

**TENAFLY BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
REGULAR PUBLIC MEETING
7:30 P.M. October 5, 2015
MINUTES**

ROLL CALL:

Present: Mr. Cytryn, Mr. Farrell, Mrs. Gilbert, Mr. Levene, Mr. Lieberman, Mr. Grossman.
Absent: Mr. Brensilber Mr. Callahan, Mr. Kominsky.
Also present: Mr. Ritvo

OPEN PUBLIC MEETINGS ACT STATEMENT

Chair Grossman read the Open Public Meetings Act Statement: "In compliance with the Open Public Meetings Act P.L. 1975, chapter 231, the notice requirements have been satisfied. Notice for this meeting date was faxed to the Record on January 2, 2015, posted on the bulletin board in the lobby of the Municipal Center and posted to the municipal web site."

COMMUNICATIONS

NJ Planner, July/August 2015

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion by Mr. Lieberman second by Mr. Cytryn to approve the minutes of September 21, 2015. All members on a voice vote were in favor.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Resolutions to be memorialized:

Approved: Harel, 233 Engle St – 1703/1
Circular driveway. ZB2015-18.

Denied: Anamisis, 4 Lawrence Parkway – 1804/2
Building coverage, front yard coverage by driveway, front yard setback, rear yard setback, side yard setback. ZB2015-13.

Motion by Mr. Cytryn second by Mrs. Gilbert to memorialize the resolutions. All members on a voice vote were in favor.

There followed a delay in the proceedings as the Board was waiting for one additional member.

NEW BUSINESS

The meeting reconvened at 8:10PM with six members. The applicant was advised he could carry the application to the next meeting as there were only six members present. The applicant chose to proceed with his application.

Carrillo, 92 Howard Pk Dr – 2201/10
Side yard setback 9.8ft; FAR 31%. ZB2015-16. (Rec'd 9/23/15 decision by 1/21/2016.)

After some discussion the board agreed that this application was substantially different than the prior application that was denied.

The architect Mr. Mederos said this application has changed, a side yard setback variance is still needed on the left side of the property, and the FAR has significantly been reduced; they brought the rear addition in by three feet, and have removed the front overhang. The code allows a two foot projection into the front yard, which will be maintained and this will reduce the FAR. The existing front walls of the house on the second floor are at 6ft and to keep this architectural look the ceiling will go up from that height.

Marked as A-1 were two pages of photographs in the area showing which properties had an addition over the garage. Mr. Mederos said the FAR has been reduced to 81SF, and a side yard setback variance of 9.8ft for the left side yard, the proposed addition will extend straight up over the existing first floor.

Mr. Ritvo reminded the board that they should be considering if the property can handle the increase in FAR, and if the positives outweigh the negatives.

In response to questions from the board Mr. Mederos said the house on the left (east) slopes away and he did not feel the light would be blocked; the width of the bedroom at 10ft is not unreasonable, and to take the space from the adjacent bedroom would be an expensive and complex task as it is an outside wall; they have made the proposed second floor smaller; they did think about going side wall to side wall, but felt this second floor addition in this location would be softer and fit in with the other homes in the neighborhood that are three bedroom, albeit large bedrooms.

There were no questions or comments from the public.

Mr. Mederos gave a summary of the application. The board went into deliberative session.

Mr. Farrell thanked the homeowner and architect for the changes they had made to the proposed addition, he felt 1% over on FAR was not too bad, the side yard was minimal and would be aesthetically pleasing, the proposed addition would fit in with the neighborhood and he was in favor.

Mrs. Gilbert agreed adding three large bedrooms is a fair option and she did not have a problem with the bedroom sizes. There being no neighbors present made her decision a little easier.

Mr. Levene said they had made a reasonable effort to change the plan, and he did not feel it would impact the neighborhood in a negative manner.

Mr. Lieberman said he was torn and felt there would be an impact on the neighbors.

Mr. Cytryn said they had done a good job in addressing the issues the board expressed at the last hearing, and no neighbors were present with concerns; he was in favor.

Mr. Grossman said the plan was well thought out, but he was undecided given the slope of the land, but did not think the second floor addition would affect the neighbor.

Mr. Lieberman said it would be nice to see an elevation of the neighbor's house, and which part would be looking at the addition.

Motion by Mr. Cytryn second by Mr. Farrell to approve the FAR.

Roll call vote:

In favor: Mr. Cytryn, Mr. Farrell, Mrs. Gilbert, Mr. Levene, Mr. Lieberman, Mr. Grossman.

Opposed: None.

FAR of 31% approved 6-0.

Motion by Mr. Farrell second by Mr. Cytryn to approve the side yard setback.

Minutes approved: 11-02-2015

Roll call vote:

In favor: Mr. Farrell, Mr. Cytryn, Mrs. Gilbert, Mr. Levene, Mr. Lieberman, Mr. Grossman.

Opposed: None.

Side yard setback of 9.8ft approved 6-0.

Variances for side yard setback and FAR approved.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Mrs. Gilbert second by Mr. Levene to adjourn the meeting. All members on a voice vote were in favor, the meeting was adjourned at 8:52PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Lindsay Graham
Board Secretary