

CHATHAM BOROUGH ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

September 26, 2018

7:30 p.m.

Chairman Michael Cifelli called this Regular Meeting of the Zoning Board of Adjustment to order at 7:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers, Chatham Borough Hall. He stated that adequate notice of this Zoning Board of Adjustment meeting was given as required by the Open Public Meetings Act.

Names	Present	Absent
Michael A. Cifelli, Chrmn.	X	
Helen Kecskemety	X	
Frederick Infante	X	
Douglas Herbert	X – arrived 7:34 p.m.	
H.H. Montague	X	
Jean-Eudes Haeringer	X	
Patrick Tobia	X	
Alida Kass	X	
William DeRosa		X
Patrick Dwyer, Esq.	X	

Public Comment

There was none.

Resolution #ZB 2018-16

The Zoning Board of Adjustment minutes of the July 25, 2018 meeting were approved as submitted.

The Zoning Board of Adjustment minutes of the August 22, 2018 meeting were approved as amended.

Returning and New Applications

Chrmn. Cifelli announced the following applications will be carried to the Special Zoning Board Meeting to be held on October 4, 2018:

Application ZB #16-006: 8 Watchung Avenue, LLC

Application ZB #17-30: Main Street Development Group, LLC – 585-589 Main Street

Application ZB #18-01: Hume – 233 Fairmount Avenue

Application ZB #18-16: 548 Main Street, LLC

Chrmn. Cifelli announced the following applications will be heard tonight, time permitting:

Application ZB #18-13: Frey – 7 Ellers Drive

Application ZB #18-14: Williams – 36 Kings Road

Application ZB #18-15: Rajappa – 56 North Summit Avenue

Application ZB #18-17: Catullo – 49 Fairmount Avenue

Application ZB #18-18: Ou – 27 Girard Avenue

Application ZB #18-12: Glenbrook Properties, LLC – 50 Inwood Road  
Application ZB #18-19: Clancy – 24 Essex Road  
Application ZB #18-20: Kopesik – 17 Mercer Avenue  
Application ZB #18-21: Marotta – 23 Oliver Street

The architect for Application ZB #18-21: Marotta – 23 Oliver Street – asked to carry the application. Chrmn. Cifelli consented.

At this point in the meeting, Vice Chairman Douglas Herbert joined the meeting.

Application ZB #18-13

Laura Frey

7 Ellers Drive

Block 33, Lot 42

Side Yard/Building Coverage

Laura Frey, the applicant, was sworn in to testify.

Ms. Frey testified that her home was one of the original concrete block houses in the neighborhood. She bought it in 2010. The house had a family room. Currently the only way to reach the family room is through a very small kitchen. The existing kitchen only measures 10 ft. by 10 ft. Unfortunately, when cooking is going on in the kitchen, there is constant foot traffic to reach the family room.

Ms. Frey pointed out that a majority of the originally styled block homes in her neighborhood are now being demolished. The whole style and dynamics of the neighborhood are being changed with these demolitions. Ms. Frey stated that she really wants to remain in the neighborhood. She has tried, with these proposals, to maintain the character of the neighborhood.

Mr. Infante asked if she had a slab house.

Ms. Frey confirmed that it was a slap house. The exterior of the home is concrete block.

Dana Napurano, the architect for the applicant, was sworn in. She submitted her professional credentials to the Board. The Board accepted them.

Ms. Napurano testified that the applicant's house was built circa 1952. It is a one and a half story high colonial style home. The owner of the house, before Ms. Frey, had constructed a family room at the rear of the house in 1969. A one-story section exists on the right side of the house which serves as a garage. Most of the proposals will be situated at the back of the home. The proposals won't be seen from the street. Only an extension of the roof line will be evident.

Ms. Napurano stated that the applicant is looking to improve some of the deficiencies of the existing home. Ms. Napurano testified that among the deficiencies was the connection between the kitchen, the dining area, and the family room. Ms. Napurano pointed out that the house was constructed on a slab. There currently is no storage in the basement. Some additional storage

space is being proposed. The existing laundry will be moved out of the first-floor bedroom closet into a space on the second floor. Another entry will be created on the side of the house.

Ms. Napurano testified that the existing kitchen only measures 10 ft. by 10 ft. and is very compartmentalized. She described the existing family room. The applicant is proposing a 200-ft. addition in “the nook” of the existing house. Ms. Napurano explained that this addition would create a dining room which could fit a reasonable size table and still allow for circulation. Currently the circulation is very tight for a person walking from the dining room into the kitchen and on into the family room.

Ms. Napurano stated that better circulation will be created to make a more functional kitchen. A good connection will be created between the kitchen and the family room. Another connection will be made between the garage and the mudroom. The proposed side entrance will create another means for the family to enter the home to drop groceries, etc.

Ms. Napurano testified that the house currently has 4 bedrooms. The proposals will make one of the bedrooms more functional. This particular bedroom has taken in the “over-flow” of the laundry area.

Ms. Napurano stated that the proposed two-story addition, on the second floor, will have the new master bedroom. She explained the sloping ceilings and sloping walls of the existing master bedroom. These sloping conditions make it difficult to furnish the bedroom. An extension of an existing shed dormer will increase the size of an existing bedroom, creating adequate headroom. Ms. Napurano stated that the second story of the proposed addition will extend only as far as the kitchen on the first floor. The existing dormer on the right side will expand a little on the right side in order to create a master bathroom. The new laundry room will be created in the center of the house.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked where the intensification was coming from. Ms. Napurano answered the left side yard setback. She pointed out that the proposals for the second floor will not extend beyond the current first floor of the house, except where the dormer is being extended, which is just roof. Ms. Napurano testified that the only place where the footprint of the house changes will be in the center of the house. Ms. Napurano explained how additional storage space will be created

in the attic. The existing garage is currently being used for storage.

As for the exterior, Ms. Napurano noted that all the mortar joints are showing in the concrete blocks of the home. New siding will be applied along the first-floor level. The house will get a new roof and some additional updating. Chrmn. Cifelli confirmed with Ms. Napurano that the first and second floor exteriors will be made uniform.

Michael Lanzafama, the planner for the applicant, was sworn in to testify. Mr. Lanzafama submitted his professional credentials to the Board. The Board accepted them.

Mr. Lanzafama submitted Exhibit A-1: An aerial photo of the applicant’s property and neighborhood.

Mr. Lanzafama testified that the applicant's property is slightly undersized for the R-3 zone. He pointed out to the rear of the applicant's property is property belonging to the Chatham Board of Education. A wooded area serves as a buffer between the applicant's rear property and the Bd. of Education property.

Mr. Lanzafama stated that the existing building has already had some existing non-confirming conditions. The current home does not comply with the Borough's side yard setback requirements. He explained that a C-1 variance is needed for the proposed dormer. Mr. Lanzafama testified that the proposals will not significantly impact on light, air, or open space belonging to the adjoining properties. The existing home is already over the allowable building coverage regulations by 230 sq. ft. Mr. Lanzafama pointed out that the proposed plans are under the allowable FAR regulations. The proposed building coverage is also under the allowable building coverage regulations.

Mr. Lanzafama reviewed the proposed improvements for the house. The circulation of the home will be improved. With the proposals, the current family could possibly "age into" this house. Two quality bedrooms are being proposed for the first floor.

Answering Chrmn. Cifelli's question, Mr. Lanzafama submitted Exhibit A-2 photos of the homes in the neighborhood. He and Ms. Frey reviewed which cinder block homes were still remaining in the neighborhood. Mr. Lanzafama confirmed with Chrmn. Cifelli that the applicant's neighborhood is trending towards demolishing the block homes. Ms. Frey noted that the recent construction done at 11 Ellers Drive is similar to what she is proposing for her home.

Mr. Infante asked how far away the Board of Education building was from the back of the applicant's property.

Mr. Lanzafama answered that the Board of Education building is hundreds of feet away.

Mr. Lanzafama reiterated Ms. Napurano's testimony that the proposed addition is a modest size. The proposed plans are below the allowable lot coverage.

Mr. Herbert asked if there had been a variance for the earlier addition.

Ms. Napurano believed that the addition pre-dates the zoning ordinance.

There were no questions or comments from the public on this application.

Board discussion began. Chrmn. Cifelli felt that the applicant's undersized property makes the proposed lot coverage appear larger than it seems. He pointed out that the proposed bulk will not be visible from the street. Chrmn. Cifelli noted that the existing narrow passageway from the kitchen is a dangerous situation. Mr. Herbert stated that the proposals, at the rear of the home, backs up to an empty area. Mr. Tobia supported the application. Mrs. Kecskemety noted that these concrete block homes, not having basements, seriously lacked for storage. She felt the proposals will help improve this situation. Mr. Montague had no additional comments. Mrs.

Kass felt that the proposals will be a real improvement to the home without any detriments to the neighbors. The proposals will be contained within the existing structure. Mr. Haeringer totally supported the application. Mr. Infante pointed out that an empty lot exists behind the proposed bulk.

Chrmn. Cifelli made a motion to approve Application ZB #18-13: Frey – 7 Ellers Drive with the applicant to follow any stormwater recommendations as stipulated by the Borough Engineer. Mrs. Kass seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken:

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

Application ZB #18-13: Frey – 7 Ellers Drive was approved.

#### Application ZB #18-14

Bradley & Kirsten Williams

36 Kings Road

Block 29, Lot 13

Bradley Williams, the applicant, was sworn in to testify.

Mr. Williams gave an introductory statement. His house is at least 100 years old. On the existing second floor are 4 bedrooms and one bathroom. A bathroom exists in the attic. There is a half bath in the downstairs. The house currently does not have a master suite arrangement. Mr. Williams stated that he would like to use some of the available air space above a first-floor addition which had been constructed several years ago. No changes will be made to the footprint of the house. An existing bedroom will be extended. Some other general improvements will be made to the house.

Mr. Williams discussed the construction projects on either side of his property. He pointed out that Kings Road is currently undergoing a great deal of construction and renovation.

Douglas Miller, the architect for the applicant, was sworn in to testify. Mr. Miller submitted his professional credentials to the Board. The Board accepted them.

Mr. Miller testified that the applicant wants to preserve the style of the 100-year old house, while creating a master suite addition.

Mr. Miller submitted Exhibit A-1: photos of the existing house.

Mr. Miller described the current construction going on either side of the applicant's home.

Mr. Miller reviewed Sheet A-1 showing the current and proposed site plans. The proposed addition will be constructed over an earlier addition on the first floor. This earlier addition was probably constructed in the 1980s, and unfortunately does not match well with the overall style of the house.

Chrmn. Cifelli confirmed with Mr. Miller that the applicant's lot is required to have 12-ft. setbacks on either side. He also confirmed with Mr. Miller if a house was built on that lot, to conform with the ordinance, a 24-ft. wide house would have to be constructed, creating a very narrow dwelling.

Mr. Miller distributed to the Board drawings of the slight modification that has recently been proposed for the interior of the house. The only difference to the proposed exterior would be a change of placement for a window. These drawings were marked as Exhibit A-2.

Using Sheet A-2, Mr. Miller described the existing first floor. No changes will be made to the first floor. Mr. Miller described the existing and proposed floor plans for the second floor. An existing rear bedroom will be converted into a master bathroom and closet space. An access will be created to run from the hall to the new master bedroom. The master bedroom will measure 13 ft. 4 inches by 12 ft. 5 inches. The 3 existing bedrooms will remain.

Using Sheet A-5, Mr. Miller described the proposed elevations. The proposed rooflines will match with those rooflines of the existing house. The new rooflines will tie the aesthetics of the proposed addition into the existing home. He explained why other options would not work with this home. Mr. Miller pointed out that the applicant's home does not go as far back into the rear yard, like the neighboring homes, therefore the light, air, and open space will be preserved.

Mr. Montague discussed the deck situation with Mr. Miller. The deck will be 4 feet off the ground.

After further discussion, the applicant closed his application and submitted it to the Board for consideration.

There were no questions or comments from the public.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked for comments from the Board. Mr. Haeringer felt that there was no other place to put this proposed addition. Mrs. Kass believed that the proposed design will improve the functionality of the property. Mr. Montague had concerns about the side yard setbacks; however, he will support the application. Mrs. Kecskemety believed it was a good design. Mr. Tobia believed that the benefits outweigh the detriments with this application, particularly concerning the side yard setbacks. Mr. Herbert stated that the proposed changes to the interior of the house will make it a better home. Chrmn. Cifelli believed that what was being proposed would be a vast improvement for the home.

Mrs. Kass made a motion to approve Application ZB #18-14: Williams – 36 Kings Road with the applicant to follow any stormwater recommendations made by the Borough Engineer. Mr. Infante seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken:

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

Application ZB #18-14: Williams – 36 Kings Road was approved.

Application ZB #18-15  
Rajesh & Kristin Rajappa  
56 North Summit Avenue  
Block 54, Lot 8

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

Rajesh Rajappa, the applicant, was sworn in to testify.

Mr. Rajappa gave an introductory statement for his application. He explained the need for more room in his house. The house has only one bathroom. His house sits on an undersized lot.

Marjorie Roller, the architect for the applicant, was sworn in to testify. Ms. Roller submitted her credentials to the Board. The Board accepted them.

Ms. Roller testified that the house was built in 1939. The current house has 3 bedrooms and one small bathroom on the second floor. The first floor is small and not too manageable. To make the kitchen more manageable, the applicant has had to bump space into the garage for the refrigerator.

Ms. Roller testified that an open family room/kitchen concept is being proposed for the first floor. A mudroom and powder room are also proposed. For the second floor, a modest-sized master bedroom suite is being proposed.

Ms. Roller discussed the side yard setbacks. She and the applicant will insert a buffer on the side yard which will have the least impact on the neighborhood. Ms. Roller testified that some overhangs will be constructed over the garage door. A new covered porch will be constructed in the front. Ms. Roller stated that 137 sq. ft. over the allowable building coverage is being proposed. The applicant is hoping to reclaim his garage for his car. The application is not the allowable FAR or lot coverage.

Answering a question from Mr. Herbert, Ms. Roller testified that the existing sunroom at the rear of the house will be removed. In place of the sunroom, an addition will be constructed across the back of the house. It will measure 31 ft. 6 inches by 17 ft. 6 inches on the first floor. The ridge of the house will be raised to create a clean elevation for the front of the house.

Board members discussed the existing shed with Ms. Roller. The shed contributed 80 sq. ft. towards the building coverage. It will remain in its current location.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked where the additional 57 sq. ft. of building coverage was located. Ms. Roller explained the existing constraints of the sizeable lot. Chrmn. Cifelli felt the mudroom was a major factor. He noted that in terms of actual living space, the applicant was seeking 57 sq. ft. on the second story.

Ms. Roller gave planning testimony. She pointed out that the homes in the neighborhood are repetitive. Ms. Roller discussed a Google aerial map where she had superimposed the applicant's proposed addition. This map was submitted as Exhibit A-1. Using this exhibit, Ms. Roller pointed out that the applicant's home with the proposed addition would be consistent, bulk-wise, in size with the nearby homes.

Mr. Infante commented that what the applicant is proposing will not disturb the sight line, compared to some of the neighboring homes.

Mr. Montague asked that dimensions be included in the elevations. The Board had questions on the heights, existing and proposed.

Ms. Roller submitted Exhibit A-2: a photo showing the space between the applicant's home and the neighbor's house. Ms. Roller felt the photo proved that there is plenty of space between the two structures. That situation will not change with the proposals. She felt the proposals would be a reasonable request for the applicant's property.

There were no questions or comments from the public for the witnesses.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked for comments from the Board. Mr. Infante felt the proposals will not be an impact on the neighborhood. He will support the application. Mr. Herbert felt the addition was a great improvement to the house. He felt the intensification would be more than warranted in this particular situation, given what the applicant will be doing to the home. Mr. Tobia noted that the proposals will not disturb the sidelines. The addition is very practical. Mrs. Kecskemety pointed out that the addition will be in keeping with the neighborhood. Mr. Montague will support the application. Mrs. Kass felt the balance between detriments and benefits with this application is very positive. Chrmn Cifelli stated that the plans were well done.

Mrs. Kass made a motion to approve Application ZB #18-15 with the applicant to follow any stipulations on stormwater as recommended by the Borough Engineer. Mr. Tobia seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken:

Mr. Tobia                      -                      yes



Mr. Montague	-	yes
Mr. Infante	-	yes
Mr. Herbert	-	yes
Mrs. Kecskemety	-	yes
Mrs. Kass	-	yes
Chrmn. Cifelli	-	yes

Application ZA #18-15: Rajappa – 56 North Summit Ave. was approved.

At 9:08 p.m. a break was taken in the meeting.

At 9:20 p.m. the meeting resumed.

A representative of Application ZB #18-19: Clancy – 24 Essex Road asked that the application be carried. The Board consented that the application be carried.

Application ZB #18-17

Jeff & Christine Catullo

49 Fairmount Avenue

Block 118, Lot 24

Side Yard/Rear Yard/Building Coverage

Jeff & Christine Catullo, the applicants, were sworn in to testify.

Mrs. Catullo gave an introductory statement. She described the existing conditions of the house. The core of the house dates 1856. The basement is fieldstone. Mr. Catullo testified that there are two staircases in the home that he literally cannot go down. He has to go down sidewise. Mr. and Mrs. Catullo explained the feedback they have received from builders. They do not want to leave their premises. They are now proposing to build from scratch and create a long-term home for their family.

Mrs. Catullo stated that the proposal is to construct a home that faces Second Street. The driveway will be on Second Street. The current driveway on Fairmount Ave. has proved to be unsafe. Chrmn. Cifelli asked if the applicants had a current floor plan.

Mrs. Catullo submitted Exhibit A-1: existing floor plan sketch.

Andrew Clarke, the applicant's engineer, was sworn in to testify. He submitted his professional credentials to the Board. Mr. Clarke testified that he is also a licensed surveyor.

Mr. Clarke submitted "The Proposed Development Plan" that he had prepared for the applicant's proposed new home. On these plans, on the upper left corner, Mr. Clarke pointed out the existing conditions, based upon a survey he had taken of the applicant's property.

Mr. Clarke testified that the existing house is narrow and deep, and faces Fairmount Avenue. He described the existing driveway and garage. The existing porch has an open porch. He

described the existing topography of the applicant's property. This topography, in general, will be maintained. Most of the trees on the site will be kept.

Mr. Clarke testified that the proposed house will be oriented to face Second Street. The new driveway will be to the left of the proposed home. A two-car garage will be constructed with the appropriate setback. A wrap-around porch will go across the balance of the house frontage on Second Street, and wrap-around onto Fairmount Avenue. These proposals will make the rear yard more usable as recreation space for the family.

Mr. Clarke reviewed the proposed rear yard and side yard setbacks. He testified that the proposed porch pushes the plans over the allowable building coverage. He felt in terms of the lot depth, there is a little bit of a hardship condition. Mr. Clarke believed that the detriments for the plans are very minor in nature. The plans will give the neighbor on Lot 25 a better perception of the applicant's property.

Mr. Clarke stated that two existing trees will be removed. One tree sits directly in the proposed driveway footprint. The other tree is a street tree. It's also an ash tree which has caused damage to the curb and the sidewalk. The homeowner has been in dialogue with the Borough Shade Tree Commission. The applicant can work with the Shade Tree Commission in replacing these trees.

Mr. Clarke discussed with Board members how the proposed home would line up with the neighboring houses. Directly across the street from the proposed home are the Fish & Game tennis courts.

The public had no questions for Mr. Clarke.

John Lyons, the architect for the applicant, was sworn in to testify. He submitted his professional credentials to the Board. The Board accepted them.

Mr. Lyons reviewed the proposed first floor plans. The wrap-around porch is proposed for the house to give a face to both Fairmount Ave. and Second Street. A chimney will face Fairmount Ave. A mudroom and office space will connect the kitchen to the one-car garage. The proposed second story will have 3 bedrooms, a laundry room, and a hall bath. A master suite and master bathroom will be constructed over the garage.

Using Sheet A-1.2, Mr. Lyons described the proposed attic. A stair will lead up to the attic. The attic will be used for storage space. Mr. Lyons described the front entrance of the proposed home. Mr. Lyons pointed out on the right elevation where the porch wrapped around the house. French doors will lead into the dining room. The chimney will run through the family room.

Mr. Montague asked what the height of the home would be.

Mr. Lyons answered that the overall height will be 33.7 feet.

Mr. Lyons submitted a survey of the neighboring homes that have porches or porticos, along with their square footages. The applicant's proposed porch is over the 285 sq. ft., however will be in keeping with the neighborhood.

Mr. Herbert asked what drove the interior design of the house.

Mr. Lyons felt that the proposed second floor drives the size of the house. Four bedrooms are being proposed.

Mr. Herbert asked Mr. Lyons, as the architect, what did he do aesthetically to make this proposed home as it was viewed by people heading up Fairmount Avenue.

Mr. Lyons felt that the gambrel roof, the stone chimney, and the wrap-around porch would be the main elements of the proposed design. It will catch people's eye as they travel up Fairmount Ave.

Mr. Montague pointed out that chimneys aren't seen on that side of Fairmount Avenue. He felt that most people like to see a front door on Fairmount Ave.

Chrmn. Cifelli felt that the front door which is being proposed mimics what exists on the current house.

Mr. Montague had concerns about the chimney being located on Fairmount Avenue of the home.

Mr. Herbert asked for more testimony on why the driveway is being moved from Fairmount Avenue to Second Street.

Mr. Catullo testified to the unsafe conditions of having his driveway on Fairmount Ave. He has been hit by a car at that location. Also, the school buses line up directly from his driveway. Also, traffic from Borough Hall exits close to his driveway.

Chrmn. Cifelli brought up Mr. Montague's point about the location of the proposed chimney. Mr. Haeringer asked Mr. Lyons if it was possible to bring the proposed porch across the entire front. Mrs. Kass pointed out that Mr. Lyons and the applicant have designed a showcase house. The only problem is the other showcase homes on that street face out onto Fairmount Avenue. Chrmn. Cifelli felt the house will be sort of entrance way of sorts of Fairmount Avenue.

With permission from Mr. Cifelli, Mr. Lyons and the applicants conferred in private for a few minutes.

Returning to the Board, Mr. Lyons stated that Mr. and Mrs. Catullo would be happy to extend the porch across the front of the proposed home, thus covering the proposed chimney on the first level. The proposed entry door will remain where it is.

Attorney Dwyer labeled the marked-up plans as Exhibit B-1.

After further discussion, Chrmn. Cifelli felt another side front yard setback existed because of an encroachment. Mr. Haeringer and Mr. Lyons discussed the porch. Mr. Lyons testified the extension of the porch would measure 5 ft. 6 in. It would be a usable porch.

Mr. Herbert asked if the Board would be voting on these revised plans tonight.

Attorney Dwyer pointed out that there are no real plans tonight.

Chrmn. Cifelli concluded that Mr. and Mrs. Catullo should re-submit plans consistent to what the Board is permitting. With the newly proposed porch arrangement, the new side yard setback would be 24.5 feet. The porch would then be giving a visual block to the chimney. Fieldstone will be used for the proposed chimney.

Attorney Dwyer confirmed with Mr. Lyons that there will be no stairs on the Fairmount Avenue side of the home.

Chrmn. Cifelli did not feel comfortable voting on the revised plans just yet. He asked Mr. Lyons if he could make the revisions on the plans and submit them in time for the special Zoning Board meeting next week on October 4<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Lyons answered yes.

Mrs. Kecskemety asked what the length of the proposed home was, on the Second Street side.

Mr. Lyons answered that the overall length of the house would be 58 feet 3 inches.

Chrmn. Cifelli announced that Application ZB #18-17: Catullo – 49 Fairmount Avenue will continue to the October 4, 2018 Special Zoning Board Meeting.

Chrmn. Cifelli asked if the public had any questions or comments on the application thus far.

Fran Drew, 32 Inwood Rd., noted that she is a member of the Chatham Borough Shade Tree Commission. She reported last year Honor Tree Service had treated Borough ash trees to protect them from the Emerald Ash Borer. She felt that the treatment did work.

Mr. Herbert asked what about the ash tree belonging to Mr. and Mrs. Catullo.

Mrs. Drew asked Mr. and Mrs. Catullo who had they spoken with on the Shade Tree Commission.

Mrs. Catullo answered that she and her husband had an arborist do an evaluation of this particular ash tree. The arborist recommended that this tree should be taken down because of its age and other issues. The Shade Tree Commission will have their arborist look at the tree next. The tree will be inspected again in the spring. Mrs. Catullo stated that the Commission had told her that the tree was okay for now, but within a year it may have to be taken down.

Mrs. Drew gave an update on what the new tree ordinance stipulates. Residents now have to follow regulations when removing a tree on their private property.

She reminded Mrs. Catullo that public sidewalks, uprooted by trees, can always be repaired. She thanked the Board and Mrs. Catullo for their time.

Attorney Dwyer asked if there had been any discussion on whether there will be a replacement for the tree for the one removed.

Mrs. Catullo answered that a review would have to be done to see if their lot could handle a replacement tree. The sidewalk creates a narrowness where the replacement tree would be planted.

Chrmn. Cifelli announced that the remaining applications on the agenda, which weren't heard tonight, will be carried to the Regular Zoning Board of Adjustment meeting scheduled for October 24, 2018.

At 10:20 p.m. the meeting adjourned.

A Special Zoning Board of Adjustment meeting will be held on Thursday, October 4, 2018, 7:30 p.m., Council Chambers, Chatham Borough Hall.

The Regular Zoning Board of Adjustment meeting will be held on Wednesday, October 24, 2018, 7:30 p.m., Council Chambers, Chatham Borough Hall.

Respectfully submitted:

Elizabeth Holler  
Recording Secretary