

Offered By: Mr. Skowronski

Second: Mr. Grossman

Date: November 6, 2014

Minutes of October 16, 2014 Land Use Board Meeting

Regular Meeting of the Hazlet Township Land Use Board scheduled for October 16, 2014 was called to order at 7:30PM with a Salute to the Flag followed by a moment of Silent Prayer and a Reading of the Letter of Compliance by Trish Cullen.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Mr. Bace, Mr. Grossman, Mr. Pobega, Chairman Tyler, Mr. Skowronski, Mr. Lavan

Professionals- Mr. Kittner, Mr. Vella, Mrs. Keegan

Absent: Mr. Pisano, Mr. Solomeno, Mayor DiNardo, Deputy Mayor Belasco, Mr. Vignola, Mr. Szczuplak, Mr. Moore

Memorial Resolution- # 14-11L Andrew Szumera; 49 Virginia Avenue; Block 86 Lot 3; R-70 Zone. Applicant has obtained permission to retain a 17ft x 20ft wood deck, 13ft x 16ft concrete/paver patio, 6ft x 21ft and 3ft x 4ft slate patio/walkway.

Motion to Approve:

Offered by: Mr. Skowronski

2nd: Mr. Grossman

ROLL CALL

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Mr. Pobega (abstain)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Bace	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Lavan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Szczuplak (absent)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Chairman Tyler	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Solomeno (absent)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Vignola (absent)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Deputy Mayor Belasco (absent)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mayor DiNardo (absent)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Alt #1 Mr. Grossman	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Alt #2 Mr. Moore (absent)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Alt #3 Mr. Skowronski	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Alt #4 Mr. Pisano (absent)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

New Case # 14-12L Robert and Rosalie Preuss; 5 Garden Terrace; Block 199 Lot 16; R-70 Zone. Applicant is seeking permission to construct a 16ft x 32ft garage addition; 10.9ft x 11ft 1 story rear addition; remove 3.9ft x 12ft of existing garage and convert into living space.

Swearing in Robert Preuss

Mr. Vella- I would like to mark as A-1 survey of property and A-2 as plans by Kevin C. Roy.

Mr. Preuss- The kitchen is very small. My wife wants a dining room and where the garage is now would become the living room with a new garage on the other side. I'm going to keep the house straight across.

Chairman Tyler- You're neighbor to the left apparently has added on to the garage.

Mr. Preuss- That's been there since I have been there.

Mr. Pogeba- Is the proposed garage the same size as the current garage?

Mr. Preuss- A little bigger.

Mrs. Keegan- 4 feet.

Mr. Vella- It's 16 x 32.

Chairman Tyler- You're taking a lot from both sides making it tight there. Let's talk about the lot coverage. What would the coverage be if we were looking at the new numbers?

Mr. Kittner- I don't have the proposed table that we have in front of me but I believe the R-70 zone was in the 40% range. The applicant is asking for 42% on the proposed conditions.

Mr. Vella- Obviously you plan to install a new 16 x 30 foot driveway in front of your new garage.

Mr. Preuss- I had the architect draw up the addition I never said anything about a driveway.

Chairman Tyler- What your plans show is keeping the existing driveway and adding additional driveway in front of the new garage and that is what is in the application.

Mr. Kittner- You're shifting your driveway over so naturally you're going to have to propose a driveway.

Mr. Preuss- I'd probably move the grass over more to the right and the driveway to the right.

Mrs. Keegan- So we'd be taking away 12 x 30 off the lot requirement.

Chairman Tyler- What you have on your plans is a 28ft wide driveway so if we cut it back Mr. Kittner can advise on what a reasonable width is for a 2 car driveway.

Mr. Kittner- For a 2 car garage 20ft is the minimum width, if you eliminate the 12 x 30 existing paved driveway that reduces the impervious coverage down to 38%.

Mrs. Keegan- Was it your intention to leave the driveway where it is now?

Mr. Preuss- No I'm moving it over a little to the right.

Chairman Tyler- If we make it 20 feet wide you stay below the 40% coverage.

Mr. Kittner- If he made the driveway 20 feet wide the impervious coverage would be 39.4%.

Chairman Tyler- I think that's reasonable.

Mr. Kittner- You also talked about sliding the driveway over a few feet and there is a setback requirement where you have to keep 3ft from the property line.

Mr. Vella- Mr. Preuss, do you know what the setback is to the adjoining property to your left?

Mr. Preuss- I don't know. Every house regarding the left side is the same.

Mr. Kittner- So it's your testimony that it is consistent with the neighborhood?

Mr. Preuss- Yes.

Mr. Vella- Your 2 sheds violate the setbacks are you willing to move them?

Mr. Preuss- When they rot I'll put them in the garbage.

Mrs. Keegan- There is a drainage easement back there.

Mr. Kittner- If you were to straighten out the sheds you could still keep them catty-cornered but you'd have to move them out of the drainage easement.

Mrs. Keegan- He needs a minimum of 7ft from the pool's water edge

Mr. Kittner- The 8x8 will have to be straight to meet the requirements for the pool.

Mr. Vella- Applicant shall revise the plans to remove portion of the existing driveway and have the driveway at a maximum of 20ft with a minimum of 3ft from the property line, move 2 sheds out of the drainage easement and to comply with the 2ft setback providing an as built survey showing the setbacks approved by this board.

Motion to Approve:

Offered by: Mr. Skowronski

2nd: Mr. Lavan

ROLL CALL

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Mr. Pobega	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Bace	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Lavan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Szczuplak (absent)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Chairman Tyler	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Solomeno (absent)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Vignola (absent)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Deputy Mayor Belasco (absent)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mayor DiNardo (absent)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Alt #1 Mr. Grossman	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Alt #2 Mr. Moore (absent)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Alt #3 Mr. Skowronski	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Alt #4 Mr. Pisano (absent)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

New Case # 14-13L Grace Cunningham; 12 Lafayette Drive; Block 190 Lots 48; R-70 Zone. Applicant is seeking permission to construct a 12ft x 28ft add a level; 6ft x 20ft front covered porch; install a 16ft x 32ft in ground pool.

Swearing in Grace Cunningham

Mr. Vella- We have marked A-1 survey of property and A-2 plans prepared by Kevin C. Roy Architect.

Ms. Cunningham- I purchased my home in June of this year and it's a 3 bedroom home. I would like to add 2 rooms upstairs. We need more room.

Mr. Kittner- The relief she's asking for is existing non-conformities.

Mr. Vella- One new variance she's asking for is lot coverage which is associated with the pool. Are you planning a patio around?

Ms. Cunningham- Just the 3ft concrete.

Mr. Kittner- The existing coverage is 29% the proposed is 34% without the pool patio and the pool patio bumps the impervious coverage from 34% to 38%.

Mr. Vella- The pool equipment has to be a 10ft setback. The applicant is proposing a 10ft setback from the water line to the property line. The pool equipment is going to be like 3ft from the property line. Would you have a problem with your pool equipment complying with the ordinance with a minimum of 10ft from the property line?

Ms. Cunningham- No.

Mr. Vella- To comply you'd have to move the pool 3ft towards the house and 3ft towards the shed.

Ms. Cunningham- That's fine.

Motion to Approve:

Offered by: Mr. Pobega

2nd: Mr. Grossman

<u>ROLL CALL</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Mr. Pobega	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Bace	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Lavan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Szczuplak (absent)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Chairman Tyler	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Solomeno (absent)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Vignola (absent)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Deputy Mayor Belasco (absent)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mayor DiNardo (absent)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Alt #1 Mr. Grossman	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Alt #2 Mr. Moore (absent)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Alt #3 Mr. Skowronski	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Alt #4 Mr. Pisano (absent)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Conceptual Review; Yen Chen; 63/65 Central Avenue; Block 4 lots 9, 10, 11; R-70 Zone. Mr. Chen proposes to potentially buy an existing 16,800 sq. ft. lot and subdivide it to a 70ft x 100ft and a 122.5ft x 80ft lot.

Mr. Vella- The Municipal Land Use Law allows the Planning Board to hear conceptual hearings and the applicant is not under oath. We will let the applicant go over what the proposed plans are, why he thinks it's a benefit to the neighborhood and why he thinks those variances are generally good.

Mr. Chen- I am in the process of buying a house in Hazlet and upon review of all the information I realized this is a real huge oversized lot in the neighborhood. The lot is almost 17000 sq. ft. with a small house sitting there. The oversized lot doesn't look right and I was thinking if I could subdivide that into a bigger sized lot and put a nice house there. I used the tax map that shows the block where the house is. There is also a street that was vacated.

Mr. Pobega- The existing house sits on Central Avenue?

Mr. Chen- Yes.

Chairman Tyler- Looks to me that a very old house that appears to be non-conforming use on a very nice sized lot, that doesn't mean you can put two houses there. It creates a condition to subdivide for the existing residence that- I have a problem with it.

Mr. Chen- I think the board sees what the situation is there. If I should buy the house I'd like to improve that. Do you have suggestions to what I can do if I do buy it?

Mr. Pobega- Do you plan on living in it yourself?

Mr. Chen- Not right now my wife is not retired yet but we do like this area.

Mr. Vella- You have plenty of room to build an addition or anything in the back.

Mr. Chen- Yes I do but I'd like to take this chance to see how the board feels. If I don't put a house there I make the existing house a little more desirable.

Chairman Tyler- The house has a sizeable footprint that you can easily go up with it or go back with it and make the house larger. If you were to consider that you might consider getting rid of the garage on the right and maybe put a larger garage somewhere. I think you should work with the residence that you have there on the larger lot instead of trying to fit two homes on one size lot and now you create a condition where you just have too much lot coverage.

Mr. Bace- Have you considered knocking those houses down?

Mr. Chen- It's going to get very expensive.

Mr. Bace- If you put two houses on there you'd have to knock it down.

Mr. Chen- Yes.

Mr. Bace- So this is an investment for you more than a person use?

Mr. Chen- At the present time yes.

Chairman Tyler- In my opinion if the idea is I'm going to buy this property and I can build another house on it and therefore make some money I would say that's not something that supports the idea of asking for variances on a property and putting too much construction on a property. This is not a double lot not in my opinion.

Mr. Chen- The lot size requirement is 7,000 square feet so we do have enough room for two lots.

Chairman Tyler- A number of variances will be created and if not just lot size its lot coverage, setbacks and there's a number of things so while the lot is an ample size you're existing residence is in such a location and has a certain amount of existing variances that we would never approve today. If you were talking about improving the house, as you saw on the previous applications, you're taking an existing condition then we can work with that if you're making an improvement to a house. If you're saying we're going to take an existing condition and make it much worse than it is so I can build another house in the back, no that's not something I support.

Mr. Chen- I think the problem that the board pointed out is the existing house is in the wrong location but would I be willing to knock the house down? If I do that I would be able to create two conforming structure on the two lots. Is that something that the board feels like that could be an asset to the area if I did that?

Mrs. Keegan- It wouldn't be a conforming lot.

Mr. Kittner- If you left the lot line the same as you proposed with this application and raised the house and tried building a new house the lot would still not be conforming. The lot with the existing

house would still need a variance for lot depth 100 feet is required and it looks like you're proposing 80.

Mr. Chen- That would be the only variance I need though.

Mr. Kittner- Lot frontage is the new lot that you're proposing.

Mr. Chen- In the new lot if I extend the street and pave it would that be ok then?
If I extend another 40 feet that would be a 70 foot frontage.

Mr. Kittner- At that point you would satisfy the lot frontage and that variance would go away. Then that would be a conforming lot.

Mr. Chen- I'm just trying to get some feedback. I have no intention to create something that would not be an asset to the area.

Mr. Kittner- Keep in mind that if you propose to extend Third Street you would have to coordinate with our office to see if there are any particulars with that. You may require additional survey or deed research to make sure that there aren't any restrictions that exist that would preclude you from extending the road so there's more diligence that you would to do. In terms of satisfying the lot frontages if the road were to be extended then yes it would satisfy that.

Mr. Pobega- It sounds like you have a big lot but it's just not big enough to do 2 conforming properties and that's the challenge here.

Chairman Tyler- If you were to consider constructing 2 new residences where they are situated perhaps 2 stories so their foot print smaller perhaps there is a way to minimize the amount of variances you need.

Mr. Bace- Did you buy this property yet?

Mr. Chen- No I'm in contract stage.

Chairman Tyler- If you have further questions you can refer to our Zoning Officer.

VOICE VOTE: YES

Motion to Adjourn: Sole Offer

Next Meeting: November 6, 2014

Trish Cullen

Secretary

