

Case # 1394 – Maldonado – Block 140, Lot 10 – 33 Teaneck Road

An application requiring a variance to create a driveway in the front yard of the existing one-family dwelling located at 33 Teaneck Road, Block 140, Lot 10, in the R-3 Zone. The applicant, Noemi Maldonado, and her son, Oscar Maldonado, Jr., were sworn in. The Board was presented with proof of service, taxes paid and proof of publication. The Chairman read the denial letter. Oscar Maldonado, Jr. presented photos and documents to the Board in support of the application. They were marked as follows: Exhibit A1 – a copy of the certified survey of the property; exhibit A2 – a photo of the applicant's property at 33 Teaneck Road. Mr. Maldonado testified that their home is next to an apartment complex. There had been a verbal agreement with the apartment complex in which they were allowed to use the apartment's driveway to access a parking area in the rear of their lot. That access has now been denied by the new manager of the apartment complex. Exhibits A3 to A16 were introduced by Mr. Maldonado, and shared with the Board members, showing various views of their property, the damage done to their fence by the apartment complex, the paved front yards of adjacent properties, views of Teaneck Road and Bergen Turnpike.

Mr. Maldonado testified that since they do not have parking on their property and parking is not allowed on Teaneck Road, they must park approximately 700 feet from their home on Bergen Turnpike. His mother works until 3 am and there is concern for her safety walking from where she must park to the house at that time.

Oscar Maldonado, Sr. was sworn in. He testified that they were told that there had been a driveway easement in the past with the lot to the north. However, the house that exists there now was built encroaching on the easement. The Maldonado's house is 3 feet from the property line to the south with the apartment, so there is no way to get to the back of their property on either side of the house, except to pass over the apartment's property to the south. The proposed size of the space to be paved is 18 X 15 feet. There was discussion by the Board, with concern about that much impervious coverage. The applicants were asked if they would be open to installing a surface that would provide drainage, such as crushed stone or pavers. The applicants indicated that this would be acceptable to them.

The case was opened to the public – No one appeared. The case was set down for work session.

Case # 1395 – Lavery – Block 8, Lot 13 – 133 Fourth Street.

An application requiring variances to construct a new garage on the property located at 133 Fourth Street, Block 8, Lot 13, in an R-2 Zone. The applicant, Tammy Lavery, was sworn in. The Board was furnished with proof of service, taxes paid and proof of publication. The Chairman read the denial letter. The applicant testified that she wished to construct a one-car detached garage on her property. She has recently gotten a new car and wants to protect it from the elements. There was an old garage at the very back of the property when she purchased, but it fell

down soon after she moved in. The concrete floor has been removed and the area is now a garden. She wishes to build the new garage closer to the house to retain the garden in the back and for a shorter distance to the house for her mother, who lives with her. There is a deck on the rear of the house and it will be approximately 6 feet from the garage. If the garage were built to the required setback, it would be too close to the deck. Therefore, the variance is being requested.

The case was opened to the public. No one appeared.

The case was set down for work session.

The Board went into work session and came out with the following decisions:

Case # 1394 - Maldonado

Mr. Vorhees, seconded by Mr. Morton, made a motion to approve the application.

Roll Call:	Mr. Cathcart – Yes	Mr. Morton - Yes
	Mr. McCormack – Yes	Mr. Vorhees – Yes
	Mr. DellaFave – Yes	Mr. Wohlrab – Yes
	Mr. Spontak – Yes	

The resolution will be prepared for memorialization at the next meeting.

Case # 1395 - Lavery

Mr. Vorhees, seconded by Mr. McCormack, made a motion to approve the application.

The resolution was read into the record. A copy is attached.

Roll Call:	Mr. Cathcart – Yes	Mr. Morton - Yes
	Mr. McCormack – Yes	Mr. Vorhees – Yes
	Mr. DellaFave – Yes	Mr. Wohlrab – Yes
	Mr. Spontak – Yes	

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Quinn
Secretary

Tape # 460

