



Township of Montclair

205 Claremont Avenue

Montclair, NJ 07042

tel: 973-509-4954

fax: 973-509-4943

MONTCLAIR ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT



**Graham Petto, AICP**  
**Assistant Planner**

*Department of Planning and Community Development*  
*gpetto@montclairnjusa.org*

## MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT JUNE 15, 2016

**ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 7:35 p.m. by Graham Petto. Mr. Petto read the notice of compliance with the New Jersey Open Public Meetings Act and indicated that appropriate notice was forwarded to the officially designated newspaper of Montclair and posted in the Municipal Building. The schedule of meetings is also posted on the Township website.

**ROLL CALL:** Mr. Petto called the roll. Present were Mr. Harrison, Mr. Fleischer, Mr. Susswein, Mr. Reynolds, Ms. Baggs, Mr. Allen, Ms. Chowaniec, Mr. LaVail, Mr. Sullivan, and Mr. Petto. Ms. Checca and Mr. Moore were excused.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Mr. Harrison introduced the minutes of the May 18, 2016 Board meeting. He noted a few edits to the minutes as presented. Ms. Baggs also provided a few edits.

A motion to approve the minutes as amended was offered by Mr. Fleischer, seconded by Mr. Reynolds. The minutes were approved unanimously with Mr. Allen and Ms. Chowaniec abstaining.

### **OLD BUSINESS:**

**Resolution for App 2437: Mark & Kristy Iannarelli. 225 Park Street. Bulk variance for a rear yard setback.**

Mr. Harrison introduced the resolution. Ms. Baggs noted a minor edit to the resolution as presented.

A motion to approve the resolution as amended was offered by Mr. Fleischer, seconded by Mr. Reynolds. The resolution was approved unanimously with Mr. Allen and Ms. Chowaniec abstaining.

**Resolution for App 2451: Yimin You & Larry Qiu. 767 Valley Road. Bulk variance for accessory structure setback.**

Mr. Harrison introduced the resolution. Ms. Baggs noted a minor edit to the resolution as presented.

A motion to approve the resolution as amended was offered by Mr. Fleischer, seconded by Mr. Reynolds. The resolution was approved unanimously with Mr. Allen and Ms. Chowaniec abstaining.

**Resolution for App 2454: Matthew & Nicole Masso. 553 Grove Street. Bulk variance for fence height exceedance.**

Mr. Harrison introduced the resolution. Ms. Baggs noted a minor edit to the resolution as presented.

A motion to approve the resolution as amended was offered by Mr. Fleischer, seconded by Mr. Reynolds. The resolution was approved unanimously with Mr. Allen and Ms. Chowanec abstaining.

**App 2003: Wallwood Gardens, Inc. 400 Orange Road. *Site plan***

Mr. Harrison introduced the application. No one was present on behalf of the application.

Mr. Sullivan stated that a resolution has been prepared for the Board that will dismiss the application based on the lack of response and appearance by the applicant.

A motion was made by Mr. Fleischer, seconded by Mr. Reynolds to dismiss the application and approve the resolution as presented. The application was dismissed and the resolution was approved by the Board unanimously.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**App. 2461: Scott & Diane Marshall. 5 Cornell Way. *Bulk variance for front and side yard setbacks, building coverage and building width.***

Mr. Harrison introduced the application. Present on behalf of the applicant was attorney Calvin Trevenen.

Mr. Trevenen summarized the application. He noted that the applicants have lived in Montclair since 1995 and recently purchased the subject property, which they intend to occupy.

Mr. Trevenen noted that the application intends to reuse the existing foundation on the subject property. He stated the intent is to construct a one-and-a-half story dwelling on this foundation.

Mr. Trevenen introduce Mr. Joe Bruno, architect for the applicant.

Mr. Bruno reviewed the plans for the application. Mr. Bruno also reviewed Exhibit A-1, a packet of seven photographs of the subject property in its current condition.

Mr. Bruno reviewed the plans in detail and noted that the non-conforming side yard of the dwelling would be eliminated. He also noted that a new addition would be constructed to the rear of the dwelling to accommodate a new master bedroom. He stated that the front porch area would be covered under the plan. He also noted that the building width would be reduced.

Mr. Bruno reviewed the change in building coverage and the proposed size of the modified dwelling. Mr. Bruno stated that the total square footage would be about 3,066.

Mr. Bruno noted that there is one large pine tree near the southeast corner of the existing dwelling. He noted that this tree was too close to the house and was negatively impacting the structure. He stated this tree would be removed.

Questions from the Board were then accepted.

Mr. Fleischer asked about the attic space and if it would be occupied. Mr. Bruno said the space would be used for storage and mechanical equipment. He noted that there are no plans for occupancy.

Mr. Fleischer asked about the finished height of the ceiling of the attic. Mr. Bruno stated it would be eleven feet.

Mr. Fleischer noted that the plans do not prevent any use of the attic. Mr. Trevenen stated that the applicant has not contemplated occupancy use of the attic.

Mr. Fleischer asked for clarification on the reuse of the existing foundation. He asked if these new garage would be within the existing basement. Mr. Bruno replied yes. He noted that the existing foundation walls of the basement would be reused.

Mr. Fleischer asked if the existing driveway area on the side of the existing dwelling would be infilled and the grading in this area restored. Mr. Bruno referred to photo #5 of Exhibit A-1 and stated that the grade would not be manipulated.

Mr. Fleischer noted that approximately six to seven feet of the front yard would need to be excavated to reach the basement level. Mr. Bruno reviewed access to the garage and the existing driveway/garage access. He noted that the proposed addition for the master bedroom would be over a portion of the existing driveway.

Mr. Reynolds asked if the proposed rear addition would meet the grade of the rear yard under the proposed plan. Mr. Bruno replied yes.

Mr. Fleischer asked for further clarification of the garage location and the existing driveway. Mr. Bruno detailed the garage location and the driveway for Mr. Fleischer on the plans.

Mr. Trevenen introduced Mr. Scott Marshall, applicant, to provide testimony.

Ms. Baggs asked about the proposed use of the new basement. Mr. Marshall noted that there are no formal plans for use of the basement. He noted that there would be a laundry room, which will be located in the basement. He noted that the remaining basement would be unfinished.

Ms. Baggs asked if the basement would have any living space. Mr. Marshall replied no.

Ms. Baggs asked about the height of the proposed retaining wall adjacent to the new proposed driveway. Mr. Bruno noted that they would be 6.5 to 7 feet in height nearest the dwelling, and the walls would lower in height towards the street.

Ms. Baggs asked if a drainage plan would be prepared for the application. Mr. Bruno replied yes. Ms. Baggs asked if the area has a history of drainage problems. Mr. Bruno replied no.

Mr. Harrison asked about the portico over the stairs and if there would be any extension towards the street beyond the end of the existing stair. Mr. Bruno replied no.

Mr. Harrison asked if the highest elevation of the property was on the western side. Mr. Bruno replied yes and noted that the property has been graded.

Mr. Harrison asked if both retaining walls around the existing driveway area in the rear yard would be removed. Mr. Bruno replied yes.

Mr. Harrison asked if the area would be filled behind the new addition to ensure the area behind the addition will meet the existing grade of the rear yard. Mr. Bruno replied yes.

Mr. Harrison asked if the existing driveway would be removed and the area would be landscaped. Mr. Bruno replied yes, and he noted that the applicant intended to minimize impact to the neighbor.

Mr. Harrison asked if the proposed driveway area in the front yard would need to be excavated to ensure the proposed driveway would meet the relocated garage area in the basement. Mr. Bruno replied yes.

Mr. Harrison asked if the elevated landscaped area between the existing driveway and the proposed driveway would be retained. Mr. Bruno replied yes.

Mr. Harrison returned to the retaining walls to be located on the western side of the proposed driveway. He noted that the height of these walls, proposed to be 6.5 to 7 feet in height, would require an additional variance from **Montclair Code 347-27.1(B)**.

Mr. Fleischer noted that the inclusion of any guard rail atop the proposed retaining wall would also count towards the height of the wall, as noted in the code.

Mr. Harrison reviewed the side yard setback. He asked if the west side of the dwelling would be adjusted to meet the required side yard setback. Mr. Bruno replied yes.

Questions from members of the public were then accepted.

Howard Krongard, 9 Cornell Way, asked about the western elevation and what rooms would be located in the upper story windows. Mr. Bruno stated those windows would be located in the attic level.

Mr. Krongard asked what room would be located on the first floor of the western elevation. Mr. Bruno stated the dining room would be in this area.

Mr. Krongard asked if this was the location of the existing porch on the existing dwelling. Mr. Bruno replied yes.

Mr. Krongard asked if the large tree on this side of the dwelling would remain. Mr. Bruno replied yes.

Following public questions, Mr. Trevenen requested a two minute recess. The Board agreed to the request.

Following the recess, Mr. Trevenen stated that the applicant would like to add a variance to the application for the height of the proposed retaining wall, subject to **Montclair Code 347-27.1(B)**, **Montclair Code 347-27.1(H)** and **Montclair Code 347-27.1(I)**.

Mr. Trevenen then called Mr. Roger De Niscia, professional planner for the applicant to testify.

Mr. De Niscia reviewed the project and summarized the variances requested by the applicant. He also summarized the impacts on the zone plan. He noted that the application would advance purposes a, g and i of the MLUL.

Questions from the Board were then accepted.

Mr. LaVail asked if the new basement was included in the proposed building coverage calculation. Mr. Bruno replied yes, noting that the 3,066 square feet of space was for the entire structure. He stated that the basement was not counted twice towards the building coverage.

There were no questions of the planner from the public.

Comments on the application from the public were then accepted.

Howard Krongard, 9 Cornell Way, asked what the height of the peak of the roof would be along the western elevation of the proposed dwelling. Mr. Bruno stated that it would be 26 feet in height and that the existing dwelling is 15 feet in height.

Mr. Paul Sionas, 60 Heller Way, stated that his property abuts the rear of the subject property. He noted that he has resided at his property for 34 years. He stated the application is good and during his time residing in the area the subject property has not undergone any improvements. He stated the proposed storm water management for the property is good. He stated that he was pleased to see the application.

Mr. Trevenen summarized the application and noted that the plan fits the context of the neighborhood and will improve the dwelling.

Final comments from the Board were then accepted.

Mr. Fleischer stated that he was generally in favor of the application. He stated he would not be in favor of the additional variance for the height of the proposed retaining wall adjacent the west side of the driveway. He noted that the driveway as proposed is very wide, and could be reconfigured to reduce the height of the proposed retaining wall.

Mr. Reynolds stated that he would be in favor of the application. He noted that the retaining wall variance may not be the best solution and was not in favor of that variance request.

Ms. Baggs stated that she could be in support of the application if some conditions of approval were added. She noted that a condition that the house not exceed 1 ½ stories should be added, if possible. She also requested a condition that a storm water management plan be submitted prior to the issuance of building permits. Ms. Baggs also noted that she was unsure how the retaining walls could be adjusted to eliminate the need for a variance. She stated that the height of the walls should be minimized. She stated that the reuse of the existing foundation would minimize the loss of trees on site and would advance principles of the Township's Conservation Plan Element of the Master Plan. She also noted the Township's Storm Water Management Element recommends a maximum of 40% impervious coverage, whereas the applicant proposes 35%. She noted the application is consistent with those goals.

Mr. Allen stated that overall it was a good application and he would be in favor. He also noted that a condition regarding the storm water management plan would be good.

Mr. LaVail stated he agreed with Mr. Fleischer's comments. He stated he would support the application but not the variance for the proposed retaining wall.

Ms. Chowaniec stated that she would also be in favor of the application. She noted that she agreed with Ms. Baggs regarding a proposed condition that the house not exceed 1 ½ stories. She stated that the application represented a benefit to the neighborhood. She also noted that she would be in favor of the variance for the retaining wall.

Mr. Harrison stated that he had no concerns about the front yard variance for the covered entry. He also noted that the side yard variance represented an existing condition of the foundation of the dwelling, which would be reused. He noted that the maximum building width variance also represented an improvement of the existing condition. Mr. Harrison also noted that while the building coverage is increasing, the impervious area is maintained and the applicant will prepare a storm water management plan. He also noted that the proposed addition would not be visible from the street.

Mr. Harrison summarized the proposed conditions of approval:

1. The proposed dwelling is not to exceed 1 ½ stories.
2. The applicant is to prepare a storm water management plan to be reviewed by the Board Engineer.
3. The previous driveway location area at the side and rear of the house is to be appropriately landscaped.

Mr. Harrison stated that the testimony provided by the applicant does not justify the variance for the proposed retaining wall. He noted that other options do exist and should be evaluated.

A motion was made by Mr. Fleischer to approve the application as submitted without the requested variance for the retaining wall, subject to the conditions stated by Mr. Harrison. The motion was seconded by Mr. Reynolds. The application was approved unanimously.

**App. 2462: Roger & Michele Murray. 141 N. Fullerton Avenue. Bulk variance for swimming pool location on lot.**

Mr. Harrison introduced the application. Present for the application were Mr. Roger Murray and Ms. Michele Murray.

Mr. Murray summarized the application. He noted that the application was for the installation of an above ground pool. Ms. Murray reviewed the materials submitted with the application for the Board.

Questions from the Board were then accepted.

Ms. Baggs asked about adjacent uses in the area. Ms. Murray replied that most of the houses in the area are multi-family. She noted that their property is one of the few single-family dwellings in the area.

Mr. Allen asked when the house was built. Mr. Murray stated the house was built in about 1890.

Ms. Chowaniec asked if hedges would be planted along the property line and proposed fence enclosure. Mr. Murray replied yes.

Mr. Fleischer stated that the code requirement for a minimum side yard setback of ten feet with a dense hedge was intended for safety. He noted that there is a building adjacent to the proposed pool location on the subject lot. Mr. Fleischer asked if the fencing will surround the pool in its entirety. Mr. Murray replied yes.

Mr. LaVail asked if any decking was to be installed around the pool. Ms. Murray replied no, noting that only the pool would be installed. She noted that there will be an additional locking gate to be located at the base of the pool ladder.

Mr. Harrison asked if the width of the lot was estimated on the plans. Mr. Murray replied yes and stated that the width was estimated to be 31 feet.

Mr. Harrison noted that the lot does narrow as it moves rearward from the street. He stated that it may not be 31 feet wide in this location.

Mr. Harrison asked if the adjacent masonry building located next to the proposed pool location was accessed from Fidelity Place. Mr. Murray replied yes.

Final comments from the Board were then accepted.

Mr. Reynolds stated that he would be in favor. He noted that the lot does present a hardship. He also noted that the ordinance related to swimming pools was written for in-ground pool installations and this was an above-ground pool. He stated he would be in favor of also fencing around the pool.

Ms. Baggs stated she would be in favor. She noted that a condition that shrubs be planted along the side lot lines. She also noted that the pump and filtration equipment should be located away from the lot lines.

Mr. Allen stated that he would be in favor and agreed that a condition that the pool area be fenced should be added.

Mr. LaVail stated he would be in favor.

Ms. Chowaniec stated that she would be in favor. She agreed with Ms. Baggs' comments that shrubbery should be included.

Mr. Fleischer stated that he would be in favor. He noted that a 10 foot setback should be maintained on one side of the pool. He stated that shrubs should be carefully planted so as not to reduce the area around the pool given the narrow lot. He also noted that the fence should be installed to protect the pool area.

Mr. Harrison stated that he would be in favor. He noted that the lot is exceptionally narrow and is narrower than most. He stated that there would be no detriment particularly given the situation of the building on the adjacent lot. Mr. Harrison summarized the following conditions of approval:

1. The pool is to be set back 10 feet from the northern property line.
2. The pool is to be no more than 12 feet in width.
3. Shrubs are to be planted along the northern property line, consistent with the requirements of Montclair Code 305-6(A).
4. Fencing is to be installed around the pool area, consistent with requirements of Montclair Code 305-12.

5. The location of all pumps and filtration systems shall comply with Montclair Code 305-6(D).

A motion was made by Mr. Reynolds to approve the application with the conditions as stated by Mr. Harrison, seconded by Mr. Fleischer.

The application was approved unanimously.

**App. 2448: The Deron School. 130 Grove Street. Site plan approval.**

Mr. Harrison introduced the application. Present on behalf of the applicant was Mr. Stephen Hehl, attorney for the applicant.

Mr. Hehl summarized the application to expand the northern parking lot on the subject property.

Mr. Hehl introduced Mr. Brett Skapinetz, engineer for the applicant, to review the site plan. Mr. Skapinetz reviewed the proposed modifications and expansion to the parking lot.

Questions from the Board were then accepted.

Mr. Fleischer asked about the total number of spaces in the lot. Mr. Skapinetz stated that there would be nine spaces along the existing building and 14 tandem spaces in the expanded parking area.

Mr. Fleischer asked if the applicant considered adding the four or five additional spaces to the southern parking lot. Mr. Skapinetz stated that was considered, however he noted that there is a grade change, an existing retaining wall and large trees in the area where the southern parking lot could be expanded. He noted that the tandem parking spaces would not be for use by the public and would be managed by the employer.

Mr. Harrison asked about the variance for front yard parking. Mr. Skapinetz noted that eight of the tandem spaces are located in the front yard along Christopher Street.

Mr. Harrison asked if any landscaping was proposed. Mr. Skapinetz replied yes and reviewed the location of the proposed landscaping on the corresponding plan sheet.

Mr. Harrison asked if the door on the Oxford Street side of the building was used as an entrance. Mr. Skapinetz replied yes.

Mr. Hehl then introduced Mr. Malcolm McBurney, consulting arborist and tree expert for the applicant.

Mr. McBurney reviewed the plans in context of the large tree located adjacent to the proposed parking lot expansion. Mr. McBurney stated that there would be no negative impact of the proposed parking lot expansion on the tree.

Questions from the Board were then accepted.

Mr. Harrison asked how deep the ground would be dug to accommodate the new parking surface. Mr. McBurney stated that a 4-6 inches base of gravel or stone would be used. He noted that the digging for the parking area will not be a concern if the roots are properly pruned.

Mr. Harrison asked how far the roots extend into the proposed parking area. Mr. McBurney replied that there are no visible surface roots which indicate a vibrant and extensive root system.

Mr. Fleischer asked if the finish grade height of the parking area expansion would be higher than the existing ground height. Mr. Skapinetz replied yes and noted that this installation method reduces the impact on the tree. He also noted that there is no curbing of the parking area, which further reduces any impact.

Mr. Fleischer asked if there would be any compaction near the tree. Mr. McBurney replied yes, there would be a minimal compaction area. He stated that the area of impact is quite small and will be able to recover.

Mr. Fleischer asked if the applicant would be open to a condition to replace the tree. Mr. McBurney noted that there are many other factors that can kill the tree.

Mr. Fleischer noted that the testimony has indicated that the tree will not be damaged. He recommended a condition that the tree should be replaced per Montclair Code.

Ms. Chowaniec asked if there was a plan to care for and mulch the tree. Mr. McBurney replied yes that the tree would be properly maintained.

Questions from the public were then accepted.

Mr. John Michura asked if the other trees on the subject property were evaluated. Mr. McBurney replied yes and noted that other trees in the area were evaluated.

Mr. Michura asked about the previous expansions by the applicant of the school facility and if trees were not maintained on the property. Mr. McBurney stated that there are no concerns about the trees on the subject property.

Mr. Michura stated that the applicant is a good steward of both the building on the property and the trees.

Ms. Chowaniec asked if the accessible parking was located in the south lot only. Mr. Skapinetz replied yes.

Mr. Hehl introduced Mr. Kenneth Alter, director of the Deron School to testify on the parking situation at the school.

Mr. Harrison asked if the applicant had pursued changes to the on-street parking regulations to accommodate parking for school staff. Mr. Alter replied yes and noted that the pending ordinance to change the on-street parking regulations for the school has not proceed to the Council.

Mr. Harrison noted that the applicant previously appeared before the Planning Board in 2014 to create a multi-use parking area. He asked how many spaces were included in that application. Mr. Alter replied yes.

Mr. Harrison asked what has changed since the previous application for 8 additional spaces. Mr. Alter stated that the recent on-street parking regulation change resulted in a need to accommodate all of the parking for staff on-site.

Mr. Harrison asked about the switch from permeable pavers under the previous application to the Planning Board to a non-permeable surface. Mr. Skapinetz stated

that runoff would not be handled well using the permeable paver system. He noted that maintenance is required to ensure the permeable pavers remain functional and that they are not appropriate for daily use in this application.

Mr. Harrison noted that in 2007 testimony to the Board of Adjustment for the first variance request, the applicant stated that the parking lots were sufficient for the use. He asked what has changed since 2007 that more parking is required. Mr. Alter stated that the student population is increasingly disabled and requires additional staff support.

Mr. Harrison asked how many staff were employed at the school. Mr. Alter replied there are 73 employees, 7 of which are part-time and 2 of which work at night.

Mr. Hehl then introduced Mr. George Williams of the Nishuane Group, professional planner for the applicant.

Mr. Williams reviewed the proposal to expand the parking lot. He reviewed the planning criteria and noted that overall the benefits of the application would outweigh any detriments.

Questions from the Board were then accepted.

Mr. Harrison noted that the original approval by the Board of Adjustment was not based on available street parking. He asked how this would impact the evaluation by the Board. Mr. Williams stated that previously staff has been parking on Oxford Street and that the applicant would like to shift these employees to park on-site.

Final comments from the public were then accepted.

Dr. Renee Baskerville addressed the Board. She stated that she is in favor of the application. She noted that the applicant has done an outstanding job responding to questions and comments by neighbors and local officials. She also noted that neighbors in the area became concerned about the on-street parking two years ago. She stated that the Council place a 2-hour restriction on Oxford Street which has created a parking problem in the area.

Mr. Harrison asked why there was no parking permitted on the west side of Christopher Street for the applicant. He also asked why a permit parking system could not be established similar to the other school facilities in the Township.

Dr. Baskerville stated that other requests for on-street parking permits have been denied. She noted that other businesses in the area have requested on-street parking, however, they have been denied. She stated that she would be in favor of an on-street system if all requestors for on-street permits could be accommodated. Dr. Baskerville also noted that other arrangements could be made to solve the parking issue in the area, such as a shuttle bus.

Mr. Harrison noted that there is ample parking at the end of Label Street near the train tracks up to the arena. However, he noted there are no permits available despite the available spaces.

John Michura, 29 Brookfield Road, stated that he would be in favor of the application. He noted that much in the area has changed with the train and bus access. He noted that competition for parking has increased and that the plan represents the best

solution. He noted that the removal of cars from the street will improve the condition and safety in the area for children. He stated the application represents the best solution for the children.

Mr. Hehl summarized the testimony presented to the Board and the application. He noted that overall the application is inherently beneficial.

Final comments from the Board were the accepted.

Ms. Baggs stated that she would be in favor of the application. She noted that the expansion of the parking lot benefits to the surrounding neighborhood to accommodate the additional parking off the street. She noted that efforts to minimize the impact of the lot expansion by protecting the trees and screening the lot from the street were well considered by the applicant. She noted the reasons presented by the applicant for not using permeable pavers is sensible as debris build up limits the permeability of the pavement. She also noted the applicant will reduce the number of cars parked on the street and the streets in the area are already busy. She reiterated she would be in favor.

Mr. Allen stated he would also be in favor of the application. He noted the area is very busy and the streets adjacent to the school property need to remain clear for safety. He stated the plan is considerate of the trees on the property and is a good design.

Mr. LaVail stated he would be in favor. He noted appreciation for the efforts to protect the tree. He stated the tandem parking seems to be a good solution to accommodate additional parking spaces.

Ms. Chowaniec stated she would be in favor. She said the design was thoughtful. She noted that tree maintenance and care should be a condition of approval, in addition to tree replacement consistent with requirements of Montclair Code. She noted that providing parking off-street is a good alternative.

Mr. Fleischer stated he would be in favor. He stated the conditions of the original approval have not changed much. He stated that the tandem parking spaces are not the best choice and that additional spaces could be created elsewhere on the lot. He agreed with Ms. Chowaniec that a condition to replace the tree should it be damaged during construction should be added to the approval.

Mr. Reynolds stated he would be in favor of the application. He noted the tandem parking arrangement would be for employees only, which makes the arrangement more manageable. He noted appreciation for the arborist testimony.

Mr. Harrison stated that he was concerned that the applicant has not presented a parking study as required by the ordinance. He stated the applicant has not clearly presented how the parking situation at the subject property has changed since 2007. Mr. Harrison stated that the application has not met the burden of proof. He stated that the parking needs of the school and the adjacent neighborhood have not been evaluated by the applicant.

Ms. Baggs expressed concern about the proposed parking tandem arrangement. She noted that an approval could set a precedent that tandem arrangements are acceptable.

Mr. Harrison stated that the situation of the school property is unique and the proposed tandem arrangement will be regulated. He stated this could distinguish the approval from another situation.

Ms. Baggs stated that she was also concerned that granting the variance without the submission of a parking study may also set a negative precedent.

The Board noted the lack of a parking study was a concern.

Mr. Hehl requested to consult with the applicant.

Following the consultation, Mr. Hehl stated the applicant would have a parking study/traffic impact study prepared for the next meeting of the Board of Adjustment on July 20, 2016. He requested the application be carried to this meeting.

The Board agreed to the request to carry the application to the July 20, 2016 meeting date.

**App. 2457: Ronald DeMyers, Sr. Agency, Inc. 119 Grove Street.** *Use variance for professional office on first floor in N-C: Neighborhood Commercial Zone.*

Mr. Petto noted that a correspondence had been received from Mr. Alan Trembulak, on behalf of the applicant. He noted that the applicant has requested an extension to the July 20, 2016 meeting of the Board of Adjustment. Mr. Harrison stated that the application would be carried with no further notice.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

A motion to adjourn the meeting was offered by Mr. Fleischer, seconded by Ms. Baggs. The meeting was adjourned at 11:45pm, June 15, 2016.

Respectfully submitted,



Graham Petto, AICP  
Zoning Board of Adjustment Assistant Secretary