

BOROUGH OF CAPE MAY POINT

Planning Board

Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, December 17, 2019 at 7:00 pm

Cape May Point Fire Hall

Pledge of Allegiance

Opening

In compliance with the Open Public Meetings Act, adequate notice of this session has been provided by official announcement in the Star and Wave Newspaper and posting of the scheduled meeting dates on the official Municipal Bulletin Board, 215 Lighthouse Avenue, Borough of Cape May Point, New Jersey.

Roll Call

Present: Mr. Greenberg, Mrs. Busch, Mr. Fraatz, Mr. Keosky, Mr. Hood, Comm. vanHeeswyk, Mr. Casey, Mr. Murphy, Mayor Moffatt, Mr. Yunghans, Mrs. Leming

Absent: None

Also Present: Rhiannon Worthington, Secretary; Mr. Nathan Van Embden, Esq., Attorney

Minutes

The minutes from the November 20, 2019 meeting were postponed for review on a motion by Mr. Greenberg and second by Mr. Fraatz. All present voted aye except for Mayor Moffatt, Mr. Yunghans and Mrs. Leming who abstained.

Business

1. Mayor Moffatt read a statement (enclosed) to the Board and public.
2. Hearing for Application PB2019-03: 323 Brainard Avenue, Block 11, Lot 10.02
 - i. Mr. Hood recused himself due to owning a residence within 200 feet of the subject property.
 - ii. Applicant: Mr. Michael Thompson of 410 Pavilion Condominium Association
 - iii. Applicant's Representative: Mr. Jeffrey Barnes, Esq. of Barnes Law Group LLC, 117 E 17th Avenue in Wildwood NJ.
 - iv. Applicant's Professional: Mr. John Helbig of Guzzi Engineering, 203 South Main Street in Cape May Court House NJ.
 - v. Mr. Barnes stated the following:
 - i. The units are on an irregular lot.
 - ii. The property is managed by a condominium association created in the late 1990s and contains 2 units. Unit A, a one-story dwelling, is owned by Eliza and Matthew Taylor; unit B, a 1.5 story dwelling, is owned by Michael Thompson and the estate of Mary R. Thompson. Each unit as part of the condominium association has 50% interest in common elements.
 - iii. The applicant is seeking relief to construct a shed to replace an existing shed. The applicant attempted to replace the shed instead of repair the shed or replace with a Rubbermaid unit and violated zoning requirements. Work ceased on the shed pending determination from the board. Both units exceed permitted coverages.
 - iv. 323 Brainard Avenue requires variances for existing conditions as follows:
 - i. Less than 15' from the street
 - ii. Less than 10' between structures
 - iii. Exceeds permitted building and lot coverages
 - v. The request does not exacerbate existing non-conformities as it replaces exactly what existed previously and improves the property with a more aesthetically pleasing structure.

- vi. Mr. Thompson was sworn and testified the following:
 - i. Mr. Barnes distributed a picture of the property, labeled Exhibit A-1, which Mr. Thompson confirmed was the property at the time of purchase in 2016.
 - ii. Property was purchased January 30, 2016 and the homeowner has been updating the property since. Property consists of the neighboring home, a smaller one bedroom, Cape Cod style structure, and the resident's home, a quirky three-story structure with a porch on the third floor. The property has not been utilized as a rental property since purchase in 2016.
 - iii. The homeowner demolished the existing shed, which was in condition beyond repair, assuming that if the foundation remained, the structure would not require variance or permit for replacement.
 - iv. The existing structure was 9' x 9' with a height between 9'-10' on a wood foundation. Roof was asphalt shingle, siding/walls were T1-11 and there was a door for entry.
 - v. The proposed structure would be same dimensions and height on remaining foundation with new plywood. Roof will be asphalt shingle and siding/walls will be T1-11. New door for entry and a window to be added for ventilation and sunlight.
 - vi. The structure serves as a privacy barrier for the neighbor/adjacent unit.
 - i. Mr. Van Embden noted this also benefits the neighbor as well as the applicant.
 - vii. The condominium association supports the proposed construction.
- vii. Mr. Helbig's qualifications were reviewed and he was accepted by the Board as an expert witness. He was sworn and testified the following:
 - i. Guzzi Engineering was retained to complete the required updated property survey.
 - ii. Mr. Helbig referenced the plan survey submitted with the application when discussing neighborhood and surrounding properties. He summarized characteristics of the property and surrounding areas, noting that that the subject property is similar to surrounding properties – single family homes with detached sheds, a lot of vegetation and aesthetics. He also noted that there is a 12' vegetation buffer in the right of way which keeps the shed from being near the street while being close to the edge of property and right of way.
 - iii. Stated that the C-1 variance (hardship) was the irregular lot. Due to the lot size and shape an accessory structure cannot exist on the lot without a variance, creating an exceptional situation with practical difficulties.
 - iv. Stated that the C-2 variance (positive criteria) was met as follows:
 - i. Item I – promotes a positive visual environment
 - ii. Item G – there is sufficient space in an appropriate location for this use
 - iii. Item M – land use procedures which aim to make land use more efficient
 - v. The end goal of the project is that the property will be more compatible with the neighborhood which one of the strongest purposes of zoning. The structure will be more aesthetically pleasing, no additional clearing of vegetation and the noise/visual barrier that existed for neighbors will be maintained.
 - vi. Understands the concern of exceeding permitted coverages, however, he does not feel the proposed variance imposes concerns or issues of large-scale development, which is what coverage limitations are intended to manage.
 - vii. Overall does not feel there are any detriments to the project.
- viii. Board Questions and Comments
 - i. Mr. Keosky asked about property ownership, clarifying ownership by the Kubiak family.
 - i. Mr. Thompson clarified that the Taylor family had purchased both units from the Kubiak family. When the mother of the Taylor family passed away, one of her children bought out the other two to buy one of the units, and the other was sold as part of the estate and purchased by Mr. and Mrs. Thompson.
 - ii. Mr. Keosky asked if a permit was obtained prior to demolishing the shed.
 - i. Mr. Casey indicated that due to size of shed (less than 200 square feet) a permit was not required.
 - ii. There was discussion as to why a variance was needed and it was confirmed that the Zoning Official felt the variance was needed not due to lack of permit but existing non-conformities, such as distance from the street and the like.

- iii. Mr. Casey read from the ordinance, arguing that he did not feel a variance or permit was necessary here because of the applicant's intent to not further exacerbate the existing non-conformities by altering the structure. Comm. vanHeeswyk agreed however indicated historically, once the structure was removed so was the non-conformity and therefore the ordinance Mr. Casey was referencing did not apply.
 - iv. Mr. Barnes and Mr. Van Embden agreed to proceed per Mr. McGraw's determination. Mr. Barnes confirmed that the applicant has applied for appropriate relief per this determination.
 - iii. Mr. Fraatz asked about Mr. Helbig's reference to the front of house facing Pavilion Circle.
 - i. Mr. Helbig responded that from a planning perspective it would appear that the front of the home, however, the front of the house would be determined formally by the homeowner or someone else.
 - ii. Mr. Keosky advised that the front of the home or address is determined by the location of the front door. There was discussion about where the front door on the property was located since the address is Brainard Avenue and not Pavilion; however it was not determined and deemed unimportant.
 - iv. Comm. vanHeeswyk asked Mr. Helbig about statement that the shed on the neighboring property is on the property line.
 - i. Mr. Helbig responded that he did not survey the adjacent property and could not provide an exact dimension, however it was close to the property line. He agreed it may be 5' away.
 - v. Mrs. Busch asked for clarification as to why 10' is required between structures, as she recalls from previous discussions it may be related to fire and emergency access.
 - i. Mr. Keosky stated the Zoning Official has said the two are not related.
 - ii. Comm. vanHeeswyk responded that is the fire code. Fire code is not addressed in zoning ordinances; however, the intent may be there unstated.
 - iii. Mr. Casey referenced the Master Plan, where general purpose of separation is to promote open air and light.
 - vi. Comm. vanHeeswyk made a general statement about the property itself; questioning how it had been constructed at all considering part of one of the units extends into the Borough right of way. Although it has been questioned whether variance is necessary for this project due to the existing conditions, it is expected that the Zoning Official review all projects thoroughly and consistently, which she believes she was done here.
 - vii. Comm. vanHeeswyk asked about the location of the trash containers on adjacent property. She feels that although the trash cans in the right of way belong to the other unit, they are part of the condominium association responsibility, which the applicant is part of.
 - i. Mr. Fraatz referenced the deed's delineation of limited common elements within the condo association.
 - ii. Mr. Barnes further explained to the Board members the difference between common elements and limited common elements, and how the latter pertains to the usage.
 - iii. Mr. Keosky mentioned that as a fireman, Brainard Avenue is one of the most difficult streets to navigate within the Borough and moving the referenced trash containers further on the property would help clear more room for emergency vehicles. He added that this comment in no way reflects on the applicant as they are not trash containers for his unit.
 - viii. Mr. Murphy asked for confirmation of the size of the shed, as it has been referenced as 9' x 9' throughout the hearing, but the survey indicates it is 9.9' x 9.9'.
 - i. Mr. Helbig advised that they survey was taken of the exterior of the shed and was correct per the survey. He noted that the interior measurement may have been closer to 9' x 9'.
 - ix. Mayor Moffatt indicated he has received correspondence from neighbors in support of the variance.
- ix. Public Comment
 - i. Public comment was opened at 7:55 pm on a motion by Comm. vanHeeswyk and second by Mr. Greenberg.
 - ii. Beth Bretherick – 408 Pavilion Avenue CMP
 - i. Supports variance request.
 - ii. Explained why the address is Brainard even though “front door” is on Pavilion – at one time her property and the subject property were both considered 408 Pavilion. The Borough asked

the owner at the time (Kubiak family) if it was acceptable to change the address to Brainard to separate the properties.

- iii. Pete Manzo – 313 Brainard Avenue CMP
 - i. Supports variance request.
 - ii. Noted that the shed contributes to the privacy of the property as the homeowners contribute to the community with their updates of the structure.
 - iv. Public comment was closed at 8:00 pm on a motion by Comm. vanHeeswyk and second by Mr. Casey.
 - x. Mr. Casey asked for the addition of request for C-1 variance. Mr. Barnes agreed. Mr. Van Embden confirmed that the published public notice was adequate to incorporate this modification to the application.
 - xi. There was discussion confirming the shed dimensions, both walls and height, which was proposed at 10' but determined may be higher to peak of structure.
 - xii. Comm. vanHeeswyk asked that a condition be added regarding movement of the trash containers for the other unit be moved up towards the structure, consistent with zoning ordinance.
 - i. Mr. Casey suggested that Borough use code enforcement to address trash container storage location.
 - ii. Mr. Barnes noted that the approval from the condo association was specific to “the project” of the shed and expressed concern about increasing the scope.
 - iii. Mrs. Busch asked about who would receive the violation from the Zoning Officer for the trash containers. Comm. vanHeeswyk stated the condo association would, however, Mr. Fraatz stated that the master deed indicates such a violation would go to the unit owner.
 - iv. There was significant discussion and the consensus was that trash containers for the adjacent property were not appropriate for inclusion in this variance as they are not the responsibility of this property owner or the condo association.
 - xiii. Mr. Van Embden requested a motion in the affirmative to approve installation of a 9.9' x 9.9' shed structure on an existing wood foundation, with a maximum height of no more than 12' at the peak, inclusive of all ancillary variances created by removal of the existing shed.
 - i. Motion was made by Mr. Keosky and second by Mr. Casey. All present voted aye.
3. Historic Preservation Subcommittee Update
- i. Mr. Yunghans provided the Board members with a package, including a subcommittee update (enclosed), summarizing the information obtained by them to date with possible options for action, should the Board choose to recommend creation of a Historic Preservation Commission to the Commissioners.
 - i. Mr. Casey asked for clarification on what Mr. Yunghans means when he says things are possible but may not be legal.
 - i. Mr. Yunghans stated that there are plenty of ideas and once those that are determined to be most possible are determined, they can then be reviewed in the legal sense as enforceable and doable. His impression is that local municipalities have a lot of flexibility regarding historic preservation, if state law is not violated.
 - ii. There was brief discussion regarding some of the documents enclosed in the package.
 - iii. Mrs. Busch stated that at a previous council work session where demolition waiting periods were discussed, the solicitor indicated that an HPC would have to be formed before such an ordinance could be adopted.
 - i. Mr. Yunghans did not agree.
 - ii. Mr. Van Embden said he believed the argument was that the borough cannot infringe on someone's right to modify their property without an ordinance dictating the requirement and adding the creation of an HPC would require changes to zoning ordinance. However, he also stated that if something was enacted to delay demolitions while the HPC review occurs, there could be a sudden increase in property demolitions by homeowners trying to avoid future restrictions. He summarized that he understands both sides and unfortunately is not able to provide a finite answer regarding this question.
 - ii. Comm. vanHeeswyk informed the Board that copies of previously completed reports regarding historic properties within Cape May Point had been located and provided to Mrs. Worthington. Mrs. Worthington will scan and distribute this information, file size permitting, to all Board members. The Board would be notified when the hard copies were available at the municipal offices for viewing.

- i. Comm. vanHeeswyk feels the Borough has the data needed for properties that remain since the 2008 assessment to determine what would be considered historic, it's a matter of determining how historic is determined and by whom.
 - iii. Mr. Greenberg asked the Board if it was acceptable that Mr. Kinney provide a presentation on Historic Preservation at the January 15, 2020 meeting. The Board agreed.
 - iv. There was discussion of videotaping Mr. Kinney's presentation and the fee for it to be completed by a professional videographer. It was agreed that this would be most effective way to ensure all aspects of the presentation (visual and auditory) were preserved for future viewing. Mr. Greenberg made a motion to request the Commissioners provide a professional videographer to record the meeting and post to the borough website and Mr. Keosky second. All present voted aye.
 - v. Mr. Hood asked the Commissioners to review what is possible regarding a demolition moratorium. He noted that presently the Borough is losing one historic property each month.
 - i. Mayor Moffatt and Comm. vanHeeswyk responded that it had been discussed at the work session that afternoon and they were not proceeding based on advice from the Borough Solicitor.
 - ii. Mr. Greenberg made a motion to request that the Commissioners revisit the demolition topic, obtaining legal advice regarding what may or may not be done relating to the extension of demolition permit application review and Mr. Murphy second. All present voted aye except for Mayor Moffatt and Comm. vanHeeswyk who abstained.
 - vi. Mr. Hood asked about the location of a binder created by Historic Preservation subcommittee for the Commissioners. Mr. Yunghans indicated he had the binder and would drop off to the municipal offices for the Commissioners after some clean up.
 - vii. Mr. Keosky thanked Mr. Yunghans and all the members of the subcommittee for their work on this subject.
4. Exterior Lighting Discussion
- i. Discussion was postponed on a motion by Mayor Moffatt and second by Mr. Yunghans. All present voted aye.
5. Joint Insurance Fund (JIF) Land Use Liability Training
- i. Mr. Van Embden confirmed that the training was completed prior to the start of the meeting for members who were not present at the November meeting.
 - ii. These board members signed group affidavit, certifying attendance.
6. Mrs. Busch expressed concern about social media comments being made by Planning Board members and/or spouses, particularly those which name specific Board members, and requested Board members discuss consider this and discuss with other household members before making these public comments.
- i. Mr. Greenberg stated there has been significant obstruction and to the historic preservation process since inception and that these constant conflicts have delayed progress. He listed examples of times that he feels Mr. Casey has impeded progress for the subcommittee, specifically referencing discussion of the historic preservation community survey and demolition delay. Mr. Greenberg stated that it was inappropriate for Board members to receive information about the Board or Council from other sources. Mr. Greenberg asked Mr. Casey and any other board member to contact him immediately and directly regarding any questions or concerns that can or should be resolved individually, to minimize the effect these conflicts are having on the Board and ability to accomplish the tasks before them. In closing Mr. Greenberg apologized to Mrs. Busch for what she had experienced. He indicated he is not aware of what is going on with social media as referenced by Mrs. Busch but asked that it be stopped immediately so the Board can continue to work together.
 - i. Mr. Casey noted that he does not accept Mr. Greenberg's open criticism, acknowledging many of his comments were directed towards him. He reiterated the references he made at the time the conflicts occurred and noted that, although Mr. Greenberg is agreeing with him now, his position was different at the time. He suggested that everyone calm down and proceed in a professional manner. Mr. Casey noted that although the subcommittee was formed in February, all that the Board has received for their efforts was the package provided this evening and he does not feel it is appropriate to place the blame for that delay on other people. Mr. Casey acknowledged that he does not participate in social media; however, he is sure that if a comment was made to include and upset Mrs. Busch, he would likely find it inappropriate as well.
 - ii. Mr. Greenberg responded that he disagrees with Mr. Casey's assessment of the subcommittee, who has completed all tasks in good faith towards an end. He acknowledged that some of the objections

made are credible, but some are trivial in nature. Mr. Greenberg gave Mr. Casey credit and thanked him for his work as the Chair of the noise and construction subcommittee. Said that he has not had this type of interaction with a board member in the past and as it is distasteful for Mr. Casey, it is for himself, and he would like it to stop. He suggested they speak directly instead of addressing at public meetings.

- ii. Mayor Moffatt and Mr. Keosky expressed a desire to start fresh in 2020, with new efforts for everyone to get along.
- iii. Comm. vanHeeswyk expressed support for Mrs. Busch's experience as she has seen much of this on social media herself among members of the community.

Public Comment

1. Public comment was opened at 9:00 pm on a motion by Mr. Keosky and second by Mayor Moffatt.
2. Mary Kelly – 421 Cambridge Avenue CMP
 - i. Thanked the Board for addressing all of the concerns of the community.
 - ii. Requested consideration of expansion and restriction of grading on all properties, not just historic properties or properties adjacent to historic properties. Feels this will address flooding concerns as well as reduction in vegetation due to construction. Understands budget and schedule constraints, however, she suggested that the additional work associated with addressing the grading concerns be consolidated into the Zoning Officer's responsibilities.
 - iii. Requested clarification about statements made by Mr. Casey and Mr. Van Embden during the hearing which seemed to indicate the Zoning Officer's interpretation may not have been appropriate and a variance may not have been necessary.
 - i. Mr. Van Embden stated that he was sympathetic to the sentiment; however, the Zoning Officer's interpretation is the bottom line.
 - ii. Mr. Casey confirmed that she accurately understood his position.
 - iv. Asked if the Board could have provided an interpretation of the ordinance absent the applicant applying for variance relief.
 - i. Mr. Van Embden stated that Land Use Board's do not interpret ordinances. The applicant could have applied for interpretation but by applying for variance, they were able to obtain the relief they needed. An interpretation could have resulted in an incremental step in the process, which could have eventually required the applicant to apply for a variance anyway.
3. Jamie Goren – 219 Stites Avenue CMP
 - i. Co-founder of Journal of Cape May Point
 - ii. Asked if existing historical surveys would be viable for use currently.
 - i. Comm. vanHeeswyk reiterated her earlier comment regarding her belief that the property information was accurate, but a historic professional would need to review the info to determine what is still applicable now.
 - ii. Mrs. Goren asked about starting the process to retain that individual.
 - iii. Comm. vanHeeswyk indicated that action steps regarding historic preservation would not be taken prior to the NJDEP presentation.
 - iii. Asked how many board members have historic homes.
 - i. Board discussion indicated that generally homes were classified historic if they were constructed more than 50 years ago but the Borough would ultimately determine, with creation of an HPC, what the time frame and other parameters would be.
 - ii. Mr. Hood indicated there are several lists, including one compiled himself, regarding ages of structures within the Borough, which the subcommittee and Board intend to use. He noted that he has not been to a meeting since February where someone mentions that historic preservation has been discussed before and was not approved.
 - i. Comm. vanHeeswyk confirmed this topic has been discussed previously, however, the public consistently expressed that it was not desirable.
 - ii. Mr. Hood requested it be noted that he believes the public support will be different this time.

4. Carol Hood – 504 Cape Avenue CMP
 - i. Stated that she was the person who wrote the social media post discussed by the board members during the meeting. She explained that the post was regarding a recent demolition and the post had 500 comments of concerned citizens.
 - i. Mrs. Goren explained that her comments were intended to address the harshness and obstruction occurring on the Board.
 - ii. Mrs. Busch stated that she did not feel it was productive for either of them to contribute to it.
5. Public comment was closed at 9:14 pm on a motion by Mr. Casey and second by Mayor Moffatt.

Board Information

1. Mayor Moffatt asked when the Fire Company Dinner was scheduled. It was confirmed to be on January 17, 2020.
2. Mr. Casey asked about Planning Board capability to interpret ordinance.
 - i. Mr. Van Embden responded that it is a function of the Planning Board; however, it must be applied for by the applicant.
 - ii. Comm. vanHeeswyk responded that she feels a variance is better for the purposes of zoning than an interpretation because a variance only affects the subject property while an interpretation can modify the ordinance from that point forward.
 - iii. Mr. Van Embden reminded all present that applicants are free to request an interpretation and/or variance as they feel is appropriate.
3. Mr. Fraatz asked if the board would be reviewing the capital budget plan for consistency with the Master Plan.
 - i. Comm. vanHeeswyk and Mr. Van Embden confirmed it was within the Board's jurisdiction to do so.
 - ii. Mr. Fraatz requested a copy be provided to the Board for review once available.
4. Mrs. Worthington informed board members that the annual mandatory board member training to be held at Cape May County Technical High School was scheduled for February 22, 2020. She did not believe there was anyone on the board who required training at this time.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 9:17 pm on the motion by Mayor Moffatt. All present voted aye.

Respectfully Submitted by:
Rhiannon Worthington
Board Secretary
Approved by Board 1/15/2020

Mayor Moffatt Statement:

At Tuesday's work session, I had the opportunity to thank the efforts of the Environmental Commission. I also want to acknowledge the Friends of Lake Lily for their time and efforts on behalf of Cape May Point.

Considering recent events and concerns and many public discussions, I think it is appropriate for me to say a few words about the Planning/Zoning Board. As you know, all members of the Board serve at the pleasure of the Mayor and were appointed by me and ratified by all the Commissioners.

I am heartened by the commitment to the welfare of the Cape May Point community shown by the members of the Board. I am pleased that the Board has addressed the issues of drainage/grading, construction/noise and is in the process of addressing historic preservation under the leadership of Gregg Greenberg and Mike Keosky. Mr. Greenberg and Mr. Keosky were appointed in 2018 and unanimously elected by the Board to their position.

The Chair created subcommittees to address the three issues noted earlier. Mike Keosky was named Chair of the drainage/grading subcommittee, Kevin Casey, Chair of the construction/noise subcommittee and David Yunghans, Chair of the historic preservation subcommittee. The appointment of the Chairs and their subcommittee members was done to encourage participation by all members of the Planning/Zoning Board. I would like to express my support and confidence in the Board under Gregg Greenberg and want to sincerely thank all members for their service and giving their time and effort when it's not always easy. Thank you.

Mayor Robert Moffatt VMD

To review, we have consulted with the New Jersey department of environmental protection, specifically the division of Historic Preservation. We have also looked at like and in-kind communities and their response. To remind those present, previous efforts to have an historic preservation were turned down by this community. Following are our suggestions for planning board discussion.

Suggestions:

Suggestion 1. The commissioners create an ordinance that prohibits tear downs for a period of 180 days, with an option to renew that ordinance for an additional 180 days.

Suggestion 2. Loop the planning board into the process of issuing a permit for a tear-down.

Suggestion 3. Ask the planning board to create a permanent HPC team in accordance with state law.

Suggestion 4. Create a voluntary HPC for the homeowners of Cape May Point based on the 2016 Cape May County Circuit Rider. (See attachment)

Create a ***VOLUNTARY HPC PROGRAM*** for Cape May Point

The 2016 Cape May Circuit Rider provides us with a list of properties in Cape May Point that may be considered historic. We suggest that these property owners be contacted in writing and be asked if they would voluntarily participate in an HPC program for Cape May Point.

The benefits of being a voluntary program could be:

1. Transferrable property tax abatement over a five-year period.
2. The neighboring properties to you on the left, right and rear of your property may not build or rebuild a structure greater than 2 feet higher than your property without written approval of the zoning officer, the planning board, and your neighbors within a 100 yard radius.
3. Neighboring new construction may not change the grade of their project without written approval of the zoning officer and planning board.
4. Neighboring new construction must adhere or all current zoning laws and ordinances.
5. Your existing home, once voluntarily tagged as HPC, may receive certain physical considerations in exchange for the designation.
 - a. An example may be: Relaxing FAR ratios for HPC home to accommodate a new shed or outdoor storage area. Other considerations may reveal themselves during the discussion process and will be considered as these suggestions are made.

Summary:

We have learned that Cape May Point property owners historically have rejected HPC proposals in the past for potential fear of being told what the 'can or cannot' do to improve their home. Our objective here is to re-ignite HPC thinking for Cape May Point and to understand whether or not the majority of homeowners are in favor of such a project. The answer to this and other questions may be a ballot issue. We do strongly recommend the implementation of a process to better control outside development and new construction immediately. It would be wise to have Jonathan Kinney come and educate this board on January 15th. Residents are always welcome.