

## **CHESTERFIELD TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD**

**July 21, 2020**

The meeting of the Chesterfield Township Planning Board was called to order by Chairman Kelly at 7:00PM. The Open Public Meetings Act statement was read and compliance noted.

Roll call was taken showing present: Brian Kelly; F. Gerry Spence; Jon Davis; Jerry Hlubik; Lido Panfili; Glenn McMahon; Gary Pollack; Aparna Shah. Absent: Denise Koetas-Dale. Professional staff present: Steve Raymond, Attorney; Chris Dochney, Planner; Joseph Hirsh, Engineer.

### **AGENDA MATTER(S) REQUIRING RECUSAL(S)**

Mr. Panfili recused himself from the Lynch Use Variance application.

### **MINUTES**

#### June 16, 2020 Regular Minutes

A motion was made by Mr. Spence seconded by Mr. Pollack to approve the June 16, 2020 Regular minute with the addition. All were in favor. Motion carried.

### **RESOLUTIONS**

None

### **HPC APPLICATION FOR ACTION**

#### Madison Laske/Jacob Schneider 8 Church Street, Crosswicks, Block 200, Lot 12

Chimney: The applicant is requesting to remove the brick chimney located in the center of the roof because the chimney supports in the attic are in disrepair. The HPC requested that the applicant repair or rebuild the chimney located in the center of the roof, since it is an important character-defining feature on the exterior. The applicant agreed to this request and said that they would use the old bricks from the attic to rebuild the chimney.

Doors: The applicant proposes replacing the front exterior door with a fiberglass door with 6 lights as shown in provided materials. The HPC recommends approval.

The applicant proposes removing the front facing door and window in the small addition to the south side of the house, and replacing it with a large replacement window. The HPC does not support this change in appearance of the current openings, and instead recommends that the applicant leave the existing window opening as is and replace the door with a window similar to the existing windows, leaving 4-6" between the windows. Replacement windows are addressed below.

Porch: The applicant is proposing to remove the front porch and replace it with a porch with white vinyl columns and railings and composite decking. The HPC supports removing the current porch, which was a replacement of the original, but does not support the use of the vinyl columns and railings. The HPC recommends using pressure-treated wood square railings and columns of a similar design as

others in the Crosswicks Historic District and recommends approval of the requested composite decking.

Roof: The applicant proposes the installation of Timberline GAF HD roofing, which matches the garage roof. The HPC recommends approval of this roofing.

Siding: The applicant proposes replacing the vinyl siding where needed, and if necessary to replace the siding, using fiber cement siding like Hardie Plank. The HPC recommends approval of the siding.

Windows: The applicant proposes replacing damaged windows with Andersen 400 series windows with 6/6 grille pattern. The HPC recommends approval of this type of replacement window with the condition that the grille profile be visible on the exterior of the window, not between the glass panels. The applicant also proposes adding a new window to the front elevation on the second floor where there was never a window opening. The HPC does not recommend approval of this requested change or any other change in the window placement because it would significantly alter the original appearance of the front of the house.

Shutters: The applicant proposes the replacement of existing vinyl shutters with wood board and batten shutters, and “Bermuda board” shutters over one window. The HPC does not support the use of wood board and batten shutters, or Bermuda board shutters, because they are not historically accurate for the architecture in the Crosswicks Village Historic District. There is ample evidence that the overwhelmingly majority of shutters in the district have consisted of wood paneled and louvered shutters of a width that would cover the entire window when closed. Traditionally, the ground floor would usually have paneled wood shutters and the second floor and above windows would have louvered shutters. The HPC does not recommend approval of the board and batten and Bermuda board shutters, and recommends that the applicant be required to use wood paneled and/or louvered shutters on the windows.

Chairman Kelly asked if Madison or Jacob were here and want to address this? Madison Laske, 8 Church St. stated that the window they want to add would make the house look symmetrical. She would like to appeal the HPC decision to deny the window. Mr. McMahon spoke to Mr. Heinold and it was determined that when the HPC recommends it should be noted that they approve and when they don't recommend something it should be noted a denial. The applicant can then file an appeal with the Planning Board. A form will need to be designed so that the Planning Board Planner and the board can have time to review the architectural. Mr. McMahon will get the form to Ms. Laske so that it can be heard at the next meeting. The two issues that are being denied are the windows and the shutters. All other requests have been approved by the HPC.

A motion was made by Mr. Spence second by Ms. Shah to approve the items that were recommended for approval on the application. All were in favor, motion carried.

## **APPLICATION**

Tom and Jennifer Lynch 437 Ellisdale Road, Block 301, Lot 19.02, Use Variance  
Tom and Jennifer Lynch were sworn. Mr. Lynch testified that they would like to add a detached garage with an in-law suite for his father-in-law and also to use the garage for storage. The garage will be to the right of the house looking from Ellisdale Rd. Mr.

Lynch is looking for guidance from the board on how large the garage and suite can be. Mr. Mahon stated that the property is in an Ag Zone and an accessory structure has to be in the rear of the lot and the proposed garage is on the side of the existing home which requires a variance. The applicant is proposing a 25x25 two story structure. Mr. Dochney reviewed his report of July 8, 2020. The applicant testified that no farming is performed on the property. He stated that there is a three car garage and additional driveway space for vehicles. Mr. Dochney requested the applicant show more detail to the extent of some sort of architectural drawings would be helpful.

At 7:44 Mr. Panfili left the meeting.

Mr. Hirsh went over his review letter dated July 6, 2020. He asked for clarification of the height so that setbacks can be established, also a clear idea of the location. In regard to the electric the applicant plans on using their existing service. There will be a one room apartment above the garage and because there is no sewer Mr. Hirsch stated that they would have to get a certification from the Department of Health which would be a condition of approval. The applicant agreed to a deed restriction to limit the use to family members and prohibits rentals.

Chairman Kelly stated that he feels that there are too many details missing for a decision to be made. Mr. Dochney suggested a visual idea of what the building will look like and showing the exact footprint would be helpful. Chairman Kelly suggested to the applicant to address the questions on both professional letters.

The applicant ask the board to table the application until they can put together more details.

## **CORRESPONDENCE**

Memo from Parker-McCay-Permit Extension Act of 2020

This explains the Governor's Executive orders on COVID and extensions that were given.

## **DISCUSSION**

Ordinance 2020-6-11 requesting the Planning Board determine whether or not the areas references qualify for Areas in need of Non-Condemnation Redevelopment.

Chairman Kelly would like suggest an amendment to this ordinance to reference the fact that it will allow broader goals of the Master Plan and not just for retail so there is a better balance and not just competing for retail. In reference to the old municipal building and the old firehouse these buildings should try to be preserved as Historic buildings. He stated that we need to be thinking of this in a more strategic way.

Mr. Dochney stated that this ordinance is just the first step in the process to see if the properties meet the criteria then a study would be done and at that point the Planning Board would recommend to the governing body a redevelopment plan be designated.

A motion was made by Mr. Spence second by Ms. Romeu to move forward with the investigation process. All were in favor, motion carried.

## **ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA**

Chairman Kelly mentioned that in regard to Old York Village and a number of trees that have been taken down in fear of damage to the sidewalks. There is a conflict with the ordinance in that Township is responsible for the trees or the homeowner is. Mr. McMahon stated that it's being worked on. The issue is the trees are dying or coming up underneath and raising the sidewalk and the homeowner is responsible for the repair of the sidewalk. They are being told they can remove the tree but they can't replace it until the ordinance can be figured out. Ms. Romeu stated the Environmental Commission is aware and have developed a document to help the residents on the best type of tree to plant that will not damage the sidewalk and a maintenance plan. Mr. McMahon stated that the conflict in the ordinance is one part says the trees need to be replaced and in another part they do not need to be replaced.

## **INVITATION FOR PUBLIC COMMENT**

Chairman Kelly opened the meeting for public comment. Hearing none the public portion was closed.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

A motion was made by Mr. Spence seconded by Ms. Romeu to adjourn. All were in favor, meeting adjourned at 8:26 PM.

Respectfully submitted,  
Aggie Napoleon, Secretary