Page 1 of 7

Present in Person:, Mr. Kassis, Ms. Batistic, Mr. Cleary, Mr. McCord,

Jack Van Horne (Board Attorney), Ms. Bauer (recording secretary)

Absent :, Mr. Corona, Ms. Westerfeld

Mr. Kassis called the meeting to order at 7:30 pm

**Mr. Kassis** announced that the meeting had been published as required by the Sunshine Laws of the State of New Jersey.

The Feb. minutes were approved by Mr. Cleary and seconded by Ms. Westerfeld

#### **Applications**

<u>1388 Peter &amp; Dana Luppino</u>		66 Pershing Place B		<b>B 136 L 310</b>
Description	Required	Existing	Proposed	Variance
Front Yard Set Back	25'	25'	25'	
Side Yard	15'	15.43'	15.43	
Abutting/Lot				
Other Side Yard	20'	25.0'	25.0'	
Combined Side Yards	35'	40.43'	40.43	
Min. Rear Yard	30'	32.83'	32.83'	
FAR	30%	18.5%	18.5%	
Height of Building	28'	27.7'	27.7'	
Lot Frontage	100'	100'	100'	
Lot Depth	100'	135'	135'	
Bldg. Coverage %	20%	19.99%	19.99%	
Impervious Coverage variable	30.1%	29.13%	32.61%	2.61%
Lot Area	10,000 Sq.ft	13,500 Sq.ft	13,500 Sq.ft	

The applicants are before your board for approval. They propose to extend their patio in the back-yard by 375 s.f. at the above referenced address.

Page 2 of 7

	1388 Peter & Dana Luppino (Cont.)	66 Pershing Place	B 136 L 310
--	-----------------------------------	-------------------	-------------

Mr. Morgan McCord recused himself.

Mr. Peter Luppino was sworn in

**Mr. Luppino testified** that they built the house 3 years ago. We have 2 kids, 6 and 4, one of them goes to school with Morgan's son. I volunteer coach, I'm involved in the community. We love it here, my kids love it here. The house was built 3 years ago to code. So, we didn't need any exceptions. And after about 3 years, we felt we needed to expand our patio just so we to have a little more room for entertaining, and also it is a good place for the kids to play when it is wet outside. So, what I am asking for here is a variance just for the Impervious Coverage. Its going to go from 30% to 32.6%. I provided the paperwork and I gave you a diagram with a survey with the extension that I am requesting.

**Mr. Kassis asked** are there any questions for the applicant ? Before we get started, so the site plan, which was included with your application, is the one we are going by or is there a larger copy ?

**Mr. Luppino** said sorry that's correct. The site plan I provided is because it has all the percentages of the Impervious Coverage, but I also provided a survey which is a little bit bigger, And its on the survey on which I drew the 2 scale document. And I shaded in the area so you can see the existing patio and the extension that we are trying to do.

**Mr. Kassis** said so the patio that is being proposed is not going beyond the side plains of the house on both sides ?

Mr. Luppino said correct.

Mr. Kassis asked any Board members have any questions regarding this ?

**Ms Batistic** said that she had a question. On the survey there is a note that you are removing the existing pavers. Its also a paver patio ?

**Mr. Luppino** said its not pavers, its impervious pavers right now. What I want to do, is remove the existing ones, and use the whole thing as a permeable patio system to help with the water drainage.

Ms Batistic said thank-you

**Mr. Kassis** said the permeable system runs into some reducing percentages for Impervious Coverage with the Building Department. Did you discuss with the Building Department the system in which you are installing. Depending on the type of system, some of it is classified in Cresskill as impervious. And there are some systems that are...... that have empty voids underneath, that allow cold water to travel. Whatever has to be done here would be subject to the approval of the Building official. But the entire patio is going to be, as you call it, a drainage type system ?

**Mr. Luppino** said that's what I would like to do. Yes. And the percentage is 32.6% that I'm going over. That's assuming that it's all impervious.

**Mr. Kassis** said so you are proposing a standard patio for now. And if the Building Department would have some issues with water storage and run-off ?

**Mr. Luppino** said I'm not assuming there would be. I know the law is 30% Impervious, but for my own sake. We have a raised ranch. We did not do the typical 2 floors and then a basement. Perhaps my house is in the basement, my garage is in the basement, my driveway is built down. My uncle built it, he's a builder, and I told him I don't want water issues. He put seepage pits on both sides of my driveway. And I will say that last summer, when we had hurricane Andre

#### Page 3 of 7

#### 1388 Peter & Dana Luppino (Cont.)66 Pershing PlaceB 136L 310

followed by Ida, with all the water we got, I didn't get a drop of water in my basement and I didn't get a drop of water in my garage. So I'm very happy the way he set it up. And I don't want to do anything that jeopardizes that. Half my house is in the basement, right, we use that a lot. So I'm not suggesting that there would be a problem. I'm assuming there wouldn't be. We're not building that much more, and by also taking out the impervious and putting in a permeable system, or anything that would help. I'll talk to the department and get a just....., I'm open to it. So, we just wanted to do a little bit of an expansion if you could regard over. We are trying to be sensitive to the water drainage issues

**Mr. Kassis** said that any approval of this application, or any application for that matter, is subject to any requirement that would be outlined by the Building Official requirements. **Mr. Luppino** said sure.

**Mr. Kassis** said you would be subject to all of that. If the existing seepage tanks are large enough to accommodate the additional Impervious Coverage calculations. Since this is a newer structure, or the tanks at least, the town would probably have engineering for that available.

## Mr. Luppino said ok

Mr. Kassis asked any other question for the applicant ?

**Mr. Kassis** asked is there anyone in the audience here for or against the application ? For the record none seen. That being the case, is there a motion to approve this application, subject to the Zoning requirements of the town .

Mr. Cleary made the motion

Ms. Batistic seconded.

The application was granted.

Mr. Kassis explained the memoralization process to the applicant.

#### **Continued next page**

Page 4 of 7

**Application** 

1389 Avi Bacalu	300	<b>County Rd</b>	В 7	72 L 1.02
Description	Required	Existing	Proposed	Variance
Front Yard Set Back	25'	78.2	78.2	
Side Yard Abutting/Lot	15'	6.9'	6.9'	enc
Other Side Yard	20'	7.1	7.1'	enc
Combined Side Yards	35'	14.0'	14.0'	enc
Min. Rear Yard	30'	157.6'	157.6'	
FAR				
Height of Building	28'	25'	25'	
Lot Frontage	100'	59.46'	59.46'	enc
Lot Depth	100'	283.14'	283.14'	
Bldg. Coverage %	20%	12.9%	12.9%	enc
Impervious Coverage variable	34%		61.1% + 1.5%	28.6%
Lot Area	10,000 Sq.ft	16927 Sq.ft	16927 Sq.ft	

The applicant is before your board for approval. He would like to extend the pool patio at the above referenced address.

The pool coping is not included in the proposed application. Only water's surface is exempt. 1.5% was added to reflect the total amount of Impervious Coverage.

Mr. Sean McClellan, engineer for the application, was sworn in.

**Mr. McClellan** testified the project is at 300 County Rd. which is Lot 1.02, Block 72. It's located in the R10 residential zone. It is 16,927 Sq.ft. It is not a conforming Lot Frontage, 59.46' where 100' is required. The Impervious Coverage is 4538 Sq.ft which is 61.1%. The reason the coverage is so high, is because you can only count the first 125' of property in the calculation. In that area that is only 7433 sq.ft ., while the whole property is almost 17,000 sq.ft. If we were allowed to use the entire property, the Impervious Coverage would be 26.8% . That 125' line comes basically across the rear of the house. This is the only portion of the lot that we are allowed to use for the Impervious calculation. What we are planning to do in the rear is to add a swimming pool 18' by 38', because the water area itself does not count for Impervious Coverage but the coping does which is 116 sq.ft and also 24 sq.ft for utilities. In order to keep the copperts exactly the same, there won't be any increase in ......coverage.......we will remove a small portion of the driveway. So in conclusion, we are adding a pool, we are not

Page 5 of 7

1389 Avi Bacalu (cont.) 300 County Rd B 72 L 1.02
---

having any increase in Impervious Coverage. The hardship is the lot which is only 59' wide in width, and because of that we can only use a small portion area .....

Mr. Kassis said are you saying that currently the Impervious is 61 % ?

**Mr. McClellan** said we are looking to add 1.5%. Well actually we are removing parts of the driveway so we are not adding any percent. So its going to be exactly the same as it is today. **Mr. Kassis** said OK. The application in front of us says 61.1 plus 1.5.

**Mr. McClellan** said yes, I saw that but I think that was before we removed a portion of the driveway. We removed a portion to make sure we didn't have an increase.

**Mr. Kassis** said OK. Is there anyone on the Board have any questions or comments regarding this application ?

**Mr. Kassis** asked is there anyone in the audience for or against this application? Let the record show that no one is here for that.

**Mr. Kassis** said so the application, let us re-iterate what was just said. Nothing is really changing, we are dealing with existing coverages. There is no real change besides approving what already exists. That being the case can I have a motion to approve or deny this application.

Mr. Cleary made a motion to approve.

Mr. Kassis said we have a motion to approve, is there a second.

Mr. McCord seconded.

The application was granted.

Mr. Kassis explained the memoralization process to the applicant.

**Continued next page** 

Page 6 of 7

#### **Application**

1387 Teri Augustine	74 Hillside Ave		B 85 L 52	
Description	Required	Existing	Proposed	Variance
Front Yard Set Back	25'	31.5'	31.5'	
Side Yard Abutting/Lot	15'	10.7', 11.0'	10.7', 11.0'	4.3'
Other Side Yard	20'	11.0'	11.0'	9.0'
Combined Side Yards	35'	21.7'	21.7'	13.3'
Min. Rear Yard	30'	70'	70'	
FAR	37.02%	29.98%	29.98%	
Height of Building	28'	25'	25'	
Lot Frontage	100'	60'	60'	enc
Lot Depth	100'	150'	150'	
Bldg. Coverage %	20%	18.52%	18.52%	
Impervious Coverage variable	33.9%	32.5%	32.5%	
Lot Area	10,000 Sq.ft	9000 Sq.ft	9000 Sq.ft	enc

# The applicant is before your board for approval. The structure in the rear of the above referenced address was removed with no permits nor zoning approval.

Mr Kassis introduced the application.

Mr. Kassis said let the record reflect that there is nobody here for this application.

Bobbi, was there any request to adjourn this ?

Ms. Bauer replied No. I got nothing.

Mr. Kassis said let the record show that there was no one in the outside chamber.

The application is dismissed for no attendance.

Page 7 of 7

# **Re-organization**

**Mr. Kassis** said this would be the point in which we would offer, to anybody interested, there are 2 positions that have to be voted on. That would be the chairman and the vice-chair. They would be pleased to be able to serve the community and work with all the Board members. I offer my name as a candidate. If there is anyone else that would like to do the same, do so now, or someone that they would like to vote for. Now would be the time. And when it comes to the vice-chair, I were thinking about this. There might be an opportunity for continuing so we prefer, probably, to leave that position open for one more month . Give everyone an opportunity, if there is somebody interested in that position to come forward and give some thought, and then we will make that decision of vice-chair next meeting. So just for the purpose of continuity, unless there are any other names forward for chair, could we have a motion to either have a new candidate or to approve of the current.

Ms. Batistic said I make a motion to have Glen Kassis as our chair.

Mr. McCord seconded.

All members of the Board agreed.

**Ms. Bauer** said that Glen Kassis remains as chair. The positions of vice-chair and board secretary to be decided at the next month meeting.

Mr. Kassis agreed.

**Ms. Batistic** said that she must be absent a lot, and she doesn't want to put the Board in a bad position. She thinks that someone else should take over.

**Mr. Kassis** said lets have some thoughts at the next meeting. Hopefully we will have additional members here . But at least now, we have some continuity.

Mr. Kassis said we need to approve the attorney.

Mr. Van Horne left the room.

All members of the Board voted in favor of Mr. Van Horne continuing as attorney.

Mr. Kassis said as there is no other business before the Board, I make the motion to adjourn the meeting

Mr. McCord seconded.

The ZBOA meeting was adjourned at 7:55 pm.