

**Borough of Cresskill
Zoning Board of Adjustment
Minutes Apr. 24, 2014**

Page 2 of 4

Mr. Scarano said that drainage calculations were not included because the deck is an open system which allows the water to just pass through down to the ground below. It will not create a condition of changing drainage patterns on the site. The Cresskill Building department said because of the existing non-compliances you are not allowed to create anything new on a property without going to the Zoning Board.

Mr. Scarano reviewed the bulk variances. The space opposite the front door happens to be narrow, the open area designated as the back-yard is actually the side of the house. None of the bulk of the house is going to change as a result.

Mr. Kleiner asked, if the board grants the application will these variances have any negative impact on the zoning scheme of the neighborhood.

Mr. Scarano said no, I believe the deck is customary to other decks in similar sizes and shapes. This somewhat a modest deck compared to others.

Mr. Kleiner asked if it will have an adverse impact on the overall zoning scheme of the borough of Cresskill.

Mr. Scarano said no it will not.

Mr. Kleiner asked if this is a positive use of the property.

Mr. Scarano said yes, it definitely enhances the value of the property. It is hidden behind the house. There are a lot of trees and foliage around it. We sculpted the deck to be away from some of the trees, so as not to disturb the crown of existing trees.

Ms. Furio asked what is the distance between the property line and the house to the south ?

Mr. Scarano said 31' at the most narrow and 38' at the widest.

Ms Furio asked how far was the neighboring house.

Mr. Scarano said they had a current survey made of the property but they may not have included all of the neighbors. It shows a masonry along the back. Behind the house is a driveway and then a series of extended garages. The wall runs along the back.

Mr. Scarano gave Ms. Furio a copy of the survey. The survey was marked A-2.

Mr. Scarano said the outdoor space is on the south side. There is no garage on the property. There is a parking area.

Ms. Furio asked about the lower deck.

Mr. Scarano said it was for use by the tenant. It gives the tenant use of the back yard.

Mr. Van Horne asked if he had done the Impervious Coverage calculation.

Mr. Scarano said yes. It is based on everything that is there: masonry walls, macadam surfaces, the building foot-print.

Mr. Van Horne asked if that was existing.

Mr. Scarano said that's existing.

Mr. Van Horne said you did not take the deck into account.

Mr. Scarano said the deck is not a contributing surface because it allows the water to go right through to the same drained area that is already there. It was a brick patio there before .

Ms. Furio asked is there a brick patio now.

Mr. Scarano said yes, a concrete and brick patio in the area where the proposed deck is.

Ms. Furio asked is that coming up.

Mr. Scarano said no, it is remaining.

Ms. Furio said the deck will go above.

Mr. Scarano said yes.

Mr. Merzel asked how did you make the calculation for Impervious Coverage. Usually we get the details for the calculation.

Mr. Scarano said we did that internally. We could submit, if necessary, a breakdown of all the individual components.

**Borough of Cresskill
Zoning Board of Adjustment
Minutes Apr. 24, 2014**

Page 3 of 4

Mr. Merzel said so the 44% is all complicit, but you have it listed as proposed.

Mr. Scarano said its both but that is how we were asked to submit it by the Cresskill Building dept. They said to use that number both for existing and proposed.

Mr. Merzel said as far as the deck construction, is there a certain way that you need to construct it so that it does not add to the Impervious Coverage.

Mr. Scarano said there is a 3/4" spacing between the baton boards. So whatever water is on the deck, it does not get collected to a gutter or drain- it washes right through.

Ms. Batistic said the deck is considered as part of the building coverage if it is attached to the building.

Mr. Van Horne said that's another issue we are focused right now on the Impervious. You are testifying that there is a 3/4" gap between the boards.

Mr. Scarano said yes.

Mr. Van Horne said I think we need to see the Impervious Coverage calculation. This would have been existing as well as all the other non-conforming conditions.

Mr. Merzel said the concern is that if it is right now 38% instead of 44%, and we are accepting it as 44%, then it would be a problem for me.

Mr. Scarano and Mr. Kleiner said they could provide that (Impervious Coverage calculation details).

Mr. Van Horne asked if he had the calculation in his file.

Mr. Scarano said that he did not know if he had it, but he wanted to have it put in properly.

Mr. Scarano and Mr. Kleiner said they want to do a good job, and would resubmit.

Mr. Scarano said I will have the survey done as well. I had the surveyor come back a few times and embellish the survey's dimensioning because of the irregular shape of the houses and the walls. I will have the surveyor cross-verify the survey.

Ms. Westerfeld asked how close the staircase, from the upper deck, is to the edge of the property.

Mr. Van Horne said I suggest we carry this application to next month. You do not have to re-notice, but you have to address the Impervious Coverage calculation, the Building Coverage calculation. We also would like to see a survey with a red seal.

Mr. Scarano agreed.

Mr. Van Horne said the application must be resubmitted 10 days before the hearing.

Ms. Furio asked what is the distance of the edge of stairs to the property line.

Mr. Scarano said I'll get that also.

Mr. Merzel said he would like some details about the construction of the deck- usually we get more detail on that.

Mr. Scarano agreed.

Mr. Merzel said this is a 4 family house not a 2 family house.- where are the entrances.

Mr. Scarano said it is a 4 family. The main entrance of the house leads to the entrances of the others. Once you are inside, there are separate entrances. There are 2 apartments on each floor.

Ms Furio said the downstairs deck is completely over shadowed by the upper deck.

Mr. Scarano said yes, with the exception of that little piece with the stairs. Its meant to be a landing area for the steps.

Ms. Westerfeld asked if the sliding doors upstairs were replacing the windows.

Mr. Scarano said they were.

Ms. Batistic said the Zoning Schedule says existing rear yard 4.4' but your plan shows 3.4'.

Mr. Scarano said the 4.4' was a typo.

Mr. Van Horne said 3.2' was the narrowest.

Ms. Furio said that May 22 was the next meeting and the plans must be submitted 10 days before.

Memorializations**1241 Joseph Gottlieb 11 Margie Ave Block 166 Lots 30-31**

The applicant was granted the following variances to construct a 2nd floor addition..

Description	Required	Existing	Proposed	Variance
Front Yard Set Back	25 ft	19.73'		5.27'
Side Yard Abutting/Lot	15 ft	9.9'		5.1'
Combined Side Yards	35 ft	23.21'		11.79'
Rear Yard Set Back	30 ft	34.2'		
Max. Livable Fl.Area FAR	39.0%	30%	37.19%	
Lot Frontage	100 ft	50'		50'
Lot Depth	100 ft	100'		
Bldg Coverage %	20%	24.72%		4.72%
Impervious Coverage	35%	49.1%	49.32%	14.32%
Height	28 ft	19'	26.83'	
Lot Area.	10,000 sq.ft	5,000 sq.ft		5,000 sq.ft
Driveway from Prop. line.	10'	9.99'		0.01'

Other Business

The board agreed that when an application has large existing variance(s), a search should be made of the Zoning Board files to find the application(s) granting the variance(s); and a search of the Building Dept. files to find building permit(s) for the construction that incorporated the variance(s).

Ms. Batistic said that there was no survey submitted, though the applicant brought one in.

Mr. Van Horne said that a survey should be on the list of required documents.

Mr. Van Horne said that the application should be reviewed for completeness, and is not complete unless there is a survey.