The Chairman called the meeting to order and stated it was being held in compliance with the “Open Public Meeting Act” and had been duly noticed and published as required by law.

ROLL CALL

Present: Mr. Cupersmith, Mr. Daddario, Mr. Leoncio, Mr. Weil, Mr. Willard, Mr. Schwenke

Absent: Mr. Brocco, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Senges

Also, present, Stuart Platt, Board Solicitor and Corrine Tarcelli, Zoning Board Secretary

**CORRESPONDENCE**

Correspondence received from Mr. Luongo, Jr., Attorney for the Applicant, Jason Morovich, 9 Covington Lane, dated April 15, 2019, requesting the application be carried and the action date extended to June 13, 2019. Application was originally carried to April 25, 2019.

Mr. Weil made a motion that the application be carried and the action date be extended to June 13, 2019; seconded by Mr. Willard; none (0) against; no abstentions.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**James and Rosemary Kearney**

6 Oak Ridge Court

Block 202.10, Lot 1

Seeking Bulk Variance relief from Section 150.12(B)(1) to allow a concrete driveway to remain with a side-yard setback of 0 feet, where in no event shall any improvement be permitted within five feet of a side or rear property line; from Section 150.12(B)(1) and 150.13(A)(7)(c) to allow a shed to remain less than five feet from both side and rear property lines, where in no event shall any improvement be permitted within five feet of a side or rear property lines; and with a side-yard setback of 2.5 feet where 10 feet is required; and a rear-yard set-back of four feet where 10 feet is required by the ULDO. Also seeking any and all other variances, waivers, and/or other relief as may be deemed necessary by the Board and/or its professionals.

Mr. James Kearney, Applicant, was sworn in to testify. Mr. Kearney indicated the concrete driveway was poured in 1999 and the shed was built in 2012. The concrete driveway was widened to allow their children to play in an area that was flat so they would not have to play in the street for their safety. The shed was located close to the rear inside property line because the property is heavily wooded and slopes in many areas. The location of the shed is a flat area and was located there so the applicants would not have to remove any trees. He further stated they have not received any complaints regarding the driveway or the shed. There has been no impact and there will be no impact in the neighborhood since one of the adjoining properties is vacant land, and the property next door has a shed in a similar situation.

The meeting was opened to the public. Seeing no one from the public, the public portion was closed.

TheBoard agreed there was an exceptional and undue hardship upon the applicants arising out of the location of structures and improvements lawfully existing and the unusual shape and contours of the rear portion of the property. Additionally, the applicant would be forced to significantly modify the current topographic features of the rear yard to satisfy the requirements of the ULDO.

Mr. Weil motioned to approve relief from Section 150.12(B)(1) to allow a concrete driveway to remain with a side-yard setback of 0 feet, where in no event shall any improvement be permitted within five feet of a side or rear property line; from Section 150.12(B)(1) and 150.13(A)(7)(c) to allow a shed to remain less than five feet from both side and rear property lines, where in no event shall any improvement be permitted within five feet of a side or rear property lines; and with a side-yard setback of 2.5 feet where 10 feet is required; and a rear-yard set-back of four feet where 10 feet is required by the ULDO; seconded by Mr. Willard.

Ayes: Mr. Weil, Mr. Willard, Mr. Daddario, Mr. Leoncio, Mr. Schwenke, Mr. Cupersmith

Nays: None

Abstentions: None

Seeing no further business Mr. Weil made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Willard.

Meeting was adjourned.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Corrine Tarcelli

Zoning Board Secretary