Mrs. Maria Campagna opened the meeting at 7:00 pm.

Please stand for the PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.

This meeting was held in accordance with the Open Public Meeting Act and as such, proper notice of this meeting was published in The Observer, The Courier News and The Star Ledger providing same to the Borough Clerk.

It is the policy of the South Plainfield Zoning Board of Adjustments, not to hear any new applications after 10:00 pm and no new witnesses after 10:30 pm.

ROLL CALL:

Present:

Absent:

Maria Campagna Darlene Cullen Cindy Eichler April Wasnick, 1st Alternate Joseph Scrudato, 2nd Alternate Gino Leonardis, Chairman James Gustafson, Vice Chairman Ken Bonanno Frank Lemos

Also attending, Alex Fisher, Esq.; Bob Bucco, PE, CME, CPWM; Jeff Cucinotta, PP

MINUTES: None

RESOLUTIONS: None

HEARING:

A. Case #11-19 – Sehal Patel Block 254: Lot 17.01 C0002: R 1-2 Zone 156 Teeple Place

The applicant is requesting to construct a roof over front landing and steps that requires a <u>Front Yard Setback</u> <u>Variance</u>. Required 30' — Requesting 25' — Variance 5'.

Sehal Patel - 156 Teeple Place, South Plainfield, New Jersey - owner is sworn in and addressed the Board. He is seeking an approval for a variance to build a roof over front steps. The size of the roof exceeds the size allowed.

Mrs. Campagna stated that the following Applicant is seeking the same.

Mrs. Campagna stated looking at the survey, the house on the left. Mrs. Campagna asked the size of the roof. Mr. Patel stated approximately sixty (60) square feet... six feet (6') out and ten feet (10') across.

Mr. Patel submitted Exhibit A1 - Roof Structure for Existing Entrance Platform - sheet 1 of 1 - prepared by Se Hwan Kim, Architect. Mr. Patel stated it is the plans for both houses... the Applicant that is following.

Mrs. Campagna asked Mr. Patel if this will cover the door and steps. Per Mr. Patel, yes.

Mrs. Campagna asked what type of material will be used. Mr. Patel stated wood. Mrs. Campagna asked who is going to build it. Mr. Patel stated they are debating whether to hire a contractor or to build it themselves. But

believes probably a contractor. Mrs. Campagna asked if there will be columns. Mr. Patel stated yes... two (2) at the end of the steps.

Mrs. Campagna stated looking at the survey, the house is thirty-one feet (31'). The roof will come out six feet (6') which will require a five foot (5') variance. Requesting a twenty-five foot (25') setback.

Mr. Fisher asked if other homes in the area have a similar roof. Mr. Patel stated yes, the only difference this will cover the steps. Others on the street only cover the landing.

Mrs. Cullen asked if Mr. Patel is enlarging the porch. Mr. Patel stated no.

Mrs. Campagna asked if the porch will be enclosed. Mr. Patel stated no. Mrs. Campagna continued... it will be open.

Mrs. Cullen stated that the application states this is part of a condo association. Mr. Patel stated yes... two (2) houses - 154-156 Condo Association. Mrs. Cullen asked if there is another approval required. Mr. Patel stated no... the Association is between the two (2) owners.

Mrs. Cullen asked what the post will look like. Mr. Patel stated it will be white.

Mrs. Campagna stated that she had driven by the house. Believes the cover is important to be protected from the rain and snow. A five foot (5') setback does not interfere with sight triangle or anything else.

Mrs. Campagna called for a motion of *approval* of the roof with the conditions that the porch will not be enlarged and not enclosed. Mrs. Eichler made motion, seconded by Mrs. Cullen. Those in favor: Mrs. Campagna; Mrs. Cullen; Mrs. Eichler; Mrs. Wasnick; and Mr. Scrudato. Those oppose: None

B. Case #12-19 – Dinesh Patel Block 254: Lot 17.01 C0001: R 1-2 Zone 154 Teeple Place

The applicant is requesting to construct a roof over front landing and steps that requires a <u>Front Yard Setback</u> <u>Variance</u>. Required 30' — Requesting 25' — Variance 5'.

Mr. Dinesh Patel requested the presence of Mr. Sehal Patel to help explain the roof over front landing and steps. Board Members agreed.

Dinesh Patel - 154 Teeple Place, South Plainfield, New Jersey - owner and applicant, is sworn in. Mrs. Campagna asked if he knows Senal Patel. Mr. D. Patel stated yes... he is my nephew.

Mrs. Campagna stated heard testimony for 156 Teeple Place. Mrs. Campagna asked if Mr. D. Patel is requesting the same thing as Mr. S. Patel. Mr. D. Patel stated yes... the same thing.

Mr. Fisher stated that this is a zero lot line condominium. They are attached.

Mrs. Cullen asked Mr. D. Patel if his roof over porch will differ in anyway then Mr. S. Patel. Per Mr. D. Patel, no. The houses are attached to each either and everything will be the same.

Mr. Scrudato asked if it will be the same contractor. Mr. D. Patel stated yes. Mr. Scrudato asked if there will be any electric on top of the roof. Mr. D. Patel stated there is a light over the door and that will remain. No other lights.

Mrs. Cullen asked if Mr. D. Patel will be enlarging or enclosing the porch. Mr. D. Patel stated no.

Mrs. Campagna opened the discussion to the public. No questions or concerns.

Mrs. Campagna called for a motion of *approval* of the roof with the conditions that the porch will not be enlarged and not enclosed. Mrs. Eichler made motion, seconded by Mrs. Cullen. Those in favor: Mrs. Campagna; Mrs. Cullen; Mrs. Eichler; Mrs. Wasnick; and Mr. Scrudato. Those oppose: None

C. Case #13-19 – Mark Sprenger Block 2160: Lot 15: R 10 Zone 1622 Sampton Avenue

The applicant is requesting to construct a 14' X 13.7' rear deck and enclosed an existing porch that requires a <u>Second Front Yard Setback Variance</u>: Required 30' — Existing 4.6' (house) and proposing 15' (deck) — Variance 25.4 (house) and 15' (deck).

Mark Sprenger - 1622 Sampton Avenue, South Plainfield, New Jersey - Applicant is sworn in and addressed the Board. Would like to put a deck on rear of house... corner lot.

Mrs. Campagna stated the house is raised... why is it raised and how high is it going to be. Mr. Sprenger stated it is being raised thirty-two (32) inches. It is higher now then what it will be. It was raised higher so the mason is able to work. It was his grandfather's house. The reason it is being raised is that there is a six inch (6") transition between the kitchen and living room. Grandfather put 2'X4' on an angle. One side of the kitchen is three inches (3") higher than the other side. Put another floor on top which leveled the kitchen but left a six inch (6") transition. Went to an engineer and was told that the one (1) foundation is three inches (3") to high. The other issue was the basement. Mom grew up in the house. Was a dirt floor basement. Was told that 'back then', basements were not used. The basement height is five feet eight inches (5' 8"). Applicant is six feet (6') tall. Will have a usable basement and fix the foundation by lifting the house.

Mrs. Campagna stated went by the house. Asked when the house is lowered, how tall will the basement be. Mr. Sprenger stated seven feet eight inches 7' 8". Mrs. Campagna asked how much will the house be lowered. Mr. Sprenger stated does not know. It is raised higher than the actual size so work can be done. The house will be thirty-two inches (32") when completed.

Mrs. Campagna asked where will the house be in relationship to Johns Place. The survey shows the house is 4.5'. Mr. Sprenger stated that will remain. The footprint of the house with the raise will remain the same.

Mrs. Campagna confirmed with Mr. Sprenger that the picture showing the small back porch is what is being requested enclosed and will be part of the inside of the house. Adding a deck behind it. Mrs. Campagna asked where the steps will be facing. Mr. Sprenger stated the steps were removed with the raising. Will have stairs from the deck. Is putting in a new exterior door in a new location to the deck. The stairs off the deck will be facing Johns Place. It is determined the deck will be fifteen feet (15') from Johns Place.

Mrs. Campagna stated behind the house is a shed. Mrs. Campagna asked how close is the shed to Johns Place. Mr. Sprenger stated the shed was there when purchased. Mr. Fisher stated it is a pre-existing non-confirming... therefore, does not need relief.

Mrs. Campagna asked if Mr. Sprenger will enclose the deck or put a roof over the deck. Per Mr. Sprenger, no. Mrs. Campagna asked if there will be railings. Mr. Sprenger stated yes. Mrs. Campagna asked what the deck will be made from. Mr. Sprenger stated pressure treated timber for the structure, Trex and vinyl PVC railing.

Mrs. Campagna asked if the walkway will be removed. Mr. Sprenger stated it will be removed. There is an exterior door. Is planning to leave a concrete pad for the door only. The rest will be removed. Mr. Sprenger stated when you would walk into the that door, you had to go up narrow stairs to the kitchen. The door for the other stairs in the kitchen swing into each other.

Mrs. Campagna asked when was the house built. Mr. Sprenger stated his grandfather bought it 1960. Went to tax office and was told sometime in the 1920's. Mrs. Cullen stated 1929... It is on the property card.

Mrs. Campagna asked Mr. Sprenger to describe the house. Per Mr. Sprenger... will have a basement... first floor has the kitchen, one (1) bedroom, living room, dining room, one (1) bathroom and a sunroom... second floor has three (3) bedrooms. No real plans for the basement.

Mr. Fisher stated for the setback variance the deck will be further from the road then the house. It is not increasing or noticeable.

Mrs. Cullen asked if Mr. Sprenger agrees to not enclosing the deck. Mr. Sprenger agreed.

Mrs. Campagna stated this is a large property but the house is to one side. Mr. Sprenger presented the original survey when his grandfather purchased it.

Mrs. Campagna asked if the structure with black shingles belongs to this property. Mr. Sprenger stated that the story goes that the shed housed a horse and buggy. At some point, his grandfather built the shed and attached it to the building that housed the horse and buggy.

Mrs. Campagna opened the discussion to the audience. No comments or concerns.

Mrs. Campagna stated the house is pre-existing. The deck does not seem to interfere with much. Does not believe when the house is lowered, it will not impede on the sight triangle

Mrs. Campagna called for a motion of *approval* with the condition that the deck will not be enclosed. Mrs. Eichler made motion, seconded by Mrs. Cullen. Those in favor: Mrs. Campagna; Mrs. Cullen; Mrs. Eichler; Mrs. Wasnick; and Mr. Scrudato. Those oppose: None

D. Case #44-18 – T-Mobile Northeast, LLC Block 228.01: Lot 46.03: RH Zone 4701 Stelton Road

The applicant is requesting a <u>Preliminary and Final Site Plan</u> with <u>Use and Bulk Variances</u> to contrast twelve (12) communication antennas and generator.

Warren Stillwell, Esq. attorney for Applicant addressed the Board. Would like an adjournment to October 1, 2019. Mr. Fisher announced that the notice has been reviewed and is in order. Mr. Stillwell stated will grant any extension.

Mrs. Campagna announced to the audience that this case will be carried to October 1, 2019.

E. Case #35-18 – 2271 Hamilton LLC Block 390: Lot 1 & 2: M-3 Zone 2271 Hamilton Boulevard

The applicant is requesting a <u>Preliminary and Final Site Plan</u> with <u>Use and Bulk Variances</u> to contrast a ten thousand three hundred (10,300) square foot retail building and fifty-five thousand two hundred thirty-seven (55,237) square foot warehouse.

Mrs. Campagna read a letter addressed to the Board Members from Walter K. Abrams, Esq, attorney for the Applicant:

'This will confirm that I represent the applicant in the above matter and request that tonight's hearing be adjourned. The basis for my request is that we have been advised that there will not be a full Board present at the hearing and in view of the fact that this is a use variance, we ask that the hearing be carried and the new date to be announced to avoid republication and re-notice. The applicant grants any extension necessary pursuant to the MLUL. My client asked me to advise you that he is willing to pay for special

hearing if the Board is able to schedule one. Thank you for your courtesy and cooperation. Respectfully, Walter K. Abrams.'

Mr. Fisher stated that Mr. Abrams had not provided any proof of notice and is not present with it. The Board could carry without further noticed, if this hearing was adequately noticed within two (2) days or require to re-notice.

Mrs. Campagna stated the hearing will be carried to October 1, 2019. The Board Secretary will inform Mr. Abrams the new date.

Mrs. Campagna announced to the audience that this case will be heard on October 1, 2019.

INFORMAL HEARINGS: None

OLD BUSINESS: None

NEW BUSINESS: None

CORRESPONDANCE: None

EXECUTIVE SESSION: None

ADJOURNMENT: 7:35 PM

Respectfully Submitted, Joanne Broderick Recording Secretary