

**New Milford Zoning Board of Adjustment  
Work Session  
May 8, 2018**

Vice Chairman Stokes called the Work Session of the New Milford Zoning Board of Adjustment to order at 7:30 pm and read the Open Public Meeting Act.

**ROLL CALL**

Mr. Adelung	Absent
Ms. Hittel	Present
Mr. Joseph	Present
Mr. Loonam	Present
Mr. Rebsch	Present
Mr. Seymour	Present
Mr. Stokes - Vice Chairman	Present
Mr. Weisbrot	Absent
Mr. Schaffenberger- Chairman	Absent
Mr. Sproviero - Attorney	Present
Ms. Batistic	Present

The Chairman would not be present due to a business trip and the Vice Chairman would be chairing the meeting.

**REVIEW MINUTES OF THE WORK SESSION – April 10 2018**

The Board Members reviewed the minutes and there were no changes.

**REVIEW MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC SESSION – April 10, 2018**

The Board Members reviewed the minutes and there were no changes

**NEW BUSINESS**

**18-03 DeBari – 510 Albert Place- Block 1103 Lot 5 – addition**

Front yard setback and side yard setback

The Board Attorney believed the applicant was requesting to carry the application to June as a result of some unforeseen circumstances that have arisen with the applicant's family.

**18-04 Chen – 140 Hirschfeld Place – Block 1403 Lot 8 – Addition of a Portico**

Front yard setback

The Board Members reviewed the application and there were no comments.

Motion to close the work session was made by Mr. Rebsch, seconded by Mr. Loonam and carried by all.

**New Milford Zoning Board of Adjustment  
Public Session  
May 8, 2018**

Vice Chairman Stokes called the Public Session of the New Milford Zoning Board of Adjustment to order at 7:40 pm and read the Open Public Meeting Act.

**ROLL CALL**

Mr. Adelung	Absent
Ms. Hittel	Present
Mr. Joseph	Present
Mr. Loonam	Present
Mr. Rebsch	Present
Mr. Seymour	Present
Mr. Stokes- Vice Chairman	Present
Mr. Weisbrot	Absent
Mr. Schaffenberger-Chairman	Absent
Mr. Sproviero - Attorney	Present
Ms. Batistic	Present

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**OFFICIAL MINUTES OF THE WORK SESSION – April 10, 2018**

Motion to accept the minutes was made by Ms. Hittel, seconded by Mr. Rebsch and carried by all.

**OFFICIAL MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC SESSION – April 10, 2018**

Motion to accept the minutes was made by Mr. Rebsch, seconded by Ms. Hittel and carried by all.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**18-03 DeBari – 510 Albert Place- Block 1103 Lot 5 – addition**

Front yard setback and side yard setback

Mr. Michael Gadaleta, representing the applicant, stated the applicant notified the office today that they would not be attending. Mr. Gadaleta requested the application to be carried to the next meeting and asked if they needed to renote. The Board Attorney said they did not need to renote because they were recognizing the application to be carried to the June 12, 2018 meeting.

**18-04 Chen – 140 Hirschfeld Place – Block 1403 Lot 8 – Addition of a Portico**

Front yard setback

Ms. Margaret Peterson, 3 Dukes's Court, Morristown, NJ, was sworn in by the Board Attorney.

The Board Members accepted the qualifications of Ms. Peterson as an expert licensed architect.

Ms. Peterson, representing the client, stated that this was a small split level home and were proposing a few small additions to the existing house. Ms. Peterson one area of improvement is in the back of the house where they are making the kitchen larger and a sitting area. She stated that addition did not require any variance because they were complying with all the setbacks and coverage. They wanted to construct a portico at the front of the house but the house was already at the minimum front yard setback, said the architect. She noted there were only two houses on the block and the front yard setback was 28.9'. The proposed vestibule would have a door that leads into the house to prevent drafts from heat or cold air coming into the house.

Ms. Peterson felt this would improve the quality of their life and the portico covers the front stoop so there would be no ice or snow. She felt the house looks more attractive with the proposed portico and believed there was no negative impact on the neighbor. The architect thought it was improvement to the aesthetics of the house and a more functional house.

Ms. Peterson stated there was no negativity with this application and requested the Board Members to grant the variance for the portico.

Mr. Stokes commented that the existing door was being moved back into the house about 3' into the house. Ms. Peterson agreed.

The Board Attorney asked if the existing average setback was 28.9' and they were proposing 26.4'. Ms. Peterson agreed.

Mr. Loonam and Ms. Batistic noted that the building coverage calculations on the worksheet were incorrect. The Board Attorney told the architect to recalculate the numbers for the board members so the members knew precisely what the applicant was requesting.

Recess

The Board Attorney wanted to know the numbers that implicate the front yard variance to confirm the entirety of the project was not triggering any other variances.

Ms. Peterson said she reviewed the form submitted and said the main mistake was in the existing building footprint and with the step and walkways. The architect corrected it and said the existing building coverage percentage was 15.1 and proposed was 18.8 were 20 percent was required. The maximum impervious was 60 percent existing was 25.9 and proposed was 29.4. The Borough Engineer asked for the square footage of the building. Ms. Peterson said the building footprint existing was 1,267 sf and proposed was 1,606 sf. Ms. Peterson said the 60 sf for porches and patios was removed.

Mr. Seymour asked for some examples how the portico would improve the aesthetics and functionality of the house. The architect said they would have a place to change their shoes and have a closet. Ms. Peterson felt it would be a neater house and mentioned there would be a separate door closing off the vestibule from the main house keeping the hot / cold air from going directly into the house.

Mr. Loonam asked what the proposed front yard setback was. Ms. Peterson answered existing was 28.9' and proposed 26.4'.

Motion to open to the public was made by Mr. Rebsch, seconded by Mr. Seymour and carried by all.

No one in the audience wished to speak.

Motion to close to the public was made by Ms. Hittel, seconded by Mr. Loonam and carried by all.

The Board Attorney said there were no special conditions being imposed with this application.

Motion made by Ms. Hittel, seconded by Mr. Rebsch to approve the application with the corrected figures as presented.

The motion passed on a roll call vote as follows:

For the Motion: Members Hittel, Rebsch, Loonam, Seymour, Stokes, Joseph.

Approved 6-0

As there was no further business to discuss, a motion was made to close by Ms. Hittel, seconded by Mr. Rebsch and carried by all.

Respectfully submitted,  
Maureen Oppelaar