

APPROVED  
July 11, 2019

**Borough of Ho-Ho-Kus  
Bergen County, New Jersey  
Zoning Board Minutes  
May 2, 2019  
Regular Meeting**

**Meeting Called to Order at 7:30PM by Chairman Tarantino**

**Open Public Meetings Statement: Read into the record by the Board Secretary.**

**Roll Call:** Messrs. Deegan, Cox, Forst, Ms. Metzger, Messrs. Rodger, Madden, Chairman Tarantino

**Also in attendance:** David Rutherford Esq., Board Attorney; JoAnn Carroll, Board Secretary

---

**Mr. & Mrs. R. Bulleri, 60 Sycamore Avenue, Block 702, Lot 15, R3 Zone:** applicants seek to add a garage to the rear of the property; non-compliance with Section 85-11 G (1) lot coverage; Section 85-11 I (4) side yard setback; Section 85-11 (5) rear yard setback.

**Roy Bulleri, Maureen Bulleri and Mr. Gary Irwin, applicant's architect, sworn in by Mr. Rutherford. Mr. Irwin gave his educational and professional background; his license is in good standing; Mr. Irwin was accepted as a professional in the field of architecture.**

**Mr. Irwin:** referred to plans dated 3/19/19 consisting of 6 pages; provided a 2 page supplemental plan which shows the floor plan and elevations of the garage; the building height of the garage was in question; needed space in the house to create a family room; the lot is non-conforming due to the frontage requirement; the lot is deeper than required for the zone; variances requested are for the rear and side yard setbacks for accessory structures; also a variance for lot coverage due to the proposed garage; the driveway covers almost the entire rear yard; changing the way the garage will be accessed which will eliminate a lot of this pavement; reduction in improved lot coverage; area map showing neighboring structures part of application; all other lots are deeper than what is required for the zone; garage only 3 ft. from property lines but still further away from other accessory structures; location of proposed garage does not impact anyone and will not be noticed; proposed garage dimensions are 20' x 14' and 14.9 ft. in height; the half sized drawing shows the driving and existing residence; placing a deck in the stone patio location; page 3 shows the garage plan; simple structure; page 4 shows comparative before and after drawings; basement and first floor plan shown; finishing it with a rec room, powder room and storage room; the hall on the first floor is too small to be of

any use; family room will be located in the existing garage and the patio changed to a deck; all within the existing confines of the house.

**Chairman Tarantino:** referred to diagram 1, upper left hand corner; the 3 neighboring detached garages are shown; asked the approximate distance to the closest one.

**Mr. Irwin:** stated 35 ft. from the property line for the garages on the side; the one in the rear is 11 ft. so the applicant is 14 ft. away from that structure.

**Mr. Cox:** asked if the 11 ft. is measured from the rear lot line or the proposed garage.

**Mr. Irwin:** stated from the lot line.

**Chairman Tarantino:** asked if the applicants had spoken to their neighbors regarding their application.

**Mr. Bulleri:** stated all the neighbors he had spoken to were in favor of the application.

**Mr. Irwin:** referred to page 5 which shows the before and after elevations of the structures; proposed roof covering over the front door; there will be a change to the garage where the door is being removed.

**Chairman Tarantino:** asked for a summary of the landscaping on the property and adjoining properties.

**Mr. Bulleri:** stated there is nothing by the garage; their lot is clear; along the rear lot line there are about 7 – 9 ft. spruce trees; there are bushes along the side property line.

**Mr. Irwin:** stated there is a fence separating the properties and the driveway to the left which serves the garage; there are trees scattered to the right; pretty well screened to the back of the existing house.

**Mr. Rodger:** stated there seems to be enough room to increase the setback to more than 3 ft.; asked Mr. Irwin why he chose a 3 ft. setback.

**Mr. Irwin:** stated he felt 3 ft. was enough distance for the structure to be maintained; the applicant's want as big a backyard as possible.

**Mr. Rodger:** asked if the garage could be set at 5 ft. or 10 ft.

**Mr. Irwin:** stated 10 ft. destroys a significant portion of the backyard and requires an additional 10 ft. on the turnaround depth of the driveway; if the

Board was not in favor of a 3 ft. setback then the applicant would have to settle for 5 ft.

**Chairman Tarantino:** asked if the distance from the two garages to the proposed garage is approximately 35 ft.

**Mr. Irwin:** stated yes from the lot line.

**Chairman Tarantino:** asked what is located within the 35 ft.

**Mr. Irwin:** stated there are scattered trees; not a lot; some full size trees and some shrubs; didn't see the need to put landscaping on the applicant's lot.

**Chairman Tarantino:** asked if the height of the garage is in keeping with the height of the surrounding garages in the area.

**Mr. Irwin:** stated yes; one of the garages may exceed 15 ft. due to it being older.

**Mr. Cox:** asked if the adjacent house to the left had a garage that encompassed the house.

**Mr. Irwin:** stated that garage entrance is on the side; appears to be an old addition; the driveway is very narrow.

**Mr. Cox:** asked if the adjacent lot to the left had the same non-conforming side yard setback.

**Mr. Irwin:** stated he didn't know.

**Please note: no members of the public came forward regarding this application.**

**Mr. Rodger:** stated he felt a 3 ft. setback is too small.

**Mr. Forst:** stated he understands the 3 ft. setback issue; looking at the configuration, distance is needed to make a turn into the garage.

**Mr. Cox:** agrees with Mr. Forst.

**Ms. Metzger:** stated the addition seems modest.

**Chairman Tarantino:** stated he understands Mr. Rodger's concerns; this is not a de minimis variance; believes the architect made a good argument from the standpoint of the undersized lot area; the distance of the other two garages at

35 ft. softens the blow; knowing there are a number of trees in the back mitigates the negative impact that is normally seen; recommends approval.

**Motion to approve application:** Chairman Tarantino

**Seconded by:** Metzger

**Ayes:** Deegan, Cox, Forst, Metzger, Madden, Chairman Tarantino

**Nays:** Rodger

---

**Mr. & Mrs. J. Vaccarino, 10 Lloyd Road, Block 705, Lot 9, R2 Zone:**

applicants seek to build an addition to the left rear area of existing home, and add a walkway and patio; non-compliance with Section 85-10 E (3) rear yard setback; Section 85-10 G (1) lot/building coverage; Section 85-10 G (3) improved lot coverage.

**Mr. & Mrs. Vaccarino sworn in by Mr. Rutherford.**

**Mr. Rutherford:** stated a 2 page plan (V1 and V2) was submitted with the application prepared by RDS Architecture, dated 2/19/19 and revised 3/19/19.

**Mr. Vaccarino:** read from a prepared sheet which described his application.

**Chairman Tarantino:** asked how big the patio was in the rear of the property.

**Mr. Vaccarino:** stated 13' x 13'.

**Mr. Rutherford:** stated 3 variances are required; building/lot coverage, improved lot coverage and rear yard setback; there are 2 pre-existing non-conformities; not being exacerbated; the rear yard setback is the problem.

**Chairman Tarantino:** asked what is located behind the home.

**Mr. Vaccarino:** stated his neighbor's rear yard.

**Mr. Rutherford:** asked if there was any screening.

**Mr. Vaccarino:** stated yes; there is a fence and some arborvitaes; he has a fence, his neighbor also has a fence along with the trees.

**Mr. Rutherford:** asked how far the neighbor's house is to the lot line.

**Mr. Vaccarino:** stated they are pretty far removed.

**Chairman Tarantino:** asked if the applicants had spoken to their neighbors regarding the application.

**Mr. Vaccarino:** stated yes and they were in favor of the application.

**Please note: there were no members of the public in the audience at this time.**

**Mr. Cox:** stated he understands the hardship due to the lot; asked where the garage was located.

**Mr. Vaccarino:** stated the garage is attached; small garage.

**Motion to approve application:** Rodger

**Seconded by:** Cox

**Ayes:** Deegan, Cox, Forst, Metzger, Rodger, Madden, Chairman Tarantino

**Nays:** None

---

**Approval of Minutes:**

April 4, 2019

**Motion to approve April 4, 2019 minutes:** Forst

**Seconded by:** Deegan

**Ayes:** Deegan, Forst, Rodger, Chairman Tarantino

**Nays:** None

---

**Motion to adjourn:** Metzger

**Seconded by:** Deegan

**All in Favor**

**None Opposed**

**Meeting adjourned at 8:05PM.**

Respectfully submitted by:

  
JoAnn Carroll  
Zoning Board Secretary  
May 13, 2019