

CHATHAM BOROUGH ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

June 28, 2017

7:30 p.m.

In Chairman Cifelli’s absence, Vice Chairman Douglas Herbert called this Regular Meeting of the Zoning Board of Adjustment to order at 7:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers, Chatham Borough Hall. He stated that adequate notices for this Zoning Board of Adjustment meeting were given as required by the Open Public Meetings Act.

Names	Present	Absent
Chrmn. Michael Cifelli		X
Helen Kecskemety	X	
Frederick Infante		X
Douglas Herbert	X	
H.H. Montague	X	
Jean-Eudes Haeringer	X	
Patrick Tobia – 1 <sup>st</sup> Alternate	X	
Alida Kass	X	
Patrick Dwyer, Esq.	X	

Resolution #ZB 2017-11

The minutes of the May 24, 2017 Zoning Bd. of Adjustment meeting were approved as amended.

Old/New Business

Mr. Montague discussed the three applications heard by the Planning Board at their meeting held on June 21, 2017. The Post Office Plaza Redevelopment Visionary Session held the evening of June 15<sup>th</sup> at the Chatham Middle School was very well attended. Exhibits were on display and the public gave valuable feedback.

Public Comment

No one came forward.

Resolutions

Application ZB #17-06

Phyllis Klein

33 Jackson Avenue

Side Yard/Building Coverage/Floor Area Ratio

Block 71, Lot 5

Attorney Dwyer summarized this application which was seeking to expand an existing Cape Cod style home and converting a one-car garage into a two-car garage. During the hearing, the applicant revised her plans to expand the setback. The revised plans were approved by the Board. Vice Chrmn. Herbert made a motion to approve the resolution, confirming the Board’s approval of the variances. Mr. Montague seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken:

- Mr. Haeringer - yes
- Vice Chrmn. Herbert - yes

Mrs. Kecskemety	-	yes
Mr. Montague	-	yes
Mr. Tobia	-	yes

Application ZB #17-08

Maureen & John Shalhoub

15 Carmine Street

Front Yard/Building Coverage

Block 78, Lot 3

Attorney Dwyer summarized this application which proposed a new portico, enlarging a breeze-way and constructing a one-story addition at the rear of an existing home. The Board felt the variances were modest in size, and approved the application. Vice Chrmn. Herbert made a motion to approve the resolution, confirming the Board’s approval of the variances. Mr. Haeringer seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken:

Mr. Haeringer	-	yes
Vice Chrmn. Herbert	-	yes
Mrs. Kecskemety	-	yes
Mr. Montague	-	yes
Mr. Tobia	-	yes

New and Returned Applications

Vice Chrmn. Herbert reviewed the list of applications scheduled to be heard tonight, time permitting:

- Application ZB #17-02: Evans & Morris – 43 Rowan Road
- Application ZB #17-09: Fagan – 95 Hillside Avenue
- Application ZB #17-10: Towers – 5 Penn Terrace
- Application ZB #17-11: Aue – 15 Vincent Street
- Application ZB #17-12: Acevedo/Adonis Real Estate, LLC – 11 Elmwood Ave.
- Application ZB #17-14: Torkelson – 210 Fairmount Avenue
- Application ZB #17-15: Norcia – 69 Elmwood Avenue
- Application ZB #17-16: Tuminaro & Eckert – 31 Roosevelt Avenue
- Application ZB #17-17: Deters – 38 Hedges Avenue

Vice Chrmn. Herbert explained to the applicants that there is a limited number of Board members present tonight to hear and vote on their applications. He pointed out that at least five yes votes are needed to approve a FAR variance. Those applicants who are seeking FAR variances may want to consider carrying their applications to the July 26, 2017 Zoning Bd. of Adjustment meeting when more Board members will be present.

At this point, Application ZB #17-17: Adam Deters – 38 Hedges Ave., asked to carry their application to the July 26, 2017 Zoning Bd. of Adjustment meeting. The request was granted.

Application ZB #17-16: Jed Tuminaro & Meredith Eckert – 31 Roosevelt Ave., asked to carry their application to the July 26, 2017 Zoning Bd. of Adjustment meeting. The request was granted.

Application ZB #17-03

Linda Evans & Scott Morris

43 Rowan Road

Side Yard/Building Coverage/ Floor Area Ratio

Block 83, Lot 24

This is continued from the May 24, 2017 hearing.

Vice Chrmn. Herbert reminded Ms. Evans and Mr. Morris that there were only five Board members present tonight to vote on their application. He asked Ms. Evans and Mr. Morris if they still wanted to proceed with their application tonight. Ms. Evans and Mr. Morris indicated that they wanted to proceed.

Vice Chrmn. Herbert confirmed with Mrs. Kass that she had listened to the tape of the May 24, 2017 hearing. Mrs. Kass was therefore eligible to vote on this application.

The following came forward and remained under oath from the previous hearing:

Scott Morris & Linda Evans, the applicants

Gary Rosard, the architect for the applicants

Mr. Rosard noted that at the last hearing, the Board had requested elevations of the proposed building be submitted, along with the dimensions. Those documents had been submitted ten days ago.

Mr. Rosard testified that attic space is needed for the home's mechanical equipment. The pitch of the roof has now been made steeper to accommodate that need. This adjustment is still within the Borough's height restrictions.

Mr. Rosard reviewed all the dimensions that have recently been submitted.

Mr. Morris submitted and explained Exhibit A-3: the neighborhood analysis. He reviewed the spacing between homes on Rowan Road and Weston Avenue. Mr. Morris testified that there are many homes in this area that are well within the side yard setback requirements. He pointed out that the existing paper street on the side of his property is all gravel and provides a significant amount of space between his house and the one next door.

Mr. Morris testified that the existing house was probably built in the late 1940s or 1950s. The only update to the house is the roof. The existing house is more closer to the setback line than the proposed house. The proposed house will be set farther back.

Mr. Morris submitted and explained the following:

Exhibit A-4: a list of Rowan Road homes & the number of feet between these homes

Exhibit A-5: an aerial photo of Rowan Road

Exhibit A-6: an aerial photo of Weston Ave. and the number of feet between homes  
Exhibit A-7: a photo-board showing homes in the immediate area that are well below the setback standards for the Borough. Every one of these lots is a corner lot. Mr. Martin gave the setback measurements of each one.

Exhibit A-8: a photo-board of the remaining homes, on corner lots, in the immediate area that were below the 30-ft. setback.

Exhibit A-9: a photo showing the gravel path's easement

Vice Chrmn. Herbert asked Mr. Morris if there was anything directly behind his house.

Mr. Morris answered that there was a creek and woods. The gravel path goes over a wooden foot bridge.

Mr. Morris submitted Exhibit A-10: drawing of the proposed house, showing this house positioned well beyond the setback.

Mr. Morris showed a photo of the house, 46 Rowan Rd., he and Ms. Evans currently live in.

Vice Chrmn. Herbert asked Mr. Morris how he felt about his proposed house at 43 Rowan Road fitting in with the rest of the neighborhood.

Mr. Morris felt that when the proposed house is all finished and landscaped, it may look different from the surrounding homes, but will be a nice addition to the neighborhood. He believed the young couples moving from the city prefer non-traditional looking homes in Chatham Borough.

Vice Chrmn. Herbert asked what is the condition of the current home at 43 Rowan Road.

Mr. Morris answered the current home is in poor condition. He believed the house had structural issues.

Mr. Rosard testified that the style of this proposed home will not be "dramatically modern."

The Board had no further questions for the applicant and architect. There were no questions or comments from the public.

Mr. Morris closed his application and submitted it to the Board for their consideration.

Board discussion began. Vice Chrmn. Herbert felt that the proposed home will add character to the neighborhood. The existing gravel roadway will provide more space for the new home. He thanked the applicant for returning to the Board with the requested material. Mrs. Kass pointed out that the proposed home would have a greater setback than the existing structure. Mr. Montague, Mrs. Kecskemety, Mr. Haeringer, and Mr. Tobia indicated that they approve of the application.

Vice Chrmn. Herbert made a motion to approve Application ZB #17-02: Evans & Morris – 43 Rowan Road. Mrs. Kass seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken:

Mrs. Kass	-	yes
Mrs. Kecskemety	-	yes
Mr. Montague	-	yes
Mr. Tobia	-	yes
Mr. Haeringer	-	yes
Vice Chrnm. Herbert	-	yes

Application ZB #17-09  
Austin & Christine Fagan  
95 Hillside Avenue  
Building Coverage/Lot Coverage  
Block 114, Lot 6

Vice Chrnm. Herbert recused himself from this application, because he lives within the 200-ft. radius of the applicant's property. He departed from the room. Mrs. Kass took charge of this hearing.

The following were sworn in to testify:  
Austin & Christine Fagan, the applicants  
Ann Sears, the architect for the applicants

Mr. Fagan gave an introductory statement on the application. He testified that his home is a small colonial-style house. He and his wife are proposing an extension at the rear of the house. This extension would consist of a family room and a master bedroom.

Ms. Sears submitted his professional credentials to the Board. The Board accepted them.

Ms. Sears testified that the original house at 95 Hillside Ave. was built in 1911. It was constructed on an undersized lot. The house recently had a "face-lift" done with renovated bathrooms. The foot-print has remained the same. The height of the basement measures under 6 ft. 8 inches.

Ms. Sears submitted Exhibit A-1: existing conditions of the current house, consisting of the floor plans, the survey, and elevations. Ms. Sears described the existing first and second floors of the current home. There are four bedrooms in the existing home, and one shared bathroom. Some of the bedrooms are on the small side, measuring 10 ft. 8 inches by 10 ft. 7 inches.

Ms. Sears pointed out that the only variances being sought were for Building Coverage and Lot Coverage. The applicant is looking to add 242 sq. ft. of living area on the first floor. The existing kitchen, dining room, and living room will remain. An area will be created to form a connection into the family room. A small mudroom area will be created in that connected area. A yard entrance to the new patio area will also be created.

Regarding the second floor, Ms. Sears testified that the smallest existing bedroom will be the connecting space to the proposed master bedroom suite. Another bathroom and a little more storage space will be added to the second floor.

Ms. Sears testified that the applicant's undersized lot has a long, paved driveway that goes to a detached garage in the backyard. This driveway adds to the lot coverage coverage. An existing front porch adds to the building coverage.

Mr. Montague confirmed with Ms. Sears that the patio was also contributing towards the lot coverage. Ms. Sears noted that there is no room to construct a conforming deck on the side.

Ms. Sears submitted Exhibit A-2: a neighborhood analysis regarding square footages.

Mrs. Kecskemety asked if the neighbor on the corner would be impacted in any way by the proposed patio area.

Ms. Sears answered that natural evergreens run along that property line providing privacy for the neighbors. Mr. Fagan testified that there is a great deal of pachysandra and existing trees between the two homes.

Mr. Haeringer asked if the stairs on the side would require a variance.

Ms. Sears answered no. She reviewed her calculations with Mr. Haeringer and Attorney Dwyer. Ms. Sears testified that on the left side, the bottom tread would measure 10 feet 2 inches from the side yard. Attorney Dwyer believed that measurement would then trigger a side yard variance. He suggested Ms. Sears include testimony about this staircase.

Ms. Sears testified on the 3 ft. platform being proposed for the staircase. The risers to the grade would be the patio area. She stated that the proposed two treads overhang the 12 ft. setback, making it 10 ft. 2 inches.

Mrs. Kass and Mr. Montague were interested in a comparison of building coverages to the lot sizes of adjoining properties.

To help answer this question, Ms. Sears submitted Exhibit A-3: a chart showing neighboring lot sizes, similar to the applicant's lot size. Mrs. Kass confirmed with Ms. Sears that across the street from the applicant, there are lots similar in size to the applicant's lot; however, the houses are larger than the applicant's. Mrs. Kass concluded that on Exhibit A-3 there are three lots comparable in size to that of the applicant's, however the homes are larger than the applicant's house.

Ms. Sears testified that massive rooms are not being proposed in this application. She felt Mr. and Mrs. Fagan were just looking to upgrade their living quarters to modern standards.

Mr. Haeringer asked why the roof is being raised at the back of the home.

Ms. Sears explained how the bridging piece connects at the break of the existing dormer, and widens out beyond.

Mr. Haeringer confirmed with Ms. Sears that a side yard variance is being added to the application to allow for the staircase's bottom tread arrangement.

Mrs. Kass asked if there was testimony on the proposed patio, because it is triggering an additional variance.

Ms. Sears testified that at the rear of the property, the applicant's family does not have any real outside entertainment area. Currently there is a spot to put a grill. The patio will give the Fagans an area to enjoy their backyard. It will also serve as a "soft transition" from the backyard to the house.

Mrs. Kass asked if the public had any questions for Ms. Sears. No one came forward. No one from the public had any comments on this application.

Mr. Fagan closed his application and submitted it to the Board for their consideration.

The floor opened up for Board discussion. Mr. Haeringer felt the proposed addition was well done and was definitely needed. Mr. Tobia believed the addition was well designed and will provide good living space. Mr. Montague pointed out that smaller homes, like the applicant's, are needed in town. Mrs. Kass stated that the data presented made a good case for these variances. She will support this application. Mr. Montague made a motion to approve Application ZB #17-09: Fagan – 95 Hillside Avenue, with the applicant to follow any stormwater regulations stipulated by the Borough Engineer. Mr. Haeringer seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken:

Mr. Tobia	-	yes
Mr. Haeringer	-	yes
Mrs. Kecskemety	-	yes
Mrs. Kass	-	yes
Mr. Montague	-	yes

Vice Chairman Herbert returned to the Board table.

Application ZB #17-12: Leo Acevedo/Adonis Real Estate, LLC – 11 Fern Avenue will continue to the July 26, 2017 Zoning Bd. of Adjustment meeting.

At 8:50 p.m. a break was taken in the meeting.

At 9:00 p.m. the meeting resumed.

Application ZB #17-10

Kevin Towers

5 Penn Terrace

Front Yard/Side Yard/Rear Yard/Floor Area Ratio

The following were sworn in to testify:

John Lyons, the architect for the applicants

Kevin & Marie Towers, the applicants

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

Mr. Lyons testified that Mr. and Mrs. Towers existing house has 3 bedrooms. The Towers are proposing to expand their kitchen and create a fourth bedroom, and a master bedroom suite on the second floor.

Mr. Lyons testified that the applicant has an existing non-conforming site. The existing lot width is non-conforming. The existing home is positioned in the right side yard setback and in the existing front yard setback. Regarding the second floor, Mr. Lyons explained the extension that will go over the existing roof, triggering a front yard setback. Mr. Lyons reviewed the proposals for the rear yard setback. The proposed building coverage and lot coverage are conforming. Mr. Lyons testified that the FAR variance is triggered by the proposed space extending beyond the 7 feet ceiling height in the attic.

Mr. Lyons explained the existing and the proposed first floor plans. The proposed family room, on the first floor, will be “pushed out” at the rear of the home. The second floor, with the proposals, will have four bedrooms and two baths. The additional attic space will provide storage area for the family. Mr. Lyons explained that there will be a full staircase leading up to the attic.

Mr. Montague asked what would be the height of the peaked roof. Mr. Lyons answered 31 feet to the ridge of the roof.

Mrs. Kass pointed out that an additional variance will probably be needed for this proposed attic space. The Board needs more information on this matter.

Regarding the proposed FAR, Mr. Montague asked what the applicant’s neighborhood was like.

Mr. Lyons submitted Exhibit A-1: Aerial photo of Penn Terrace. Mr. Lyons also had a side view of the applicant’s neighborhood. He pointed out the neighboring homes that have had additions put on.

Mr. Montague felt that the proposed FAR was high. At the moment, Mr. Lyons didn’t have the FAR measurements for the neighboring homes. Mrs. Kass and Mr. Montague asked for these neighborhood FARs. Mrs. Kass suggested clarification also be made on whether a variance is needed for the proposed attic space.

Mr. Towers and Mr. Lyons asked that the application be carried to the next meeting.

Application ZB #17-10: Towers – 5 Penn Terrace will continue to the July 26, 2017 Zoning Bd. of Adjustment meeting.

Application ZB #17-12: Acevedo/Adonis Real Estate, LLC – 11 Fern Avenue will continue to the July 26, 2017 Zoning Bd. of Adjustment meeting.

Application ZB #17-11

Aaron & Tamara Aue

15 Vincent Street

Side Yard/Building Coverage/Floor Area Ratio

Block 79, Lot 26

The following were sworn in to testify:

Aaron & Tamara Aue, the applicants

Brian Siegel, the architect for the applicant

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

Mr. Siegel submitted the following:

Exhibit A-1: Conceptual perspective, showing before and after pictures of the proposals.

Exhibit A-2: Neighborhood analysis showing the single-family homes within a 200-ft. radius

Mr. Aue testified that he and his wife had purchased the property in 2011. They are proposing a living room at the rear of the house. They would like to modify the kitchen to become more accessible to the living room area. A master bedroom suite is proposed for the second floor.

Vice Chrmn. Herbert asked if there were any factors within the interior of the house which are triggering these variances. Is it an older home?

Mr. Aue stated that the house was built in the 1940s. The existing kitchen was probably updated in the 1990s. Mr. Aue felt an update was needed. Mrs. Aue, with young children, is seeking more of an open concept for the kitchen.

Mr. Siegel described the existing conditions of the home. He reviewed Sheet A-4 which depicted the existing second floor, giving the measurements of the current bedrooms. The existing house has 1 ½ bathrooms.

Mr. Siegel stated that the applicant is looking to open up the rear of the house. The existing formal living room will be eliminated. The new dining room will be put into the old living room space. A “walling-off” will be done, near the front foyer, to create a mudroom. A small bathroom is being proposed, and a small hallway to get access to the garage.

Mr. Siegel reviewed the measurements of the new bedrooms. A “Jack and Jill” bathroom will be created over the garage for the daughters to share. This new bathroom is triggering the side yard setback variance. Mr. Siegel testified that the applicant’s property has a pre-existing nonconforming setback.

Mr. Siegel stated that the view of the house, from the street, will remain the same except for the replacement of windows and a portico to be constructed over the front entrance. He explained

that instead of demolishing the house, he and the applicant are trying to “build off of the character” of the existing home and expand.

Mr. Siegel felt that one of the reasons the applicant has to appear before the Board was because of the pre-existing conditions related to the lot size, which is a third smaller than what should be allowed for this particular zone.

Mr. Siegel testified that the proposals were positioned to be the least obtrusive to the neighbors. He pointed out a buffer of evergreens between the applicant’s property and the neighbors to the west. Screening also exists between the applicant and the neighbors to the east. The back wall of brick garages, belonging to an apartment complex, runs along the back property line.

Mr. Siegel discussed the neighborhood analysis he had done on the 29 properties. The applicant’s property measures no well near the average property size of these neighboring properties. The applicant’s property is significantly under that size.

Vice Chrmn. Herbert confirmed with Mr. Siegel that there’s not really any bulk added to the home except the proposed bathroom to go on top of the existing garage.

Mrs. Kecskemety questioned the amount of FAR being proposed.

Mr. Siegel pointed out that the applicant’s house was “basically maxed out” as it’s currently designed.

Mr. Siegel discussed what little, if any, impact these proposals would have on the neighbors. Mr. Montague confirmed with Mr. Siegel that the new roof with the proposals will be the same height as the original roof. Mr. Montague expressed concern about the overage on the FAR variance. Mrs. Kass felt a FAR comparison needed to be done on the neighborhood. Mr. Siegel felt that the second floors would be very difficult to calculate. He believed that 50% of the 29 homes in the neighborhood had four bedrooms.

Mrs. Kass asked for a streetscape showing the distance between the houses in the applicant’s neighborhoods.

Vice Chrmn. Herbert and Mr. Siegel discussed the size of the house to the right of the applicant’s. Mr. Siegel stated that this particular neighboring house had four bedrooms and had a significantly larger FAR than the applicant’s home. Therefore, the applicant’s home, if the proposals were approved and constructed, would not be the largest home in the neighborhood. Mr. Montague still wanted a streetscape of the neighborhood.

Vice Chrmn. Herbert asked Mr. Siegel and the applicant if they wanted the Board to vote on their application tonight, or carry it to the next meeting. The applicant asked if an informal poll could be taken of which Board members were ready to vote on the application as presented tonight. A majority of the Board members voted to wait until further information was presented on the Floor Area Ratios of the neighboring homes.

Mr. Siegel and the applicant asked to carry their application to the next meeting. The Board consented. Mr. Siegel will obtain information on the FARs and building coverage of the neighboring homes.

Application ZB #17-11: Aue – 15 Vincent Street will continue to the July 26, 2017 Zoning Bd. of Adjustment meeting.

Application ZB #17-14  
Kristen & Bruce Torkelson  
210 Fairmount Avenue  
Side Yard/Rear Yard/Building Coverage/Lot Coverage  
Block 64, Lot 17.01

The following were sworn in to testify:

Bruce & Kristin Torkelson, the applicants

John James, the architect for the applicants

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

Mr. James submitted Exhibit A-1: a photo of the existing house.

Mr. Torkelson gave an introductory statement for his application. His house was built in 1908. It sits on a very long and narrow lot. Mr. Torkelson reviewed the renovations he and his wife have done to the home. He noted that with these proposed plans, the house will remain 95% in its current state. Mr. Torkelson testified that he and his wife are seeking a small bump-out to the kitchen. Also, an outdoor basement stairwell will be enclosed.

Mr. Torkelson noted that the garage and driveway will be re-oriented. The existing driveway behind the house will be removed. The existing garage will be demolished. A new garage will be constructed. The new driveway will run on the far side of the lot, and curve in.

Mr. Torkelson explained that currently he and family members have to exit the driveway by backing out onto Fairview Avenue, which is difficult with all the school traffic going on. He is proposing a circular space on the front of his property to allow his vehicles to turn around and exit the driveway nose first. These proposals will also create good backyard space for the Torkelsons.

Mr. James testified that 210 Fairmount Ave. is a corner lot, positioned on the corner of Fairview Ave. The property is 110 years old. The house needs upgrading to match the character of the neighborhood homes.

Using Exhibit A-1, Mr. James pointed out the existing car port area and the two-car garage with a sloping roof does not fit well with a historic Chatham home.

Mr. James testified that the applicant is proposing to expand the existing kitchen out by 5 feet. An expansion of about 6 feet will cover the basement stair. The garage will be moved farther

away from the rear yard. The proposed one story addition will have a hipped roof that will match the existing roof on the house. A new side entrance will be created with the proposed covering over the existing stairwell.

Mr. James explained that the existing kitchen and existing breakfast room will be “flipped” so the kitchen will have a view of the backyard. The existing alignment of the house will remain the same with the new kitchen. Mr. James testified that the property has an existing nonconforming side yard condition. With the expansion of the kitchen, the non-conformity will be extended; however, it will only be for one story. He explained the side yard and rear yard variances with regard to the proposed garage.

Mr. James testified that the proposed garage will be made tighter to the house with regard to mass and volume. Mr. James pointed out that the proposed plans are under on FAR.

With regard to lot coverage, Mr. James explained that the proposed circular turn-around, in the middle of the property, would be an easier way for a vehicle to exit the property. This turn-around could be easily screened.

Mrs. Kass asked why the front driveway was needed, with a proposed driveway and garage at the rear of the property.

Mr. James explained that on Fairmount Ave. all the homes face the front. He believed that the resident should have some way to access the front door of his house, as opposed to parking in the back. Some of the Board members suggested the possibility of a U-shaped driveway in front, instead of the circular driveway.

Mr. Torkelson stated that the existing driveway does not have room for a vehicle to turn around in. After further discussion, Mr. Montague felt that a great deal of lot coverage will still be added.

Mr. James pointed out that an effort was made not to have the circular driveway close to the porch and family areas. Mrs. Torkelson stated that some of her friends who visit have to park across the street at the cemetery.

Vice Chrmn. Herbert pointed out that Board members are still concerned about the amount of driveway that is being proposed, and the amount of lot coverage requested. The Board members have to make sure that over-building does not occur on Borough properties.

Mrs. Kass asked Mr. James if he had a calculation of the existing pavement on the applicant’s lot. Mr. James answered yes. He showed Mrs. Kass the spreadsheet of the pavement calculations. Mrs. Kass reviewed the lot coverage measurements with the proposed driveway and the rear driveway. She felt there were other ways for the applicant to accomplish their driveway goals without backing out onto a busy street.

Vice Chrmn. Herbert asked Mr. James if he had a neighborhood analysis for this application. Mr. James answered no. He pointed out the “minimal solutions” made with the application, particularly with the proposed driveway.

There were no questions or comments from the public.

Mr. Haeringer asked what would be the alternate if the circular driveway was not done.

Mrs. Torkelson stated that as a mother she had serious concerns about cars backing out onto Fairview Ave. She would ask Mr. James to figure out an alternative. Mr. Haeringer brought up the idea of the U-shaped driveway. Mr. James felt that a U-shaped driveway would be too close to the private areas of the home. A circular driveway would be a more gracious driveway arrangement.

Mr. and Mrs. Torkelson closed their application and submitted it to the Board for their consideration.

Vice Chrmn. Herbert asked for comments from the Board. Mr. Haeringer approved of the applicant removing the present garage. He was not happy with the proposed circular driveway; however, he will support the application. Vice Chrmn. Herbert agreed with Mr. Haeringer’s feelings about the circular driveway; however, he approved of the large amount of asphalt removed in the back and the new garage being attached to the house. Mrs. Kass felt that the changes causing the intensification to the side yard were not a detriment. It was a benefit. Mr. Montague felt that the Borough had regulations about parking circles in front of homes. He knew of no home on Fairmount Ave. that had a circular driveway. Mrs. Kecskemety stated she supported the application. The applicant is forced to deal with the awkward way the property had originally been designed. Mr. Tobia stated he will support the application.

Mrs. Kass made a motion to approve Application ZB #17-14: Torkelson – 210 Fairmount Avenue, with the applicant to follow any stipulations from the Borough Engineer regarding stormwater run-off. Mr. Tobia seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken:

Mrs. Kass	-	yes
Mrs. Kecskemety	-	yes
Mr. Montague	-	no
Mr. Haeringer	-	yes
Vice Chrmn. Herbert	-	yes

At 10:50 p.m. the meeting adjourned.

The next Zoning Board of Adjustment meeting will be held on Wednesday, July 26, 2017, 7:30 p.m., in the Council Chambers, Chatham Borough Hall.

Respectfully submitted:

Elizabeth Holler  
Recording Secretary