

PLANNING BOARD
JUNE 26, 2018

The Mountainside Planning Board met on Tuesday, June 26, 2018 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: Messrs. Garran, Jakositz, Matlin, Parker, Tomaine. Zawislak, Attorney Loughlin and Secretary Rees.

ABSENT: Messrs. Disko, Ford and Younghans

The minutes of the May 22, 2018 meeting were approved as presented.

Mr. Tomaine announced to the audience that Downey General Contracting postponed.

MEMORIALIZATIONS:

Herttua/Spencer, 23 Tanglewood Lane, Block 22.02, Lot 8 – Applicant was seeking approval to continue to keep an existing detached garage on a newly constructed single-family dwelling. New variances included the driveway in the side yard and an existing detached garage. A motion was made and seconded to approve the resolutions. All were in favor.

Ricciardi, 340 Darby Lane, Block 7.09, Lot 17 – Applicant proposed to construct an addition onto a single-family dwelling. Existing variances included lot area under 15,000 square feet where 12,000 square feet existed, lot width under 100 feet where 80 feet existed, and lot area within 150 feet. New variances included side yard under 10 feet or 10 percent width where 8.6 feet was proposed, foundation area over 15 percent where 19.1 percent was proposed, driveway in the side yard where 0 feet was proposed, and a generator in the side yard where 5 feet was proposed. A motion was made and approved to approve the resolution. All were in favor.

NEW BUSINESS:

Regency International, 253 Sheffield Street and 1112 Bristol Road, Block 7.04, Lot 3 – Applicant was seeking site plan approval for the installation of three exterior overhead doors and a handicap ramp on an existing commercial building. Existing variances included front yard parking, foundation area over 35 percent where 55 percent existed, and lot coverage over 75 percent where 83 percent existed. New variance included insufficient parking.

Mr. Stephen Hehl of Hehl and Hehl represented the applicant for site plan approval.

Attorney Hehl explained that the applicant would like to add three bays for better circulation on both sides the building as well as the parking lot.

There would be no changes to the operation of the business and no changes to the building other than the proposed loading bays.

An additional handicap parking space was proposed. The number of front yard parking spaces would be reduced.

Attorney Loughlin duly swore in Mr. Thomas Ignoscia of Regency International as the director of operations for the company.

Mr. Ignoscia explained that his company imports home décor and garden accessories for various retail stores and that Mountainside was the distribution center for the company. As soon as the products come in they are immediately sent out to the retail stores such as Home Goods and the QVC network.

The currently have 25 employees and operate Monday through Friday.

The goods are delivered by containers from the port approximately 4-5 times a day. Tractor trailers, UPS or FedEx then take the packages out 2-3 times a day.

Mr. Ignoscia explained that the reason the proposed bays were necessary was that most companies have a receiving dock and a shipping dock. Shipping and receiving use the same loading docks. The company would run more efficiently and be more organized if there were separate shipping and receiving bays. By adding the bays, the company would be able to remain in Mountainside.

Exhibit A-1: Colorized version of the site plan showing the existing eight bay doors.

The existing bay doors and the proposed bay doors (receiving) would be on opposite ends of the front of the building. There would be no canopy over the loading doors.

Parking: Approximately 12 parking spaces were used on a daily basis so that there would always be ample parking. There was another tenant on the other side of the building; on Sheffield Street side and they also have ample parking.

Transportation: A broker arranges the containers to be delivered to the Mountainside site and then delivered to the customers. They would be considered a wholesaler who sells to retailers. The Mountainside location was a distribution center only. Customers do not come to the Mountainside location.

Mr. Zawislak inquired about the number of parking spaces. Mr. Ignoscia stated that there were approximately 30 striped parking spaces in front of the building and that they have approximately 83 spaces. Mr. Chadwick stated that the parking variance was significant.

Mr. Tomaine informed Mr. Ignoscia that the ordinance required parking lots to be well maintained, however, the parking spaces needed to be re-striped and the potholes repaired. Mr. Ignoscia assured the board that he would discuss it with the landlord to re-stripe and repair the parking lot.

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

Attorney Loughlin duly swore in Ms. Lorali Totten of Crest Engineering as the engineer for the applicant. She gave her credentials to the board.

Ms. Totten explained that the building was located between two streets; Sheffield Street and Bristol Road.

She described the existing building and parking areas.

There were five light poles in the parking area and several wall-mounted light fixtures. Ms. Totten believed that the lighting was adequate for the property.

Parking: No. 4 of Mr. Chadwick's report was discussed regarding handicap parking spaces. There was currently only one handicap parking space for both the Sheffield Street side and the Bristol Road side. The applicant proposed to add an

additional two parking spaces for the building as well as a handicap ramp in order to made the building ADA assessable.

Parking spaces: The parking space size is currently 9' x 18' and would remain that size. There were 129 parking spaces. With the proposed loading docks there would now be a total of 83 parking spaces in order to make room for the tractor trailers and vans. Ms. Totten believed that parking would still be adequate due to the number of employees in the building.

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

Attorney Hehl gave his summation.

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

CONDITIONS:

- The applicant would submit a plan to Mr. Disko for the re-stripping and repairing of the parking lot
- All the items listed in Mr. Disko's report are to be complied with, including number 20, regarding the ADA handicap spaces
- No other exterior changes are to be made

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Mr. Tomaine
Mr. Zawislak
Mr. Garran
Mr. Matlin
Mr. Parker
Mr. Jakositz

NAYS: 0

MOTION: Approved

Yasinski/Current, 363 Darby Lane, Block 7.07, Lot 7 – Applicant proposed an addition onto a single-family dwelling. Existing variances included lot area under 15,000 square feet where 12,464 square feet existed, lot width under 100 feet where 85 feet existed, and lot area within 150 feet. New variances included side yard under 10 feet or 10 percent width where 5.5 feet was proposed, and driveway in the side yard setback where 7 feet was proposed.

Attorney Loughlin duly swore in Andrew Yasinski and Ashley Current; the homeowners and Mr. Thomas DiGiorgio, the architect. He did not have to give his credentials.

Mr. DiGiorgio reviewed the variances and the existing setbacks.

Mr. and Mrs. Yasinski would like to enlarge and expand on the house by adding bedrooms and an additional garage, thereby creating a new two-car garage, adding a front porch, deck, bathroom, master bedroom, master bathroom, laundry room and enlarge the kitchen.

The existing retaining wall would be rebuilt and cut back in order to accommodate the new two-car garage. Mr. Zawislak expressed his concern that the neighbors would be looking at the wall and windows of the new addition.

The garage would be 5.5 feet off the property line.

The exterior of the home would be upgraded by constructing a new false dormer.

Although there would be windows facing the neighbors, the area would be used for attic storage only. The lighting would be put on by a switch and not every day, only when needed.

There would be no windows in the garage area.

Mr. Garran inquired if there had been any consideration in pulling the proposed addition further back from the property line. Mr. DiGiorgio stated that due to the grading of the property, the addition had to be closer due the property line.

The proposed retaining wall was discussed and the fact that the neighbors would be looking at a very massive retaining wall.

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

Mr. Zawislak expressed his concern that there would not be much area between the two properties.

Mr. Tomaine stated that the main issue was the degree of non-conformity of the side yard setback.

Mr. Parker inquired if Mr. DiGiorgio had considered pushing the garage forward. Mr. DiGiorgio stated that he could not put it forward due to the retaining wall.

Mr. DiGiorgio then suggested that the second floor addition could be set back by two feet.

Exhibit A-1: Alternate No. 1. Cut back the second floor addition; that would reduce the master bedroom, sitting area and walk-in closet.

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

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

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Attorney Loughlin duly swore in Mr. Frank Duca, Jr. of 366 Darby Lane. Mr. Duca stated that he lived across the street and had no objections to the addition. The applicants were an asset to the neighborhood as well as the community.

Attorney Loughlin duly swore in Mrs. Maria DeOliveira of 367 Darby Lane also spoke in favor of the application.

Mr. Zawislak inquired if the applicants would accept the revised/amended plans. Mr. Yasinski stated that he would accept the revised plans.

Several members gave their comments to the applicants.

Having no further discussion, Mr. Zawislak made a motion to approve the revised/amended application and Mr. Garran seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

AYES: Mr. Tomaine
Mr. Zawislak
Mr. Garran
Mr. Matlin
Mr. Parker
Mr. Jakositz

NAY: 0

MOTION: Approved

Bento, 1246 Knollwood Road, Block 16.09, Lot 4 – Applicant proposed second story and rear yard additions onto a single-family dwelling. Existing variances included lot area under 15,000 square feet where 10,914 square feet existed, lot width under 100 feet where 75 feet existed, lot area within 150 feet and driveway in the side yard setback. New variances included side yard under 10 feet or 10 percent width where 7.9 feet was proposed, foundation area over 15 percent where 16 percent was proposed, and floor area ratio over 22.5 percent where 27.5 percent was proposed.

Attorney Loughlin duly swore in Mr. Helio Bento, the homeowner.

Attorney Loughlin advised the homeowner that five affirmative votes were required for this application. Attorney Loughlin also noted that the applicant's architect was not present.

The variances were reviewed.

Mr. Bento described the proposed addition. The house is currently a cape cod and Mr. Bento would like to add a second story addition and rear yard addition. He would like to change the floor plan to reconfigure the house.

The house would become a four bedroom, three bathroom house with a laundry room on the second floor.

The height of the ceilings would be raised.

A porch and balcony was also proposed.

Mr. Tomaine discussed the proposed Floor Area Ratio (18 percent).

Mr. Matlin inquired if the house could be redesigned in order to use less space. Mr. Bento stated that the first floor could be reduced by three feet and the second floor could possibly be redesigned.

Mr. Matlin inquired about the proposed increase in the floor area. He would be approximately 550 square feet over.

Mr. Parker inquired if Mr. Bento would consider reducing the second floor addition, such as the laundry room, etc. Mr. Bento stated that he would consider reducing the addition.

Attorney Loughlin advised the applicant regarding his application.

The board voted to continue the application.

Due to the lack of information by the applicant on the application, the application will be continued on August 28th meeting.

APPLICATION: Postponed

Having no further business, the meeting was duly adjourned at 9:45 pm.

Ruth M. Rees

