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. Cohen, Mr. Cupersmith, Mr. Leoncio, Mr. Schwenke, Mr. Weil, Mr. Willard

Absent: Mr. Brocco, Mr. Daddario, Mr. Senges

Also, present, Chris Norman, Board Solicitor and Corrine Tarcelli, Zoning Board Secretary

**MINUTES FOR APPROVAL**

 Mr. Cohen motioned to approve the Minutes from June 27, 2019; seconded by Mr. Willard; none (0) against, Mr. Leoncio and Mr. Schwenke abstained.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Robert and Dana Carson**

1308 Pine Avenue

Block 194, L1.01

Seeking Bulk Variance relief from Section 150.13(A)(7)(c), to permit an existing 140 SF shed to remain with a 4.8’ rear setback where a minimum of 10’ is required; and from Section 152.015(D)(2)(b), to construct a patio roof over an existing unroofed rear patio with a rear setback of 20’ where a minimum of 25’ setback is required. Seeking any and all other variances, waivers and/or other relief as may be deemed necessary by the Board and/or its professionals.

 Mr. and Mrs. Carson were sworn in to testify. Mr. Carson explained the back yard is wide however, it is not deep. They did not obtain permits for the shed and placed it where it is currently located so the kids can play in the yard. If they placed the shed to meet the setback requirements, the shed would have to be placed in the middle of the yard and again there would be no room for the children to play. They prefer to have their children play in the backyard for safety reasons because there is a lot of through-traffic on their street. Mr. Carson also stated the previous owners had a pool. The pool was removed and now there is a slope on the property. The shed was placed on the flattest part of the yard.

 Mr. Carson stated in reference to their request for a roof over the patio, the property was vacant for over four years. The patio existed when they purchased the home. They had to have overgrown trees removed and therefore there is no shade whatsoever over the patio. It is too hot to sit outside and the rear room of the home is very hot as well. They did replace the trees, however, they do not shade the patio. It would be more energy efficient as it would cool the rear of the home and would provide shade when sitting outdoors. They cannot cut the patio back to the size required to meet the setback requirements because the patio would then become too narrow and would be more like a step as opposed to a patio. Having a step as opposed to a patio would result in a safety issue.

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

 Mr. Weil motioned to approve relief from Section 150.13(A)(7)(c), to permit an existing 140 SF shed to remain with a 4.8’ rear setback where a minimum of 10’ is required; and from Section 152.015(D)(2)(b), to construct a patio roof over an existing unroofed rear patio with a rear setback of 20’ where a minimum of 25’ setback is required; seconded by Mr. Cohen.

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

Nays: None

**Jason and Andrea Johnson**

124 Paradise Drive

Block 238, L10

 Seeking Bulk Variance relief from Section 150.14(B)(1)(b)(2) to permit the installation of 6’ high vinyl fencing in the secondary front yard, where no fencing is permitted in front yards, and seeking any and all other variances, waivers and/or other relief as may be deemed necessary by the Board and/or its professionals.

Mrs. Johnson was sworn in to testify. Mrs. Johnson explained their home is located on a corner lot. In 2003 she received variance approval for a four-foot fence to be placed further in the front yard so they could utilize more square footage of the yard. She stated she would like to replace the four-foot wood fence with a six-foot vinyl fence and again is requesting to move the fence forward to gain additional square footage. Teenagers have jumped the fence to gain access to their pool. Mrs. Johnson has a large dog that can actually see over the current fence. Their neighbors received a variance a few years ago for the same and Mrs. Johnson would like to move their fence to line up with their neighbor’s fence. A higher fence would promote safety for the kids, the pool as well as the dog. Secondly, installing the fence forward of the rear property line, the windows to the garage will now be located behind the fence for safety purposes.

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

Mr. Weil motioned to approverelief from Section 150.14(B)(1)(b)(2) to permit the installation of 6’ high vinyl fencing in the secondary front yard, where no fencing is permitted in front yards; seconded by Mr. Willard.

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

Nays: None

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

Meeting was adjourned.
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