

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD
ZONING HEARING BOARD
MINUTES – JULY 16, 2019

The regular meeting of the Zoning Hearing Board of the Township of Lower Makefield was held in the Municipal Building on July 16, 2019. Mr. Gruen called the meeting to order.

Those present:

Zoning Hearing Board: Jerry Gruen, Chair
Anthony Zamparelli, Vice Chair
Keith DosSantos, Secretary
Pamela Lee, Member

Others: James Majewski, Director Zoning and Planning
Barbara Kirk, Township Solicitor (left meeting
in progress)
Adam Flager, Zoning Hearing Board Solicitor
Frederic K. Weiss, Supervisor Liaison

Absent: James McCartney, ZHB Member

APPEAL #19-1826 – SHADY BROOK INVESTORS, L.P.
TAX PARCEL #20-016-039, 20-012-001-003, 20-012-002-002

Mr. Gruen announced that Shady Brook Investors have asked for a Continuance until August 20 so that there is a chance for the Board to review the Traffic Study which was done.

Mr. DosSantos moved, Mr. Zamparelli seconded and it was unanimously carried that the Continuance request to August 20 be granted.

APPEAL #19-1833 – DANIEL SWANTKO
TAX PARCEL #20-030-074 – 1413 N. RIVER ROAD

Mr. Gruen stated Mr. Swantko has also asked for a Continuance. He asked Mr. Flager if Mr. Swantko gave a reason for the Continuance request and until when. Mr. Flager stated Mr. Majewski went out to the site, and Mr. Swantko indicated he needed more time as there was a family emergency. Mr. Majewski stated Mr. Swantko stopped into the Township today, and they discussed Mr. Swantko's need for additional time to gather everything together to answer all the questions that were raised at the last meeting. Mr. Majewski stated he requested a Continuance via e-mail to the August 20 meeting.

Mr. Zamparelli moved, Ms. Lee seconded and it was unanimously carried to Continue the matter as requested until August 20, 2019.

APPEAL #19-1839 – KEVIN & BARBARA FISCHER
TAX PARCEL #20-30-073 – 1385 N. RIVER ROAD

Mr. Gruen stated he understands that they have also requested a Continuance via e-mail today. Mr. Gruen asked Mr. Majewski why they are requesting the Continuance, and Mr. Majewski stated he just heard that they requested a Continuance. Mr. Flager stated this request was for a Continuance to the August 6 meeting.

Ms. Kirk stated the Township will be participating in this Application, although they are not opposed at this point.

Ms. Lee moved, Mr. DosSantos seconded and it was unanimously carried to approve the Continuance to the August 6, 2019 meeting.

Ms. Kirk left the meeting at this time.

APPEAL #19-1838 – ROB BROWN
TAX PARCEL #20-068-078 – 1221 COLTS LANE

Mr. Rob Brown 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 impervious surface breakdown was marked as Exhibit A-3. A photograph of the proposed shed was marked as Exhibit A-4. The letter sent to neighbors about the Variance request was marked as Exhibit A-5. 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. Gruen asked if anyone in the audience wants to speak on the Application, they will be given a chance after the Board hears the Evidence.

Mr. Brown stated he would like to put a shed next to his driveway directly across from the entrance to his garage. He stated he feels this will give him easy access. He stated the reason why he wants to put it there rather than in the back yard where classically a lot of people would is because it would be more convenient and easier for him to get to. He stated since he moved into the property a year and a half ago, he has had a problem with flooding in the back yard. He stated they have brought in some people to help them rectify the situation by laying down more dirt, and he feels it will take a couple of years to fully rectify the flooding problem. He stated he is worried that putting a shed back there will cause it to sink and then destroy the shed in a couple of years. He stated this is about convenience to him and “elegance in the way it is going to look.” He stated he believes it will provide them with a “great looking shed” out front. He stated while there may be people who feel there may be a problem with how much they can see it, he feels there is enough tree cover.

Mr. Gruen asked if there is an issue with impervious surface in this Application, and Mr. Majewski stated there is not. Mr. Gruen asked Mr. Brown what kind of flooding problems he has. Mr. Brown stated anytime there is a lot of water coming from a storm, there will be a part of his yard where you can see the water has pooled; and if you walk back there, it can get half way up your foot or up to your ankle.

Mr. Gruen asked Mr. Brown if he has considered putting the shed up on blocks and raising it with gravel underneath. He stated according to the Ordinance, you have to anchor the shed anyway to the ground. Mr. Brown stated he has lived here for a year and a half, and he came from Utah. He stated he is not accustomed to how much water we get here, and how deep they would have to dig in order to avoid that type of flooding. He stated he does require a lot of professional help “with this aspect.” He stated he has talked to several people about how he “could achieve this project,” and a lot of people “have the same idea.” He stated the anchor would be included; but if he was to do it himself, he would want to dig three to five foot holes, pack them with concrete, and have a joist going across all of those similar to what you would build a deck on. Mr. Gruen stated he could do that. Mr. Brown stated “they” advised against that, and told him that he would probably want to flatten out the ground, put gravel down, and build it on top of that as that would be a lot more cost effective, a lot simpler, and it would help him in the long run.

Mr. Zamparelli stated on the drawing it looks like the shed doors are perpendicular to the garage doors, and Mr. Brown agreed. Mr. Zamparelli asked what is next to the garage, and he asked if it is a trailer. Mr. Brown showed on the Plan the driveway, two entrances to the garage door, and he showed where he wants to put the shed. Mr. Brown stated there is a fence that was recently installed for his dogs which is not shown. He showed where the fence goes, and he stated the fence is limiting a lot of the space where he has to put the shed. He showed the end of the driveway and where the fence line goes. He stated it goes toward his neighbor and then straight up the property line almost due north. He stated the shed would be right up against his driveway, and he drew on a Plan the space it would take up.

Mr. Zamparelli asked how much intrusion into the setback there will be with the shed. Mr. Brown stated he knows it is supposed to be about 20', and Mr. Zamparelli stated it is 25; and Mr. Brown stated he is not coming close to that. Mr. Gruen stated that is the side yard setback. Mr. Gruen asked about the front setback from the road, and Mr. Brown showed where they would come to which he feels is at least 40'. Mr. Gruen asked Mr. Majewski about the setback requirements from the front yard, and Mr. Majewski stated the requirement for an accessory structure which a shed is is that it be located in the fourth of the Lot furthest removed from the road. He stated in this case, it would be the fourth of the Lot furthest removed from Jockey's Way as well as Colt's Lane; and that would put it somewhere in the northeast quadrant of the property. He stated other than there is no setback for that. Mr. Majewski stated the Exhibit that was submitted with the Plan shows the shed being located closer to Jockey's Way than has been described by Mr. Brown, and it seems that Mr. Brown described it to be directly opposite the garage just on the other side which would be approximately a 50' setback from the right-of-way of Jockey's Way. Mr. Gruen asked what does a house require as a front yard setback; and Mr. Majewski stated for that development, the setback requirement is 75'. Mr. Majewski stated this is an older development. He stated in 2006 the Township changed the setback requirements for newer developments, so a Lot of this size would have a 50' front setback and a 75' rear yard setback so that newer homes would be constructed with more of a back yard and less of a front yard. He stated currently for this development 75' is what is allowed for the front yard setback.

Mr. Gruen stated this will be a pre-fabricated shed, and he understands that the builder told Mr. Brown that he wants to put it on a bed of gravel; and Mr. Brown agreed. Mr. Gruen stated the builder wants to do that because it would be easier for the builder, and Mr. Brown agreed. Mr. Gruen stated while the Zoning Hearing Board is not supposed to give advice, he is reluctant to approve this; and he feels what Mr. Brown discussed about the concrete piers is the right thing. Mr. Gruen

stated he should put 4 by 6 pressure-treated posts on the concrete piers, and the shed will then be approximately 8" above grade. Mr. Gruen stated he should put gravel underneath, and he and his neighbors will be happy.

Mr. Zamparelli stated Mr. Brown mentioned a trailer in his Application; however, he does not see where that is on the Plan. Mr. Brown stated he has a "simple trailer," and it is a normal car length wide by "maybe 10' to 12' long. He stated he can easily pull it with a small vehicle. Mr. Zamparelli asked where it is located right now; and Mr. Brown stated it is where the shed would go, and it is sitting on the grass. Mr. Zamparelli asked where it would go if the shed were there, and Mr. Brown stated it could go in the driveway in front of the shed or inside the garage.

Mr. DosSantos stated by Ordinance the shed is supposed to be located as noted by Mr. Majewski. Mr. Brown stated that is the location of the most flooding. He stated they hired a landscaper to come in, and they installed a French drain, digging into the ground and placing rocks on top; and that leads straight out to where the drain is between the property to the north. Mr. DosSantos asked if they have noticed if that French drain has helped; and Mr. Brown stated in that part it helped, but to the left more toward the center of the yard, they still have a collection of water, and that is what they are working on. Mr. DosSantos stated the center of the yard is not the area they are talking about, so where the French drain has been installed is actually where the Ordinance would require that the shed be located. Mr. DosSantos stated the reason for this is because the development requires a 75' setback, and the photograph shows the front of the houses which are all in a row; and Mr. Brown is looking to put the shed right in front that which he feels is probably of concern to some of the neighbors. Mr. DosSantos also stated the proposed shed of 12 by 16 is a "decent" sized shed, and the reason the Ordinance requires that it be in the furthest quarter of the Lot is to keep it off the front. Mr. DosSantos stated the hardship seems to be inconvenience since he wants it close to his driveway, and Mr. Brown agreed. Mr. DosSantos stated he does not know that is enough to impact the look of the neighborhood.

Mr. Gruen noted that there are only four members present this evening, and tie vote would be a "no" vote. Mr. Gruen stated the Board would give the Applicants this evening the opportunity to defer it until a fifth member would be available. Mr. Brown asked when that would be, and Mr. Gruen stated it could be next month. Mr. Brown stated he would not have a problem waiting until then. Mr. Gruen stated the Board could also rule on it this evening. Mr. Brown stated he would like to "have a tie breaker if he can get one."

Mr. DosSantos stated he assumes Mr. Brown is getting a feel where at least two of the Board members present are looking and their reasons behind it. Mr. DosSantos asked Mr. Brown if he has discussed this proposal with his neighbors. Mr. Brown stated he sent out a letter which the Board received a copy of. Mr. Brown stated he did not verbally discuss it with anyone. Mr. DosSantos asked Mr. Brown if he received any feedback from his neighbors to the letter he sent, and Mr. Brown stated he did not.

Mr. Gruen asked Mr. Brown if he would like to postpone a Decision, and Mr. Brown stated he would if it is okay with the Board. He stated he does not see the project happening any time soon anyway. Mr. Brown stated this would also give him more time to think about the project. Mr. Gruen stated he should consider the possibility of putting it in the location he discussed with Mr. Brown.

Ms. Margaret Prestifilippo was sworn in. Ms. Prestifilippo stated she lives next door and has also put in a shed and has the same water issues. She stated her shed is on gravel in the back corner where it is supposed to be. She showed the location of her property. Ms. Prestifilippo stated they are not in favor of this idea at all as it would be right on top of them. She stated when they come up their driveway, "it will be right in their face." She stated when they built the neighborhood, the Applicant's property was built higher than hers. She stated the way it is designed, the drain takes four houses, and the next drain takes four houses. Ms. Prestifilippo stated her back yard is worse because of the way the property was pitched, she has five houses draining into her yard. She stated they get a pool of water that goes across over the drain, yet she still has her shed in her back yard.

Mr. Marco Vietti was sworn in. He stated there has been no communication about this with Mr. Brown or his wife to him. Mr. Vietti showed the location of his home which is across the street diagonally from the Applicant's house. He stated he has talked to five or six neighbors, and no one is "crazy about it," although they were not able to attend this evening. Mr. Vietti stated everyone put their sheds in the back setback. Mr. Vietti stated Mr. Brown has indicated there were trees, but he does not know where they are since there is no tree cover when Mr. Brown indicated there was. Mr. Vietti stated the setback to the shed will not be even 25'. Mr. Vietti stated he does not feel a convenience factor should weigh in. He stated Mr. Brown bought into a neighborhood that has rules and Zoning for a particular reason and particular look to maintain the neighborhood. He stated he feels for convenience, everyone would probably want their shed closer to the driveway so that they could get the tractors and bikes inside. Mr. Vietti stated he understands issue since they all have it. He stated they can put the shed on an extra two tons of rock, and it will raise it up. Mr. Vietti stated he is against the proposal. He stated the aesthetics would be "horrible since you will see a big, brown barn sitting in front of a very nice, manicured neighborhood."

Mr. Zamparelli stated Mr. Brown indicated there were trees at this location; however, Mr. Vietti stated there were not. Mr. Zamparelli asked Mr. Brown what he needs the shed for, and Mr. Brown stated there is “plenty of stuff” when they came from Utah which had been in their shed in Utah which is now packed away in various of the house and the garage, and they would like to keep it in a shed. Mr. Gruen stated Mr. Brown indicated that he would put the trailer in the garage so it seems that there would be a lot of room in the garage.

Mr. DosSantos stated if the Applicant has already decided that he would like to come back at a future meeting, taking any more Testimony from the Applicant at this time is not a good way to proceed.

There was discussion about a date for the Continuance. Ms. Lee stated she will not be present at the August 20, 2019 meeting.

Mr. Gruen suggested to Mr. Brown that he look into an alternative because convenience is not considered a hardship. Mr. Gruen stated one of the main reasons the Board gives Variances is if there is a hardship involved.

Mr. Vietti asked for an explanation why there is going to be a Continuance. Mr. Gruen stated it is a five-member Board; however, only four members are present this evening. It was noted that if the vote is two to two, it would be considered a Denial. Mr. Vietti asked if they could vote this evening and see if the vote is three to one adding he does not “have time to keep doing this.” Mr. Flager stated Mr. Vietti would not have to come. Mr. Vietti stated he would not want “to do this and not come back as he feels pretty strongly about it.” Mr. DosSantos advised Mr. Vietti he has already given his Testimony.

Mr. Flager discussed Party Status which would give certain rights to Appeal, etc.; and Mr. Vietti stated he does not want to Appeal, and he does not know why they do not just take a vote now. He stated if it is two to two, they would do it again, and if it were three to one, it is done. Mr. Flager stated it is the Applicant’s prerogative. Mr. Gruen stated if they were to vote, and the vote were two to two which would be a Denial then Mr. Brown could not come back.

Mr. Majewski stated the next meeting would be August 6, and if this matter were Continued to that date, there would then be four Appeals for that meeting. Mr. Majewski stated the meeting on August 20, in addition to Ms. Lee not being able to attend, would have Shady Brook and the Swantko Application. He stated he feels August 6 would be best if Mr. Brown is available that evening. Mr. Brown stated he is not available on that date. Mr. Majewski stated the first meeting in September would be Tuesday, September 3. Mr. Gruen stated if there is nothing

else for that date, they might cancel that meeting since it follows Labor Day weekend. Mr. Majewski stated there are some other Applications coming up, but they could move this to the subsequent meeting on September 17 if Mr. Brown is available. Mr. Brown stated he would be available at that time.

Those interested in Party Status provided their names and contact information to Mr. Majewski. Mr. Majewski stated those requesting Party Status were Margaret and Michael Prestifilippo, 1792 Jockey's Way.

Mr. Brown requested a Continuance until September 17.

Mr. DosSantos moved, Ms. Lee seconded and it was unanimously carried the Applicant's request to Continue the matter until September 17, 2019.

APPEAL #19-1840 – MUNZ CONSTRUCTION
TAX PARCEL #20-061-060 – 1201 LANDMARK ROAD

Mr. Wayne Steven Kliefoth and Mr. Steve McGill were present and 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 worksheet 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. Gruen stated in case of a tie vote, the Application would lose; however, if they would like to postpone it to another Hearing they could do so. Mr. McGill stated they will proceed at this time.

Mr. McGill stated they are looking for a Variance for the second frontage setback. He stated they feel this is a hardship since the homeowner lives on a corner Lot so he has a double frontage which limits the area where they would be able to put the semi-detached garage.

Mr. Zamparelli asked if he does not already have a double garage there. Mr. McGill stated this would be a workshop garage. Mr. Zamparelli asked what is the hardship, and Mr. McGill stated it is because there is a double frontage on the property. Mr. Zamparelli asked if the workshop is just for a hobby or is it a business, and Mr. Kliefoth stated it is a hobby. Mr. Kliefoth stated the

two-car garage never gets a car in it. Mr. Majewski asked that he describe the property as to the house lay out and where the garage will go in relation to the driveway, etc.

Mr. McGill showed the driveway on the east side where there is a double garage on the east side of the house. He stated the new semi-detached garage would be at the north end of the driveway and would be attached with a breezeway to the house. Mr. McGill stated it will be a two-car garage.

Mr. DosSantos stated with regard to the orientation, it will be encroaching north into his own backyard, and Mr. McGill agreed. Mr. DosSantos stated it will not be encroaching into any side yard beyond what is already existing on the property; however, Mr. McGill stated it is which is why they are requesting a Variance. Mr. DosSantos stated it is not extending any further out toward the roadway than the existing footprint. Mr. McGill stated it would be in line with the driveway, but not the house. Mr. McGill showed the driveway, existing garage, and the location of the proposed garage. Mr. Majewski stated the driveway is at the right, front corner of the house facing Mill Road.

Mr. DosSantos asked if there is a reason why the proposed garage could not be lined up with the existing structure. Mr. McGill stated there is an existing deck on the back of the house. Mr. Gruen stated they could move the deck. He stated he is asking for a lot. Mr. Gruen asked what is required, and Mr. Zamparelli stated 40' is required for the front yard setback. He stated since this is a corner Lot, it has two front yards; and the requirement from each right-of-way of both Landmark Road and Mill Road is a 40' setback from the right-of-way line which is approximately 50' from the curb line of the road.

Mr. DosSantos asked what it would be if it were not a corner Lot, and Mr. Majewski stated it would have been a 15' setback for this Lot. Mr. DosSantos asked if the proposed structure is within that 15', and Mr. Gruen stated it is 29'. Mr. DosSantos stated therefore the hardship is because he is on a corner Lot. Mr. Gruen stated that is the Zoning. Mr. DosSantos stated these corner Lots come up often because of the Ordinance. Mr. Gruen stated if it were to be a one-car garage a Variance would not be needed, and he showed on a Plan where the garage could end.

Mr. Kliefoth stated the purpose of the garage is as a workshop, and the intent is to build an airplane. He stated it would not be for cars to go in and out. He stated it is to have enough space to assemble an airplane so he needs the width. He stated since he first looked at this a few years ago, he believes that the setback off of Mill Road has changed; and he does not believe he would have needed a Variance if he

had done it when he first considered it. He stated he is making it on the smaller side width wise so he cannot go a lot smaller and still be successful in having the room to do this. Ms. Lee asked if there was a change, and Mr. Majewski stated the Zoning has not changed, and he believes that it has been 40' all along. Mr. DosSantos stated he is looking for an 11' Variance since he is supposed to be at 40', and he will be at 29'.

Mr. Gruen asked the width of the wing span of the plane. Mr. Kliefoth stated the wings themselves would not necessary be on inside the garage as it would not be big enough for that; however, he needs enough room to have a shop to assemble, to have tables, and to have a 9' ceiling. He stated the tail sits 8 ½' high. He stated to have enough room to have the workshop work, it is 26' at the back and 18' at the front. He stated it has to "kick out" as it is due to the way the house is laid out and because of the setback off of Mill Road.

Mr. DosSantos asked Mr. Kliefoth if he has discussed this with his neighbors, particularly the neighbor across Mill Road; and Mr. Kliefoth stated while they know about it, he has not specifically gotten into the details although they are familiar with the "assembly." Mr. DosSantos stated it will be right in their front yard; and while Mr. Kliefoth stated it will, he added there is a tree line that runs along Mill Road, and this will be within the tree line that Toll Bros. put in on his side of the property. Mr. DosSantos asked if the tree line is dense, and Mr. Kliefoth suggested they drive down Mill Run adding the trees are probably set back 15' off of Mill Road. Mr. DosSantos asked if it is a dense tree line, and Mr. Kliefoth stated there are oak trees and evergreen trees. He added in the winter time when there are no leaves on the oaks, there will be gaps.

Mr. DosSantos asked about the aesthetics of the garage itself, and Mr. Kliefoth stated the garage will match the house. He stated it will not be a "shed." Mr. McGill stated it was designed to match the aesthetic of the homes in the neighborhood and be "appealing." He stated they are doing a brick wash wall on the front of it on either side of the door, and it will be more than just a "shed."

Mr. DosSantos asked about the impervious surface, and Mr. Majewski stated there is no issue with the impervious surface.

Mr. Gruen asked if it could be made a little narrower and longer, and Ms. Lee stated he had indicated that he would not be able to fit the airplane. Mr. McGill asked how much narrower, and Mr. Gruen stated it would be whatever he can do so that it would lessen the percentage of the request. He added they are asking almost 30% relief. He stated if they could make it narrower and longer it would

provide the same square footage for work space. Mr. Kliefoth stated he would have to look into that as he had laid out at the current dimensions, and he is not sure it could be made narrower as the would make it a little less “user-friendly.”

Mr. DosSantos stated he assumes that would incur additional architectural expenses to do that. Mr. Kliefoth stated they have already used an architect to design this. Mr. DosSantos stated he is not inclined to add a lot more money to an already-expensive project.

Mr. Gruen asked about the possibility of taking a piece of the deck on the right, enlarging the deck to the left, and move the garage in off the road. He asked if that would interfere with egress into the house, and Mr. McGill stated he would have to look into that. He stated the Ordinance requires that a detached building be no taller than 13’. He stated to accommodate the tail piece and Ms. Kliefoth’s requirement that the garage look good, they had to go taller than that so that is why they are doing the semi-detached. He stated with regard to “kicking it in,” that is a possibility he would have to look into; however, they would probably have to do additional work to the driveway, and he would have to re-evaluate where they would be with impervious. Mr. DosSantos stated that would add a lot more to the cost.

Mr. Gruen stated they are circumventing the Zoning by adding “the little square” attaching it to the house on the corner or they could not build it for more than 15’ as a detached building. Mr. Majewski stated also a detached building would have to go on the fourth of the Lot furthest removed from the road; and in this instance that would put it back in the wooded wetlands area in the northwest corner of the property. Mr. DosSantos stated from what he knows of the neighborhood, and this Lot in particular, where it is proposed is where they would have to put the garage. Mr. Kliefoth stated the trees pretty much from the front of the driveway almost all the way down Mill Road, and he felt if it stayed within the inside of the trees, it would probably not be an issue for anyone.

Mr. Gruen stated the Board has to look for a hardship, and just because he wants to build a plane is not a hardship. Mr. Gruen stated he understands that the corner Lot is a hardship, but wanting to build a plane is not really a hardship. Mr. DosSantos stated the hardship is not what he wants to do, it is where he can do it. Mr. Gruen stated he does not need the building except for building an airplane. Mr. DosSantos stated the idea is that he has the right to build on his property, but he is limited by what he can do; and the hardship is that it is a corner Lot, and there is the wetland issue as well which he feels is a significant hardship on his property. Mr. DosSantos

stated there is the tree line and the aesthetic issues that have been discussed, and there is no one present in the audience to speak on this. Mr. Gruen stated the hardship would be if he did not have a garage; however, he has a garage.

Mr. Kliefoth stated the existing garage is not tall enough. Mr. Gruen stated it is not tall enough for the plane. Mr. Gruen stated the hardship is the plan – not the garage. Mr. DosSantos stated he does not agree with that.

Mr. Zamparelli stated he agrees with Mr. Gruen.

Mr. Flager stated often when they talk about hardships, they talk about the unique characteristics of the land itself. He stated that is what Mr. DosSantos is saying as it relates to the use and a homeowners use of their property. Mr. Flager stated sometimes you can take into account what they want it for whether it is for a medical issue or something like that; however, it really has to do with the characteristics of the land and how that effects the homeowner's ability to use the land. Mr. DosSantos stated if they were to Appeal, the legal standard that the Court is going to look at is the characteristics of the land. Ms. Lee stated it is not the Board's business to judge what he wants to do with his property.

Mr. Gruen asked why there is Zoning on corner Lots. He stated anyone in the Township that has a corner Lot could say they want to build a garage on it. Mr. Gruen stated the Zoning Hearing Board is supposed to look at why they want to build the garage. He stated if they did not have space for a garage and they were on a corner Lot, that would be a hardship; however, he has a garage.

Ms. Lee stated as proposed the driveway would go to both garages, and Mr. McGill agreed. Mr. Kliefoth stated the garage would be built right at the top of the present driveway.

Mr. DosSantos asked Mr. Kliefoth would like to Continue the meeting since there are only four members present. Mr. Kliefoth stated he would ask for a Continuance. Ms. Lee suggested that he not come back on August 20 since she is unable to attend that meeting.

Mr. Majewski stated the Continuance could be August 6 or September 17. Mr. Kliefoth stated he is not available August 6.

Mr. DosSantos moved, Ms. Lee seconded and it was unanimously carried that the matter be Continued as requested to September 17.

July 16, 2019

Zoning Hearing Board – page 13 of 13

There being no further business, Mr. DosSantos moved, Mr. Zamparelli seconded and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully Submitted,

Keith DosSantos, Secretary