circumstances or conditions associated with the property. He mentioned the narrow dimension of the developable portion of the site and the presence of Thompson Run Creek and the 100-year flood plain along the west side. He pointed out the reparent buffer is the area between the western side of the proposed development and Thompson Run Creek.

Mr. Banner again mentioned in the Monroeville review comments of the land development plan they stressed the importance of maintaining the reparent buffer. He stated they are significantly increasing the reparent buffer.

Mr. Banner reported the additional parking spaces needed for Building Six could be placed along the west side of the property but that would reduce the proposed reparent buffer area. He pointed out some of the parking spaces could be located on the north side of Building Six but that would create the potential for blocking lessees of units in Building Five from being able to park in front of their unit. He stated the request for the reduction in the number of parking spaces by five is so they would not have to reduce the size of the reparent buffer and siting those parking spaces in the front yard setback.

Mr. Banner reviewed No. Two, the property could be developed in conformance with the ordinances and the applicant wants to reduce the number of required parking spaces rather than have them located on the west side of the site and decrease the proposed reparent buffer. He pointed out placing the additional spaces along the west side of the site puts the spaces further away from Building Six.

Mr. Banner reviewed the unnecessary hardship has not been created by the appellant. He explained the hardship is the narrow width of the developable portions of the parcel and the presence of Thompson Run Creek and the 100-year flood plain located along the west side of the site.

Mr. Banner reported considering the location of the self-storage facility approval of the variance will not alter the character of neighborhood, impair the use or development of adjacent property or be detrimental to the public welfare. He asserted even reducing the parking of Building Six from 15 to 10 will still provide five times the number of spaces necessary to meet the estimated maximum peak daily trips expected to the entire facility. He reported the variance represents the minimum variance to afford relief and represents the least modification possible of the regulation in issue. He stated reducing the number of parking spaces from 15 to 10 still provides sufficient parking spaces for Building Six based on the estimated trip generation numbers and will preserve the valuable reparent buffer expansion.

Mr. Grysiak inquired whether there were any full-time staff on site. Mr. Banner answered there will be one in Phase Two in the building during the day. Mr. Grysiak inquired whether there is an elevator in Building Six and Mr. Banner answered affirmatively. Mr. Grysiak inquired about a loading dock and Mr. Banner explained any loading docks would be internal to the building. He reported there is no reason for a truck to come in and back up into the building. Mr. Grysiak confirmed they were discussing Building Six and Mr. Banner concurred. He added most of the vehicles will be cars but there might be U-Haul or box trucks occasionally. Mr. Grysiak pointed out he noted on the plan that the parking spaces will be painted on the pavement and Mr. Banner agreed. Mr. Grysiak was concerned with bottle necking the driveway. Mr. Banner indicated it would be highly unlikely that two people would be there at the same time in spots next to each other.

Mr. Gaydos inquired whether it is not one way between the buildings and Mr. Banner agreed. He explained that is why they are leaving spaces so there will be 15 feet remaining wider than an interstate lane.

Mr. Rosipal inquired about the number of parking spaces the applicant is requesting the zoning hearing board give up and Mr. Banner answered five. Mr. Rosipal questioned the number of handicapped spaces that would be taken and Mr. Banner answered none. He pointed out there would be two provided at the corner of the building.

Mr. Grysiak questioned whether it was key accessible or card swipe and Mr. Banner answered affirmatively. He pointed out the originally approved driveway from Thompson Run Road. He reported after discussion with PennDOT and the municipality they submitted a highway occupancy permit application to request a driveway from Frey Road. He explained there will be fence 40 feet from Frey Road so there will be plenty of room for two vehicles to queue. He indicated there would be a card reader.

Mr. D'Agostino inquired whether it would be accessible 24 hours a day, seven days a week and Mr. Banner answered negatively. He reported the hours would be 6 a.m. to 10 p.m.

Mr. Grysiak questioned whether the municipality received any comments and Mr. Whealdon answered negatively.

There being no further discussion, Mrs. Wilkins duly made a motion to approve Application No. 22-3-A and Mr. Gaydos seconded it. Upon a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Furthermore, Mr. Grysiak duly made a motion to approve Application No. 22-4-A and Mrs. Wilkins seconded it. Upon a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

22-5-A  
HENDERSON

The applicant is requesting a variance from Table 201 A, Permitted Uses, Conditional Uses, Yard and Area Requirements of the Monroeville Zoning Ordinance, No. 1443, as amended to construct a residential home that will encroach 10 feet into the required 30 feet front yard building setback along Jamison Lane. The property address is 166 Jamison Lane, Tax Parcel 639-M-097, in the R-2, One-Family Residential Zoning District.

Mrs. Kimberly Henderson, the applicant, came forward to explain the application. She reported they are proposing to build a house on Jamison Lane and she showed a plan of what it would look like. She reported there is an easement in the back yard and they designed their house to meet the requirements. She explained the manhole should be in the middle of the easement or 7 ½ feet but it is 2 ½ feet outside of the easement. She reported their request is for a variance to move the house up ten feet. She showed a plan and explained the surveyor staked the property and she pointed out the manhole, and the setback. She showed how the variance would look.

Mr. Whealdon requested she point out the easement and Jamison Lane. Mrs. Henderson pointed out Jamison Lane, the 30-foot setback in blue and the 40-foot setback and the 10 foot. She pointed out the manhole which is located at the butt of the house.

Mr. Grysiak inquired whether she was requesting to pull the house forward and Mrs. Henderson answered affirmatively.

Mr. Scott Lantz, Schumacher Homes, came forward representing the applicant. He reported when they did their initial visit the easement was tight so they designed the house to fit in the easement. He explained once the surveyor laid out the house they noticed the manhole was only five off the corner of the property. He reported the manhole is 17 feet deep and if they put their footer in that area it would put too much pressure on the manhole and potentially the line underneath it. He indicated they are proposing to pull the house up ten feet but they will still have some bad soil conditions on the property on the right-hand side. He stated they are trying to pull that up to help eliminate the pressure on the manhole and on the line down below so they are requesting a 10-foot reduction in the front yard setback.

Mr. Rosipal inquired whether they contacted the Water Authority and Mr. Schumacher reported they have done a PA1 Call and called the Sewer Authority. He stated they brought the tap out of the ground that day before the house is built so there would not be anyone in that deep hole with the structure around it.

Mr. Grysiak questioned whether there were any comments and Mr. Whealdon answered negatively.

There being no further discussion, Mr. Gaydos duly made a motion to approve Application No. 22-5-A and Mr. Grysiak seconded it. Upon a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

#### ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the zoning hearing board, at this time, Mr. D'Agostino duly made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:48 p.m. and Mr. Gaydos seconded it. Upon a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

James Rosipal  
Chairman

JR/sam