

would be nosier for and closer to the neighbors. Mr. Vecchione asked why not locate it closer to the house. She responded the gas lines run under the bridge and this location would be better for the installation. Moving it down would make it closer to the house at 106 Lookout. Michael Sullivan agreed this was a hardship, but it also could be a C-2 variance. You could argue this was the best use of land. Jake DeNooyer thought a generator under the bridge would echo. Brett Paddock added you need air circulation for the gas, placing it under the bridge could create a hazard. James Murphy confirmed the house was on pilings.

Chairman Murphy asked if there were any other Board questions or comments. Brett Paddock thought this was the best location for the generator and he was fine with the replacement of the A/C units. Mark Caputo asked if anyone lived across the street. Yes, they did but they were no closer than their other neighbors. J. DeNooyer and K. McCormick were fine with the location. Annie Peters thought it was the right spot. The location was the furthest from the neighbors and the least visible. R. Astrup had no objections. Michael Sullivan explained the applicant had 18 months to replace the A/C units. J. Murphy found the location for the generator acceptable.

No one from the public wished to comment on the application.

Mark Caputo made a motion to approve the application as presented. J. Murphy seconded the application. The Board voted 7 – 0 to approve the application with members Murphy, DeNooyer, Peters, McCormick, Vecchione, Paddock and Caputo voting in favor.

Carried Application:

Michael Booth
136 Ball Road

Appl# 21-732
Blk. 103, Lot 83

Floor Area Ratio (2) Side Yard Setback R-A Zone

Michael Booth and Keira Keller, of 136 Ball Road, continued their application. They listened to the Board's comments and suggestions and redesigned their home. They removed the addition over the garage from the plans. The current house is a 1 ½ story cape. They want to make it a true 2 story colonial. They remove the breeze way and changed it into a 2-car garage. They also revised the elevation to have more of a Hapgood style. They showed the originally proposed front elevation and the new proposed front elevation. The current FAR was 16.2% and now they are asking for 22.8% rather than their original request of 31.3%. They have an ILC of 29.3% which they have reduced by 5%. They are adding 714sqft to the house. M. Sullivan pointed out the undersized lot and noted there might be a COAH obligation for the renovation.

The architect, Ken Mihalik, reviewed the design. They have significantly reduced the size of the house. It would be 2500sqft rather than 3500. They have not increased the footprint of the house. Two side yard setbacks are existing non-conforming conditions. They are asking for three variances. An FAR of 22.5% where 17% is allowed and 2 side setbacks of 20.86ft and 20ft where 25ft is required. J. Murphy confirmed the FAR variance was a D variance and the side setbacks were C-1 variances. Mr. Sullivan added they might like to also apply as a C-2 variance since they were reducing the ILC. Brett Paddock asked how they reduced the lot coverage. M. Booth said they removed the screened in porch, a deck off the porch and some of the driveway. B. Paddock thought this was a dramatic improvement over the last design. Jake DeNooyer felt the exhibit of the old and new elevations helped him. He liked the new design even though the FAR was 5% over he

could support it. K. McCormick liked the lower ILC. She felt the design worked in the neighborhood. Annie Peter said the 5% over the allowable FAR bothered her. How much wider was the house on the garage side. The northeast side setback of 20.67ft becomes 20ft and the southwest side is unchanged. M. Sullivan said the lot size in the zone was 15,000sqft and this lot was 11,000. K. McCormick said the FAR requested was very high, but the neighboring lots had homes that were much larger. J. Murphy asked if the applicant did an analysis of the neighborhood homes. They did not. Ryan Astrup had no meaningful objections and Steve Vecchione had no comments. Jim Murphy said he understood the lot was small for the zone. The existing square footage of house is currently 1800sqft and they are proposing 2500sqft which would be a small home for Mt Lakes. However, the FAR they were requesting was a 33% increase. In the past three years the Board has granted 7 homes an FAR variance of about 21.6%. They average a 20% increase over the original home, and the Booths were asking for a greater increase. Were they tearing down the garage. Yes, and asking for a grater setback of on the garage side. He thought the applicant should be requesting a side setback of 21ft to improve the current setback of 20.67 not the 20ft they were looking for.

No one from the public wished to ask a question or make a comment.

Mr. Murphy asked for a motion on the application. Jake DeNooyer didn't agree with the comments made by J. Murphy on the side setback. He made a motion to approve the application as presented including the standard conditions outlined by Mr. Sullivan. Steve Vecchione also didn't have a problem with the width of the garage. He was fine with the plan presented and provided the second. The Board voted 6 – 1 to approve the application with members Murphy, DeNooyer, McCormick, Vecchione, Paddock and Caputo voting in favor and Peters voting against.

New Application:

Dan Amato & Jennifer Bulger	Appl# 22-741
8 Crescent Drive	Blk. 127.02, Lot 16
Floor Area Ratio, Improved Lot Coverage	R-2 Zone
(2) Front yard Setbacks	

Dan Amato and Jennifer Bulger, of 8 Crescent Drive, said their family was growing and their home was becoming a bit small. Rick Nelson, a licensed architect in the state of NJ, continued the presentation. The lot was on the corner, and the front yards had an irregular shape. There are no previous resolutions on the property. They are requesting an FAR variance of 24.18%, are currently at 20.28%, and 20% is allowed. They are counting two small cathedral ceilings in that calculation. They have asked for an ILC of 29.57% where 25% is allowed. They are required to have a front setback of 30ft on Crescent and are requesting 21ft. They must have an average front setback of 42.5ft on Center and they are requesting 30ft. The front setback in the zone is 30ft. It is a 1 ½ story home and they are keeping that look even though they could do 2 stories. They are converting the 2nd floor dormer in a usable bedroom. The steps to the front door are not covered. They would like to add one. Lastly, they would like to add a one-story addition to the side of the house for a family room with an attached front porch. Rick Nelson pointed out the 2nd floor hallway had a clipped ceiling that counts as a cathedral space. He reviewed the elevations of the front porch and how it softens the scale of the house. They also counting the family room cathedral ceiling in the FAR.

The chair asked the Board if they had questions. Brett Paddock thought they had a nice design. Could they clip the cathedral ceiling to reduce the FAR. He questioned the addition to the side and the ILC calculation. R. Nelson answered they are removing an old patio and walkways in the same place. Was there a patio in the rear? No, there is not. How big was the covered porch. It is 130sqft. Mr. Paddock said he could support the bedroom and family room but thought the covered porch was a lot of coverage. What was the lot coverage without the porch. It goes from 29.57% to 28.27%. He thought the porch was nice to have, he questioned the need. Mark Caputo was having trouble supporting the cathedral ceiling in the family room. He thought a 9ft ceiling would be sufficient. J. DeNooyer liked the proposed design but would remove the cathedral ceilings. Rick Nelson showed exhibit A-1, the photo of the 2nd floor hallway ceiling and explained how it adds to the cathedral calculation. Kelly McCormick questioned the need to count this ceiling as cathedral. Mr. Sullivan inquired would changing the cathedral ceilings affect the front appearance of the home from the street. R. Nelson replied, it would not change. Annie Peters did not think they should change the cathedral ceilings. J. DeNooyer liked the porch. K. McCormick asked if there were any other areas where they could reduce coverage. Mr. Nelson said the trees have rocks walls around them. They could remove them to reduce the coverage to 27.51%. A. Peters liked the design, especially the porch, and how it would look from the road. Ryan Astrup had no issue with the FAR. He did not think they should change the second floor. S. Vecchione did not have an issue with the cathedral ceilings. He asked if they could remove the living room stove and change bedroom #2 on the 1st floor by opening it up so it was included in the living area. R. Nelson said that was a load bearing wall, they use the stove for heat, and they were using bedroom #2 as the home office. J. Murphy reviewed the list of variances including the reduction of ILC to 27.51%.

The chair asked for comments from the public. Jessica Bickham, of 4 Vale Dr., was in support of the application. Paula Lewis, of 4 Center Dr, and would face the new additions was in support of the application. The public portion of the hearing was closed to the public. M. Sullivan said a condition of approval was to have sheet 2 of the application and the site plan updated to reflect the change in ILC to 27.51%. Steve Vecchione approve application with our standard conditions and the reduction in ILC. A second was provided by Brett Paddock. The Board voted 7 – 0 to approve the application with members Murphy, DeNooyer, Peters, McCormick, Vecchione, Paddock and Caputo voting in favor.

Other Matters / Public Comment:

Public Comment – No one wished to speak during the public comment period.

Ordinance Subcommittee – A Board members was needed to represent the Zoning Board on the subcommittee. Jim Murphy or Jake DeNooyer will be our representative.

Economic Development – There has been no activity the last two months.

Brett Paddock made a motion to adjourn the meeting and Annie Peters provided the second. The meeting was adjourned at 9:45PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Cynthia Shaw