

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD
ZONING HEARING BOARD
MINUTES – JUNE 16, 2020

The regular meeting of the Zoning Hearing Board of the Township of Lower Makefield was held remotely on June 16, 2020. Mr. Zamparelli called the meeting to order at 7:38 p.m.

Those present:

Zoning Hearing Board: Anthony Zamparelli, Chair/Temporary Secretary
Pamela VanBlunk, Vice Chair
Matthew Connors, Member
Peter Solor, Member
Michael Tritt, Member

Others: James Majewski, Director Planning & Zoning
Adam Flager, Zoning Hearing Board Solicitor
John B. Lewis, Supervisor Liaison

APPEAL #20-1857 – TIMKO FAMILY ASSOCIATES, L.P.
TAX PARCEL #20-016-096 – NORTH WEST CORNER OF INTERSECTION OF
EDGEWOOD ROAD AND SANDY RUN ROAD

Mr. Zamparelli stated they have requested a Continuance until July 21.
Mr. Flager noted that their attorney, Edward Murphy indicated that
their Witnesses were not available tonight.

Mr. Solor moved, Ms. VanBlunk seconded and it was unanimously carried
to grant a Continuance until July 21, 2020.

APPEAL #19-1846 – MARIA JIMINEZ/GALVIS c/o JOHN CARMONA
TAX PARCEL #20-033-001 – 236 OXFORD VALLEY ROAD

Mr. Zamparelli stated they have requested a Continuance as their attorney
is withdrawing. Mr. Zamparelli asked how much time they are requesting,
and Mr. Flager stated it is a sixty-day request. Mr. Flager stated their attorney
has withdrawn his appearance for both this and a matter in Court. He stated
they are requesting sixty days in order to prepare everything properly and a
letter was sent to that effect. Mr. Zamparelli asked if there is an issue with the
time. Mr. Flager stated Plans were submitted to Mr. Majewski, and they want

to know from Mr. Majewski if those Plans are sufficient. Mr. Flager stated if additional Plans are needed they may need an additional Extension, but at this time they are requesting sixty days so it would be the second meeting in August.

Mr. Zamparelli asked Mr. Majewski if they have submitted any Plans; and Mr. Majewski stated their attorney did submit Plans, and the Plans are good enough to consider the matter at hand. He added that there may be some Code issues they may want to review. Mr. Zamparelli asked why they need sixty days instead of thirty. A member of the Jiminez/Galvis family indicated that they could not afford the lawyer fees any more and because of COVID, they are not at all prepared. She stated they want more time to get everything together and be able to work without a lawyer or make more money to get one.

Mr. Zamparelli asked if Architectural Plans have been submitted to Mr. Majewski, and the Applicant indicated that they have. Mr. Zamparelli asked if they will be ready to represent themselves in sixty days, and the Applicant stated that is the Plan.

Ms. VanBlunk moved, Mr. Solor seconded and it was unanimously carried to Continue the Appeal until August 18, 2020.

APPEAL #20-1861 – JAMES E. MILLWARD
TAX PARCEL #20-042-311 – 341 SHERWOOD DRIVE

Mr. Flager marked the Exhibits as follows: The Application was marked as Exhibit A-1. The Site Plan was marked as Exhibit A-2. The reasons for the requested relief was marked as Exhibit A-3. The impervious surface break down was marked as Exhibit A-4. The shed information was marked as Exhibit A-5. The Pool Plan/Dig Plan was marked as Exhibit A-6. The Hot Tub and Gazebo Sketch Plan was marked as Exhibit A-7. Exhibit A-8 is an additional Site Plan with setback information. The Proof of Publication was marked as Exhibit B-1. The Proof of Posting was marked as Exhibit B-2. The Notice to the neighbors was marked as Exhibit B-3.

Mr. James Millward was sworn in and stated his Mother purchased the house in 1990. He stated he married in 1996 and moved out for twenty years. He then moved back into the house and re-built the house about four years ago. He stated there is nothing in the back yard at all at this time other than his shed. Mr. Millward stated the walkways out front are not there and they need to be done because they put the porch on and

landscaping was added. He stated he and his wife would like to put a pool in so he can keep his family in the area. He stated they would like to put in the pool and patio to finish it.

Mr. Millward showed a Plan and noted the green arrows which are underground gutter drains. He stated he had them put in because they had serious erosion and very bad run-off. He stated the house is on the corner of Sherwood and Friar, and the retention basin is behind his house. He stated he moved all of his gutters underground to go to the retention basin. He stated he had a fence put in three years ago and he lost almost a foot of ground underneath his rear fence at a location where the yellow line is on the Plan. Mr. Millward stated he put in a small garden wall and running all of the gutters to the base of that to try to solve the run off problem which he believes he has done. Mr. Millward stated he now wants to put the pool in. He stated he will level out the yard.

Mr. Millward stated with regard to the shed. He stated the Plan sent to the Board is the Build Plan for when he had the shed built. He stated it sits on a stone pad, and it is moveable if needed; however, because of the erosion he did not have any other place to put it. He would like to keep the shed at that location if possible.

Mr. Zamparelli stated there is a dimensional issue with the shed. He asked if the underground gutters were installed under a Permit and reviewed by the Township engineer. Mr. Millward stated it was not as he did not think he had to do that because according to what he read on the LMT site, he was able to put his run-off into open space/the retention basin where it was all going anyway. Mr. Zamparelli asked if the gutters are coming from the rainspouts from the roof, and Mr. Millward agreed. Mr. Zamparelli asked Mr. Majewski if that is something that would be appropriate to go into the retention basin, and Mr. Majewski stated it is; however, the reason you would want a Permit for that is so that if the contractor does something that creates a problem for the homeowner, the homeowner has some manner of recourse. He stated they probably should have had a Permit.

Mr. Zamparelli stated the impervious surface will increase from 16.55% to 25%. Mr. Zamparelli asked how this relates to the gutter run-off. Mr. Majewski stated according to the Stormwater Management Ordinance, they need to control the run-off from the additional impervious surfaces either through the planting of trees, an underground seepage bed, etc. in order to soak up some of the water before it gets to the basin. Mr. Zamparelli asked Mr. Millward would consider this as part of an Approval. Mr. Millward

stated he was planning to do some flower beds along the fence and try to put a French drain behind the pool so that if there was any run-off it would go out through the gutters off of his house.

Mr. Millward apologized for not putting the gutters on a Permit adding the reason he installed them was because he had so much erosion that over a three year time, he dropped almost one foot at his back fence. He stated on the Plan above the shed where it says, "25258," the fence sits right in front of that; and he stated he has already in some bushes along that fence line. Mr. Millward stated at the fence on the other side of the house where it comes off the driveway there is a small walkway that he wants to put in, and the fence comes across there about 6', and then runs all the way back to the property line on the back corner. Mr. Millward stated he is also going to put bushes along that as well including arborvitaes. He stated they will also probably add some flower beds around the pool and along the back fence including rose bushes and stone gardens with other plants in order to soak up the water.

Mr. Zamparelli stated what Mr. Millward is describing is all plants to mitigate this, and he asked Mr. Majewski if that is appropriate for this or should he install a dry well which he feels would be better. Mr. Majewski stated he feels a combination would work, and Mr. Millward would have to work with the Township engineer to come up with something that would be appropriate. Ms. VanBlunk stated traditionally they have not relied upon just plants because the next homeowner could remove them. She stated since she has been on the Board they require something more like an underground seepage bed. Mr. Majewski agreed, and they would need to do something more substantial than just flower beds unless underneath the flower beds had a stone trench that would absorb the water and/or trees. Mr. Zamparelli stated he agrees with Ms. VanBlunk that the Board has for many years required something more permanent that cannot be changed by the next homeowners. He asked Mr. Millward if he is willing to work with Mr. Majewski and the Township engineer to do something besides just plants. He added that what is being requested is a high percentage.

Mr. Solor stated that he agrees that it needs to be something more substantial as this is a significant amount of area. Mr. Solor asked if the porch was added or was it there and re-built. Mr. Millward stated the porch in the front was Permitted when they did the house four years ago. He stated it is the front section that says "39 feet," going right in front of "walkway 1." He stated walkway 1 and walkway 2 connect to it.

He stated that porch was added four years ago when they did the full plan of the house. Mr. Solor asked if there was any infiltration associated with that expansion, and Mr. Millward stated there was not as far as he knows. He stated it was done by the contractor, and the Plans were submitted through them. Mr. Tritt stated he does not believe they have hit the threshold because they are still only at 16% impervious coverage right now so it would not have necessitated having anything done at that time.

Mr. Millward stated he did mention a French drain. He stated was considering going from one drain all the way to the other drain and putting a 60' French drain in all the way across there, and he asked if that would be suitable for the run-off. Mr. Zamparelli stated that would have to be sent to Mr. Majewski for his review to see if that is okay. Mr. Majewski stated he has done some rough calculations, and a 60' long trench would probably be sufficient; and they would have to work out what the depth would have to be. Mr. Majewski stated they would have to work out the details and would be subject to review and approval by the Township engineer as to the required width and depth.

Mr. Zamparelli stated he feels that would be the only way that the Board would consider approving this, and Mr. Millward stated he did plan on doing this anyway. He stated if everything is going to go in "the yard will come up," and he did not want to bury the French drain too deep across the back. Mr. Zamparelli asked Mr. Millward what he means by "the yard will come up," and he asked if he is going to raise the grade. Mr. Millward stated it will come up probably 4". He stated it will still slope, but he has such run-off and erosion that he needs to bring it back up again as the yard slopes away "real bad." Mr. Zamparelli stated he will have to submit that to Mr. Majewski for approval.

Ms. VanBlunk stated this is an older home, and the impervious surface requirement is 18%. She asked what they are trying to get the effective rate back down to, and she asked if they are trying to get it back down to 18%. Mr. Millward stated 25.1% is what it would be. Mr. Majewski stated what they would be looking for, and what is required by Ordinance, is that they need to control the stormwater for all the additional impervious surface and that includes the shed even though it is already there since technically it was not Permitted. He stated the sidewalk, pool decking, etc. all need to be added. He stated they will need to take it down to the current number which is 16.6% impervious surface. Mr. Majewski stated in this case they are not using an effective number since they are well "below the starting line."

He stated the Board could grant the Variance for impervious surface ratio of “25.1%” subject to review and approval of the stormwater management system by the Township engineer. Mr. Zamparelli and Ms. VanBlunk asked Mr. Majewski to clarify the percentage number. Mr. Majewski stated typically on a lot of cases, 18% is what is allowed; but many of the properties in the Township already exceed that percent. He stated what the Zoning Hearing Board often does is to indicate that they advise the Applicant that they do not expect them to go back to what it was when the house was built, but that they should take it back to where they are now with an effective rate that may be over the 18% or some number slightly lower. He stated in this case, the Board does not have to worry about that because they are under the 18%, and they will have to control all the stormwater that they are creating. Mr. Zamparelli stated they would therefore have to go back to 16.55%, and Mr. Majewski agreed. Ms. VanBlunk asked if that is not unreasonable, and she feels there should be an effective rate of 18%, as going to 16.55% would be asking him to do more than what is required. Mr. Majewski stated what he is speaking to is required under the Stormwater Management Ordinance, and that requires that he control all additional impervious surfaces.

Mr. Connors asked if the detention system was designed with the understanding of maximum build out for the Code at that time, or was it just based on what was built. Mr. Majewski stated they do not have the information on that. He stated he does not know whether the basins have ever built up to overflowing. Mr. Millward stated he has been there since 1990, and the highest he ever saw was the storm of 1996; and since then they have been fine. He stated they have come up and overflowed a little bit, but they have never made it into his yard. Mr. Connors stated the problem is if it was designed for a twenty-five, fifty, or hundred-year storm, they will never see the point at which it overflows; but if it was designed for full build-out of the Subdivision, there would be a little bit of a benefit of it up possibly to 18% or whatever the Code was at that time depending on how it was Permitted initially. Mr. Millward stated it is a big basin behind him, and at the corner of his yard there is a very large metal overflow and rarely has it reached that metal overflow.

Mr. Zamparelli asked what they have to do to get this back to where it will not be a problem, and he asked the percentage. Mr. Solor stated they have to get it back to the 16.5% and everything has to be accounted for that is being added by impervious.

Mr. Flager stated the Township is not participating in this matter.

There was no one from the public wishing to speak on this matter.

Mr. Zamparelli stated there is also a dimensional issue with the shed which is at three feet, and it should be at ten feet. Mr. Zamparelli asked if the shed is at the right portion of the yard. Mr. Connors stated it is also sitting on top of an Easement. Mr. Majewski stated that is a Stormwater Management Easement. Mr. Tritt asked if the fence is going through the Easement, and Mr. Millward agreed. Mr. Tritt asked if Mr. Millward agree that if there was the need for access to the Easement, he would agree to remove the fence and the shed; and Mr. Millward agreed. Mr. Millward stated he also has a 10' gate on the Easement where they could access the yard if needed. Mr. Zamparelli asked if the fence has clearance underneath it at least 2" to allow for water drainage, and Mr. Millward agreed. Mr. Majewski stated the shed is location in the right location of the yard.

Mr. Tritt asked how long the shed has been there, and he stated he assumes that his neighbors do not have an issue with the shed at that location. Mr. Millward stated he only has one neighbor because he is on the corner Lot, and that neighbor has no problem at all; and they have a pool. Mr. Millward stated the shed has been there since he put the fence in, and the fence went in about three years ago. Mr. Zamparelli asked if there was a Permit issued for the fence, and Mr. Millward stated the Township approved the Permit on it as far as he knows. Mr. Majewski stated he believes that is correct. He stated there are two surveys that were done on the property, one that shows the Easement and one that does not.

Mr. Zamparelli stated the Motion would have to include the dimensional for the shed, agreement to remove the fence and the shed if needed for access by the Township, plus the Motion would also involve the impervious surface issue which would have to be an engineered drawing working with Mr. Majewski to get it back to 16.55%. Mr. Majewski stated he would word it that they provide stormwater management subject to review and approval of the Township engineer.

Mr. Tritt moved, Mr. Connors seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Variance subject to the submission and review by the Township engineer of a Stormwater Management Plan and wording in the Amendment that the homeowner will remove the fence and the shed if access is required to the Easement.

Mr. Millward stated he understands that he is to work with the Township engineer and Mr. Majewski to come up with the stormwater management, and Mr. Majewski stated Mr. Millward could e-mail him next Monday about this. Mr. Millward asked if he can have the pool company “push forward” so that he can get in their schedule or does he have to wait until he goes through the Township engineer. Mr. Majewski stated they will need more detailed Plans to get started on that and he can work with them on what his thoughts are as to stormwater management working with the Township.

APPEAL #20-1862 – CRAIG SANFORD
TAX PARCELS #20-043-193, #20-043-192, #20-043-191, #20-043-190,
#20-043-189 & #20-043-188 – 102 EFFINGHAM WAY

Mr. Craig Sanford was sworn in.

Mr. Flager marked the Exhibits as follows: The Application was marked as Exhibit A-1. The Site Plan was marked as Exhibit A-2. The Proof of Publication was marked as Exhibit B-1. The Proof of Posting was marked as Exhibit B-2. The Notice to the neighbors was marked as Exhibit B-3.

Mr. Sanford stated he would like to have four to six chickens on his property. He stated their property backs up to the woods and the Canal, and they would have a small coop behind their home. He showed a Plan and noted the proposed location for the coop on the Plan. He stated they would not have any roosters, and it would just be females.

Mr. Zamparelli stated normally you need to have five acres to have chickens. Mr. Zamparelli asked if they own any chickens now, and Mr. Sanford stated they have them at his mother’s home in Lower Makefield where she has ten acres, and no Variance was needed there.

Ms. VanBlunk stated the last time they approved something like this if was for someone who had two to three acres, but they were abutting undevelopable land. Mr. Lewis stated they were abutting Farmland Preservation land. Ms. VanBlunk stated she believes that the Board made them get an Agreement with that property owner before they could have chickens although she is not sure of the number they wanted. Mr. Zamparelli stated he recalls that it was possibly four and they agreed that it would be only for the time that they lived on the property. Mr. Connors stated he believes that it was more than just chickens involved, and he believes that there were goats involved as well.

Mr. Flager stated there was a non-profit entity that had space next to the property involved, and the Applicant had to Lease land from them to create a larger space than they actually owned; and that was a Condition that was put on the Approval.

Mr. Solor stated without roosters, chickens are not that noisy, and his only concern would be if the neighbors have a concern. Mr. Tritt stated looking at the map, the property is heavily wooded, and they will probably be at least 150' to 200' away from the neighbor with the coop; and Mr. Sanford agreed. Mr. Tritt stated he has no issue with the request.

Mr. Zamparelli stated he does not have an issue with the request either, but he would not want it to continue to the next property owner without approval; and he believes that is how they did the last one. Ms. VanBlunk stated she did not feel they could limit it to this property owner only, and Mr. Flager agreed that it would run with the land. Ms. VanBlunk stated a subsequent property owner would automatically get this; however, she believes if the next property owner does not exercise that, it would go away. Mr. Flager stated if they abandoned it, that would be correct. He also stated that the same issues with regard to nuisance would apply for this owner and any subsequent owners if there were issues with smell or sound; and the Township has those powers.

Mr. Majewski stated that the prior Decision that the Zoning Hearing Board members were referencing was for a property on Dolington Road. He stated the Appeal was granted for one full unit of chickens, which is thirty chickens and three miniature goats; and the Applicant was required to obtain an additional four-acre Lease from the contiguous property for two full units of chickens and no more than five goats.

There was no one in the public wishing to speak on this matter.

Ms. VanBlunk moved, Mr. Connors seconded and it was unanimously carried to grant the Variance to allow for no more than six chickens and no roosters so long as the property owner owns all six parcels that butt up to the Canal.

APPEAL #20-1863 – JAMES & KIMBERLY PERRI
TAX PARCEL #20-058-130 – 1316 LEXINGTON DRIVE

Mr. James Perri and Ms. Kimberly Perri were sworn in.

Mr. Flager marked the Exhibits as follows: The Application was marked as Exhibit A-1. The Site Plan was marked as Exhibit A-2. The Impervious Surface Breakdown was marked as Exhibit A-3. The Proof of Publication was marked as Exhibit B-1. The Proof of Posting was marked as Exhibit B-2. The Notice to the neighbors was marked as Exhibit B-3.

Mr. Perri stated with the pandemic, they have shut down the Township Pool; and so they wanted to construct their own pool.

Mr. Zamparelli stated they have 24.6% impervious surface, and they want to increase it to 29.7%; and they are only allowed to have 18%. He asked if Mr. Perri had done any improvements before that increased the impervious surface, and Mr. Perri stated he did not that he was aware of. Mr. Zamparelli asked Mr. Majewski if the calculations are correct, and Mr. Majewski stated they are. Mr. Zamparelli asked Mr. Perri if he was planning on doing anything to mitigate the extra 5% impervious surface. Mr. Perri stated the engineer has shown on the drawings a stormwater management system. Mr. Majewski stated he reviewed that, and their stormwater management system will be an underground infiltration bed that controls all of the additional run-off that is generated by this project, and will bring it back to what it currently is existing on the property.

Mr. Zamparelli stated the Township is not participating in this matter.

Mr. Solor stated the Plan shows the pool equipment pad right up against the property line, and he asked if that is acceptable. Mr. Majewski stated typically that needs to be 5' from the property line. Mr. Zamparelli stated he is sure they will not have a problem adjusting that. Mr. Majewski stated the way the property is graded, the water will go toward the seepage bed.

Mr. Fred Childs, 1345 Lexington Drive, was sworn in. Mr. Childs stated he was waiting and thought that the adjacent neighbors, Larry Miller and Ms. Burdick, might be making a comment. Mr. Childs stated he believes that they sent an e-mail or letter to the Board, and Mr. Zamparelli stated they did. Mr. Childs stated in speaking with Mr. Miller, he understands that Mr. Miller had concerns with water infiltrating to his property because of the grading that exists already from Knox Drive behind those properties and also with the additional impervious.

Mr. Zamparelli stated the engineer has checked the extra impervious surface and stated with the grading it was flowing right into the seepage bed which mitigates the extra impervious surface. Mr. Majewski stated the way they have it graded, is that they are building a small retaining wall about 2' tall with the down slope side toward the rear being lower. He stated they will take the area on the upside of the wall closest to the house and where the patio is going, and that area will be graded so that it will not go toward the property behind but will go back toward their house directly to the storm sewer. He stated it will cut off a bit of the water that currently flows down hill.

Mr. Zamparelli stated in the letter received from Mr. Miller and Ms. Burdick states: "With this elevation, water from the rain run-off has caused ponding in the back yard and there has also been a natural change of the grading of the land over the years and may have installed lawn drains around the back yard perimeter of the house to help alleviate the increase in water." Mr. Zamparelli asked if this water is from their property or is it from the drainage in the area.

Ms. VanBlunk stated she did not receive a copy of the letter. Mr. Zamparelli stated the letter was addressed to him.

Mr. Zamparelli asked if the problem is because of the grading of the land or for some other reason. Mr. Zamparelli stated he does not want to compound a situation, and he asked if additional mitigation is needed.

Mr. Connors asked if they should check to see if Mr. Miller is on the line who could speak to this after they find out if Mr. Childs has any concerns of his own rather than his neighbor's. Mr. Childs stated if Mr. Miller is on, he should speak as he has direct knowledge; and he was just echoing Mr. Miller's concern.

Mr. Larry Miller, 1326 Lexington Drive, was sworn in. Mr. Miller stated he and his wife, Kim Burdick, live next door. He stated they were primarily concerned about the increase in impervious space with the construction of the in-ground pool. He stated in the Board's letter dated May 15, it noted that the installation of an in-ground pool would increase the impervious surface to 29.7% from the allowable 18%. He stated the houses on his side of Lexington Drive have a slight increase in elevation in the back of the properties; and with the elevation, water from rain run-off has caused pooling in the back yard. He stated they have lived in their house for about thirty-three years and have seen a natural change of grading of the land over the years. He stated they have installed

lawn drains around their back yard perimeter of the house to help alleviate the increase in water flow. He stated they are concerned about the increase in impervious surface that will increase the additional water flow onto the properties and want to be re-assured that drainage has been done to alleviate the flow. Mr. Miller stated he tried reading the schematic, but the print was small; and he did not see any drainage on the schematic. Mr. Miller stated their concern is where the excess water will go.

Mr. Majewski stated if they start at the back of the house that is the subject of this Application and go toward Mr. Miller's property there is a paver patio, and they are adding onto that with the pool and an additional paver patio. Mr. Majewski stated where the paver patio ends, they will be putting up a small retaining wall. He stated that wall will be about 2' high, and they will take the drainage from that point toward the house to some drains that will go to an underground sub-surface seepage bed. He stated that bed will be 5' wide, 3' deep, and 30' long. He stated the water will go into that and be stored underground, some will infiltrate, and the rest will be stored there for a while to let it have a chance to seep in.

Mr. Miller stated while he understands this, if after two to three years the land settles and there is pooling of water from rain, what additional mitigation could be considered. Mr. Majewski stated usually if it is compacted properly the settlement is insignificant. He stated the only thing that could be done is that trees could be planted along the property line to help soak up some of the water before it gets to Mr. Miller's property. He stated they could do that in addition to the seepage bed. Mr. Zamparelli asked Mr. Miller if they went with the suggestion by Mr. Majewski that if there is settling would he be more comfortable if there were additional trees or plants installed, and Mr. Miller stated that would make him more comfortable.

Mr. Solor stated he realizes that for most storms the water would go to the seepage bed, but it does look like the Plan creates a shallow, natural pond where the seepage bed is proposed. Mr. Majewski stated that would be an area that could potentially hold water in a really heavy rain for some amount of time, and that would all be on the Perri property.

Mr. Lewis stated there seems to be a lot of pavers for the patio, and he asked if they could make those pervious to help mitigate stormwater run-off. Mr. Zamparelli stated the design is to take the water into the seepage bed. He added that pervious pavers are not counted as pervious in the Township.

Mr. Solor stated there are pervious paver systems, but he does not know that is really an appropriate use here; and Mr. Zamparelli agreed. Mr. Solor stated the seepage bed will carry the load from what he heard from Mr. Majewski. He stated effectively there is some also extra capacity there because of the depression, and Mr. Zamparelli agreed.

Mr. Connors asked what the patio will be constructed over. Mr. Perri stated the pavers are set with sand. Mr. Connors asked what is underneath them, and Mr. Perri stated it would be crushed stone, the sand, and then the pavers. Mr. Connors stated if they use 6" of crushed stone that would actually increase the capability of stormwater. Mr. Majewski stated water could seep in the cracks. Mr. Connors stated from the topography, it seems that Mr. Miller's property is actually higher than the Perri property. Mr. Connors asked Mr. Majewski if he is aware that there is stormwater coming from Mr. Miller's property onto the Perri property and then the Martin property. Mr. Majewski stated he is not aware of any issues; however, as Mr. Miller has stated the Lots are graded where the water comes down and there is 3' to 4' from the road to the house.

Mr. Zamparelli stated Mr. Connors comments that Mr. Miller's water run-off is heading to the Perri property, and he asked if the seepage pit is sufficient to carry all of that water. Mr. Majewski stated he does not feel that the water is necessarily coming from either property.

Mr. Connors stated the Perris are not responsible for Mr. Miller's property, and they are only responsible for whatever impervious they are adding; and it is not on them to solve all of the drainage issues in this neighborhood which probably has the same problems as all of the other neighborhoods in the Township where water does pond because of the clay in the soil.

There was no further public comments.

Mr. Zamparelli stated the Township is not participating in this matter.

Mr. Connors moved, Mr. Solor seconded and it was unanimously carried to grant the Variance as designed on the Zoning Compliance Plan for the Perri property dated 5/8/20 subject to the Township engineer's review and approval of the detention system and the patio system set in sand with a gravel sub base subject to the Township engineer's review and approval and planting of trees subject to the Township engineer's review and approval.

June 16, 2020

Zoning Hearing Board – page 14 of 14

CANCEL JULY 7 MEETING

Ms. VanBlunk moved, Mr. Solor seconded and it was unanimously carried to cancel the July 7 meeting due to lack of Agenda items.

There being no further business, Mr. Zamparelli adjourned the meeting at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Anthony Zamparelli, Chair