

CHATHAM BOROUGH ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

May 25, 2022

7:30 p.m.

Chairman Michael Cifelli called this Regular Meeting of the Chatham Borough Zoning Board of Adjustment to order at 7:30 p.m. This was a hybrid meeting. Chrnm. 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, Chrnm.	X	
Frederick Infante	X	
Jean-Eludes Harbinger		X
Patrick Tobias		X
Joseph Telaar	X	
David DeGidio	X	
Peter Hoffman	X	
Curt Dawson	X	
Patrick Dwyer, Esq.	X	

Our thanks to Borough Administrator Steve Williams, for hosting the Zoom broadcast for tonight’s meeting.

Public Comment

There was none.

Resolution #ZB 2022-01

The minutes of the April 27, 2022 Zoning Board of Adjustment Meeting will be reviewed at the next meeting.

Resolutions

Application ZB 21-016

33 Milton LLC

39 North Summit Avenue

Block: 55 Lot: 45

This resolution will be voted on at the next Board meeting. Attorney Dwyer explained that the applicant’s attorney had made an error on his client’s zoning table. Mr. Brightly, the Board Engineer, then sent a corrected memo to the applicant asking them to correct their plans and re-submit. Attorney Dwyer stated that a revised resolution has not yet been received.

On another matter, Chrnm. Cifelli brought up Application ZB 20-012: Chatham Holdings, LLC – 34 River Road. A hearing date still needs to be established. The attorney for Chatham Holdings was present tonight. The attorney offered some possible hearing dates in July. After further discussion, the attorney suggested that Application ZB 20-012 could be carried to the June 22, 2022 Zoning Bd. Meeting. At that meeting a Special Meeting date could then be officially announced. Chrnm. Cifelli agreed that would be a good idea.

Chrmn. Cifelli announced that Application ZB 20-012: Chatham Holdings, LLC – 14 River Road will carry to the June 22, 2022 Zoning Board of Adjustment meeting.

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

- Application ZB 22-003 - Savage: 60 Chandler Rd.
- Application ZB 21-011 – Huo: 61 Center Ave.
- Application ZB 22-001 – Bicknese: 237 Washington Ave.
- Application ZB 22-002 – Lampert: 48 Fairmount Ave.

Chrmn. Cifelli announced the following applications will be carried to the June 22, 2022 Zoning Board of Adjustment meeting:

- Application ZB 22-005 – Padhi: 7 Harding Street
- Application ZB 22-007 – Kelleher: 143 Washington Ave.

- Application ZB 21-017
- Li Lin & Hau Liu
- 174 North Passaic Avenue
- Block: 44 Lot:5
- Minimum Side Yard Setback (Left)
- Minimum Side Yard Setback (Right)
- Minimum Rear Yard Setback
- Maximum Principal Building Coverage
- Maximum FAR

This application is continued from the April 27, 2022 Zoning Board of Adjustment meeting.

Chrmn. Cifelli recused himself from this hearing because he lives within the 200 ft. radius of the applicant’s property.

Board member Fred Infante stepped in and chaired this hearing.

Mr. Infante noted that at the last hearing only 4 Board members were present to vote on this application, which had included an FAR variance. The following Board members who were absent from the April hearing, affirmed that they had watched the Zoom recording of that first hearing, thus making them eligible to vote on this application: Mr. DeGidio and Mr. Hoffman,

Mr. Infante reminded Li Lin, Hau Lin, and Jeff McEntee that they still remained under oath from the previous hearing.

Mr. Infante briefly reviewed what had transpired at the earlier hearing. He reviewed the current conditions of the applicant’s home and property. The applicants are looking to update their home to current standards. Mr. Infante reviewed the proposals to upgrade the home. To achieve these updates, the applicants will be building up, a proposal that triggers the side yard variances. The expansion of the kitchen requires a rear yard setback variance. Building coverage and FAR variances are also needed to accomplish these proposed plans.

Mr. Infante asked Mr. Hoffman and Mr. DeGidio if they had any questions on this application. Neither of these Board members had questions for Mr. McEntee nor the applicants.

Mr. Infante asked if the public had any questions for the witnesses.

Mr. Infante informed the applicants and Mr. McEntee that five voting Board members are present tonight. Five affirmative votes would be needed to approve their FAR variance. Would the applicants like to now close their application?

On behalf of the applicants, Mr. McEntee closed the application and submitted it to the Board for a vote.

Mr. Infante asked for comments from the Board. Mr. Treloar felt that the proposed variances were not onerous. The proposed covered porch is something the Master Plan encourages. The updating of this home would be a benefit to the Borough. Mr. Dawson agreed with Mr. Treloar's comments. Both Mr. Dawson and Mr. Hoffman believed that the home was in serious need of an upgrade to make it more functional. Mr. Hoffman felt that there was no other way to upgrade the home, in a meaningful way, without intensifying the side yard setbacks. The proposed design is reasonable. Mr. Hoffman believed that the FAR variance is de minimus. Mr. DeGidio agreed with the comments made by his fellow Board members. Mr. Infante pointed out that the applicants' under-sized lot drives the need for many of the variances being sought. The granting of these variances will not cause a substantial detriment to the public good and will not substantially impair the intent and purposes of the zoning plan. There are no light, air, and open space issues with this application.

Mr. Infante made a motion to approve Application ZB 21-017: 174 North Passaic Avenue with the applicant to follow any stipulations made by the Borough Engineer regarding stormwater. Mr. Treloar seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken:

Mr. Treloar	-	yes
Mr. Dawson	-	yes
Mr. Hoffman	-	yes
Mr. DeGidio	-	yes
Mr. Infante	-	yes

Application ZB 21-017 was approved.

Chrmn. Cifelli returned to the Board table.

Application ZB 22-003  
Casey & Caroline Savage  
60 Chandler Road  
Block: 11, Lot 6  
Side Yard Setback (Left)  
Minimum Side Yard Setback (Right)

Maximum Principal Building Coverage

Steven Azzolini, Esq., attorney for the applicant, introduced the applicant and the witnesses who will be testifying in tonight's hearing.

Attorney Dwyer swore in the following witnesses:

Casey Savage, the applicant

Catherine Mueller, P.E., engineer for the applicant

Peter Dorne, architect for the applicant

Bill Van Reisen, an associate of Peter Dorne Architects

John McDonough, project planner for the architect

Ms. Mueller submitted her professional credentials to the Board. The Board accepted them.

Peter Dorne submitted his professional credentials to the Board. The Board accepted them.

Bill Van Reisen submitted his professional credentials to the Board. The Board accepted them.

John McDonough submitted his professional credentials to the Board. The Board accepted them.

Attorney Azzolini noted that the Zoning Board of Adjustment had listened to a previous application submitted to them by Mr. and Mrs. Savage back in September and October, 2021. This previous application had been denied by the Board. He noted that the Board, back then, had concerns about the light, air, and open space being impacted by the proposed second story addition over the existing garage.

Attorney Azzolini stated that the new application being presented tonight, will be pulling that second story addition back from the garage. The proposed re-configuration over the garage which creates an intensification on the left side. There will also be a minor intensification of 4 inches on the right side. The proposed open air porch will require a building coverage variance.

Chrmn. Cifelli confirmed with Attorney Dwyer that before this new application is heard by the Board, the Board must officially determine that this present application is "substantially different" from the Savages' application that was heard back in 2021.

Attorney Azzolini read aloud his statement to legally prove that the "substantially different" requirement has been met. In his statement, he pointed out that the relief being sought in this present application is less than the relief being sought in the Savages' application last fall. A better design for the applicant's home is now being proposed. The originally proposed left side violation has now been removed. Attorney Azzolini felt that these recent actions are sufficient to warrant the Board's decision that this present application is "substantially different" from the earlier one.

Mr. Infante asked for further testimony on the differences between the two applications.

On the Zoom screen, Mr. Dorne put the different renderings – the existing elevations, the previously proposed elevations, and the elevations of what is now being proposed. He pointed out the new dormers now being proposed to the roof. The roof-lines are now steeper. The left-

side setback has now been pushed back. The pitch of the roof has been substantially changed. The roofs on the left and right hand sides have now been dropped to allow for more light and air.

Referring to the rear elevations on the Zoom screen, Mr. Dorne pointed out how the proposed pitches of the roof are different from the originally proposed pitches. The roofs will now pitch more steeply. The gables will be larger. He reviewed the latest changes made to the dormers and gables. The finished basement will also be different. Chrmn. Cifelli confirmed with Mr. Dorne that now an actual change in the style of the structure is being proposed. Also, the side yard setbacks will now be different. The second story roof will now be pushed back.

Chrmn. Cifelli and Mr. Infante believed that the application being presented tonight has “substantial changes” from the earlier application.

Chrmn. Cifelli took a voice vote of the Board members, making a motion that the Board has found a substantial difference between the Savages’ earlier application in 2022 and the present application. All Board members present voted aye, agreeing that there was a substantial difference between the two applications.

Mr. Savage gave an introductory statement for the application. He and Mrs. Savage have lived in the house for almost 3 years. They are the third owners of the house. The house was built in 1946. No significant updating has been done on the house for 25 plus years. The windows in the house date back to 1946. There are insulation issues in the attic. Mr. and Mrs. Savage are proposing to update their existing kitchen and adding another bathroom upstairs.

Mr. Savage testified that his home, with the proposals, will not become the largest house on the street. He felt it would become just an average size. In regard to the proposed porch, Mr. Savage stated that his house faces southwest and becomes very hot in the summer. The proposed porch will help cool the house. Mr. Savage pointed out that there are no sidewalks in front of his house. There are times of the day when traffic from nearby Chatham High School becomes very active. The porch would provide safety and security for his children and the neighbors’ children. The porch would also compliment the design of the house really well.

Chrmn. Cifelli reviewed the three variances and their calculations with Attorney Azzolini.

Catherine Mueller, the applicant’s engineer, came forward. She put the plans up on the Zoom screen. Ms. Mueller testified that the applicant’s property is rectangular in shape. The property slopes moderately from Chandler Road to the rear. Ms. Mueller testified that the home will be expanded at the rear. The driveway will be improved to its proper width. The proposed covered porch will have a walk that will connect it out to the newly reconfigured driveway. A proposed terrace will be created in the rear. The existing deck at the rear will be demolished.

Ms. Mueller stated that the property with the proposals will be compliant with lot area regulations. The property will also comply with the front yard requirements. The building height is compliant. The building coverage variance is seeking an overage of 299 sq. ft. This is mainly triggered by the proposed front porch. The proposed lot coverage is compliant. The

front yard coverage is compliant at 25%. The proposed plans are under the maximum FAR. Ms. Mueller testified that the impervious coverage on the property will be increased 812 sq. ft.

Mr. Mueller testified that a dry well will be installed in the back of the property. The water on the applicant's property flows towards the back. Ms. Mueller stated that she had consulted with the former Borough Engineer about the soil depth with regard to dry well installation.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked if Board members had any questions for Ms. Mueller.

There were none.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked if the public had any questions for Ms. Mueller.

There were none.

Mr. Treloar asked for the square footage of the porch.

Ms. Mueller answered that the front porch will be 258 sq. ft.

The Board had no further questions for Ms. Mueller.

Peter Dorne, the architect for the applicant, came forward. On the Zoom screen, Mr. Dorne reviewed the proposed first floor plans. A powder room is proposed at the rear of the house. A stair will be constructed to reach the proposed terrace in the back yard. At the right rear corner of the house, Mr. Dorne pointed out the 4 inch space that will replace an existing notch in the house.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked about the additional building coverage minus the porch measurements.

Mr. Dorne pointed out the front of the house between the garage and the house, there is an existing notch. That notch will be filled in, providing a nicer continuity across the front of the house. At the rear of the house a powder room will be added, the kitchen will be expanded, a little pantry area will be added. A 4-inch notch will be created for the office area.

Chrmn. Cifelli confirmed with Mr. Dorne that this proposed building coverage is 41 sq. ft. over the allowable. They reviewed the calculations for the notch for the office space.

At Chrmn. Cifelli's request, Mr. Dorne reviewed the advantages of the proposed front porch. Mr. Dorne felt that the porch will be in keeping with the vernacular of Chatham. Chrmn. Cifelli confirmed with Mr. Dorne that the proposed porch is the same as what was proposed in the previous application. The dimensions of the porch will be 43 ft. 2 inches by 6 feet deep.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked if the Board any questions for Mr. Dorne.

There were none.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked if the public had any questions for Mr. Dorne.

There were none.

Attorney Azzolini asked John McDonough, the applicant's planner to come forward.

Mr. McDonough submitted Exhibit A-1: a deck of ten slides giving information on the applicant's property, specifically:

Sheet 1: A tax parcel map, with a focus on the applicant's lot

Sheet 2: Another tax parcel map showing the applicant's house

Sheet 3: A Land Use Map showing the applicant's property & neighborhood

Sheet 4: A Zoning Map of the applicant's neighborhood, showing the applicant's home/property is consistent with the neighborhood zoning pattern

Sheet 5: An overhead drone photo of the applicant's home with the proposals

Sheet 6: A photo of the subject site & the greater neighborhood

Referring to Sheet 6, Mr. McDonough pointed out that the 57 Chandler Rd. relief was also granted for 12.9% building coverage, the same amount as the applicant is seeking. Mr. McDonough testified that the applicant is not doing anything that is substantially divergent from what is seen in his neighborhood. The side yard setback will only be a 4-inch sliver on the right hand side, which he considered de minimus. Mr. McDonough discussed the garage. Unlike the previous application, the proposed upper level of the garage will now meet the setback requirements.

Mr. McDonough returned to labeling each sheet of Exhibit A-1:

Sheet 7: A front view of the applicant's existing home. Mr. McDonough pointed out where the proposals will be located. He testified that the proposed alterations will be de minimus.

Sheet 8: A view of the back of the property. Mr. McDonough stated that the backyard was well buffered. The applicant is keeping what is there.

Sheet 9 (?) None was mentioned.

Sheet 10: The 4-inch extension on the side on the right hand side. Mr. McDonough felt that the needed side yard variance would be de minimus.

Mr. McDonough testified that the primary relief being sought is for building coverage. Regarding the left and right side yard variances, he felt there is an element of hardship with working with a building that already exists. Mr. McDonough stated that the benefits outweigh the detriments with this application. The proposed improvements will add value and quality to the applicant's home. The improvements will add to the aesthetics of the home. Mr. McDonough testified that the mass and the scale of the home, with these proposals, will remain in harmony with the neighboring homes.

Mr. McDonough testified that similar variance relief has been granted to a home two lots away, at 68 Chandler Road in 2020.

Mr. McDonough testified that these variances could be granted without creating any adverse impact to the public or to the Borough zone plan. No building height relief is being sought. Mr. McDonough felt the applicant has done a good in listening to the Board's concerns expressed with the earlier application.

Chrmn. Cifelli noted that the proposed front porch will extend 6 feet into the front yard. Will this extension be out of conformity with the neighboring properties in regard to their front yard setbacks. Will the porch stick out like a sore thumb?

Mr. McDonough answered no. There is a strong prevailing setback in that neighborhood. He emphasized that the porch will be open air.

Chrmn. Cifelli confirmed with Mr. McDonough that the applicant's home, if the proposals were approved and constructed, would be consistent with the neighboring homes. It will not become the largest home in the neighborhood.

Mr. Infante asked Mr. McDonough if he knew the distance between the neighborhood structures.

Mr. McDonough believed there was at least a 28 feet separation between houses.

Board members had no further questions for Mr. McDonough.

The public had no questions for Mr. McDonough.

Attorney Azzolini had no further witnesses to present.

At 9:12 p.m. a break was taken in the meeting.

At 9:25 p.m. the meeting resumed.

Attorney Azzoloni gave his summation of the application. He pointed out that most of the building mass being proposed is for the open air porch. The Master Plan encourages front porches. The front setback of the house with the proposed porch will be over 50 feet, where 30 feet is required. Attorney Azzoloni discussed the justification for the two side yard variances. He believed Mr. and Mrs. Savage had listened to the comments the Board made concerning their earlier application and have come up with more acceptable plans.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked if any members of the public would like to comment on this application.

Brian Newman, 69 Chandler Rd., was sworn in. Mr. Newman believed the proposals were de minimus. These plans will create significant upgrades to the home. The proposed porch would be very welcome on such a busy street.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked Mr. Newman if he had any concerns about light, air, and open space between neighboring homes being impacted by the applicant's proposals.

Mr. Newman answered no, he had no such concerns about the proposed bulk and frontage. He noted that another neighbor has an existing front porch that "mirrors" what Mr. and Mrs. Savage are proposing.

Dawn Stadinski, 64 Chandler Rd., was sworn in. Mrs. Stadinski testified that her home is to the left of the applicant's. She believed that the proposed porch would help deal with the strong sunlight that hits the house. What the applicant is proposing will fit in nicely with the neighborhood.

Cindy Rice, 57 Chandler Rd., was sworn in. She stated that her home was across the street from the applicant. Mrs. Rice felt that the applicant's proposals were much needed. These proposals will keep the historic feel of Chatham.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked for comments from the Board. Mr. Hoffman commended the Savages and their professionals for taking into consideration the comments and suggestions made by the Board at the earlier application. The plans have been substantially scaled down. Mr. Dawson felt the proposals would be beneficial to the community. Mr. Infante believed these proposals will be an upgrade to the building stock. There will be no detriment to the public good. The light, air, and open space will not be impacted by the proposed construction. Mr. Treloar pointed out that the building coverage is slightly over the allowable; however the lot coverage is under the allowable. Therefore, no undue impervious coverage is being created. Mr. DeGidio agreed with the previous comments made. Chrmn. Cifelli felt that excellent testimony had been given for the proposed front porch, which is encouraged by the Master Plan.

Chrmn. Cifelli made a motion to approve Application ZB 22-003 with the applicant to follow any stipulations made by the Borough Engineer regarding stormwater. Mr. Hoffman seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken:

Chrmn. Cifelli	-	yes
Mr. Hoffman	-	yes
Mr. Infante	-	yes
Mr. DeGidio	-	yes
Mr. Treloar	-	yes
Mr. Dawson	-	yes

Application ZB 22-003 was approved.

Application ZB 21-011  
Ran Huo  
61 Center Avenue  
Block: 63 Lot: 16

Minimum Side Yard Setback (Left)

Minimum Side Yard Setback (Right)

Minimum Rear Yard Setback

Attorney Dwyer swore in the following to testify:

Ran Huo, the applicant

Doug Asral, the architect for the applicant

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

Ms. Huo testified that she and her family moved to 61 Center Ave. in December 2014. She stated that the current house has 3 bedrooms and 2 bathrooms. Currently there are 5 members in the family. The extended family members are now living in the house as well. Ms. Huo noted that her 2 daughters currently have to share a bedroom with either her or their grandmother. A jack & jill bathroom arrangement for the two girls is on the second floor.

Ms. Huo stated that sometimes her job entails Zoom meetings at night when other family members are asleep. Currently, the kitchen is the only place where she won't disturb sleeping family members. The existing kitchen is very small and lacks cabinet space. The existing living room is used as a storage area, a library, and a kids' study area. Ms. Huo noted that it is hard to do any remodeling for the home without having to seek a variance(s).

At this point, Attorney Dwyer believed there was a Board member who lives within the 200 ft. radius of Ms. Huo's home. It was discovered it was Board member David DeGidio. Mr. DeGidio recused himself from the hearing.

Chrmn. Cifelli then informed Ms. Huo that the number of Board members has now been reduced to five. Ms. Huo can still obtain her variances with if the majority of these Board members vote to approve. However, some applicants in this situation delay their application until more Board members are present. Chrmn. Cifelli asked Mr. Asral if he and Ms. Huo would like to confer off the record, in private, about which option to take. Mr. Asral agreed, asking for a five minute break.

At 9:51 p.m. a break was taken in the meeting.

At 9:55 p.m. the meeting resumed.

Mr. Asral asked if the application could be presented tonight, he and Ms. Huo will listen to the comments from the Board, and ask for a postponement of the Board's vote if need be.

Chrmn. Cifelli stated that would be acceptable.

Chrmn. Cifelli reminded Mr. Asral and Ms. Huo that the applicant's personal needs cannot be the only reason when seeking variances. Other legal criteria must be presented to the Board.

Chrmn. Cifelli noted that the applicant has an undersized house on an undersized lot. It sounds like the existing undersized house cannot reasonably sustain not only modern conveniences, but

modern necessities in terms of bedrooms and bathrooms. The construction being proposed will provide normal living space for an average size family. Mr. Huo agreed with Chrmn. Cifelli's observation.

At this point in the meeting, at 10 p.m., Chrmn. Cifelli, announced no further applications would be heard tonight. The remaining applications on tonight's agenda will be carried to the June 22, 2022 Board of Adjustment meeting.

Mr. Asral put the plans and data on the Zoom screen. He testified that the applicant's lot is undersized, measuring at 5,789 sq. ft. The existing house is a Cape Cod. There are two bedrooms upstairs and one bedroom downstairs. Ms. Huo would like to get all the sleeping arrangements on the same level. She would also like to increase the living area on the first floor. A one story addition is proposed to expand the kitchen and make it more usable.

Mr. Asral and Chrmn. Cifelli reviewed the calculations for the proposed front yard side yard, and the rear yard setbacks. After further discussion, Ms. Huo agreed that the side yard setback is a pre-existing nonconformity. Mr. Asral testified that the overall lot coverage will be reduced by 100 sq. ft. The proposed building coverage will remain within the allowable. The total floor area will also remain with the allowable number. The building height will remain under the allowable amount.

Mr. Asral testified that the rear yard variance is being sought because of the nature of the applicant's property, its size, and its geometry. Pointing out on the plans, Mr. Asral explained the proposed upward expansion, which will be constructed on top of what already exists on the first floor. However, a one-story addition is proposed for the kitchen expansion.

Mr. Asral testified that the existing deck will be reduced to a size under 200 sq. ft. The encroachment into the rear yard will be 3 feet 4 inches and is needed for the kitchen expansion.

Mr. Asral pointed out where the master bedroom suite will be located on the second floor, a hall bathroom for the children. The existing laundry area will be moved from the basement to the second floor.

At Chrmn. Cifelli's request, Mr. Asral put the existing conditions of the house on the Zoom screen. It was marked as Exhibit A-1. Mr. Asral testified that the current lay-out of the first floor will remain as is except for the kitchen expansion. He pointed out this proposed expansion on the plans.

Mr. Asral submitted Exhibit A-2: the proposed second floor plans. He felt that the current lay-out of the second floor was not making the best use of the existing space. Mr. Treloar confirmed with Mr. Asral that all the bedrooms currently have sloped ceilings. Mr. Asral testified that the goal is to change this Cape Cod home into a Colonial style home.

Chrmn. Cifelli and Mr. Asral discussed the proposed bump-out at the rear of the home. Mr. Asral explained that the bump-out is the only expansion of the home's footprint, and it stops at the first floor. Mr. Asral clarified that the proposed bedrooms will not be constructed over the

garage. He also clarified that the second floor will be constructed completely over the first floor. Ms. Asral testified that the building coverage is increasing; however, will stay within the Borough's limit.

At Chrmn. Cifelli's suggestion, Mr. Asral put the elevations on the Zoom screen. Regarding the front elevation, he pointed out the proposed new entrance with a cantilevered roof supported by brackets. Mr. Asral showed the proposed rear elevation, pointing out the kitchen addition and the bedrooms over the garage.

On the side elevations, Mr. Asral pointed out the proposed doghouse dormers in the attic.

Regarding the elevation showing the proposed left side, Chrmn. Cifelli discussed the wall-like appearance on that side, which would be unattractive for the neighbors on that side. Was any thought given to architecturally breaking up that wall-like appearance? Mr. Asral answered that he would be willing to create some architectural features to dispel the wall appearance.

Answering Chrmn. Cifelli's inquiry, Ms. Huo described the homes in her immediate neighborhood. To help, Mr. Asral submitted Exhibit A-3: a google image of the applicant's existing home and the neighboring homes on either side. He also submitted Exhibit A-4: similar screen shots of the neighboring homes further down on either side. Chrmn. Cifelli noted that the immediate neighbor to the right of the applicant's home is another Cape Cod home. Chrmn. Cifelli asked for the height of the proposed roofline. Mr. Asral answered 28 ft. 4 inches. This roofline will not go beyond the height of the neighboring homes.

Mr. Asral indicated that he had nothing further to present to the Board

The Board had no further questions for Mr. Asral and Ms. Huo.

Ms. Asral and Ms. Huo then closed their application and asked for comments from the Board.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked if any members of the public had questions on this application. There were none.

Board discussion began. Chrmn. Cifelli discussed the difficulty of developing on an undersized lot. He believed the current home is not really livable for an average family. Chrmn. Cifelli had concerns whether the proposed bulk would be detrimental; however, what is being proposed is not over-reaching. The size of the proposed bedrooms are not outrageous. Mr. Dawson felt that if the proposals were made to the applicant's home, it would not be inconsistent with the neighborhood. Agreeing with an earlier point made by Chrmn. Cifelli, Mr. Treloar believed that if a re-built home was done on this property, it would not be beneficial to the town and the neighborhood. The applicants are making sufficient use with the space they already have. Mr. Infante felt the proposed lot and building coverages have made it a better application. Mr. Hoffman believed the rooms will be modest in scale. The house will become more attractive and functional.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked Ms. Huo and Ms. Asral if they would like the Board to vote on this application tonight, or would they like to carry it to the June meeting.

Ms. Huo asked that the Board take a vote tonight.

Mr. Infante made a motion to approve Application ZB-011 – 61 Center Avenue with the applicant to follow any recommendations made by the Borough Engineer with regard to stormwater and that the architect have a minimum of two windows installed on the left side elevation to break up the wall-like appearance. Mr. Treloar seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken:

Mr. Hoffman	-	yes
Mr. Dawson	-	yes
Mr. Infante	-	yes
Mr. Treloar	-	yes
Chrmn. Cifelli	-	yes

Application ZB-011 was approved.

Chrmn. Cifelli announced that the remaining applications on the agenda will be carried to the June 22, 2022 ZB meeting without further notice.

The next Chatham Borough Zoning Board of Adjustment Meeting will be held on Wednesday, June 22, 2022, 7:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Elizabeth Holler  
Recording Secretary