

****These minutes have not been approved and are subject to change by the public at its next meeting****

The regular meeting of the Park Ridge Zoning Board of Adjustment has been called for Tuesday, November 16, 2010, at 8:00 pm in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Building.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG:

ROLL CALL: Mr. Martin, Mr. Raman, Mr. Sandler, Mr. Walker,
Dr. von der Lieth, Mr. Hoskins, Mr. Raman, Mr. Flaherty

Absent: Mr. Brennan, Mr. Capilli

Also Present: John Ten Hoeve, Jr., Board Attorney
Kevin Kain, Professional Planner
Eve Mancuso, Professional Engineer

COMPLIANCE STATEMENT:

The Notice for this meeting required by Section 3(d) of the Open Public Meetings Act has been provided by the adoption of a resolution by the Park Ridge Zoning Board of Adjustment of January 19, 2010, setting forth a schedule of regular meetings by mailing of said schedule to The Ridgewood News and The Record on January 22, 2010, and by the posting of said schedule on the Municipal Bulletin Board and the continuous maintenance thereof and by filing the said schedule in the office of the Borough Clerk.

PENDING CASES:

<u>CASE:</u> 10-09 Block: 1909 Lot: 14	Application of <u>Robert Meister and Jacqueline Devlin</u> , 135 Morningside Avenue for variance to construct fence in required front yard (Chestnut Street) exceed height of fence in front yard. Hearing scheduled for August 17, 2010, at applicant's request, was postponed and continued on September 21, 2010. Determination forthcoming this evening.
---	---

WALKER: I have one item to be marked into evidence in regard to this application.

Item 8 is a Board secretary letter dated 10/26/2010.

FLAHERTY: We have a resolution in the affirmative for this application.

WHEREAS, ROBERT A MEISTER, (hereinafter referred to as "Applicant"), being the owner of premises known as 135 Morningside Avenue, in the Borough of Park Ridge, County of Bergen and State of New Jersey, said premises also known as Lot 14 of Block 1909 on the Tax Assessment map for the Borough of Park Ridge, has applied to the ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT FOR THE BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE seeking variances from the terms and provisions of the Zoning Ordinance of the Borough of Park Ridge to permit the construction of a five (5) foot fence in various portions of the property; and

WHEREAS, the premises are located in a R-10 Zoning District as same is defined by the Zoning Ordinance of the Borough of Park Ridge; and

WHEREAS, Applicant has submitted a survey of the premises prepared by Christopher J. Lantelme, Licenses Surveyor of the State of New Jersey dated July 14, 2004, illustrating the proposed location of all fencing; and

WHEREAS, a hearing was held before the ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT OF THE BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE duly convened on September 11, 2010, upon due notice as required by law; and

WHEREAS, the BOARD has carefully considered the application and all testimony and evidence submitted in connection therewith;

WHEREAS, no person appeared in opposition to the requested variances;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT OF THE BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE that the BOARD hereby makes the following findings of fact:

1. Applicant is the owner of a single family home located at 135 Morningside Avenue in the Borough of Park Ridge. The Applicant's lot is a corner lot located at the intersection of Morningside Avenue and Chestnut Avenue.
2. Applicant filed a request to permit the construction of a five foot high, chain link fence to be located along a portion of the Chestnut Avenue front lot line of the property. The precise location of all requested fencing was shown on the survey submitted to the BOARD.
3. Section 101-21(E)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance of the Borough of Park Ridge provides that no fence in excess of four feet in height shall be located in any front yard. The Applicant's proposed fencing thus violates the provisions of this section of the Zoning Ordinance.
4. Applicant testified that the proposed fencing is required to provide a safe place for his dogs and to prevent animals from entering the yard. The Applicant also noted that Chestnut Avenue is a small street having very little traffic.
5. Applicant further testified that while the fence is located approximately four feet from the Chestnut Avenue lot line, there exists a substantial landscaped area between the lot line and the edge of pavement for Chestnut Avenue. While the fence is but four feet from the lot line, it appears to be at least twenty feet from the lot line.
6. Applicant further testified that the fence was constructed without a permit and without BOARD approval in the location shown on submitted plans. Applicant stated that family health issues required the construction of the fence prior to BOARD review. Applicant also testified that he intended to provide plantings along the outside edge of the chain link fence and that the Applicant would be willing to accept, as a condition of approval, a requirement that plantings be provided along the outside of the fence constructed along Chestnut Avenue. Finally, BOARD members raised concerns with respect to a large shrub or bush located at the intersection of Chestnut Avenue and Morningside, a shrub that blocked the views of individuals operating vehicles on both streets. Applicant agreed to remove the bush so as to avoid any sight obstruction for operators of vehicles at the intersection.
7. The BOARD finds that the Applicant faces a unique condition in that his property is a corner lot with one of the adjacent street being a roadway with limited traffic. Moreover, the Applicant is not seeking to construct the fence along the entire property line. Applicant is thus fencing in his rear yard in a manner similar to that of property owner not situated on a corner street. Applicant's lot is also unique in that there exists a large landscaped area between the property line and the edge of pavement along the street.
8. The BOARD thus finds that there will be benefits resulting from the construction of the proposed new fence. The fence will provide safety benefits and privacy for the occupants of the Applicant's home and will prevent deer and other animals from entering the property.

9. The BOARD further finds and concludes that there will be no negative impact from the proposed fence if plantings are provided to screen the fence from view. The BOARD thus finds and concludes that Applicant must provide plantings as described in the list of conditions herein below.
10. Finally, the BOARD also finds and concludes that the proposed fencing, with the required plantings, will not result in any substantial detriment to the public good, nor will same impair the intent and purpose of the zone plan or Zoning Ordinance of the Borough of Park Ridge in any way.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT FOR THE BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE, by virtue of the foregoing, and pursuant to the authority of N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70, that the BOARD does hereby grant the Applicant's requested variances to permit the construction of the proposed five foot high fencing along Chestnut Avenue as shown on the submitted plan subject to the following conditions:

- A. That Applicant construct the proposed improvements as set forth on all final plans submitted to the BOARD and that same not be constructed in such a fashion so as to exceed the scope of the improvements set forth on all final documents submitted and described in all testimony presented to the BOARD.
- B. That Applicant comply with all Borough Ordinances and State Statutes with regard to the application for building permits and that the construction of the proposed improvements be in compliance with all applicable codes with all required approvals to be rendered by appropriate officials. Nothing contained herein shall be construed to represent an approval of the specific building plans submitted by the Applicant, said approval to be granted by appropriate Borough Officials.
- C. That Applicant provide plantings along the outside edge of the fence along Chestnut Avenue. The plantings shall be arborvitae planted four feet on center and have a height of at least four feet at the time of plantings.
- D. That the Applicant remove the bush or shrub located on the Applicant's property near the intersection of Chestnut and Morningside as agreed.

The resolution was offered by Mr. Hoskins and seconded by Mr. Martin.

ROLL CALL:

Ayes: Mr. Martin, Mr. Walker, Mr. Hoskins,

Abstain: Mr. Flaherty, Mr. Raman, Mr. Sandler, Dr. von der Lieth

CASE: 10-11 Block: 707 Lot: 24	Application of <i>Gerard Glauda</i> , 158 North Avenue for rear yard coverage variance to construct an in-ground swimming pool in an R-20 residential zone.
---	--

FLAHERTY: Do we have anything to add? We have a resolution in the affirmative for this application.

WHEREAS, GERARD GLAUDA (hereinafter referred to as "Applicant"), being the owner of premises known as 158 North Avenue, in the Borough of Park Ridge, County of Bergen and State of New Jersey, said premises also known as Lot 24 of Block 707 on the Tax Assessment Map for the Borough of Park Ridge, has applied to the ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT FOR THE BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE

seeking a variance from the terms and provisions of the Zoning Ordinance of the Borough of Park Ridge to permit the construction of an in-ground swimming pool on the property; and

WHEREAS, the premises are located in an R-20 Zoning District as same is defined by the Zoning Ordinance of the Borough of Park Ridge; and

WHEREAS, Applicant has submitted a survey of the premises prepared by Thomas W. Skrable, Licensed Engineer of the State of New Jersey, dated August 30, 2010, illustrating the proposed location of the swimming pool together with other improvements on the subject property; and

WHEREAS, Applicant requires a variance from the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance of the Borough of Park Ridge limiting rear yard coverage of accessory structures to 10% of the rear yard area; and

WHEREAS, a hearing was held before the ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT OF THE BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE duly convened on October 19, 2010, upon due notice as required by law; and

WHEREAS, the BOARD has carefully considered the application and all testimony and evidence submitted in connection therewith;

WHEREAS, no person appeared in opposition to the requested variances;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT OF THE BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE that the BOARD hereby makes the following findings of fact:

1. Applicant is the owner of a single-family home located at 158 North Avenue in the Borough of Park Ridge. The Applicant's lot is located in the R-20 Residential Zoning District of the Borough, a district requiring a minimum lot area of 20,000 square feet. Applicant's lot is an undersized lot having a lot area of slightly less than 17,000 square feet.
2. Applicant filed a request to permit the construction of a free form, in-ground swimming pool in the rear lot of the premises. The precise location of the pool is set forth on the survey submitted to the BOARD.
3. The Zoning Ordinance of the Borough of Park Ridge limits the maximum area that accessory structures may cover in any rear yard to 10% of the overall rear yard area. The construction of the proposed swimming pool, together with the proposed patio and walkway, result in a rear yard coverage of slightly more than 25%.
4. Applicant and Applicant's pool contractor testified that it is impossible to construct a pool in the rear yard that would not exceed 10% rear yard coverage limitation based upon the size of the Applicant's lot and the location of the residence on the lot. The undersized nature of the lot provides Applicant with substantially less rear yard area than would be the case if the lot were not undersized.
5. Applicant and the Applicant's pool contractor further noted that the proposed pool would comply with all other setbacks for pools required by the Zoning Ordinance. No portion of either the pool or the proposed patio and walkways would violate any provision of the Zoning Ordinance.
6. The BOARD is also cognizant of the fact that the Borough Planner and Planning Board of the Borough of Park Ridge have proposed revisions to the Zoning Ordinance of the Borough that would either eliminate or substantially modify current rear yard lot coverage requirements.

7. The BOARD finds that the Applicant faces a unique condition and hardship by virtue of the undersized nature of the lot. The BOARD further finds that an additional unique condition exists by virtue of the location of the home on the subject lot.
8. The BOARD further finds that there will be no negative impact whatsoever resulting from the grant of the requested variance. There is a substantial wooded area on the lot directly to the rear of the subject property. The pool and related structures will not violate any other bulk requirement of the Zoning Ordinance. There will be no negative impact on the neighborhood or on the Zoning Ordinance of the Borough.
9. Finally, the BOARD also finds and concludes that the grant of the requested variance to permit the construction of the pool will not result in any substantial detriment to the public good, nor will same impair the intent and purpose of the zone plan or Zoning Ordinance of the Borough of Park Ridge in any way.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT FOR THE BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE, by virtue of the foregoing, and pursuant to the authority of N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70, that the BOARD does hereby grant the Applicant's requested rear yard coverage variance to permit the construction of the proposed pool as shown on the submitted plan subject to the following conditions:

- A. That Applicant construct the proposed improvements as set forth on all final plans submitted to the BOARD and that same not be constructed in such a fashion so as to exceed the scope and extent of the improvements set forth on all final documents submitted and described in all testimony presented to the BOARD.
- B. That Applicant comply with all Borough Ordinances and State Statutes with regard to the application for building permits and that the construction of the proposed improvements be in compliance with all applicable codes with all required approvals to be rendered by appropriate officials. Nothing contained herein shall be construed to represent an approval of the specific building plans submitted by the Applicant, said approval to be granted by appropriate Borough Officials.

The resolution was offered by Mr. Raman and seconded by Dr. von der Lieth.

ROLL CALL:

Ayes: Mr. Martin, Mr. Raman, Mr. Sandler, Mr. Walker, Mr. Flaherty, Dr. von der Lieth, Mr. Hoskins

Abstain: None

NEW CASES:

CASE: 10-12 Block: 1603 Lot: 5	Application of <i>Philip Mania d/b/a Mania Hair Salon</i> , 62 Park Avenue for variance to construct and install awnings with signage over window and door in a N.B.D. zone.
---	---

WALKER: Mr. Chairman, I have the following items to be marked into evidence in regard to this application.

- Item 1 is the application dated 10/26/2010.
- Item 2 is certification of service dated 10/28 and 11/03/2010.
- Item 3 is legal notification dated 11/05/2010.
- Item 4 is proof of payment of taxes dated 11/08/2010.
- Item 5 is the a lease dated 7/12/1991
- Item 6 is the survey dated 6/03/1987.

Minutes of the Park Ridge Zoning Board of Adjustment
Meeting of November 16, 2010 – Page 6

Item 7 is owners authorization.

Item 8 is photos of buildings and awnings with specs undated.

Item 9 is Planner's review dated 11/11/2010.

That is all that I have at this time, Mr. Chairman.

FLAHERTY: Thank you, Mr. Walker.

TEN HOEVE: Please raise your right hand. Do you swear that the testimony that you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

MANIA: I do.

TEN HOEVE: Please state your name and address.

MANIA: Philip Mania, the business address is 62 Park Avenue, Park Ridge.

TEN HOEVE: Thank you.

FLAHERTY: Okay, Mr. Mania would you care to take us through your application and what you would like to accomplish with it?

MANIA: We have done a rather large renovation, right across the street. Over the course of time, we have taken over 3 of the spaces that were in the building. So, we basically occupy all of the building except for Magic Cleaners.

With that said, there were box signs above each rental spot. So, like I said, we took over all three, so there are 3 box signs. We have eliminated the box signs because there were 3. So, we literally had the name of the business times 3. It really looked silly. So, we eliminate them and we would like to put up awnings above the windows and the door.

FLAHERTY: I think you had a computer generated photo of that, right?

MANIA: Yes. It will look a lot nicer than the box signs looked. They looked awful to be perfectly honest with you.

FLAHERTY: So you want to put up 4 and they will all be the same size?

MANIA: Correct.

FLAHERTY: How far out will they project?

MANIA: They will project 30 inches.

FLAHERTY: 30 inches out from the side, and will they be illuminated at all?

MANIA: There is a soffit, and existing soffit with existing high hats, that we feel is going to be sufficient enough to light the signs and not be too much either at the same time. We don't want it to look like Christmas, we just want it very subtle.

FLAHERTY: What are the hours then that the lights are on in the soffit? When is that on? Is that on all night long, or is just for business hours?

MANIA: Currently?

FLAHERTY: Currently and what would be the plan going forward? Would it stay the same?

MANIA: Currently, I think, I have never really taken much notice to it, they are very subtle, to be honest with you. They are sitting in a soffit, so they are not projecting

out to the street. They are just projecting down. I believe that they are on timers, so I could request that they go off at a reasonable time, if that is an issue. The box signs that were there were lit.

TEN HOEVE: They are probably either on a timer or a shut off because the Borough Ordinance requires that they be off by 11 o'clock.

MANIA: I just never took notice for the actual soffit lights.

FLAHERTY: So, let me ask the Board Attorney to help me understand this. The variance is for what...

TEN HOEVE: The question here is have you seen a report that came from our Planner at all? You may not have seen it. Maybe I can ask some questions?

Are all of the awnings going to be the same color, shape and design?

MANIA: No, I didn't see that. Are all the awnings going to be the same shape, yes. Yes, the same color also and I can tell you the color that we are requesting. It is from a company called Sunbrella. I think I gave a copy of this with the paperwork, it is "True Brown". It is basically like a chocolate brown, a dark, deep brown.

TEN HOEVE: I am just trying to get some of this on the record, to make sure that it complies. They are going to be at least 7 feet high off of the ground?

MANIA: I just have to look at my notes. Yes, definitely.

TEN HOEVE: They won't extend more than 6 feet out from the face of the building?

MANIA: Oh, much less than 6 feet, It is going to be 30 inches.

TEN HOEVE: The total number of colors that are going to be on the signs?

MANIA: The awning itself is going to be that solid true brown color that I mentioned, and then we are requesting silver writing. So, 2 colors.

TEN HOEVE: That fine. It is going to have just the name of the occupant on the sign?

MANIA: Yes, we are not looking to put telephone numbers or we do hair or we do nails, none of that, just the logo.

TEN HOEVE: And it is not going to be blocking any windows, doors, fire escapes?

MANIA: Absolutely not.

TEN HOEVE: And it is not going to be anywhere near the curb line, I assume?

MANIA: Not even close.

TEN HOEVE: I think that those are the only questions that we have.

FLAHERTY: Are there any other questions or concerns from the members of the Board? Is there anyone in the public here to speak to this application?

RAMAN: I have one question. The angle of the sign, is it your attention to make sure that it still falls within the overhang?

MANIA: The soffit you mean, yes. The whole idea is for it not to protrude out dramatically, and 30 inches is not a lot.

RAMAN: The angle at which it is, I mean this is just a statement. Your building is at a higher level than the road, right? So, if your intention is to have the sign visible, it almost looks like you are not going to get much of a visibility at the angle that it is at right now.

MANIA: Yes, I have already done due diligence, if you will, with the company. I think you have a copy of the drawing.

RAMAN: Oh yes, okay.

FLAHERTY: Thank you for your time Mr. Mania. You can call the office in the morning.

TEN HOEVE: I am sure that a resolution will be adopted at our next meeting and if you need anything more quickly than that, you can just speak to the Building Department or Zoning Officer.

MANIA: And that would be Nick Saluzzi?

TEN HOEVE: Yes.

MANIA: I can speak directly to him?

TEN HOEVE: You can and if he has any questions, tell him to call me.

MANIA: Okay, great, thank you.

CASE: 10-13 Block: 1103 Lot: 6	Application of <u>James Babcock</u> , 47 Midland Avenue for Floor Area Ratio, building coverage, rear setback, front setback variances to construct an addition to existing house in an R-15 zone.
---	--

FLAHERTY: Would the applicant please come up?

WALKER: Mr. Chairman, I have the following items to be marked into evidence in regard to this application.

- Item 1 is the application dated 10/25/2010.
- Item 2 is certification of service dated 11/02/2010.
- Item 3 is legal notification dated 11/05/2010.
- Item 4 is proof of payment of taxes dated 10/27/2010.
- Item 5 is the deed dated 1/30/2007.
- Item 6 is the survey dated 10/08/2010.
- Item 7 is elevations dated 10/25/2010.

That is all that I have at this time, Mr. Chairman.

TEN HOEVE: I assume that you will both be testifying. Please raise your right hands. Do you swear that the testimony that you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

BABCOCK: Yes.

BRUNO: Yes.

TEN HOEVE: Please state your names and addresses.

BABCOCK: James R. Babcock, 32 West Park Avenue, Park Ridge, NJ.

BRUNO: Joseph J. Bruno, 29 Pascack Road, Park Ridge, NJ.

FLAHERTY: So, Mr. Babcock, do you live at the home, 47, or do you live....

BABCOCK: No, I have been living in West Park since 1955. I live in West Park as of now, and I have Midland Avenue. We have decided to go to 47 Midland and get a one floor living. We are not getting any younger. That is about it. We have bigger back yard and our grandchildren are getting a little bit bigger and we have a bigger lot there.

FLAHERTY: Okay, thank you for the background.

BABCOCK: You can see the length and width it is a pretty nice piece.

FLAHERTY: Yes it is. Okay there are another of variances being sought on this application, so why don't you, if you want to take us through it your self or your architect, Mr. Bruno.

BRUNO: I will go first. I would like to.....

MARTIN: Mr. Bruno in the absence of Mrs. Beer, would you please speak into the black microphone for the record?

BRUNO: That is the traveling one, right?

WALKER: Item 8 is 5 undated photographs.

BRUNO: I will take the Board through the variances that are required first, and then I will explain the project.

The first variance listed on the Zoning Data Chart is for building coverage. The ordinance provides 20%. By the way, the house is in the R-15 Zone. The Ordinance permits 20%, and we are proposing 22.67%. Impervious coverage we comply with the requirement, or the maximum allowed, I should say, is 35%, and we are at 29.32%.

The front yard setback triggers another variance. We are required to have 30 feet and on the survey prepared by Azzolina and Feury, shows the existing to be 24 feet, so, it is encroaching by 6 feet, as we start. We are proposing a front porch and I will explain that in a little bit, which will be at its closest to the front lot line at 19.67 feet. So that triggers a front yard setback variance.

The other variance is for rear yard setback. The requirement for the building is 45 feet and we are proposing 20.50 feet, so that is a variance for that and for the setback to the deck the ordinance requires 20 feet and we are at 12 feet, so we have 2, really essentially, 2 rear yard setback variances there.

The last is Floor Area Ratio, which is a maximum of 25%, or 4,250 square feet per the latest revision to the ordinance. We are at 25.59%, at 4,095 feet. So for the, to put it in perspective, we are 95 square feet over for the Floor Area Ratio. We are permitted based on the size of the lot, which is 16,000 square feet to be at 4,000 square feet and we are proposing 4,095 square feet.

The house is an existing 2-family. The second floor apartment will not be expanded. The second floor apartment consists of a bedroom, a kitchen, a living room, and a bath. The only, really alteration work, that is required is for a window in one of the rear dormers of the living room to be removed to accommodate the roof line of the first floor addition, which is the living quarters of the owner.

The floor plan as it sits now, is, you walk in the front door and there is a living room. Straight ahead is a dining room, kitchen to the back is more colloquially none as a Florida room with jalousie windows, drafty and not suitable for use year round. There are 2 bedrooms and a bathroom at that level, with a breezeway connecting the home to the garage. What Mr. and Mrs. Babcock had requested, of me, was to design an addition that would not only accommodate them in their retirement years but also to accommodate visitation by the family for holidays, and weekends and things of that nature.

So, we would create a front porch to give, you know, it is utilitarian. It allows people to, it allows them to receive guests and guests can be undercover until the door is answered as well as providing for a great deal of aesthetic benefit.

It is an older styled home, and the Babcock's wish to have a more usable and more friendly appearance of the house to the street. So, we are proposing to come out 6 feet, which would be the minimal amount to at least be able to have a couple of chairs to sit. They are not looking to entertain out there or anything of that nature. They want something to at least give them an opportunity to sit outside in the front and watch the neighbors go by if they wish.

You come in, we put a foyer with closets in part of the living room and then, what I term as a sitting room, is really the leftover space in the living room. We would maintain the existing bedroom in the front of the house as well as the existing bath. It would be renovated, of course, but the spaces would not change in there shape or configuration.

One of the bedrooms would then be turned into a dining room and the kitchen would be expanded into the existing dinette area. Right now the kitchen is about 10 foot square, so it is not a very large space. Going towards the rear of the home, we would put a family room and master bedroom, closet, and master bath.

Then, inside of the breezeway space, we would create a vestibule for entrance into the apartment upstairs, because there is really no closet to enter there. Then, at least, they would not be having to cross paths between the apartment upstairs and downstairs, but that is all done internally. There is not an exterior vestibule or anything of that nature.

Then, there is a laundry and bedroom and bathroom for their younger son to occupy, which would connect to the existing garage. Due to the topography, you will see on the photographs, and in the packet, it would be photographs number 2 and 3, you can see that the land slopes off pretty steeply from the house down towards the back property line. So, we really have no choice but to have designed a deck to be constructed for outside use. It would be too many steps to go down from the living space down to a grade patio, which is why we have the deck, which because of the siding of the house, on the site, you will see the line that I am pointing to now, is the setback line for the deck. This other line, the 45 foot setback line is for the setback for the house, which the southwest corner of the house presently just about touches.

It is important to note that the land in the back is not built upon. It is wooded area and I believe that it is owned by the Borough of Park Ridge. Is that correct? So, that you would see in the 4th photograph in the set. The title of that is "View looking south from rear of house on subject property".

FLAHERTY: Is that land, do you know if that land developable?

BABCOCK: No, not to my knowledge. It is landlocked. I have been working for the Borough for 28 years and it has been there for 28 years.

FLAHERTY: There is no access from the road?

BABCOCK: No. That is correct, there is not.

FLAHERTY: Do you know if it is coded or termed wetlands or.....

BABCOCK: That I am not sure of. I did work for the Road Department. I work for the utilities now. When I was with the Road Department, periodically we would have to cut it free, but it has been that way as long as I have lived in town.

MARTIN: I believe that there is a creek back there.

BABCOCK: You are right, there is.

MARTIN: I don't know how far from the property line it is, but there is a creek back there.

BABCOCK: It is pretty far back, it is probably—it is below me, and it way down there.

MARTIN: Yes, I know that.

BABCOCK: You know the 2 house flooded. I am on Emergency Management, and I go there over 4 years and we have been there about 6 times that that house has been wiped out.

TEN HOEVE: What is that property used for now? Do you know?

BABCOCK: What property?

TEN HOEVE: The town property.

BABCOCK: It is just vacant land. I don't know what else. Maybe Margot knows.... I don't.

TEN HOEVE: No she doesn't know.

BABCOCK: I don't know. It has never been anything. It has just been there.

MARTIN: The creek goes through there but it is just such a severe drop.

BABCOCK: I can almost say it is a cliff.

TEN HOEVE: And it is completely landlocked? There is not any access to any street?

BABCOCK: It would be on the survey. I don't really know.

SANDLER: Echo Place.

BABCOCK: Echo Place is a 40 foot easement, I guess you would call it, or right-of-way. It is a paper street that is to the east of my property. As long as I have worked for the town periodically we have to take a vehicle down there. We used to maintain it a little better than we do now. I was with the Road Department, but I am not anymore. I am with Electric and Water. Bergen County Utility Authority periodically, I think once a month, goes down there to read their meters, that is the way that Park Ridge gets billed for the sewers, through meters, and they do go down there. They used to drive down there but for the last, don't quote me because I am not on roads, 10 or 12 years, they physically walk, now, down there because it hasn't been maintained. It is just dirt. But, there is a main sewer line going down there, speaking as utilities, there is no electric or water, there is just a main sewer line, which is a metering pit that follows the main trunk line, a 46 or 48 inch trunk line, follows that brook level all the way down to Pascack Road, passed the church and then it heads up and ends up and in Little Ferry. That is the way our sewer system runs, gravity.

MARTIN: John, the only way, from my recollection of that area, and I have been over there a number of times, in that general vicinity, that you would be able to get onto the town's property, you would probably need some climbing gear.

WALKER: How much property is that down there?

BABCOCK: I think that it is 4, don't quote me, it is 4 or a hair over 4 acres, because to the west of me, if you guys or if you look at a map, you go up 5th Street and make a right on to Midland, there is good piece of property there. That is town property. That goes this way and then it follows the swale and goes all the way down, heading down to Pascack Road.

KAIN: To give it a little perspective, the property that Jim and Ben are mentioning, is not to dissimilar to the one at Atkins Glen. That type of severity. This seems a lot more wooded, because at Atkins Glen, at least on the Park Ridge side we have that walking trail, which doesn't exist here, I don't believe.

BABCOCK: No. I haven't seen anybody back there, hardly. I have seen someone walking a dog back there, but there are more deer than humans back there.

BRUNO: The first photo in that group is taken directly across the street. Those are the two houses that are rather essentially come right up to the front property line or the right-of-way line. I show that photograph to illustrate that what is being proposed here in terms of the front yard setback request, is not unusual to the neighborhood. We are not trying to do something that is.....

WALKER: So, the existing house already 19.7 feet.

BRUNO: The existing house is already, I think it is 20 feet. Let me just check that. It is 24 at the furthest and 19.7 at the, which would be the northeast corner or front northeast corner of the garage.

WALKER: The porch is really not necessarily going to set any further out than that 19.7 line.

BRUNO: Well, we are proposing I think it is 19.7, or 19.67, which is essentially the same. The porch would be open. It would be roofed but it is open on really the 3 sides, the front, the east side and the portion of the west side that projects past the front wall of the house. There is not intention of ever closing that in. It is meant strictly for the aesthetic benefit of the home as well as providing for some cover for guests.

I show the north elevation. We are not trying to create a large over built house, for the site, we are still maintaining the character of the existing dormers in the front. We will be using clapboard siding, stone facing on the front, all traditional materials for Park Ridge, what I would call the older style of the Park Ridge homes, which is more cottage style residences, particularly in that area.

I would say that even though we are asking for several variances, the intent of the zoning plan would not be harmed. The Floor Area Ratio variance at 95 square feet, I would suggest is diminimous. The house is not massive and it is not overbuilt for the site. It provides an appropriate amount of living space for modern family life and also for an appropriate house sometime in the future to be sold. If it is 20 or 30 years, whatever, at least it is a house that is commensurate with, as I said, modern family life. The setbacks are not, the setback variances that we are requesting are to the rear, and not to the sides, so that the house is not overly wide for the site. The distance or the proximity to the rear property line is not detrimental because that is a rather large tract of wooded area and with the creek running through it, at some point it is not really a developable area, as shown in that photograph. It is not as if we are hovering over a neighbor.

FLAHERTY: Okay, so what is the current, the home is currently how far off of the rear yard setback?

BRUNO: At its closest, it is 35.1 feet. That is from the furthest back corner of that Florida room.

FLAHERTY: So you want to go from that 35 feet to 20.5 feet?

BRUNO: For the building, yes. That is to create the family room.

FLAHERTY: Okay. When we look at this, the 5 variances, 3 of them are rather, jump off the page as substantial. Now, if we break them down and we look at the front yard setback. As Mr. Walker pointed out, that, because part of the home is already set 19 feet off, so as I think Mr. Walker said, is really a wash.

TEN HOEVE: There is probably one other variance that I think is required. This is a 2-family, you said?

BRUNO: Yes.

TEN HOEVE: Is it presently owner occupied 2-family?

BRUNO: Not at the present, but the purpose of this is to make it an owner occupied.

TEN HOEVE: It will make it an owner occupied.

BRUNO: Yes. I spoke with Mr. Saluzzi, because when we were engaging in the beginning of the design process, I had asked him if under the zoning code, if the configuration of that vestibule at the ground floor would be considered in any way an expansion of the apartment, which we know is not permitted. His answer to me was no, that is why it was not identified as a variance.

TEN HOEVE: The reason why I—generally, as you probably know, non-conforming uses can't be expanded. Two-family homes are non-conforming uses throughout the Borough. There is no zone in which 2-family homes are permitted.

BRUNO: Right, I am aware of that.

TEN HOEVE: A pre-existing 2-family use throughout the Borough, at one time they couldn't be expanded at all, because, well, without getting a "D" variance for the expansion of the non-conforming use. We adopted an ordinance, probably 10 or 15 years ago, which provided that pre-existing, non-conforming, owner occupied, 2-family dwellings could be enlarged provided that you didn't have any additional dwelling units and that none of the districts yard coverage or height restrictions would be violated. This obviously is an expansion that would violate a yard restriction, which means even if the Board considers it to be an owner occupied 2-family house, because it will be, presumably at some time in the immediate future. It is still an additional variance because you are expanding a pre-existing, non-conforming use.

BRUNO: I see, okay.

TEN HOEVE: It doesn't comply with the yard coverage restrictions. So, in essence, you need a "D" variance for the expansion of a non-conforming use.

BRUNO: In addition to the one for the F.A.R.?

TEN HOEVE: In addition to the rest of the variances.

BRUNO: But the F.A.R. he as already agreed.

TEN HOEVE: Right. In fact, that variance is a very, it is less than 1% variation. I don't remember the number but it like ½% or something.

BRUNO: For the F.A.R.? Yes, it is

TEN HOEVE: It is like 25.5 something.

FLAHERTY: 25.59. So it is .59%.

BRUNO: Yes, we are 95 square feet over. The purpose of this is to allow the Babcock's to occupy it. They are not interested in renting.

TEN HOEVE: I understand that, but you have to understand what I am saying about 101-14, which provides that you can expand a pre-existing, non-conforming, 2-family, owner occupied, as long as you don't violate any of the other restrictions.

BRUNO: Without a variance.

MARTIN: What are the plans for the remaining second floor apartment?

BRUNO: Nothing. Other than the removal of the one window and closing the opening to accommodate the first floor roof line.

MARTIN: There will be no tenants in there moving forward?

BRUNO: We will continue the apartment, but it won't be expanded, if that is what you are asking.

MARTIN: No, I am asking, they are going to move into the first floor, is the second floor going to be vacant or is still going to be occupied by a tenant?

BRUNO: No, that will still be occupied by a tenant, as it is now.

MARTIN: Okay.

RAMAN: I thought I heard that the Echo Place is a paper road?

BABCOCK: I guess that is what you would call it. I am not sure.

RAMAN: It is about a 10 foot drop from the street.

BABCOCK: It is a 40 foot whatever you call it.

RAMAN: It is just a right-of-way at this point. There is so much acreage in the back there, I mean, would it be conceivable that the town might want to sell it at some point?

BABCOCK: I don't know.

FLAHERTY: That was part of what we were trying to figure out, if that was at all developable. From some members of the Board have seen it and it sounds like it is not.

TEN HOEVE: Brigitte recently did extensive work with the open space analysis that has gone on and she would know what that is. Unfortunately, she is not here tonight, so... She would clearly

RAMAN: The drop from the back is about 8 feet, which is not tremendous, and then it flattens out from the little that I can see here. So, I think that we just have to check that in case you could get a lot out of it...

BABCOCK: You mean down the road? I got you. You mean that they would pave that Echo Road and put up one house down there. I am just kind of lost here.

TEN HOEVE: No, I don't think that the Borough would have any plans of developing that, especially if it is subject to steep slopes.

BABCOCK: It sure is. When I say you could almost reel down that hill.

TEN HOEVE: There must be something else going on with respect to what the Borough is doing with that or why it has never been developed. It might have something to do with the sewer easement. It might have.....

BABCOCK: That is what I think. I am just overhearing one day when Azzolina was there, and they mentioned something about something, I don't know.

MANCUSO: Maybe it is a category 1 stream, with the 300 foot required buffer.

TEN HOEVE: But it would have had to have been a part of our open space and vacant land analysis in connection with the COAH submissions.

MANCUSO: In all the submissions, I don't recall any allocation of units being applied to that piece. It is just an open space.

BABCOCK: It is just like the top of Ridge Avenue. That has been vacant as long as I have lived here, and that has never going to be developed.

TEN HOEVE: My guess is that there is some reason that the Borough has it and it can't be developed, but I don't know what that is. You are just here on an unfortunate night because there is a League of Municipalities convention that is taking place. Lyn is not here because of that. She would probably know. Brigitte is not here because of that and she would probably know. There is no way that we can find it quickly enough during this hearing.

FLAHERTY: Again, the rear yard setbacks are aggressive but if we can confirm whether or not that back property is ever going to be developed. That is going to have an effect or influence on how the Board looks at this.

BABCOCK: If you walk it, I have 160 by 100 and then whatever. If you go from the back to the brook line there isn't a whole lot of property. The town parcel goes from west of me and then it goes on an angle and follows the brook. I think that they own like half of the brook.

MANCUSO: The brook should go through the middle of the piece.

BABCOCK: There you go. I walk back there a lot. I used to with the Road Department all the time. It goes on an angle like this, so even though, I mean I can't speak for the town, if you came down that road and built a road, you could probably have a cottage, but don't know, like 20 by 50 feet or 20 by 90, It would be a funny looking thing.

TEN HOEVE: I don't think the issue is that it is about to be developed or would ever be developed. I think there must be some other factor that we just don't know about right now.

FLAHERTY: I think that in order for us to consider that rear yard setback and John, you tell me if you think that this is right, I think that we may need to take a month so members of the Board have to do a site visit and then we can have our Engineer discuss it next month. John, what do you think?

TEN HOEVE: I think that if you have all of the testimony on the record that you want now, then, that is probably a good idea. It will make it quicker and easier than depending upon

BRUNO: I really don't have anything to add because basically as far as the variances for the rear yard setback is concerned, you know, that really, and as the Chairman, Mr. Flaherty, has correctly pointed out, the request for the rear yard setback variance is aggressive. We are already deficient by 10 feet because of the depth of the property is less than what is required, by the ordinance.

I will reiterate for the record that the effect of the rear yard setback deficiency, for lack of a better term, is greatly mitigated by the fact that is a large piece of wooded land. With the stream running through it, the likelihood of it being developed is pretty much nil, but I understand the Board's position that it needs to have, before it can render a decision, it needs to have some definitive answers to make certain that it is doing its diligence. So, I am perfectly comfortable with that.

FLAHERTY: Okay, so if we could carry this until next month, and I encourage all members of the Board to try and take a look at this property, so we can discuss it next month.

WALKER: I have a couple of questions.

FLAHERTY: Okay,

WALKER: Joe, how high off of the ground is that wood deck in the back?

BRUNO: The wood deck is probably, let me see, it is about 6 or 8 feet, something like that.

WALKER: So there is probably going to be more than 4 steps to get down on the ground?

BRUNO: On the side we are less, but we may have to add some steps. When Azzolina and Feury, if the project goes ahead, and Azzolina and Feury, of course, because of the site plan ordinance, would have to prepare a site plan, so we can address that.

WALKER: You know as it is already so close to the rear boundary, couldn't the steps be taken to the side?

BRUNO: I will definitely consider that. It would probably be better to go to the side anyway, so that we are not having a very large staircase.

WALKER: My second question is why the remote bedroom behind the garage? I mean the rest of that area flows very nicely, and then.....

BRUNO: How old is Michael?

BABCOCK: 28.

BRUNO: It is for their 28 year old son.

BABCOCK: It is also, I live in a small house now, and we do have grandchildren that live in Hillsdale and I do have relatives up in New York State, and her mother is getting older, that lives on Johnsville since 1953, and we have the capabilities now, if we do get a guest, that could be their area with their own little bathroom, because I do only have 1 bathroom.

WALKER: So the second floor would still be a rental but not family members?

BABCOCK: Right, I am not going to do the stairs anymore.

FLAHERTY: Are there any other questions or comments from the Board?

MARTIN: I just have one suggestion, Joe. You might want to check any kind of wetlands EPA issues, because I have personal history in a different town with my family with wetlands issues.

BRUNO: I have spoken with Mike Ritchie about the issue and he is comfortable that with what we want to do, because it is on previously developed land and we are not cutting down trees or anything like that. The permit by rule would be in effect here.

MARTIN: It is just something to look at and make sure that there isn't any EPA problems also.

BRUNO: No, he is working on that and when he...he will address that when he is preparing the site plan. We wouldn't want to go through the whole process and then hit a roadblock later. Obviously it wasn't like we didn't know it was there.

FLAHERTY: Okay, anyone else with questions or comments? Is there anyone from the public with questions or comments?

BRUNO: We won't have to re-notice, will we?

TEN HOEVE: No.

FLAHERTY: See you next month.

NEW BUSINESS:

Madison Square Developers – 86 Madison Street

Maintenance Bond Release request – Engineer and Planner

TEN HOEVE: Eve would you like to comment on this application.

MANCUSO: The Madison Square has requested relief of the Bond for the site, the Maintenance Bond for the site. Two years have passed and we went back and looked at the site and everything is in pristine condition. They did a very nice job and I recommend that you release it.

Brigette has also gone out to look at the landscaping components and she agrees that they are ready for the release.

A motion to release the Bond was made by Mr. Hoskins and seconded by Mr. Martin.

ROLL CALL:

Ayes: Mr. Martin, Mr. Raman, Mr. Sandler, Mr. Walker, Mr. Flaherty, Mr. Hoskins, Dr. von der Lieth

Abstain: None

Lollipop Day Nursery School – 67 Spring Valley Road

Bond release request – As-Built to be submitted by applicant to Engineer and Planner for review.

TEN HOEVE: Do you have Brigette's most recent report?

URDANG: I don't think so. I have the report that I responded to, which I assume is not the most recent report.

TEN HOEVE: We have a policy that they are supposed to be given to you, but, to all applicants.

URDANG: Is it very long?

TEN HOEVE: one page.

URDANG: I am a quick study, lets see if I can do something with it.

TEN HOEVE: Again, this is probably because of the personnel not being here.

URDANG: This isn't much different from the original one, as far as I can see, John.

TEN HOEVE: I was just asking if you had it.

URDANG: Okay, I didn't, but now I do. The reason why I made that comment, was because the issues that are being raised in this letter were already answered in my previous letter and I think that they remain the same.

TEN HOEVE: The landscaping issues?

URDANG: Well, the landscaping issues, basically what she said, that there are some perennials that are missing and we acknowledge that. That was included in my letter that we were told by our landscaper that we shouldn't be putting them in at that particular time, and that we should wait until the spring. We certainly intend to put them in, in the spring and we certainly have no problem with you retaining money to guarantee that. There were a significant number of mums that were planted in the meantime, that were an addition to what had been approved to give some temporary cover.

With respect to the tree that was damaged, and Jim can tell you that we have pictures of it. Our landscaper believes that it can be saved and has taken measures to try to save it. It has been wrapped and they put some tree sap on it and wrapped and he believes that it will survive. If it doesn't survive, we will replace it.

With regard to the fence. Board on board fence is in fact located a couple of feet onto Lot 7. The reason for that is because there simply wasn't enough room to put in the landscaping because it would have butted up against the Belgian Block, which would not have been good for it.

With respect to what is going to happen with Lot 7. We have no intention, or Jim has no intention of selling Lot 7 apart from the school property and my suggestion would be if your concern is that the fence remain where it is, and that the fence be maintained there, we are willing to give you a deed restriction, so that anybody searching title to Lot 7 if it were sold separately or even if it is sold as part of it, would know that the fence has to be maintained unless it comes back to this Board.

TEN HOEVE: I thought that the concern was that, not that the property would be sold, but that the garage, shed, whatever it was, would not be used for any school purposes. I think that was in the resolution.

URDANG: Yes, well we said that we were not using it for any school purposes. Do you want that in the deed restriction too, we will put that in. That is not a problem. We are not using it for school purposes.

TEN HOEVE: I think that the Planner's comment was then, why was there a gate added at the location and a paver walkway to provide access to?

URDANG: It was to provide access. Jim owns both properties. He keeps personal stuff, like a snow blower and other stuff, but that is not for school use. That is all done by contractors. That is because he doesn't have enough room in his home. It is not being used for school purposes and again if you want that included, as long as we are preparing a deed, if that is what you want, we will put that in as well.

TEN HOEVE: If I understood you correctly, what you are saying is that you would allow remaining funds to be held to bond the landscaping improvement that the Planner has in her report?

URDANG: Is that the fee that she has about \$2,500.00? Is that what she is suggesting?

TEN HOEVE: Somebody is here from her office, so we can ask.

KAIN: Yes, that is correct.

URDANG: We don't have any problem with that..

TEN HOEVE: What was the position with the tree?

URDANG: The one that was damaged?

TEN HOEVE: Yes, number 2.

URDANG: We have taken corrective measures. We just disagree with her conclusion that it can't be saved. We think that it can. It is worthwhile it to try. If it doesn't, we will replace it.

ANGELILLO: The tree actually looks fine to me.

URDANG: We have a picture here if you would like to see.

KAIN: As long as it is not a safety issue, posed by it right now, I don't personally object to it.

ANGELILLO: I think that the landscaper nicked it with the bucket when it came off the truck.

WALKER: It will be a good idea when it is time to bloom next year, whether or not it has made it.

ANGELILLO: If there is a problem with the tree, I will replace it immediately. It looks like it will be fine to me.

MANCUSO: What is being suggested now, though, is release of a Performance Bond. He is still required to post a Maintenance Bond.

URDANG: Understood.

MANCUSO: So there will be another place to address issues such as that tree. The only thing that wouldn't be addressed, are the plantings that are not yet done.

TEN HOEVE: The bond will cover that if you withhold that amount.

MANCUSO: Right, so if we could, I would suggest that you release the Performance Bond, and enter into the Maintenance Bond, but perhaps add the extra, what was it \$2,500.00.

URDANG: My understanding is that there is about \$38,000.00 that is in cash, in the cash portion of the bond. If you were to withhold the \$2,500.00 for the plantings, as suggested by Brigitte, that is fine, but release of the letter of credit is important.

MANCUSO: Don't you want to convert to a Maintenance Bond?

URDANG: Yes.

MANCUSO: Right, that is what I am suggesting. You don't want to continue your Performance open. You want to close it and open a Maintenance Bond.

URDANG: Right, the release of the revocable letter of credit would be conditional on our posting a Maintenance Bond.

ANGELILLO: What does the Maintenance Bond, what amount does that have to be?

MANCUSO: It would be 15%.

URDANG: 15%.

MANCUSO: That was spelled out in your developers agreement, early on.

ANGELILLO: 15% of the total project, the 380?

MANCUSO: Of that original cost estimate that was attached the developers agreement.

URDANG: Right, as opposed to 120% of the estimate.

MANCUSO: Correct.

TEN HOEVE: In addition to retention of \$2,500.00 cash from the—is that what you are saying?

URDANG: Yes.

MANCUSO: Right so it should be.....

URDANG: We will take it out of the cash portion and release the rest of the cash.

MANCUSO: It should be turned over.

TEN HOEVE: And the deed had questioned.

URDANG: Yes, just lets go over it. In the deed you want to reference the fence and also that the shed on Lot 7 is not to be used in conjunction with the school.

TEN HOEVE: Is that is acceptable with the Board?

WALKER: Yes.

VON DER LIETH: Yes.

MANCUSO: Okay, so we are releasing the Performance Bond and we are turning it over to a Maintenance Bond, plus we are getting \$2,488.75.

RAMAN: Is the tree replacement, if it can't come back, is that covered by the Maintenance Bond?

MANCUSO: Yes. That is a Maintenance Bond type of item, plus the deed.

ANGELILLO: May I ask one question? The Maintenance Bond, that is a separate bond that I have to get?

URDANG: Yes. You would have had to do it anyway. You have to. It is 15%, that would have been required anyway.

ANGELILLO: The revocable letter of credit that I have our for 320, that comes back completely.

URDANG: As soon as you post the Maintenance Bond. You have to post the Maintenance Bond.

ANGELILLO: I post the Maintenance Bond and then you give me that back?

MANCUSO: Right. So, it is a lesser amount. Instead of 120%, it is only 15%, because now you have performed and everything is in place. Now, it is just guaranteeing that what was performed is maintained.

URDANG: It is for 2 years.

FLAHERTY: Do we have any other questions or comments from the Board?

ANGELILLO: I just have one other thing for Ms. Mancuso. Your representative was there yesterday. The manholes were all taken opened up and cleaned up. I do have pictures.

MANCUSO: That is a maintenance issue as well. He did bring back the same photos as well, so I know what to look for.

FLAHERTY: Okay, I think we have everything that we need tonight.

URDANG: At some point is this going to be reflected in a resolution, John?

TEN HOEVE: It will. I will prepare something.

URDANG: Which would be adopted at the next meeting?

TEN HOEVE: Yes.

URDANG: Okay, that is fine, good. Thank you. John, I will prepare that deed and I will send it to you for approval.

CORRESPONDENCE:

None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The Chairman entertained a motion that the September 21, 2010, minutes be approved as submitted. So moved by Mr. Hoskins and seconded by Mr. Martin.

ROLL CALL:

Ayes: Mr. Martin, Mr. Hoskins, Mr. Walker

Abstain: Mr. Flaherty, Mr. Raman, Mr. Sandler, Dr. von der Lieth

APPROVAL OF VOUCHERS:

None

DISCUSSION OF APPLICATIONS:

The first application that the Board discussed was for *Philip Mania d/b/a Mania Hair Studio*. The members were all in agreement that the variance could be allowed. Attorney advised to draw a resolution of approval for the next month's meeting.

The next application to be discussed was that of *James Babcock*. The attorney advised the members that there are essentially 2 types of variances that the Board has the power to grant under the Municipal Land Use Law. He advised that there are "C" variances which are traditionally bulk type of variances, for setbacks or building coverage. It can be granted by a majority of the Board.

He explained that the other type of variance is a "D" variance, which is more difficult variance to obtain. It is usually referred to as a "Use" variance, because in most cases it applies to situations where you want to put in a use that is not permitted in a district, or expand a use that is not permitted somewhere. Density and floor area ratio variances are "D" variances. They are a more difficult variances to obtain. You need to have 5 votes, no matter how many people are voting. You can't approve a "D" variance without having a 5 vote majority. The tests that apply are that there is going to be some inherently beneficial result from the granting of a "D" variance. Some examples that he used were Nursing Homes, Day Care.

Minutes of the Park Ridge Zoning Board of Adjustment
Meeting of November 16, 2010 – Page 22

Two-family houses in Park Ridge, are non-conforming uses. They are not allowed anywhere. This application violates the conditions of the modified ordinance which allows for improvement to a owner-occupied, 2-family home provided you don't require any other bulk variances. This application requires bulk variances, 4 or 5 variances. So it is a more difficult variance to grant.

The members felt that this applicant does really intend to move into the home. They felt that it was going to be a big improvement to the dwelling if he were allowed to do the renovation.

The Board members agreed to try and make a site visit before the next meeting. The Engineer advised the Board that there is an existing double wide driveway that should be addressed when looking further at this application.

ADJOURN:

There being no further business to come before the Board, by motion of Mr. Walker and seconded by Mr. Hoskins, the meeting was adjourned at 9:15 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Margot Hamlin,
Transcriber