

CHATHAM BOROUGH ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
February 24, 20217:30 p.m.

Chairman Michael A. Cifelli called this Regular Meeting of the Zoning Board of Adjustment to order at 7:30 p.m. This was a virtual meeting. Board members, Attorney Dwyer, and the applicants were present by way of Zoom. Mr. Cifelli stated that adequate notices for this Board of Adjustment meeting were given as required by the Open Public Meetings Act.

Names	Present	Absent
Michael A. Cifelli, Chrmn.	X	
Frederick Infante	X	
Douglas Herbert	X	
H.H. Montague	X	
Jean-Eudes Haeringer	X	
Patrick Tobia	X	
Joseph Treloar	X	
David DeGidio	X	
Peter Hoffman	X	
Patrick Dwyer, Esq.	X	

Public Comment

Amanda Stent, 10 Meadow Rd., stated that she had 6 questions for the representatives for the Verizon application tonight. Following the advice of Chrmn. Cifelli and Attorney Dwyer, Ms. Stent agreed to hold her questions until the Verizon application is actually before the Board.

Resolution #ZB 2021-01

The minutes of the January 27, 2021 Zoning Bd. of Adjustment meeting were approved as amended.

Resolutions

Application ZB #20-016

Matthew & Kimberly Auer

89 Summit Avenue

Block 125 Lot: 27

Maximum Principal Building Coverage

Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage

Rear Yard Setback

Exterior Side Setback (Intensified)

Side Yard Set

Front Yard Setback (Intensified)

Attorney Dwyer summarized this application which proposed a two-story addition to an existing one family home. The home is located on an undersized corner lot, and sits at an angle, which triggered a number of variances. The Board felt that the benefits of the application outweighed the detriments, and approved the variances. A roll call vote was taken to approve the resolution confirming the Board's approval of Application ZB #20-016:

Chrmn. Cifelli	-	yes
Mr. Herbert	-	yes
Mr. Haeringer	-	yes
Mr. Infante	-	yes
Mr. Hoffman	-	yes
Mr. Tobia	-	yes

Application # ZB 20-014
Sadie Lane Properties, LLC
1 Ellers Drive
Block 33 Lot 44
Ext. Side Yard Setback (Weston) Left
Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage
Floor Area Ratio

Attorney Dwyer summarized this application which proposed to enlarge a single family home which sits on an oversized corner lot. The Board felt the lot could handle the increase in size, and granted the variance. A roll call vote was taken to approve the resolution confirming the Board's approval of Application ZB # 20-014:

Mr. Tobia	-	yes
Mr. Hoffman	-	yes
Mr. Infante	-	yes
Mr. Haeringer	-	yes
Mr. Herbert	-	yes
Chrmn. Cifelli	-	yes

Application #ZB 20-020
Daniel Handerhan
9 Pihlman Place
Block: 113 Lot 7
Side Yard Setback – Left
Rear Yard Setback
Maximum Principal Building Coverage
Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage

Attorney Dwyer summarized this application which proposed to construct a deck at the rear of an existing home and to construct a room underneath the deck. The Board heard testimony that the proposed rear deck and room will face the railroad tracks. The Board granted all the variances being sought, as well as a variance for a newly created third story. A roll call vote was taken to approve the resolution confirming the Board's approval of Application #ZB 20-020:

Mr. Tobia	-	yes
Mr. Hoffman	-	yes
Mr. Infante	-	yes
Mr. Haeringer	-	yes

Mr. Herbert - yes
Chrmn. Cifelli - yes

Returning and New Applications

Chrmn. Cifelli announced that the following applications will be heard tonight, time permitting:

Application #ZB 20-019: Cronin/Smith: 23 Broadview Terrace
Application #ZB 20-021: Murnane: 12 Elm Place
Application #ZB 20-017: Rodino: 24 Kings Road
Application #ZB 20-018: Verizon Wireless: Brooklake Road

The attorney for Verizon Wireless respectfully requested that his client's application be heard at a separate Zoning Bd. of Adjustment meeting. Chrmn. Cifelli stated that at the 9 p.m. break in the meeting, a possible meeting date can be decided on. The Board secretary has to find out what nights the Council Chambers will not be reserved for other meetings.

Application # ZB 20-019

Tara Cronin & Charles Smith

23 Broadview Terrace

Block: 97, Lot 15

Side Yard Setback – Left

Maximum Principal Building Coverage

The following were sworn in to testify:

Tara Cronin & Charles Smith, the applicants

John Lyons, the architect

Mr. Lyons submitted his professional credentials to the Board. The Board accepted them.

Ms. Cronin gave an introductory statement. She and her husband are looking to update and enlarge their home. They are proposing to add a mudroom and a small addition to the kitchen. There will be a small addition to the upstairs. Mr. Smith testified that the house is 70 years old.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked how many bedrooms and bathrooms currently exist in the home.

Ms. Cronin answered 4 bedrooms and 2 ½ bathrooms.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked for more details on the proposed mudroom. Ms. Cronin answered that the mudroom will be located behind the garage. It will be only one floor. Ms. Cronin and Mr. Smith are proposing to expand the kitchen. The kitchen is of a 1950s style. Up above the kitchen, with the expansion, there will be an enlarged bathroom and more living space.

Mr. Lyons put the application's site plan up on the Zoom screen. He arranged for the existing site plan and the proposed site plan to be next to each other. Mr. Lyons testified that the applicant's lot is shaped slightly irregular. The shaded area on the proposed site plan are the proposed additions.

Referring to the zoning chart for the application, Mr. Lyons reviewed the variances being sought. He pointed out the existing non-conformities of the existing home. The plans are under on lot coverage and FAR. There are no building height issues. Chrmn. Cifelli confirmed with Mr. Lyons that only two variances were being sought.

Mr. Lyons reviewed the first floor plans, existing and proposed. A porch roof will be added over the existing front door. Off of the back of the existing garage, a mudroom and pantry will be added. A deck will be constructed off the back of the kitchen. On the second floor, the existing 4 bedrooms will remain. The space for the expansion of the kitchen, will be used on the second floor for a master bedroom. There will be minimal changes to the front of the house. Mr. Lyons explained why the garage roof must be slightly raised.

Mr. Lyons referred the Board to the rear elevation. He pointed out the existing sunroom, which is an existing non-conformity, and will remain as is.

Mr. Lyons testified that concerns about storm water run-off were expressed by neighbors. To address these concerns, the applicants reached out to a civil engineer and also met with Mr. DeNave, the Borough Engineer. They all had met on site and discussed ways to control the water.

Mr. Lyons submitted Exhibit A-1: Preliminary Drainage Plan dated 02-18-2021. This plan had been submitted to Mr. DeNave last week. Mr. Lyons described the topography of the applicant's property. The applicant's civil engineer advised that all the underground drain pipe water and down spouts should be directed towards the street. A lawn inlet would be installed. Re-grading will be done at the back of the home.

Chrmn. Cifelli noted that the term "Preliminary" is used for this Drainage Plan. Is there an intention to revise the Plan to become a final plan?

Mr. Lyons answered yes.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked if Mr. DeNave had requested any changes to this Plan, or has he approved it?

Mr. Lyons answered that no denials or revisions have been received yet from Mr. DeNave.

Mr. Lyons answered no. No revisions or denials have been received yet from Mr. DeNave.

Mr. Haeringer asked Mr. Lyons if he is aware of any springs in the area of the applicant's home.

Mr. Lyons answered no. The applicants are aware of the water running downhill. They are trying to control what is on their property, water-wise.

Mr. Haeringer asked if the applicants had talked with their neighbors about this water situation.

Mr. Smith answered yes. Their neighbors had reached out to them. Mr. Smith and Ms. Cronin let them know that they are working with a civil engineer to draw up a plan to remedy the water problem.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked Attorney Dwyer if a condition could be included, if the application was approved, and the Preliminary Drainage Plan was included, to still allow the Borough Engineer to make changes to the plan.

Attorney Dwyer answered that in the past, the Board has delegated the final say on drainage to the Borough Engineer.

Mr. Lyons testified that this Preliminary Drainage Plan was discussed on site with Mr. DeNave, the Borough Engineer. However, Mr. DeNave did not officially approve the drainage plan at that time.

Chrmn. Cifelli reminded Mr. Lyons that there is always a stipulation, if a Zoning Board application is approved, the applicants have to follow all directives on stormwater made by the Borough Engineer.

Mr. Haeringer asked if a temporary drainage plan will be in place during the construction phase?

Mr. Lyons answered that temporary above ground drainpipes could be installed during construction.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked if testimony could be given on the bulk variances. He asked how close the applicant's house is to the neighboring properties. Also, what would the streetscape look like should the application be approved?

Mr. Lyons explained that he and the applicants did not plan to build the addition over the garage and sunroom. Such an arrangement would be intensifying a non-conformity. It would be overbearing to the neighboring properties. Putting the addition at the rear of the applicant's house, would be less intrusive to the neighbors. Mr. Lyons described the buffers that existed on the applicants' property.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked if there were any photos of the neighborhood. He was interested in seeing the distance between the homes.

Ms. Cronin testified that one neighbor at 178 Fairmount Ave. has an ease way all the way to Broadview Terrace. Mr. Smith testified that this particular neighbor is several hundred feet away from his home, and is up a hill. Chrmn. Cifelli then confirmed with the applicants and Mr. Lyons that what is being proposed will not impact the light, open air, open space of the neighbors.

Mr. Herbert asked if there was any foliage between the applicant's home and the neighbor on Fairmount Avenue.

Mr. Lyons pointed out the existing line of evergreen trees. The applicants testified that they had no plans to remove these trees during construction. Mr. Lyons pointed out one tree on the property which may have to be removed in order to create a swell for the water.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked for more testimony regarding the improvements for the kitchen.

Referring to the first floor plan, Mr. Lyons described the existing kitchen. It measures 13 ft. 6 inches by 11 feet. With these measurements, there is not enough room for cabinets by today's standards. A kitchen island could not be created. There is an existing fireplace that cannot be removed for the kitchen expansion. The mudroom is needed to serve as a buffer for people entering from the garage, going towards the kitchen. Upstairs, the existing 4 bedrooms are relatively small.

Summing up the application, Mr. Lyons testified that the variance relief, if granted, would not have a substantial detriment to the public good. It would not have a negative impact to the Borough's zone plan. It will be appropriate for the existing neighborhood.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked if the public had any questions for Mr. Lyons or the applicants.

Gene and Grace Foca, 29 Broadview Terrace, indicated that they had questions. Mr. Foca noted that his property is two lots below the applicant's.

Mr. Foca stated he was under the impression that this application included a basement. He noted that his property already receives significant flooding from the two properties above the applicant's property. Mr. Foca asked Mr. Lyons if he could explain why a swale and a single yard drain would be able to handle the displaced water caused by the proposed basement expansion. Would it be better to install a side external French drain to direct the water towards the street?

Mr. Lyons testified that there will be a basement underneath the kitchen. An external and internal footing drain will be installed that would connect into the basement, and help drain the water away, re-directing it to the street.

Mr. Foca thanked Mr. Smith and Ms. Cronin for addressing this drainage issue.

Mr. Herbert asked Mr. Lyons if the finished basement and proposed crawl space have anything to do with water? Will it impact the water being drained onto the other properties?

Mr. Lyons answered no, it shouldn't. He felt the proposed drainage items will improve the existing drainage conditions.

Mr. Herbert asked if these proposed basement area will have French drains, or will it have a sump pump?

Mr. Lyons answered sump pumps will be installed. They will be brought out to the front lawn, going downhill, close to the street. There will also be a gravel area on the front lawn. The applicants testified that Belgian block curbing runs all the way down from their home.

The public had no further questions for Mr. Lyons.

The Board had no further questions for Mr. Lyons.

Mr. Lyons closed the application and submitted it to the Board for their consideration and vote.

The public had no comments on the application.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked for comments from the Board. Mr. Herbert believed the proposed addition was of a modest size. He felt the applicant chose the best side of the house to construct the addition. Mr. Infante felt that the benefits outweighed the detriments. He agreed with Mr. Herbert that the variances were modest in size. Mr. Tobia acknowledged the drainage issues with this application; however, the Board will trust the Borough Engineer will help the applicants deal with this situation. Mr. Hoffman stated that he initially had concerns about the proposed intensification on the left hand side of the house; however, the testimony cleared things up. Basic functionality and improvements will be done to this 70 year old home. Mr. Haeringer did not believe the addition will visually impact the neighborhood. It will add value to the neighborhood. Mr. Treloar and Mr. DeGidio agreed with the points previously made by Board members. Mr. Treloar was satisfied with the proposed drainage arrangements. Chrmn. Cifelli believed that the 150 sq. ft. being sought, will not affect the light, air, and open space. He felt the only negative criteria is the drainage situation. The applicants will be required to follow the Borough Engineer's stipulations on this situation.

Mr. Infante made a motion to approve Application # ZB 20-019: Cronin & Smith – 23 Broadview Avenue, with the applicant to follow any recommendations the Borough Engineer will give concerning stormwater run-off, also to apply for any tree removal permits if necessary, and to submit a copy of Exhibit A-1 to the Zoning Board Secretary. Mr. Tobia will second the motion. A roll call vote was taken:

Mr. Herbert	-	yes
Mr. Infante	-	yes
Mr. Haeringer	-	yes
Chrmn. Cifelli	-	yes
Mr. Tobia	-	yes
Mr. Hoffman	-	yes
Mr. DeGidio	-	yes

Application # ZB 20-019 was approved.

Application # ZB 20-021
Don & Patricia Murnane

12 Elm Place

Block: 62 Lot 4

Maximum Principal Building Coverage

Board members Jean-Eudes Haeringer and Joseph Treloar recused themselves from this application. Mr. Treloar had received a notification that their homes are within the 200-ft. radius of the application.

The following were sworn in to testify:

Don & Patricia Murnane, the applicants

Janet Siegel, the architect for Mr. & Mrs. Murnane

Ms. Siegel gave her professional credentials to the Board. The Board accepted them.

Mr. Murnane gave an introductory statement for the application. He testified that he and his wife have lived at 12 Elm Place since 1989. Mr. Murnane stated that he and his wife are now in their early 60s. He believed their home is small, by Chatham standards. The house sits at the end of an cul-de-sac very close to Milton Ave. School. In 2006 or 2007, the Murnanes, in answer to an inquiry from then-Mayor Plambeck, bought a portion of the existing paper street. Mr. Murnane and his wife would now like to upgrade their home and make it more livable. For instance, a very steep staircase currently goes into the basement. Mr. Murnane stated that he and his wife would like to have everything on one floor because of their ages. They would also like to expand the garage some and construct a mudroom. Some office space is also being proposed.

At 8:55 p.m. a break was taken in the meeting.

At 9:11 p.m. the meeting resumed.

Chrmn. Cifelli announced that the Verizon Wireless application will not be heard at tonight's meeting. A separate meeting night will be held exclusively for this application. After speaking by Zoom with Verizon's attorney, and consulting with the Board members and professionals, Chrmn. Cifelli settled on a date for the Special Meeting. It was announced that Application # ZB 20-018: Verizon Wireless – Brooklake Road will be heard on Thursday, March 11, 2021, 7:30 p.m. It will be a virtual meeting. The link for this meeting will be posted on the Chatham Borough website.

Russell Stern, a planner and landscape architect from the Borough of Madison, spoke up. Mr. Stern stated that he will be unable to attend the March 11th hearing. He asked if he could meet or have a Zoom call with the applicant to review the concerns of Madison Borough and to give suggestions on how to camouflage the wireless facility.

Chrmn. Cifelli did not have a problem with Mr. Stern's request; however, he suggested that Ms. Lelei, the Zoning Bd.'s planner, be included in the discussion with the applicant. Mr. Stern said he would welcome Ms. Lelei's participation in this discussion.

Chrmn. Cifelli confirmed with Attorney Dwyer that no further notice is needed for this special meeting date: Thursday, March 11, 2021, 7:30 p.m. However, this event will still be posted on the Chatham Borough website.

Application # ZB 20-021: Murnane continued

Ms. Siegel testified that the Murnanes, as previously testified, had annexed their property in 2009. She reviewed the upgrades that Mr. and Mrs. Murnane had proposed to her.

Ms. Siegel testified that the current home has 4 bedrooms. There are two bedrooms downstairs and two small bedroom upstairs. There are two existing bathrooms. Ms. Siegel noted that the plans are proposing a three bedroom house with 2 ½ baths. The house would still have the potential for development without changing the roofline.

Ms. Siegel put on the Zoom screen the details for the proposed building coverage variance being sought by the applicants. She noted that most of the overage for the building coverage variance is because of the two combined porches. The garage also adds to the building coverage. The rear porch and existing house will remain as is. On page A2 of the plans, Ms. Siegel pointed out the basement plan, the first floor existing plan, the second floor plan, and the roof plan.

Ms. Siegel testified that the applicants' home is a simple house with a Cape Cod layout. She believed the house has "good bones". The current stair is in an awkward location, in the middle of the house, and takes up a lot of space in the existing kitchen. Ms. Siegel reviewed the original basement and the original crawlspace. She described the new and improved staircase. There will be one bedroom suite on the first floor, eliminating the two smaller bedrooms. The proposed mudroom will have entrances from the outside and from the garage. The rear of the garage will contain the mudroom, the laundry room, storage area, and a large closet. She reviewed the dimension changes that will be made to the garage.

Ms. Siegel described the proposed second floor. The existing bedroom on the right hand side will remain. Ms. Siegel pointed out the shed dormer which will come out the back of the house. The original ridge line of the house will remain. Ms. Siegel put up a slide of the front elevation with the proposed additions. The proposed bulk will still keep the home at one and a half stories. Ms. Siegel discussed the rear elevation. She explained how it will be minimally impacted by the proposed additions. Ms. Siegel showed a 3-dimension photo of what the home will look like with the proposed additions.

Ms. Siegel submitted Exhibit A-2: a drawing showing the rear elevation with the proposed additions. She also showed recent photos she had taken of the applicant's neighborhood, looking north to show that the applicant's home, with the proposed changes, will blend in well with the rest of the neighborhood.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked Ms. Siegel what was really driving the numbers for the variances. Ms. Siegel explained that there was no way to remove anything from the existing home in order to create a functional garage, ease way, and mudroom at minimum measurements.

Ms. Siegel submitted and described the following:

Exhibit A-3: four slides of the neighboring homes

Exhibit A-4: four slides of the neighborhood homes on the opposite side of the applicant's home

Ms. Siegel concluded that there are numerous two car garages in the neighborhood. Most of them are facing the front, and most are facing the street.

Ms. Siegel showed an aerial view of the applicant's home and neighborhood. She pointed out two homes that were recently constructed in the neighborhood. Ms. Siegel also pointed out the un-developed area which will be the only area impacted by the enlarged garage. This aerial view was submitted as Exhibit A-6.

Ms. Siegel out of the 18 properties within the 200-ft. radius, twelve of these properties have attached garages. Ten are front-facing garages. Ms. Siegel testified that the applicant is keeping the front-faced garage. The applicant is maintaining the ridge line. A front porch is being constructed for safety. In the 200 ft. radius, there are six 1 ½ story homes, which is similar to what the applicant is proposing.

Ms. Siegel reminded the Board that a tear-down had not been considered. Also, a future family will have options to enhance this home even more, if the current proposals were approved and constructed. The proposals will bring the applicant's home up to modern standards. The proposed bulk of the garage will extend towards the pedestrian walkway.

Ms. Siegel again reviewed the proposed garage and its new dimensions.

Chrmn. Cifelli and Ms. Siegel discussed the consistency that will be maintained in the neighborhood if these proposals were achieved. Ms. Siegel noted that the existing house has "good bones" and just needs improvements to give it a new life.

Chrmn. Cifelli recalled that earlier Mr. and Mrs. Murnane had testified that part of the reasons they would like to stay in their home is because they are getting older and single floor living space would be easier on them. Chrmn. Cifelli said unfortunately variances cannot be granted based on personal needs. He asked for more testimony on how the home will be brought up to modern standards, for instance, in the kitchen.

Ms. Siegel testified that "aging in place" in the design of a home is important for all age groups. She explained the actions that will be taken to make the kitchen safer and more up to date. Making the applicant's house into a center hall colonial home will benefit any future owners as well as Mr. and Mrs. Murnane. The new proposed staircase will lead to up to open space that could be turned into a rec area for a future owner with children.

Ms. Siegel summed up the application. She testified that the design standards would be good. There will be no impact to the Borough's zone plan.

Mr. Infante referred Ms. Siegel to the left side of the house, the garage side. He asked what would be the distance from there to the nearest dwelling.

Ms. Siegel clarified that there is no dwelling to the left of the applicant's home. Only open space and a walkway.

The Board members had no further questions for Ms. Siegel.

The public had no questions for Ms. Siegel.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked for comments from the Board. Mr. Infante noted that he was satisfied that the proposed enlargement of the garage will not impact any neighbors. Mr. Herbert felt that the applicant's property was large enough to handle the proposed addition. He approved of the modernizations that will be done to the home. Chrmn. Cifelli was glad that the traditional home, in this case, was being kept. These proposals will benefit any future owners of the home, with young children. Mr. Hoffman felt a good presentation was made to justify these variances. The proposals will enhance the neighborhood in a good way. The bulk being added on to the left side of the home will not be a significant detriment. Mr. Tobia and Mr. DeGidio agreed with the comments made by their fellow Board members.

The public had no comments on this application.

Mr. Hoffman made a motion to approve Application # AB 20-021: Murnane – 12 Elm Place with the applicant to follow any recommendations on stormwater as stipulated by the Borough Engineer. Chrmn. Cifelli seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken:

Mr. Herbert	-	yes
Mr. Infante	-	yes
Mr. Tobia	-	yes
Mr. Hoffman	-	yes
Chrmn. Cifelli	-	yes

Application # ZB 20-021 was approved.

Application # ZB 20-017

Michael Rodino

24 Kings Road

Block: 29 Lot: 11

Rear Yard Setback

Maximum Principal Building Coverage

Board members Jean Haeringer and Joseph Treloar re-joined the Board meeting.

The following were sworn in to testify:

Heather & Michael Rodino, the applicants

Eric Baker, the architect for the applicants

Mr. Baker submitted his professional credentials to the Board. The Board accepted them.

Mrs. Rodino gave an introductory statement. She and her husband bought 24 Kings Road four years ago. The home is 200 years old. She and her husband are looking to modernize the home, but will try and maintain the home's character.

Mr. Baker testified that the main portion of the house was built in 1750. It sits on a non-conforming lot. He put up the property survey on the Zoom screen. He noted that the existing rear yard setback is 40 feet. Mr. Baker testified that two variances are being sought: the rear yard setback and the building coverage.

Mr. Baker submitted Exhibit A-1: A photo of the existing house and a Google aerial view of the applicant's neighborhood. A red dot indicates the applicant's home on King's Road.

Using Exhibit A-1, Mr. Baker indicated a portion of the house which will be removed, since it is in bad condition.

Chrmn. Cifelli and Mr. Baker reviewed the calculations of the two variances.

Mr. Baker put the floor plans up on the Zoom screen. He pointed out the proposed new area. The applicant's house is currently 4 bedrooms. It will be increased to 5 bedrooms. Some existing impervious coverage will be removed. Mr. Baker testified that the current house has no basement; however there is a little cellar space under the kitchen. It provides room for the boiler and heating equipment.

Mr. Baker testified that the proposed plans will provide new space under the new garage and proposed family room. Returning to the existing first floor plans, Mr. Baker pointed out the existing garage and existing family room which will be removed. An existing deck will also be removed. A modern kitchen, pantry, and powder room will be created. A two-car garage is being proposed. A mudroom with a staircase is included. Underneath the new family room there will be basement space created as a play area for their son.

Mr. Baker reviewed the second story. The existing 4 bedrooms are located in the 1750 portion of the home. He pointed out where the master bedroom will be located. It will have a walk-in closet and a master bathroom. Office space will also be created on the second floor.

Showing the front view of the home, Mr. Baker explained how pieces of the existing house will be used to create details for the new dormers, new windows, new trim and gables.

Mr. Baker showed the two side views with the proposals and the rear view with the elevations.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked Mr. Baker if he had the existing and proposed elevations.

Mr. Baker answered no. However, he showed the Board photos of the rear elevation and side elevation.

Chrmn. Cifelli concluded that the property is already over on building coverage. However, the applicant is still seeking 218 sq. ft. over what is permitted. Mr. Baker agreed, pointing out that

1% overage is being proposed. He noted that the existing driveway will remain. Seeking a new curb cut for a new driveway would incur another expense. Mr. Baker pointed out the section of the house, close to the property line, which will be removed. The proposed family room will be kept as small as possible. Mr. Baker testified that as much building coverage as possible will be removed, by cutting back the driveway and the home's footprint.

Chrmn. Cifelli and Mr. Baker discussed the rear yard situation. He confirmed with Mr. Baker that the home is 3.5 feet from the property line. The backyard neighbor is a commercial property. Mr. Baker clarified that this 3.5 feet is the portion of the existing garage which will be removed. Chrmn. Cifelli confirmed with Mr. Baker that the applicant's lot is very odd-shaped and greatly impacts the home's footprint. The neighboring homes were constructed to work with the angle of their properties. Mr. Baker explained that the applicant's house is constructed proper to the street, parallel to the streetscape. However, because the applicant's property is irregular in shape, problems arise.

Mr. Herbert asked Mr. Baker if he had any photos of the neighborhood.

Mr. Baker answered no, but he could Google some photos if that is allowed at tonight's hearing.

Mr. Herbert asked about the neighbor living behind the applicant's house.

Mr. Baker answered that the back neighbor was the CVS Plaza and a condo complex. The house to the left of the applicant's home is a new-build, three stories high.

Chrmn. Cifelli confirmed with Mr. Rodino that his house had been added on to over the years. Mr. Rodino explained that he is trying hard to hold onto the original house in these plans, rather than tearing down and starting from fresh.

Referring to a Google map of the property, Mr. Haeringer asked how thick were the line of trees in the boundary between the applicant's property and the CVS plaza.

Mr. Rodino clarified that all those trees were outside his property line. Those trees belong to the condo association. They run at least a length of 50 feet.

Borough Administrator Steve Williams put up an aerial photo of the neighborhood to give a better view of Kings Road, specifically the applicant's property.

After studying the map, Mr. Haeringer asked Mr. and Mrs. Rodino if one of the goals of their plans is to create a backyard for their home. Currently, it looks like there is no backyard.

Mr. and Mrs. Rodino answered yes, he was correct. They would like a backyard.

Chrmn. Cifelli commented that the Master Plan prefers detached garages, but at the same time, the Master Plan does not want construction on property lines, which is what the applicant is avoiding.

The Board members had no further questions for Mr. Baker or the applicants.

The public had no questions for Mr. Baker or the applicants.

Mr. Baker submitted the application to the Board for consideration and a vote.

The public had no comments on the application.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked for comments from the Board. Chrmn. Cifelli understood why the proposed garage will be joined to the main building. In this situation, it will not be so close to the property line. He felt the additional bulk will not affect the light, air, and open space of the neighborhood. Chrmn. Cifelli appreciated that the character of this home will be maintained. A re-build will not be done. Mr. Tobia felt the proposed design is very sensible, considering the location of the home, with commercial properties behind it, with a line of trees serving as a buffer. He felt the aesthetics of the home will improve with these plans. Mr. Haeringer believed that the relocation of the garage is a good proposal for this particular property. He pointed out the woods serving as a buffer between the applicant's property and the commercial property. Mr. Hoffman commented that the building coverage variance is significant; however, it will be needed to preserve a historic structure in our town. The proposed bulk will not be really noticeable from the street. Mr. Herbert pointed out that the next door neighbors are quite a distance from the applicant's home, even if the new proposed bulk was added. Removing the existing garage will create a nice backyard. Mr. Infante commented that the building stock is definitely being upgraded with this application. Mr. DeGidio and Mr. Treloar agreed with the comments made by their fellow Board members.

Chrmn. Cifelli made a motion to approve Application # ZB 20-027: Rodino – 23 Kings Road, with the applicant to follow any recommendations made by the Borough Engineer regarding stormwater. Mr. Infante seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken:

Mr. Herbert	-	yes
Mr. Infante	-	yes
Mr. Haeringer	-	yes
Chrmn. Cifelli	-	yes
Mr. Tobia	-	yes
Mr. Hoffman	-	yes
Mr. DeGidio	-	yes

Application # ZB 20-018 was approved.

Chrmn. Cifelli announced Application # ZB 20-018: Verizon – Brooklake Road, will be carried to the Special Zoning Board of Adjustment Meeting on Wednesday, March 11, 2021, 7:30 p.m. It will be a virtual meeting.

At 10:43 p.m. the meeting adjourned.

A Special Zoning Board of Adjustment Meeting will be held on Wednesday, March 11, 2021, 7:30 p.m. It will be a virtual meeting.

A Regular Zoning Board of Adjustment Meeting will be held on Wednesday, March 24, 2021, 7:30 p.m. It will be a virtual meeting.

Respectfully submitted:

Elizabeth Holler
Recording Secretary