


To: Ridgewood Zoning Board of Adjustment
Matthew R. Weiss, Esq.

From: John Barree, PP, AICP 

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

Date: October 9, 2024

Re: ZBA 24-24 Steinberg
234 Fairmount Road
Block 1604, Lot 4
"C" Bulk Variance; Completeness Review and Comments – 2nd Review

I have reviewed the following materials in preparation of this report:

- Village of Ridgewood Board of Adjustment Application Form dated July 16, 2024.
- Cover letter from Matthew R. Weiss, dated July 25, 2024.
- Property Survey prepared by Christopher J. Lantelme, PE, PLS, dated March 6, 2024.
- Architectural Plans consisting of 6 sheets, prepared by EMM Associates, unsigned, revised through **September 19, 2024**.
- Zoning Table

Completeness Review and Comments

1. The subject property is an oversized parcel in the R-1 Zone on the south side of Fairmount Road, with 20,000 square feet of lot area where 14,000 square feet are required. The property is developed with a two-story detached residence with a driveway, in ground pool, patios, frame sheds, and other typical improvements.
2. The applicant is proposing an approximately 224 square foot addition to the ground floor of the residence along with modifications to the existing patios and walkways on the property.
3. The applicant requires the following relief:
 - a. Exceeding Coverage by Above Grade Structures within 140 feet of the front lot line – 20% is permitted where 21.7% is proposed. The proposal exceeds the limit by 221 square feet.
 - b. Exceeding Gross Building Area for the Whole Lot – 24% is permitted where 25% exists and 26.1% is proposed.
 - c. Exceeding Gross Building Area within 140 feet of the front lot line – 29% is permitted where 35.7% exists and 37.3% is proposed.

4. The property has been the subject of three zoning board applications and approvals, most recently in 2010. The 2010 application permitted a second-floor addition and a new covered porch at the front door. The resolution of approval notes that the improvement coverage within 140 feet was approved to be 44.17% where 40% was permitted and the approved gross building area was 33.79% where 29% was permitted.
 - a. Was the project approved in 2010 undertaken?
 - b. Can the applicant explain the discrepancies between the approved conditions in 2010 and the existing conditions described in the present application?
5. A proposed grading plan has not been provided. The height of the proposed stone patio adjacent to the house with the seat wall and outdoor kitchen has not been provided. The applicant shall revise the plans to note the height of proposed walls and indicate whether the patio is more than 1 foot above grade. If the patio is a foot or more above grade, it should be included in the "Coverage by Above Grade Structures" calculation. ***The plans have been revised to show grading near the patio, which confirms that it should not be classified as an "above grade structure."***
6. There are two sheds shown on the survey and replicated on the proposed conditions plot plan. Neither of the sheds has been included in the coverage by above grade structures calculation. The calculations and plans shall be revised to reflect the sheds as the extent of the requested variance for coverage within 140 feet of the front lot line will change. ***This comment has been addressed through the change in calculations and notes on the revised plans.***
7. The survey shows a shed, an outdoor shower, and a rectangle labeled "OP" along the east side of the residence. None of these features is shown on the plot plan – are they being removed? If they will remain, they should be accounted for in coverage as applicable. ***This comment has been addressed in the revised plans.***
8. The .pdf of the architecture plans do not include attribution for the preparer and are not signed and sealed. Please revise the plans to provide the name of the preparer and either an electronic signature / seal or a note indicating that the electronic plans are a direct reproduction of the signed and sealed originals on file. ***The plans revised through September 19 still do not have attribution or license information for the preparer.***
9. The .pdf of the survey is not signed and sealed. Please revise the survey to either include an electronic signature / seal or a note indicating that the electronic plans are a direct reproduction of the signed and sealed originals on file. ***Addressed.***

10. The applicant shall provide revised plans addressing the comments in this report. Upon receipt of satisfactory revisions, the application can be deemed complete and scheduled for a hearing. ***The application is technically complete and can be scheduled for a hearing. The applicant should be aware that the Board may raise questions about the lack of attribution on the architectural plans.***