


To: Ridgewood Zoning Board of Adjustment
Rachna Kaul and Matthew Laurita

From: John Barree, PP, AICP 

CC: Jane Wondergem
Chris Rutishauser, PE
Bruce Whitaker, Esq

Date: November 7, 2024

Re: ZBA 24-30 Kaul & Laurita
468 Cambridge Road
Block 3002, Lot 2
"C" Bulk Variances; Completeness Review and Comments

I have reviewed the following materials in preparation of this report, which supersedes the prior report of November 5, 2024:

- Village of Ridgewood Board of Adjustment Application Form with attachments dated September 17, 2024
- Property Survey prepared by Michael L. Ritchie, PLS dated October 9, 2013.
- Zoning Compliance Table
- Architectural Plans consisting of Sheets A-1 (9/13/24), SK-1 (**11/6/24**), and SK-2 (9/13/24)

Completeness Review and Comments

1. The subject property is an undersized corner lot in the R-2 Zone at the intersection of Cambridge Road and Ponfield Place. The size of the subject property is 7,302 square feet, which is 49.6 percent of the required 14,700 square feet. The lot is developed with a residential dwelling, detached garage and driveway to Ponfield Place, a deck, and several walkways.
2. The applicant is proposing to renovate the ground floor, add approximately 354 square feet in an addition to the second floor, and increase the height of the second floor walls to create additional livable space. The proposal extends the footprint of the second floor to match that of the first floor. A new covered front porch is proposed along the Cambridge Road side of the house with a small wrap around onto the Ponfield Place side of the house. The exterior wooden deck will be removed and a new paver patio constructed.
3. The applicant requires the following relief:
 - a. Insufficient Front Yard Setback – The applicant is proposing a front yard setback of 38 feet to Cambridge Road and 15.5 feet to Ponfield Place where 40 feet is required.

- b. Exceeding Maximum Coverage by Above Grade Structures – A maximum of 20 percent is permitted where 20.49 percent exists, and 23.43 percent is proposed.
 - c. Insufficient Setback between Principal and Accessory Structures – A covered entrance to the rear porch is proposed that will exacerbate the existing non-conforming setback (12 feet required) between the principal and accessory structures. ***The existing setback between the principal and accessory structures is 4.5 feet where 1.5 feet is proposed with the addition of the rear canopy.***
4. The following non-conforming conditions exist and will not be altered by the application:
 - a. Insufficient Lot Area – 7,302 square feet where 14,700 square feet is required.
 - b. Insufficient Lot Width – 75 feet where 105 feet is required.
 - c. Insufficient Lot Depth – 100 feet where 120 feet is required.
 - d. Insufficient Rear Yard – 29.5 feet where 30 feet is required.
5. The survey provided with the application is over ten years old; however, the applicant has provided an affidavit verifying that it remains accurate.
6. The applicant shall verify the setback for the new pavers proposed along the southern side of the dwelling. Patios are required to be setback 10 feet from a side property line. ***The proposed pavers are considered a walkway rather than a patio, so the setback requirement does not apply.***
7. The modified survey layout shown on sheet SK-1 of the architectural plans does not include the rear covered landing shown on revised sheet A-1 (dated 9/13/24). As a result, it is unclear how close the covered entrance is to the detached garage. The details and measurement shall be added to the plans so the Board knows the specifics of the variance request. ***An updated SK-1 drawing dated has been submitted showing the proposed canopy and distance between the buildings.***
8. The application includes two separate sheets labeled A-1 with different dates that include different drawings – the applicant should revise the sheet labeling to avoid confusion. ***The applicant has clarified that the A-1 and A-2 sheets dated May 2024 are not part of the application and were a prior submission that should be disregarded.***
9. When items 6, 7, and 8 have been addressed, the application can be deemed complete and scheduled for a hearing. ***The applicant has provided the necessary revisions and the application is complete for a hearing.***