

Unified Planning/ Zoning Board of Adjustments Meeting
October 4, 2010

The meeting was called to order by chairman, Ken Cassidy, and the pledge of allegiance was recited.

Roll Call was taken with the following members present: Mr. Buccellato, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Dolan, Mr. Gallego, Mr. Mendes, Mr. McKenna, Mr. Montfort, and Mr. Shea. Absent were: Ms. Malanga and Mr. Saporito.

The first application was Mr. Shah 10B Edgemere Drive Block 49, Lot 19.04

Mr. Shah of Cranbury NJ is the applicant's architect and was sworn in. Mr. Hadderer, the board engineer, was sworn in. Mr. Buccellato noted that the denial of this application was for the 50' buffer and utility easement, but the current application has it flipped so this application should not have a hearing tonight. Mr. Shah said there is no variance relief and there should not be a need for site plan relief for a single family home. Mr. Hadderer said the applicant should apply for a site plan waiver and that once it was flipped, it should have been reviewed by an administration official and not this board. Mr. Buccellato asked if the engineer's letter should supersede this hearing. Mr. Hadderer stated if the comments from the letter were complied with, then it should be alright. Mr. Buccellato made a motion to dismiss this hearing as long as the engineer's letter was satisfied and then the applicant should be able to move forward with a Borough official signing off on it and Mr. Cassidy second. The board voted with all members in favor.

The second application was Emlerich LLC 126 Main St Block 24 Lots 3,4,6,6.07,7-9

Mr. Alfieri is the applicant's attorney. Mr. Marchetto is the applicant's architect. The Class 1 & 3 members have stepped down. Mr. Dolan has recused himself. Mr. Marchetto said that revisions were made to the plans due to comments by the board and public. He reviewed the revised rendering in regards to Little Street and the width of the sidewalks and marked it for exhibit. He also stated that all sidewalks are on the property. He stated that the ground level floor plan was revised to include a recreation room or community room of 400 square feet and the retail space has been reduced. The other revisions were: there were 42 units and now there are 39, there were 27 1-bedroom units and now there are 15, there were 12 2-bedroom units and now there are 21, there were 3 3-bedroom units and now there are still 3, there was 6,675 square feet gross overall and now there is 6,275, there was 5,605 square feet net overall and now there is 5,150, there was 117 parking spaces and now there are 111 with a variance only needed for 7 spaces. He then reviewed the entrance/lobby area and the community room entrance. He stated that all residents/units will have keys or key pad access to the room. He reviewed the 2nd and 3rd floor plans and reviewed the square footage of each which conforms and he also reviewed the storage units. He stated that they will comply with all items in the fire official's letter. He then displayed a 3 dimensional exhibit and reviewed that with everyone from all the different angles.

Public Questions:

Ms. Khanna, 120 Main Street, wanted to see the alley between 120 and 126 on the 3D and asked if the alley will go all the way through and how big is the space in between and Mr. Marchetto said it is about 1’.

Mr. Bradley, 2 Maiden Ln, wanted to see how the shadow would fall on his property from the 3D and Mr. Marchetto said it would fall on the parking lot.

Board Questions:

Mr. Montfort asked about the setback on the building on Jackson Street and Mr. Marchetto said there is hardly any setback but 5 or 6’ of sidewalk. The sidewalk is not on the applicant’s property.

Mr. Cassidy asked what the customary width of the sidewalk is and Mr. Hadderer said it is usually 5’ and that is what it is there.

Mr. Gallego asked what was the narrowest part of the sidewalk on Jackson Street and Mr. Marchetto said that due to the property line being skewed there, the narrowest part is 4’ due to the angle.

Public Questions:

Mr. Young, 1 Maiden Ln, asked the width and length of the parking spaces and Mr. Marchetto said 9’ by 18’ and 9’ by 16’.

Mr. Young said the Borough has a minimum of 9’ by 20’ and Mr. Marchetto said this is a private parking lot and that 9’ by 18’ is a conforming space.

Mr. Young noted that there are still trees shown on the Little Street rendering and Mr. Marchetto said the rendering was updated only to show the community /recreation room.

Mr. Young asked if the recreation room is to fill the ordinance and Mr. Marchetto said this is just a common area or recreational space.

Mr. Irene asked the reference number of the ordinance he is referring to and if it states outside recreational area and Mr. Young gave him the ordinance number and said it says 50 square’ per unit has to be allotted.

Mr. Irene said we will check and see if this complies with the ordinance.

Mr. Alfieri said the ordinance is for a multi family garden apartment and that is not what this project is.

Mr. Young asked where the moving trucks will park when residents are moving in and out and Mr. Marchetto said there is a driveway on the Maiden Ln side of the building for all deliveries, trash pickups and a service corridor connects it. He stated they could put a door there to accommodate this also.

Mr. Cassidy asked how would they bring home groceries and Mr. Marchetto said the residents park in the basement parking area and there are 2 spaces per unit (76 spaces) and the rest are for the retail area.

Mr. Gorman, 4 Little Street, questioned the adequate lighting, air and open space issues and Mr. Marchetto said it should not be a problem as the building is on the North side of his property.

Mr. Gorman said the building is encroaching on his property and Mr. Marchetto said that it would not.

Mr. Gorman asked about the setbacks and Mr. Hadderer said they would need a variance because it should be 20’ and they now have 4’, 4’ and 0’.

Ms. Van Jura, 135 Main Street, asked if these were apartments or condos and Mr. Alfieri said they were built for condo ownership.

Mr. Rea is the applicant's traffic engineer from Manasquan NJ. He reviewed the traffic report and marked exhibits to show the traffic flow and traffic lights. He reviewed all the aspects that could affect this area and alternate parking availability.

Mr. Alfieri asked if all the intersections will operate proficiently and Mr. Rea said yes and this project has less impact than the previous supermarket on traffic and parking.

Mr. Montfort asked if parking would be buffered so people could get in and out and Mr. Marchetto said that is why the bumpers are there and they should stop that, but he agrees it would be better to get rid of 2 spaces and put barriers on the other side to stop that. He went on to explain that when the garage doors are opened you are alerted and would have to pull out into the street once you cleared the doors.

Mr. Cassidy asked if the alert that is given are bells and Mr. Marchetto said they are audible only within the area but he said they could put flashers there and then the noise would not be an issue but the safety would be covered.

Mr. Montfort asked about the curb cuts and if they would meet ADA requirements and Mr. Marchetto said yes they would have to.

Mr. Hadderer reviewed the points in the engineer's letter and said the applicant will widen the driveways for the garage doors, the aisle for traffic seems ok, and the times for the garage door openings would be controlled by a clicker. He asked questions about the space between the columns or bumpers to protect cars and the applicant said the column does not take away from the parking space. They could either wrap the columns or make these spaces for compact cars. He does feel that the 25' access aisle between is sufficient. He asked how the parking is assigned and the applicant said it is reserved for residents and then first come, first served for multiple cars. The next point was how the mechanical room was maintained by the access that is available and the answer was the room is in the corner and it is accessible within the space that is there. The next point was if they could move the columns on the 2 spaces in question and the answer was they would be moved. The last point was how the spaces will be noted for the compact cars and the applicant will have signage on them.

Public Questions:

Mr. Young, 1 Maiden Ln, asked about the traffic study for the downtown train station project and Mr. Cassidy said that was a big project and wouldn't affect this and was probably no longer accurate because of how long ago it was done.

Mr. Young asked about the intersections and the cut through and Mr. Rea said there are very few so it is a non-issue.

Mr. Young said there is a lot of traffic on Maiden Ln and no sidewalks, it is a very narrow street and Mr. Rea stated that there is not much traffic there, even with this project so it should be alright.

Mr. Young asked about putting a traffic light at Maiden and Mr. Rea said that all the surrounding streets will be used so there is not enough impact for a traffic light to be there. If the residents are worried about stopping or pulling out there, they could take the matter up with the local police.

Mr. Gorman, 4 Little St, said that Jackson Street is a 1-way that becomes a 2-way street but the size of it does not change and Mr. Rea said the Borough engineer should revisit the signage and upgrade where the 1-way and 2-way start and end so it is more evident.

Mr. Gorman asked about the handicap spaces and Mr. Marchetto said there are 6 total but only 5 are required.

Mr. Gorman asked how the handicapped people get to the building and Mr. Marchetto said the access is out to Little St with 3-4 spaces and concrete walks on Maiden Ln and they can also add a railing if needed.

Mr. Montfort made a motion to carry the application to the December 6, 2010 meeting without re-notice but with time extension granted and Mr. McKenna second. The board voted with all members in favor.

The third application was Mr. Rahman 131 Main Street Block 9, Lot 27

Mr. Hadderer, the board engineer, was sworn in. The notices were approved. The survey map, floor plan and site plan were marked for exhibit. They need D variance to expand a non-conforming use. There are 2 stores downstairs and 2 apartments upstairs with one being a 3 bedroom and one being a 2 bedroom. The applicant wants to put a door and fire escape to make the 3rd floor a separate apartment.

Mr. Irene asked if they had a CO for the apartment with 2 floors and the applicant said yes when he bought the property in 2003.

Mr. Irene asked the sq. footage and the applicant did not have it, but said he could get it.

Mr. Cassidy asked about the parking spaces and the applicant said there are 11 in the back that are not lined but just a gravel area.

Mr. Montfort said the applicant needs a scaled drawing of what he is planning. He needs the plan to show the lighting, parking, and the board needs measurements of everything that is being requested.

Mr. Cassidy said there is not enough here for the board to see or to vote on.

Mr. Montfort made a motion to carry it over to the November 1, 2010 meeting without re-notice and extension of time granted and Mr. McKenna second. The board voted with all members in favor.

Resolutions:

Borough of Matawan Resolution: Mr. Montfort made a motion to approve the application and Mr. McKenna second. The following roll call vote was taken: Mr. Cassidy-yes, Mr. McKenna-yes, Mr. Montfort-yes and Mr. Shea-yes.

Other Business:

Mr. Montfort made a motion to approve the September 8, 2010 meeting minutes with 2 corrections and Mr. McKenna second. The board voted with all members in favor.

Mr. Montfort made a motion to adjourn the meeting and Mr. Cassidy second. The board voted with all members in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Cannon
Board Recording Secretary