Present: Ms. Furio , Ms. Westerfeld, Mr. Corona, Mr. Merzel, Ms. Batistic, Mr. DePalo, Mr. Kassis, Mr McCord (Observer), Mr. Van Horne (Board Attorney), Ms. Bauer (recording secretary),
Absent:
The meeting was called to order at 8:04 pm.
Ms. Furio announced that the meeting had been published as required by the Sunshine Laws of the State of New Jersey.
Minutes of the Oct. 22, 2015 meeting were approved.

1275 NJR Investment Properties II 150 South Street Block 159 Lot 12
Mr. Saenz is applying for the following variances. NJR Properties were granted variances for this property on Dec. 5, 2013, Docket # 1234.

Description	**Required**	**Existing**	**Proposed**	**Variance**
Front Yard Set Back	25ft			
Side Yard Abutting/Lot	**15 ft**	**10.09**		**granted**
Combined Side yards	35 ft			
Rear Yard Set Back	30 ft			
Max. Livable Fl.Area FAR (variable)				
Lot Frontage	**100 ft**	**75 '**		**granted**
Lot Depth	100 ft			
Bldg Coverage %	20%			
Impervious Coverage (variable)	**31.9%**		**34.97%**	**3.07%**
Height	**28 ft**		**28'7"**	**7"**
Lot Area.	**10,000 sq.ft**	**8,156 sq.ft**		**granted**
Driveway from Prop. line.	10'			

The applicants must produce validation from the Boro Engineer for the height calculation, and a final survey of the property.

Mr. Marc Weissman , attorney representing NJR Investment Properties II, said that Mr. Saenz, the property manager was unable to attend and that Mr. Boris Hishinski would take his place. The issue before the board was whether the process used to measure the height was legitimate, and thereby determining if a height variance was required.
Mr. Hashinski was sworn in.
Mr. Weissman said the original plan showed the height as 28'7". Since then Planters have been installed, as shown on the new survey. Taking into account the Planters, the height is now 28' .
Mr. Paul Azzolina, Borough Engineer is here to give the board his interpretation of the survey.
Mr. Paul Azzolina was sworn in.
Mr. Azzolina said the way the zoning applications typically work, I do not become involved until there is a request for a soil movement permit and for an As-built review. In this case they applied for a soil movement permit. The seepage pits were found to be deficient so they were directed to re-construct. Then for the As-built, I determined there was a height issue, 28' 7". Whereas the plan submitted for review showed a height of 28' from grade, without any photographic mapping to support that statement. Probably the plan as presented is showing a line that has no elevation to it. Assuming

they constructed the roof from a plan that was approved at greater than 28'. So that without telling them to tear down the roof, that to me as an as constructed situation didn't make a lot of sense. So I figured they could re-grade the property in some manner. Their proposal was to construct the planters, which given the fact that our code basis the height on 2 spot elevations, I don't take great exceptions to them utilizing the 2 spot elevations that they are showing on the revised As-built revision #2 dated 6/3/15. It shows an elevation at the left corner of the building of 98.5 and at right corner at 98.9. Which then gives you an average elevation of 98.7. Which is subtracted from the roof peak of 126.6 gives a building height of 27.9. Given the situation: an As-built condition with a lot of difficulty on the site, I would not take exception to the calculation. Because if they had done nothing to alter the site, and constructed it 28' above the grade at the front of the house that existed, they would be above 28'. I believe the height is acceptable given the minor modifications at the front.
Ms. Furio asked were the planter raised up ?
Mr. Azzolina said yes, approximately 8".
Ms. Furio said the soil was raised and the elevations were taken again from the soil.
Mr. Azzolina said the stones surround and dirt was in there, and they took the elevations at the corners at the top of the planters. We are only talking 8". It was not a modification of feet, it was a modification of inches.
Ms. Furio said so the soil was only raised up at those 2 points and no where else on the property. Aside from the seepage pit that was dug up and re-graded.
Mr. Azzolina said correct. The rear yard was re-graded and portions of it were raised and portions were cut in order to allow it to drain properly.
Ms Furio said the biggest situation was in the front with the planters.
Mr. Azzolina said in terms of height, yes.
Mr. Azzolina said if the board does not agree with that, the other option is for the applicant to seek an after the fact variance.
Mr. Van Horne asked did they explain how did this happen ?
Mr. Azzolina said I believe that the house was constructed according to plan. You would not know that the height was off unless you had a base line elevation to work from. The drawings that were approved by this board and by the building dept do not have that information. That is pretty much the case with a lot of the plans. The plans that come to the Planning Board all have topographic surveys. They are full site plans. When I review them, I establish the base line elevation and ask for a ridge elevation to be shown on the plan. The architect provides a vertical separation between the finished first floor and the ridge. Then I can tell if calculated properly and being built properly. The plans submitted to this board are less detailed. So this occasionally happens.
Ms Furio said so the definition you are using are the 2 spot elevations coming from the raised soil in the planter meets your definition of the height.
Mr. Azzolina said in this instance, given the fact that we are dealing with an existing condition……. I think that if this board were to receive a plan that showed a spot elevation of 98.5 and 98.9 was the corner without a planter around it and the grade fell to elevation 98 you really would not think anything of it. Its not a forced grade. If you built a 2' or 3' retaining wall around the foundation, that is a different scenario. Given the circumstances, I think it is acceptable. If the board does not share my views, they must direct the applicant to seek the variance, and either grant it, or direct them to lower the roof .
Ms. Furio asked You are also seeking an Impervious variance ?
Mr. Weissman requested **Mr. Hashinski** to display photos of the property exhibit A-1.
Mr. Hashinski said that the walkway deviates from the Building plan. It was done because we thought it was more aesthetic .

Mr. Weissman said that the driveway was widened after the plan was approved because of the size of the vehicles.
Mr. Hashinski said about a foot.
Ms. Furio asked was it the walkway or the driveway
Mr. Hashinski said it was a combination.
Mr. Kassis said according to the plot plan that we have here the property line is in from the curb line, so the Impervious coverage is not being calculated on the plot size. The edging of the driveway falls outside the property calculation.
Mr. Weissman We discussed the option of replacing the paving to crushed stones. Because the pavers are more aesthetically appealing we were hoping to avoid that outcome. That's the way it could be adjusted if necessary.
Ms. Furio asked if the board had any more questions on the proposed variances.
Ms Batistic said the 3% of the Impervious Coverage that you are over is 245 sq.ft. I don't think that even if the driveway curved, to take into consideration made straight, or the walkway, I don't think it will still work. When this was presented to the Building Dept. was it presented as no variances required ? There was an error made by someone.
Mr. Weissman said when I look at the survey in comparison to what was approved that was approved I really can't see any significant deviation**.** We did curve the sidewalk somewhat.
Ms. Furio said the sidewalk went from angular to cursive.
Mr. Kassis said what about the driveway in the back. There is a 10' setback from your side property. You have less than 10', was there a variance granted for that ?
Mr. Azzolina said the resolution makes reference to the driveway as not satisfying the 10 ft standard. The statement was made that it is just not possible given the existing location on the property. It is an undersized property. Where the additional Impervious is coming from is that driveway. On the architect's plan, approved by this board, he is showing a driveway area of 504 U and existing as 473. The 'As Built' indicates 1055 but I'm not sure if the architects numbers were accurate. I think that the overage is in that driveway. I think not really a luxury in this case, you need that additional driveway area in order to turn your vehicle into the garage.
Mr. Kassis asked does not this have to be part of the variance ? According to the resolution, the back driveway would be in conformity but the front would not due to the current curve of the driveway. But the back is equally, if not, less than, the 10' distance required.
Mr. Azzolina said I agree, but the plan approved did not show that 10', scale is about 4'. I would recommend, if you are doing an amended approval, that condition would be recognized an after the fact variance.
Ms. Furio asked anymore comments about the height and / or coverage from the board ?
Ms. Furio asked regarding the height based on the planters- these are just paver stones and dirt ?
Mr. Weissman said no, they are landscaped areas.
Mr. Weissman introduced Tony Demaras as another witness.
Mr Demaras was sworn in.
Mr Demaras said the stones are large landscaping stones placed in a circle around the corner of the house with a decorative evergreen tree.
Ms. Furio asked if anyone else on the board had questions or comments either the impervious or the height ?
Ms. Furio asked is anyone in the audience for or against this application ? Questions or comments.
Mr Demaras said in regards to the driveway, I have 2 young kids and both my wife and I have SUV's. The driveway from the wider part is a very short part and then it curves in and there is all grass on the side. So, as it is, it is very hard to even get into the driveway to turn to get into the garage. So its

not used for luxury or to say we have a wide driveway. It narrows in and you got to pull in, the width is only for one car.
Mr. Kassis said regarding the planters, you have soil up against the vinyl siding which is in proximity of the wood structure. That potentially creates a problem that is not within building code. You have the soil at that level but it will create a problem for insects.
Mr Demaras said that they will take the vinyl siding down up to 6' around the house and put stucco or whatever else after that.
Mr. Kassis asked what kind of stones is that going to be ? Is it more than 1" thick ?
Mr Demaras said I believe so**.**
Mr. Kassis asked if there will be stones on the sides too ?
Mr Demaras' answer was not audible
Ms. Furio asked questions or comments? Anyone on the board would like to make a motion to approve or deny the application ?
Ms Batistic asked are we accepting Mr. Azzolina's interpretation that no height variance is required ?
Ms. Furio said that was my question to him earlier. Based on the code definition of the height: the vertical distance measures the lower of either of the average existing or the average proposed contour lines at the base of the front of the building to the highest point of the building excluding only chimneys.
Mr. Van Horne said can I suggest maybe we take a vote first on whether we accept Mr. Azzolina's testimony and if we don't than its going to have to be as a variance.
Mr. Kassis asked do we have to address any other concerns regarding variances or only one at a time ? chimneys.
Mr. Van Horne said there is only one other issue.
Ms. Furio said the Impervious.
Mr. Kassis asked the driveway is not an issue ?
Mr. Van Horne said that is encompassed in the impervious.
Ms. Furio said that could be the amended portion.
Ms Batistic said the driveway is closer than 10' to the property line in the front for a distance and then it is also in the back. Which was on the plan that was submitted. It was graphically shown but they didn't put the dimensions'
Ms Furio asked when were those pictures taken.
Mr. Hashinski said a few months ago.
Ms. Furio asked there are 2 cars in the driveway ?
Mr. Hashinski said yes.
Mr Demaras said the left one is not mine, the right one looks like my GMC.
Ms Furio asked the other car in the driveway is it similar to one that a family member drives ?
Mr Demaras said the right one, my wife has the same exact GMC.
Ms. Furio said the two vehicles parked in the driveway, that's a pretty clear representation of the way it is when you have 2 cars in the driveway. Pretty close to the edges.
Mr Demaras said correct, if I pull one in the garage and I want to back out I go on this grass over here.
Ms Furio said if the board was comfortable with voting on Mr. Azzolina's interpretation of what the height is based on the planters ? We can take a vote on that and then move forward on the next thing.
Mr. Van Horne said do we accept Mr. Azzolina's testimony that a height variance is not needed because based on the measurement that he took involving the planters which have been constructed on the corners of the property. The house measures 27.9 *(said by Mr. Azzolina).* Do we accept that testimony.

Mr. Kassis made the motion to accept the testimony. Mr. DePalo seconded.
The vote was take. Ms Batistic voted 'No' , the other board members voted 'Yes'.
Mr. Van Horne said height variance is not needed. Now we move to the Impervious Coverage.
Ms. Furio asked are there anymore questions regarding the Impervious ?
Ms. Furio said would someone like to make a motion regarding the Impervious and the driveway ?
Mr. Kassis made the motion to approve the Impervious Coverage as submitted.
Mr. DePalo seconded.

The application was granted.

1276 Pat Tesler 442 Knickerbocker Block 101 Lot 7
The applicants are seeking the following variances to construct a dormer addition

Description	**Required**	**Existing**	**Proposed**	**Variance**
Front Yard Set Back	25 '			
Side Yard Abutting/Lot	**15 '**	**9.52'**	**9.52'**	**5.48'**
Combined Side yds existing	**35 '**	**17.52'**	**17.52**	**17.48'**
Combined Side yds of addition	**35'**		**27.82'**	**7.18'**
Rear Yard Set Back	30'			
Max. Livable Fl.Area FAR (variable)	30%			
Lot Frontage	100 '			
Lot Depth				
Bldg Coverage %	20%			
Impervious Coverage (Variable)	33.9%			
Height	28'			
Lot Area.	10,000 sq.ft			
Driveway from Prop. line.	10'			

Ms. Stephanie Pantale, architect, was sworn in.
Ms. Pantale testified that the property was 60' by 104' and the house was small. They propose to expand the existing dormer out the back and raise the roof.
Ms. Pantale described the existing floor plan of the house: dining room, living room, 9' X 12' kitchen, bathroom, den, one car garage, and 2 bedrooms upstairs.
Ms. Pantale said we would like to expand the dormer towards the front wall by 2.5' deep in line with the front wall, and we would like to expand out the back within the foot-print of the house 1' and cantilever about 2'.
Ms. Pantale said we are here for existing non-conformances, an existing side yard variance that will stay exactly the same.
Ms. Pantale *explained the Combined Side Yard calculation.*
Ms. Pantale *described the proposed interior of the house.*
Ms. Pantale said that they propose to raise the walls to 8'. The walls now are 6'8".
Ms. Furio said you are going straight back.

Ms. Pantale agreed.
Ms. Furio said the cantilever is in the back. You are taking a foot and adding a foot.
Ms. Pantale said we are adding 2 feet and going straight up in the front.
Ms Furio said you are not augmenting anything its just a straight line.
Ms. Pantale said we are undersized for other things that are going on in the area .
Floor Area Ratio we are allowed 37 %, we are currently at 22.3 % and we are going up to 25.2 %.
Impervious Coverage we are allowed 33.9 %, we are currently at 30 % and because of the extension of the 2nd floor we will be up to 31.07 %.
Mr. Kassis said the north side elevation has no proposed windows to break that up at all.
Ms. Pantale *explained why there were no windows as a function of the design.*
Ms. Furio asked if there was anyone in the audience for or against this application.
Ms Batistic made the motion to approve the application as presented.
Ms Westerfeld seconded.

The application was granted.

1278 M & A Real Estate Holding LLC 100 5th St Block 49 Lot 643
The applicants are seeking the following variances to construct an add a level , a front porch and a new deck. They will be raising the grade of the property approximately 3', as per site plan.

Description	**Required**	**Existing**	**Proposed**	**Variance**
Front Yard Set Back	**25 '**		**5th St – 22'**	**3'**
Side Yard Abutting/Lot	15 '			
Combined Side yards	35'			
Rear Yard Set Back	30'			
Max. Livable Fl.Area FAR (variable)	38.82%			
Lot Frontage	100 '			
Lot Depth				
Bldg Coverage %	20%			
Impervious Coverage (Variable)	34.9%			
Height	28'			
Lot Area.	10,000 sq.ft			
Driveway from Prop. line.	10'			

Applicants of # 1277 and # 1278 requested that # 1278 be heard before # 1277.
Mr. Manfredonia, attorney for the applicant, noted that the name of the applicant is M & A Real Estate Holding.
The application is in compliance except for the Front Yard Set Back. The portico is 3' in depth, resulting in a 22' set-back instead of the required of 25'.
Ms. Stephanie Pantale, architect, was sworn in.
Ms. Pantale testified the house is a 3 bedroom ranch. We want to put an add-a-level on it and go out the back slightly. The house is right up against the front yard set-back. There is currently a stoop that is

not covered and several steps going down. Too look nice, we need to widen the stoop and put a Portico over it. We are asking for a modest 3' and the steps protrude into the front yard.
Downstairs in the basement we will have a bedroom and a garage.
Ms. Pantale *described the proposed outside dimensions* .
Mr. Manfredonia said that one of the benefits of the Portico is that it helps us break up the massing of the front of the side**.**
Ms. Pantale said the only projection into the front yard is the Portico.
Ms. Furio said that the stoop that is currently there is more narrow than what you are proposing; and the steps that are there come out into the yard to the same degree that you are proposing the new ones, or are these steps farther.
Ms. Pantale said these steps are farther.
Ms. Furio said so where the current steps end now and where the proposed steps will end would be further away from the curb.
Ms. Pantale said yes.
Mr. Kassis asked what is the purpose of raising the grade 3' all around the house ?
Mr. Manfredonia said the rear porch of the dwelling is a walk out. We have frontage on a paved for street along our right side yard and there is a sports' complex field to the rear. When the house was constructed the rear was a walk-out. So as a result of that existing feature, in order to stay within the height requirements, we had to adjust the grade accordingly**.** The proposed grading plan has been reviewed by Ed Rossi. We have a full engineer site plan that was presented for his review and comment**.** I believe he did consult with Paul Azzolina, the Boro engineer.
Mr. Kassis said you are raising the grade to make a taller building.
Ms. Pantale said we are raising the grade to bury the basement.
Mr. Kassis said so you can build a taller building.
Ms. Pantale said actually if the basement is exposed and its not anything else but a basement construction, it becomes a story above grade, and basically we do not want to come before this board with a 3 story home.
Ms Furio said or the FAR which is what this would end up being.
Ms. Pantale said the front is already higher than the back. So we needed to raise the grade a little higher in the front, and carried around so we can bury the basement. The roof is very modest not very pitched.
Mr. Manfredonia said the re-grading essentially takes place within the front yard and to a limited extent along the left side yard and a tad in the rear. The rear yard situation where presently the walk-out will continue to be that way.
Ms. Pantale *explained how they had made everything conform except for the Front Yard variance.*
Ms. Furio asked how much are you burying ?
Ms. Pantale said about 2.5' in the front…….
Mr. Kassis said the Building department approved the soil movement permit and is comfortable with the work. The application in front of us is based upon an existing structure. You are building a structure, your ground floor is taller than 8'
Ms. Pantale said the existing ceiling height is 8'**.**
Mr. Kassis asked where is the 28' coming from ?
Ms. Pantale said its from the average grade at the front to the ridge.
Mr. Manfredonia said we are showing proposed grades on the plans and the elevation reflects the proposed grades as well as the site plan and the Zoning table.
Ms. Batistic said the proposed patio is that going to be at the same elevation as the existing concrete in the back. You walk out of the basement into that patio.
Ms. Pantale said yes, it will be the garage.

Ms Batistic said are you stepping up or is it level with the basement.
Ms. Pantale said it was level…..
Ms. Pantale *described the configuration of the garage, basement, driveway and deck.*
Ms. Batistic asked are you widening the driveway ?
Ms. Pantale said yes. Currently the left side is made of concrete. Its currently a one car garage. We are adding a 2nd garage door and making that basement area a garage.
Mr. Corona said there are some houses in the neighborhood that have been improved. Would this Portico in front, stick out way beyond what everybody else has on the street.
Ms. Pantale said I don't believe so. There are houses on the street that I believe are closer to the street than 25'.
Ms. Pantale *described her impressions of other houses on the street.*
Ms. Pantale said that she had the client engineer this because she could not do the engineering. She did not want to come before the board with pluses and minuses. We had it engineered by professional engineers, so everything was conforming. The only thing I couldn't get to do was the front portico and steps. They had a stoop that came out 5' and had a bunch of steps. I reduced it to 3' and spread it wider.
Mr. Manfredonia said the portico is 9' wide by 3' deep. As a means to providing some aesthetic enhancement to the modified front façade. A portico of this nature is fairly common.
Ms. Furio asked is anyone in the audience for or against this application as presented ?
Mr. Kassis made the motion to approve the application.
Mr. Corona seconded

The application was granted.

Please see next page

1277 Dan Ledven 3 Oxford Place Block 72 Lot 10

The applicant is seeking a variance for Impervious Coverage in order to obtain a CO.
The applicant built an addition at the above address. He cannot be issued a CO because the Impervious Coverage is over the allowed amount.

Description	**Required**	**Existing**	**Proposed**	**Variance**
Front Yard Set Back	25 ‘			
Side Yard Abutting/Lot	15 ‘			
Combined Side yards	35 ‘			
Rear Yard Set Back	30’			
Max. Livable Fl.Area FAR (variable)	30%			
Lot Frontage	100 ‘			
Lot Depth				
Bldg Coverage %	20%			
Impervious Coverage (Variable)	30%		**36.98%**	**6.98%**
Height	28’			
Lot Area.	10,000 sq.ft			
Driveway from Prop. line.	10’			

Mr. Matthew Capizzi (11 Hillside Ave., Tenafly NJ) introduced himself . He is representing Mr. and Mrs Ledven.

Mr. Capizzi testified that the renovation that took place this past year was of the entire dwelling as well as the surrounding grounds. The renovation to the dwelling itself involved the footprint staying the same with exception of right rear portion of the house having a one story bump-out to accommodate a family room and we replaced a driveway and redid some landscape in the backyard.

The rear yard of the property in its former condition had an in-ground pool with a surrounding patio area. During the process of finishing up the renovation of the house, the pool in the rear yard was refinished in kind and the patio was beginning to be re-laid. As the patio was being re-laid, the Ledven’s landscaper had made a recommendation that a certain portion of the patio was rather small, and actually could cause a hazard in the back door because someone could just trip over the calking and fall into the pool. The landscaper recommended adding 2 additional courses of the travertine stones that were being laid around the patio, failing to mention to Mrs Ledven that he needed to go for a permit update, and that the additional travertine stone would cause an Impervious Coverage issue.

This is what brings us before the board. As part of the process of closing out a lot of permits, we were required to obtain a Certificate of Occupancy. In order to get the CO, we needed to bring them the final ‘as-built’. Up until the time of getting a final ‘as-built’, the home owner and his builder relied upon an architectural site plan. An engineer was not involved in the process until August of 2015- getting an ‘as-built’ and closing out the permits. When Mr. Hubschman prepared the final ‘as-built’ survey, it came to light that we were in excess of our Impervious Coverage by

about 7%. That excess is driven totally by the additional paver stones that were added in the yard. So we are before the board this evening, number one, to make a 'Mia Culpa' for our over-sight and failure to go to the Building department before we modified our plans; and secondly, to request a variance for the Impervious Coverage. Mr. Hubschman is familiar with the site from its condition as of August 2015. He has prepared a Site plan for discussion this evening.
Mr. Hubschman was sworn in**.**
Mr. Hubschman said he has appeared before the Board many times as Engineer and Planner.
Mr. Hubschman reviewed the plan. The lot is 100' by 141' deep , for 14,117 sq.ft located on the west side of Oxford Place. The lot is flat. There is an existing drainage easement that runs along 2 courses of the property.
Mr. Hubschman reviewed the renovations. There was a paver driveway put in, a new walk around the side, patio, and the pool. The existing pool was re-done and re-furbished and the pool deck was added in the rear.
Mr. Capizzi said that even though the building foot-print was enlarged, we still comply with the building code.
Mr. Hubschman said yes.
Mr. Capizzi said we are still 2 or 3 % under the allowed Building Coverage.
Mr. Hubschman said yes.
Mr. Hubschman said the 'as-built' was in July or August. We are 985 sq.ft. over.
The patio and pool bed are 1700 sq.ft. The patio travertine is mortared- its set like a tile in a mortared base. The patio area is at grade.
Mr. Capizzi asked as far as the existing drainage system on site is adequate to accommodate the additional area ?
Mr. Hubschman said right. We are here for the C2 variance seeking that there is no substantial detriment to the neighbor because the pool bed is flat and its not on a hill, its not intrusive at all to the neighbors. The only real problem would be drainage, and we are lucky that there is a 15" diameter pipe that is existing with catch basins around the property. The landscaper had also put a whole row of trees. So there is no detriment to drainage. The neighboring houses are far behind or far away.
Mr. Hubschman *showed some photos (exhibit A-1) of landscaping around the perimeter of the pool* .
Mr. Hubschman said that the pine trees shown are along all 3 sides of the yard.
Mr. Hubschman said that they did a Google Area map of the property.
Mr. Hubschman described how the Google map indicated the distance of the house from the neighbors.
Ms. Furio said the extra Travertine is on the south side.
Mr. Hubschman *indicated where the Travertine had been added*.
Ms. Furio said that in the picture you can see what is around his pool. The patio is attached to it ?
Mr. Hubschman said right the patio is attached to it.
Ms. Furio said the walkway and the barbeque outdoors would that all have been there originally.
Mr. Hubschman said that was added.
Mr. Capizzi said that was a wood deck that was converted to masonry.
Ms Furio said as the landscaper was laying the Travertine, where would be the extension on the side of the pool ?
Mr. Capizzi said just on the south side.
Mr. Hubschman said I have the old plan which shows the walk around the south.
Mr. Capizza said it went from the original patio on the south side was only about 3 to 5' in depth and now its approximately 20'.

Mr. Hubschman said 10'
Mr. Hubschman said the Impervious Coverage variance is handled by the outside drainage. The landscaper said that he installed 2 Cultec chambers which I'm having him dig up to make sure he did install those. But we really don't need a lot of mitigation- its flat and there are 3 catch basins that were existing around the perimeter.
Ms. Furio said you said it went from 5' to 20' and then you said that it went from 5' to 10'. So it was extended an additional 5'.
Mr. Hubschman said and squared off. More 5' around the circle.
Ms. Furio asked how much of additional square footage was added ?
Mr. Hubschman said its 985 sq.ft over the permitted of 4235 sq.ft.
Ms. Furio said from the original to the original proposed to what it ended up being. Do you have those numbers.
Mr. Hubschman said no the existing plan here doesn't show anything that would be done.
Mr. Capizzi said the architectural site plan does not address any of the landscaping. All they did was attach a copy of the current survey.
Mr. Hubschman *indicated on the plan the original location of the pool and the wooden deck.*
Mr. Kassis said that addition doesn't seem to add up there's a lot of additional space to the area. Whats the length from the house to the back of the patio ?
Mr. Hubschman *used the plan to explain the additional Impervious Coverage.*
Ms. Batistic asked what was the surface where the house addition is at- what was there before ?
Mr. Capizzi said half of that was the deck. If the area underneath is permeable then the deck does not count as Impervious.
Ms Furio asked when was the decking put down ?
Mr. Capizzi said late spring or early summer. We had filed to close out the permits in June or July. I have only been involved since October. Mr. Hubschman was retained in July or August to prepare the 'as-built'. We became aware of the variance situation in September. There was a miscommunication between Mr. Ledven and the builder as to who was to file the application They thought that they were on this board's agenda in October. Once we knew there was an issue, we rectified to seek the variance, we did that.
Mr. Hubschman said it was sort of the landscaper's fault but there really is no detriment.
Ms. Furio said you said something about digging up the pits to make sure..
Mr. Hubschman said I have to inspect those. I have to dig up the 2 Cultec chambers, Margita knows what those are.
Ms Batistic asked this 15" pipe, and there are catch basins within the property where the run-off will go, but the additional impervious area, and its almost 100 sq.ft, is going to produce more run-off into the system. Do you know what drains off the area, just because there are 15" pipes, they are taking not just this property…
Mr. Hubschman said I believe the easement ends at the Demarest border. We are putting small drains in along the pool basin. That was my recommendation to the owner. Ad some one by one PVC drains.
Ms. Batistic said what I would like to see is this whole additional impervious area drains into some kind of retention before it discharges into the existing system. We don't know what impact this is going to have.
Mr. Hubschman said we are willing to do that.
Mr. Capizzi said if we upgrade to Cultec which would be fit to accommodate which would handle...
Mr. Hubschman said yes, there is room at the area to center of the lot, the other area on the north.

We would add a couple of basins and some Cultec chambers and excavate what the landscaper had put in.
Mr. Capizzi said we can prepare drainage calculations after your site inspection to confirm that the existing plus a modified system would comply with the RSI requirement.
Mr. Hubschman said yes, its just a formula so we would do that.
Ms. Batistic said I just noticed something, the services drainage easement is 15' wide, correct ? Its parallel to the property. The pipe is outside of the easement.
Mr. Hubschman said in that corner the pipe was outside of the easement, yes.
Ms. Batistic said the easement was there, the pipe was supposed to be centered on it.
There was speculation among board members and Mr. Hubschman why this had occurred.
Mr. Kassis asked when you worked on the house there was no underground tank that required any..
Mr. Capizzi said we did add building coverage.
Mr. Kassis asked there was no requirement for a seepage pit ?
Mr. Capizzi said no.
Ms. Furio said with the drains at the edge you feel confident that any run-off can be accommodated into the system before.
Mr. Hubschman said yes, there is no run-off on the neighbors with the berming, and the grades and we will add some storage. So there is no additional run-off.
Mr. Kassis said does the berm that the plants are in block the flow water to the inlets for the storm water?
Mr. Hubschman said no there is openings in it. We would add inlets, pipe it and put some chambers in.
Mr. Kassis said the motion be approved to include, according to the testimony tonight, there is going to be additional drainage work done on the property, and certification that the existing drainage is not only operational but is adequate.
Ms. Furio asked is there anyone in the audience for or against the application ?
Mr. Van Horne asked Mike can you be more specific about what you are going to add in terms of the drainage.
Mr. Hubschman said we would prepare a Drainage report that shows that it complies with the RSI standards.
Ms. Batistic said maybe we should recommend / request that the borough engineer review the report because they will not come back to us. He reviews the Drainage report and findings that you are going to check was there already.
Mr. Hubschman agreed to send it to the Borough engineer for review.
Mr. Kassis made the motion to approve the application with the said modifications and drainage work subject to the Borough engineer evaluating and approving the work done.
Ms. Batistic seconded**.**

The application was granted

Memorialization NONE