

CHATHAM BOROUGH ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
 July 27, 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. Most Board members and Attorney Dwyer were present in person. Chrmn. 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	X	
Frederick Infante	X – present by way of Zoom	
Jean-Eudes Haeringer	X	
Joseph Treloar	X	
David Degidio		X
Peter Hoffman		X
Curt Dawson	X – present by way of Zoom	
Patrick Dwyer, Esq.	X	

The Zoom recording of the first half of the meeting, up until 8:47 p.m. failed. The following is what I can gather from my notes. – E. Holler, Recording Secretary

Public Comment

There was none

Resolution #ZB 2021-01

The minutes of the June 22, 2022 Zoning Board of Adjustment were approved as submitted.

Resolutions

Application ZB 22-001

Eric & Kelsey Bicknese
237 Washington Avenue
Block: 5 Lot: 9

Minimum Side Yard Set Back (Corner)

Minimum Rear Yard Setback

Maximum Principal Building Coverage

Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage

Attorney Dwyer summarized this application. A motion was made and seconded to approve this resolution memorializing the Board’s approval of this application with its variances. A roll call vote was taken:

- Mr. Haeringer - yes
- Mr. Treloar - yes
- Mr. Dawson - yes

The resolution was approved.

Application ZB 22-002
Courtney & Ben Lampert
48 Fairmount Avenue
Block: 91 Lot: 4
Minimum Right Side Set Back
Maximum Principal Building Coverage
Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage
Maximum FAR

Attorney Dwyer summarized this application. A motion was made and seconded to approve this resolution memorializing the Board's approval of this application with its variances. A roll call vote was taken:

Mr. Haeringer - yes
Chrmn. Cifelli - yes
Mr. Dawson - yes

The resolution was approved.

Returning and New Applications

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

Application ZB 22-005 – Padhi
Application ZB 22-007 – Kelleher
Application ZB 22-011 – Nassif

Chrmn. Cifelli announced the following applications will be carried to the August 24, 2022 Zoning Bd. of Adjustment meeting without further notice:

Application ZB 018 – Symbios Animal Hospital
Application ZB 22-009 – Chiarello
Application ZB 22-008 – Hume
Application ZB 22-010 – Kobylarz

Chrmn. Cifelli announced that a Special Board of Adjustment meeting will be held on Monday, August 22, 2022, 7:30 p.m. to continue hearing Application ZB 20-012: Chatham Holdings, LLC

Application ZB 22-005
Gitamaya & Archana Padhi
7 Harding Street
Block: 51 Lot: 2
Maximum Principal Building Coverage

Attorney Dwyer swore in the following to testify:
Gitamaya & Archana Padhi, the applicants
Doug Miller, the architect for the applicants

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

Mr. Padhi gave an introductory statement to the Board. He described the small conditions of the existing home. Mr. Padhi and his architect are proposing to enlarge the second floor and construct a one story addition at the rear of the house.

Mr. Miller testified that the applicant's home is the only house fronting on Harding Street. He submitted Exhibit A-1: a photo-board of the applicant's neighborhood including an aerial map.

Mr. Miller reviewed the following proposals for this application:

1. Enlarge the second floor with cantilevers
2. Construct a one-story addition at the rear of the house with rear/side platforms & steps to new patio
3. Rebuild existing stoop with portico roof
4. Enlarge driveway & construct side walkway to rear
5. Existing deck & shed to be removed
6. Alterations/Renovations to interior to accommodate the addition
7. Seeking variances for the Front Yard setback & Building Coverage

Mr. Miller testified that there is a proposal to construct a recreation room under the proposed rear addition.

Mr. Miller described the existing first floor plan, pointed out the lack of privacy that is currently existing on that level. The existing dining room measures 9 ft. by 10 ft. To help alleviate this problem, the applicant is proposing to open up the back of the house. The existing kitchen will be improved with this action.

Mr. Miller described the existing second floor and its problems. A whole new arrangement of rooms is being proposed.

Mr. Miller put the elevations on the Zoom screen. He discussed the improvements that will be made to the foundation of the home. On the second floor bays and gables will be created. Mr. Miller described the proposed cantilevering for the second floor.

Mr. Miller believed that the benefits outweighed the detriments with this application. He felt the scale of the house will become more appropriate if these proposals were approved and carried out.

Mr. Treloar brought up the question of whether, by ordinance, a third story was being created, thereby requiring a variance. The Board and Mr. Miller reviewed the proposed attic calculations at length and compared them to the ordinance's language on attics. It was decided, after reviewing all the attic calculations, that a variance would not be needed for a third story. Mr. Miller pointed out that the proposed mechanicals will be situated above the master bedroom.

Mr. Miller submitted Exhibit A-3 was submitted. (Am not sure what this was, possibly the plans for the proposed first floor. – E. Holler)

Mr. Infante confirmed with Mr. Miller and Mr. Padhi that the neighboring house behind the applicant's home has a second story. Many houses in that immediate area have second floors.

The Board and Mr. Miller discussed the proposed balcony and sunroom.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked if the public had any questions for Mr. Miller or Mr. Padhi.

There were no questions from the public for these witnesses.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked if there were any comments from the public regarding this application.

David Andreasen, 25 University Ave., stated that he supported this application.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked for comments from the Board.

Mr. Treloar believed it was a very smart plan. He felt that no real bulk will show on the house. Mr. Haeringer pointed out that the house is in need of renovations, and these proposed plans would be very welcome. Mr. Dawson approved of the proposed detailing. Mr. Infante believe that a modest upgrade was being proposed. The light, open space and air will not be impacted with these proposals. Chrmn. Cifelli agreed with Mr. Haeringer's comment that the home was in need of modernization. He felt the proposed addition was modest in size.

A motion was made to approve Application ZB 22-005, with the applicant to follow any recommendations made by the Borough Engineer concerning stormwater. The motion was seconded. A roll call vote was taken:

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

Application ZB 22-005 was approved.

At 8:47 p.m. a break was taken in the meeting.

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

The Zoom recording device was now working.

Application ZB 22-007
Susan & Thomas Kelleher
143 Washington Avenue

Block: 95 Lot: 18

Maximum Principal Building Coverage

Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage

Attorney Dwyer swore in the following to testify:

Susan & Thomas Kelleher, the applicants

Terri Ziyad, the architect for the applicants

Ms. Ziyad, a licensed architect, stated that she is employed with TLA Design, and will testify on the Kelleher's application tonight. She submitted her professional credentials to the Board. The Board accepted them.

Chrmn. Cifelli reviewed the calculations of the building coverage, both existing and proposed. Variances are being sought for the building coverage and for lot coverage. Chrmn. Cifelli reviewed the calculations for these variances, existing and proposed, and their overages.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked Ms. Ziyad if the applications proposes to enlarge the lot coverage.

Ms. Ziyad answered no. The proposed addition will be constructed over an existing patio. It's an existing non-conformity. However, Ms. Ziyad stated that she was told a lot coverage variance would be needed. She stated that she understood that when Mr. & Mrs. Kelleher had bought their home, the lot coverage was "as is".

Mr. Haeringer asked Ms. Ziyad if any changes were being proposed for the lot coverage.

Ms. Ziyad answered that the lot coverage will remain "as is". The only change would be is to have the proposed addition extend over the patio.

Attorney Dwyer asked if there is any evidence of an approval for the patio and its lot coverage.

Mrs. Kelleher answered that she and her husband were not aware of any previous variance approvals for the property.

Chrmn. Cifelli concluded that technically the patio would not be a pre-existing non-conformity, because it exists. It is not known whether or not it had been permitted by the Borough. The proposed application will bring this situation into conformity. Ms. Ziyad accepted that conclusion.

Mrs. Kelleher gave an introductory statement for the application. She and her husband have lived in the subject house since 2015. They have two sons. She stated that the house was built in the 1930s. Prior owners have updated the home. Mrs. Kelleher stated that the variances being sought are to bring the home up to modern standards and functionality. She pointed out, for instance, that no pantry exists in the kitchen. She would like to expand an existing mudroom.

Chrmn. Cifelli confirmed with Mrs. Kelleher that she and her husband are seeking to make their home more functional and up to date.

Ms. Ziyad put photo-boards showing the existing home and detached garage on the Zoom screen. She confirmed that the applicants are requesting variances for the building coverage and lot coverage. Ms. Ziyad reviewed the zoning requirements for properties in this R-1 Zone. The pictures on these photo-boards show how the existing house is squeezed in on its allowable building footprint. After the required 12 feet is taken on either side, the property owner is left with only a 38 ft. width in buildable lot area.

Ms. Ziyad testified that the home has a detached two-car garage at the rear property line.

Ms. Ziyad showed a photo of the back left-hand corner of the property. She pointed where the proposed addition will be constructed. This addition will not be seen from the street.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked what the square footage of the front porch is.

Ms. Ziyad answered that the existing front porch is 100 sq. ft.

On the Zoom screen, Ms. Ziyad put up existing and proposed surveys of the property. She pointed out the rear corner of the property where the proposed addition will be constructed. Ms. Ziyad testified that it will be a modest addition on a modest house. She believed one of the triggers for the lot coverage variance is caused by the detached garage. Ms. Ziyad felt that due to the nature of the home and the width of the lot, the previous owners had no choice but to construct the detached garage at this location. She felt the garage could have been attached to the house if the lot had been wider; thereby removing a significant amount of lot coverage.

Chrmn. Cifelli pointed out that the Borough's Master Plan favors detached garages in the back of properties. If the impervious lot coverage of the driveway leading up to this garage were to be removed, it would be going against something that the Master Plan favors. Ms. Ziyad agreed with this point.

Ms. Ziyad put the two site plans on the Zoom screen again – the existing and the proposed. Ms. Ziyad explained the proposal to make the existing kitchen to speak more to a breakfast area and a family room. The footprint for the existing mudroom will be increased. A pantry storage area will be created at the entrance of the dining room.

Ms. Ziyad testified that a covered entry will still be maintained to protect visitors and family members from the elements. It will also improve the functionality of the house.

Ms. Ziyad reviewed the second floor layout. She described the awkward situation of the washer and dryer existing in the applicants' walk-in closet, producing some safety concerns. A dedicated laundry area will be created that will meet all the safety standards for ventilation. It will be kept separate from the applicants' sleeping quarters.

On the Zoom screen, Ms. Ziyad put the elevations of the home with the proposed addition. A portico is being proposed for the front of the home. No variance would be needed for the portico. Ms. Ziyad felt the portico would add curb appeal and improve the aesthetics of the neighborhood. The portico will not connect to the front porch.

Attorney Dwyer asked for the size of the portico.

Ms. Ziyad answered that the portico will measure 4 ft. 1 in. by 6 feet.

Attorney Dwyer confirmed with Ms. Ziyad that the portico will be under 30 sq. ft.

Ms. Ziyad discussed the rear elevation. She pointed out where the rear addition will be located. Ms. Ziyad also pointed out the existing door out the back of the mudroom which will remain. New roofing will be installed for the enlarged mudroom, kitchen expansion, and walk-in closet addition. There will be a bit of a shed roof installed behind the second floor addition.

Ms. Ziyad testified that there will be no changes made to the right side elevation, except for the sliver of the proposed portico. The left elevation depiction shows how the mudroom and proposed second floor addition will step back from the rear elevation of the house.

Ms. Ziyad testified that no additional lot coverage will be added to the property. The second story addition will be constructed in the location of an existing patio. The proposed building coverage variance is for 126 sq. ft. Ms. Ziyad felt that was a modest amount.

Chrmn. Cifelli confirmed with Ms. Ziyad that if the existing covered porch were to be eliminated in order to minimize the variance for the rear addition, it would eliminate an item that the Master Plan encourages.

Chrmn. Cifelli confirmed with Ms. Ziyad that the patio will remain.

Mr. Haeringer confirmed with Ms. Ziyad that the patio is slightly below grade. Ms. Ziyad explained that this is caused by the nature of the property, which slopes from the rear down towards the street. There are some retaining walls on the side of the patio to help keep conditions dry.

Regarding the lot coverage issue, Mr. Treloar asked if there was a reason why the applicant did not look into replacing the larger patio with pervious material.

Ms. Ziyad answered that different options had been discussed regarding this lot coverage situation; however, she and the applicants felt the driving force behind the lot coverage variance was the detached garage. Ms. Ziyad felt that removing any portion of the existing patio would deem the patio unusable. Currently, the patio barely fits a table. She pointed out the area that allows the applicant's family to safely exit the house and onto the patio. To remove this particular section, would be more of a detriment to the family. Ms. Ziyad recommended leaving the patio as it exists.

With regard to the rear patio, Chrmn. Cifelli asked who or what is the neighbor behind the applicant's property.

Mrs. Kelleher explained that her home is one house in from the corner of Washington Ave. and Broadview Terrace. The neighbor to the rear, on Broadview Terrace, is quite set back from the applicant's property. Mr. Kelleher added that his family's home is perpendicular to the neighbor's home at the rear. That neighboring home is uphill from the Kellehers' home.

Mr. Haeringer asked the applicants if their property received the run-off from the neighboring properties.

Mrs. Kelleher answered yes, it would seem that way.

Mr. Haeringer asked if there was any drainage installed in the patio area.

Mrs. Kelleher answered yes, there is drainage at the current patio (the patio on the left-hand side).

Mr. Haeringer asked if this drainage system, at the patio, carried the water out into the street.

Mr. and Mrs. Kelleher answered yes.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked if there was a drywell.

Mrs. Kelleher did not believe so.

At Chrmn. Cifelli's request, Mr. Kelleher tried to explain what drainage he knew existed on his property. He believed that the water from the house gutters run to underground piping on his property that directs the water out into the street. The bigger patio on the side of his house has a large French drain. River rocks currently run the length of his driveway.

Ms. Ziyad stated that to the best of their knowledge, the existing drainage is not an issue for the Kellehers or their nearby neighbors. No water will be diverted to neighboring properties.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked if there would be a system to catch the run-off on the proposed addition on the rear left-hand side. Will there be leaders installed on the proposed roof?

Ms. Ziyad answered yes, there will be new gutters and leaders on the roof of that addition. It will tie into the existing drainage system.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked if the public had any questions for these witnesses.

There were no questions.

Ms. Ziyad and the applicants indicated that they were closing the application and submitting it to the Board for their consideration.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked if the public had any comments on this application.

There were no comments from the public.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked for comments from the Board. Chrmn. Cifelli felt that the additional space being proposed is definitely needed in order to bring the house up to modern standards. It's a modest application. The second floor will become more functional with these proposals. He pointed out the patio will give a means for the stormwater to effectively drain off. Chrmn. Cifelli believed that, all around, the application would be favorable. A minimum impact would result on the light, air, and open space of the neighboring homes. Mr. Haeringer agreed with Chrmn. Cifelli's points. Mr. Dawson believed the proposed improvements would not be as huge as they could have been. He will support the application. Mr. Infante pointed out that the side yards will not be impacted. He believed that the house desperately needed the proposed portico. Mr. Treloar stated he could accept the proposed building; however, had a problem with the lot coverage. It was not clear if the existing lot coverage was ever officially approved. He could not support the application.

Mr. Infante made a motion to approve Application ZB 22-007 with the applicant to follow any recommendations made by the Borough Engineer regarding stormwater. Mr. Dawson seconded the motion. A roll call vote taken:

Chrmn. Cifelli	-	yes
Mr. Haeringer	-	yes
Mr. Infante	-	yes
Mr. Treloar	-	no
Mr. Dawson	-	yes

Application ZB 22-007 was approved.

Application ZB 22-011

Larry & Tenison Nassif

128 Chatham Street

Block: 19 Lot: 36

Maximum Building Coverage

Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage

Attorney Dwyer swore in the following:

Larry & Tenison Nassif, the applicants

David Dubinett, the architect for the applicants

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

Mrs. Nassif stated that she and her husband have lived in this house since 2009. Their house is at the dead end of Chatham Street. Mr. Nassif stated that their 1940s home is not conducive living with 3 teen-age children now.

On the Zoom screen, Mr. Dubinett submitted Exhibit A-1: Aerial photography, photos of the subject site, colorized plans, zoning analysis.

Mr. Infante asked what variances were being sought.

Mr. Dubinett testified that a building coverage variance is being sought. It is an existing non-conformity. A lot coverage variance is also needed. This is also an existing non-conformity. The existing lot coverage will be reduced.

Chrmn. Cifelli confirmed with Mr. Dubinett that the existing building coverage already exceeds what is allowed for building coverage.

Mr. Dubinett testified that the lot coverage is being reduced by 175 sq. ft.

Mr. Dubinett testified that the applicant's home is in the R-3 Zone. On the Zoom screen, Mr. Dubinett put up photos of the applicant's home as it exists today. He testified that the existing home is 1 ½ stories. Currently it does not resemble a two story home. The first floor is fairly large; however, the second floor is small.

Mr. Dubinett showed the rear elevation. A garage is currently located at the rear of the home. A significant amount of driveway is needed for this garage. On the right hand side of the home, a very small extension, measuring 2 feet, is proposed on the first floor. Mr. Dubinett stated that the neighbor to the right hand side of the applicant's home has very mature landscaping and will not be affected by this addition. Mr. Dubinett testified that 23 feet exists from the applicant's home to this neighbor next door, yielding plenty of open space.

Mr. Dubinett testified that it will be a modest-sized addition. The extension will be 2 feet. It will be constructed in the place of the existing deck. The existing deck will be made smaller. The existing dining room will be enlarged to allow adequate space for a table and chairs. The existing office will be made larger. Mr. Dubinett reviewed the modernization that will be done for the kitchen.

Mr. Dubinett reviewed the exterior elevations of the home. He explained the changes that will be made to the roof-line in order to construct the proposed extension.

Mr. Dubinett testified that the extension will be only one-story and will be situated at the rear.

Mr. Dubinett testified that the existing lot coverage, with these plans, will be reduced by 170.5 square feet.

On the Zoom screen, Mr. Dubinett reviewed his marked-up survey (part of Exhibit A-1) of the proposed outdoor changes, proving that no further impervious coverage will be created.

Mr. Dubinett reviewed an analysis he had created, using Zillow, regarding the neighboring properties with regard to lot coverage and building coverage percentages, the applicant's property is in the middle.

Mr. Dubinett discussed an analysis he did on rear garages and driveways within the 200-ft. radius of the applicant's home. Wider driveways exist in the neighborhood, so the applicant's driveway fits with what is the norm of the neighborhood.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked what the existing width of the driveway is, and what would be the proposed width.

Mr. Dubinett answered that the existing width is 8 feet. With the proposed extension, the width would become 16 feet wide, as it leads up to the house.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked what would be the purpose of this widening of the driveway.

Mr. Dubinett explained the current difficulty the family has in shuffling the family cars around when someone has to leave.

Chrmn. Cifelli noted that there will be a reduction of the driveway at the rear of the house. He asked if that would affect the turn ratio on the property.

Mr. Dubinett answered that the turn ratio will be greatly affected; however, the applicants are willing to give it up. Chrmn. Cifelli concluded that this new driveway space will be better utilized in front of the house, rather than at the rear.

Regarding the current addition at the back of the house, both Mr. Dubinett and the applicants did not know of any previous variances that had been approved for their home and property.

Mr. Dawson pointed out the only way to bring the property into conformance was to swap the garage and the first floor bedroom.

Mr. Dubinett said that option had been considered; however, he explained the problem with the grading. The driveway would have to pitch downward towards the garage, creating drainage problems.

Mr. Haeringer had a problem with the applicants' property already being way over on allowable lot coverage and building coverage. He had trouble understanding the justification of the need for these variances, particularly the proposals for the applicant's porch. Mr. Haeringer felt that the revised porch will eventually be turned into an actual room.

Mr. Nassif answered that there are no plans to turn the porch into an actual room. He would have to seek a variance for a proposal like that. Mrs. Nassif explained that the porch is currently screened-in. She and her husband are asking just for 2 feet to enclose it.

Chrmn. Cifelli noted that since the pandemic, many homeowners are asking for office space in their homes. It used to be mudrooms that were in demand. He pointed out to the applicants that any variances approved for a home gets carried to the next owner. Therefore, the Board has to carefully consider any approvals they make.

Mr. Haeringer pointed out some thought has to be given as to how these proposals will benefit the community. He was reluctant to give an approval to Mr. and Mrs. Nassif's plans, when their property is already over on building coverage and lot coverage.

Chrmn. Cifelli noted that a "C" variance is being sought. The Board has to decide whether the proposals will impact the neighbor's light, air, and open space. Chrmn. Cifelli pointed out that additional bulk will not be added. The bulk already is in place. Chrmn. Cifelli asked Mr. Dubinett to describe the office being proposed.

Mr. Dubinett testified that the office will have two windows in the front and one window on the side, and two windows at the back. The mature bush planted close to the extension will remain and buffer the office from the view of neighbors.

Mr. Dubinett pointed out that the application will not only improve the house, it will also give back 170 sq. ft. of impervious coverage. That is the positive criteria of this application. Mr. Dubinett did not see any detriments to the Borough's zone plan.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked for a break in the meeting.

At 10:25 p.m. a break was taken in the meeting.

At 10:28 p.m. the meeting resumed.

Mr. Infante asked if Mr. Dubinett could testify on how the changes to this property will be a benefit or an upgrade to the town's building stock.

Mr. Dubinett testified that it will be a modest upgrade because the living space will be slightly increased. The dining room would then become more functional. The interior flow and function of the first floor will improve. On another positive note, the lot coverage will be decreased. No trees will come down. Mr. Dubinett felt that the only ones to be impacted by these plans will be Mr. and Mrs. Nassif, and it will be a positive impact.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked if the Board had any more questions for the witnesses.

There were none.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked if the public had any questions for the witnesses.

Shawn Field, 37 Meadowbrook Rd., noted that his home is adjacent to the applicants' property. He asked if there were any plans for drainage. Mr. Field pointed out that the applicants' driveway slopes right towards his property.

Mr. Dubinett stated that a reduction will be made to the rear of the driveway that will reduce the impervious coverage in the back. Belgian block could be added to the back of the driveway to stop any run-off. Mr. Dubinett said he and the applicants would be happy to work with Mr. Field with this Belgian block installation idea.

At Chrmn. Cifelli's request, Mr. Field explained how the water, after a heavy rain, flows down to his back porch and window wells, then into his basement. He felt that stream of run-off originates in the applicants' driveway.

Mr. Dubinett said he would be happy to work with the Borough Engineer to plan a seepage pit to better control the water run-off.

Chrmn. Cifelli pointed out that if the application was approved, it would be subject to comply with any recommendations made by the Borough Engineer concerning run-off.

Mrs. Nassif indicated she would be willing to work with Mr. Field and the Borough Engineer on this situation. It was the first time she heard about it.

There were no further questions from the public.

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

Chrmn. Cifelli asked if the public had any comments on this application.

There were none.

Chrmn. Cifelli reminded Mr. Dubinett and the applicants that the "C" variance they are seeking needs a simple majority vote – three affirmative votes. Chrmn. Cifelli suggested either a poll be taken of Board members, or the applicant could wait until hopefully all seven Board members were present to vote on the application.

Mr. Dubinett asked that a poll be taken.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked Mr. Dawson for his thoughts on the application. Mr. Dawson stated that he now understood, by the testimony given, how impractical it would be to re-configure the basement to reduce the driveway. A double-wide driveway will be very helpful when sufficient space is needed to parking family members' vehicles. Mr. Treloar felt uncomfortable about approving a situation like the lot coverage which may not have been previously allowed by the Borough. Mr. Infante felt that the proposed extension would be minimal, despite the fact that it is a pre-existing non-conformity. It will be an upgrade to the applicant's home, thus benefitting the community. The extension will not be visible from the street. Mr. Haeringer stated he will listen to Chrmn. Cifelli's comments before making a decision on this application. Chrmn. Cifelli felt the proposed office is a positive move and a benefit to the community. The bulk of the home will not be increased. Chrmn. Cifelli pointed out that if the application was denied, the lot coverage does not get reduced. Also, if the application is denied, the water run-off situation on the property remains the same. The applicants are seeking just a little more living space to make the home functional.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked Mr. and Mrs. Kelleher if they would to submit their application to a vote tonight. They answered yes.

Chrmn. Cifelli made a motion to approve Application ZB 22-011 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. Dawson	-	yes
Mr. Treloar	-	yes
Mr. Infante	-	yes
Chrmn. Cifelli	-	yes
Mr. Haeringer	-	yes

Application ZB 22-011 was approved.

Chrmn. Cifelli announced the remaining applications on tonight's docket will be carried to the August 24, 2022 Regular Zoning Board of Adjustment meeting, 7:30 p.m.

Chrmn. Cifelli reminded Board Members that a Special Meeting of the Zoning Board of Adjustment will be held Monday, August 22, 2022, 7:30 p.m. for the Second Hearing of Application ZB 20-012: Chatham Holdings, LLC – 34 River Road.

At 10:54 p.m. the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted:

Elizabeth Holler
Recording Secretary