



*Janice E. Talley, PP/AICP
Director of Planning and Community Development
jtalley@montclairnjusa.org*

MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT October 19, 2011

PRESENT: Chair Harrison, Mr. Burr, Ms. Cockey, Ms. English, Ms. Holloway, Mr. Susswein, and Mr. Whipple; also, Mr. Sullivan, Esq., and Mr. Charreun, Assistant Secretary

ABSENT: Vice Chair Fleischer, Mr. Edwards, and Ms. Talley, Secretary

Assistant Secretary Charreun called the roll and announced the regular meeting of the Montclair Board of Adjustment. Notice had been given in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act.

On motion by Mr. Whipple, seconded by Mr. Susswein, the **Minutes of the September 21, 2011** regular session were adopted as modified, Mr. Burr, Ms. Cockey, Ms. English, and Ms. Holloway abstaining.

On motion by Mr. Whipple, seconded by Mr. Susswein, the following resolution memorializing the Board's decision on the application of **Catherine Bebout, 222 Fernwood Avenue** was adopted as modified, Mr. Burr, Ms. Cockey, Ms. English, and Ms. Holloway abstaining:

WHEREAS, Catherine Bebout, owner of property at 222 Fernwood Avenue, did make application to the Board of Adjustment of the Township of Montclair for variances pursuant to NJSA40:55D-70c to construct a detached garage on a corner property designated as Lot 32 in Block 1807 on the Township tax map and located in the R-1 One-Family Zone; and

WHEREAS, the applicant requested the following variances:

1. A variance from Montclair Code Section 347-46A(1) to exceed the maximum permitted height of 15 feet; and
2. A variance from Montclair Code Section 347-46A(3) for a rear yard setback of less than 6 feet from the southerly property line; and
3. A variance from Montclair Code Section 347-46C to allow the new garage to be located closer to Valley Road than the dwelling; and

WHEREAS, the applicant submitted a property survey dated April 21, 2011 and plans prepared by John Guadagnoli, Architect, PC dated August 14, 2011; and

WHEREAS, this matter came on to be heard at a regular meeting of the Board of Adjustment held on September 21, 2011 at which time it was established that notice was properly published and the property owners within 200 feet of the property in question had been properly served notice; and

WHEREAS, the Board carefully reviewed the testimony presented and established the following findings:

1. The property is an irregularly shaped corner lot at the southeasterly corner of Fernwood Avenue and Valley Road, located in the R-1 One Family Zone, and contains a single family dwelling.

2. Variances are requested for the proposed construction of a detached garage. The proposed garage is replacing a detached garage on the property that was recently required to be completely removed in order to facilitate an environmental remediation project on the property.

3. The maximum permitted height for the proposed garage is 15 feet. The testimony at the public hearing indicated that the height of the previously existing garage was nonconforming at 16 feet 2 inches. The proposed garage would have a height of 17 feet 10 inches and requires a variance. Dormers are also proposed on the southerly and northerly sides of the garage roof.

4. The minimum permitted rear yard setback for the proposed garage is 6 feet. Based on Montclair Code Section 347-25 of the zoning ordinance and the dimensions of the subject corner lot, the southerly property line is the rear property line and the easterly property line is the side property line.

5. The footprint of the previously existing garage measures approximately 20 feet by 20 feet, is positioned at an angle to the rear property line, and has a nonconforming rear setback of 1.69 feet and 3.62 feet at the southerly corners of the garage. The proposed garage footprint would be 22 feet wide by 23 feet long, and would be parallel to the rear property line with a proposed rear setback of 3 feet, which requires a variance.

6. As a corner lot, the Valley Road property line is a front property line. The dwelling has a Valley Road front yard setback of approximately 42.92 feet. Accessory buildings are not permitted to be closer to a front property line than the principal building on the lot. The previously existing garage is nonconforming, being located 24.84 feet at its closest point to the Valley Road front property line. The proposed garage would be 21.5 feet from the Valley Road front property line, and a variance is requested.

7. The testimony provided at the hearing indicated that the proposed height of 17 feet 10 inches would allow for increased accessibility within the second floor

storage area, and that the property grades downward from Valley Road, which reduces the impact of the proposed height. The applicant also requested that the Board consider granting a variance for the previously existing height of 16 feet 2 inches should the proposed height of 17 feet inches not be approvable.

8. The testimony also indicated that the proposed rear yard setback and Valley Road front yard setback are largely dictated by the location of the previously existing garage, the size and shape of the corner lot, the location of the dwelling on the lot, and the small size of the existing rear yard space.

9. The Board determined that the variance for the rear yard setback could be approved, as it represents an overall improvement from the previously existing rear yard setback. The variance for the Valley Road front yard setback could also be approved based on the reasons given, subject to a minor adjustment to the footprint as specified below.

10. The Board also determined, however, that no variance could be granted for the height. Considering the variances being granted for the rear yard setback and the Valley Road front yard setback, a height greater than permitted would have a negative impact on nearby properties and the streetscape; and

WHEREAS, the Board concluded, based upon the foregoing findings regarding the variance requested to exceed the maximum permitted height, that the applicant did not prove peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties and exceptional and undue hardship and did not prove that the variance could be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and would not substantially impair the intent and purpose of the zone plan and the zoning ordinance pursuant to NJSA40:55D-70C(1); and

WHEREAS, the Board concluded, based upon the foregoing findings regarding the variance requested to exceed the maximum permitted height, that the applicant did not prove that the purpose of the Municipal Land Use Law would be advanced by a deviation from the zoning ordinance requirements, and did not prove that the benefits of the deviation would substantially outweigh any detriment and that the variance could be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and would not substantially impair the intent and purpose of the zone plan and zoning ordinance pursuant to the requirements of NJSA40:55D-70C(2); and

WHEREAS, the Board concluded, based upon the foregoing findings regarding the variances requested for the rear yard setback and the Valley Road front yard setback, that the applicant proved peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties and exceptional and undue hardship and proved that the variances could be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and would not substantially impair the intent and purpose of the zone plan and the zoning ordinance pursuant to NJSA40:55D-70C(1); and

WHEREAS, the Board concluded, based upon the foregoing findings regarding the variances requested for the rear yard setback and the Valley Road front yard

setback,, that the applicant proved that the purpose of the Municipal Land Use Law would be advanced by a deviation from the zoning ordinance requirements, and proved that the benefits of the deviation would substantially outweigh any detriment and proved that the variances could be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and would not substantially impair the intent and purpose of the zone plan and zoning ordinance pursuant to the requirements of NJSA40:55D-70C(2); and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Adjustment of the Township of Montclair that the variance requested to exceed the maximum permitted height is denied, and the variances requested for the rear yard setback and the Valley Road front yard setback are approved, subject to the following condition:

1. The southwesterly corner of the proposed garage shall be no closer to the Valley Road front property line than that of the previously existing garage, maintaining the size and configuration of the garage as proposed.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the applicant, Township Manager, Township Council and Township Clerk.

It was announced that at the request of the applicants, special meeting dates to continue the applications of **Omnipoint Communications, Inc., 153 Park Street** and **T-Mobile Northeast, LLC, 118 Watchung Avenue** would be selected at the Board's regular meeting on December 14, 2011. The Board was granted an extension of time on both applications.

The continuation of the application of **French Institute Alliance Francaise, 37 North Mountain Avenue & 323 Claremont Avenue** was announced. Chair Harrison stated that the 7 Board members present were eligible to vote on the application. Calvin Trevenen, Esq., appeared as attorney for the applicant, and recalled Paul Sionas, Architect and Professional Planner, who was still under oath. Mr. Sionas stated that at the last hearing the Board expressed concerns about the existing site lighting and whether it was suitable in the evening hours. He stated that he has met with the property manager, inspected the site lighting and nearby street lighting, and prepared a lighting plan to explain the location and type of existing light fixtures. He noted that some of the existing light fixtures had not been regularly used in recent months, and that the applicant would assure that all of the existing light fixtures were operable and functioning when needed. Mr. Sionas stated that when all of the existing light fixtures are in operation, there is sufficient lighting on the property. He also clarified the purposes of the fenced in or partially fenced in trash or storage areas abutting the northerly side property line.

Exhibit marked:

A-5 Sheet SP-2 Lighting Plan dated 10/5/11

The Board briefly questioned Mr. Sionas. Mr. Sionas stated that the floodlights on the north side of the Georgian Inn could be adjusted to assure that the exit driveway onto North Mountain Avenue is sufficiently illuminated. Comments were offered from the public. Jane Bandler, 48 Warfield Street, was sworn and stated her support for the application. Mr. Trevenen summarized the application and requested that the Board vote on the application.

The Board discussed the application and determined that the application could be approved subject to conditions. Approval of this application is consistent with the intent and purpose of the Master Plan which seeks harmonious development which will not harm the quality of life of surrounding neighborhoods, encourages shared off-street parking, and preserves historic sites. Approval of this application advances the purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law. This unique site is particularly suited for FIAF's proposed use as the first floor of the carriage house is of sufficient size to accommodate all activities and the testimony established safe and efficient vehicular on-site traffic circulation. Based upon the Board's particular knowledge of local conditions, the application will not adversely impact the public good. Subject to compliance with condition 1, the site will contain 54 parking spaces which is sufficient to provide for the proposed mix of uses. Exhibit A-5 which depicted 18 existing building-mounted lights and one street light which the Board determined provided adequate on-site lighting. The Board determined the signs are appropriate and necessary to facilitate identification of FIAF's proposed use.

On motion by Mr. Susswein, seconded by Mr. Whipple, the application was approved, subject to the following conditions:

1. Parking Space number one and associated enclosure shall be removed and the vehicle may be relocated on site provided it does not render the parking nonconforming or block drive aisles.
2. Approved signs shall be limited to the sign plan prepared by Sionas Architecture, PC dated September 21, 2011 introduced at the September 21, 2011 public hearing as Exhibit A-3.
3. Hours of operation shall be limited to Monday through Saturday 8:30 a.m. to 9:30 p.m.
4. A Certificate of Appropriateness shall be obtained from the Historic Preservation Commission prior to any improvements to the façade including but not limited to signage and lighting.
5. Additional fencing shall be added to the trash enclosure in order to screen it in accordance with the Ordinance.
6. This approval is limited to utilization of the first floor of the carriage house.

7. A directional sign shall be added at the exit driveway on North Mountain Avenue in conformance with Section 347-108J.

8. The applicant shall be responsible for all inspection fees required under Montclair Code Section 202-27 as well as escrow fees incurred in connection with review of this matter.

The application of **Nigel & Amber Gilbert, 3 Bellaire Drive** was called. Nigel Gilbert, and Paul Sionas, Architect, were sworn. Mr. Gilbert stated that the dwelling has attached garage at the basement level that is accessed by a driveway from Bellaire Drive that slopes down towards the garage. He stated that the existing sloping driveway and basement level garage door facing the street are unattractive and difficult to use due to the narrowness of the driveway and the garage door opening, and the bend and the slope in the driveway. The property has experienced a severe flooding problem. A large amount of storm water collects in the driveway and fills the basement causing damage to the property.

Mr. Sionas described the application. The property is a corner lot located at the intersection of Bellaire Drive and Valley Road, and the yard situated between the dwelling and the Valley Road property line is a front yard. The new parking area would be located in the Valley Road front yard of the property, which requires a variance. To correct the problems associated with the existing driveway and garage, the existing garage door opening will be removed and filled in with a new masonry wall. The existing sloped driveway will be removed and the existing sloping driveway area will be filled in and elevated up to the adjoining grade level. A bilco type basement door would be added to maintain access to an existing pedestrian door that is located the bottom of the existing driveway next to the existing garage door. A new 19-foot wide driveway would be constructed on the newly graded area. The proposed driveway would overlap much of the existing driveway footprint. A 20-foot wide parking area for 2 vehicles positioned side-by-side is proposed at the end of the driveway.

Exhibits marked:

- A-1 to A-7 Photographs of the flooding on the property and associated damage
- A-8 Plot Plan, with color added, 7/26/11
- A-9 The 1993 set of plans for the building addition and garage

The Board questioned the applicant. No questions or comments were offered from the public. The Board discussed the application and determined that the requested variance could be approved subject to a condition specified below. The existing driveway and basement level garage are poorly designed, are unattractive and difficult to use, and are contributing to the severe flooding of the driveway and basement of the dwelling. The applicant demonstrated that there are limited areas on the corner lot for a conforming parking area that would not cause further removal of landscaped areas and impact the already limited rear yard space. The proposed parking area would be effectively shielded by existing evergreen hedges along the Valley Road front property line that will be maintained as a condition of approval. On motion by Mr. Whipple,

seconded by Ms. Cockey, the application was approved, subject to the following condition:

1. An evergreen hedge at a minimum height of 4 feet tall shall be maintained along the Valley Road front property line, extending at minimum from the required Bellaire Drive front setback line depicted on the plans northward to align with the northernmost end of the proposed parking area.

The application of **Alex Davies, 250 Upper Mountain Avenue** was called. Alexandra Davies, and, John Reimnitz, Architect, were sworn. Ms. Davies briefly described the project and stated that they will be utilizing environmentally sensitive and conservation techniques where possible. Mr. Reimnitz described the property and plans in detail. The property is located in the R-0 Mountainside Zone, measures 49,120 s.f. in lot area and 186.61 feet in frontage width, and contains a single family dwelling with an attached garage located at the ground level at the front wall of the dwelling. The dwelling is proposed to be enlarged with a variety of additions. The basement, first floor, and second floor would be expanded in several areas. An attic floor is proposed over part of the dwelling and the dwelling would have new roofline. A detached garage is proposed in the rear yard that complies with the zoning requirements.

Mr. Reimnitz stated that the minimum permitted front yard setback for additions to the dwelling is approximately 222 feet, which is the average front yard setback of the 4 nearest dwellings, 2 on either side of the property. The dwelling has an existing nonconforming minimum front yard setback of approximately 134.5 feet. The entire existing dwelling is located forward of the required front yard setback requirement. All of proposed additions to the dwelling require a variance for a front yard setback less than required. He explained the plans thoroughly and stated that based on the zoning ordinance and the plans proposed; the dwelling would not exceed 2½ stories. He stated that the applicant would withdraw the request for the variance to exceed 2½ stories. The property is located in the Steep Slope Area. The applicant has started the process of preparing grading and drainage plans for review pursuant to Township ordinances prior to any construction.

Exhibits marked:

- A-1 Sanborn Map illustrating the front yard setback requirement
- A-2 First Floor Plan, John Reimnitz Architect, PC
- A-3 South and West Elevations, John Reimnitz Architect, PC
- A-4 Photographs of subject property and adjoining properties
- A-5 East Elevation with color added, John Reimnitz Architect, PC
- A-6 North and East Elevations, John Reimnitz Architect, PC
- A-7 Topographic Survey, by Casey & Keller, Inc.
- A-8 Grading, Drainage, & Sediment Control Plan, by Casey & Keller, Inc.

The Board questioned the applicant. Mr. Reimnitz provided more information regarding the design of the dwelling, the 2½ story limitation, and the grading and drainage plans. With the exception of a deck enlargement, which extends 1.5 feet closer

to the front property line than the existing deck, all of the proposed additions are either aligned with the existing front setback of the dwelling, or are set back further than the existing front setback of the dwelling. The deck extension would have a front yard setback of approximately 133 feet. Questions and comments were offered from the public. Alan Martin, 246 Upper Mountain Avenue, was sworn. Mr. Martin stated that he has observed drainage problems on his property. He expressed concerns about the applicant's grading and drainage plans. He also inquired about potentially creating a grading and drainage plan for both properties, in which he would share in the cost. The Board questioned Mr. Martin and the applicant. Paulina Caploon, 227 Highland Avenue, was sworn and stated her support for the application.

The Board discussed the application. The Board confirmed that a variance for exceeding 2½ stories was neither necessary nor granted. The Board also determined that the requested variance for the front yard setback could be approved subject to the conditions specified below. The required front yard setback makes it impossible for the applicant to construct the proposed additions without variance relief. The proposed additions, with the exception of the deck extension at the front of the dwelling, would not further reduce the nonconforming front yard setback and would comply with all other zoning requirements. On motion by Mr. Whipple, seconded by Mr. Burr, the application was approved, subject to the following conditions:

1. The proposed deck extension at the front of the dwelling shall be limited to a maximum of 1.5 feet beyond the front yard setback of the existing deck.
2. The applicant shall submit the required grading and drainage plans to the Board Engineer for review and approval prior to construction. The applicant shall be responsible for required inspection fees and escrows.

The application of **Chris & Krekamey Craig, 111 Elm Street** was called. Chris & Krekamey Craig were sworn. Variances are requested to construct a detached garage in the rear yard of the property. Mr. Craig stated that he is a licensed Architect and that he prepared the plans. He also stated that he is a licensed general Contractor as well. Mr. Craig described the application. The property is located in the R-2 Two-Family Zone and contains a one-family dwelling. A driveway exists on the southerly side of the dwelling that leads to the rear yard. The Sanborn Map depicts that a previously existing garage in the rear yard in the area of the proposed garage, and that the garage was very close to the property lines. They have owned the property since 2003. The previously existing garage was not on the property when they purchased it. He does not know when the garage was removed. There are currently freestanding landscape walls and a flagstone surface in the area where the previous garage existed. These structures are not part of the previously existing garage. A detached garage is proposed in this area of the rear yard, with a footprint measuring 28 feet in width by 24 feet in length. The minimum permitted side and rear yard setbacks for the detached garage are 6 feet. A side yard setback of 3 feet is proposed from the southerly side property line, and a rear yard setback of 3 feet is proposed from the rear property line. The maximum permitted height for the garage is 15 feet. A height of 20 feet is proposed and the garage would also have shed dormers without windows. The reason for the proposed

height is to allow for storage and to have the style of the garage more closely match that of the home. The roof leaders from the garage would discharge storm water away from the side and rear property lines.

Exhibits marked:

- A-1 Existing Conditions plan with color
(Referred to as Exhibit E-1 by Mr. Craig)
- A-2 Photograph of the rear yard

The Board questioned the applicant. Mr. Craig stated the neighbors would benefit from the proposed height, since it would allow him to store his personal construction equipment in the garage and hide it from view. He also stated that the garage height could be lowered to 17.5 feet. Questions and comments were offered from the public. Maxine Johnston, 107 Elm Street, was sworn and stated her concern about ongoing construction and noise from the applicant's property, and asked how long it would take to complete the garage. Mr. Craig stated that the garage would take approximately 8 weeks to complete. Ms. Craig stated that they have done extensive work to the home and greatly improved the property. She also stated that they are willing to take their neighbors concerns about construction time length and noise into consideration.

The Board discussed the application determined that the requested variances for the southerly side yard setback and the rear yard setback could be approved. It is evident that a nonconforming detached garage previously existed in the same area of the rear yard. The proposed side and rear setbacks are in keeping with the setback variances that are granted for detached garages on lots of a similar size and condition of the subject property. The requested setback variances can be approved, subject to a condition specified below, without negatively impacting adjoining properties. The Board also determined that no variance could be granted for the height. Considering the variances being granted for the southerly side yard setback and the rear yard setback, a height greater than permitted would have a negative impact on adjoining properties, and the applicant's reasons for the height variance do not satisfy the required criteria for the granting of such a variance. On motion by Mr. Whipple, seconded by Mr. Susswein, the application was approved, subject to the following condition:

1. Storm water collected from the roof of the garage shall be directed away from the southerly side property line and the rear property line.

The application of **David Koschik & Izumi Hara, 52 Wayside Place** was called. Mr. Whipple was recused. Izumi Hara, and Architect, David Rosen, were sworn. Ms. Hara briefly described the project. Mr. Rosen described the application. Variances are requested associated with a proposed addition to the easterly side of the dwelling and a proposed 3-car detached garage in the easterly yard of the property. The property is an irregularly shaped corner lot formed by a bend on Wayside Place. The lot contains a single family dwelling with an attached garage located at the ground level on the easterly wall of the dwelling. The property has 2 front yards: westerly and southerly. The westerly Wayside frontage measures a total of 202.16 linear feet; the southerly Wayside

frontage measures a total of 135.11 linear feet. Based on the zoning ordinance, and the dimensions of the 2 lot frontages, the rear yard, which is opposite the frontage of least dimension, is the northerly yard. The easterly yard is the side yard.

Mr. Rosen described the plans. An addition is proposed on the easterly side of the dwelling. A small mudroom will be added at the northerly side of the dwelling under the roof of an existing roofed entrance. A smaller roofed entry way with steps would then be added in this area as well. The existing ground level garage on the easterly wall of the dwelling would be removed to accommodate the addition. The sloping grade level down to the existing garage would be raised and be more level as it surrounds the perimeter of the addition. The proposed addition is approximately 79 feet from the southerly front property line. He stated that due to the highly irregular street and lot pattern of the lots with frontage on the "dead end" section of Wayside Place, the average front yard setback of the 2 nearest dwellings with frontage in that section of Wayside Place should not be considered in determining the required southerly front yard setback for the subject property, and that no variance was requested.

The minimum permitted rear yard setback from the northerly property line is 43.9 feet, which is 30 percent of the lot depth as defined. The existing dwelling is already nonconforming with a rear setback of 18.5 feet to some portion of the existing stair/landing on the northerly side of the dwelling. The new entrance and stair in this area has a rear setback of 17.2 feet. The proposed addition is setback approximately 19 feet from the northerly property line, and a variance is requested. A detached 3-car garage is proposed in the easterly yard of the property to replace the existing ground level garage under the dwelling. The footprint of the garage measures 39 feet 3 inches wide by 23 feet 3 inches long. The majority of the footprint of the proposed garage is located in what is the side yard of the property by definition, and variance is requested since accessory buildings are only permitted in rear yards. The northerly property line is the rear property line. The proposed 13.2 foot setback for the detached garage complies with the 10 foot minimum permitted for accessory structures from the rear property line in the R-0 Zone. The easterly property line is the side line, where a minimum of 12 feet is permitted for accessory structures in the R-0 zone. A side yard setback of 10 feet is proposed and a variance is requested.

Exhibits marked:

- A-1 Photograph of the westerly front façade of the dwelling
- A-2 Photograph of the southerly front façade of the dwelling
- A-3 Photograph of the street corner formed by the bend in Wayside Place
- A-4 Photograph of the rear of the easterly side of the dwelling
- A-5 Aerial Photograph
- A-6 Site Plan Diagrams, 9/26/11

The Board questioned the applicant. No questions or comments were offered from the public. The Board discussed the application and determined that the requested variances could be approved. The variances associated with the application are largely technical in nature due to the atypical conditions of this corner lot and its dimensions. If

not for the orientation of the side and rear yard determined by the dimensions of the frontages, the proposal would be compliant with zoning. The proposed addition and detached garage will not negatively affect any adjoining property, as there is a sufficient distance between the dwellings. On motion by Mr. Burr, seconded by Ms. English, the application was approved.

Mr. Whipple rejoined the Board. The application of **Eric Carlson & Bridget Eklund, 303 Highland Avenue** was called. Eric Carlson, and Architect, Carmen Lenzi, were sworn. Ms. Lenzi described the application and the plans. A variance is requested associated with a proposed addition on the northerly side the dwelling. The property is located in the R-0 Mountainside Zone, measures 160 feet in width by 200 feet in depth, and contains a single family dwelling with an attached garage located on the northerly side of the dwelling. In July 1980, the Board of Adjustment approved a front setback variance to construct the currently existing attached garage on the northerly side of the dwelling. The requirement for the front yard setback at that time was 50 feet. A variance was granted to permit a front yard setback of 33 feet for the addition. In the current application, the existing attached garage and breezeway that was approved in 1980 would be demolished. An addition consisting of a new 2-car garage and a family room is proposed in the general area of the existing garage, but with a new design, shifted location, larger footprint, and with a different shape. The garage and family room would be connected to the dwelling with a new breezeway largely consisting of glass. The minimum permitted front yard setback for the new construction is 50 feet. The applicant is proposing the existing 33 foot front yard setback for the proposed addition, although with the new design, large size, new shape, and shifted location, it does not match the 1980 approval, and a new variance is requested.

The Board questioned the applicant. Ms. Lenzi described the practical problems with the design alternatives that conform and the design alternatives that would be less within the required front yard setback than proposed. She and Mr Carlson indicated that existing tree preservation was a main goal the proposed design, and additional trees would also be added to the property. Questions and comments were offered from the public. Hal Wolkoff, 14 Ingleside Road, was sworn. He described problems he's experienced with storm water runoff and expressed concerns about the proposed project in that regard. The Board discussed the application. Several Board members expressed concerns with the proposed enlargement of the structure within the required front yard setback and the shifting of the addition to the north. The applicant decided to postpone the Board's vote, and to look further into design alternatives that are less within the required front yard setback and/or differently positioned. Chair Harrison announced that the application would be continued at the November 16, 2011 meeting of the Board and that no further notice would be required.

On motion by Mr. Whipple, seconded by Mr. Susswein the meeting was adjourned.