

**PLANNING BOARD**  
**JUNE 27, 2017**

The Mountainside Planning Board met on Tuesday, June 27, 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, Garran, Matlin, Parker, Tomaine, Zawislak, Attorney Loughlin and Secretary Rees.

ABSENT: Messr. Younghans and Jackositz

The minutes of the May 23, 2017, meeting were approved as presented.

MEMORIZATIONS:

Mazzelli/Taeschler, 362 Darby Lane and 1056 Elston Drive, Block 7.08, Lot 20 and 21 – Applicants proposed a major two-lot subdivision in order to create a distinct building lot, and Lot 21. Undersized Lots 20 and 21 are currently merged. New variances included Lot 20 – front yard under 30 feet where 25.7 feet was proposed, lot area under 15,000 square feet where 11,456 square feet was proposed, lot area within 150 feet of lot depth. Lot 21 – lot area under 15,000 square feet where 11,240 square feet was proposed, lot width under 1000 feet where 80 feet was proposed, and lot area within 150 feet of lot depth.

Caruvana, 1143 Maple Court, Block 5.17, Lot 12 – Applicants proposed a patio addition. Existing variances included side yard under 10 feet or 10 percent width where 9.9 feet existed, lot area under 15,000 square feet where 14,374 square feet existed, F.A.R. over 22.5 percent where 28.2 percent existed, and lot area within 150 feet. Foundation area over 15 percent at 16.8 percent was previously granted. New variance included lot coverage over 30 percent where 31 percent was proposed.

NEW BUSINESS:

Levine, 1132 Ridge Drive, Block 5.15, Lot 6.01 – Applicant proposed to install solar panels onto the roof of a single-family dwelling. Existing variances included side yard under 10 feet or 10 percent width where 9.8 feet existed, foundation area over 15 percent where 16.8 percent existed, lot coverage over 30 percent where 30.5 percent existed, and driveway in the side yard. New variances included the solar panels on the roof which were considered an accessory use and structure.

Attorney Loughlin duly swore in Mr. Jay Levin, the homeowner, Mr. Tim Ryan and Ms. Crestina Marujo, both of Ryan Inc.

Mr. Levine stated that he wanted to install solar panels onto the roof of his home in order to help the environment.

The panel would be installed on the southwest portion of the roof. Approximately 36 panels would be installed. The panels would be black in color. Some of the panels would be able to be seen from the road.

The system would be monitored at the company so that the company can make sure that the system was working at all times.

No trees would be cut down.

Exhibit A-1: Google Earth, Photograph of Ridge Drive

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

Having no further discussion, Mr. Zawislak made a motion to approve the application and Mr. Parker seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Mr. Disko  
Mr. Tomaine  
Mr. Zawislak  
Mr. Garran  
Mr. Matlin  
Mr. Parker  
Mr. Ford

NAYS: 0

MOTION: Approved

Palumbo, 310 Summit Road, Block 7.07, Lot 19 – Applicants had constructed a shed, patio and circular driveway without zoning approval. Existing variances included lot width under 100 feet where 94 feet +/- existed, lot area within 150 feet, driveway in the side yard where 9 feet existed, walkway in the side yard where only 4 feet existed. New variances included lot coverage over 30 percent where 30.1 percent was proposed, front yard coverage over 30 percent where 42.1 percent was proposed, and shed in the rear yard where only 3 feet was proposed.

Attorney Loughlin duly swore in Angelo and Christine Palumbo, the homeowners.

Mr. Palumbo explained that they have lived in the house since the 1990's. The house was owned by a relative; who did all the work without permits prior to Mr. and Mrs. Palumbo moving into the house. Mr. Palumbo assured the board that the patio, shed and circular driveway were already there and they were unaware that everything was done without approvals by the zoning official or building department.

There are two sheds on the property. One shed is in conformance and the other required a variance. Both sheds are on slabs.

CONDITIONS:

- Obtain the necessary building permits
- Obtain the necessary zoning permit

Having no further discussion, Mr. Zawislak made a motion to approve the application and Mr. Matlin seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Mr. Disko  
Mr. Tomaine  
Mr. Zawislak  
Mr. Garran  
Mr. Matlin  
Mr. Parker\  
Mr. Ford

NAYS: 0

MOTION: Approved

Guadagnino/Montes, 220 Kings Court, Block 3.01, Lot 4.19 – Applicants proposed to construct an in-ground swimming pool and deck in the rear yard of a single-family dwelling. Existing variances included side yard under 10 feet or 10 percent width where 9.9 feet existed, lot area within 150 feet where 14,494 square feet existed, and front yard coverage over 30 percent where 43.4 percent existed. New variances included lot coverage over 30 percent where 34.9 percent was proposed.

Attorney Loughlin duly swore in Mr. Peter Guadagnino and Ms. Ileana Montes-Guadagnino, the homeowners as well as the contractor from National Pools.

The homeowners would like to construct an in-ground swimming pool, deck and a 3-foot walkway.

The existing and new variances were discussed.

The homeowners appeared before the board several years ago for a pool, but were denied. It was recommended by the board at that time that they reduce the size of the proposed pool.

Exhibit A-1 and A-2: Pictures of the rear yard

The homeowners testified that they would install a fence that would surround the property.

Mr. Zawislak inquired if the basketball court could be removed. The Ms. Montes informed him that their son loved to play basketball. The basketball court was already there when they purchased the house. The basketball court was located in the rear yard.

The homeowners would remove the walkway on the side of the house if the board requested them to do so.

It was suggested that instead of the walkway, a portion of the circular driveway between the garage and the house could be removed by approximately 100 square feet. The homeowners could plant landscaping in that area. The homeowners agreed to do that.

Mr. Disko stated that a drainage system would have to be submitted for his review and approval.

Having no further discussion, Mr. Zawislak made a motion to approve the application and Mr. Parker seconded the motion.

#### CONDITIONS:

- Remove 100 square feet of the circular driveway
- Walkway would remain
- Submit revised plan of the driveway to the engineer
- Submit landscaping plan to engineer
- Obtain building permits
- Submit storm water plan to the engineer for the pool and decking around the pool for his review and approval

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Mr. Disko  
Mr. Tomaine  
Mr. Zawislak  
Mr. Garran  
Mr. Matlin  
Mr. Parker  
Mr. Ford

NAYS: 0

MOTION: Approved

DISCUSSION:

Attorney Loughlin announced that Mr. Chadwick, the board's planner, will present an amended version of the redevelopment plan of the Barnes Tract at the July 25<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Having no further business, the meeting was duly adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

Ruth M. Rees































