

The resolution had been submitted to the Board Members. If there are no comments a motion to approve the resolution could be entertained.

A motion was made by Mr. Williams seconded by Mr. Hyland to accept the Resolution as submitted.

Roll Call: Mr. Vivona, Mr. Williams, Mrs. Romano, Mr. Styple, Mr. Borsinger, Mr. Hyland All in favor

James & Cheryl Brill

Calendar BOA 13-48.18-140

403 Green Village Road

Block: 144 Lot: 48 &

Block: 48.18 Lot: 140,142,&143.

The Resolution for the Brill application has been carried to the next scheduled meeting.

Applications:

New Cingular Wireless Pcs, ("At&T"),

Calendar BOA 15-84-3

200 Shunpike Road

Block: 84 Lot: 3

Ms. Fairweather, Esq

Mr. Morris, Engineer

Full Transcript to be submitted by Applicant.

Summary of vote approving the Extension requested and the Resolution of Approval for this application.

A motion was made by Mrs. Romano seconded by Mr. Styple to approve the **Extension** as requested.

Roll Call: Mr. Vivona, Mr. Weston, Mrs. Romano, Mr. Styple, Mr. Borsinger, Mr. Hyland All in favor

Mr. Shaw said since April 1st is when the other resolution expires he had prepared a Resolution for this evening

Mr. Hyland made a motion to approve the **Resolution** as submitted, seconded by Mr. Weston.

Roll Call: Mr. Vivona, Mr. Weston, Mrs. Romano, Mr. Styple, Mr. Borsinger, Mr. Hyland All in favor

Mrs. Katye Stanzak
6 Country Club Drive
Block: 102.03 Lot: 3

Calendar BOA 14-14-102.03-3

Mr. Vivona recused himself from this application. Mr. Weston presided as a Vice Chair.

Mr. Richard Garver, Licensed Architect - sworn

Mr. Shaw went over the process. First is a brief overview of what is being proposed and then a site visit will be scheduled to see what is involved. The second hearing is where we expect to hear the detail of the presentation. We will need a preserved copy of anything you should present.

Mr. Richard Garber, Licensed Architect sworn in.

Mr. Garber said he had been retained for this project. They are proposing a small addition. The existing site area is 22,590 sf. There is a maximum building coverage of 2500 sf. We design this house in 2008 with lot coverage of 2471 sf. we were 80 sf below the maximum allowed coverage on the site. They would like to extend the kitchen out and provide a mud room. When looking at this we realized that 83 sf has a right for a proposed addition. We are requesting that the building coverage be increased to 2658 sf. which will exceed the allowable building coverage by 83 sf or 2.5%. There is a 187 sf. addition proposed in the rear of the house. We would ask the Board to consider a variance for coverage on this site. Currently it is 2471 so we have 103 under – with the addition it would be 83 over.

Mr. Shaw noted that contained in the application were plans depicting the shape/dimension of the additional area.

Mr. Garber said the kitchen is currently oriented toward Country Rd. Drive. We are proposing a deck by the kitchen and entrance to the mudroom.

Mr. Shaw asked that the drawings be marked as A8 unless they were the original drawings.

Mr. Garber showed the dimension of the building and the proposed. The existing kitchen is 13 ft. by 16 ft. allowing for a counter w/stools and a sliding door going to the back. There is a stair into the mudroom which would make the room 6 ft. by 13 ft. The existing master suite is 17.5 x 22.5 ft. and has two windows toward the rear

yard and then the proposed plan would be to take the window on the left side and change it to a door allowing access out to a patio.

On Sheet 3 you will see the proposed addition, mudroom and patio. There will be a small foundation to support the addition and will match the existing structure.

Mr. Shaw advised that the site visit will be scheduled for the fourth of April followed by the regular meeting on April 16th. The applicant was asked to mark out the affected area.

Mr. & Mrs. McCabe
Hampton Road
Block: 48.10 Lot: 24.

Calendar BOA 14-48.10-24 9

Mr. Richard Keller, Licensed Engineer/Planner

Mr. McCabe, Applicant

Site Report - March 20, 2015

Mr. McCabe (previously sworn) said they had been before the Board about a month ago for a building coverage variance. We have been residents of Chatham for about thirty years. We are at the point of a life changing event. Mrs. McCabe's mother has moved in. About 4 years ago we started to look for a home with everything on one floor as Mrs. McCabe's mother is not mobile, cannot get up and down stairs, etc. We found the house on Hampton which we realized that with some renovations we could make it livable for Mrs. McCabe's mother and us in the future. The variance we are seeking is for a screened in porch that would help us all. Both of us are Melanoma survivors so we can't be in the sun for any length of time. We also but up against the great swamp which has a heavy mosquito population.

The building is under construction. The roof has not been raised. We put in dormers so we could have a larger second floor area. On the driveway side is where the screen porch is with the deck area in front of it. That grill is located in the covered area. If I come to the rear you will see the covered area and then the screen porch. The covered space projects about six feet from the building and aligns with the two story element. The screen porch projects into the rear yard. He noted that all the proposed materials will match what presently exists. Also noted is that no variance were required for the normal construction.

Mr. Vivona asked for any questions from the Board/Public. None heard.

Mr. Richard Keller, Licensed Engineer/Planner - gave credentials and then was sworn in.

Mr. Keller referred to his plans (A9) and found it interesting that there was no extension on the building footprint of the house. There is no extension in the front of the house that was permitted. The area being discussed today is completely over an

existing patio so there is no increase of the impervious area in that section. Referring to A9 this includes photo graphs of the home as it exists today. The site is located on Hampton Road with the Great Swamp located behind it. There are really no homes behind us. A photo will show that the patio has been removed. It shows the existing renovated footprint of the house. The rear of the property is a large distance from its nearest neighbor. Photo #3 is where we are standing at the extreme back of the proposed screened porch. Looking back at the neighbors to the rear is the great swamp. Photo #4 – standing on the north part of the proposed screened area looking at a home known as 15 Hampton Ct. and you can see there is not patio in the back of that home and we are at the garaged side over there. Within the three homes in this micro neighborhood we are very far away from the occupied portions. Finally at the property line, looking back at the house, the screened area actually makes the home look better. As indicated, we need a variance for building coverage. The proposed covered deck will be enclosed with screen panels and will not be used in the winter. We are allowed total building coverage of 2926 sf. What we are proposing exceeds the coverage by 320 sf. I will point out that the lot still remains under developed in terms of its overall coverage. We are 1000 sq. under what is permitted by code so we are having no detrimental effect. We are not increasing any square footage. We are exempt from a grading plan requirement. Drainage is not a problem and it still remains as an underdeveloped lot. The standard for the proof here is under MLUL 40.55 d 70 c.2. We feel the purpose is advanced here; it is a public health and safety as we are providing outdoor spaces which are covered from the sun, secure from the mosquito population associated with the Great Swamp. Again, there is no other way to enjoy the back yard. It also provides for a variety of residential uses. We think, as indicated by the plan (re: rear elevation w/photo #5) you can see that the porch with the standing roof, screening, columns are nicely detailed. The aesthetics component under 40.55d2 Section I, we feel there is no negative criterion. This cannot be seen from the street. There is very little visibility from either neighbor. It is only going to be used for a portion of the year. There is no insulation just screening. There will be no impact on open space or air. This type of housing allows for a mother in law to live within a suite location as well as for the occupants to be in that portion of the home actually keeps people in the community; keeps parents close and there is nothing that affects the intent of the master plan. It keeps the Township of Chatham as a residential community of a higher caliber. We feel it meets the positive/negative criteria.

Mr. Vivona asked if there were any questions/comments from the Board/Public.
None Heard

Mr. Vivona asked, as there were no questions/comments from either the Board or the Public, if someone could make a motion.

Mr. Hyland made a motion to approve the application with conditions discussed, which was seconded by Mr. Williams.

Roll Call: Mr. Borsinger, Mr. Styple, Mr. Williams, Mr. Hyland, Mrs. Romano, Mr. Weston, Mr. Vivona. All in favor

Applicant was advised that a Resolution would be read at the next scheduled meeting.

Golden River Homes, Llc

Calendar BOA 14-61-16

11 Sunset Drive
Block: 61 Lot: 16.

Mr. Shaw said that Counsel for this application was present along with 2 opposing Counsels. An issue has come up concerning the notice sent in November on the application. The notice sent out is more than 6 months old and the last thing in the world that we want is to go through a long hearing process and have a potential question as to a notice issue. This is jurisdictional decision which means that everything that we hear can be thrown out if there is a deficiency in notice and he did not feel that was something that was in the best interest of all concerned. The application will be carried to the next scheduled meeting – April 16, 2015.

Also, by the 16th, one of the comments in Mr. Ruschke's report addresses the need to have a sub-surface investigation at the location of the first drywell system as necessary to evaluate impacts to downstream properties. He hoped that during the hearing process that the applicant will have had that engineering issue addressed so that we can have that taken off the table from an engineering standpoint. I imagine there will be several hearing associated with this but it would be helpful for that to be addressed before the Board has to make a decision.

Mr. DeAngelis, Attorney for Golden River Homes said they had discusses off the record as to whether or not the Board could grant relief without the test results. We would accept that as a condition of relief. That issue has been raised by one of the attorneys of the neighboring property owners and his position is if the Board could not grant the relief without having those soil tests results and the blessing of the Township Engineer with regard to what would be designed

Mr. Shaw said it would be a major condition to have hanging over an application if it was granted.

Mr. De Angelis said they would address those two things. As you know, I believe, the notice we served was perfectly proper. As a technicality has been raised regarding that notice, rather than have an issue raised upon appeal, will we reissue to be sure that that issue is addressed.

Mr. Shaw addressed the members of the public who have been so diligent in attending the meeting for this application when we have been continuing it from meeting to meeting, you will be receiving a new legal notice. We will proceed with the meeting on the 16th of April. We appreciate everyone's patience. Thank You.

Motion to Adjourn was made by Mr. Williams seconded by Mr. Styple. All in favor

Respectfully submitted:

Mary Ann Fasano
Transcribing Secretary