

**READINGTON TOWNSHIP ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING
August 19, 2021**

The Meeting was called to order by Chair Goodwin at 7:30 p.m. stating that the requirements of the Open Public Meetings Act have been met and that this meeting had been duly advertised.

ROLL CALL

Albrecht, C.
Goodwin, M.
Kirk, T.
Mittleman, K.
Maurer, C.
Nees, S.
Tropello, S.

Board Members Absent:

Bola, E.
Hendry, D.

Ms. Albrecht moved, and Ms. Kirk seconded a motion to excuse the absences of Ms. Hendry and Mr. Bola.

Others Present:

Board Attorney, Steven Warner, Esq., Board Planner, Michael Sullivan, Board Engineer, Rob O'Brien, and Board Secretary, Ann Marie Lehberger.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Board Attorney Warner noted some corrections needed.
Ms. Kirk moved, and Ms. Mittleman seconded, a motion to approve the July 15, 2021, minutes as amended. The motion carried unanimously.

RESOLUTIONS

There were no resolutions presented for Board consideration.

PUBLIC HEARING

Vincent Randazzo

Block 95 Lot 2 – 730 Route 202
Appl# ZB20-006- Appeal and “D” Variance – Billboard

Chair Goodwin announced that at the applicant’s request, this application will be carried to the meeting on Thursday, September 16, 2021, at 7:30 p.m. No further notice will be provided.

Cody Bohler

Block 70 Lot 17.25 – 26 Cardinal Drive
Appl# ZB21-007-Variance – Pole Barn

Ms. Albrecht moved, and Mr. Maurer seconded, a motion to deem the application complete. The motion carried unanimously.

Cody Bohler was present and sworn in for testimony. Board Planner Michael Sullivan and Board Engineer Rob O'Brien were also sworn.

Mr. Bohler explained that he is seeking variance approval to construct a 36 X 50-foot detached garage/pole barn, 2,160 square feet which is 309 feet larger than what is permitted by the Township Ordinance. He stated that the proposed structure will have 14-foot-high ceilings, with a maximum peak height of 21.5 feet. He explained that it will be placed to the right of his existing home and will be accessed through his existing driveway noting that he would have to add a small driveway extension. Mr. Bohler stated that the proposed garage will be gray with stone veneer and will have three carriage style garage doors to complement his existing home. Mr. Bohler also stated that he intends to plant additional landscaping. He explained that the structure would have electric, but no water or septic connections and the proposed lighting will be motion activated during dusk to dawn. He confirmed that there will be no light spillage onto the adjacent properties because no windows are proposed.

The Board questioned if the existing garage on the property would remain a garage. Mr. Bohler confirmed that it would explaining that he collects antique cars. He stated that he currently has eight cars now and would like to add additional cars in the future.

The Board questioned why the size of the structure could not be reduced to comply with the Township Ordinance. Mr. Bohler explained that, when he purchased the property, the Ordinance requirement permitted an accessory structure to be 90% of the size of the associated principal building and that, subsequently, the percentage had been reduced to 75%. He stated that the structure could be reduced to comply with the Ordinance but explained that would like to have the additional space to fit all his cars.

The Board questioned where his antique cars are currently stored. Mr. Bohler stated that some of his cars are stored at his parents' house.

Mr. Bohler explained that a conforming sized garage/pole barn would not provide him with sufficient space to accommodate his existing vehicles and the other items he wishes to store inside. He further explained that his driveway is a single-lane driveway and, therefore, the vehicles would have to be parked on the street, or somewhere else if the garage is not approved.

The Board questioned how much square footage each vehicle needed. Mr. Bohler explained that it varies due to the size of the vehicle.

The Board questioned why there are no windows proposed. Mr. Bohler explained that he did not want the contents of the structure to be visible. He also stated that he did not include windows to avoid any potential light spillage to the neighboring properties.

The Board questioned if the applicant had a permit for the removal of the trees. Mr. Bohler stated that if the application is approved he would obtain the necessary permit and submit a tree removal and replacement plan.

The Board questioned where the closest water source would be. Mr. Bohler stated that

there was a hose bib on the back of his house that was about 50 feet from the proposed structure.

The Board questioned if the applicant would agree to an annual inspection to ensure the garage is being used as proposed. Mr. Bohler agreed.

The Board questioned if the applicant repaired the cars. Mr. Bohler explained that he does do repair work on the cars that he collects.

The Board questioned if a lift would be installed. Mr. Bohler confirmed that he does plan on installing a lift and stated that the cars are not intended to be sold for profit.

The Board questioned what the foundation would be made of. Mr. Bohler explained that the foundation will be 5 inch thick 4,000 psi fiber enforced concrete.

The Board questioned if the applicant painted cars. Mr. Bohler confirmed that he does not do body work or exterior painting.

The Board questioned how electric will be brought to the garage. Mr. Bohler explained that the proposed garage will have separate electric service from the home that will require the installation of a separate connection from the street.

The Board questioned if the structure will be heated. Mr. Bohler explained that he intends to heat the structure and install ceiling fans to help move the air around.

The Board questioned if the applicant intends to rent space out for car storage. Mr. Bohler confirmed that he will not rent any space out.

The Board discussed the size of the proposed garage and whether it could be modified to conform with the Ordinance requirements. Board Attorney Warner explained the legal standards that the applicant is required to address.

The Board questioned if the applicant has spoken to any of his neighbors about the proposal. Mr. Bohler stated that he and his wife had recently moved into the neighborhood and due to Covid had not met any of the neighbors.

Board Planner Michael Sullivan asked for clarification on the type of work that the applicant would be doing on the cars. Mr. Bohler explained that he does minor repair work but does not intend to use commercial grade tools such as air tools that may cause increased noise. Mr. Bohler also noted that he does not intend to install a sink or floor drain, and he does not use solvents that could harm the environment.

Board Planner Mr. Sullivan reviewed the relief required for the application as follows:

Variances

- §148-51.D(1) Floor area of accessory building.
- §148-51.A Accessory structure side yard setback.

Exceptions

- §148-79.9.A(1) Removal of trees with DBH greater than six inches.
§148-69.1.A Tree removal and replacement plan.

Mr. Sullivan also noted that there is an existing non-conforming shed on the property. Mr. Bohler stated that the shed was on the property when he purchased it, and that he was unaware whether the prior owner had obtained variance relief for the non-conforming setback.

Mr. Sullivan advised that windows would help modulate the facade and reduce the perceived massiveness of the structure. He further advised that installing windows would also be environmentally efficient.

Board Engineer Rob O'Brien advised the applicant that he should include the additional disturbance in his calculations for the installation of the electric utility connection and that, if the proposed disturbance exceeds 5,000 square feet, certification from the soil conservation district would be required.

The Board questioned if solar panels were considered. Mr. Bohler stated that he did consider installing solar panels, but he cannot do so at this time due to cost.

Chair Goodwin opened the public portion of the meeting for questions of Mr. Bohler.

Eugenio Matos, 7 Sunset View Road, was sworn and questioned whether the applicant considered that the proposal may not be consistent with the neighborhood. Mr. Matos expressed concern about the impact the proposal will have on the neighborhood, particularly given the height of the proposed structure and the fact that the existing landscaping will not provide sufficient buffering. He stated that he believed that an accessory structure of that size would be more appropriate on a much larger lot.

Chair Goodwin opened the public portion of the meeting for comments.

Mr. Matos read a statement into the record and introduced the following exhibits into evidence:

- Exhibit O-1: Photograph of his property (7 Sunset View Road)
- Exhibit O-2: Photograph of a pole barn taken from the internet
- Exhibit O-3: Two photographs of his property
- Exhibit O-4: Photograph of the existing large trees to be removed

Mr. Matos stated that the proposed garage/pole barn would have a significant detrimental impact on his property, as well as on the neighborhood. He stated his objection the application.

Susan Matos, 7 Sunset View Road, was sworn. Ms. Matos stated her objection to the proposal.

The Board took a 10-minute break at 9:15 p.m. and returned at 9:25 p.m. with all members present.

Mr. Bohler provided closing comments and the Board began deliberations.

Ms. Albrecht moved, and Ms. Mittleman seconded, a motion to deny the application for Cody Bohler. The roll call vote follows:

Member	Motion	2nd	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent	Not Eligible	Recused
Albrecht	X		X					
Hendry						X		
Kirk			X					
Mittleman		X	X					
Nees			X					
Tropello			X					
Goodwin			X					
Maurer (Alt #1)			X					
Bola (Alt #2)						X		

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Albrecht moved, and Mr. Maurer seconded, a motion to adjourn. The motion carried unanimously, and the meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Ann Marie Lehberger
Zoning Board Secretary