

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD
ZONING HEARING BOARD
MINUTES – APRIL 7, 2026

The regular meeting of the Zoning Hearing Board of the Township of Lower Makefield was held in the Municipal Building on April 7, 2026. Mr. Dougherty called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

Those present:

Zoning Hearing Board: James Dougherty, Chair
Christian Schwartz, Vice Chair
Mike McVan, Secretary
Larry Borda, Member
James McCartney, Member
Robert Heinz, Alternate Member (not voting)

Others: Dan McLoone, Planner
Adam Flager, Zoning Hearing Board Solicitor

APPEAL #Z-26-6 – NOTARFRANCESCO
Tax Parcel #20-042-221
660 PEVSNER ROAD, YARLDEY, PA 19067

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 Variance Narrative was marked as Exhibit A-3. The Construction Narrative was marked as Exhibit A-4. 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.

Ms. Kathleen Notarfrancesco and Mr. Justin Notarfrancesco were sworn in.

Ms. Notarfrancesco stated they would like to build a detached garage. It will increase the impervious surface to .22 where .18 is permitted. They do not currently have a garage as it was converted to living space by a previous owner so their children's bicycles, equipment, etc. has to be stored in the basement.

Ms. Notarfrancesco stated in order to mitigate for the increase in impervious surface, their plan proposes to install an infiltration trench to account for the two-year stormwater run-off increase pre to post-construction plus 20%. She stated they are also planning to remove some existing impervious surface

on the property which includes removing a shed, a walkway along the side of the house, and a brick patio off of the back of the house. She stated overall the total increase in impervious surface is only 427 square feet.

Ms. Notarfrancesco stated they are also requesting a Variance to exceed the 15' maximum height on an accessory building with the final height of the garage not to exceed 20'. She stated they believe that the precedent has been set with the approval and building of a garage in an adjacent neighborhood about one quarter mile from their home.

Mr. Schwartz asked Mr. McLoone if what they are proposing will bring them below 18% impervious surface, and Mr. McLoone stated it will bring them right to 18%. Mr. Schwartz stated if the garage were to be attached to the house it could stay at 35' or under just like the house, and he asked why they are not building it attached to the house. Ms. Notarfrancesco stated they are not opposed to that, but they were trying to keep costs down. Mr. Schwartz stated granting them a Variance for an accessory structure above the height would mean that there was an issue that was out of their control for why the structure had to be built detached. Mr. Schwartz stated while there was one approved in the area, they do not know the conditions why it was approved.

Mr. Borda asked why 20' is necessary in lieu of 15'. Ms. Notarfrancesco stated they would like to use the upper part of the garage for additional storage and work space. She stated the original design they had exceeded 20', but they worked with their designer to get the slope down a bit to be closer to 15' and not over the peak of their house.

Mr. Borda stated they did not see any renderings of what this will look like. He stated he hopes it will not be a 20' box. Ms. Notarfrancesco stated it will have 8' walls and 1' for the structural component, and a slope of 10/12 to get it to the final height which will be 19.6'. Mr. Borda stated he does not know what the house or the neighborhood looks like. He stated he assumes they are older homes, and Ms. Notarfrancesco stated their home was built in 1968. Mr. Borda asked if it would make sense to have a slanted roof with one or two windows for a Cape Cod type look to give it character as opposed to a big box.

A picture of the house was shown; however, Mr. Notarfrancesco stated that is an older version of their house, and they had the siding re-done and the front of the garage will match the front of the house. He noted the location of a privacy

fence which had been added which will be removed so that the garage can be put in that location. The picture was marked as Exhibit A-5.

Ms. Notarfrancesco stated the tallest peak on their house is 21', and the garage will be at 19.6/19.7.

Mr. McCartney stated he understands that the height hardship is for additional storage, and Ms. Notarfrancesco stated it is for storage and work space. She stated everything now has to be done in the basement which gets dirty. Mr. Notarfrancesco stated the basement is only on the smaller part of their house and is not a full-size basement and has little room for storage.

Mr. Borda asked if they received feedback from their neighbors; and Ms. Notarfrancesco stated she talked to a few of them when they received the Township letter, and no one seemed to have an issue.

Mr. Dougherty stated he does not feel what they are proposing is a problem, and the Township is not opposed to it.

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

Mr. Dougherty stated while he does not feel it is necessary that the garage be attached, other Board members may; and he feels they could attach a roof system from the house to the detached garage so that it would be attached but not right up against the house. He stated if there are windows and/or a door on that side of the house, those would not have to go away. Mr. McLoone stated while he cannot speak to the design, if there was an attached breezeway it would need to meet the side yard setback which is 15'. Mr. McLoone stated it appears that it would meet that requirement where it is proposed, and then it could be 35' in height. Mr. Dougherty stated this breezeway would be where they would walk from the garage to the house and back.

Mr. McCartney stated if they were to do the breezeway, they would not need the height Variance; and Mr. McLoone agreed. Mr. McCartney stated he would be in favor of the attachment/breezeway. Mr. Dougherty stated Mr. McCartney had indicated he had an issue understanding the hardship for the extra 5' of height, and this would eliminate that issue. Mr. Schwartz stated he agrees.

Mr. George Hyjurick, the contractor, was sworn in. He stated since what the Board is proposing will have a roof line, it would impact the impervious ratio; and that additional impervious would have to be considered with whatever relief is going to be granted. Mr. Dougherty stated the trench could be designed to increase the size to capture the additional impervious surface. Mr. McLoone stated he feels we would have to re-advertise since that would result in a higher impervious surface ratio. Mr. Flager stated it has been advertised for 22.5; and if it is going to be higher than that, it needs to be re-advertised. Mr. McLoone asked if they could re-configure the proposed walkway so that the breezeway would go over it.

Mr. McVan questioned the need for the breezeway since he feels the garage looks nice and is set up over the side so that it looks like a carriage house. Mr. Dougherty stated he does not have an issue with it as designed as opposed to adding more impervious surface. Mr. Dougherty stated two of the members are having a problem with the hardship issue associated with the 5' Variance, and they are looking for a way to solve that and still get the garage the Applicants want. He stated that would eliminate the one Variance, but they would still need the Variance for impervious.

Mr. Flager asked if it is above an existing walkway would it increase the impervious. Mr. McLoone stated if they were to add a roof over where the proposed walkway is, it would not increase the impervious. Mr. Flager stated it might be larger, but it would probably be a negligible amount; and they would not need to re-advertise. He stated a de minimus increase would not need to be re-advertised, and an approval could be fashioned taking that increase into account.

Mr. Borda stated he does not want the Applicants to have to go through the additional expense of a re-advertisement. He asked if they are only talking about putting a roof over the walkway between the two buildings; and Mr. Dougherty agreed adding that would result in them connecting the two buildings. Mr. Borda stated he would prefer that aesthetically, but he would not be opposed to what they have proposed.

Mr. Schwartz stated his concern is setting precedent so that people all over the Township will be wanting detached garages above a certain height.

Ms. Notarfrancesco stated if the covered walkway attached to the house is what the Board requires, they will do it.

After discussion, the Board was in agreement with adding 50 square feet over what has been proposed; and Mr. McLoone stated he feels that would be considered de minimus. Mr. Flager stated it would still be required that the mitigation would bring it back to an effective 18%.

Mr. Schwartz moved, Mr. Dougherty seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Appeal with the impervious surface ratio existing of 19.8, growing to 22.5, and being reduced through stormwater mitigation to an effective rate of 18% which includes an additional 50 square feet for the new breezeway covering on the sidewalk that is proposed to connect the house to the garage therefore eliminating the need for a Variance on the garage height.

APPEAL #Z-26-7 – BROZANSKI

Tax Parcel #20-061-048

1193 WATERWHEEL DRIVE, YARDLEY, PA 19067

Mr. Robert Brozanski 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 Fence Details were 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. Brozanski stated he would like to place a fence over the Easement. He stated the storm drain is on the adjacent property. He stated they want to put the fence around the pool that they are putting in, and they can then control the drainage of the water in that area. He stated it will only be about one-fourth of the length of the Easement. He stated they propose temporary piers be put in 6' into the Easement. He stated if it is ever needed to be removed, the fence can be removed.

Mr. Dougherty stated while Mr. Brozanski indicated that they were temporary piers, the Application indicates that they are permanent piers. Mr. Brozanski stated the piers will be put in permanently exactly 6' into the Easement. Mr. Dougherty stated Mr. Brozanski indicated that the storm drain is on the adjacent property so he assumes the Easement straddles both properties, and Mr. Brozanski agreed. Mr. Dougherty asked if the storm drain referenced on the adjacent property is underground, and Mr. Brozanski stated the catch basin leads into it. Mr. Dougherty asked if it is swale or an inlet, and Brozanski

stated he is not sure what it is called. Mr. Dougherty stated he believes what is being described is an inlet. He asked if the inlets are shown on the Plans, and Mr. McLoone noted the location on the Plan.

Mr. Schwartz stated with regard to the piers supporting the fence he sees that they will go 3' below grade. Mr. Schwartz asked if the entire fence will have piers like this, and Mr. Brozanski stated it will only be that part that is on the Easement. Mr. Schwartz asked about the rest of the fence; and Mr. Brozanski stated that will be similar to the fence that is already around the property, and they will be posts set into the ground. Mr. Schwartz asked Mr. Brozanski if he believes that putting concrete piers in the Easement will make it easier to remove fence and then put it back, and Mr. Brozanski stated the fence will be bolted to the piers. Mr. Schwartz asked what would happen if they had to dig through there to replace the underground piping and the piers are in the way. Mr. Brozanski stated the piers should not be in the way because they will be at least 4' back from the pipe that is in the Easement on the adjacent property. Mr. Schwartz stated if it was later decided that they wanted to replace the pipe, there is no guarantee that it would go in the same location as the existing pipe. He stated he feels they should install the fence in the Easement the same way he is installing all of the rest of the fence since he would be required to bear the cost of removal and replacement of the fence if any work had to be done there by the utility. Mr. Brozanski stated they could do it either way, but they would still remove and replace the fence at their cost. Mr. Schwartz stated they would be taking a chance on the concrete piers.

Mr. Dougherty asked Mr. McLoone who owns the Easement, and Mr. McLoone stated it is owned by the Township. Mr. McLoone stated he spoke to Mr. Fuller, the Public Works Director, who reiterated that removal and replacement would be at the Applicant/owner's expense.

Mr. Borda stated he is concerned with the precedent being set and that others might start doing the same thing. He stated if the Township had to take action in the Easement, they would have to get involved with all of these property owners; and if there are property owners who are not complying, it will hold up the project and cost the Township money. He asked the status of the pool. Mr. McLoone stated the Pool Permit was approved and was under the impervious. Mr. Schwartz stated the request being asked of the Zoning Hearing Board is one that is requested often; and there have been a lot of fences granted within Easements, with the understanding that the Applicant/property owner is responsible for all costs associated with removal and re-installation of the fence should any of the utilities have to come in and work.

Mr. Dougherty asked the reason for the proposal to have 3' deep permanent piers, and Mr. Brozanski stated it was felt it would make it easier to remove the fence if necessary. Mr. Dougherty stated he feels it would be better to just put in the fence with standard installation, and there would be a risk of much greater costs to have to tear out 3' concrete piers. Mr. Flager stated the Applicant would bear the cost of removal whether it is just the fence or to remove the concrete as well if necessary. Mr. Dougherty stated the Board does not have a problem approving this without the concrete piers, and Mr. Brozanski stated he would prefer that, and they just thought the concrete piers might be more appealing to the Board.

Ms. Maureen Carlton, Township solicitor, stated originally she felt the Township was not opposing this; however, they are opposed in concept. She stated there is an Ordinance that states that fences should not be in Township-owned Easements, and for reasons of safety for residents and neighbors, if there was an emergency situation and the Township had to remove the fence, they would be in a precarious situation of having to remove numerous fences at numerous locales. She stated if there is an emergency, it is not something the Township wants to take on. She stated in addition the Township is planning on upgrading a lot of the utilities in the next few years and spending millions of dollars doing so; and to have to remove fences in the Easement is an added expenses that while it should go back to the homeowners, the Township may have to front it first and then seek reimbursements.

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

Mr. Dougherty stated they have received approval to put in a pool, and they need a fence for the pool. Mr. Schwartz asked if the fence were put up on the edge of the Easement would it encroach on the pool, and Mr. Brozanski stated it would give them less space on that end of the pool, but they wanted more area to keep the water going into the catch basin. He stated it would be easier to maintain. Mr. Schwartz stated the fence would not stop the water, and Mr. Brozanski agreed. Mr. Brozanski stated there is an elevation there, and there would be a wall protecting the water from running into the pool. Mr. McVan stated if they would move the fencer closer it would be harder to get maintenance equipment in there. He stated he feels the hardship is the lot as it is very difficult due to the shape.

Mr. McCartney asked if a Variance was needed for the Pool, and Mr. McLoone stated he did not as they were under the impervious surface and there were no setback issues. Mr. McCartney stated he understands the height requirement for a pool fence is a minimum of 4', and there are 4' mesh fences that can be put directly around the pool deck so they are not in the yard, and he asked if that would meet Code. Mr. McLoone stated he would have to check on that as he has not seen many of those. Mr. McVan stated that would not meet Code as they are removable.

Mr. Borda noted the area at the bottom of the drawing, and asked if that is concrete or a walkway that surrounds the pool. Mr. Schwartz noted the proposed walkway around the pool and the wall at the end of the walkway that prevents run-off or overflow running back into the pool. Mr. Borda asked why the fence was not considered when he was planning to put the pool in since when it was submitted, they knew they were abutting the Easement. He asked why this was not asked for a part of the Permitting process. Mr. Brozanski stated they were going to put the fence in outside of the Easement, but once everything was approved it looked like it would be better to maintain that area if it was inside the fence rather than outside. Mr. Dougherty stated Mr. Brozanski is present for this one issue alone; and depending on the vote, he may have to re-think his plan.

Mr. Dougherty moved and Mr. Schwartz seconded to approve the Appeal. In lieu of the concrete piers that go down 3' just standard fence installation fence line where presented on the Plans with the Applicant's understanding that if the Easement owner requires removal of the fence, he needs to bear the cost of both removal and re-installation.

Motion carried with Mr. Dougherty, Mr. McVan, and Mr. Schwartz in favor and Mr. Borda and Mr. McCartney opposed.

Mr. McCartney asked Mr. McLoone to look into the 4' high mesh fence between now and the next meeting as it seems that it is permitted.

APPEAL #Z-25-51 – MURPHY/DELUCA
Tax Parcel #20-046-095
71 MANOR LANE SOUTH, YARDLEY, PA 19067

Mr. Edward Murphy, attorney, was present with Mr. Justin Geonnotti, engineer, and Mr. Joseph DeLuca who were sworn in.

Mr. Flager marked Exhibits as follows: The Revised Plans were marked as Exhibit A-15. The HRG Review Letter #2 dated 4/1/26 was marked as Exhibit A-16. The April 6 Review letter #3 from the Township engineer was marked as Exhibit A-17.

Mr. Murphy stated they were before the Zoning Hearing Board on February 3 and made a detailed presentation. At the end of the discussion the matter was Continued to afford the Applicant the opportunity to consider some of the concerns expressed by the Zoning Hearing Board members regarding some issues surrounding the Plan including the extent of encroachment into the mapped floodplain areas, the size of the dwelling, and a number of other considerations. Mr. Murphy stated on March 12 they submitted a Revised Plan that is the subject of tonight's discussion, and that Plan was the subject of the April 6 review letter from the Township engineer. Mr. Murphy stated Mr. Geonnotti has prepared an annotated response to the April 6 review letter commenting on each of the comments.

Mr. Murphy stated changes have been made to the Plan, and there are now a limited number of items that need relief as compared to the multiple items of relief that were originally sought. Mr. Murphy noted his cover letter that accompanied the March 12 Plan that was submitted which he assumes the Board has been provided. Mr. Murphy stated most of the comments in the April 6 review letter are no longer applicable. He stated the biggest change they made is that the entirety of the house itself is not located in the floodplain, and it is entirely located in that portion of the lot that is outside of the floodplain.

Mr. Geonnotti showed the Revised Plan. He stated what was proposed previously had the building extending further back into the floodplain by approximately 20' to 30' with about 671 square feet of the house that was proposed to be in the floodplain. He stated they re-configured the footprint of the house, and the new footprint of the house is smaller and the entirety of the house is outside of the floodplain. He stated the footprint of the house is a little bit bigger than the existing house.

Mr. Murphy stated the prior Plan shown in February also proposed a pool in the rear. Mr. Geonnotti agreed adding that there was also a shed proposed in the rear yard, and that along with the pool and decking around the pool have been removed.

Mr. Geonnotti stated he highlighted in yellow the areas on the Revised Plan that will encroach into the floodplain, and those areas are not the house/structure itself, rather they are an extension of a widening of the driveway that will be on grade so from a floodplain encroachment, there is no proposed impact to the floodplain. He stated this is also the same for the steps and walkway. He stated the driveway is larger because of the two-car garage. Mr. Geonnotti stated the existing driveway is shown in the middle in white, and on both sides of the driveway is a shaded-in area which is a 295 square foot encroachment into the floodplain strictly by disturbance, and there is no elevated portion and there will be no impact to the floodplain itself.

Mr. Murphy noted the L-shaped area adjacent to the east side widening of the driveway which is the walkway to the front door. Mr. Geonnotti agreed adding that there is an existing walkway which is being removed, and a proposed concrete walkway and step up to the front door to be put in. He stated this is 65 square feet of disturbance within the floodplain.

Mr. Geonnotti noted areas to the rear highlighted, and he stated the first portion is an 18 square foot encroachment into the floodplain area of stairs coming off the side door, and that is a portion of the steps themselves stepping down to grade from the side of the house. He stated there is also a triangular area in the rear, and Mr. Geonnotti stated at the rear of the house is a proposed elevated deck. He stated the entire deck will be elevated above the floodplain elevation and set on piers, and they have highlighted the portion that will be elevated above the existing floodplain. He stated the only encroachment will be the Sonotubes and piers that extend below the deck to hold up the deck itself. The square footage of this is 119 square feet. Mr. Murphy stated that is really excessive because the area of the Sonotubes that are used to elevated the deck are the only physical encroachment into the floodplain. Mr. Geonnotti agreed that in reality that will be much less.

Mr. Geonnotti stated the total square footage of the highlighted areas is 497 square feet.

Mr. Murphy stated there is now only one item of Zoning relief required for the Plan now being proposed. Mr. Geonnotti stated they are down from seven Variances originally to one Variance which is from Chapter 200-51B.1 and the corresponding calculation section of 200-52B.1 to permit disturbance of the floodplain for the construction of the widened driveway, above-grade patio and deck, and concrete walkway.

Mr. Murphy stated Mr. Geonnotti had annotated a response to the April 6 review letter from HRG, and this was provided to the Board and marked as Exhibit A-18. Mr. Murphy stated this is a letter under the letterhead of Dynamic Engineering dated April 7, 2026. Mr. Murphy stated most of the comments in the April 6 review letter are no longer applicable because the dwelling is outside of the floodplain.

Mr. Geonnotti stated Comment #1 indicated that a Permit is required before construction or development is undertaken. He stated he responded in his letter that they would comply and that the proposed dwelling would be constructed outside of the floodplain. Mr. Geonnotti stated Comment #2 indicates they should determine how electric, water, and sewer would be provided to the site. Mr. Geonnotti stated electric will be provided via overhead from the rear of the property and water and sewer are currently serving the property and will continue to do so via underground laterals to Manor Lane South. He stated all utility locations will be provided on the Building Permit Plans.

Mr. Geonnotti stated Comments #3 through #10 all pertain to the previous Plan where the dwelling was being constructed in the floodplain so they are no longer applicable, and his written comments individually reflect that response.

Mr. Geonnotti stated Comment #11 pertains to the requirement for an E & S (Erosion and Sediment Control) Plan being provided, and they will comply assuming they are successful in obtaining the Variance.

Mr. Geonnotti stated Comment #12 pertains to the requirement for a signed and sealed elevation certificate, but that is no longer applicable because the dwelling will not be located within the floodplain; however to the extent necessary for insurance purposes, that will be obtained.

Mr. Geonnotti stated Comment #13 requires a PADEP Permit for encroachment within the floodplain or floodway, and states that this Comment remains applicable due to the elevated deck structures within the floodplain area. Mr. Geonnotti stated if necessary they will be obtaining those Permits as part of the Building Permit Plan.

Mr. Geonnotti stated Comment #14 is a similar comment with regard to fill within floodplain areas, and this is a will comply, and they will demonstrate compliance during the Building Permit Plan. Mr. Murphy stated they are not proposing to introduce any fill or do any grading within the floodplain, and Mr. Geonnotti agreed.

Mr. Geonnotti stated Comment #15 pertains to stormwater management; and while it is not a Zoning item, they are preparing Building Permit Plans, and did stormwater calculations for the proposed improvements. He stated based on the reduced scope, they are only required to do a limited amount of stormwater management which can be achieved by planting trees and can be demonstrated on their Building Permit Plans.

Mr. Geonnotti stated Comments #16 and #17 pertain to utility services. He stated this is a Building Permit phase item, and all service laterals and connections will be in accordance with Floodplain Development regulations as applicable.

Mr. Geonnotti stated #18 has to do with hazardous materials and buoyant flammable explosives in times of flooding, and this pertains largely to the proposed propane tanks which will be installed outside of the floodplain.

Mr. Geonnotti stated #19 pertains to HVAC systems and how they will be secured in the house, and he stated this is no longer applicable because the dwelling is now proposed outside of the floodplain. Mr. Geonnotti stated #20 is also no longer applicable because the dwelling is constructed outside of the floodplain. He stated full architectural plans will be provided during the Building Permit Phase.

Mr. Geonnotti stated #21 is a standard comment pertaining to the Uniform Construction Code, and that will be part of their Building Permit phase.

Mr. Geonnotti stated #22 was discussed at the last meeting, and this is the request for the wetlands delineation for an absence presence on site. He stated as a professional engineer he can stated that there are no wetlands on the site; but if necessary, they can have an Absence Report.

Mr. Geonnotti stated sight triangles will be provided on the Building Permit Plan set, but it is not an issue as sight distance is available. He stated stormwater management calculations will be provided as part of the Building Permit plan, and they can satisfy that with limited plantings on site.

Mr. Murphy stated Mr. Geonnotti had commented on the size of the house as compared to the house that was depicted on the Plan in February; and he asked Mr. Geonnotti to discuss the changes that have been made since February since one of the issues was the size of the previously-proposed home.

Mr. Geonnotti stated the size of the home is approximately 1,800 square feet plus about a 400 square foot garage for a total of 2,100 square feet for the footprint. He stated the size has been reduced from the previous footprint, and this is how they were able to keep it within the limits that are outside of the floodplain.

Mr. Borda noted Item #3 and stated Mr. Geonnotti had indicated that additional grading detail will be provided on the Permit Plan, and he asked what that is to do. Mr. Geonnotti stated the question pertains to how it is graded around the house and demonstrate that floodwaters would be dissipated around the house in times of flooding. He stated that is now not necessary because the house will now be outside of the floodplain itself; however, during the Building Permit phase, they will demonstrate that there is positive drainage away from the house which is just good construction and engineering. Mr. Borda asked if they are stating that the existing topography will be sufficient, and they are not planning on any additions or changes; and Mr. Geonnotti stated the house will be set at an elevation that will provide positive drainage away from the first flood. Mr. Borda asked the elevation on the deck; and Mr. Geonnotti stated the deck itself is 34.83 elevation, and the flood elevation is 33 and a half.

Mr. Borda asked the purpose of the propane tank and its location. Mr. Geonnotti stated the propane tank will be on the right side of the house sitting on a pad which is outside of the floodplain. He stated because of the location, Comment #18 is no longer applicable.

Mr. Flager marked the Rendering and Floor Plans as Exhibit A-19.

Mr. Murphy stated at the last meeting the Zoning Hearing Board asked about floor plans and wanted to see an efficient lay-out for the size of the home that would have to be constructed because it would be significant smaller, and they therefore provided the actual proposed elevation and floor plan for the home. He stated the square footage calculations are on the lower left hand corner of one sheet. Mr. Flager stated on the Revised Plan, the garage and home is 2,100 square feet, and Mr. Geonnotti stated that is the footprint. Mr. Flager asked the previous amount. Mr. Geonnotti stated he believes the footprint was closer to 2,700 or 2,800 square feet.

Mr. Borda asked the square footage of the footprint of the existing house, and Mr. Geonnotti stated he believes it was about 1,500 to 1,600 square feet.

Mr. Geonnotti stated after hearing the comments from the Board at the last meeting, their intent was to shrink the size of the footprint, pull it entirely out of the floodplain, which they did, and limit the encroachment; and they took out the pool, the shed, and anything that was physically encroaching into any type of flood waters. He stated the only disturbance within the floodplain are at-grade structures for the expansion of the driveway, the deck, and the walkway.

Mr. Dougherty stated at this point they are requesting a Variance to Ordinance #200-51.B1 and #200-52.B1 for disturbance to the floodplain.

Mr. Borda asked if additional impervious surface is being added and is it being addressed; and Mr. Geonnotti stated 50 square feet of additional impervious square is being added, and they are installing stormwater management as part of the Application. He stated they are below the allowable. Mr. Heinz asked if the relief they are putting in is trees; and Mr. Geonnotti agreed adding that is part of the Township's Stormwater Ordinance. Mr. Dougherty stated normally the Board does not go for trees; however, this is only 50 square feet of added impervious.

Ms. Carlton stated the Township was originally opposed to this Application, but they are removing their opposition based on the submission that was recently made and the testimony this evening. She stated she does need to clarify the annotation provided for #7, and she asked if Mr. Geonnotti's response has a typo for the dwelling first floor, and she asked if it should be 35.5'; and if the first floor dwelling is 10' below the garage. Mr. Geonnotti stated that is a typo and it should be 35.5. Ms. Carlton asked for what purpose the propone is proposed for; and Mr. DeLuca stated it is for cooking, hot water, and the fireplace.

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

Mr. Dougherty moved, Mr. McCartney seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Appeal as presented tonight with the applicant seeking relief from Township Ordinance #200-51.B1 and #200-52.B1. In Exhibit A-18 #7 there is a typo where the dwelling first floor should go from 25.5' to 35.5' elevation, and the Record should so reflect that correction.

Mr. Dougherty thanked the Township for recognizing the compromise the Applicant made tonight, and he thanked the Applicants for that compromise.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Flager stated in two weeks the Board will hear the Continuation of the Car Wash, and they will be presenting their traffic engineer. Mr. Dougherty stated there will also be public comment. Mr. Flager stated there is an attorney who is representing several of the neighbors who have Party Status. He stated they will also hear from the Township. Mr. Borda asked if the engineer will be coming back since Ms. Carlton did not have an opportunity to cross-examine the engineer; and Mr. Flager stated he feels all of the witnesses should be present since while they presented, no cross-examination took place. Mr. McLoone stated this will be the only matter heard that evening. Mr. Heinz was asked to attend this meeting in case one of the regular Board members is unable to attend.

Mr. McLoone stated there are currently two Applications that have come in which will be heard on May 5. Mr. Borda stated he is not available May 5.

There being no further business, Mr. Schwartz moved, Mr. Borda seconded and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 8:50 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mike McVan, Secretary