

**PLANNING BOARD
NOVEMBER 28, 2017**

The Mountainside Planning Board met on Tuesday, November 28, 2017 at the Mountainside Municipal Building, 1385 Route 22, Mountainside, NJ 07092.

In compliance with Chapter 231 OPEN PUBLIC MEETINGS ACT in the State of New Jersey, adequate notice had been given to all members of the Planning Board and the newspaper that had been designated to receive notice, The Local Source.

PRESENT: Mayor Mirabelli, Messrs. Disko, Ford, Matlin, Parker, Tomaine, Younghans, Zawislak, Attorney Loughlin and Secretary Rees

ABSENT: Co. Fech-Caccamo, Messrs. Garran, and Jakositz

The minutes of the October 24, 2017 meeting were approved as presented.

MEMORIALIZATION:

Rose Wheeler, 1120 Maple Court, Block 5.16, Lot 4 – Applicant proposed to install solar panels onto the roof of a single-family dwelling. Mr. Zawislak made a motion to approve the resolution and Mr. Disko seconded the motion. All were in favor.

DISCUSSIONS:

Redevelopment Area Plan:

Review of the Redevelopment Area Tract, Block 14, Lots 13 and 14. Resolution No. 108-2017. Report of the Planning Board as to whether any provisions in the Redevelopment Plan are inconsistent with the Master Plan of the Borough and/or further recommendations of the Planning Board to Mayor and Council for the Redevelopment Plan pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40A:12-7(e).

Attorney Loughlin and Planner John Chadwick explained that the amendment to the Redevelopment Plan, incorporating Lots 13 and 15, went to Mayor and Council for their approval and adoption. After public input, Mayor and Council opted to eliminate Lot 15 and adding just Lot 13 to the Redevelopment Plan.

The board must now decide whether the amended Redevelopment Plan is consistent to the Master Plan and to eliminate Lot 17.

Attorney Loughlin informed the board that he drafted the resolution for the board to approve and send it to Mayor and Council.

Mr. Tomaine and Mr. Zawislak made several minor changes to the amended Redevelopment Plan. These changes would be made Mr. Chadwick and forwarded to Mayor and Council.

Having no further discussion, Mr. Younghans made a motion to approve the amended Redevelopment Plan with the corrections, and Mr. Zawislak seconded the motion. All were in favor.

Performance Guarantee:

Performance guarantee reduction for Capitol Senior Housing.

Mr. Disko explained that the developers for Capitol Senior Housing requested a reduction of their site improvement bond.

The board agreed to this and having no further discussion, Mr. Younghans made a motion to approve the reduction to the performance guarantee and Mr. Zawislak seconded the motion. All were in favor.

NEW BUSINESS:

Alison Griggs, 323 Partridge Run, Block 3.09, Lot 2 – Applicant proposed to construct an addition onto a single-family dwelling. Existing variances included lot area under 15,000 square feet where 8,946 square feet existed, Lot width under 100 feet where 70 feet existed, lot area within 150 feet, and driveway in the side yard. New variances included side yard under 10 feet or 10 percent width where 9.4 feet was proposed, foundation area over 15 percent where 17.4 percent was proposed, lot coverage over 30 percent where 40.8 percent was proposed, floor area ratio over 22.5 percent where 26.2 percent was proposed, and the proposed garage providing less than two vehicles.

Attorney Loughlin duly swore in Ms. Griggs, the homeowner, and Mr. David Bailey, the architect, of Westfield, NJ. Mr. Bailey did not have to give his credentials to the board.

Mr. Bailey described the existing and proposed conditions, addition and renovations. The house is a small cape cod that sits on a small lot. Ms. Griggs did not want to tear down the house but to renovate it in order to make the house more livable. Ms. Griggs would like to use as much of the existing space as possible.

First Floor: Mr. Bailey stated that Ms. Griggs would like to expand her existing kitchen by seven feet in order to make the kitchen into an eat-in kitchen. Mr. Bailey stated that the existing kitchen is very small.

She would also like to add an archway linkage to the existing sunroom and also expand on that sunroom.

The existing garage is an undersized two-car garage; more like one and one-half car garage. Mr. Bailey stated he would like to construct the bathroom/powder room in the area of the garage, and that the existing garage would now become only a one-car garage.

Second Floor: There would be two additions on the second floor. One addition would consist of a new master suite that would include a new bathroom and a walk-in closet. The other addition would include a dormer, two bedrooms and a bathroom. One of the additions would be located over the garage. Mr. Younghans commented that the additions were minimal from the street view.

Therefore, one addition would be located in the rear of the house, and the other addition would be located over the garage. With the two proposed additions, they would make the house more of an open space plan on the first floor.

Mr. Bailey reviewed the nine variances, including the “c” variances. He mentioned that any additions and alterations to a house and lot that size would involve variances.

Mr. Bailey explained why the additions and alterations were necessary.

Mr. Disko inquired if the proposed lot coverage could be reduced, such as reducing the size of the driveway. Mr. Bailey stated that Ms. Griggs would like to keep the driveway as is so that she could use it as a k-turn. Mr. Disko stated that the proposed kitchen addition goes fourteen inches past the sunroom. He inquired if the kitchen addition could be made flush with the sunroom. He also suggested that the archway to the sunroom be reduced. Mr. Bailey informed him that the archway could be only four feet instead of the proposed five feet. Mr. Disko expressed his concern regarding the proposed floor area ratio. The two-car garage would be reduced to a one-car garage. Mr. Disko inquired if the kitchen addition could have been shifted to the garage area.

Mr. Younghans informed the applicant that if the slate patio was removed, lot coverage could be reduced.

Mr. Tomaine opened up the floor to the audience for questions.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Mr. Stewart Thau of 325 Partridge Run, a.k.a. 1419 Deer Path inquired if there would be a new foundation. Mr. Bailey stated that there would be a new foundation only for the addition.

Mr. Tomaine opened up the floor to the audience for comments. There were none.

End participation.

The board members proceeded to give their views to Ms. Griggs and Mr. Bailey regarding the application.

CONDITIONS:

- The proposed single-story addition would remain a one story addition.
- The garage would be maintained as a one-car garage and that no further encroachment of living space take place in the garage.

Having no further discussion, Mr. Matlin made a motion to approve the application and Mr. Younghans seconded the motion. Attorney Loughlin informed the applicant that due to the F.A.R. being a use variance, five affirmative votes were required.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Mr. Matlin
Mr. Parker
Mr. Younghans
Mr. Ford

NAYS: Mr. Disko
Mr. Tomaine
Mr. Zawislak

MOTION: Denied

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Steven Hehl, Esq. of Hehl and Hehl appeared before the board to inform them that Stage House Tavern 3 would be prepared to go before the December 21, 2017 meeting. Attorney Loughlin informed Attorney Hehl that he should be prepared to discuss the issue of res judicata on the revised application. Attorney Hehl would address that at the meeting.

Having no further business, the meeting was duly adjourned at 8:55 pm.

Ruth M. Rees
Secretary

