

January 17, 2008

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

TOWNSHIP OF CHATHAM

CALL TO ORDER AND STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE

Mr. Shaw called the Re-Organization - Regular Meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. and the Statement of Compliance was read into the record.

First Order of Business:

Mr. Quinn, Mr. Schmidt and Mrs. Alcorn, Members of The Board who are beginning new terms read/signed the oath of office. Notarized copies were submitted for the records.

ROLL CALL:

Mr. Lawrence Dalziel	Mr. Parker Godwin	
Mrs. Therese Hough	Mr. Glen Nelson	Mr. Tom Quinn
Mrs. Francine Alcorn, Alt.#1	Mr. Karl Schmidt, Alt.#2	

Mr. Shaw – next order of business was the reorganization of the Board and election of officers.

Mr. Dalziel made a motion for Temporary Chairperson – Parker Godwin , seconded by Mr. Nelson Voice Vote-all in favor

Mr. Godwin , Temporary Chair – First Order of Business will be the election of a permanent Chair Person – nominations please

Mrs. Hough nominated Larry Dalziel seconded by Mr. Nelson – Voice Vote – All in favor

Mr. Godwin turned the meeting back to Mr. Dalziel.

Mr. Dalziel – we need to elect a vice chairperson... nominations please

Mr. Quinn nominated Mrs. Hough, Mr. Godwin seconded Hand Vote – 6 for 1 abstention

Mr. Dalziel – Minutes - December 20th minutes. Motion to accept minutes as drafted by Mr. Godwin , seconded Mrs. Alcorn – voice vote – all in favor

RESOLUTIONS:

1. **Board Counsel** (Mr. Shaw) - a motion made by Mr. Nelson to approve this resolution was seconded by Mrs. Hough - voice vote all in favor
2. **Consultant Engineer** - (Mr. Ruschke) -- motion to approve this resolution was made by Mr. Godwin and seconded by Mrs. Hough - voice vote all to approve in favor
3. **Planning Consultant** - (Mr. Bannish) – motion made by Mr. Godwin to accept the “*to be amended*” Resolution (rates schedule) was seconded by Mr. Nelson – All in favor.
4. **Board/Recording Secretary** - (Kali Tsimboukis) motion to approve this resolution was made by Mr. Godwin and seconded by Mrs. Hough - voice vote - all in favor
5. **Transcribing Secretary** - (Mary Ann Fasano) motion to approve this resolution was made by Mr. Godwin and seconded by Mr. Quinn - voice vote - all in favor
6. **Establishing Meeting Schedule** - motion to approve this resolution was made by Mr. Godwin and seconded by Mrs. Alcorn - voice vote - all in favor
7. **Designating Newspaper** - (Chatham Courier /Morris County Daily Record) motion to approve this resolution was made by Mr. Godwin and seconded by Mr. Nelson - voice vote - all in favor

DAMON & KRISSY CAPUTO¹
 2 OVERLOOK ROAD
 BLOCK: 102 LOT: 1.

CALENDAR BOA 07-102-1

Christopher Quinn, Attorney
Ashraf Ragar, Architect

Christopher Quinn – this is a continuation of an application which started in December with a site visit on the 5th of January. The property in question is Block 102 Lot 1 which is a corner lot in the R3 Zone on Overlook and Oak Hill Rd. Currently there is an existing 1.5 story 3 bedroom expanded ranch on the property. As you may recall we are seeking variances for an addition to their house. There are 3 variances requested – first is front yard setback (essentially because of the second story addition which is a bedroom) This is under C1/ Hardship because we are using the existing setback of the garage limitation. There are four children in a 3 bedroom house and the fourth bedroom is really is essential for the family’s needs. The other variances are more of a C2 nature. This question was brought up both at the meeting and site visit – and mostly center around the enclosed covered patio in the back and to the side. Those are building coverage variances. 2800 sf permitted, 3646 sf proposed – about 750 sf of that is just a patio. The building interior improvements (11-12 sf above threshold) almost comply with what is permitted. The covered patio is really pushing this over the limits. Secondly, the building width requires a variance as 75 ft. is permitted and 77.6 ft is existing (non-conforming) we are

¹ Caputo – tape reading 16.25

proposing (in worse case scenario) 92 ft. As many of you saw the neighborhood, surrounding is in a state of flux. There have been several recent teardowns and several large square tall colonial homes constructed around this property. The architect will testify that proposed is being done in such a way to maintain cottage feel and represents a better design option then tearing the building down and trying to build a new one from scratch which would be similar to the others homes in square footage. They are also hoping this design would be a transition between some of the new homes in the area. A question came up in the last meeting as to whether or not some of these features could be eliminated thereby possibly eliminate variances. We think to a certain degree they could but again under the C2 variance we think that the benefits of the site as mentioned before, added privacy, energy efficient covering of the patio – would outweigh the negative of the C variances. The neighbors have expressed to them that they felt that they improvements would have very little effect or detriment to them. Two of the neighbors have sent letters in support (A19 – Mr. & Mrs. McCann letter, A20 – letter from Mr. & Mrs. Malone)

Mr. Shaw – just to note in passing though letters can be received they are not evidential.

Mr. Quinn – The letters are just to advise that there are people in support of this application.

Mr. Schmidt – is there not a variance required for the second front yd. setback

Mr. Quinn – no, what was discussed and upon further review of the ordinance there was a recent ordinance which says that the other front yard – its only a one story addition and not furthering the existing non-conformance so it complies.

Mr. Godwin – this is the over the garage?

Mr. Quinn – no over the garage would require a variance as it's a two story addition. The addition facing on Overlook is not required. The encroachment on Overlook does not require variance relief.

Mr. Nelson – which variance was eliminated?

Mr. Quinn – the one to Overlook....– If you were looking straight at the house it would be the front of the house.

Mr. Schmidt – so the one required is the 29.6 ft. versus the 50. Mr. Quinn agreed.

Mr. Dalziel - asked if a site visit report had been submitted. Mrs. Hough said one was put together as yet.

Mr. Quinn asked to proceed with the Architect Testimony. He also asked that the report be sent to him when it is ready.

Mr. Ragar – said he was familiar with property. Plans from last meeting for reference are A17 – site plan; A18 – color rendering of sheet A6. Mr. Ragar submitted exhibit A21 – cardboard model – which was a schematic model of two of the immediate neighborhood homes which show the scale of all the houses around. The newer ones are the larger and the older homes are the smaller. These were based on site visits, aerial photographs. We feel that this is an accurate representation of the neighborhood.

Mr. Dalziel – asked how Mr. Ragar determined the dimensions of the adjacent houses.

Mr. Ragar – they are done by picture and compared to scale around the house. They are pretty much approximations of the size of the surrounding houses.

Mr. Quinn asked if there were any objections to the use of these as they are just to be used to show the character of the neighborhood.

Mrs. Hough - you can use it but how accurate would it be?

Mr. Quinn – in terms of the size of the house....

Mr. Ragar – there are pictures of all these houses on the model.

Mr. Quinn - these are more for generic representation. Addressing Mr. Ragar – now using your plans and these as reference can you describe the existing property conditions, house conditions including the setbacks.

Mr. Ragar - A17 – sheet A01 - The existing property is a corner lot Overlook/Oak Hill. The residence which is treated in the darker brown is the existing residence as it stands right now.. it's a 1.5 story sort of a cottage style residence with slightly rotated garage that is perpendicular to Oak Hill since the two streets are not right angled. There is a slight angle so the garage is rotated and the rest of the residence is facing Oak Hill Rd. The garage currently is one story. A lot of the residence is one story, the second floor only occupies one area.

The garage is slightly off sized so its not quite 2 cars and that is why it is proposed to be slightly enlarged so that it can be a full two car garage. The house is designed as a ranch and then the second floor was kind of added on. If you look at the existing condition the bathroom is kind of on a landing and then you have to continue up one more step to get into a bedroom and then one more step to get into the other two bedrooms. This is one of the things we are trying to rectify in our design.

..... Asked to see the other side of the exhibit

Mr. Ragar - the bathroom that serves the bedrooms is kind of two steps below some of the bedrooms and there is a second bedroom that you have to go down one step to get into the bathroom which is not quite functional.

Mr. Quinn – could you show the stairs of the existing house?

Mr. Ragar – Sheet A2 of Exhibit A17 – existing elevations – The house has a shingle wall finish and there was just solid stone masonry all in the front facing Oak Hill. Part of it is the Chimney but the full gable is veneered with stone.

Mr. Quinn - I had mentioned to the Board by introduction that the model shows the existing changing character of the neighborhood plus existing conditions of the house. In addition, we have existing conditions photo boards (Exhibits A22, 23, 24). Why don't we start with the photo board showing the Caputo house?

Mr. Ragar - re: A23 – this is from the intersection of the two streets, from the corner and it shows the stone gable and the garage which is slightly rotated to face Oak Hill rd. This is the front view from Overlook showing the front of the house. In the one picture, you will note that a lot of the trees have been removed for the purpose of neighboring construction. When the Caputos purchased the house all the house shown were not yet torn down. They were basically all ranches. Over the last three years a lot of the houses were torn down and the colonial houses were built in there places (A24).

Mr. Dalziel – I think I know why you are showing these. I am not sure whether it is based on planning versus architecture testimony but all of the houses that you are showing here, while I might agree, look larger than what you are proposing, and I think that is probably your purpose here, none of those houses required variances. They all conform to the Township standards.

Mr. Quinn – Mr. Chairman, what we are trying to establish right now is the neighborhood transition. Several homes have been torn down; other homes have been reconstructed in their place. I am only asking this question now to allow Mr. Ragar to go into what his goals were when he was tasked with the design and addition proposed. Just to establish what the neighborhood is. Part of our reasoning and goals for this design is for it to act as a transition home that would link the older with the new.

Mr. Ragar – is he intended to provide professional planning testimony

Mr. Quinn – no. He is just talking about what his goals were, what process he went through the design of the home.

Mr. Ragar – I was hired by the Caputo's in 2005-2006. I was asked to design an addition for their new residence. They had just purchased the house. They were expecting a new child (they had 3) and they needed more room. They did not want the colonial addition; they wanted the cottage style house. We went through an extensive design process. We have added smaller pieces and breaking down the scale all around the house. Additions in the front, side and back.

Mrs. Hough – Mr. Quinn, can I just say one thing before... not to try to complicate your case.. but I do think we did go through a lot of this is the first hearing. The proposal, the interiors, the meeting, the whole thing. I don't think we need to rehash again.

Mr. Quinn – I was also told by the Board that we were not putting on all our proofs. I was just explaining the generics as to what was being proposed with this application. He asked Mr. Ragar to continue... what floor was he talking about right now?

Mr. Ragar – We are proposing to replace the garage, as it is undersized and not adequate for two cars. We will completely tear it down and construct a new 2 car garage with a storage shed. To the rear of it add a mud room area with a side entrance that would come from both streets. We are proposing a side addition of an office that would be on the other side of the living room. We are proposing to expand the family room in the back and enclose the existing screened in porch -expanding it slightly to the rear. To switch the access to the basement – to put a stair under the covered portion. The kitchen would be slightly extended. Some walls would be moved to open up the space to include a kitchen breakfast and family room area. A formal living room and dining room would still be as shown. The office will not encroach any further than what is currently in the existing home – we are creating that symmetrical façade with two gables and the covered entry porch (it only extends to the same limits as the living room.) and it links the two together.

Mr. Dalziel – just a question about the garage – your site plan shows existing 1.5 story dwelling and shows the garage as existing and the shaded areas are marked proposed additions. What you are saying now is that you are going to eliminate the garage and construct it in a new size as opposed to expanding the one that is there.

Mr. Ragar – that is correct.

Mr. Dalziel – since you are going to tear it down and get rid of it, was there any consideration given to the possibility of re-planning its arrangement and location to further minimize the need for a variance on that side.

Mr. Ragar – We will be utilizing the existing foundation of the present garage.

Mr. Quinn – referred all to the color rendering A17 – the question was when you did your design did you consider expanding the front yard setback ... could you make that setback comply by shifting the garage farther away from the building?

Mr. Ragar – we are already over by a good 21 ft. so there is no-way we could push that garage back to abide by the 50 ft. front.

Mr. Daziel – that wasn't my question = my question was did you look at the possibility of rearranging it somehow to minimize a variance on that side.

Mr. Ragar – the location of the garage works with the house so it was a question of whether we squared off to line up with the rest of the residence or keep it on the angle. The clients wanted to keep that angle because it's a strong feature of the character of the house as it stands right now. We are trying to maintain as much as we can the characteristics of the house as it stands right now. Because we are removing the roof and a few of the walls of the garage so it was just a matter of removing and rebuild it here since we are putting a second floor addition over it anyway.

Mr. Quinn – re: second floor –

Mr. Dalziel – just to reiterate Mrs. Hough's comments – we did go through this the last time.

Mr. Quinn – we just want to make sure our record in complete.

Mr. Dalziel – yes Mr. Banish....

Mr. Banish – Mr. Chairman, the garage question prompts the courts to recognize that that is a pre-existing non-conformity that is protected while that building is there. When it is torn down that is another variance. I assume that is why you raised the question.

Mr. Dalziel – if you are going to completely remove it it's a little bit different than if you were just going to expand it. I think you actually sited in the last hearing the ordinance that allows you to maintain a frontage as long as you don't increase, but in this case you are actually removing it It is subtle distinction but it is different.

Mr. Quinn – from that perspective then can the garage be maintained and just do the addition...

Mr. Ragar – you can retain the two walls of the garage thereby eliminating the variance for the first story garage. We would then only need a variance for the second story addition.

Mr. Dalziel – I don't want to tell you how to build your plan but...

Mr. Quinn – at this point its only being done for convenience during construction. Is there any design that if it tearing it down versus building or expanding it?

Mr. Ragar – No, most of it will be torn down in the course of this addition project. We are tearing down the roof and 1.5 of the 3 exterior walls of the garage. If for the sake of interpretation we can keep the third wall as an existing garage then we can do that. The second floor, as I mentioned before, the staircase was somewhat awkward – the aligning of the second floor would fix that but removing completely the bedroom that was here and turning this into a small studio and then create the access area to a new bedroom above the garage. We added a bedroom - The master bedroom in the back which mostly protrudes over the covered porch. We removed a bathroom and relocated it.

Mr. Quinn – was there any other place that you could have proposed in the design other than over the garage for the 4th bedroom?

Mr. Ragar – In order to rectify the issue with the stair going up we already lost one bedroom so we needed to add one bedroom above the garage and we needed to protrude one more bedroom over the covered porch to make up for the space that was lost.

Mr. Quinn – re: exterior of the development. As I mentioned before – some of the cottage features that you are keeping maintaining....

Mr. Ragar – the front addition elevation (sheet A06) show the existing gable which is completely in stone. We opened 2 windows and just revealed the chimney. We created that office addition on the other side of it just as a mirror and we added that covered porch in the middle to bring them both together. The roof is heightened across the board to allow for a full 2-story residence. The addition above the garage shows that the roof rotated away and the dormers face the side road. Also shown is the 2-car garage as proposed, the side entrance to the mudroom area, the office addition and dormers that protrude into that additional bedroom over the garage. The covered patio is in the back. (showed rear elevation from back w/storage shed that is being added behind the garage) The dormers are above the 3 bedrooms 2 of which are protruding into the dormers above the porch and the third bedroom is sitting under a smaller dormer. Because the windows are quite small, we added a balcony here from the back. There is a stair running along the rear of the house going down to the basement. A small addition protrudes into the covered patio (family room). The fourth elevation (side elevation) shows the wrap around area of the porch above the family room window.

Mr. Quinn – I would like to discuss the patio in a little more detail. The patio proposed, could be discuss its goals, its benefits of design...

Mr. Ragar – The covered patio was essential part of this project from the first stages - something that the owners really expressed a true desire to have. It had multiple benefits to them. The privacy issue with the large residences across the back/side yard kind of overlooking into their backyard and their space. Besides offering some privacy it also offered shade since the front yard is quite bare except for one tree. Because this addition happened in bits and pieces all over the back the covered patio to the back and front kind of work as a holding factor ... kind of brings everything together because without it all these protrusions into the back would look quite awkward. The patio is an element that brings everything together and unifies as one.

Mr. Quinn – Its also the right shape for the first floor so it would be a little more energy efficient. How wide is that covered patio.

Mr. Ragar – its about 10 ft. but there is a lot happening. Under that patio there is access points into the mudroom area and into the breakfast area. There is a stair going down to the

basement so along this area of the patio there is very little space for seating. That is where the corner area was added – just for a seating area for the family.

Mr. Quinn – show the building width, existing, proposed and how its calculated.

Mr. Ragar – the existing building width is calculated from one corner into the corner of the garage on the other side and that is 77.8'. The proposed building width is from the tangent point to the corner of the garage and that is 92.9'.

Mr. Quinn – questions raised as to streetscape – the fact that the covered porch is not in the front of the house or not at the same level from that perspective as the garage. Does that affect the impact on the streetscape, in you opinion.

Mr. Ragar - No. Because of the angular nature of the house and because of that angular proposed design of the covered patio you would never see both together in the same eye. If you stand in one spot you can see the covered patio in the back but the garage is still away from you so it would be diminished. You really never see both at the same time.

Mr. Quinn – how far is the measurement - I know the ordinance requires these measures from the furthest point on one side versus the other. If you were to measure the building width on the rear of the property how far would that measure?

Mr. Ragar - that would measure 80.4' – this is the portion of the rear elevation that is actually facing the rear yard. It would only be increasing approx. 3 in 9. When the plans were submitted we were advised that this was a variance issue ... at which point the applicants wanted the covered patio and decided to apply for it as well. We have not done any landscaping plans at this time but there will be a plan that could have some trees. If the board so required they could require some screening for any visual impact from the street.

Mr. Quinn – part of the application requesting a C2 variance was the deviation to the non-conforming conditions, non-conforming coverage, non-conforming building width,, From a design perspective could you explain why you agree with that

Mr. Ragar – with the perspective of the streetscape – it is not really being a negative criteria since you would never experience the total width of the building as 92 ft. From the multitude appointment that this covered patio serves and the fact that they wanted it to be part of the future residence, when they first purchased this house we decided that there was really not that much detriment for having this covered patio in the back. All the neighbors were kept abreast of the design and no one has expressed any objections.

Mr. Quinn – just for the record – Have you reviewed our Engineering data of November 13, 2007. There are not issues?

It was confirmed that they had been reviewed and there were no comments.

Mr. Quinn said he had no further questions.

Mr. Dalziel – asked if there were questions from the Board.

Mrs. Alcorn – a comment - I would like to go on record that I live on the same street as the applicants, have not had the occasion to meet them before their application came before this board, although we are about 10 houses and 1 side street apart. Also, I don't feel that it's a conflict and see no reason to recue myself from this application.

Mr. Quinn – attorney for the applicant, said he had no objection.

Mr. Shaw – reviewing the review dates on the drawing, the initial drawings were reviewed by the client on February 5th and again on May 30th, 2006 (A046). Is it my understanding is that the Township Ordinance governing lot width was that in existence at the time you were preparing the designs in February 5, 2006 and May 30, 2006.

Mr. Quinn – no it was not.

Mr. Shaw – did you make any changes in this drawing after the town adopted the ordinance establishing the lot width.

Mr. Ragar – we weren't aware of the new ordinance. We only made aware of it when we submitted and then happened in June 2007.

Mr. Quinn – also at that time you were working with the zoning officer in terms of whether the covered patio and all the building calculations.

Mr. Ragar – we went with a few proposals for materials and structural support and it was not clear cut answer.

Mr. Dalziel – coverage would still be an issue at that time.

Mr. Ragar – only if the patio was included. Without the covered patio it would only be 11 sq. ft. over.

Mr. Dalziel – I understand that but you have a covered patio and it would have been an issue at that time regardless of the width of the house.

Mr. Ragar – no when we had the discussion with the zoning officer it was not a definitive answer that the patio would be included in coverage.

Discussion ensued regarding the conversation between the applicant's representative and the zoning officer regarding the issue of coverage.

Mr. Quinn introduced Ms. Julia Buteux, who works with Mr. Ragar. She was working on the design, she will not testify as a licensed architect as she is not licensed in this state,

however she had the conversation so she can testify as to the factual aspect of those conversations

Ms. Julia Buteux, was sworn. I went to Mr. Schmidt in May of 2007 and spoke to him regarding this project and a few of these issues. It was not at all clear whether or not this patio would be included, if it was a grade

Mr. Dalziel – to clarify the terminology – first of all its not a patio

Ms. Julia Buteux – Mr. Schmidt called it a covered patio. He said a covered patio at grade would not be included nor would it be included if it was a wood deck 8” above grade, even with a roof. Then after some back and forth he said no, in fact it would be included since the clients were willing to have it raised 8” off grade then that is the variance to go for. This entire process would took four week. It was not at all clear. If it could have been at grade and not included

Mr. Quinn – the ordinance defines the building as an area underneath the roof and above a foundation.

Mr. Dalziel – there is not much gray about that but let me just go back to what you just said, if I heard it correctly – that means that over 4 possibly 5 week period in 2007 it went from not being clear to being clear.

Ms. Buteux – yes, at first he said it could be a patio at grade, covered and that would be ok. He wanted to check on that which took some time.

Mrs. Nelson – it sounds to me that at the end of the day it was clear that there would be variances needed. Did you give any thought to ratcheting back the project and removing the patio to remove the need for the variance relief?

Ms. Buteux – it is what the clients wanted. The other changes were so minimal in terms of square footage we felt obligated to pursue what the clients had asked for.

Mr. Schmidt – do you know what the sq. ft. calculations of the gazebo protrusion as well as the part of the covered patio that comes along the side of the house.

Mr. Ragar – not exactly but the total area of the covered patio is 747 sf so that gazebo protrusion is about 1/3 so I would say about 250 sf.

Mr. Schmidt – if that is eliminated, then what is the width reduced to -

Mr. Ragar - advised it was 14.4 ft.

Mr. Schmidt – then it would be the existing width of the house – 77’

Mr. Ragar – The garage is being extended slightly toward the front of the building. What is proposed is a functional design.. it could have gone to the front or the back. We maintained the front on Oak Hill and we expanded the garage. There is a minor increase just for the extension of the garage.

Mr. Nelson – do you plan on building the air-conditioning tower, if so, why would you put a patio there with the air-conditioning towers.

Mr. Ragar – on the side. It was to add privacy to the large window off the family room.

Mr. Dalziel – I find it a bit odd.. your testimony said that the portion along the back of the house was probably 2/3 and the portion on the side is 1/3 all of which exceeds the coverage. You said the portion along the back really doesn't have much utility because of all the other things going on that is why you had to stick something out to the side. You are asking for a variance for coverage for something that has very little utility (according to your testimony). Maybe sticking something out to the side which goes into another variance and its exacerbating the condition again and again. Really the only (main utility) portion is this little extension gazebo type thing and the rest of it is a lot of coverage for not a lot of utility.

Mr. Ragar – because, as I said, the rear additions on the second floor protrudes over the patio.,,,

Mr. Dalziel – I understand that, which as the designer, is all within your control.

Mr. Ragar – it has a structural function

Mr. Dalziel – the covered porch has a structural function to the house?

Mr. Ragar – there are 2 bedrooms that are protruding about 3-4 ft. over the covered patio on the second floor. The purpose for the additional privacy aspect is of importance as well.

Mr. Dalziel – normally, at least in my experience on this Board, the concept of C2 has generally been applied to locations where it benefits the general public. If you have an issue on the front of the house and you claim it's a C2 variance there is other extenuating circumstances about the lot that require you to do this it because the general public will benefit from the visual aesthetics of the variance. In this case its all in the back so only the people driving down Oak Hill to the east would benefit from seeing that small portion of the addition. To me, I am not sure how strong the C2 case is because it's all in the back in terms of a coverage issue. I think you could accomplish some of your goals here without the extensive variances you are asking for. I think we suggested at the last meeting that there possibly some other options.

Mr. Quinn – we are hoping that the incentives point to some of the goals, desires of the application variances as requested

Mr. Dalziel – any other comments from the Board.

Mr. Schmidt – I would say that much of the testimony seems to go client desire from a design perspective. Without commenting on the design because its really not the criteria to do so. I think the variance being requested – two in particular width/max. coverage – substantially exceed what is permitted and they are in fact two of the ordinances that much time has been spent by the Township Council formulating.

Mrs. Hough – I think the building width is really – this kind of dwelling is exactly the kind of dwelling that the ordinances is enacted to try to keep the size under control. I think by your own testimony you could modify the plan to relieve some variances. I think the principal coverage increase you are requesting is excessive for all the reasons discussed this evening. The lot is over-sized to begin with and don't think the applicants have sustained their burden to show the detriment that they are proposing.

Mrs. Alcorn – I would only that the neighborhood itself is in transition and many of the original homes have been developed and have not required variances. That said I do admire the applicants choice to try to work within the house and retain the character of the house because I think that does help with the neighborhood. I think that working within the existing home, especially one that has some issues with existing conditions, whether its side yard, setbacks, garage at angle is a challenge. I understand they are trying to make the house accommodate their needs/feelings but I would like to see them try somehow to drop back to perhaps fit a little bit more within the current ordinances and still meet their objectives of keeping the character of the house rather than doing what a lot the neighboring properties have done. I am particularly concerned about the 92 ft. width. I would like to support some of the other items for them rather than see the house torn down and something else built that would become a wall of houses.

Mr. Godwin - I don't get the wall feeling especially because various design features. I think there is value in trying to retain what they call the cottage look to keep it separate from the larger boxier homes. I have less of a problem with some of the variances requested. We are looking for coverage's I suppose you wonder about how big the shed is off the back, etc. I am trying to areas where it could be pulled back. I am less concerned with the other things because I think there is value in trying to retain a variety of looks/styles of homes in every area as opposed to tearing them down and trying to get the maximum results in the box.

Mrs. Alcorn – and my comment about the wall of houses was not directed toward this façade in any way because I do think this is quite unique.

Mr. Dalziel – I will agree with you that your design/elevation is appealing. Coverage has been added everywhere and you tried to indicate that we consider that. For instance the one story addition in the front (office) appears to have a lot of coverage for one story addition. Maybe the porch is more important than the office or maybe the shed doesn't need to be. I think there is a lot of coverage here that could be achieved in another way.

Mrs. Alcorn – how much of the total increase coverage is the inside/interior living space as opposed to the covered porch which is not inside space.

Mr. Ragar – there was 1962 sq. ft. existing and 2900 proposed without the covered patio and front porch, with garage.

Mrs. Alcorn – I am looking for heated interior living space.

Mr. Banish – In working with the Planning Board one of the things we did about 6-9 months ago was we looked at a sample of teardown and rebuilds and found that out of the 9 buildings I looked at all but one came to the 35 ft. maximum height, one was 34 ft. Some of the footprints were 3000 or 3500 multiplied by several floors so the buildings were getting to be big sized building. If I read the plans right the highest point of the roof is 28 ft. So the representation that shown here, while it might be some question about just how accurate it is, in terms of relative scale I don't think its unfair that it portrays that kind of a differential. I think that the covered porch in the back – the thing that is troubling to me is – if this was just over the top in every direction, I would be very concerned. When I look at the total permitted maximum coverage and everything at 76900 sq. ft. and they are at 4500 sq.ft. that tells me that the foot print of everything on the lot is not erroneous. What is erroneous is the comparison of the permitted 2888 sq.ft. to 3644 sq.ft. The fact that the covered porch is open take some of the sting out of that feeling of building length. I think part of what we were concerned about is when you saw buildings that got to reach 2.5 stories high and over 80 ft. long.

So some of these architectural features and design do break it up into smaller pieces make it somewhat different condition but we haven't heard any testimony that tells us what the variance criteria would be. Why would you approve the changes. I think that is a bit of the problem. Some of the members sound as if the like some of what they are seeing here but you haven't been offered the testimony that would let you say it satisfies the municipal land use law criteria because here is the positive criteria and the negative criteria has been met. I don't know that they want to have their case rise/fall on what has been heard so far. It seems like there is something missing. There is some sympathy for the overall approach but there isn't enough justification that I have heard in the record to be able to say “in this case these are the merits” and we can accept the merits to approve the variance. I think some of the members are torn by this as its pressing the envelope in some directions for some reasons but if they drop that patio to grade and have no foundation under that roof there would be no variance at all. I think that is a little more of a proof than a requirement for you to make a decision – I am not hear to testify on their behalf.

Mr. Shaw – you are suggesting that they need some profession planning testimony

Mr. Banish – that sounds a little self serving.

Mr. Dalziel – that is why I asked from comments from the members so that you could get a sense of what people of thinking and you could make a decision of whether you should rethink the plan or get additional expertise, etc.

Mr. Banish - I think this has been done skillfully. If we were not violating any ordinances I would say we need more of that sort of stuff instead of the fully maxed out square boxes. I am not here to testify so....

Mr. Schmidt - I would agree especially with that last comment . I would agree with Mr. Banish but I would also acknowledge that there are many members on this board that have expressed, or come close to expressing, that the design is very attractive and that designs of this sort tend to break up a neighborhood that is more monolithic and less attractive. I do think that despite this, there are the ordinances in place and coverage/widths grossly exceed the ordinances in place. The concern that I would have potentially even with a little scaling back would go to a matter of equity because I know many homeowners in Chatham with similar situations would very much like to add covered porches/patios that would be similar to this but would exceed coverage on their lots. They are not doing that because the ruling says they cannot. So, again, I find myself conflicted, seeing a design that appears to be attractive to the town and something to the neighborhood but grossly exceeding what is permitted.

Mr. Nelson – said he couldn't agree more

Mr. Quinn – said the input was greatly appreciated and at this point I need to adjourn for tonight and we shall return with planning testimony or whatever is needed.

Discussion ensued regarding the variances requested.

Mr. Shaw – the matter is carried to the next meeting – February 21 without further notice.

MICHAEL DEZIC
6 VALLEY VIEW ROAD
BLOCK: 8 LOT: 10.

CALENDAR BOA 07-8-10

Barry Osmun, Attorney
Mr. F. Mitchell Ardman, Engineer – Reynolds Group
Robert Dill, Architect

Mr. Osmun said his presentation would be brief. The reason being that the Planner scheduled for this evening had to cancel. Know that he is the same planner for the “Monson” application.

In the absence of a Planner, with the Board's permission I will have our Engineer, Mr. Ardman, speak to the fact that the limitation of the servants area has been reduced, which reduces the magnitude of the steep slopes in the three categories.

Mr. Ardman – RE: exhibit A15 (Ormont at top/Valley Rd at bottom)– Since the last meeting you have made a site visit. We presented that map at the last meeting along with Exhibit A16 which is the soil erosion tree replacement plan. This was not part of the original package. This drawing shows the limit of disturbance which is highlighted in blue. At the last meeting the Board had asked for two things – basically on the steep slopes map to have the house, driveway shown as well as limits of disturbance for a better sense of how the calculations was done. Also, from my testimony last month was that we had an overly generous limit of disturbance line. Hearing the Boards concern disturbance of steep slopes we redid it much tighter to the building envelope and keep the limit of disturbance to a minimum. What we did then was to create a second grading plan. Basically it is the same building footprint but we tightened up the grading around the edges and tighten up the limits of disturbance. This plan has not been marked. The plan is D2 with a revision date of 12/31/07 marked as A19 (A18 site visit report) On A19 there is an outline in blue is the original limit of disturbance line and the Orange is the revised limit of disturbance line. Again, the driveway is to the rear and that was accomplished by pulling the grading in and also pulling the limit of disturbance, where it was 15' outside the grading limit where it would need to be. Having done that we recalculated the steep slope disturbances. Re: B4A dated December 31, 207 marked as A20. The calculation shown on here shows the new disturbance areas. They have been dropped significantly from:

0-15%	we are allowed full disturbance but we have dropped it from 14570 sf to just under 12100 sf.
15-20%	we are allowed 30% disturbance we originally had over 60%. We have reduced that to 43.3 % and that correlates to reducing from 7900 sf to 5663 sf.
20-25%	we are allowed 20% disturbance we originally had 44% now we are just over 20% and we dropped the disturbance 2395 sf to 1359 sf.
Over 25%	reduced it 40% to 34 % or 1991 sq.ft to 1695 sf.

All those numbers are on either D4A or D4 which is the set in your plans. D4 was the original submittal which has all those numbers on it along with the different percentages. Again, these are the changes that we felt the board wanted.

Mr. Dalziel if the were questions from the Board. There were none.

Mr. Osmun – we can come back next month with a planner and have him testify as to what he believes to be the positive/negative criteria supporting this application. I am not

asking for a vote now but I am asking if the Board was of the opinion that it would be or not be worth our time to come because of the size of the house. The house is approximately 6200 sq. ft. Should we come back with revised smaller plan?

Mr. Dalziel – is it just steep slope variances and you've heard priority in the past that steep slope is supposed to address water, drainage, stormwater management issues. The lot is over 2 sizes bigger than what is required. There are other homes in the same area which was in the area of 5200 sf.

Mr. Dalziel – we do have the site report which was read into the record by Mrs. Alcorn.

Mr. Osmun- Our Engineer can address the height of the walls, which he believes complies with the ordinance.

Mr. Ardman – on my original submittal there would be a data sheet (D1) we did the height calculations with the maximum building height (top of sheet) and we believe we are in conformance. We have not had any review comments otherwise. The retaining walls – max. height is 4 ft. in the patio area in the back. The ones on the western side are at 3-3.5 ft. and the front walls as well are 3.5-4 ft.

Mrs. Alcorn – question from Michael Boland (second page #5) “the site plan identifies 3 retaining walls “ and then it documents what those are. It says “the architectural elevations depict retaining walls of 8 ft.. The Applicant should but on testimony as to the height of the three proposed retaining walls and indicate if a variance would be required”. So that is no longer...

Mr. Ardman – I think cleared that at the last meeting . His was more an architectural rendering.

Mr. Dalziel – is there a way to arrange this house to minimize the intrusion in the slope?

Mr. Ardman – I think after the last discussion we did try to turn it around and bring it in as was discussed what happens with the driveway as it has to come out a little so it has the swing for the garage. It's a little bit of a trade off. Does it reduce it - some but I don't think to a huge extent. The disturbance again – we have the walls; the stormwater system is required, so not to an appreciable extent. It would not further the compliance to zoning. This from an engineering viewpoint works well.

Mr. Dalziel – Barry would you address some of the comments raised in the site visit about discussion/considerations, had/have there been any

Mr. Osmun - Consideration – I think the client has given some consideration to it. It can be revised. We could bring the garage in, although I don't know what percentage would do, but there may be some - we could put the garage underneath it will result in less square footage of living space. What the reduction would be I don't know .. I would guess it would go to 5200 sf. Yes it can be reduced.

Mrs. Hough – can you relocate the house somewhat on the lot to make the intrusion into the disturbance less. Can you shift it one way as opposed to another.

Mr. Ardman – as far as relocation goes there are a few critical things. To come up the driveway you want to be on the high side of the road obviously, so we can come up the slope best. We need to keep the driveway on that side. Sliding it as you can see – it's kind of a trade off. We tried to be in the envelope. Pushing it in a different direction would be detrimental and we do not feel it would be worth it. As far as steep slopes, it's fairly consistent. A few of these also, if you out in the field, you know the house was here – its a uniform slope. When the house was built, originally there were plateaus that leveled off when that house was built. We did count them. They are steep slopes (man made) but prior disturbed steep slopes. I think what is proposed is the best location for the house.

Mr. Godwin – if you lost the “T” put the garage underneath, does that give you more ability to move the footprint around?

Mr. Ardman - We cannot move it up the hill anymore because we are chasing into the bank which would hurt the disturbance (it would get worse) of the steep slope. Left to right – don't want to push toward the neighbor. If it had a great benefit we would look at it.

Mr. Dalziel – if a driver comes in heading north (dark line indicates steepest slope?) if the garage were pulled south and west out of that area and basically aligned with the driveway so you are driving into the garage would that help the condition.

Mr. Ardman – we did not do a full engineering – I did look at it...I know that it helps but I would not say significantly because we still have to keep drainage away from the house and put some swales there. We could save a portion of that but...

Mr. Dalziel – I am thinking you could save all of it.

Mrs. Alcorn – If the garage were moved, you could still create that patio area outside the breakfast room?

Mr. Ardman – I think we could still keep it somehow.

Mr. Dalziel – the second story bridge between the house/garage is that included in building coverage.

Mr. Osmun – it should not. It's not impervious – its second floor.

Mr. Ardman – checked his plan and said that it was.

Mr. Banish – any offer by the applicant to restrict against further sub-division

Mr. Osmun – said he would agree to that. I think it’s fair to say that the Board would like us to take another look and it would not be worthwhile to comeback with a planner with this plan.

Mr. Dalziel – since there was a little bit of conflicting chatter about the building coverage if you could confirm about that second floor is included.

Mr. Osmun said he would be back in February.

JOEL & KARA MONSON
262 LAFAYETTE AVE.
BLOCK 104 Lot: 16

CALENDAR BOA 07-104-16

Barry Osmun, Attorney

Mr. Osmun – advised that the Planner for this application had to cancel his testimony this evening because of a conflict. I will just make a short opening statement. Then I will ask Mr. Monson for any statement he would like to make.

What we are seeking here is a C2 variance from a recently adopted section of the ordinance to permit a dwelling with a width of 95 ft. I believe that Mr. Monson can submit proofs that if one looks at the width of the proposed house from Maple St. about 22 ft. of the width is an attached 1st floor garage with the roof alignments lower than the main section of the house. An additional 30 ft. of width is devoted to family/mud room which also has a roof line lower than the main house. So if you look at the width of the main house on the plans its an unimposing 40.5 proposed at 2 story. Its in character with the neighborhood and as a corner lot its greater setbacks. I guess what we are requesting is that the Board not look at the wrong numbers and the limits imposed by the ordinance but rather on the proportionality of the house. These structures are ordinary where the frontage, on the narrow side of the lot and the depth of the house is on the longer side. At the last meeting there was testimony that the Township Committee’s intent of this ordinance restricting the width of the house was to stop or prevent houses from looking like walls up and down the street. With houses being built out to within 15 of the setback. This is not the case here. We had 50 ft. setbacks on 3 sides of the proposed. This modest 3793 sf of living space would promote the purpose of the LUL to encourage appropriate development to provide adequate light air, open space, and promote a desirable, visual environment. In looking at the negative criteria you have to look at what the impact of what the house has on the neighborhood. Does it adversely impact the neighborhood. This does not.

Mr. Monson - I first want to say that I don’t want to rehash the troubles we have had in trying to build our home. I do however want to make it crystal clear that Sarah had zero intention of planning/designing a house that require any kind of variance or exemption from Township Standards. We have never built a new house. We have gone through variances before for major improvement. We came from a Township in St. Louis (Clayton) similar to Chatham, older town, no developable lots so any new construction

was either tear downs or rehabs. If anything, Clayton is more stringent than Chatham is. We are sensitive to the idea of fitting into a neighborhood. With past experience in mind we were extremely careful to cover all the bases before we put this lot under contract. We went so far as to diagram the boundaries within which we could build our house. We faxed it to the township zoning for confirmation. We received that confirmation so we felt we could take everything we had and put into this lot. I don't know what else we could have done to do this the right way. Our Architect met with the Township and we worked for 4 months to squeeze this 4 bedroom, 2 car garage into the confines of this corner and stay within the setbacks. As you are all aware, the first that anyone involved with the proposed of the 80 ft. width limitation ordinance was when the lot grading plan was reviewed for stormwater runoff and that is when it was brought to our attention. I also want to make clear, so you know that last month we asked for an interpretation of that ordinance. We did not rely on that when we started this plan. We did not know about this ordinance. So we asked you to say its an unclear ordinance, we didn't mean to say that we were going to rely on the fact that we are facing the street which we designated as our frontage, obviously last month you ruled as to the spirit of the ordinance. As Barry said, we read the minutes from the meetings and included the intention to prevent these imposing houses. In that sense I would like to show you that, our proposed home does not violate the spirit of that ordinance but in keeping with the character of the neighborhood. Our lot is 20000 sf in size –so it's not con-forming as it should be 25,000. Because of the 3 50 ft setback (front, rear and one side yard), we have basically a long skinny structure. Limited to this 2600 sf footprint w/ garage, we proposed a 3-section house. A traditional 2 story center hall colonial, 1.5 story section and a 2 car attached garage. The 2-car garage does have a dormer window to break up the roofline but it does not open to any finished space. The main section of the house is 43.3' and 33 ft. tall at the ridge line; the 1.5 story is 28.3' consisting of family room and mud room w/bedroom above (dormers and pitched ceiling) with a ridge line of 28'. This is only 28 ft. deep... its kind of see thru. Lastly we have the 2 car attached garage which is 24' with a cupola top. There is a dormer window with just a closet and toilet. The rest is not usable space. The whole house is 95.8' in width. If the garage were removed, you have a 72.10 ft. which is within the ordinance. From the Lafayette Side its 30.8' wide. Again, hardly imposing. With regard our desire to avoid walls/houses we have advantages on every side of the plan. Moving left to right - on the corner going to Lafayette we have 50' almost reaches the sidewalk. From the other corner of Maple to our Maple neighbor, we have 69 ft. between our home and neighbor assuming that they are at the 15 ft. min. side yard setback. In the back, assuming our neighbor on Lafayette is at the 15 ft. min side yard there is 44 ft. This lot is not 200 x 100 its 110 ft, cuts in by 20 ft. to 90 ft. It's really 25 ft. of buildable area. While we have got setback requirements squeezing us into a basic shape in which you can fit the 2600 sf I want to go to the two alternatives that would not require variances. First you can detach the garage – if we do that we would have to separate with a 10 ft. breezeway and put the garage out here. The disadvantage to us and the neighbors.

Mr. Dalziel and several members interrupted and advise that the Breezeway would be part of the structure and would then make the proposed even longer.

Mr. Monson asked – so everyone we discussed this with incorrect when they said a 10 ft. breezeway and a garage would not violate... When asked who told him that he advised that the Administrator, Tom Chiccarone.

Mr. Dalziel - In review, if the breezeway were heated it would be part of coverage

Mr. Monson - So we have a master bedroom above here in our proposed plan and using some of the garage for a master bath and closet. If we scoot the garage out we have to move the walls out to the full 80 ft. so we can get the bath and closet in. So going from the 72.10' we move out 7 ft. here. This isn't so bad for the second floor but the first floor what it does is create another 7 ft. of frontage. I now have increased the room below which I don't want or need. The garage since we can no longer fit within the impervious coverage and increases mass. With all the adjustments we come up with 115' rather than 95' of frontage.

The other option would be to squeeze the house along Maple, squeeze the garage in to make it 80 ft. If we do that, we loose 15 ft. of Bedroom and 1st floor family room. We end up swapping a study for a family room. It now goes up to the building line which decreases the distance between neighbors. On the flip side we do get a larger second floor with a tight bathroom between the bedrooms but frankly it gives space we don't need and I would rather not build it if I don't have to. If we loose 15 ft. in our second floor bedroom we will have to build out over the whole garage. If we do that the garage has to be squared up and will look like a bigger front of the house because we have to use the entire area for bedroom, bath, etc.

Both of these alternatives, reducing space between our house and the neighbors, increase the size of our structure, the face of the structure, etc. Each have their own disadvantages. Because we relied on advice given to us by the Township we are not in a difficult situation, our lease is up in the summer, our finances are stretched .. had we been told that we could only build 80 ft. we would not have bought the lot.

Mr. Dalziel – I just want to stop you for a moment because I want to clarify something about what we heard at the last hearing. I have heard rumors about this application before you came in. Then Mr. Schmidt came in and questions were asked of Mr. Schmidt about what in fact he advised you of. I don't recall him saying you could build a 95 ft. house. What I heard is that he confirmed the building envelope dimensions. Then you architect took that information and designed the house.

Mr. Monson – the building envelope was 100 ft.

Mr. Dalziel – that does not necessarily allow that you can build a house of 100 ft. given other ordinances in existence. How did you architecture make the leap from the building envelope to a 95 ft. house with an ordinance that says there is a limit on the width of the house.

Mr. Monson – when our Architect sat down to speak with zoning with the rough floor plan that would have been a good time for zoning to say something.

Mr. Monson – before we bought the property and we were speaking with Mr. Schmidt and he was advising us as to what we can and cannot do with this lot he said that of the building envelope your challenge will be to fit 2600 sf. within. We faxed the information to him and asked if this was what he was talking about. He confirmed that it was. He did not mention that it could be 80 ft.

Mr. Dalziel – that lies with your architect.

Mrs. Monson – she conferred with him.

Mr. Shaw – talking does not relieve her from reading the ordinances.

Mrs. Hough – aren't the officials charged with knowing the ordinances

Mrs. Monson – when we were here talking to the zoning officer, trying to gain approval

Mrs. Dalziel – one of the missing links that came out of that last meeting is apparently the architect didn't communicate with Mr. Muolla. Mr. Muolla's zoning table does not reflect that particular ordinance.

Mr. Shaw – we have had several applications that were actually filed and pending when the ordinance was adopted.

Mr. Osmun – This is a unique piece of property. It does further the intent of the width of structure in the sense that it will not look like a huge wall. This is a unique situation with 50 ft. side yards, which will probably never happen.

Mrs. Monson – we did research on new construction in the immediate area and close by. We looked up new homes and looked at the tax records for property sizes. We calc. the ratio from house size to lot size. You will see our ratio in many respects smaller than most of the new house in our area.

Mr. Monson – not only is it in the lower half of the ratio of house to lot size its also one of the smallest houses on the entire page. The house directly across the street is facing Maple might be comparable.

Mr. Osmun – stressed that he felt that the proposed met the criteria of the LUL. A professional planner would probably put forth the same argument I have made.

When asked when there meetings were with Mr. Schmidt the Monsons' replied Mar, April, thru May. The zoning permit was issued on October 1st and then rejected October 21st.

Mr. Shaw – we previously determined that we did not have discretion to hear any appeals of the zoning officers determination given that the appeal was from action by Mr. Ruschke in making the determination as the Township Engineer.

Mr. Ruschke – it is the applicants ultimate responsibility comply with our zoning codes and not rely on the zoning officer where the zoning officer did in fact sign off.

Mr. Monson – if you need more information you need then we will do that.

Mr. Nelson gave a brief rundown on what the site visit report read. They had seen that the lot had been marked with flags, we walked it and observed the size of side yards. Mr. Nelson felt that if the garage was moved over a variance would not be needed.

Mr. Shaw – I would suggest that given the nature of this application you would want to have a very solid factual basis to insure that any action has can be factually distinguished from anything else.

Mr. Osmun they are not going to court

Mr. Shaw - I am not saying they are going to court but someone else might take it to court. You could have a municipality who very strongly suggest that if we didn't you could have a township council file an appeal of our approval if they did not think it was appropriate to have done that. I think it is incumbent upon this board to have professional expert testimony to justify any decision that we make.

Mr. Osmun – what I am asking you is this a reasonable proposal – is it worthwhile

Mr. Shaw – it is not for me to say. I think its important to have a record here so we can..

Mr. Monson – we then need a professional planner

Mr. Shaw – you need proper factual foundation and expert testimony that can be placed into a resolution.

Mrs. Hough - the Township Committee is very serious about this ordinance and any deviation from this ordinance.....

Mr. Monson – there are a lot of wealthy people in this area but this is costing me thousands of extra dollars and time. If I have to move twice before (already moved 5 times) I can't tell you how angry I am at this Township. I cannot believe I moved here instead of one of the other Townships. I know its probably cutting my own throat but I have to tell you it is so disappointing... I don't know what else I could have done.

Mr. Dalziel – I can appreciate your situation and I feel for you but it's not our fault that you are in this situation.

The Monson's will submit 14 copies of floor plan – 13 ledger size and one normal size.

MICHAEL MCCAFFREY
BRITTEN ROAD
BLOCK: 48.18 LOT: 145.02.

CALENDAR BOA 07-48.18-145.02

David Krasnica, Contractor

Mr. Dalziel – we ask that you give us a brief description of what you proposed, we will schedule a site visit in February, and there will be a follow up meeting on February 21st.

Michael McCaffrey – we are proposing an addition inside of our home. Our home is 19.8' from the property line. We will try to continue that same line. We can't go back because of the septic system. We hope to utilize the only area available for the addition.

Mr. Krasnica – the McCaffrey's are a growing family and they wish to add to their home. The addition is extending out to the side. There is no other space available to add to and still keep the house flowing and make everything work. We are increasing the size of the master bedroom as it's very small and we are adding living space. Currently this house does not have a lot of room. There is one existing setback and we are requesting 2 setback variances. The side is existing non-conforming and the garage is non-conforming. There is an existing second story to the back not in the front

Questions from the Board – None

Mr. Dalziel – questioned the existing one story shed in the back

Mr. Krasnica – it's not a shed.. it's actually a historical piece. It's been there before any other home on the street. It's kind of like a hunting cabin with a little fireplace. There was a well one time on the property and the fireplace to heat water from the well.

Mr. Dalziel – was that existing when you purchased the house.

Mr. McCaffrey – yes... it's just not as historical as the shed.

Mr. Dalziel - on the zoning table you left the required column blank so if you could fill that in.... (DN1)

Mr. Dalziel – we will be conducting a site visit on February 2nd at 9 am. We would ask you to mark out where the addition is proposed. If you could somehow where the 50 ft. set back line is would also be helpful. It will be a continuation of a hearing on February 21, 2008.

A motion was made by Mr. Godwin seconded by Mr. Schmidt to adjourn the meeting at 10:30 p.m. – all approved

Respectfully submitted

Mary Ann Fasano
Recording Secretary