

**Borough of Cresskill
Zoning Board of Adjustment
Public Meeting 7:30 pm
Minutes Aug 26, 2021**

Page 2 of 6

1380 Erland Castillo (cont.)

22 Jefferson Ave

B 66 L 5

summary of what's proposed and you can let me know how you would like me to handle the application.

My clients have lived at this property for over 8 years. Its an undersized lot at 22 Jefferson Ave. It only has 50' of width, where 100' width is required. The property's improvement is an existing 1 1/2 stories single family dwelling. What's unique about this house is that it sits slightly askew to the left and right property line. The left corner of the house is only 4' off the left property line, and the right rear corner is about 16' off the right property line. It sits on an angle. What we are proposing to do this evening is essentially about 500 sq.ft of *intel* on the 2nd floor on the rear portion of the existing 2nd floor, just to provide some additional bedroom space for the family to continue to reside in this house. Because the *intel* don't do a *purge* directly over the existing floor, we don't have an opportunity to improve those side-yard set-backs, so those set-backs remain approximately 4' along the left side and 16' along the right side. There is also a combined side-yard set-back requirement in the zone of 35' where 20' is existing and will remain at 20'. Mr. Blake can take us through the drawings that were prepared by Mr. Benanti, who has since retired after he had prepared the drawings. Chris spoke to Mr. Benanti and is familiar with the drawings, and he can take us through the details of the proposed addition. As you will hear from Chris, we don't believe the addition will cause any substantial impact on either neighboring properties. The property to our left is developed as a single family home, is actually behind our home. He sits to the rear. The front of his building is behind the rear of ours- so he won't be impacted at all by the addition, and the closest structure on that left property, that's our northerly property, is a driveway, so there is a significant distance between the proposed addition and the structure to the north. And to the south we are still 16' off the right side-yard . The FAR complies . We are well below the allowed limits for Impervious Coverage, Building Coverage, FAR and Height. And as well as some of these aesthetic improvements that are going to result from this renovation. We're doing *new sides around the* dwelling and new windows at the 2nd floor level. The hardships exist with the result of the under-sized nature of the lot, as well as the fact as to where the addition is taking place and some of the other improvements, and where the improvements are on the neighboring property that there would not be any negative impact from theaddition. That's substantially the application.

Chris Blake (architect) set-up the plans

Mr. Chris Blake was sworn in.

Mr. Capizzi said Chris, I had mentioned that these plans were prepared by another architect. Did you have an opportunity to speak with him about his drawings ?

Mr. Blake said yes Mr. Benanti discussed the intent of the work. The drawings speak for themselves.

Mr. Capizzi said could you give us a summary of what's existing there and what we are proposing to do by way of this addition.

Mr. Blake said the existing house is what we call a Cape Cod. Its got a full sized 1st floor and it has a partial 2nd floor tucked in the roof. The property itself is about 48' in the rear. Its not exactly a perfect rectangle, its got a couple of angles and stuff like that. But its a narrow property, 48' wide in the rear. Its essentially within 50 to 48'.....the whole distance of the property and therefore a very narrow lot. The lot itself is not necessarily super under-sized- its 9922 where 10,000 is required, but the narrowness of the lot of 48', or so, is dramatically under-sized for a 100' required lot width in the R10 zone.

**Borough of Cresskill
Zoning Board of Adjustment
Public Meeting 7:30 pm
Minutes Aug 26, 2021**

Page 3 of 6

1380 Erland Castillo (cont.)

22 Jefferson Ave

B 66 L 5

Mr. Capizzi said the existing house does it adhere to the side property lines as well ?

Mr. Blake said yes, the property itself is not exactly a perfect rectangle.....so we are talking about a 4' set-back on one side or so, its actually 10 over 120 . – its more 7' or 8' in the rear, but its obviously a side-yard set-back issue where its narrowest on the property and where the house is located.

Mr. Capizzi said so the addition as you head to the rear of the property the set-back increases

Mr. Blake said correct.

Mr. Capizzi said and so since we are putting in the addition on the rear portion of the 2nd floor, the closest point of that addition will be approximately what ?

Mr. Blake said I think at that point its 4.2' or so, or something like that. The closest point of the addition- and as you go towards the back, the addition is more 7.1'.

Mr. Capizzi said can you take it to what's being created by way of the addition ?

Mr. Blake said right . On the 1st floor again its kind of a modest house, its not large in square footage. The first floor itself is in the neighborhood of 1000sq.ft., or not even. The first floor has a living, dining and kitchen. It has a little family room in the rear and it has a bathroom and a foyer and porch thing in the front. Currently the upstairs has kind of one big bedroom, if you will, and a bathroom. We will take off the rear attic portion, and create 2 more bedrooms and another bathroom. So upstairs altogether we will have 3 bedrooms and 2 bathrooms. Essentially the front will remain the same, with the rear kind of being extended two full bedrooms.

Mr. Capizzi said *and that rear addition is directly on top of the existing 1st floor ?*

Mr. Blake said it is. There is an over-hang from the front....

Mr. Capizzi said as far as the facade, how are we going to blend in the addition with the balance of the house ?

Mr. Blake said I think you said the whole house will be re-sided so it will bethe character will remain the same...rustic or cottage-like feel to it...it will look like more of the same.

Mr. Capizzi said *as far as the bulk cable is concerned so the variance was just for like....the primary set-back. Is that correct ?*

Mr. Blake said that's what I understand, yes.

Mr. Capizzi said and the Building Coverage, Impervious Coverage, FAR are in compliance. Correct ?

Mr. Blake said yes

Mr. Capizzi said as far as the neighbor's concern, I have described some of the improvement from the northerly property. Are you familiar with that home's situation to ours ?

Mr. Blake said that home is further set back on the left side.

Mr. Capizzi said you have the drivewaythat's to the rear of our home . Correct ?

Mr. Blake said correct. Our house is just under the 25' allowed as far as the front-yard set-back, 24.3,.....quasi deep kind of property 195' deep. The house is kind of set forward where the other houses in the neighborhood are more set back.

Mr. Capizzi said anything else about the addition Chris ?

Mr. Blake said no, I think this fits in with the character of the existing house, and the character of the neighborhood, obviously. Its not an over-sized house.....fits in with the location of the existing house.

Mr. Capizzi said Thank-you . I have no further questions Mr. Chairman.

**Borough of Cresskill
Zoning Board of Adjustment
Public Meeting 7:30 pm
Minutes Aug 26, 2021**

Page 4 of 6

1380 Erland Castillo (cont.)

22 Jefferson Ave

B 66 L 5

Mr. Kassis said I have two questions. On the narrow side which is on the north side of the property, is there any equipment going to be located there ? Air-conditioning or generator or something along those lines ?

Mr. Blake said no, if we did that it would be in the rear itself.

Mr. Kassis said OK. And second of all, you took that map having an over-hang. What would be the soffit diameter or overhang on that side ?

Mr. Blake said.....it would be less than 2', I would imagine, 16" or 18".

Mr. Kassis said it would be a concern about having more than an over-hang that was necessary- although larger over-hangs can be attractive, on a small side-yard its important to keep them at a minimum.

Mr. Kassis asked are there any other questions for the applicant ?

Ms. Batistic asked I need a clarification, the letter of denial and the table show the existing and proposed Side Yard as 4', but the survey shows 1., where is 4' ?

Mr. Capizzi said that's at the addition.

Ms. Batistic said OK. So existing is 1.65, proposed, at the addition is 4 .

Mr. Capizzi said correct.

Ms. Batistic said which is at the other end of the 7. something to the front

Mr. Capizzi *confirmed.*

Ms. Batistic said so the existing is wrong on the schedule of proposed- it says existing 4', so it should be 1.65, right ?

Mr. Capizzi *confirmed.*

Mr. Kassis asked any further questions ? Is there anything else you wanted to add before we open it up.....to the audience ?

Mr. Capizzi *declined.*

Mr. Kassis said let the record show that there is nobody in the room besides those supporting the application.

Mr. Kassis said if there are no other questions from the Board, is there a motion to either approve or deny the application as submitted.

Ms. Batistic made the motion to approve.

Mr. Cleary seconded.

The application was granted.

Mr. Kassis said As you know the application will be available next month after it has been memorialized.

Mr. Capizzi said Thank-you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Kassis said next on the agenda are the memorializations.

Continued next page

**Borough of Cresskill
Zoning Board of Adjustment
Public Meeting 7:30 pm
Agenda Aug. 26, 2021**

Memorialization

1383 Richard & Susan Gonci 424 Knickerbocker Rd B 101 L 16

Description	Required	Existing	Proposed	Variance
Front Yard Set Back	25'			
Side Yard Abutting/Lot	15'			
Other Side Yard	20'			
Combined Side Yards	35'			
Min. Rear Yard	30'		19.6	10.4'
FAR	34.32%			
Height of Building	28'			
Lot Frontage	100'	60'		
Lot Depth	100'	104'		
Bldg. Coverage %	20%			
Impervious Coverage variable	32.4%			
Lot Area	10,000 sq.ft			

The applicants were granted the variances listed above to construct a 12' by 16' deck.

Meeting adjourned at 7:47 pm. Motion by Ms. Batistic, seconded by Ms. Schultz-Rummel