

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER MAKEFIELD
ZONING HEARING BOARD
MINUTES – SEPTEMBER 1, 2026

The regular meeting of the Zoning Hearing Board of the Township of Lower Makefield was held in the Municipal Building on September 1, 2026. Mr. Schwartz called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

Those present:

Zoning Hearing Board: Christian Schwartz, Chair
 James McCartney, Vice Chair
 Mike McVan, Secretary
 Larry Borda, Member
 Robert Heinz, Member
 Tony Zamparelli, Alternate (not voting)

Others: Dan McLoone, Planner
 Adam Flager, Zoning Hearing Board Solicitor

ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF EXTENSION FOR 777 TOWNSHIP LINE ROAD (Z-24-18)

Mr. Flager stated the Board approved this in September, 2024 which required the Applicant to proceed in two years. He stated it was a conversion of office space to medical space. Work is still being done so they are requesting an Extension so that the Approval does not expire. Mr. McLoone stated they got their Permit in November, 2024. The Applicants are not required to come back before the Zoning Hearing Board. While no specific time was requested, Mr. McLoone suggested that the Extension be for one year. Mr. Flager stated this has been done previously for other Applicants when their projects take longer than expected.

Mr. Schwartz stated they were approved to increase the amount of medical office space inside the building. Mr. McLoone read the Decision Notice into the Record.

Mr. Heinz asked if someone should not be here to present information, and Mr. Schwartz stated when the Board grants Approval, they have two years from that date to pull Permits and get the work completed. This is giving them an Extension to complete the work. Mr. Heinz asked why a representative should not be here to tell the Board that they are “here and interested.” Mr. Schwartz stated they have the Permits and are doing the work.

Mr. Flager stated Mr. Ed Murphy, who represented the Applicant, reached out via e-mail to Mr. McLoone and himself to advise what was going on and requesting the Extension. He coordinated with Mr. McLoone to put it on tonight's Agenda since the Approval was September 4, 2024. Mr. Flager stated this is a technical, administrative formality with no new evidence being presented.

Mr. Heinz moved and Mr. McVan seconded to extend the exemptions for Z-24-18 by one year. The Motion carried with Mr. McCartney opposed.

APPEAL #Z-26-23 – O'NEILL/BARTOLUCCI
Tax Parcel #20-055-073
1505 ESTHER LANE, YARDLEY, PA 19067

Ms. Kathleen Bartolucci, Mr. Nicholas Asta, and Mr. Mark Irwin, contractor, were sworn in.

Mr. Flager marked Exhibits as follows: The Application was marked as Exhibit A-1. The Site Plan was marked as Exhibit A-2. The Renderings and Lay-Out of the proposed project were marked as Exhibit A-3. The Proof of Publication was marked as Exhibit B-1. The Proof of Posting was marked as Exhibit B-2. The Notice to the neighbors was marked as Exhibit B-3.

Ms. Bartolucci stated following the last meeting, they made revisions and changed the way they were going to use some of the space. Mr. Irwin stated the only reason they are doing this renovation is because it is two families coming together at the property, and they need the space for themselves and their children.

Mr. Schwartz stated the Variance at this time is only for impervious surface, and there is no encroachment on any of the setbacks, and Mr. Irwin agreed. Mr. Irwin stated the engineer had indicated that he saw online it was okay if it was under 30%. Mr. McLoone stated that is incorrect for the impervious, and it is 18%. He stated he feels what the engineer was looking at is for homes built after 1987.

Mr. Schwartz stated the drawing does not show where they plan to put the infiltration trench. He stated it was previously discussed that outside of the addition in the front of the property would be the best location, and Mr. Irwin agreed. Mr. Schwartz stated since the property is already over 18%, and they are looking to bring it back down to 18%, they would like to see some

rain leaders taken to it both from the new roof and a couple from the existing roof; and Mr. Irwin agreed. Mr. Schwartz stated he can work with Mr. McLoone on the correct sizing and get approval from the Township engineer.

Mr. Schwartz asked about the red building on the back of the property labeled, “shop.” Mr. Asta stated part of the renovation involves shortening the addition, and they are taking space from the garage. He stated he is a “DIY person,” and has a lot of tools; and the shop area in the back is an area for him to store some of his tools since they will be losing some garage space. Mr. Schwartz stated this will not involve a home business, and Mr. Asta stated it will not.

Mr. Borda asked what will be the number of bedrooms and baths with this proposal, and Mr. Irwin stated it will be six bedrooms and four bathrooms as opposed to the eight bedrooms proposed previously. Mr. Borda thanked the Applicants for cutting back the addition.

There was no one from the public wishing to speak on this matter.

Mr. McVan moved and Mr. Borda seconded to approve the Appeal as written with the exception of the rain leaders and the filtration ditch being approved by the Township back to 18%. Motion carried with Mr. Heinz opposed.

APPEAL #Z-26-21 – SRA HOME PRODUCTS/ZUBAIR
Tax Parcel #20-024-055
641 FOX HOLLOW DRIVE, YARDLEY, PA 19067

Mr. Khurram Zubair, homeowner, and Mr. Tom Mazza, contractor, were sworn in. Mr. Flager marked the Exhibits as follows: The Application was marked as Exhibit A-1. The Site Plan was marked as Exhibit A-2. The Specs were marked as Exhibit A-3. The Construction Drawings were marked as Exhibit A-4. The Proof of Publication was marked as Exhibit B-1. The Proof of Posting was marked as Exhibit B-2. The Notice to the neighbors was marked as Exhibit B-3.

Mr. Mazza stated they are proposing building a three-season sunroom off of the back of the house approximately a 14’ projection by 20’ wide in the area of an existing deck. He stated they are going to remove the deck and build a new deck. He stated they are building the sunroom with a 30’ rear setback where 50’ is required so they are asking for 20’ of relief.

Mr. Schwartz stated from the corner of the house to the rear yard setback he sees 26.7', and Mr. McLoone stated that is correct. Mr. McLoone added that a lot of the corner lots are non-conforming.

Mr. Schwartz asked if the existing deck is pervious or impervious. Mr. McLoone stated it looked like it was impervious based off of GIS mapping from our engineer. Mr. Schwartz stated they are not adding any impervious if it is the same size, and Mr. McLoone agreed. Mr. Mazza stated they are actually removing approximately 2' of the deck so the new deck will be 2' smaller on the width. Mr. McLoone stated the maximum impervious allowed for this Subdivision is 18%; however, they do not need a Variance for the impervious because where the work is going, it is over an existing impervious area.

An aerial of the property was shown. Mr. Schwartz expressed concern about the amount of asphalt at the front of the property adding it appears that they are well over 18% already on the property. He asked if that was calculated in. Mr. McLoone stated he did not think they needed a Variance for the impervious, so he did not take it into consideration.

Mr. Flager asked when the neighborhood was built, and Mr. Zubair stated it was built in 1987. Mr. Schwartz asked if that falls in the 18%, and Mr. McLoone stated the Ordinance would be 18%.

Mr. Borda asked if it is known when the deck was put on and if there was a Variance for the deck. Mr. McLoone stated they would not need a Variance for the deck because the way the Ordinance is written, decks are exempt from the rear yard setback. Mr. Borda asked if it is known what the current impervious is, and Mr. McLoone stated he does not know because it was not relief that was requested. Mr. Borda stated there is a lot of asphalt. Mr. McLoone stated the engineer had the space where the addition is going marked as impervious. Mr. Schwartz stated if they looked at the aerial view of the property, they probably calculated the impervious at the time, and did not see a problem; and Mr. McLoone agreed.

Mr. Heinz asked why the impervious surface is not being calculated. He stated they are now putting a "three-season roof on it." Mr. Schwartz stated they just explained that they looked at it and calculated it as impervious. He added that they are reducing the size of it by 2' on the back with the new build. Mr. Heinz stated the overall impervious surface calculation has not been completed, but they are reducing the existing footprint to help with that. Mr. McLoone stated his understanding is that based off of an aerial from the Township engineer

where the new three-season room is going, that existing area is impervious. He added that the contractor indicated that it will be smaller so the impervious would not be increasing.

Mr. Borda asked why they need a Variance, and Mr. McLoone stated it is needed for the setback. Mr. Borda stated they already have the setback with the deck. Mr. Flager stated putting the roof on it triggers the setback.

Mr. Borda asked if the Board is legally entitled to address the impervious surface. Mr. McLoone stated that relief is not being requested, and it is just the setback in front of the Board. Mr. Flager stated the project that they are here for is not increasing impervious. He stated if it was an existing non-conformity, which many homes in Lower Makefield are, and were adding to it, they would need a Variance for that; however, if they are not adding to it, they do not need a Variance. Mr. Borda stated we are basing that on “one map that someone prepared a long time ago that indicated it was impervious.” Mr. McLoone stated it was an engineer who did it within the past year.

Mr. Borda stated he was not sure if the Board could ask for a survey to confirm what the existing conditions are. Mr. Flager stated the Board could ask if there is anything under the deck. He stated if there is not, a deck is not normally counted as impervious when it is elevated. He stated it is possible that it was counted as impervious when it should not have been counted. Mr. Borda asked about the construction of the deck and what is underneath it. Mr. Mazza stated there is dirt underneath the deck. He added that new deck will be post and beams per Code at the same elevation as the existing deck.

Mr. Heinz stated it will now have a roof on it, and Mr. Schwartz stated that is why they are asking for the Variance for the setback to the rear yard. Mr. Heinz stated he feels they would also need to re-calculate the impervious surface because it has already been calculated as impervious even though it is not. He stated the deck is now being reduced in size and would not require any additional Variances.

Mr. McCartney asked if the driveway was built that way when the builder built it or was there an extension of the driveway at some point. Mr. Zubair stated he bought it like that in 2000. He added it was re-sealed. Mr. McCartney asked about records with regard to the driveway, and Mr. McLoone stated he did not look into the impervious and just prepared for the setback.

Mr. Zamparelli asked if anyone knows what the existing impervious surface is, and Mr. McLoone stated they do not. Mr. Zamparelli stated he feels we should know that; however, Mr. McLoone stated they are not requesting a Variance from impervious surface. Mr. Schwartz stated it seems that when the Permit came in, the engineers did not see an issue on the impervious surface so it was not suggested that they needed that Variance, and Mr. McLoone agreed.

Mr. McCartney stated he feels it will be difficult to make a decision on something that has nothing to do with impervious when they all see that it is obviously over the impervious. Mr. McVan stated this is a pre-existing condition, and the Zoning Hearing Board is not the policing end of it; and they are just here to decide on the setback. Mr. McCartney stated we have no idea what the impervious surface is; and because someone else calculated the existing deck as impervious, the Board should look at it the same way.

Mr. Flager stated according to the Township engineer the existing deck was already calculated as impervious although in reality it is not. He stated technically they are now adding impervious because it will be covered. He suggested that there be a Continuance to look into this as they may need two Variance which would need to be re-advertised.

Mr. Mazza asked if that is not contradictory to what the engineer said; and Mr. Flager agreed, but it is felt that it may be erroneous because they were counting something as impervious that was not, and by adding the roof, they are adding impervious and they would be over and this would need to be re-advertised to address that. He stated the Applicant may also want to modify their plans. Mr. Flager stated time is needed to determine what is the current impervious and what the proposed would be. He stated they would have to offset any overages under the Code.

Mr. Schwartz stated he does not feel the Board will approve this if they are forced to make a decision tonight; however, if there is a Continuance, the Applicant could come back with the numbers showing they need just the one Variance or that they are over and will need to do something.

Mr. Mazza asked if the existing deck is pervious or impervious. Mr. McLoone stated if there is just dirt underneath it, it is pervious.

Mr. Heinz stated for the deck setback, they are requesting reduction to 20', and "right now they are already to 30' reducing it by 20 and instead of 50' it will be 30'." He stated the current drawing calls out 26.7 as the smallest distance from the corner of the house to the endpoint.

There was no one from the public wishing to speak on this matter at this time.

Mr. Schwartz moved, Mr. McCartney seconded and it was unanimously carried to grant a Continuance to October 6, 2026.

APPEAL #Z-26-22 – LAGRASSA
Tax Parcel #20-046-197-043
851 MANOR LANE EAST, YARDLEY, PA 19067

Mr. Michael LaGrassa was sworn in.

Mr. Flager marked the Exhibits as follows: The Application was marked as Exhibit A-1. The Site Plan was marked as Exhibit A-2. The Proof of Publication was marked as Exhibit B-1. The Proof of Posting was marked as Exhibit B-2. The Notice to the neighbors was marked as Exhibit B-3.

Mr. Schwartz stated two Variances are being sought one for the rear yard setback and one for impervious surface.

Mr. LaGrassa stated he moved here five years ago with his wife and one child, and he now has three children, and they have filled up the house. He stated there are four grandparents one of whom has a likelihood of moving in with them in the future. He stated for that reason, they want to put in a first floor family room off of the back of the house with an additional one bedroom and bathroom.

Mr. LaGrassa stated he understands that he has to prove a hardship, and he spoke with his architect about the restrictions on the property including a 50' setback from the fence which he understands means any modifications to the back of his house would require a Setback Variance as there is almost no way to modify off the back of the house without incurring the additional distance to the back fence. He stated there is some precedence as he understands that in 1997 there was a 7' Variance granted for a similar setback off of the kitchen which is seen in the drawings which put it past the 50'.

Mr. LaGrassa stated they have tried to make a bedroom that was sizable enough for the purpose they need with a full bath and a family room that was of a size that was worth it to move forward with the project. He stated they understand that there was an opportunity to go vertical; however, they are looking for a first-floor addition and they want to keep the additional space

on the first floor for that convenience which is why they have the first story off the side into the back yard.

Mr. LaGrassa stated he feels that the extension maintains the character of the neighborhood. He stated there are no modifications to the front of the house, and the addition of the side room will sit behind the side fence so it will not be “blatantly” visible from the road. He stated they are also not going up in any sizable fashion on the house, and from the street it will be largely hidden in the back yard.

Mr. Borda stated the way the addition roof comes into the main house it appears to come in flush with the lower part of the windows, and he asked if that is allowed by Code since he felt elevation was needed there for snow, etc. Mr. McLoone stated he was not sure, and this would be addressed when Building Permits are submitted.

Mr. Borda stated they are cutting down the setback by about 50%, and Mr. LaGrassa agreed. Mr. Borda asked if there is the potential for shortening the depth of the room to lessen the impact on the setback. Mr. Borda stated it is a 20' room, and Mr. LaGrassa stated they wanted a room that would be suitable for their family as the children grow up.

Mr. Schwartz asked if they considered another arrangement where the larger part of the addition was on the side and the extra bedroom/bathroom were in the back. He stated the dotted line area on the side of the house has more space to it where the building envelope could be. Mr. LaGrassa stated they did not consider that. Mr. Schwartz stated he recognizes that a larger space on the side would require a higher roof which could go even further up into the windows. Mr. LaGrassa stated where the room is behind the house opens to the side, and there is a large garden area where they propose the wooden deck off to the side of the house.

Mr. Schwartz asked Mr. LaGrassa if he has had discussions with the neighbors on both sides and behind him; and Mr. LaGrassa stated he did his best, and some of them are present this evening.

Mr. Heinz asked if the chimney is necessary since a fireplace is not needed in that space and they are adding a foot and a half onto the requirement for a de minimus setback. He stated he also agrees with Mr. Schwartz's suggestion to put more on the side since there is a larger space in the side yard where

there is only a 15' or 13' setback requirement from the property at that point. He stated putting the fireplace on the side would be better for the setback requirement.

Mr. Heinz asked if the existing shed was included in the calculation for the impervious.

Mr. LaGrassa stated the fireplace was included as it is a "nice aesthetic" within the room, and part of the project was to make the room look like it is part of the house. He stated they feel that the flow of the house naturally takes you to the back of the house. He stated they also did not put it off of the side, and he noted the front corner where the bedroom is short at the front of the house is where the utilities come into the house; and part of this was a consideration to reduce the scope of moving all of the utilities. He stated they also stopped short of the fence line so they would not have to remove the fence. He stated while there is more space on the side of the fence, they did not want to interfere with other things they have on that side. He stated a patio has also been removed so when it comes to impervious surface, that was already counted, and they are "putting this over that."

Mr. Borda asked if the bedroom is for the relatives who might be coming in, and Mr. LaGrassa agreed. Mr. Borda stated it is not known if they are coming in. Mr. LaGrassa stated while it is not a certainty, the four grandparents are all over 70; and one is in the area and health is an issue. Mr. Borda asked if it would be possible to add the bedroom when and if needed as a separate project and proceed with the great room, and Mr. LaGrassa stated anything is possible. Mr. Schwartz stated that would not change the setback; however, Mr. Borda stated he was thinking about the impervious. Mr. LaGrassa stated they would have to face the impervious at that point.

Mr. McCartney asked if they are on slab or is there a basement. Mr. LaGrassa stated they have a basement. Mr. McCartney asked if they are excavating under the new space, and Mr. LaGrassa stated it will be on slab although in speaking to one contractor they mentioned a small crawl space which is what is under the other addition that was added onto the house previously in 1987 which was the 7' extension off of the kitchen which he had mentioned earlier.

Mr. Kai Faltot, 6 Meadow Lane, was sworn in. He stated he is on the right side of the property. He stated Mr. LaGrassa and his family are great neighbors, but he is concerned about Zoning procedures and how far things need to be from

the fence. He stated on his property the proposed addition will not impede on his fence, and it was just the back yard. Mr. Schwartz stated the Variance is for the rear yard setback and not the side.

Mr. Faltot stated impervious would be the issue, and it has been a “hot topic.” Mr. Schwartz stated the Board would require a filtration trench and probably have them put rain leaders from the new addition to it so that the water does not spill over to the neighbors. Mr. Faltot stated that was his concern since water is a big issue in their neighborhood. He stated he wants to keep his property as dry as possible. Mr. Faltot stated there are some things on the side that if he were to build on that side, they should be included in the impervious surface calculation. He stated there is a greenhouse, playground equipment with a roof, and a shed that was put there by the previous homeowner.

Mr. Schwartz stated he believes that the shed was included in the impervious surface. He stated play gyms are not part of those calculations. Mr. Faltot stated it has a roof on it, and Mr. McLoone stated it is de minimus in size. Mr. Faltot asked the distance from the fence that a shed or playground equipment, etc. would have to be. Mr. McLoone stated if it is more than 200 square feet, it needs to be 10’ from the property line; and if it is less than 200 square feet, it needs to be 5’ so for this it would need to be 5’ from the property line.

Mr. Rich Nabasny, 500 Manor Gate, was sworn in. He stated he bought his house in 1988 and described the area at that time when he bought the property. He expressed concern with granting Variances for setbacks which will increase the size of the houses on the lots as well as for impervious since we have a concern about stormwater in the Township given the special fee that we now have to pay. He stated because of the trees on his and the Applicant’s property he cannot see the Applicant’s house, but he is concerned about the Variances for impervious surface and setbacks.

Mr. Joseph Cammarasana, 835 River Road, was sworn in. He stated he lives in the property behind the Applicant. He stated he regrets being forced into this situation because Mr. LaGrassa is a “very nice man.” Mr. Cammarasana stated before Mr. LaGrassa moved in there was a previous owner who put up the shed which was not to “Zone spec, and was an eyesore.” He stated because of that he spent more than \$5,000 trying to cover the view of the shed with arborvitae. He stated Mr. LaGrassa then put an additional shed next to that shed which has not been painted which is part of the Code as well. He stated it has discolored and degraded, and his property value is directly involved with Mr. LaGrassa’s shed. Mr. Cammarasana stated he did not say anything because he wanted to be a good neighbor.

Mr. McLoone stated the property is currently under the allowable impervious. Mr. Cammarasana stated he is talking about the view from his property.

Mr. Schwartz asked Mr. Cammarasana what he believes makes the first shed against Zoning Code. Mr. Cammarasana stated he was told by the inspector at the time that it was not within Code. He stated it has a roof on it that is as high as a first-story building with an A-roof on it, and it is very prominent. Mr. McLoone stated the height limit is 15', and Mr. Schwartz stated that would be the first story. Mr. Cammarasana stated he is just telling what he was told.

Mr. Cammarasana stated he feels the 50' property line rule is important and developed for a number of reasons. He stated it lends to the consistency of the other properties. He stated he was told that in order to add space, they transitioned the garage into living space so the house is "maxed out," so the Applicant has to add living space to it which he understands; however, it impacts his property because the addition will bring it 26' closer to the back of his property, and they are "already looking into each other's' kitchens as it is."

Mr. Cammarasana stated his own house is one of the most prominent in the development. He stated he has been there for 18 years, and "as his house goes, the rest of the development will go." He stated if this addition is permitted and the Appeal is granted, his property will be impacted severely because now he does not have a house that is a normal distance away, and it will be right on top of him. He stated if this is granted, it will affect his property value in a great way, and "no matter what he has done, he has not been able to get past the problem behind him."

Mr. Borda asked Mr. Cammarasana asked if the Applicant reached out to him prior to tonight's meeting, and Mr. Cammarasana stated he did not.

Mr. Cammarasana showed his property on the aerial. Mr. Schwartz asked Mr. Cammarasana if he has sheds at the back of his property as well. Mr. Cammarasana stated there is a small shed. He also showed the location where instead of peat moss he has a stone bed made out of river rock. Mr. Heinz asked if there is something vertical inside the stone, and Mr. Cammarasana stated there is a screen that the builder put up to try to get privacy between his house and the house behind him. Mr. Schwartz asked the height of that screen, and Mr. Cammarasana stated it is about 6' or 7'.

Mr. Schwartz stated he has 10' on one side of his house and 15' on the other and his neighbors have the same so it is 25' between houses and not 50' and 50' so it is difficult for him to relate.

Mr. Cammarasana stated he stands to lose a lot of value if this addition encroaches closer to his property.

Mr. Steven Leng, 3 Manor Lane N., was sworn in. He stated there is a house being built next door to him. He stated he was sent a letter that said 851 when the house he is talking about is 827 which is being built right now. He stated he was under the impression that it is 50' that is supposed to be from the house to his property line.

Mr. Schwartz asked Mr. Leng if he has any questions about the Hearing that the Board is hearing now. Mr. Leng stated his question is if it is a standard measurement of 50' from the house to the property line throughout the Township. Mr. McLoone stated he discussed earlier with Mr. Leng, he would be happy to look into 1 Manor Lane, but that has nothing to do with what the Board is talking about tonight. Mr. Leng stated his question is if the 50' is the standard, and Mr. McLoone stated he understands that it is for this Subdivision. Mr. Leng stated he thinks the house that they are building next door to him is encroaching on his property and it could be effecting his value.

Mr. LaGrassa stated he did knock on all the doors other than Mr. Leng's who lives across the street, and he did not realize he was within 200'. Mr. LaGrassa stated he travels out of the Country a lot, and he had one opportunity to go to Mr. Cammarasana's house, but he was not home. He apologized for not speaking to him in person. Mr. LaGrassa stated with regard to the shed, it was there when they bought the house, and he has "heard about is endlessly from multiple neighbors for some time." He stated the shed "has nothing to do with he and his family and is just on their property now and they inherited it." He stated if it needs to be painted he will consider it. He stated with regard to the comment of encroaching 26 additional feet, he wants to correct that they are adding 18' off the farthest point of the back of the house according to the drawings. He stated he understands that they are going about half the distance of the 50' but the back of the house is already part of the way out there. He stated he is willing to hear the Board's comments on filtration trenches, rain leaders, and any remedial efforts for the impervious area.

Mr. Schwartz stated with regard to filtration trenches generally the Board wants them to be near the addition with roof drains taken into them from the addition. He stated since the current impervious surface is not already over, he does not feel they will require roof drains from the existing roof. Mr. LaGrassa stated the existing roof already has them on almost all of the drains. Mr. Schwartz asked if they are going to a filtration trench, and Mr. LaGrassa stated there is a long PVC pipe down to a pit with a “pop top” on it. Mr. Schwartz asked if there is a pump in it; however, Mr. LaGrassa did not know. Mr. LaGrassa added that all of the gutters have a 10’ 4” PVC pipe down to a holding container with a “pop top for swelling water on it.” Mr. Schwartz stated it sounds like they already have some groundwater control. Mr. LaGrassa stated it was there when they got the house. He added that he understands in previous projects the addition of trees and plants is considered as well; however, Mr. Schwartz stated while the Board does not discourage trees and plants, they do not like to count them toward impervious surface because they do not last forever. He stated whatever Variance is granted goes with the property. He stated the Board has been turning away from trees and plantings except for rain gardens because they have a filtration trench under them. He stated they have also turned away from rain barrels because they need constant maintenance from the homeowners. Mr. Schwartz stated the Board will most likely want to see the impervious surface brought to 24% which should not take a large filtration trench, and the size can be determined when the Permit is submitted and they work with the Township engineer.

Mr. LaGrassa asked about removing half of the driveway as a trade-off and reducing it to a straight driveway instead of a double wide, and Mr. Schwartz stated he would have to share the calculations on that. He stated that would bring the impervious surface down; but that does not seem to be the biggest problem, as the biggest problem seems to be the setback.

Mr. McCartney asked Mr. LaGrassa is “locked into this Plan,” since he feels if he were to go 24 by 20 off of the right side and make that the family room, he would just be going into the side yard setback by approximately 2’.

Mr. McLoone stated it looks like he has room within the side yard setback.

Mr. McCartney stated if he then took the 13 by 20 proposed bedroom/bathroom/living room and turned it on its side and goes 13’ off the back of the house, he would then only be 7’ additional into the rear setback. Mr. LaGrassa stated this is what they liked, and this is why they had the architect draw it up this way. He stated if it puts them in a position where the Zoning Hearing Board tells them they cannot do it, they still need the living space. He added that the right side of the house where it was noted that the roof line hits the

windows is access and is where all the HVAC runs up for the second story. He stated as far as project scope goes, they would now be talking about ventilation and utilities into the house although they could look at it.

Mr. Borda stated he would like to accommodate the Applicant even though the issue is not urgent since the older relatives do not need to move in right away, but he is concerned about the back yard neighbor and his perceptions about the impact on the value of his property. Mr. Borda stated looking at the photographs, they are taking up half the distance which is substantive. He stated if they can pull the great room around to the side and in its place put the bedroom, they are only impinging by 14' to 15' which he would be able to approve.

Mr. McCartney stated he agrees with Mr. Borda and feels it is too far of a setback in the rear, but the side could accommodate a couple feet of a setback and then 7' in the rear which he would be comfortable with.

Mr. McCartney stated they would still get the bedroom, although he recognizes that it is probably not the perfect floorplan. Mr. LaGrassa stated it would change the way that they use the house. Mr. McCartney stated there are other options, and they could eliminate the bedroom completely and use the existing office as a bedroom and make the half bathroom a full bathroom. Mr. LaGrassa stated he works in the office. Mr. McCartney stated he understood he was out of the Country for work, and Mr. LaGrassa stated when he is home he works in that office. Mr. McCartney stated they are trying to get to a point where they can have something happen.

Mr. Schwartz stated Mr. LaGrassa could take the recommendations he heard this evening and work with his architect and come back to the Board. Mr. McVan stated the architect would be advised that it should fit into a different envelope, and the architect would come up with different plans to get as much as he can for Mr. LaGrassa. Mr. Schwartz stated this is similar to the earlier Application, and they had a larger plan and came back to the Board with a revision. Mr. LaGrassa stated he understands it would be a re-advertisement and another process with the architect so there is a cost commitment.

Mr. Schwartz stated the family may fit better in the side and would not need a Setback Variance; and instead of putting the bedroom in the back and still have an issue, they have on the floor a room marked existing office, and they could build on top of that. Mr. LaGrassa stated that is not something that they want to do. Mr. Schwartz stated the bedroom could be downstairs and the office

above it. Mr. LaGrassa stated they are not open to that. He stated while he appreciates that and understands that is the common approach for many people in the neighborhood who extend the garage and build the house up, he does not like the look of that, and they wanted to maintain the character of the neighborhood. He stated many of the houses look the same, and he does not want a “giant flat-walled house.” He stated the office has vaulted ceilings with skylights; and if he puts a bedroom up there, he loses that and he loses the character of that room in the house.

Mr. McCartney stated while he understands Mr. LaGrassa’s point, from an aesthetic standpoint the proposed front elevation with the side roof pitch away from the windows does not fit aesthetically in the neighborhood. Mr. LaGrassa stated while he understands Mr. McCartney’s point, it is behind some trees and a fence.

Mr. McLoone advised Mr. LaGrassa that if there is a Continuance he would not have to pay any more costs from an Administrative standpoint.

Mr. Schwartz moved to grant a Continuance to October 6.

Mr. LaGrassa stated if he comes back and takes Mr. McCartney’s proposal to move the room within the space and he still has the “aft Variance on the table,” how will his neighbors’ comments still play into that. Mr. Schwartz stated they get to comment again on the new proposal. Mr. McCartney asked if they will need to re-advertise; and Mr. Flager stated if the relief is being minimized, it does not need to be re-advertised. He stated if he has to go into the Side Yard Setback, it will need to be re-advertised. Mr. Schwartz stated it is the same for the impervious; and if they are not adding more than they want to add now, it would not need to be re-advertised. Mr. Flager advised Mr. LaGrassa that he could speak with his neighbors in the interim and take what they and the Board have stated today and discuss this with the architect to see what they can come up with.

Mr. McCartney seconded and the Motion carried unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Schwartz stated the next meeting will hear the Appeal of the Car Wash at the former CVS. Mr. Zamparelli was asked and agreed to make himself available at that meeting in case someone is unavailable. Mr. Schwartz stated he will

September 1, 2026

Zoning Hearing Board – page 16 of 16

contact Mr. Sial about doing so as well. This is the only matter on the Agenda for that evening.

Appeals to be heard on October 6, 2026 were noted.

There being no further business, Mr. Borda moved, Mr. McVan seconded and it was unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting at 8:50 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mike McVan, Secretary