

ADEQUATE NOTICE OF THIS MEETING HAS BEEN
PROVIDED AS IS REQUIRED BY CHAPTER 231, PUBLIC
LAW 1975 AND BY RESOLUTION 2016-5, WITH THE
REQUEST OF THE HOME NEWS AND TRIBUNE AND THE
SENTINEL NEWSPAPERS TO PUBLISH SAME, AND THIS
ANNOUNCEMENT MUST BE ENTERED INTO THE MINUTES
OF THIS MEETING.

A meeting of the Zoning Board of Adjustment was held on May 10, 2016, commencing at 7:30 PM at the South River Middle School Cafetorium, 3 Montgomery Street, South River, NJ.

Present were: Mr. Bodak, Mr. Clancy, Mr. Clifton, Mr. DeMonico, Ms. Farren, Mr. Giannakopoulos, Mr. O'Grady, Mr. Sapata, Mr. Scala
Also present were Mr. Kinneally Attorney, Mr. Koch CME Engineer and Mr. Bletcher, Planner.
Absent: None

PUBLIC HEARING(S)

ZB2016-01 Absolute Properties Mgt. LLC. Block 271, Lots 1 & 2

Division, Anderson, Charles & Whitehead

Requesting Use Variance for multifamily 33 unit apartment complex in R-75 Zone, Bulk Variances for front yard setback, maximum yard coverage, maximum building height in stories, maximum building height in feet and maximum gross density

- Mr. Pressler, applicant's attorney asked Mr. Lauri for a brief history of his professional career.
- Mr. Ron Sadowski, applicant's engineer reviewed the proposed development's parking, landscaping, utilities, storm water management system and refuse enclosure
- Mr. Ludwig, applicants architect reviewed the development's floor plans, design of buildings, meters
- Mr. Bodak questioned the term "high end apartments"; Mr. Lauri defined as 2 bedroom apartments that look very nice and residents consider their home, can raise a family - not just renting for a year and move out. Rent for area \$1500 month and he is confident that he will be able to rent out all 33 apartment units
- Mr. Taylor completed the traffic study for the area. His study concluded that there is no detrimental impact to the area. The roads can handle the traffic of the apartments; sufficient parking and 4 handicapped spaces.
- Mr. Clifton questioned a traffic light – Mr. Taylor stated that the volume does not warrant a traffic signal.

- Mr. Chadwick, applicant's planner reviewed aerial views of the area, reinforced that residential fits the site, meets standards of the site with a benefit of widening the road and equal to the families in the neighborhood. This is not a flood zone.
- Mr. Bodak questioned 33 units; Mr. Chadwick stated it fits the site and 2 bedroom units are desired
- Mr. Bletcher, Borough Planner, reviewed his report. Planner recommended a 2 ½ story building height. Also requested the floor plans to include the utility area.
- Questions on the water table, dumpster site and water management were all answered by the respective professionals.
- Mr. Bodak questioned the reports from previous applicants interested in the property; Mr. Koch will review.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

- D. Mason, 97 Division St. – questioned the driveways coming out of the development; concerns of headlights shining right into her house. Asked when project would start and if residents will be notified. Mr. Lauri commented that he hopes to start soon after if approved and he will personally notify residents, he will be on the job site.
- E. Butewicz, 24 Charles St. – Three areas of concern: Height of structure, Lack of Parking and Luxury Rentals. Her mother lives at 20 Anderson Street and she too has concerns. Stated that previously 15 single family residents were denied.
- C. Sullivan, 44 Division St. – Stated that parking is an issue, cars speed up and down the road, suggested it be a 55 and older residential complex.
- I. Costa, 45 Division St. – She feels it is a good idea
- M. Bove, 41 Rubin St. – Considering the town lost a lot of houses in Storm Sandy, he feels it is a good thing; will help with borough's taxes
- F. Walmar, 87 Division St. – Stated that the sewer's in the area back up, Division Street still won't be wide enough, 33 units will be an overload on electricity
- V. Vancoff, 16 Anderson St. – Stated that there are large vehicles that park on the street, questioned the electricity changes for a 3 story building and how far the main is from the building – flooding is an issue in the area.
- S. Goncalves, 79 Division Street – Doesn't object, it would be an improvement to South River and bring income into the town.
- M. Santos, East Brunswick – He lived in South River and will be coming back to town, good for town.
- Sonia, 15 Northside Ave. – Good for the area, area is in need of improvement
- S. Santos, 37 Division St. – Parking concerns
- Claudia, 93A Whitehead Ave. – Has lived in South River for 30 years, parking has always been an issue. Project would be a benefit town. The issues that are being brought up are issued that presently exist.
- E. Costa, 93 Whitehead Ave. – In favor of the development, no issues with parking, it will be a beautiful community.
- Mr. Riecio, 29 Water St. – It will be good and benefit everybody

- C. Beck, 5 Theresa Pl. – Questioned parking, 66 cars/33 units – 73 parking spots. Questioned snow removal. Two bedroom apartments could bring 1 to 2 children which based on her calculations could be 30-60 additional children to the school system
- J. Butewicz, 24 Charles St. – Thanked Mario for maintaining the property. Concerns that there will be more than 2 cars per unit, there will be water problems and the proposal is not consistent with the Master Plan – multifamily development is discouraged. He feels this is in direct opposition to the Master Plan. Requesting relief is a request to destroy the neighborhood. The street is a ‘snow emergency street’, where are the cars going to park. His mother, a resident of 67 years was unable to make the meeting but she is asking that the Zoning Board consider the safety and beauty of South River.
- M. Beck. 5 Theresa Place – Questioned the parking requirement based on his calculations, 33 apartments’ means 33 students in the system – Board of Ed just laid off teachers. Stated the complex is too dense for the area, suggested cutting back the apartment size.
- J. Alai, 198 Main St. – Water flow may be an expense, suggested that the water flow be looked at carefully
- G. Ferreira, 93 Whitehead Ave. – Looks at this as one of the greatest projects in South River, apartments provide everything needed and parking is being provided for – should not be a concern for private parking.
- E. Klimczak, 17 Charles St. – Stated Division Street is overloaded, questioned snow removal
- N. Ferreira, 124 Whitehead Ave. – Stated it looks the whole project is organized, better than an empty lot and feels it is a good business decision.
- J. Baginski, 2 Anderson St. – Residents who are for the project are not residents of Division, Charles, Anderson or Whitehead.

COUNCIL COMMENTS

Mr. Clancy

- Concerns on snow parking and permit parking
- Questioned 2 ½ stories vs. 3 ½ stories
- Possible be age restrictive

Mr. Sapata

- Impact on traffic. Applicant noted that over 1 ton is not allowed.

Mr. Clifton

- Negative Aspects were addressed such as parking, number in household/school children, residential area is promoted in Master Plan. Mr. Pressler commented that most of the issues raised are Police/Code Enforcement issues

Mr. Bodak

- 33 Units as designed, has some building and occupancy load concerns

Mr. Clancy made a motion to delay the vote until May 31, 2016 for additional reports to be submitted as discussed tonight; Mr. Clifton seconded the motion.

Mr. DeMonico stated that a YES vote would be to delay the vote to the May 31, 2016 meeting.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

YES: Mr. Clancy, Mr. Giannakopoulos, Mr. O'Grady, Mr. Scala, Mr. DeMonico

NO: Mr. Bodak, Mr. Clifton,

Vote carried over to May 31, 2016 Zoning Board Meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn by Mr. Clancy, seconded by Mr. Scala. All present in favor.

Adjourned at 10:15 PM

Respectfully submitted
Sheryl L. Nevin
Zoning Board Secretary

Approved at Zoning Board Meeting
held on May 31, 2016.