

Minutes of the Township of Aberdeen Zoning Board of Adjustment Public Meeting of Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Present are Mr. Brenner, Mr. Bucco, Mr. Byock, Mr. Falco, Mrs. Friedman, Mr. Phillips, Mr. Phelps, Mr. Sinclair

Also present are Marc Leckstein, Esq., Leckstein and Leckstein, Anthony Abbonizio, CME Associates, and Jason Cline, Remington & Vernick Engineers

New Business, **V19-110/Trabachino Willow Avenue, Applicant: Gary Trabachino, Property Owner: Mary Knebel, 102 Willow Avenue, Block 137, Lot 1, Variance** request to construct a single family home on the corner of Willow and Grand Avenues in the Freneau Section of Aberdeen Township, in the R 100 single family residential zone. Applicant proposes a 2-1/2 story single family dwelling fronting on Willow with driveway located on Grand Avenue. Variance required for Lot Area 10,000 sq. ft. minimum required, 7,386 sq. ft. existing and proposed; Lot Depth 100 ft. required, 50 ft. existing and proposed; Front Yard Setback 35 ft. required on each street (corner lot), 10 ft. proposed on Willow Avenue and 40 ft. on Grand Avenue; Maximum Building Height 35 ft. permitted, actual height to be determined. **Note (1): This application was originally submitted and heard under V 19-104/Sunrise Design, Inc., which was withdrawn by the applicant before a decision was rendered by the Zoning Board. Note (2): This application was to be carried to the February 26, 2020 Zoning Board Public Meeting with no further notice, but will now be carried to the March 25, 2020 Public Meeting.**

Mr. Phelps announces this application will be carried to the March 25 Public Meeting with noticing by the applicant's attorney.

New Business, **SP 16-513 (Amended)/241 Cliffwood Properties, LLC, Applicant and Property Owner: 241 Cliffwood Properties, LLC, 239, 241, 255-277 Cliffwood Avenue, Block 183, Lot 11.01, Amend Preliminary and Final Site Plan** (approved by the Zoning Board in June, 2017, and **Use Variance** approved by the Zoning Board in 2014), to construct 52 multifamily dwelling units, 42 to be market rate units and ten affordable units, in five two story buildings, along with parking and recreational areas, on property located in the NC (Neighborhood Commercial) and R 100 (single family residential) Zones. The applicant seeks to amend the site plan to modify the architectural elevations, number of stories increased to 3 stories from 2-1/2 stories, and floor plan of the multifamily buildings. The building height will remain compliant with the Ordinance, but will go from 2-1/2 stories at 35 ft. to 3 stories at 35 ft., requiring variance approval; Combined Side Yard Setback 72 ft. required, 38.6 ft. approved, 39.4 ft. now proposed, requiring new variance approval; Maximum Building Coverage 20% permitted, 20.4% previously approved, 20.3% now proposed; Maximum Building Height 2-1/2 stories permitted and previously approved, 3 stories now proposed; Parking spaces required 119, previously approved and proposed 119 parking spaces. Prior variance approval granted for Front Yard Setback 35 ft. required, 25.3 ft. approved and proposed. **This application has been carried from the February 26 Public Meeting.**

Mr. Leckstein marks as Exhibit A-1 the preliminary and final site plan last dated February 28, 2020; Exhibit A-2 are the elevation and architectural plans dated November 19, 2019, received February 28, 2020. Marked as Exhibit B-1 is the Zoning Board of Adjustment use variance

resolution adopted November 12, 2014; Exhibit B-2 is the Zoning Board of Adjustment resolution dated June 28, 2017; Exhibit B-3 is the CME review letter dated March 5, 2020; Exhibit B-4 is the Remington and Vernick review letter dated March 6, 2020.

Salvatore Alfieri, Esq., of the firm Cleary, Giacobbe, Alfieri, attorney for the applicant, says this application was originally approved as a use variance and site plan for 52 townhouse units, ten of which will be affordable. Since the approvals, his client, the developer, has posted bonds, entered into a developer's agreement with the town, did the grading and clearing of the site, installed the storm water management, installed the utilities, and got the site ready for construction.

Sometime late last year, Ryan Homes, NVR, decided to buy the project. Their townhouse project is different than the townhouse project presented to and approved by this Board. They are seeking relief from the condition of approval that said the units can only be 2-1/2 stories. Because of the definition of stories in the Ordinance, the number of stories has changed, and the Board planner has ruled that since the difference between what was allowed and approved vs. what is being asked for is more than 10%, it is a d variance, so they are here for a height variance. Minor modifications were made to the site plan.

Mr. Alfieri says the first witness to be called has mounted architecturals and reduced size versions of Exhibit A-2 to be handed out to Board members and professionals tonight, which Mr. Leckstein says the Board already has.

John Battaglia is sworn in by Mr. Leckstein, and states he is with Ryan Homes, NVR as Division Manager and Vice President of their Central New Jersey office of Ryan Homes. Answering Mr. Brenner, he has no financial interest in this project other than thru his office. Answering Mr. Alfieri, Mr. Battaglia says Ryan Homes NVR is a large nationally publicly traded home builder in the United States, operating in 32 different markets, 14 different states. They have built over 450,000 houses over the past 40 years. They do about 19,000 houses, mostly in the eastern part of the state. They operate two divisions in New Jersey where they build between 500 and a thousand homes a year. His division operates out of Ocean County up to Sussex County.

Answering Mr. Alfieri, Mr. Battaglia says the architecturals handed out are part of the original package given out for this application. Mr. Alfieri says this is marked as Exhibit A-2.

Mr. Battaglia says they are looking to have the previously approved architectural plans changed to a design they have previously built in the Township. They will be marketing all the homes, constructing, building and servicing them.

He says the other Aberdeen project was finished four or five years ago, and called Bluffs at Aberdeen on Phillip E. Frank Way in Cliffwood.

Mr. Battaglia understands there is a 10 unit affordable housing approval as part of the original application. He says two units will be built within each of the five buildings to be built within the community. Answering Mr. Leckstein, Mr. Alfieri says there is no change, the original approval was to distribute them equally among the five buildings.

Mr. Battaglia says the units will be for sale, there will be a condominium form of ownership which they will have to file and receive DCA approval, and they are in the process of doing that now.

Referring to the architectural drawings, Mr. Battaglia says it is a typical elevation of what the building will look like. Within the community there are four ten unit buildings and one 12 unit building. The front elevation is the front sheet, along with the rear and side elevations on further sheets. They will be offering three different floor plans within each unit. He has provided floor plans for those units, namely Beethoven, Mozart and Straus. He has included the basement or first floor level, the second floor level, the living area, and the third floor level, bedroom areas. He has also provided floor plans for the affordable housing units on the last page. Mr. Battaglia is referring to Exhibit A-3 on the easel.

Mr. Alfieri says an issue raised in the planner's report was whether or not they need a sales trailer and/or a construction trailer. Mr. Battaglia says there will only be a construction trailer, no sales trailer.

Mr. Alfieri refers to the planner's report questioning whether there should be a deed restriction to prevent the conversion of rooms to create additional bedrooms. Mr. Battaglia says, not including the affordable units which are a mix of one, two and three bedrooms, the other units will all be one or two bedrooms. He is willing to state in his public offering that there can be no additional bedrooms. He would agree to a deed restriction if the Board requests it. Mr. Alfieri, answering Mr. Leckstein, says the deed restriction would state there would be no conversion of any other rooms into bedrooms. The units will only have one or two bedrooms.

Mr. Alfieri says they marked as Exhibit A-3, which exhibit is on the easel, an architectural plan prepared by Chester Plousas dated 8/1/16. Mr. Alfieri says it was A-3 in the original site plan application, being 2-1/2 stories. Mr. Leckstein says it was A-3 before and A-3 now.

Answering Mr. Alfieri, Mr. Battaglia says each building is 35 ft. in height, same as what is being proposed. There is also three floors of living space in the approved plans, first floor, second floor and a loft built into the third floor. The pitch 4/12, answering Mr. Bucco. The current plans are three floors, with bedrooms on the third floor.

Mr. Battaglia, summarizing the three different floor plans, in the Beethoven, Mozart and Straus. Looking at the front elevations, there are three stories. The ground floor will have either an unfinished rec room area or finished rec room area, foyer and garage. You will travel up a set of stairs to what is called the second floor, has a kitchen and living room. You then go up another set of stairs to the third floor which will have two bedrooms, owner's bath and another bathroom. Clarifying the plans say basement level, Mr. Battaglia is calling it lower level. He confirms to Mr. Leckstein there is no basement, everything is above grade.

Answering Mr. Alfieri, the target market for these homes isn't changing from what originally was approved, first time home buyers, young couples, divorced, commuters.

Answering Mr. Alfieri about the square footage, from what was originally approved, the lower level and the first floor are a bit smaller and the third floor is a bit bigger. Depending on the mix of the floor plans, because three different floor plans of different sizes will be offered, on average it will be about 300 sq. ft. bigger than what was originally approved, but it will still be within the approved maximum coverage of the community, but the footprints are a bit smaller.

Mr. Alfieri, referring to the planner's report of March 6, Item 7, which he believes has been answered...***the applicant should agree that no configuration that would create a bedroom on the ground floor by ordinance definition will be offered, largely that access to the rear area will be by hallway rather than doorway***....Mr. Battaglia says that is correct, no bedroom on the ground floor, and he has agreed to a deed restriction.

Mr. Alfieri, referring to Item 11 in the planner's letter, which states...***the submittal proposes a two foot stagger of the front facades of the townhouse buildings across the length of each building, where the variation on the previously approved footprint included greater variation***.....Mr. Battaglia explains that their configuration will be they will be offering different height stones from one unit to the next unit, so different heights of stone, and they have a 2 ft. stagger within the unit, with an elevation change between each unit so it doesn't look like a straight flush front. It is an architectural look to break it up from just a flush front.

Answering Mr. Bucco, who says the original plans had an overhang over the front doors, none is proposed now, Mr. Battaglia says they removed that to meet the coverage required.

Answering Mrs. Freidman as to why the change, Mr. Battaglia says they are a large national home builder, this is a product that they have marketed and built, they have had success with it, they have the best floor plans. Answering Mr. Leckstein if these are the same as built at The Bluffs, Mr. Battaglia says there are variations, they do changes over time.

Mr. Leckstein swears in the Board's professionals.

Note that Mr. Cline, the Board's planner, speaks, but it cannot be picked up.

Mrs. Friedman says the COAH units in the original plan could not be told apart, and these don't look like the other units. Mr. Battaglia says they will be two story units, otherwise they would have to create another floor, giving more square footage to one of the two units, giving someone the opportunity to finish off another bedroom.

Mrs. Friedman says deed restriction or not, people can convert. Mr. Battaglia responds in the market rate units, each level is already finished, without the opportunity to add rooms. If there was another story on the COAH units, you would have to build a floor system, walls, truss system, and leave it unfinished. One unit would have one story, the other unit would have two stories.

Mr. Leckstein says one of the things the Board likes about the old plan there is no way to determine from the exterior what was going on inside the unit. Mrs. Friedman says that is the way it should be, you can't tell one unit from the other. Mr. Battaglia says the roof on that unit will be taller.

Answering Mr. Phelps, Mr. Battaglia says the units have a rec room on the other properties they built in town. There are COAH units there but Ryan Homes did not build them; they were built separately and in separate buildings from the market rate units.

Mrs. Friedman asks how far back the units go, since some of the units have a 10 ft. difference; Mr. Battaglia says they will offer three different floor plans. The Beethoven unit has a 32 ft.

depth, the Mozart has a 36 ft. depth and the Straus is 42 ft., depending on what the customer selects, what floor plan they choose. The COAH units are 40 ft. deep.

Answering Mr. Cline, whose question is not picked up on the mic, Mr. Battaglia says in any building they could put six of the larger unit and two of the middle class. It will be calculated as they go. Each building could be a make up of a Mozart and Straus. Again Mr. Cline is speaking but cannot be picked up on the mic.

Answering Mrs. Friedman, Mr. Battaglia says they will build a whole building. Each building will have a foundation for each unit throughout the building. They will be built on spec if they don't have a buyer.

Answering Mr. Bucco, the buildings will have vinyl siding and stone with variations.

Mr. Alfieri, answering Mr. Leckstein, says that prior conditions remain, including the playground and contacting the school board. Mr. Alfieri says the applicant will agree to all prior conditions of approval.

Answering Mrs. Friedman as to a reason the applicant has not yet contacted the school board, Mr. Alfieri says it will be done.

There are no questions from the public of this witness.

Mr. Alfieri calls the applicant's engineer. Mr. Leckstein swears in Arthur Kuyen, the applicant's engineer, who states he is a licensed engineer in the State of New Jersey. Answering Mr. Alfieri, Mr. Kuyen states he is employed by Stonefield Engineering. The plans were prepared under his supervision, and were previously marked as Exhibit A-1. Answering Mr. Leckstein, he states other than fees received for this project, he has no other financial interest in the project.

Answering Mr. Alfieri, Mr. Kuyen says changes made to the site plan from the original approvals to the current application, he says the applicant and the architect took the onus to maintain the integrity of the previous site design. What changed is a little bit of a stagger, now more of a rectangle shaped building. The driveway locations that originally abutted each other, now with the new building footprint and driveway locations. There are minimal changes to the lighting and landscaping, a few trees have moved due to the driveway locations, some of the building mounted lights had to be revised due to maxing the new building footprint. There are still the same amount of plantings and lightings as originally approved. The utility connections for the buildings themselves shifted with the driveways. From a storm water management standpoint, was maintained, same amount of inlets, same amount of basins originally approved. The number of units did not change, so the parking requirements did not change, nor did the number of parking spaces. The originally approved circulation has been maintained. We are looking, from a site standpoint, a few minor tweaks along the frontage of the buildings. The driveways are the same size.

Answering Mr. Alfieri, Mr. Kuyen says they just notified the school board of the revised design, sending them the school bus turning they prepared. They informed him they are in the process of distributing it to their professionals. The bus will probably not enter the site but rather pick up students at the curb on Cliffwood Avenue. We will work with them to provide anything they

want. They said they are generally OK with the revisions, but they will continue to coordinate with them and keep us informed. We will go back to the Zoning Board with it if there are changes. Answering Mr. Leckstein, Mr. Kuyen says he is speaking to Adam Nasser, at the school, who Mrs. Friedman acknowledges is the person to handle this.

Answering Mr. Alfieri, Mr. Kuyen says they are not changing building coverage from what was originally approved, as well as building height and bulk standards. They will maintain the recreation approvals, including gazebo and patios. The storm water management will comply with New Jersey State regulations, and they have State and Monmouth County approvals. Parking spaces remain at 119. He is in agreement with all the comments put forth by the Board's professionals.

Mrs. Freidman is waiting for feedback from the school district, but is concerned (1) will the buildings change the line of sight, and (2) would the applicant consider building some sort of bus stop for the children to come to and be dropped off safely, and if the line of sight would change them doing this safely. Mr. Kuyen says the previous line of sight is what it is now, since they have maintained all the original building setbacks. It would not be altered from the previous approvals, whether there was a bus stop on site. If the school board comes back and says they need a cut out or something else for a bus stop, they would agree. Mr. Leckstein says it is the school district. Mr. Kuyen says whatever they want for a school bus location they will abide. Mr. Leckstein says this would be a condition of approval and subject to the Board engineer's review.

Mr. Abbonizio says if they have a bus stop at the curb, it would have to be approved by the County. Mr. Alfieri says if the school district comes up with that, they would have to work with the County and make some alternate compromise the applicant would have to agree to. The County may not want a bus stop where the school district says it should be. Mr. Abbonizio says if the County comes back saying they don't want a bus stop on Cliffwood Avenue because of traffic, the circulation plan shows a bus could navigate the site, so there probably is a location within the site for a bus stop.

Mr. Phelps asks the depth of the above ground detention basin on both sides. Mr. Kuyen says the east side is about 7-1/2 ft. The west side will be about 6-1/2 ft. Mr. Phelps asks if it was determined the level of water at any one time. Mr. Kuyen says it would depend on the rain Event, its intensity and duration of the storm. Mr. Phelps asks about protection of the basins from children, and Mr. Kuyen says there is 4 ft. high chain link fencing around the basins.

Mr. Sinclair, referring to Point 9 in the planner's review letter, which states...***the applicant should provide information as to the expected change in target market if the proposed amendments are approved, and an impact on total and student population...***asks if there are any changes in target operation. Mr. Alfieri states it will be the same as prior testimony. Answering Mrs. Friedman if they target adding more children, Mr. Alfieri says the bedroom count is the same as originally approved.

Answering Mr. Cline, who says the previous version had roofs over the porches, and this version does not, which would affect coverage. Mr. Kuyen says there will be no roofs over the porches.

There are no questions from the public for the engineer.

Mr. Leckstein swears in Tanya Marione, the applicant's planner, who states she is a licensed planner in the State of New Jersey, and has no ownership in the development.

Mr. Alfieri addresses the issue of a "d6" variance, stating the applicant is seeking a height variance for three stories from the originally approved 2-1/2 stories. Ms. Marione says the only difference is the three stories, the height of 35 ft. was already approved.

Proofs would be is the approved height consistent with the surrounding neighborhood, would that structure be out of place with the neighborhood, is the appearance of the neighborhood going to be degraded by the structure, would it be out of character with the neighborhood. Those are some of the proofs looked into for a "d6" variance.

She states she went thru the resolutions and sees that some of the same Board members present today, so they are more familiar with the project than she is. One of the things in the resolution that the height was not out of character with the neighborhood because of other similar developments in the neighborhood, including a Ryan Homes development and one being the Glassworks. They are both similar approvals, and it has been established this project is not out of character with the neighborhood.

The difference is minimal in that they are filling out the third floor, which already existed, but now making it a full third floor. She does not know if it was entered into exhibits, but there is an extra 313 sq. ft. in the market rate units, but the COAH units are also being corrected. The main difference is there is no parking on the ground floor in the COAH units like there is in the market units. The COAH units are growing by an average of 137 ft., which Mr. Leckstein says has not changed since there was no first floor parking in the units, but they are slightly bigger. She believes this project is more consistent with the neighborhood land having slightly larger COAH units.

Mrs. Friedman says the original application had approval for more units than was appropriate, so essentially they are asking to build the same amount of approved units but bigger units, on the same small piece of land, so it is not that it does not fit the character of the neighborhood, but rather does not fit the land. Having three stories makes it look more congested and crowded. Mr. Alfieri says when originally approved this was a split zone, the front being commercial, the back residential. The use variance was originally approved for up to 66 units. At site plan they reduced the number of units, made changes at the request of the Board, and were approved for 52 units. Mrs. Friedman says her point is the land it is on doesn't call for 66 units but approved for 52, but now essentially building a bigger building on a very small piece of land. This site is not a huge open space piece of land for the proposed size. You cannot compare the projects. She feels it is not conforming or consistent to put a large structure on a small piece of land. Mr. Alfieri says his position is this is the building Ryan Homes builds, and he believes it is consistent with the property size. Mrs. Friedman says looking at the pictures and looking at the difference between the COAH units and the rest of it, there is a significant, obvious size difference, so it gives the appearance it is different. Mr. Alfieri says some people don't want to stigmatize. Mr. Leckstein says in the previous application the COAH units are the same as the market rate units, and he believes that was inferred. Mr. Phelps says the Board's concern was the distinction between the market rate units and the COAH units, and the stigma that goes along with that, which Mr. Leckstein says is right. Mr. Alfieri says that would have to be looked at. Mr. Falco says it looks off balance.

Mr. Phelps, referring to Mrs Friedman's comments and other properties and comparing them, asks the square footage of the other units. Mr. Alfieri does not have that information, and Mr. Phelps asks him to get that information. Mr. Alfieri says he will get it if the Board needs it. Mrs. Friedman says she understands it is basically taking up the same footprint, but the COAH units look smaller in appearance because they do not have the extra floor. Mr. Alfieri says the COAH units were not the same height as the other units. All the buildings were 30-35 ft. high, it is just that the third floor was a half floor, making the COAH units now lower. Mrs. Friedman says but again it is a smaller unit. Mr. Byock says all the units were the same size of the bigger units in the old plan, but now they cut the COAH units down half a story. Mr. Falco says it does not have the appearance of a two story building, looking more like a single family house. Mr. Leckstein says it is definitely smaller. Mrs. Friedman says she understands it is still the same height, but it is optically what it looks like, and how it fits. She understands it is an appearance thing, but something that looks larger, even though it is not, does not fit the piece of land. Mr. Brenner says it is not one but five buildings being built, and does not know if we have a second bite of the apple. Mr. Leckstein says we definitely have a say in the architecture, but we cannot change the number of units. Mr. Phelps says this goes back to his question of the other units, are they three stories. Mr. Kuyen does not know the height of the Bluffs at Aberdeen, if it is 35 or 40 ft. Mr. Phelps asks if the Board wants to know. Mrs. Friedman says she prefers to have all the information. Mr. Abbonizio agrees the White Oak Lane development has COAH units mixed in with the market rate for sale units. It is not obvious from the outside what are COAH units. Mr. Brenner says this is a whole lot put into a little piece of property. Mr. Leckstein says we might want to poll the Board to see if the members want to see the COAH units at the same height as the market rate units, or leave it the way it is. Mr. Alfieri says he understands the point, but the building showing in the architectural is a six unit; they could show you a ten unit building, though it may not change the thinking. Mrs. Friedman says adding the new look to the plans makes it look bigger, whether it is or not.

Mr. Brenner says we are talking about two different things, one is density, and the other is how do the COAH units look. Mrs. Friedman says she is not against the architectural plan. Mr. Brenner says it is how it looks. Mr. Bucco says he doesn't like it, but doesn't think it is that big a deal. Mr. Leckstein says we are talking about the height of the COAH units. Mr. Byock asks if we want them all 35 ft. Mr. Leckstein says that is what he is talking about. Mr. Brenner says now it is 20 ft. wider, which Mr. Leckstein says is why Tom doesn't mind it. Mr. Bucco says it is set back, the roofs are broken up, and he tends to like that look better than if it were all straight across. Mr. Byock has a problem with it like this because you will know they are COAH units. He would have less problems if they were smaller, regular units. Living there you will know they are COAH units. Mr. Phelps asks if he is saying there is a stigma attached. Mr. Byock replies there is. He has no problem with the three stories, and if they were the same size. Mr. Alfieri says they can make them the same if that's what he needs to get five votes. Mr. Leckstein says that's why he wants the Board to decide if they want uniformity or they don't mind the way it is presented.

Mr. Phelps polls the Board as to whether they want uniformity or not. Mr. Phelps, Mr. Byock, Mr. Brenner and Mr. Phillips want uniformity. Mr. Phelps says the Board goes with uniformity. Mrs. Friedman says she has two issues, one being the three stories, so she is looking at uniformity. Mr. Leckstein says we are definitely looking at uniformity. Mr. Alfieri agrees to have the architecturals revised.

Mr. Phelps asks if we want the applicant to provide us the information on other properties as to size of the property vs. number of units approved, to compare with this project, the way the properties are laid out and the buildings on them. Mr. Leckstein reminds the Board it is not a density issue, and that every application stands on its own. We can't say what a different development looks like, we have to talk about this development on this property.

Mr. Phelps asks if they understand what the Board is saying; Mr. Alfieri says the comments from the planner are right from the resolution of approval. Mrs. Friedman says that is right, but looking at 2-1/2 story buildings, 35 ft. was approved by the Board. Their planner is saying it is conforming to the area around it, but if indeed those developments are three floors on a bigger piece of property and does not have that same visual, she doesn't know if it will change her mind how she feels about a third floor and how it looks. Mr. Phelps says he tends to agree with Mrs. Friedman except he wants to know what it looks like, he wants to see before he says it does fit.

Mr. Brenner asks if they have elevations on a board similar in size. The dimensions may be identical, but it gives the appearance of being bigger. Maybe something else could be done to mitigate the design.

Mr. Sinclair is concerned that with the third floor some of the units will now be looking down on the backyards of the single family homes on Locust Street and on Dogwood Court. He does not believe the third floor was to be living space in the previous architecture. Now it will be. It will have an adverse impact on the residents on those streets. Mr. Alfieri says he believes the other units had a loft with a window. Mr. Bucco questions if those units had a loft with a window or were like a dormer or skylight. Mr. Alfieri says they had dormer windows. Mrs. Friedman says those are tiny windows, so Mr. Sinclair's point that the prior approval was more a dormer with storage space. Now you have actual living space. Mr. Alfieri says the ten units originally approved in Exhibit A-3 dated October 7, 2014, according to their planner. Mr. Leckstein says we are up to Exhibit A-4. Mr. Byock asks what room was approved in the back of the third floor. Mr. Keyun says you need to have a window in the back.

Mr. Bucco asks if they are 2 ft. stagger. Mr. Kevun says yes, in the front. Mr. Bucco asks if that means the ridges are going to be staggered, are the ridges going to be in the center or offset. Mr. Kevun says they will be front and back. Mr. Bucco asks if they will be in the center of each individual unit; Mr. Kevun says that is correct.

Mr. Cline asks how far back the ridge line is approved. Mr. Kevun says the ridge line will be symmetrical when looking at the front and offset the unit differentiation, the roof is flush, so you take one roof and move it forward, but when it goes down the back one unit is 42 deep from the peak back, the truss is a bit longer. Mr. Bucco asks if it is a 4 pitch in the front. Mr. Kuyen says pretty much. Mr. Phelps asks if it will be obvious from the ground, not one side to the other, but the ends. Mr. Kuyen says they will all look exactly the same, 36 on 42, you will see where it comes out, it staggers back. Mr. Phelps asks how you would notice this either way, front or back. Mr. Kuyen says it would depend on what unit is selected next to each other to really see it. For a 30 ft. tall building, you have to stand pretty far back to see all the way up.

Mr. Alfieri refers to prior architectural plans, which Mr. Leckstein says are marked as Exhibit A-3. There is no Exhibit A-4.

Answering Mrs. Friedman, who asks if the dormers she is looking at lead to a storage area, Mr. Kevun replies there is loft space that is living space that goes out to the back window of the unit.

Mr. Brenner says if the end unit is the COAH unit...**note Mr. Alfieri makes a comment but it is not picked up by the mic, and there is talk amongst the Board members into the mics on the dais.**

Mr. Leckstein says the plans are dated October 7, 2014, last revised February 27, 2016. He asks at the time of the 2017 hearing if the 2014 plans were revised in 2016. Mr. Alfieri is unable to clarify the dates, but says if we are using the August 4, 2016 plans he believes it is where four more unit were added, the August date has three sheets. Mr. Leckstein marks the exhibit as A-4 dated February 27, 2016, not Exhibit A-3.

Mr. Alfieri requests a break in the hearing to speak with his client. Upon returning to the dais, all Board members present at the beginning of the meeting tonight are still present.

Mr. Alfieri says he knows there are other issues, but the one issue, whether they can make the affordable units the same height as the other units, they think they can do it, but cannot commit to it tonight, having to go back and talk to the architect and staff. He asks to be carried to the April 22 meeting, and will address other comments as well as the issue of the affordable units at that time.

There is no one from the public questioning the testimony of the applicant's planer or engineer.

Mr. Brenner moves to carry the application without further notice, seconded by Mr. Byock, and on voice vote all members agree.

Memorialization of Resolution **V 20-101/Keel, Applicant: Daniel Keel, Property Owners: Daniel Keel and Tory Zancocchio, 24 Indigo Lane, Block 79, Lot 6, Variance** request to construct a 21.4 ft. x 12.4 ft. rear addition 21 ft. from rear property line were 25 ft. minimum is required on single family home located in the R 75/PC Zone is summarized into the record by Mr. Leckstein. Mr. Falco moves to memorialize, seconded by Mrs. Friedman,

Yes: Mr. Brenner, Mr. Falco, Mrs. Friedman, Mr. Phillips, Mr. Phelps, Mr. Sinclair

No: None

Abstain: None

Meeting adjourned.

