Page 1 of 10

Present:, Ms. Batistic, Mr. Cleary, Mr. Kassis, Mr McCord, Mr. Merzel,

Ms. Schultz-Rummel, Ms. Westerfeld, Ms. Furio, Mr. Van Horne (acting Board Attorney),

Ms. Bauer (recording secretary),

Absent: Mr. Corona

The meeting was called to order at 8:01 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 Mar. 22, 2018 meeting were approved. (Ms. Schultz-Rummel, Ms. Westerfeld) Mr. Robert Cleary has joined the Zoning Board of Adjustment.

## **Applications**

1327 Robert & Milanka	B 76 L 59			
Description	Required	Existing	Proposed	Variance
Front Yard Set Back	50 ft	57.4'		
Side Yard Abutting/Lot	15 ft	7.4'		
Other Side Yard	20 ft	12'		
Combined Side Yards	35 ft	19.4		
Side Yard Set Back	5 ft	1.6'		
For accessory building				
Max. Area of accessory building	600 sq.ft	487 sq.ft		
Lot Frontage	100 ft	50 '		
Lot Depth	100 ft	294.18 '		
Bldg Coverage %	20%	15.58%		
Impervious lot Coverage	35%	54.88%	64.5%	29.5%
Height of accessory bldg	15 ft	13'		
Lot Area.	10,000 sq.ft	14,709		
	-	sq.ft		
Driveway from Prop. line.	10'	0'	0'	10'
<b>Driveway Location</b>	50' between		30'	20'
	Curb Cuts			
<b>Driveway Encroachment</b>	10' from		0'	10'
The	side yard			

The applicant would like to construct a circular driveway

# Robert & Milanka Lippman were sworn in.

**Ms Lippman** testified that they are here to ask the board for permission to extend our driveway. Right now we have a very long narrow driveway. We have 2 kids that just started driving. Backing out onto Hillside when it is busy, is not easy, and for ourselves, now that we have 4 cars, it becomes 'musical' cars everyday- what car to pull out, what car to go first. So, we'd like permission to make it a circular driveway in the front. My husband would like you to know out that since we parked in the street a few times we've gotten hit also. It's a busy road and the biggest concern for us is our children. The 2<sup>nd</sup> problem is just having to move cars around all the time to accommodate 4 cars in a long, very narrow driveway.

Page 2 of 10

#### 1327 Robert & Milanka Lippman (cont.) 65 HillsideAve B 76 L 59

Ms. Furio said one in front of the other.

Ms. Lippman said correct.

Ms. Furio said you are removing the walkway in the center

Ms. Lippman said correct.

Ms. Furio said you want an 8' driveway across the front connecting to the existing driveway

Ms. Lippman said correct.

Ms. Furio asked what is the length now of the existing driveway ?

Ms. Lippman said the length of the driveway up to the house is 50'.

Ms. Furio said up to the house or the entire length ?

Ms. Lippman said the entire length to the garage is close to 100'. But its very narrow. Its 10' that

narrows down especially by one area to 7.4' and then widens a little bit more

Ms. Furio said towards the back it widens up again.

**Ms. Batistic** said it appears that its more than 100' its probably 120' - 130'. Because if the lot is 50' wide you have more than two widths to the garage

Ms. Lippman said at that scale.

Ms Batistic said even if its not to scale its still proportional .

**Ms. Lippman** said I don't have the exact existing . I was more focused on what the new would be. I know that the Impervious coverage is based on the lot size of 100' by 100'. Our lot is 50' by 300', so out lot is very long, and there is grass all around.

**Ms. Batistic** asked so when you have the circular driveway, how are you going to solve the problem of not moving the cars ? Are you going to have all the cars park on the driveway ?

**Ms. Lippman** said no, some cars will still go, like my husband and I, like my daughter goes to school earlier than I go to work. Some of us will park in the circular and some of us in the side also. Our kids will park in the circular. So for them it will be easier to move out. My husband and I will park on the side-so we can back-out because we are more experienced drivers.

**Ms. Batistic** asked have you considered making a portion in front of the house paved, so you could back into it like a K-turn ?

**Ms. Lippman** said I did but I think aesthetically it really wouldn't look as good. And we need the space because just parking 4 cars one behind the other, every morning it's a ritual to have to try to move the cars; and our kids come home later than we do. So then we have to be first, so we have to move all the cars- its really such an ordeal to do that whole process of moving cars around.

**Mr. Lippman** said also it's a safety issue. because of the pool we have a lot of people over, and they park up and down the street in the summer. This would give more people room to park with a circular instead of a straight driveway.

**Ms. Furio** said by removing the walk and adding the circular driveway, you are coming in at 29.5% of impervious. Have you tried any other configuration that doesn't push it so high up ?

**Ms. Lippman** said again the biggest concern is for the kids are to be able to pull out of the house. In order to make it a K-turn you would really have to take our grass... I really can't imagine what would look like in our front yard. We have a very narrow lot. So at least this way we will still have another 32' of grass in the middle so that it will have a nice look to it. Whereas the other way its going to have to take a sliver of it in the front and it would look very odd

**Mr. McCord** said rather than using asphalt or concrete, however you were planning on doing this, they do make pervious pavers.

Page 3 of 10

# 1327Robert & Milanka Lippman (cont.)65 HillsideAveB 76 L 59

**Ms. Lippman** said the problem with that, I've looked into that, it's a cost factor. Unfortunately pavers are much higher than the asphalt. We are already over budget on that house when we renovated when we came before the board 2 years ago. We just recently got an assessment on our taxes and it does not reflect anyway near how much we spent on the house. So we are not looking really to go above and beyond financially, so we would like to make this the least expensive route also, if that's possible.

Now, we have a neighbor on 39 Hillside that has the entire front yard in cement, and there is no..

Mr. Lippman distributed some pictures (A-1) of the property on 39 Hillside.

**Ms. Lippman** said so we feel what we're looking for isn't really a big stretch from what we already have in our neighborhood, and aesthetically would look nice and would serve the purpose of not having to play musical cars and again our kids would be able to both just drive out in the morning without having to back-out.

Ms. Batistic asked do you know how wide this lot is? (39 Hillside)

Mr. Lippman said 75'

**Ms. Lippman** said still the whole entire lot is covered. Its covered all the way to the house. There is a garage on the left and there is a cement sideway all the way to the house and it goes to the other side also. **Ms. Batistic** said but we don't know where the property line is.

**Ms. Lippman** said we can see in the photo, I'll show you... (*Ms. Lippman indicated the property lines on the photo*)

**Mr. Merzel** said I don't know if that really matters, we don't know why its like that, it could be investigated. In my opinion it should not matter on what we are doing here.

Ms. Lippman said I assume that they had a permit. Hillside is a very busy road.

**Mr. Merzel** said I don't know, I have no idea. Maybe it was pre-existing and they got a permit for something that was already there.

Ms. Furio said your option is: you just want asphalt on the drive.

Ms. Lippman said that would be our preferred- cost effective

**Mr. Lippman** said plus it would not look right if we had the asphalt driveway that's existing and then when it starts turning we make it the other material. It wouldn't match then.

**Ms. Lippman** said and to have to tear the whole thing and redo it. The expense that we can't handle at this point.

Mr. Merzel asked who did the Impervious Coverage calculation ?

**Ms. Lippman** said my previous architect who did the original plans when we did the driveway and the garage- 2 years ago.

Mr. Merzel said we don't have a copy of the calculations

Ms. Lippman said I have the previous

**Mr. Merzel** said existing 54.88%, proposed 64.5%. The proposed 64.5% is based on who's calculation ? **Ms. Lippman** said again it's the architect, she's the one that figured it out.

Mr. Merzel asked based on this drawing ? (hand drawing with title 'Lippman Site Plan')

Ms. Lippman said I did the drawing myself. I just asked her to do the calculations.

Mr. Merzel asked based on this drawing she did the calculation ?

**Ms. Lippman** said yes. Based on the sizes 8'. I did not know how to figure out the Impervious coverage. I did not want to pay another fee to have her do this...

Mr. Merzel said we just want to be sure that these calculations are accurate.

Ms. Lippman said here is the previous, if you'd like to see that. The existing, from the last resolution.

Page 4 of 10

# 1327Robert & Milanka Lippman (cont.)65 HillsideAveB 76 L 59

Mr. Merzel asked did you get a variance for that existing ?

Ms. Lippman said yes

Mr. Merzel asked for the actual Impervious Coverage ?

Ms. Lippman said yes.

Mr. Merzel asked that was part of the previous..?

Ms. Lippman said the previous Zoning meeting that we were here for..

We had only one variance for the Impervious Coverage to increase the size of our garage because we had a one car garage. Unfortunately our lot size is small- so we didn't go wide, we went deep. We went back to back and we added another car in the back. So..

Mr. Merzel asked how much was the Impervious Coverage before that variance ?

Ms. Lippman said it was 53.88% and it went to 54.88%.

Ms. Batistic said you are proposing to come to the property line,

**Ms. Lippman** said on our right side we are already brought up against our neighbors so it will be the same on the left side. If the board has a different suggestion, we are open.

Mr. Kassis said so you are proposing zero.

Ms. Lippman said we already have zero on the other side.

**Mr. Kassis** said on your previous variance when you were here the last time, the patio on this plan is exactly as on the plan previously submitted ?

Ms. Lippman said correct. That was all there.

Ms Furio asked is there anyone in the audience for or against the application ?

Ms. Furio asked anyone on the board have any questions or comments ?

**Mr. Merzel** said on a 50' wide lot, its kind of difficult to have a circular driveway. I just want to ask again. There are other options. I understand that you don't want to back out..

Ms. Lippman said by backing out you are going to go half into the property anyway

**Mr. Merzel** said if you made the existing driveway a little wider, at least in one section, that you could park 2 cars.

Mr. Lippman said we tried that, we could barely get 2 cars in there. Its just too tight.

Ms. Lippman said with the 50' and again we need our kids to do that- the concern is for our children.

Mr. Merzel said if the gravel was wider on the left you couldn't park 2 cars ?

**Ms. Lippman** said it would be hard because.. that was our first thought to just kind of widen it, but to try to park 2 cars in front of the house, from the street to the house is hard to do..

Mr. Lippman said its tight

**Ms. Lippman** said you have to go way in the back and be able to back in a certain way. Which our kids are not experienced enough drivers.

Mr. Kassis said we need to stay germane to the application.

Ms. Furio said we have zero distance so its right on the property line

**Ms. Lippman** said I mean we could move it in a little bit if that would suffice and if the Board would prefer we could move it maybe 5' in the front.

Ms. Furio said and you toyed with K-turns and parking in parallel..

**Ms. Lippman** said we toyed with adding it this way, but what happens, you have the house there and then someone has to go, because one car is parked and the other one has to go in, and the kids don't come in at the same time. One kid comes later than the other. The other kid would have to back out from the...pull in from the driveway and then try to back into a very tight space. We actually did it on the grass. That would have been the easiest and least expensive way for us to do this. But for what our goal is there does not seem to be the easy fix. So we thought the circular would be the easy fix.

Page 5 of 10

## 1327Robert & Milanka Lippman (cont.)65 HillsideAveB 76 L 59

**Mr, McCord** asked what if you were to pave from your current existing driveway to proximately where your walkway is – didn't go all the way accross ?

**Ms. Lippman** said we've already spent a lot of money on doing the driveway. So now we'd have to tear it apart and redo the driveway with pavers and pavers are very expensive to begin with...

**Mr. McCord** said pavers to the house, instead of going all the way across going to where your walkway is.

Ms Furio said instead of having a circular drive, widen your existing driveway.

Mr. McCord said widen your existing driveway then you will still have half of your front lawn.

*Mr. McCord indicated on the plan where the cars could be parked* 

Ms. Lippman said I didn't want to create a parking lot in front of my house.

Mr. Lippman said a circular driveway looks more normal.

**Mr. McCord** said you need additional variances. You've got the ten footage.- its on your application. If you could do something like this, you could avoid some..

**Ms. Lippman** said I know. I think that would aesthetically .. I think that this town has come up in a nicethere's a lot of nice homes are being built around. I think there should be some concern just to how things look too. I think having a parking lot, more or less, in front of the house- and that's how I feel that would look like. Not as aesthetically pleasing as a circular driveway.

**Ms. Furio** asked any other questions or comments ?

Would someone like to approve or deny, based on some of the suggestions and the amount of impervious that was listed here.

Mr. Kassis made the motion to deny the application.

Ms. Lippman asked based on the Impervious Coverage or based on having the circular driveway ?

Mr. Kassis made the motion to deny the application.

Mr. Lippman don't we have the right to know why its being denied ?

Mr. Van Horne answered it's a motion that has not been voted yet.

Ms. Batistic seconded.

**Ms. Batistic** said I vote yes. I think a 50' wide lot is not conducive to a circular driveway and the reason for the safety of Hillside Ave. can be addressed by providing a K-turn, and the space for enough cars can be also addressed by widening the driveway for 8' that is proposed on the other side, so it will probably be the same amount of pavers.

All board members voted yes

**Ms. Lippman s**aid so that means the whole board is against it. I don't care for the parking lot in front of my house, but I care about my children more. Could we have what you recommended then ? Extending the width of the driveway....

Ms. Furio said you can try and work it out again...

Ms. Lippman said we need to come back again ?

**Mr. Van Horne** said if you had modified the application before the vote, it could have been voted on tonight.

Ms. Lippman said I did not know.

**Mr. Van Horne** said you are representing yourself and we are not allowed to give legal adviceunfortunately that's the situation your in.

**Ms. Lippman** said so now to do that we have to come back in another month. OK. And I assume the board will be OK with that, so I don't waste my time and energy.

Ms Furio said you heard everybody's opinion and you should take that into consideration .

Mr. Van Horne said it should be that the Impervious is the only issue.

Ms. Lippman said and what about our neighbors that have taken a lot more. That doesn't matter ?

Page 6 of 10

1327Robert & Milanka Lippman (cont.)65 HillsideAveB 76 L 59Ms. Lippman said OK thank-you, to explanation from Mr. Van Horne.

#### The Application was Denied

1328 Ramapo Develop	ers LLC	75 Delmar Av	ve	B 158 L 60
Description	Required	Existing	Proposed	Variance
			_	
Front Yard Set Back	25 ft	30.5'	20.30'	4.7'
Side Yard Abutting/Lot	15 ft	8.00'	10.92'	4.08'
Other Side Yard	20 ft	20.3'	20.3	
Combined Side Yards	35 ft	28.3'	31.22'	3.78'
Rear Yard Set Back	30 ft	30'	24'	6'
Max.Livable Fl. Area				
FAR	35.22	31.48	36.58%	1.36%
Lot Frontage	100 ft	75.71'		Tech
Lot Depth	100 ft	100'		
Bldg Coverage %	20%	18.17	22.96%	2.96%
Impervious lot Coverage	Variable	40.05%	31.2%	
	32.9%			
Height	28 ft	21.05' ft	27.45 ft	
Lot Area.	10,000 sq.ft	6978.54 sq.ft		Tech

The applicant (Mr. DeCarlo) would like to construct an addition.

Mr. Dean Stamos of Ferrari and Stamos introduced himself as attorney for the applicant.

**Mr. Stamos** reviewed the application. The applicant seeks to remodel and add an addition to the existing single family dwelling. There two variances that are existing non-conformity: minimum lot area of 6,978 sq.ft., minimum lot frontage of 75.71'. There are Bulk variances: the Front, Side/ Rear Yards, Building Coverage, and FAR variance that have minor deviation. I have 2 witnesses : Mr. Hubschman and Ms.Pantale.

Mr. Mike Hubschman, engineer, was sworn in.

**Mr. Hubschman** testified that his firm had submitted the plan that was part of the application. He is familiar with the subject property and the proposed development. He also is familiar with the family. It's a 70' by 100' corner lot on Delmar Ave. and Rose St. It's a single family dwelling. Frank DeCarlo, Ramapo Builder, the applicant, wants to add an addition, create a 2 car garage, square off the house. Its an under-sized lot and a narrow lot and a corner lot so it has a hardship associated with it.. The existing house is on a corner lot with 2 front yards. The existing house is 20.3' from Rose St. To the north is an existing one car garage that is being removed. That is one variance created by the line of the existing house is 8' off that Side Yard 15' is required. The Side yard is on the west side of the lot. The existing house is 8' off that Side Yard. We are moving that to 10'. We are cutting out part of the existing house to 10.92'. The new addition is 13.3' in the back. We are expanding it and there is a 2<sup>nd</sup> floor there. The Rear Yard we are requesting a variance for 24'. The house to the right of us is 19' off the line. There is almost 43' between

Page 7 of 10

<b>1328 Ramapo Developers LLC (cont.)</b>	75 Delmar Ave	B 158 L 60
the 2 dwellings. So we are requesting that varian	nce. Due to the sizes of the	e rooms- it's a very small house-
2500 sq.ft house. The FAR is 96 sq.ft over which	h requires as a function of	f the 2 car garage. Very small
rooms, the bedrooms are 11' by 12'. We can't n	nake them much smaller.	Building Coverage is 200 sq.ft
over, again because of the size of the lot. We wo	ould like to have a 2 car ga	arage- that add the 200 sq.ft.
There are hardships: undersized lot, corner lot, the	he nature of the 2 front ya	rds and the position of the
existing house on the lot. There's the D-4 varian	ce or the FAR which the o	criteria is: that can the lot
support that additional square footage. 90 sq.ft. o	on 2 floors so its 45 sq.ft.	It doesn't create any adverse
light, air nor open space nor any drainage proble	em. We are actually reduci	ing the Impervious on site
through removing the driveway- we are reducing	g the Impervious on site.	
Mr. Stamos said so the variance will not cause	substantial detriment or ar	av harm to the Zone Plan or

**Mr. Stamos** said so the variance will not cause substantial detriment or any harm to the Zone Plan or Zoning Ordinance ?

Mr. Hubschman said No, we are removing portions of the house. No height variance needed.

Ms. Stephanie DeCarlo Pantale, architect, was sworn in.

**Ms Pantale** displayed the plan for the house. The garage was pulled back as much as we could to give the other lot to the side on Delmar as much area as we could for the Side Yard.

Ms Pantale described the layout of the house using the plan.

The garage was pulled back as much as we could to give the other lot to the side on Delmar as much area as we could for the Side Yard.

The foundation plan includes the existing full basement, the slab on grade, and a crawl space. The first floor has a front hall and stairs, the family room, the kitchen, full bathroom, the dining room, the living room, and the garage. The second floor has the Master bedroom suite with bathroom, 3 bedrooms, family bathroom, laundry room. Total square feet is 2400- 1000 sq.ft first floor, 1368 sq,ft 2<sup>nd</sup> floor.

Ms. Batistic asked you are not demolishing the whole house ?

Ms. Pantale said we are keeping the front wall and the side walls.

Ms Furio said you are pulling the driveway off...

**Ms. Pantale** said the side on Delmar- is gone. There is more distance between the back of the house and the adjacent property owners, behind, then there is to the sides, so we felt there is possibly still a little more extra room and adds to the rear Yard Variance.

Ms. Furio said currently the Front Yard set back on Rose is 20'.

Ms. Pantale said yes.

Ms. Batistic asked you are not proposing any outdoor- no patio...

Ms. Pantale said just a little platform.

Mr. Hubschman said they have about 1 ½ %, 70-80 sq.ft. If they had a little patio.

**Ms. Pantale** said moving the garage from Delmar to the Rose side, and making it a 2 car garage, you can have 4 cars parked on the property. Whereas the previous way out we had a one car garage with one car space and the other plan had parking on this side, so we are trying to consolidate 2 driveways. Make it look nicer.

Mr. Hubschman said make it look more normal. There was a parking area where our driveway is.

Ms. Pantale said and there was a deck also protruding into the side.

Ms. Furio asked anyone in the audience for or against the application ?

Ms. Kathleen Nasse, 69 Delmar Ave., said I am right next door.

Mr. Van Horne said do you want to testify or just question the witness.

Page 8 of 10

## **1328** Ramapo Developers LLC (cont.) 75 Delmar Ave

B 158 L 60

**Ms.** Nasse said I just want to ask how much space will be left between what will be the back of the house and the property line ?

Mr. Hubschman asked facing your house ?

Ms. Nasse said you are going to remove the garage...

Ms. Nasse was sworn in.

Mr. Van Horne asked do you want to testify?

**Ms.** Nasse said I really don't want to testify . I just want to know how much room there is going to be between my house and the back of your house.

**Mr. Hubschman** said that's going to be 20'. A little over 20'. Your house is about 10' off the line. The existing garage is 8'. There's only 18' now, that's increasing to 20.9'- about 21'.

**Ms. Pantale** said the kitchen sticks out further than the  $2^{nd}$  floor. On the first floor the family room is going to stick out about 1  $\frac{1}{2}$  and the kitchen will stick out about 2' or 3'. On the  $2^{nd}$  floor all is going to come straight across.

**Ms.** Nasse said I'm on the side the garage is. I think the house is beautiful, I just don't... I feel I'm going to lose the sun. I'm going to lose the view. I'm going to lose the breeze coming thru because its almost like its just going to be this big, tall thing beside me.

**Ms. Pantale** said...so it wasn't one big building. The kitchen was bumped out a little bit, and things were moved in and out slightly..

Ms. Nasse said the kitchen is on the other side of the house.

**Ms Pantale** said not on this house. That's where it used to be, now its on your side. You are going to look kitchen to kitchen.

Ms. Pantale, using the plan, explained to Ms. Nasse the layout of the proposed house

We moved the kitchen to the opposite side, and we knocked down the garage, and I pulled back the kitchen, and then I pulled back the whole 2<sup>nd</sup> floor. So the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor is going to be further back from your side. So its not a bill board- its broken up, so there's some visual interest for you, We just need more room in the kitchen its kind of small. So in our proposed kitchen we swapped out what we needed. *MS Pantale related how the design developed thru conversations with the applicant*.

**Ms.** Pantale said so we tried to pull this back as far as we possibly could still be respectful to the applicant and you and that was the intention.

Ms. Nasse expressed her satisfaction with the explanation.

**Mr Kassis** said he too had concerns. Currently the distance between the property line and the living structure of the house not including the current garage. The living space excluding the one story garage that is there now is 20' away, and now, you are talking about a 2 story house that is , at one point 10' away and the rest of iy is 12' away So when you talk about adding extra space,...

the size of the house and the height of the house- much taller than what was there before- which was much further back, another 10' back. The concern is about the tightening of this one story board here, its problematic. I know we talked about the kitchen...

**Mr. Hubschman** said the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor is 13.3' away from the property line. The kitchen is just on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor. 15' is required. The kitchen does bump out 2.9.

Mr. Kassis said the house existing now is 20' away.

# Mr. Hubschman said 18'.

*Mr.* Hubschman, Ms Pantale, Mr. Kassis discussed the distances of the existing and proposed houses from the neighboring house.

Page 9 of 10

<b><u>1328 Ramapo Developers LLC (cont.)</u></b> 75 Delmar Ave B 158 L 60
<b>Mr. Stamos</b> said the set-back is still 8'. You don't differentiate living space and attached garages
<b>Mr. Kassis</b> said all applications are taking - maybe your planner could explain that Its germane to the
concerns of air and light. There is much more air and light between these 2 houses before this was being
proposed. Now we are talking about a 2 story that's much closer, and then you have a bump-out because
the kitchen is not big enough. The 2.5' is coming that much closer to that property. As an architect you
can jazz up the sides to make it look better than just a wall. The closeness of the existing structure is
changing dramatically
<b>Mr. Hubschman</b> said in response, the Side Yard requires 15 and we are on a corner lot. So we lose,
because of the corner, the Front Yard Set-back here, we're really at a disadvantage. If we had 15' and
15'we're pushing back a little bit. We're at 13.3 where 15 is required- we are 1.7' off.
Ms. Pantale used the plans to describe the design of the proposed roof line and how it effects the view
from the neighboring house.
<i>Ms. Pantale and Mr. Hubschman. using the plans, argued with Mr. Kassis that the proposed house would</i>
not impact the air and light to the neighboring property.
<b>Mr. Kassis</b> suggested moving the A/C units from the area that has been tightened up to the north side of
the property .
Mr. Hubschman said we can do that. That's not a problem.
Mr. Kasssis asked what about the bump-out?
Ms. Pantale said its only one story.
Mr. Hubschman said this is a fairly modest home in comparison to what is normally done in terms of a
significant remodel.
Ms. Pantale said there are other considerations of garages and driveways, being able to keep everybody
on the same property, getting rid of 2 driveways.
Ms. Furio asked anyone on the board have questions or comments ?
Mr. Van Horne asked you are moving the A/C to which side ?
Mr. Hubschman said the north side adjacent to the garage.
Ms. Furio asked would someone on the board like to make a motion to approve or deny the application ?
Mr. McCord made the motion to approve with the stipulation that the A/C units are moved.
Ms. Batistic seconded.
Mr. Kassis voted 'No'. All other members present voted 'Yes'.
The Application was Granted
Continued on next page

Page 10 of 10

#### **Memorialization**

1268 Care One at Dunroven221 County RdBlock 71 Lot 13-14The applicants were granted a one-year extension of the Resolution 1268 approvalsfrom the June 30, 2017 expiration date to June 30, 2018.

The applicant was granted the following variances to construct a pool.

The applicant must submit a revised plan with the following modifications : Pool equipment moved to the right side of the pool Patio Bump-out on the left side of the pool removed. The area between the deck and the pool squeezed back. Reduced size of the patio on the left side of the pool. A fence appropriate for children (like those used for school yards) No removal of foliage (arbor vitas) at the back of the property

<u>1326 Masahiko Fukano</u>	41 Allen St Block 73.01 Lots 3		73.01 Lots 35.01	
Description	Required	Existing	Proposed	Variance
Front Yard Set Back	25 ft			
Pool Side Yard	15 ft		15.7'	
Abutting/Lot				
<b>Other Pool Side Yard</b>	20 ft		9.2'	10.8'
Combined Pool Side	35 ft		24.9'	10.1'
Yards				
House Side Yard	15'	10'		
Abutting /Lot				
House Other Side Yard	20'	10'		
Rear Yard Set Back	30'			
Max. Livable Fl.Area	(variable)			
FAR	36.12%			
Lot Frontage	100 ft	50'		Tech
Lot Depth	100 ft	180'		Tech
Bldg Coverage %	20%			
Impervious Coverage	(variable)			
	35%		39%	4%
Height	28 ft			
Lot Area.	10,000 sq.ft	9,000 sq.ft		Tech

Meeting adjourned at 8:56 pm