

**MINUTES
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
TOWNSHIP OF CHATHAM
NOVEMBER 17, 2021**

Mr. Weston called the Special Meeting of the Zoning Board of Adjustment to order at 7:40 PM.

Adequate notice of the meetings of the Zoning Board of Adjustment of the Township of Chatham was given as required by the Open Public Meetings Act as follows: Notice in the form of a resolution setting forth the schedule of meetings for the year 2021 and January 2022 was published in the *Chatham Courier* and the *Morris County Daily Record*, a copy filed with the Municipal Clerk and a copy placed on the bulletin board in the main hallway of the Municipal Building.

Roll Call

Answering present to the roll call were Mr. Weston, Mr. Borsinger, Mr. Fitt and Mr. McHugh. Mr. Silva arrived late.

Mr. Vivona and Mrs. Chang were absent.

Also present were Board Attorney Scott Carlson, Board Planner Frank Banisch and Engineer Dan Honoshowsky filling in for Board Engineer John Ruschke.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Fitt moved to approve the minutes of the February 18, 2021, March 18, 2021, October 21, 2021, June 18, 2020, October 22, 2020, and November 18, 2020 meetings. Mr. Borsinger seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Application to be Withdrawn

Calendar BOA-21-009 (July 29, 2021) Mr. & Mrs. Cairns, 46 Dellwood Avenue, Block: 78 Lot: 19.01. Requesting to construct a retaining wall and make other site improvements.

Mr. Carlson announced that the application has been withdrawn and is no longer pending before the Board of Adjustment.

Resolutions

Calendar BOA -21-001(February 8, 2021) Lechner, Scott/Minelli, 6 Crestwood Drive Block: 74 Lot:4. Requesting Height Variance to construct a single-family dwelling (Revisions 4/30/2021. Complete 6-14-2021-First Hearing)

**RESOLUTION 21-0024
Calendar No. BOA – 21-001
RESOLUTION OF THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT OF THE TOWNSHIP OF
CHATHAM, IN THE COUNTY OF MORRIS, STATE OF NEW JERSEY REGARDING THE
APPLICATION OF SCOTT AND MINELI LECHNER, 6 CRESTWOOD DRIVE, CHATHAM
TOWNSHIP**

WHEREAS, Scott and Mineli Lechner (hereinafter the “Applicants”) are the owners of certain premises located at 6 Crestwood Drive, Chatham Township, New Jersey and designated as Block 74, Lot 4 on the Tax Map of the Township of Chatham, (hereinafter referred to as the “subject property”), and have applied to the Zoning Board of Adjustment of the Township of Chatham pursuant to the provisions of N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70(c) of the Municipal Land Use Law (MLUL) and Section 30-47.3 of the Land Development Regulations of the Township of Chatham (LDR) for the approval of variances from the requirements of Sections 30-75.2 of the LDR, and the revised General Ordinances of the Township of Chatham to permit the removal of the existing dwelling and the reconstruction of a new dwelling and related site improvements; and

WHEREAS, the Applicants represented themselves before the Board of Adjustment during the hearings on the subject application; and

WHEREAS, the Applicants have served the required Notice of Public Hearing, have filed proof of service in accordance with the pertinent statutes, have given public notice of the application by publication in the official newspaper of the Township of Chatham, and also have provided proof that no real property taxes and sewer charges are due and delinquent, and the matter having been heard by the Board of Adjustment at its regularly scheduled public meetings on July 22, 2021 and October 21, 2021, and

WHEREAS, the Board of Adjustment examined, considered and placed on file with its records all the exhibits submitted by the Applicants and by the Board of Adjustment, has further considered all of the testimony and said exhibits received in evidence at the public hearings for the subject application, and the Members of the Board of Adjustment visited the subject property on October 2, 2021 and their observations made at such site visit have been set forth in the Site Visit Memorandum prepared by Bruno Silva; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Adjustment does hereby make the following findings of fact and conclusions:

1. The application is properly before the Board of Adjustment, which has the appropriate and exclusive jurisdiction to conduct hearings on the application for variance relief and to render a decision regarding a variance request in accordance with the MLUL and the LDR.
2. The subject property is an existing single-family residential lot located on Crestwood Drive within the R-3 Residential Zone. There is an existing 10-foot wide drainage easement running along the south side lot line of the parcel, and an existing depression located partially within said easement and partially on neighboring Lot 3, which appears to collect stormwater runoff from piping in Crestwood Drive and offsite areas to the north and east. The subject property contains an existing 1.5-story single-family dwelling with attached side-entry garage and rear patio. The subject application has been submitted for a building height variance associated with the proposed removal/reconstruction of the dwelling. Related site improvements include, but are not limited to, new rear patios, walkways, retaining walls, drywells for stormwater management, and a new driveway.
3. The Applicants request the following variances for the proposed improvements:
 - 1) Maximum building height, 35’ permitted, 38.45’ proposed (Section 30-75.2).
4. The Applicants relied on the testimony of David Fantina, P.E., who explained that the reason for the height variance is a dramatic change of grade on the subject property. The proposed house would not loom over other nearby houses because of the low grade of the property. The house immediately to the north is significantly larger than the proposed house. Alteration of the proposed roofline would be detrimental from an aesthetic standpoint. In order to make sure the proposed roof height is accurate, Applicants propose to have a surveyor on site at relevant times during construction. The variance is justified by the hardship created by the slope on the south side of the property. There will be no negative impact on the neighborhood because the additional height will be mitigated by the low grade of the property, and the proposed dwelling will not be inconsistent with other dwellings in the neighborhood.

5. The Applicants further relied on the testimony of Ezio Columbro, their licensed professional architect, who provided that Applicants made efforts in their design to reduce heights at various parts of the structure to mitigate the massing of the building. Lowering the building to the permitted height would make the building appear more dominant due to the monolithic massing that would be created. The façade will be a natural stone veneer and siding will be clapboard.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, on this 21st day of October, 2021 that the Zoning Board of Adjustment of the Township of Chatham, under the authority of N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70(c) of the MLUL and Section 30-47.3 of the LDR does hereby grant approval of the requested variance.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that variance relief is subject to the following conditions:

1. The Applicants shall pay any escrow deposits in addition to initial escrow deposit, if required, to offset any Township costs or professional services rendered by the Board's consulting engineer and the Board's legal counsel in connection with this application, including but not limited to services rendered in reviewing the plans and exhibits, inspections, and preparing this resolution of approval.
2. The Applicants shall comply with all Federal, State, Local and County laws and regulations as they may apply and shall construct the improvements in accordance with this application.
3. Any variance granted herein shall expire unless construction, alteration or uses permitted by the variance shall have commenced within one year from the date of approval, subject to reasonable requests for an extension
4. Applicant will comply with the comments set forth in the review memoranda of the Board's engineer and planner.
5. Applicant will revise the plans to show the addition of planters, as described at hearing, to the satisfaction of the Board's engineer and planner.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the granting of the variance relief described herein shall not be construed to obviate compliance with any other requirements of the Land Development Regulations, insofar as such requirements relate to any construction, or to any other requirements established elsewhere than in such ordinance.

This Resolution memorializes the action taken by the Zoning Board of Adjustment approving the variance relief at its October 21, 2021 public meeting.

Mr. Borsinger moved to adopt Resolution 21-0024. Mr. Weston seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Mr. Vivona, Absent; Mr. Weston, Aye; Mr. Borsinger, Aye; Mr. Fitt, Aye; Mr. McHugh, Aye; Mr. Silva, Absent; Mrs. Chang Absent.

Calendar BOA-21-007 (July 14, 2021) Mr. & Mrs. Gallucci, 331 Lafayette Avenue, Block: 70 Lot: 46. Requesting a variance for the installation of an in-ground pool. (Complete 8-30-21- First Hearing). Escrow #34469

RESOLUTION 21-0023

Calendar No. BOA – 21-007

RESOLUTION OF THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT OF THE TOWNSHIP OF CHATHAM, IN THE COUNTY OF MORRIS, STATE OF NEW JERSEY REGARDING THE APPLICATION OF JOHN AND DAWN GALLUCCI, 331 LAFAYETTE AVENUE, CHATHAM TOWNSHIP

WHEREAS, John and Dawn Gallucci (hereinafter the “Applicants”) are the owners of certain premises located at 331 Lafayette Avenue, Chatham Township, New Jersey and designated as Block 70, Lot 46 on the Tax Map of the Township of Chatham, (hereinafter referred to as the “subject property”), and have applied to the Zoning Board of Adjustment of the Township of Chatham pursuant to the provisions of N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70(c) of the Municipal Land Use Law (MLUL) and Section 30-47.3 of the Land Development Regulations of the Township of Chatham (LDR) for the approval of variances from the requirements of Sections 30-78.112 and 30-13-1.5 of the LDR, and the revised General Ordinances of the Township of Chatham to permit the construction of an in-ground swimming pool, patio, outdoor kitchen and fire pit area in the rear yard; and

WHEREAS, the Applicants were represented by Michael S. Miller, Esq. before the Board of Adjustment during the hearings on the subject application; and

WHEREAS, the Applicants have served the required Notice of Public Hearing, have filed proof of service in accordance with the pertinent statutes, have given public notice of the application by publication in the official newspaper of the Township of Chatham, and also have provided proof that no real property taxes and sewer charges are due and delinquent, and the matter having been heard by the Board of Adjustment at its regularly scheduled public meetings on September 22, 2021 and October 21, 2021, and

WHEREAS, the Board of Adjustment examined, considered and placed on file with its records all the exhibits submitted by the Applicants and by the Board of Adjustment, has further considered all of the testimony and said exhibits received in evidence at the public hearings for the subject application, and the Members of the Board of Adjustment visited the subject property on October 2, 2021 and their observations made at such site visit have been set forth in the Site Visit Memorandum prepared by Marty McHugh; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Adjustment does hereby make the following findings of fact and conclusions:

1. The application is properly before the Board of Adjustment, which has the appropriate and exclusive jurisdiction to conduct hearings on the application for variance relief and to render a decision regarding a variance request in accordance with the MLUL and the LDR.
2. The lot is a 29,995s.f. lot located in the R-3 zone. The subject property is developed with a single-family dwelling. The Applicants propose installation of an in-ground swimming pool, patio, and fire pit, which would exceed the maximum allowable impervious coverage and minimum side yard setback to swimming pool.
3. The Applicants request the following variances for the proposed improvements:
 - 1) Maximum lot coverage, 8,000s.f. permitted, 8,919s.f. existing, 9,638s.f. proposed (as submitted), 9,513s.f. (as revised) (Section 78.112).
 - 2) Minimum setback distance to private swimming pool, 20 feet required, approximately 15.5 feet proposed (Section 13-1.5).
4. The Applicants relied on the testimony of John Gallucci, an owner of the Property, who testified that Applicants seek to install a pool and surrounding patio. He described the existing conditions on the subject property. The area where the pool will be located was chosen because it is the flattest portion of the subject property.
5. The Applicants further relied on the testimony of Mr. Donahue, appearing on behalf of Weissman Engineering Co., P.C., who testified that the subject property is 29,990s.f. in area and contains an existing single-family dwelling that is setback approximately 123 feet from the streetline. The driveway contains a turnaround area for safety reasons because a portion of the driveway slopes at approximately 14.5%. The length of the existing driveway is required to navigate the slope and to have located the existing dwelling on the flat area of the subject property. Applicants propose to remove the existing walkway and patio area in the rear yard and construct a new pool and surrounding patio area. Stormwater will be collected in a proposed discharge system. The

proposed construction is located behind the existing dwelling. The proposed additional impervious is 594s.f. for a total 9,513s.f. of impervious coverage. The rear yard is densely screened and, accordingly, the additional impervious coverage will not have a visual impact on nearby properties.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, on this 21st day of October, 2021 that the Zoning Board of Adjustment of the Township of Chatham, under the authority of N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70(c) of the MLUL and Section 30-47.3 of the LDR does hereby grant approval of the requested variances.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that variance relief is subject to the following conditions:

1. The Applicants shall pay any escrow deposits in addition to initial escrow deposit, if required, to offset any Township costs or professional services rendered by the Board's consulting engineer and the Board's legal counsel in connection with this application, including but not limited to services rendered in reviewing the plans and exhibits, inspections, and preparing this resolution of approval.
2. The Applicants shall comply with all Federal, State, Local and County laws and regulations as they may apply and shall construct the improvements in accordance with this application.
3. Any variance granted herein shall expire unless construction, alteration or uses permitted by the variance shall have commenced within one year from the date of approval, subject to reasonable requests for an extension.
4. Applicants shall comply with all the recommendations set forth in the review letter prepared by the Board's engineer, to the satisfaction of the Board's engineer.
5. Applicants shall submit a copy of the plans to the fire marshal for recommendations and approval.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the granting of the variance relief described herein shall not be construed to obviate compliance with any other requirements of the Land Development Regulations, insofar as such requirements relate to any construction, or to any other requirements established elsewhere than in such ordinance.

This Resolution memorializes the action taken by the Zoning Board of Adjustment approving the variance relief at its October 21, 2021 public meeting.

Mr. Fitt moved to adopt Resolution 21-0023. Mr. McHugh seconded the motion.

Roll Call: Mr. Vivona, Absent; Mr. Weston, Aye; Mr. Borsinger, Aye; Mr. Fitt, Aye; Mr. McHugh, Aye; Mr. Silva, Absent; Mrs. Chang Absent.

Hearings

Calendar BOA-21-010 (September 1, 2021) Mr. & Mrs. Spina, 102 Candace Lane, Block: 37 Lot: 24. Requesting front yard setback variance to add an addition to their home for a screened-in porch. (Complete 10/7/21) First Hearing

Mr. Weston stated that a Site Visit will be scheduled for December 4, 2021 at 9:00 AM. Tonight's hearing will be an overview, and the hearing will be continued at the next

Beata Szacillo, a licensed architect representing the applicant, was sworn in to give testimony. Mrs. Szacillo provided an overview of the application. She stated that the application is for relief from the 50 foot front yard setback requirement. The applicant wants to add a screened-in porch to the side of their house. Due to the lot configuration, the side of their house is technically

considered the front yard. The proposed addition will be 22.9 feet from the property line, which is why the variance is needed. Mrs. Szacillo said that the property is considered a hardship because of the configuration of the lot in relation to the street, an undersized lot depth, and a preexisting nonconformity for the front yard of a 33.1-foot setback. She also pointed out that much of the front yard is obscured by heavy vegetation and most of the lot lays along Mountain Avenue and has a rapid slope. The only vantage point from which the addition would be visible is from Candace Lane. Mrs. Szacillo said that the neighboring properties will not be affected by the addition and it will not be detrimental.

Mr. Weston noted that the property has a preexisting nonconforming condition. Mrs. Szacillo reiterated that the existing setback is 33.1 feet, and 22.9 feet are proposed. The required setback is 50 feet.

Mr. Weston asked that the proposed addition be marked out for the site visit.

Mr. Borsinger asked if electronic copies of drawings were distributed. Mrs. Tsimboukis said that any documents received were posted on the website. Mr. Fitt stated that an email was received by the Board on November 10th.

Mrs. Szacillo asked if she should be present at the site visit. Mr. Weston said that is up to the applicant.

Calendar BOA-21-013 (September 13, 2021) Mr. Alex Birdsall, 12 Jay Road, Block: 48.14 Lot: 113.13. Requesting three (3) variances: 1) Building Height 2) Number of Stories, 3) Side Yard Setbacks, to construct a larger second level to an existing garage accessory structure. (Complete 10/18/21)

Janet Siegel, an architect representing the applicant, was sworn in to give testimony.

Mr. Weston stated that a site visit will be held on December 4, 2021 at 9:30 AM.

Alex Birdsall, the homeowner, provided an overview of the application. He stated that they are seeking to add usable living space over their garage to make it easier to work from home.

Mrs. Siegel stated that the footprint of the existing garage is over what is allowable for a two-car garage. There is currently an unfinished area over the garage. The application seeks to raise the roof by 4 feet 10 inches, to rebuild the roof at the same pitch and to add some dormers to allow for livable space over the garage. The footprint of the garage will not be changed. The variance requested is for the height of an accessory structure. The average height limit is 18 feet, and the proposed garage will be 21.5 feet. The current average garage height is conforming. The second variance requested is for a second story in an accessory structure. Mrs. Siegel addressed the side yard setback. Building coverage is not changing, and there will be improvements of lot coverage because the sidewalk will come from the front of the garage to the back. Mrs. Siegel stated that the overall impact is minimal. She also stated that the application will add livable space without increasing the visual impact from the street.

Mr. Fitt asked if this application would allow for a home office. Mr. Birdsall stated that is the objective.

Mr. Weston noted that mark outs for the site visit will not be possible as the addition is only vertical.

Mrs. Siegel asked if screen sharing will be possible for drawings to be presented at the next meeting. Mrs. Tsimboukis stated that originals still need to be submitted, and screen sharing will be available.

Mr. Fitt asked if there is a way at the site visit to get a sense of how imposing the garage will be to neighboring properties. Mrs. Siegel shared photos of the existing garage compared with renderings of the proposed garage.

Mr. Borsinger asked at what point an accessory structure becomes another building. Mr. Carlson said the Board would have to determine if the structure is customary to the primary use. Mr. Borsinger asked if HVAC installation would make the difference. Mr. Carlson said that HVAC alone would not be the deciding factor, and he will do research on the matter for the next hearing. Mr. Weston asked if there will be running water or sanitary facilities. Mr. Birdsall said there would not. Mrs. Siegel said that there is already electricity in the accessory structure.

Mr. Fitt asked that any proposed exterior lighting be marked out for the site visit. Mrs. Siegel noted that the lighting is shown on the plans submitted, and the locations will be pointed out at the site visit.

Mr. Weston confirmed that the hearing will be continued at the December 16th meeting.

Calendar BOA-21-011(September 7, 2021) Mr. & Mrs. Jordre, 16 Pine Street, Block: 85 Lot:34. Requesting three (3) variances to install a pool. Pool fall within the 10' setback of the house. The placement of the equipment, and construct a patio. (Complete 10/19/21) First Hearing

Mr. Fitt noted that he is recused on this application.

Mr. Weston stated that a site visit will be conducted on December 4th, and the hearing will be continued on December 16th.

Antoine Hajjar, a planner, surveyor and engineer representing the applicant, was sworn in to give testimony.

Michael Jordre, the applicant, thanked the Board of Adjustment for hearing the application. He stated that he and his wife want to install their pool in a space that maximizes sunlight and also preserves greenspace.

Mr. Hajjar said that a 272 square foot fiberglass swimming pool is proposed with a 116 square foot lounging paver patio and a 165 square foot louvered pergola. There is also a proposed wall on the northwest which will include a rinse shower. The variance requested is for the equipment to be placed on the southern side of the dwelling where the AC condenser and backup generator are located. That site was chosen because the neighboring home is about 100 feet away. Mr. Hajjar said the required setback for pool equipment is 11 feet, and the application proposes a 5-foot setback.

Mr. Hajjar stated that the second variance is for the lounging pad. The Township Code book has a 15-foot setback requirement, and the proposed lounging area is only 10.9 feet. The third

variance is regarding the setback between accessory structures and other structures. The pool is proposed to be seven feet from the existing dwelling and three feet from the steps to the deck, whereas a 10-foot setback is required in both cases. Mr. Hajjar also stated that the Board should also determine if the pergola is considered a structure.

Mr. Weston opened the floor for public comment.

1. Brian & Ellen Whiteman, 15 Lenape Trail, said that their home is directly behind the Jordre residence and directly down gradient. Mr. Whiteman stated that he has concerns about the rear setback variance. He stated that based on the plans, the patio could be shifted between the pool and the pergola so that a variance would not be needed and it would be less invasive to his property. Mr. Whiteman also stated that the retaining wall should be elevated so that he can have more privacy. Water runoff was also cited as a concern.

Mr. Weston stated that the public is welcome to attend the site visit. He also stated that as the Board has not yet seen the project yet, comment cannot be given on alternatives. However sometimes the Board does ask for alternatives to reduce impact on neighbors.

Mr. Hajjar addressed the water runoff comments, and explained that a drywell will be installed so that water will infiltrate instead of running off to neighboring properties.

Mr. Weston stated that such discussions should be handled at the next hearing.

Mr. Hajjar stated he has a conflict on December 16th and asked if the hearing can be held on a different date. Mr. Carlson said that the hearing can be scheduled so that he can attend both meetings, or he could have colleague fill in for him. Mr. Weston asked if pools are normally installed in December or January, or if the next hearing could occur in January. Mrs. Jordre asked that the scheduling be discussed offline so that they can report back to the Board Manager.

Mrs. Whiteman raised additional concerns. Mr. Carlson explained the Board procedures and stated that full testimony from the applicant's professionals will come at a later time. He also stated that if the Whiteman's concerns are not addressed at that time, they can ask additional questions at that time.

The hearing will be continued on January 12, 2022. Mr. Weston stated that the site visit will be held on December 4th at 10:00 AM.

Calendar BOA-21-012 (September 12, 2021) Dr. Laura Downey, 134 Chatham Street, Block: 93 Lot: 5.02. Requesting two (2) variances to construct an addition. Rear yard setback and principal building coverage: (Complete 10/26/21) First Hearing

Mr. Weston stated that there will be a site visit on December 4th and the hearing will continue on December 16th with an overview being provided tonight.

Remo Caputo, an attorney representing the applicant, provided an overview for the application. He stated that the purpose of the application is for the addition is to provide a semi-independent living condition for an adult child who has a medical condition. The medical condition requires an adequate amount of sunlight. Two variances are required. The first variance pertains to the rear yard setback. The Township's zoning ordinance requires a setback of 50 feet in the rear

yard, while the application provides for a rear yard setback of 27.6 feet. The applicant is also requesting a variance from Section 30-78.11d as the proposed building coverage will increase to 2,707 square feet which exceeds the maximum of 2,242 square feet permitted by ordinance. Mr. Caputo stated that some waivers will be requested as well.

Paul Anderson, an engineer representing the applicant, was sworn in to give testimony. He provided his qualifications and was accepted as an expert.

Mr. Anderson presented the plot plan for the application. He showed on the plan where the variance relief is needed. Mr. Anderson also confirmed that the property is of a nonconforming size.

Mr. Borsinger asked if the variances are requested due to hardship. Mr. Anderson stated that there are hardship elements, however the primary proof will be the C-2 criteria. He addressed lot size in the zone, and said that there is also an element of the C-1 criteria. Mr. Anderson stated that the benefits will outweigh the detriments, and he said he will address that further at the next meeting.

Jonathan Babula, an architect representing the applicant, was sworn in to give testimony. He provided his qualifications and was accepted as an expert.

Mr. Babula described the design of the proposed addition. He noted that there are a lot of windows to enhance natural light, and there is unrestricted access to the addition.

Dr. Downey, the applicant, was sworn in to give testimony. Dr. Downey described her daughter's medical conditions that give her a disadvantage on living alone. The proposed addition is to allow Dr. Downey's daughter to have more independence but still be close by so that she can be assisted with her medical conditions. The location of the proposed addition was chosen so that it can get the maximum amount of sunlight.

Mr. Borsinger commented that the criteria for a C-2 variance should be discussed with the applicant's attorney to ensure that they have the proofs necessary. Mr. Caputo said that there are C-1 and C-2 criteria available. Mr. Anderson stated that he would address the planning proofs at the next hearing.

Mr. Weston stated that the site visit will be on December 4th at 10:30 AM. He asked for the proposed conditions and variances to be marked out in the field.

Mr. Weston opened the floor for public comment.

1. Justin Boyd, 51 Meadowbrook Road, stated that he is concerned about the application's lot coverage. He stated he sent videos to the Construction Official about runoff from the site. Mr. Boyd also stated that a drywell has done little to mitigate stormwater flow. Mr. Boyd further stated that he is concerned about privacy between the lots. He also said he understands Dr. Downey's need to care for her daughter, however he is concerned about the impact this application will have on neighboring properties.
2. Jon Monks, 47 Meadowbrook Road, said that a prior subdivision of the subject property has resulted in a disadvantage to his property from water runoff. He said he has had to perform a home renovation, and never had water in his basement prior to the construction

of homes on the subdivided lots. Mr. Monks described the water problems he has had in his house, and opined that the stormwater plans for the subject property were inadequate. He also stated that his basement is currently unlivable due to flooding from recent storms. Mr. Monk expressed a concern that the proposed addition will exacerbate the drainage issues. He stated he will attend the site visit.

Mr. Weston asked if there has been any engineering work done on the prior subdivision in the past that can be reviewed in advance of the subdivision. Mr. Honoshowsky stated that in the technical review there were comments regarding stormwater related issues.

Mr. Boyd offered to submit videos of the water runoff. Mr. Anderson said he would like to see at the site visit what damage was done by stormwater so that the issues can be addressed.

3. Bruce Alder, 49 Meadowbrook Road, said that there has been a considerable amount of runoff from the subject property to his. He also said he is concerned about runoff. Mr. Alder also said that he is sympathetic to Dr. Downey's circumstances, however neighboring properties also need to be considered and runoff needs to be addressed.

Mr. Weston closed the floor to the public.

Mr. Fitt moved to adjourn at 9:04 PM. Mr. Borsinger seconded the motion, and the motion carried unanimously.

Gregory J. LaConte
Recording Secretary