

CHATHAM BOROUGH ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

May 27, 2020

7:30 p.m.

Chairman Michael A. Cifelli called this Regular Meeting of the Zoning Board of Adjustment to order at 7:30 p.m. Chrmn. Cifelli was present in the Council Chambers. All other Board Members and Attorney Dwyer were present by Zoom. Chrmn. Cifelli stated that adequate notices for this Zoning Board of Adjustment meeting were given as required by the Open Public Meetings Act.

Names	Present	Absent
Michael A. Cifelli, Esq., Chairman	X	
Frederick Infante	X	
Douglas Herbert	X	
H.H. Montague	X	
Jean-Eudes Haeringer	X	
Patrick Tobia	X	
Alida Kass	X	
Peter Hoffman	X	
Patrick Dwyer, Esq.	X	

Borough Administrator Steve Williams was present, as a host, to help run the technical aspects of this Zoom meeting.

Chrmn. Cifelli explained to the members of the public how they could participate in this Zoom meeting by phone or computer.

Public Comment

There were none.

Resolution #ZB 2020-01

Chrmn. Cifelli noted that there were no Zoning Board of Adjustment Meetings held in March or April because of the pandemic. The February 26, 2020 Zoning Bd. of Adjustment meeting was the last meeting held by the Board.

Mr. Haeringer made a motion to approve the minutes of the February 26, 2020 Zoning Bd. of Adjustment meeting as submitted. Mr. Tobia seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken. The minutes were approved as submitted.

Resolution

Application ZB #19-019

Peter & Beth Paulson

195 Hillside Avenue

Block: 107, Lot 3

Maximum Building Coverage

Attorney Dwyer summarized this application which proposed adding a front porch to a home, where, historically there had once been a front porch. The Board felt the porch and its dimensions were not out of character and granted the variance. Chrmn. Cifelli made a motion to approve the resolution confirming the Board's approval of Application ZB # 19-019. Mr. Herbert seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken:

Mr. Herbert	-	yes
Mr. Montague	-	yes
Mr. Haeringer	-	yes
Chrmn. Cifelli	-	yes
Mr. Tobia	-	yes
Mr. Hoffman	-	yes

Returning and New Applications

Chrmn. Cifelli announced the following applications will be heard during tonight's meeting:

- Application ZB #20-001: Leslie – 68 Chandler Rd.
- Application ZB #20-004: Bruno – 182 Watchung Ave.
- Application ZB #20-005: Bravoco – 71 North Summit Ave.

Chrmn. Cifelli announced that Application ZB #20-002: Kneebone – 187 Washington Avenue will carry to the June 24, 2020 Zoning Bd. of Adjustment meeting.

Application ZB-001

Erin & Scott Leslie

68 Chandler Road

Block 11, Lot 4

Maximum Building Coverage

The following were sworn in to testify:

Scott & Erin Leslie, the applicants

Timothy Klesse, the architect for the applicants

Mr. Leslie gave an introductory statement for his application. He testified that he and his wife currently live on Dempster Road in the Borough. Mr. Leslie stated that he and his wife were constructing a new home at 68 Chandler Rd. He noted that the variances being sought tonight were for a porch to be added to the new construction. The front porch will be functional. Mr. Leslie testified that the front façade of the home is facing south. It will be constantly hit by sun. Adding this front porch will help keep the house cool during the summer months. Mr. Leslie testified that he and his wife were not seeking any extension to encroach on any existing setback. No FAR or lot variances are being sought. Mr. and Mrs. Leslie will never enclose the front porch or build on top of the front porch.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked Board members if they had any questions for Mr. and Mrs. Leslie on their opening statement and description of their property.

There were no questions from the Board.

Mr. Klesse submitted his professional credentials. The Board accepted his credentials.

Mr. Haeringer asked where were the plans for the second and third floors.

Mr. Klesse answered that those floor plans were not included, because the application only focused on the first floor.

Chrmn. Cifelli felt that the issue was really why couldn't the proposed porch be constructed within the allowable dimensions on that particular property.

Mr. Klesse testified that an effort was made to make this new home in scale with the neighborhood homes. Also, enough bedrooms were created in the new home, to make it feasible to build it. Unfortunately, the plans then ran out of allowable building coverage. Mr. Klesse stated that he and the applicants believed that the porch would be a positive amenity.

Mr. Klesse asked the Board to look at his Statement of Reasons, dated January 7<sup>th</sup>. He noted that the porch will measure 214 sq. ft. Mr. Klesse stated that the porch would be "transparent" and will not appear as a mass or part of the building. The porch will be compatible with the Master Plan. He explained why he could not feasibly make the first floor rooms smaller. Mr. Klesse felt that the front porch will minimize the visual mass of the structure. The porch will be an architectural enhancement of the structure.

Mr. Klesse stated he and Mr. Leslie would welcome any questions from the Board.

Mr. Hoffman felt the application is straightforward. He did not see any need to include a condition that the porch never be enclosed. If there were ever any plans to enclose it, the homeowner would have to return and seek a FAR variance. Chrmn. Cifelli agreed, pointing out that the proposed FAR is less than 100 sq. ft. than what is allowable. Mrs. Kass, Mr. Montague, and Mr. Haeringer had no questions for the applicant.

Mr. Infante asked Mr. Leslie why the porch had not been included in the original drawings.

Mr. Leslie explained that when the home was being designed, enough space was made for his 3 children and visiting relatives. He and his wife would like to maximize this house, in the interior, for the long term. Mr. Leslie pointed out that the home currently under construction on the corner of Fairmount Ave. and Second Street has a porch that need a variance, but that porch will be improving the character of the home.

Mr. Infante pointed out that the porch on that new home on Second Street was approved prior to construction, not post-construction. Chrmn. Cifelli added that this particular home was on a corner lot. The Board had encouraged that applicant to put a façade on the Fairmount Ave. side of the home, since the proposed entrance was on Second Street. Chrmn. Cifelli agreed with Mr. Infante's point that each application is different.

Mr. Haeringer confirmed with Mr. Leslie that his new home is up already, but construction is not completed.

Mr. Tobia pointed out that the Board does not have the second floor drawings. He asked if anything on the second floor would be constructed over the mudroom.

Mr. Leslie answered that above the mudroom will be the laundry room and the back portion of the master bedroom.

Mr. Tobia asked if anything would be constructed above the bump-out areas of the kitchen. Mr. Leslie answered that the master bathroom will be constructed over those bump-out areas.

Mr. Tobia felt that when the home was being designed, some of the first floor elements could have been cut back some.

Mr. Herbert questioned Mr. Klesse's explanation of why this porch could not be put in the original design. He asked Mr. Klesse again why this porch could not be included in the original design.

Referring the Board to the first-floor plans, Mr. Klesse explained that he and the applicants could not find any location to pick up 200 sq. ft. for the front porch. The mudroom is really needed. The other rooms could not be reduced. Mr. Klesse felt the proposed front porch would help "finish the building". The porch would be a transparent object in front of the building, which would help scale it down.

Mr. Montague had no questions.

Mrs. Kass asked why would this incremental porch be a benefit?

Mr. Klesse answered that the front porch will be an enhancement to the building. It will help the scale and texture of the building and "finish the building".

Mrs. Kass confirmed with Mr. Klesse that the plans do not have the "surface area" to provide a porch.

Mr. Infante asked if the applicant had done a survey on the porches existing in the neighborhood.

Mr. Leslie stated that from his understanding of that section of Chandler Rd., between Lafayette Ave. and Washington Ave., there are no front porches. The homes on that section of Chandler Rd. are very far from the street. He felt that very few families spend time in front of their homes. There aren't porches for them to sit on.

Mrs. Leslie pointed out that this section of Chandler Road has no sidewalks. She felt it would be advantageous, with young children, to have a front porch to both keep an eye on the children and to socialize with the neighbors.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked Mr. Klesse what the dimensions of the proposed front porch were.

Mr. Klesse answered 10 feet on the left side. The right side by the garage it is 6 feet. The total length of the porch would be 33 feet.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked if the porch would be more than 3 feet off the ground.

Mr. Klesse answered that the porch would be 2 feet off the ground. Chrmn. Cifelli confirmed with Mr. Klesse that no railings would be installed. He also confirmed with Mr. Klesse that the only obstacles on the porch would be the columns that would support the roofline above. Mr. Klesse testified that the roofline will minimize the mass of the building.

The Board members had no further questions for Mr. Klesse.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked if the public had any questions for Mr. Klesse.

There was none.

Mr. Klesse stated that his testimony was finished.

Mr. Leslie submitted his application for the Board's consideration and vote.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked for comments from the Board. Mr. Infante questioned why the applicant didn't choose to put living space over the proposed front porch at the outset. He was concerned this proposed arrangement came after the house was built. Mr. Infante also pointed out that there are no other porches in the neighborhood. He wasn't sure the applicant's porch would fit in the neighborhood. Mr. Haeringer agreed with Mr. Infante's points. He did not like that the applicant proposed this porch after the home's construction, after the fact. Mr. Montague believed the porch would add to the aesthetics of the home. He will accept it. Mr. Tobia stated he would have preferred seeing the plans for the second floor. He felt the applicants had maximized the living space. Mr. Tobia disagreed with Mr. Klesse's testimony that a mudroom is needed. Mr. Tobia is not in favor of the application. Mrs. Kass did not see any detriment to the town if this porch was approved and constructed. The community will be benefiting from this lovely architecture. Mrs. Kass pointed out that there is no FAR issue with this application. Mr. Hoffman agreed with Mrs. Kass's points. He believed there were no detriments to add this porch to the home. Mr. Herbert still questioned the reasons given by Mr. Klesse for the construction of this porch. Chrmn. Cifelli discussed the second-floor issue for this application. He did not feel that what was on the second floor is irrelevant. Chrmn. Cifelli pointed out that this application is seeking a bulk variance of 214 sq. ft. This additional bulk will not inhibit any light, air, or open space. The 214 sq. ft. is almost de minimus. There will be no wall or railings. Chrmn. Cifelli felt the applicant's proposal was reasonable.

Mr. Haeringer to the roll call vote on this application. Mr. Montague asked that a condition be included that Mr. Klesse submit second story plans and elevations to the Board.

Mrs. Kass - yes

Mr. Herbert - no  
Mr. Infante - yes  
Mr. Montague - yes  
Chrmn. Cifelli - yes  
Mr. Tobia - no  
Mr. Haeringer - yes

Application ZB-001: Leslie – 68 Chandler Rd. was approved.

At 8:56 p.m. a break was taken in the meeting.

At 9:10 p.m. the meeting was resumed.

Application ZB #20-004

Christopher & Tammy Bruno

182 Watchung Avenue

Block 18 Lot 8

Maximum Building Coverage

Maximum Impervious Lot Coverage

Accessory Structure Height

The following were sworn in to testify:

Christopher & Tammy Bruno, the applicants

Doug Miller, the architect for the applicants

Mrs. Bruno gave an introductory statement for the application. She testified she and her husband have been living in the home, 182 Watchung Ave., for 14 years now. The house is 100 years old. Mrs. Bruno noted that there are zero closets on the first floor. The kitchen has cabinets, but no pantry closet. There is currently no area to store coats, pet equipment, etc. Mrs. Bruno testified that she and her husband would like to re-locate their garage, push it back a little, and to the side. There is not street parking on Watchung Avenue. It is very hard to back a car out onto Watchung Avenue. Space is needed for a K-turn. At some point her children will be driving, and it would be tricky for them to safely back out of the current driveway. The existing wood deck is starting to deteriorate. Mrs. Bruno would like to replace the deck with a patio. Drainage improvements will be done. Mrs. Bruno reported that she and her husband are discussing this drainage work with Mr. DeNave, the Borough Engineer.

Mr. Miller, the architect, submitted his professional qualifications to the Board. The Board accepted them.

Chrmn. Cifelli reviewed that there were three variances being sought: building coverage, impervious lot coverage, and accessory structure height. It seemed none of the Board members had denial sheets for this application.

At Chrmn. Cifelli's request, Mr. Miller reviewed the calculations for building coverage. Chrmn. Cifelli confirmed with Mr. Miller that the existing building coverage is already over the

allowable amount. Mr. Miller gave the calculations for the impervious lot coverage. Chrmn. Cifelli confirmed with Mr. Miller that the lot measured 55 feet width and 174 feet deep. It is a narrow, deep lot.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked if there were any other existing non-conforming aspects of the property.

Mr. Miller answered yes. The lot frontage, the lot width, and the right-side yard. He explained that a cupola would be added to the top of the garage, which would increase the height to 17.33 feet.

Mr. Miller testified that immediately to the right of the applicant's property is the Washington Ave. School playground. The existing garage cannot hold two modern-sized cars.

Mr. Miller explained that the building coverage variance is to construct the one-story addition. A mudroom with a covered entry is being proposed. The proposed addition will conform with the side yard setbacks. The new garage size will be minimized to lessen the increase of overall building coverage overage.

Putting the existing and proposed plans on the screen, Mr. Miller pointed out the location of the proposed patio, the mudroom. There is currently no way to adequately hang coats in the home. The applicants must park their cars at the front of the driveway and enter and leave through the front vestibule. The proposed new garage and mudroom would allow the applicants to easily get in and out of their home and will remove their cars from the front of the home. The current visual clutter will be eliminated.

Mr. Miller testified that the mudroom will be an attractive and useful enhancement to the house.

Charm. Cifelli asked if the additional driveway contributed to the lot coverage. Mr. Miller answered that the driveway will keep the same square footage. The driveway has just been reconfigured. The additional lot coverage comes from the proposed patio and the elimination of the existing deck.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked Board members had any questions on the building coverage and the mudroom.

Mr. Infante noted that the existing garage is towards the center of the backyard. Is there a reason why the garage will be moved over?

Mr. Miller answered that had to do more with lot coverage, and also improved circulation of the cars and making K-turn space.

Chrmn. Cifelli confirmed with Mr. Miller that the current way the homeowners enter the home can bring in leaves, snow, rain. Unfortunately, the front entrance currently serves as a mudroom of sorts. The proposed plans would alleviate this problem.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked Mr. Miller to discuss the lot coverage variances. Mr. Miller noted that the existing deck will be removed and will be replaced with a slightly larger patio. The applicant's outdoor living space will be moved down to ground level. This arrangement will give the applicants more privacy from the school playground. The backyard will be opened up more. Mr. Miller explained the benefits of the altered driveway and new garage. A parking area and a K-turn area will be created. Mr. Miller testified that even though there will be an increase to lot coverage, a larger piece of property will visually appear. Mr. Miller felt that the applicant's plans to eliminate the drainage problem would be a benefit to the community.

Mr. Infante asked how close the Washington Ave. School structure to the applicant's side yard is.

Mr. Bruno and Mr. Miller answered probably 200 feet.

Chrmn. Cifelli noted that there is a slope behind the back of the house that steeps downward, possibly 6 feet. He asked Mr. Miller if the property steeps down even further at the rear.

Mr. Miller answered yes, but it eventually levels off.

With this in mind, Chrmn. Cifelli asked if the proposed garage, and its placement would produce more visual bulk.

Mr. Miller believed that the placement of the proposed garage will not have detrimental affect on light and air regarding the properties.

Chrmn. Cifelli confirmed with Mr. Miller that a continuity will be achieved with the incorporation of the mudroom with the deck, and the porch.

Chrmn. Cifelli brought up the building height of the proposed garage.

Mr. Miller testified that the garage structure is conforming. The height variance is for the cupola. He felt that the cupola would add to the aesthetics of the home. He did not believe the cupola would impact anyone.

Mr. Herbert asked if the Board were to approve the height variance, would it be only for cupola? Could a subsequent owner build a new garage, almost 3 feet taller than the existing garage? Also, will the applicants have a storage space inside of the garage?

Mr. Bruno said there is storage space in the attic of the garage, but it's not an area where someone can stand up in.

Board Attorney Dwyer added that this particular height variance only has to do with the cupola. If a future owner wants additional height for another situation, they would have to come before the Board again.

There were no questions from the public for Mr. Miller.

Mr. Miller summarized the application. He stated that the proposed garage will improve the circulation on the property. The scale of these proposals will be in keeping with the neighborhood. The pre-existing drainage issue will be corrected, which will be a benefit to the community.

Mr. and Mrs. Bruno closed their application and submitted it to the Board for their consideration and vote.

The public had no comments on the application.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked for comments from the Board. Mr. Herbert believed that the building coverage variance was de minimus. The proposed plans will provide functionality to a home with no closets on the first floor. The lot coverage variance, if approved, will bring the driveway into a more modern size. The cupola will be a nice addition. Mr. Infante agreed with Mr. Herbert's points. The driveway improvements will not only increase the safety for the applicants, but for the community as well.

Chrmn. Cifelli noted that Mr. DeNave was now present at this virtual meeting. He asked Mr. DeNave for his comments. Mr. DeNave explained that Mr. and Mrs. Bruno had wanted to correct that pre-existing drainage problem, even if the application was not approved. The drainage work that will be done will benefit Mr. and Mrs. Bruno, but the neighbor behind them. The Board of Education has been in talks with this improvement, because the water will be taken away through a drainage system that is on the school property. Permission will be obtained from Washington Ave. School. Mr. Haeringer felt that the mudroom was very modest and narrow. The garage was well designed. Mrs. Kass believed that the mudroom was a good proposal. The proposed patio would also be a good improvement. Mr. Hoffman felt that the functionality and aesthetics of the home would be greatly improved with this application. Mr. Tobia believed it would be a thoughtful upgrade for the house and property. Mr. Montague felt that the new driveway arrangement would bring more safety to not just the applicants, but the neighborhood in general. Chrmn. Cifelli stated he supported the application, as long as the height of the garage is limited to the cupola.

Mrs. Kass made a motion to approve Application ZB # 20-004 with the applicant to follow any recommendations made by the Borough Engineer for stormwater. Mr. Tobia seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken:

Mrs. Kass	-	yes
Mr. Herbert	-	yes
Mr. Infante	-	yes
Mr. Montague	-	yes
Mr. Haeringer	-	yes
Mr. Tobia	-	yes
Chrmn. Cifelli	-	yes

Application ZB # 20-004: Bruno – 182 Watchung Ave. was approved.

Application ZB # 20-005

Devinne Bravoco

71 North Summit Avenue

Block: 55, Lot 60

Rear Yard Setback

Building Coverage

Mr. Haeringer recused himself from this application because he lives within the 200-ft. radius of the applicant's property.

The following were sworn in to testify:

Devinne Bravoco, the applicant

Daniel Encin, the architect for the applicant

Ms. Bravoco testified that her family purchased this home on December 31, 2019. The house was built in 1946. The house only had one previous owner. The interior of the house is dated and small. Ms. Bravoco is proposing to enlarge the living area, especially the kitchen. A detached garage is proposed to maximize the living space.

Mr. Encin submitted his professional credentials to the Board. The Board accepted them.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked Mr. Encin to testify on the building coverage variance – what is triggering it, what it will accomplish, if approved.

Mr. Encin testified that the home was constructed in 1946. The original footprint of the house has an attached one car garage which had no connection into the house. This home sits on a corner lot. Regarding the building coverage, 658 sq. ft. will be added to the first floor. 315 sq. ft. will be for a single detached garage to be constructed at the rear of the property. The remaining 343 sq. ft. of the building coverage is for living space for the house.

Mr. Encin testified that the existing property is undersized for the R-3 Zone. It's an existing nonconformity for this size property.

Referring the Board to Sheet A3, which showed the proposed floor plans for the levels of the house, Mr. Encin pointed out a more sizeable kitchen area with a small eating area attached to it. A comfortable family living space will be created. A small mudroom space will be added with space for a washer and dryer.

Mr. Encin testified that an attempt was made, with this application, to respect the setback and zoning requirements of the property and remove the addition from any street view. The added space will be "nestled" in the back. It will not impact any light or air. Mr. Encin testified that an attempt was made to respect the Borough's FAR requirements.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked for testimony on the proposed additional space for the garage.

Mr. Encin testified that the garage will be situated at the rear of the property. The garage will be facing towards Weston Ave. The existing driveway comes out onto North Summit Avenue. Chrmn. Cifelli confirmed with Mr. Encin that the driveway will be significantly decreased.

Chrmn. Cifelli brought up the lot coverage issue. He asked why the additional space for the garage is necessary.

Mr. Encin testified that the existing kitchen pushed out a pantry and refrigerator, thereby reducing the available width of the current garage. A car cannot pull into the current garage, unless it is at a steep angle.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked the size of the proposed garage.

Mr. Encin answered 15 feet by 21 feet. This size garage is still considered a single car garage. If the building coverage variance for the proposed garage was eliminated, the garage would become non-functional. Mr. Encin also testified that “the neighbor” behind the applicant’s home is Chatham Borough property.

Mr. Herbert asked if the old driveway will be taken up. Chrmn. Cifelli noted that it makes sense that the existing driveway will be kept.

Mr. Herbert asked how the applicant will walk from the garage to the house. Is that arrangement included in the calculations?

Mr. Encin answered that there is no proposed walkway from the detached garage to the house. It’s a relatively short distance, and there is the desire to keep that area for open space.

Mr. Herbert asked if the owners intend to actually occupy the house or sell it.

Ms. Bravoco answered that she will live in the house.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked for testimony for the rear yard setback variance.

Mr. Encin reviewed the existing, required, and proposed calculations for the rear yard setbacks. Chrmn. Cifelli confirmed with Mr. Encin that in order to make the family room a reasonable size, the rear of the house would have to be enlarged. Chrmn. Cifelli confirmed with Mr. Encin that the deck conforms with the Borough regulations. The deck will be 100 feet deep.

Board members discussed the depth of the Borough property behind the applicant’s property. Mr. Herbert noted that a ravine runs between the back of the applicant’s property and the Borough’s property. It is fairly substantial.

Mr. DeNave felt that the Borough property is not quite 100 feet deep. The reason the Borough did not want to sell this property was because it goes down to about 45 feet in width at the North Hillside Ave. frontage and widens out 55 feet at the back. There is a drainage issue on that lot

that still needs to be resolved. Mr. DeNave noted that the Borough has no plans to sell that lot because it was deemed to be an unacceptable size for a stand-alone building lot.

Mr. Infante asked Mr. DeNave if the Borough had any objections to the applicant's rear yard setback proposals.

Mr. DeNave did not believe so. The rear yard proposal is a very minimal intrusion.

Mr. Herbert asked Mr. DeNave if the proposed garage, so close to the property line, would have an impact on the water situation on the Borough property or the ravine.

Mr. DeNave answered no. The Borough should be taking care of that water issue this summer. The applicant will be required to direct their stormwater right out to Weston Avenue.

There were no further questions from the Board for Mr. Encin or Ms. Bravoco.

There were no questions from the public.

Summing up, Mr. Encin stated that the application tried to respect as many of the Zoning requirements as possible, while adding living space to the originally constructed home. The small house character will be improved. Mr. Encin testified that the benefits outweigh the detriments.

Ms. Bravoco closed the application and submitted it to the Board for their consideration and a vote.

There were no comments from the public on this application.

Chrmn. Cifelli started the Board's discussion by noting that this is a very straight-forward application. The proposed building coverage is not too substantial. The plans are designed in a way, that any bulk to be added will not be detrimental to the light, air, and open space. He will support the application. Mr. Herbert noted that this particular lot is undersized. The applicant's ask is rather large. He questioned the allowing of two driveways. Mr. Herbert would rather have the existing driveway enlarged to park 2 cars in the driveway and one in the garage. Mr. Tobia stated that overall, the proposed plans would be good for this lot. Mr. Infante was not happy about the two proposed driveways but will support the application. Mrs. Kass also questioned why two driveways were being proposed. It's a small lot for two driveways. Mr. Montague felt a walkway from the garage to the house would be helpful to the applicant, especially in the wintertime. Mr. Hoffman understood that the home needs the proposed building coverage to bring the house up to modern standards. However, he did not like the two driveways.

Mr. Encin stated that the applicant is willing to eliminate the front driveway from the application.

Chrmn. Cifelli brought up Mr. Montague's suggestion of a walkway from the side walk to the mudroom at the back of the house. Mr. DeNave will review this new arrangement.

Mrs. Kass made a motion to approve Application ZB # 20-005 as amended with the front driveway to be removed, a walkway to be installed leading up to the mudroom, and that the applicant must follow any recommendations made by the Borough Engineer regarding stormwater run-off. Mr. Tobia seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken:

Chrmn. Cifelli	-	yes
Mr. Herbert	-	yes
Mr. Infante	-	yes
Mrs. Kass	-	yes
Mr. Montague	-	yes
Mr. Tobia	-	yes
Mr. Hoffman	-	yes

Application ZB #20-005: Bravoco – 71 North Summit Avenue was approved as amended.

At 10:48 p.m. the meeting adjourned.

The next Chatham Borough Zoning Board of Adjustment Meeting will be held on Wednesday, June 24, 2020, 7:30 p.m. A virtual Zoom meeting will be held.

Respectfully submitted:

Elizabeth Holler  
Recording Secretary