

9.

Florence, New Jersey 08518-2323
April 6, 2015

The Regular meeting of the Florence Township Board of Adjustment was held on the above date at the Municipal Complex, 711 Broad Street, Florence, NJ. Secretary Buddenbaum called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. followed by a salute to the flag.

Member Bott then read the following statement: "I would like to announce that this meeting is being held in accordance with the provisions of the Open Public Meetings Act. Adequate notice has been provided to the official newspapers and posted in the main hall of the Municipal Complex."

Upon roll call the following members were found to be present:

Brett Buddenbaum	William Bott
John Groze	Anant Patel
Joseph Cartier	Anthony Drangula

ABSENT: B. Michael Zekas
Lou Sovak
Larry Lutz

Also Present: Solicitor David Frank
Engineer Anthony LaRosa

Excused: Planner Barbara Fegley

RESOLUTIONS

Resolution No. ZB-2015-05 Appointing Conflict Solicitor and Engineer

It was the Motion of Patel, seconded by Bott to approve Resolution No. ZB-2015-05.

Upon roll call, the Board voted as follows:

YEAS: Bott, Buddenbaum, Groze, Patel, Cartier, Drangula
NOES: None
ABSENT: Zekas, Sovak, Lutz

Resolution No. ZB-2015-06 Dismissing the Application of Firdous A. and Irfan Ul Huq for a Use Variance to Abandon Commercial Use and Convert the Building to Two Residential Apartments, One on Each Floor

It was the Motion of Bott, seconded by Groze to approve Resolution No. ZB-2015-06.

10.

Upon roll call the Board voted as follows:

YEAS: Bott, Buddenbaum, Groze
NOES: None
ABSENT: Zekas, Sovak, Lutz

**Resolution No. ZB-2015-07
Granting the Application of Collin and Katherine Riker for
Bulk Variance for Rear Yard Setback to Allow
Construction of a Roof Over an Existing Concrete Patio**

It was the Motion of Groze, seconded by Buddenbaum to approve Resolution No. ZB-2015-07.

Upon roll call, the Board voted as follows:

YEAS: Bott, Buddenbaum, Groze, Drangula
NOES: None
ABSENT: Zekas, Sovak, Lutz

APPLICATIONS

- A. Application ZB#2015-03 for Robin Bond. Applicant is requesting bulk variance for impervious lot coverage to permit construction of a 15' X 26' above ground swimming pool on property located at 127 Fairbrook Drive, Florence Township. Block 166.06, Lot 3.

Robin and Tim Bond were sworn in by Solicitor Frank. Ms. Bond said she would like to install an above ground pool in her yard. A variance is required for the amount of impervious lot coverage. Mr. Bond said most of the neighbors have pools. Member Bott asked about the drainage and where it would go. Mr. Bond said he will drain the backwash to the street. Member Buddenbaum asked about drainage on the property aside from controlled backwashing. Ms. Bond said the property is graded to drain to the back.

Member Patel asked about fencing. Mr. Bond said the yard is gated and it can be locked. Solicitor Frank said there are requirements through the Code and Construction office that will need to be met. The applicants both said they understood there were requirements and would comply. Member Drangula noted there was a shed hand drawn on the submitted plan. He said there were no setbacks shown. Mr. Bond said it is 2' from the side and 2' from the back. It is a portable shed and is under 100 sq. ft. There is no foundation so it could be moved. Member Drangula said the applicants would need to show dimensions on the plan when they obtained the required permits.

Engineer LaRosa said many times the sketches are done by homeowners, so sometimes they neglect to include some information. He recommended they move the shed to meet

11.

the requirements of the zoning code. There was no notice given for a variance for the shed for this evening's meeting.

Solicitor Frank said this is a fairly typical situation that the board sees. It is an existing undersized lot. The impervious coverage would be at 32%. It is very reasonable.

Member Bott inquired about decking. The applicant said there is no decking proposed.

The meeting was opened to the public at this time regarding Application ZB#2015-03. Seeing no one wishing to be heard, it was the Motion of Cartier, seconded by Bott to close the public portion.

Engineer LaRosa said the application was for impervious coverage. The existing is at 29% and the proposed would make it 32% where the regulations are for 25%. It is an existing undersized lot, there would be a 3% increase.

It was the motion of Groze, seconded by Bott to approve Application ZB#2015-03.

Upon roll call the Board voted as follows:

AYES: Bott, Buddenbaum, Groze, Patel, Cartier, Drangula

NOES: None

ABSENT: Zekas, Sovak, Lutz

B. Application ZB#2015-04 for Richard and Paula Levenduski. Applicant is requesting Bulk variances to permit a garage addition on property located at 144 East Delaware Avenue, Roebling. Block 96, Lot 9.

Richard and Paula Levenduski were sworn in by Solicitor Frank. Mr. Levenduski said his property is over the allowed impervious coverage. He wants to build a pole style addition that would be attached to the existing garage. It will save money since he would not need to demolish the original and build all new. It would extend the garage 16' in width and 36' in depth. He would adhere to all of the setbacks.

Member Bott asked what it would be used for. Mr. Levenduski said it would be storage for classic cars. Member Bott asked if there were any garages in the neighborhood that were comparable to what was being proposed. Mr. Levenduski said the closest one that is comparable is near St. Clare's Church. He said the new building would be taller than the existing garage and will be tied into it.

Member Buddenbaum asked if the applicant was going to open up the inside of the garage. Mr. Levenduski said there is a man door already there that connects the two. Right now it is the door to the outside for the current garage. Member Bott asked how many cars would fit in the garage. Mr. Levenduski said there would be at least four in the new addition of the garage. Member Bott asked how many tow trucks would be stored there. Mr. Levenduski said there would be two small tow trucks.

12.

Member Bott asked if the applicant would be working on the cars at the garage. Mr. Levenduski said he would not be working on the cars. Member Bott was concerned about noise and disturbing the neighbors. The applicants said there would not be any noise.

Member Patel asked if any trees had to be removed to accommodate the addition. The applicant said there would not be any tree removal. Member Patel asked if the driveway was going to be extended. Mr. Levenduski said it would be extended with stone. Member Buddenbaum asked about drainage on the site. Mr. Levenduski said he has a large side yard that can accommodate the run off. Member Buddenbaum asked about electric in the addition. Mr. Levenduski said there is electric in the current garage and the addition will be hooked into the existing electric.

Solicitor Frank asked if the applicant was planning any commercial use. Mr. Levenduski said there would not be any commercial use of the building. The cars are a hobby.

Engineer LaRosa said the existing impervious coverage is at 50%, the addition to the garage would bring it to 59% where 25% is allowed. He encouraged the applicant to use stone for the driveway so as to not add more impervious coverage. The existing roof would not affect the neighbors and he would like the new roof to drain onto the applicant's property and not to a neighboring property. Any construction done on the site would require building permits and inspections.

Member Buddenbaum asked what the outside would look like and if it would blend with the existing garage. Mr. Levenduski said the new garage would be skinned to match the old garage.

The meeting was opened to the public regarding Application ZB#2015-04.

Marilyn Loiacono, 1050 Grove Street, questioned a pole barn being built in an RA Zone. She said the proposed structure will dwarf the applicant's house. There are two large motor homes on the property. She thinks the pole barn would be an eyesore. It is not appropriate for this area.

Member Bott asked about the motor homes. Mr. Levenduski said there is a camper on the side of the property and the other is a storage trailer that is going to be removed when the garage is constructed. The camper is only on the property during the winter.

Mr. Levenduski said the pole barn would not look like something you would see out in the country. Ms. Loiacono said it was described as a 13' X 16' pole barn. The house would look out of place with something that big.

Solicitor Frank asked how tall the garage would be. Mr. Levenduski said it would be 17'. He confirmed that it is higher than the existing garage. Member Buddenbaum asked what the size difference was. Mr. Levenduski said there was a difference of about 5'. Solicitor Frank inquired about the large size of the door. Mr. Levenduski said it was

13.

because of the layout of the garage it was required to be able to maneuver the turn into the building. Mr. Levenduski said the survey showed the concrete driveway that goes to the existing garage. In order to make the swing into the building it needed to be expanded with stone for more turning room.

Solicitor Frank asked why it needed to be so high. Mr. Levenduski said his contractor recommended it to keep the price of the job down.

Member Bott asked Ms. Loiacono where her house was in relation to the property. She said she sees the side of the property. Her backyard is caddy corner to the back part of the property.

Solicitor Frank asked if the exterior height was driven by the way the new structure would tie into the existing and not by the need for interior volume. There was discussion regarding the process if the applicant were to build the addition at the same height as the existing garage. Mr. Levenduski explained that it would require more intense work and the cost would be much higher.

Engineer LaRosa asked what the difference was between the ridge of the existing garage and the new addition. Mr. Levenduski said it is about 5' to 6'. Engineer LaRosa said if they were the same it would look more uniform.

Solicitor Frank said it may be in the applicant's best interest to investigate that option and come back to the Board with an alternative drawing that has less of a height variance. He noted the applicants are asking for some big relief for impervious coverage. He said the Board needs to look at how intensely the property is developed relative to the zoning.

Solicitor Frank said the Board is trying to find a way to give everyone what they want. He noted the neighbor was concerned about how big and tall it is going to appear from her perspective. The applicant is concerned about floor area to park his cars. He suggested if the height came down there would still be the required floor area but perhaps the neighbor would think it was more in keeping with the area. He hoped a compromise could be reached.

Solicitor Frank explained to the applicants that they could ask the Board for an adjournment and consult their builder. There was discussion regarding moving the addition back to line up the roofs and using a different roof design. The applicant said it would be hard to lower the roof because of the pitch. The eaves line up with the peak.

Solicitor Frank said from looking at the drawing the peak of the existing garage is going to land under the eaves of the new structure. That is a way to do it, another is to get the ridge heights the same and get the roof pitches the same and then make valleys where the two roofs meet. They could build a building right next to the old building and extend over and it would not be much harder. Mr. Levenduski said cost-wise it is a big difference. He wants the best looking most economical garage. He didn't want anything gaudy looking.

14.

Member Groze asked about the lot next door to the property. Mr. Levenduski said it belongs to Dr. Irfan Huq. The house on Mr. Huq's lot is vacant and has been for about two years. Member Groze asked about the properties behind him.

Member Bott said he sympathized with Ms. Loiacono but he had to look at the information before the Board. There would be a big cost difference to change the project and it was noted that all of the houses behind the garage are higher than the garage. He thinks it conforms to the area.

Member Buddenbaum asked about the color. He wanted to know if it is going to match the house. The applicants both said the garage would be white to match the house.

It was the Motion of Bott, seconded by Cartier to close the public hearing regarding Application ZB#2015-04. All ayes.

Solicitor Frank said some conditions that were discussed were skinning the garage to match the old garage similar to the color of the house, the driveway extension would be stone to remain impervious, roof run off can't be directed to adjoining properties, the applicant agreed to remove the storage trailer and there can be no commercial uses on the site.

It was the Motion of Groze, seconded by Drangula to approve Application ZB#2015-04.

Upon roll call the Board voted as follows:

AYES: Bott, Buddenbaum, Groze, Patel, Cartier, Drangula

NOES: None

ABSENT: Zekas, Sovak, Lutz

C. Application ZB#2015-05 for Annette Gaeta. Applicant is seeking a bulk variance for the off street parking requirement that was triggered by the change of use from a vacant hair salon to a single family residence on property located at 505 Broad Street, Florence. Block 52, Lot 4.01

Member Cartier recused himself because he was included on the 200' list. He left the meeting at this time.

Solicitor Frank swore in Annette Gaeta, 466 Stagecoach Road, Clarksburg, NJ. She said property was a hair salon and she would like to convert it to a single family residence. The property does not have a driveway. Solicitor Frank clarified for the Board that there are minimum parking requirements for residences. The former commercial use predates the current standards. There was a similar application recently. In both cases the residential use is permitted in the zone. The problem is the parking requirements. The Board needs to explore if there are parking issues.

Member Drangula asked the applicant where she plans to park. Ms. Gaeta said there are four parking spots on the street in front of the property. Member Drangula said he had a

15.

chance to look at the property and determined the building takes up much of the property. There is no way to provide off street parking.

Member Bott asked where the patrons of the former commercial use used to park. He thought there must have been parking issues. He thinks for the residential use there should be ample parking. Solicitor Frank said there are two bedrooms proposed so the requirement is two off street parking spots. The Board is able to waive the requirement, but needs reasons to do so.

Member Patel asked about other residences and their parking situations. Ms. Gaeta said there is plenty of parking in the area. Member Patel asked if the residences in that area had off street parking. Members of the Board noted that most of the residences on Broad Street have on street parking.

Engineer LaRosa said during his site visit he noted there are similar detached dwellings in the area that cannot provide off street parking. The property is zoned RA. Solicitor Frank noted the residential use is more conforming with the zone. Member Buddenbaum said he always felt Broad Street should be more commercial than residential. He would like to see a Farnsworth Avenue kind of feel.

Member Patel inquired about the amount of concrete in front of the building. The applicant said it is the sidewalk and the concrete on the property is existing. Member Drangula said a long time ago there were tables on the concrete. It used to be a place for teenagers to get together.

Member Bott asked about the encroachment of the fence that was noted in Engineer LaRosa's report. Engineer LaRosa said it does show on the survey there is an encroachment. He wanted to make the Board aware of it. It is an existing condition. He explained the encroachment and where it was. It is hard to determine who the fence belongs to.

It was the Motion of Bott, seconded by Patel, to open the meeting to the public regarding Application ZB#2015-05. All ayes.

Ardis Semptimphelter, 503 Broad Street, said there is no yard on the property and she doesn't know how a family will live there. Ms. Gaeta said it has a small yard. Ms. Semptimphelter asked how many people would be living in the house. Ms. Gaeta said it would be her daughter and son-in-law.

Ms. Semptimphelter said she didn't realize the hearing was just regarding parking, but noted parking is adequate in the area.

Solicitor Frank said Ms. Semptimphelter's comment supports the idea that off street parking will not be an issue.

It was the Motion of Patel, seconded by Bott to close the public hearing. All ayes.

16.

Engineer LaRosa told Ms. Gaeta that if the Board approves her application, she will still need to obtain the proper permits to do any work inside the structure. The approval would have nothing to do with building permits.

Solicitor Frank said the Board is looking at granting relief from the requirement that the applicant have two off street parking spaces for her two bedroom residence. The relief would be based upon the adequacy of on street parking and the commonality of using off street parking for residences in the area.

It was the Motion of Bott, seconded by Drangula, to approve Application ZB#2015-05.

Upon roll call the Board voted as follows:

YEAS: Bott, Buddenbaum, Groze, Patel, Drangula

NOES: None

ABSENT: Zekas, Sovak, Lutz

MINUTES

It was the motion of Drangula, seconded by Patel to approve as submitted the minutes of the March 2, 2015 meeting. All ayes.

CORRESPONDENCE

OTHER BUSINESS

Motion of Groze seconded by Patel to adjourn the meeting at 9:01 p.m. Motion unanimously approved by all members present.

Brett Buddenbaum, Secretary

/ak