

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING OF PISCATAWAY TOWNSHIP HELD ON THURSDAY, AUGUST 13, 2020.

The Regular Meeting of the Piscataway Zoning Board was called to order at 7:30 P.M. online via Zoom, Piscataway, New Jersey, by Chairman Bleich.

Chairman Bleich stated: IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE OPEN PUBLIC MEETING ACT, ADEQUATE NOTICE OF THIS MEETING WAS PROVIDED IN THE FOLLOWING WAYS:

- *Posted on the bulletin board of the Municipal Building and made available through the Township Clerk;
- *Notice published in the Courier News;
- *Notice sent to The Star Ledger;
- *Notice made available through the Township Librarians.

ROLL CALL:

PRESENT: Shawn Cahill, Roy O'Reggio, Steven Weisman, Jeff Tillery, Warren Zimmerman and Chairman Bleich. **ABSENT:** Kalpesh Patel

Also present: James Kinneally, Esq., Henry Hinterstein, John Chadwick, PP and Laura Buckley, Recording Secretary. It was determined that a quorum was present by roll call.

4. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Kinneally states that the following applications have been postponed:

- # 5 20-ZB-36V, Aileen Soriano, has been postponed until Sept. 10, 2020-Must notice MCPB.
- # 9 20-ZB-30V, Mary Rogers-has withdrawn her application.
- # 14 19-ZB-69V, James Livingston, has been postponed until 9-24-2020-Must notice
- # 16 20-ZB-09/10V, Equity Land Group-Postponed until 9-24-2020.

- 6. 20-ZB-26V Jody Gill**
Bulk Variance
Block 2501, Lot 1; Zone: R-15
49 North Randolphville Road
Applicant proposes to install a 6' privacy fence.

VARIANCES REQUIRED:

- 21-619.1** Required – in a residential district, a fence located within the front yard setback line shall not be over 4 feet in height and/or consist of no more than 50 percent solid material
Proposed – a 6-foot solid fence located within the front yard setback line (located along a portion of the Peabody Street frontage)
- 21-501** Required – 40 foot front yard setback
Proposed – 38 foot front yard setback (N. Randolphville Rd.) (existing)
Required – 60 foot front yard setback for an accessory structure
Proposed – 10 foot front yard setback for an accessory structure (garage) (Peabody Street) (existing)
- 21-601** Required – the right-of-way shall not be encroached upon in any manner
Proposed – fence located within the right-of-way (existing)

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING OF PISCATAWAY TOWNSHIP HELD ON THURSDAY, AUGUST 13, 2020.

21-606 Required – a fence shall not be located within a sight triangle
Proposed – a fence located within the sight triangle (existing)

Action to be taken prior to September 26, 2020

Jody Gill and Gary Hoffman, the applicants, are here to testify on their own behalf. Ms. Gill states that they would like to take an old chain-link fence in the back of their property which is described as the side of their property and put up a privacy fence. The fence is old and is almost diseased; it's in disrepair. The chain link fence is next to a walkway on Peabody Street going towards North Randolphville Road is part of their property and their property is pretty large. That is were the 4 foot chain link fence is with weeds, poison oak and poison ivy.

Ms. Gill states that what they would like to do is have someone come by and take away all of the weed-like trees along the side of the property line so they can install a fence similar to her neighbors fence which is like a 6' tall wooden fence on her right side. Mr. Hoffman states this would clean up the property line and then install a 6' high privacy fence which would allow their backyard privacy which they currently don't have.

Mr. Kinneally asks about Mr. Hintersteins' report. Mr. Hinterstein states that in the report he points out that it is a unique property. It is considered a corner property with two frontages but that being said, the side is really a paper street and there is not a road in that location. Currently there is just a bike or walking path that exists that connects North Randolphville Road to Peabody Street and Central Avenue. It's sort of a busy cut-through for kids going to school so he does sympathize with the Gill's regarding the privacy issues that may occur with the walking path in this location. There is only a 25 foot right of way there and he states that it is a right-of-way, but doesn't anticipate that road ever being built. It's more just the location of that connector path for pedestrians and students to walk thru to the school. He states that the fence should be placed in the exact location where the fence exists now. It shouldn't be any closer to the right-of-way location.

Mr. Hinterstein states that he doesn't have an issue with them removing some trees as long as the trees are within their property. He hopes that they would save anything that's good quality and not in the way of the fence. Ms. Gill states the property is like a triangle, and they're going to clear all of that out inside the triangle. On the right side is the Peabody side which extends to her two neighbors, and her neighbor on North Randolphville, Jim, has put a fence up similar to the fence she wants to put up. There is a bit of the gap when you come towards Peabody on the left side. Can she fill in two plates on that side as well. She would like to close it up. Mr. Hinterstein states that it is shown that way on your survey so there isn't a problem doing that. He states that only issue would be that she needs to stay where the existing fence is now or come in more. The fence needs to be push back to get it out of the site triangle. Chairman Bleich asks if there are any more questions from the Board; none. He goes out to the public portion/closed.

MOTION was made by Mr. Cahill to approve the application; seconded by Mr. Weisman.

ALL IN FAVOR; ROLL CALL: Mr. Cahill, Roy O'Reggio, Steve Weisman, Warren Zimmerman and Chairman Bleich.

7. 20-ZB-29V

Danyel Hutchinson

Bulk Variance

Block 11402, Lot 9; Zone: R-15

25 Mitchell Avenue

Applicant proposes to install a 6' privacy fence on corner lot. Applicant also seeks relief for existing inground pool

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING OF PISCATAWAY TOWNSHIP HELD ON THURSDAY, AUGUST 13, 2020.

VARIANCES REQUIRED:

- 21-501** Required – minimum lot area 15,000 square feet
Proposed – lot area 11,559 square feet (existing)
- Required – 40 foot front yard setback
Proposed – 39.6 foot front yard setback (existing)
- 21-601** Required – no open space, municipal drainage way, right-of-way or easement contiguous to any building shall be encroached upon or reduced in any manner
Proposed – a wall located within the right-of-way (existing)
- 21-617** Required – a pool and pool equipment shall not be installed within 10 feet from any side yard or rear yard property line
Proposed – a pool installed 3 feet from the side yard property line (existing)
- 21-618** Required – a pool installed on a corner lot must comply with the required front yard setback (40 feet)
Proposed – a pool located 27 feet from the front yard property line (Cheryl Court) (existing)
- 21-619.2** Required – in a residential district, a fence located within the front yard setback line shall not be over 4 feet in height and/or consist of no more than 50 percent solid material
Proposed – a 6-foot solid fence located within the front yard setback line (located along a portion of the Cheryl Court frontage)

Action to be taken prior to October 18, 2020

Daniel Hutchinson and Lathan T. Hutchinson are both sworn in to testify. Ms. Hutchinson states that they are looking to replace their existing fence with a solid 6’ fence. Currently they have a six foot fence with lattice on the top when they purchased the home. When they purchased the home in 2007 they were not aware that some of the construction on their property was not within code compliance. They did not find out until they attempted to replace the wooden fence because after a few storms, it had been damaged. They wanted to upgrade it with vinyl fencing. They retained a couple of fence companies and one of them told her it was not in compliance so they needed to seek out a variance. In so doing, they found out that the pool and a few other things were also not in compliance.

Ms. Hutchinson states that they were not aware of things, even the lot size, not being conforming; they were only the second owners of the property. They are here to bring it into Township codes and so doing, they would also like to replace their fence. Mr. Kinneally asked if they received Mr. Hinterstein’s August 7, 2020 report; they have. Ms. Hutchinson states that the primary thing is that the only thing they can’t comply with is relocate the current fence at least 10 feet off of Cheryl Court which would literally take up their yard and the fence would be right in front of the pool; they have 8 children, six are under the age of 16, the youngest being 5 years old. Putting the fence there would not be a safe environment for her children. The cost would be hard for them, her husband is furloughed to a degree and they would not be able to take on the renovations that this type of project would require them to do.

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING OF PISCATAWAY TOWNSHIP HELD ON THURSDAY, AUGUST 13, 2020.

Mr. Hutchinson states that the whole setup with the fence and the pool in relation to the compliance code it's a bit awkward because the existing fence is beat up. If you look at it it's an eye sore. They would like to have it replaced; they are just going to replace the existing portion that is facing right on Cheryl Court; not the side facing Mitchell Avenue. Ms. Hutchinson states to Mr. Hinterstein that the primary issue that they have would be the offset off the 10 feet off of the property line on Cheryl Court. They would like a privacy fence, they already have a six foot fence. Even when they had the lattice fence, they actually had a young man that went over the fence using the lattice and that's another reason they are looking to get a privacy fence. For safety, they would prefer a privacy fence so it's not as easy to climb.

Mr. Hutchinson states that with the lattice, they had to keep replacing it and would like to put up a solid privacy fence. Mr. Hinterstein states that he can sympathize with the applicants, but unfortunately everything that was done that he researched was done illegally. The pool is in a location that typically would never be allowed in the front yard of Cheryl Court, there is no evidence that he could find for a variance for that. Mr. Hinterstein states that there was never a permit taken out for the fence; it's in the right-of-way. Just because it's there now, done illegally, it's not a hardship and doesn't have planning testimony to back it up. They can move it back a minimum of ten feet, they need to realize that the ordinance is 40 feet, so moving it back 10 feet off of the right-of-way line is a more than adequate compromise that the Township is making.

Mr. Hinterstein states that if they move the fence back 10 feet, they still have 17 feet between the fence and the pool. The fence isn't right on top of the pool and the pavers will have 17 feet. Minimal compromises to try to make this to be in some what a little bit more in compliance with the ordinance regarding the fence and the pool. Ms. Hutchinson states that they have been speaking to their neighbors, one of which has been since prior to Cheryl Court being actually built. She (neighbor) stated that the original owners did the work prior to it being paved. This could be why there was not a variance needed because it wasn't an actually road. Mr. Hinterstein states that even if it didn't exist, the right-of-way would still have been there. Even if it was a paper street, a variance should have been required.

Ms. Hutchinson states that she is asking the Board to consider that they are only the second owner's of the property and in fact, the previous owners built the home prior to Cheryl Court ever existing. She doesn't want to be penalized, they have invested so much of their time with their family in this home and she is just asking for the Board to consider what they are asking for. Mr. Hutchinson asks if the variance is denied, what do they do with the fence that is already there. Mr. Chadwick states that the fence around the pool doesn't conform with what the construction code requires. There has to be a four foot high fence that is not climable. Ms. Hutchinson doesn't want to move the fence. He believes that Mr. Hinterstein's suggestions make a lot of sense; they have to replace the fence anyway so when they do that, they can move it in the 10 feet that is being requested.

Chairman Bleich asks the Board if they have any further questions; none. Public portion is open/closed. Mr. Cahill states that he does sympathize with them, but if they follow the letter of the law they would have to move the fence back forty feet. He believes 10 feet is a good compromise. Ms. Hutchinson states that when they replace the fence, they will move it 10 feet from the property line. Mr. Hinterstein states that the retaining wall is also in the right-of-way, it can stay there if they want it there but they have to know that if the Town has to come in and replace sidewalks or any other work, it's up to them to repair or replace the wall. It is their responsibility because it is not supposed to be there; the Hutchinson's agree.

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING OF PISCATAWAY TOWNSHIP HELD ON THURSDAY, AUGUST 13, 2020.

MOTION was made by Mr. Cahill to approve the application. The applicants are to move the fence back 10 feet from the property line; seconded by Mr. Weisman. **ALL IN FAVOR; ROLL CALL:** Mr. Cahill, Roy O'Reggio, Steve Weisman, Warren Zimmerman and Chairman Bleich.

- 8. 20-ZB-28V Adam Penfield
Bulk Variance
Block 12701, Lot 1.01; Zone: R-15
56 Ross Hall Boulevard North
Applicant proposes to install an 8 foot deer fence.**

VARIANCES REQUIRED:

- 21-501** Required – 10 foot side yard setback
Proposed – 9.85 foot side yard setback (existing)
- 21-619.1** Required – maximum height of a fence in a residential zone, 6 feet
Proposed – a fence 8 feet in height

Action to be taken prior to October 16, 2020

Adam Penfield, the applicant, is sworn in to testify on his own behalf. Mr. Penfield states that he would like to put in an 8 foot deer fence around his property. It is see through, he does want to be able to see nature in his backyard but would like to keep the deer out. Mr. Hinterstein asks Mr. Penfield what type of fence exactly. Mr. Penfield states that it is a black plastic mesh fence and will be no larger than 8 feet in height.

Mr. Penfield states that he would like to have a gate to the back if he needs to get back there for any reason and a large swing gate on the left side of his home. Mr. Hinterstein states that there is no reason for him to be able to get to the back property that is not his. He will put up a gate on the one side and another one on the other side of the home. Public portion open/closed.

MOTION was made by Mr. Cahill to approve the application; seconded by Mr. Weisman. **ALL IN FAVOR; ROLL CALL:** Mr. Cahill, Roy O'Reggio, Steve Weisman, Jeff Tillery, Warren Zimmerman and Chairman Bleich.

- 10. 20-ZB-16V Madhusudhan Soni & Archana Mohta
Bulk Variance
Block 1217, Lot 31.01; Zone: R-10
151 Sherman Avenue
Applicant proposes to construct a new single family dwelling.**

VARIANCES REQUIRED:

- 21-501** Required – minimum lot area 10,000 square feet
Proposed – lot area 5,000 square feet (existing)
- Required – 100 foot lot width
Proposed – 50 foot lot width (existing)
- Required – 35 foot front yard setback
Proposed – 26 foot front yard setback (porch)

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING OF PISCATAWAY TOWNSHIP HELD ON THURSDAY, AUGUST 13, 2020.

Proposed – 27.5 foot front yard setback (steps)

Required – 25 foot rear yard setback

Proposed – 17.67 foot rear yard setback (deck)

Required – maximum building coverage 20 percent

Proposed – 22.7 percent building coverage

21-613

Required – 100 foot lot frontage

Proposed – 50 foot lot frontage (existing)

Action to be taken prior to September 2, 2020

Madhusudhan Soni and Archana Mohta, the applicants, are sworn in to testify on their own behalf. Mr. Soni states that they purchased the property to rehab the existing one and a half story cape cod style structure. Including a one car detached garage. It was their intention to add a second floor, bedrooms and an additional bathroom. But, upon inspections, they found significant termite damage on the property. The water damaged the foundation and building walls and floors so the existing porch was also pretty damaged. There was no roof over it and there was water everywhere; it can't be salvageable.

With their architect, who performed the investigation and inspection, it was deemed that the structure was unsalvageable and therefore it was best to demolish it and construct a new two story single family with an attached garage and a covered porch. At the time they purchased the property, they were unaware that it was an existing non-conforming lot. It is undersized by 5,000 square feet where minimum is 10,000 square feet in the zone. Even if they just made an addition, they would have to go for a variance. The property has been abandoned and in disrepair for many years. The want to demolish the structure and make it new; he believes would be a welcome addition to the neighborhood.

Chairman Bleich asks if there are any questions from the Board. Mr. Cahill asks Mr. Hinterstein if he has any issues with the application. Mr. Hinterstein states that this is a unique situation; it is a 50 foot lot so it's half of what's allowed in the zone. Trying to get a two story home, although it's a minimum coverage variance, the issue is it's just a tight lot. He asks the applicant if he approached any of the adjacent lots to see if there is any extra land from the adjacent lots to be purchased. Mr. Soni states that the very next house just did an addition, that is what they thought they were going to do. Mr. Kinneally asks if he knows how large that lot is; he states 50 by 100. Mr. Hinterstein states that he believes the other lot is conforming; 100 by 100. But he believes that the two, if you're facing the house, to the left, are ranches and the one house to the right is a 1 ½ story modified cape that is dormered out.

Mr. Hinterstein states that he doesn't have a huge issue with the two-story, the biggest issue is that he has a two-story on a 50 foot lot with variances on one side. Is there anyway to look at the architecture of the home and see if it's possible to do a different roof line on the home where you can bring the roof line down, maybe more of a mansard roof or a sort-of in line with a cape so it doesn't look like a two-story. He thinks a 28 to 28.5 foot height request on there for the structure; somewhere a little bit closer to the cape that is there on the one side and the ranches are a lot lower on the other side so they need to compromise so the applicant's house doesn't stick out.

Mr. Soni states that his architect is on the meeting as well and he did make changes and resubmitted based on the changes that were proposed by the Township. Steven Druga, architect, is sworn in to

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING OF PISCATAWAY TOWNSHIP HELD ON THURSDAY, AUGUST 13, 2020.

testify; 250 Stelton Road, Piscataway, NJ. Mr. Druga states that they had lowered the height of the house to 28 feet; by creating a hip roof up front, it would give it a lower view of the house. Typically a ranch would be like 16 to 18 foot to the peak, this house would be only about 10 feet taller and is set back 30 feet instead of the 26 feet that was existing.

Mr. Hinterstein asks Mr. Druga that if he can modify this to make it lower by putting a hip roof on the house. Mr. Druga states that the height would be the same, but since it's sloping down from the street it gives it an appearance of being lower; there is no vertical wall. The roof line would start above the windows and moving away from the street which gives it a lower view. Mr. Hinterstein asks if they can lower the pitch to a 12/6; Mr. Druga states yes, a six on twelve. Mr. Hinterstein states that anything they do there to try to lower that height and give the appearance of lower would be good.

Mr. Druga states that that is why they located the house further from the left property line away from the ranch and towards the other 1 ½ -story on the right hand side. This also gives more space between the ranch and this proposed residence. Mr. Kinneally states that they mentioned a revised plan; are they still seeking a variance for the front yard and rear yard setback. They are only asking for the front yard setback variance which is 30 feet; 35 feet is required. Mr. Druga states that is from the property line to the front of the porch. Mr. Kinneally asks what is the setback for the steps. Mr. Druga states that the step setback is 27 feet; he doesn't really consider that as part of the setback requirement, just the porch itself.

Mr. Hinterstein states that the plan is reflecting what the variances are; that is what the zoning officer picked up. The plan hasn't been modified since it was submitted. The proposal improves a couple of conditions; the previous front yard was 26 feet, it's now going to be 30 feet. Previously the side yard setback on the home was 8 feet on one side and it's now going to be 10 feet. He believes that they tried to improve the existing variances that existed on the property as far as the setbacks go. The only new variance is the coverage variance.

Mr. Kinneally states that on the agenda it shows a rear yard variance. Mr. Hinterstein states that is for the deck which is minimal and it is being shown as 12 foot in depth and the rear property line would be 17.5 feet; he doesn't have a big issue with that. That deck is 2 to 3 feet off of the property line; Mr. Druga agrees. Mr. Chadwick states that the plan shows overhead wire connection, can they put it underground. Mr. Druga states that they can put in underground. Mr. Chadwick believes that with a new house he believes you have to. Mr. Cahill asks if it will or it can? Mr. Druga states that if it's required they can do that.

Chairman Bleich asks if there are any other questions from the Board. Mr. Hinterstein states that he recommends that they just, at a minimum, modify the roof to change the pitch to 6 on 12 would help lower it a little bit to make the appearance from the street that the height of the structure is a little bit less than what is shown now. It would blend in a little better with the adjacent homes that exist now. The applicant agrees with Mr. Hinterstein. Chairman Bleich asks if there are any other questions from the Board. None. Public portion open/closed.

MOTION was made by Mr. Cahill to approve the application; seconded by Mr. Weisman.

ALL IN FAVOR; ROLL CALL: Mr. Cahill, Roy O'Reggio, Steve Weisman, Jeff Tillery, Warren Zimmerman and Chairman Bleich.

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING OF PISCATAWAY TOWNSHIP HELD ON THURSDAY, AUGUST 13, 2020.

- 11. 20-ZB-27V Eugene Bozzo
Bulk Variance
Block 2303, Lot 6.01; Zone: R-7.5
300 Tabb Avenue**

Applicant proposes to construct a new front porch with steps.

VARIANCES REQUIRED:

- 21-502** Required – minimum lot area 15,000 square feet
Proposed – lot area 12,500 square feet (existing)
- Required – 40 foot front yard setback
Proposed – 24.35 foot front yard setback (existing)
Proposed – 18.6 foot front yard setback (steps)

Action to be taken prior to October 22, 2020

Eugene Bozzo, the applicant, is sworn in to testify on his own behalf. Mr. Bozzo states that he would just like to replace the existing front steps. They were originally cinder block but would like to put up brick. He will be replacing the porch as well and will not have a rood. He will comply with Mr. Hinterstein’s report. Public portion open/closed.

MOTION was made by Mr. Cahill to approve the application; seconded by Mr. Weisman.
ALL IN FAVOR; ROLL CALL: Mr. Cahill, Roy O’Reggio, Steve Weisman, Jeff Tillery, Warren Zimmerman and Chairman Bleich.

- 12. 20-ZB-31V Dan & Sarah Jackson
Bulk Variance
Block 7702, Lot 6; Zone: R-20
3 Suttie Avenue**

Applicant proposes to install an 8 foot by 12 foot shed.

VARIANCES REQUIRED:

- 21-502** Required – minimum lot area 20,000 square feet
Proposed – lot area 13,198.68 square feet (existing)
- Required – 100 foot lot width
Proposed – 87.87 foot lot width (existing)
- Required – 150 foot lot depth
Proposed – 127.44 foot lot depth (existing)
- Required – 40 foot front yard setback
Proposed – 25.1 foot front yard setback (existing)
- 21-613** Required – 100 foot lot frontage
Proposed – 87.87 foot lot frontage (existing)
- 21-621** Required – no shed shall be higher than 9 feet above ground level
Proposed – a shed 11 feet in height

Action to be taken prior to October 22, 2020

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING OF PISCATAWAY TOWNSHIP HELD ON THURSDAY, AUGUST 13, 2020.

Dan and Sarah Jackson, the applicants, are both sworn in to testify. Ms. Jackson states that they would like to install an 8 foot by 12 foot shed in their backyard that is 11 feet high. They would like it a little bit higher so they can use it as storage overhead. Mr. Hinterstein states that he would like it to be at least 8 feet off of the property line instead of 3 feet since it is higher than what is allowed; they agree. It is states that it has to be used for storage only. Public portion open/closed.

MOTION was made by Mr. Cahill to approve the application; seconded by Mr. Weisman.

ALL IN FAVOR; ROLL CALL: Mr. Cahill, Roy O'Reggio, Steve Weisman, Jeff Tillery, Warren Zimmerman and Chairman Bleich.

13. 20-ZB-35V

Anton Frazier

Bulk Variance

Block 7108, Lot 29.01; Zone: R-10

414 Hillside Avenue

Applicant proposes to install a 6 foot privacy fence on a corner lot.

VARIANCES REQUIRED:

21-501

Required – minimum lot area 10,000 square feet

Proposed – lot area 9,200 square feet (existing)

Required – 35 foot front yard setback

Proposed – 29.4 foot front yard setback (Hillside Avenue) (existing)

Required – 100 foot lot depth

Proposed – 92 foot lot depth (existing)

Required – 25 foot rear yard setback

Proposed – 22 foot rear yard setback (deck) (existing)

21-601

Required – no open space, municipal drainage way, right-of-way or easement contiguous to any building shall be encroached upon or reduced in any manner

Proposed – landscape timbers located within the right-of-way (existing)

21-619.3

Required – in a residential district, a fence located within the front yard setback line shall not be over 4 feet in height and/or consist of no more than 50 percent solid material

Proposed – a 6-foot solid fence located within the front yard setback line (2 feet from the Kent Street frontage)

Action to be taken prior to November 11, 2020

Anton Frazier, the applicant, is sworn in to testify on his own behalf. Mr. Frazier states that he would like to put up a 6 foot privacy fence on a corner lot. It would be located approximately 2 feet from the property line on Kent Street. Mr. Hinterstein states that it would be too close and recommends that it be moved 10 feet back from the property line as per his report. The allowable setback is 35 feet and feels that a 10 foot compromise is acceptable. Mr. Frazier asks if that is 10 from the curb. It is ten feet from the property line which would be 20 feet from the curb. Mr. Frazier agrees to the 10 feet. Public portion open/closed.

MOTION was made by Mr. Cahill to approve the application; seconded by Mr. Weisman.

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING OF PISCATAWAY TOWNSHIP HELD ON THURSDAY, AUGUST 13, 2020.

ALL IN FAVOR; ROLL CALL: Mr. Cahill, Roy O'Reggio, Steve Weisman, Jeff Tillery, Warren Zimmerman and Chairman Bleich.

- 15. 20-ZB-24/25V Alexander L. Bell**
Preliminary & Final Site Plan, Bulk Variance
Block 6101, Lot 2.02; Zone: BP-1
326 Fitz-Randolphville Road
Applicant seeks to construct a 4,500 square foot building.

VARIANCES REQUESTED:

- 21-501** Required – use permitted in a business professional zone
Proposed – use not permitted in zone (single-family residence with building and storage yard for landscaping/snowplowing equipment) *
- Required – minimum lot area 3 acres
Proposed – lot area 1 acre (existing)
- Required – minimum lot width 200 feet
Proposed – 157.53 foot lot width (existing)
- Required – minimum lot depth 300 feet
Proposed – 276 foot lot depth (existing)
- Required – 15 foot side yard setback for an accessory structure
Proposed – 9 foot side yard setback for an accessory structure (existing)
- Required – minimum floor area 10,000 square feet
Proposed – floor area 5,527.74 square feet (reduction of an existing condition)
- 21-613** Required – minimum lot frontage 200 feet
Proposed – 175 foot lot frontage (existing)
- 21-1101.3** Required – all parking spaces, passageways and driveways shall be paved with a hard surface
Proposed – stone parking area and storage area for landscaping/snowplowing equipment and material

*A use variance is required.

Action to be taken prior to October 22, 2020
Attorney: Kevin Morse

Kevin Morse, Attorney, is here to represent the applicant. Court Stenographer present; transcripts are on file in the Community Development Office.

MOTION was made by Mr. Cahill to approve the application; seconded by Mr. O'Reggio.

ALL IN FAVOR; ROLL CALL: Mr. Cahill, Roy O'Reggio, Steve Weisman, Jeff Tillery, Warren Zimmerman and Chairman Bleich.

- 17. ADOPTION OF RESOLUTIONS FROM THE REGULAR MEETING OF JULY 9, 2020:**

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING OF PISCATAWAY TOWNSHIP HELD ON THURSDAY, AUGUST 13, 2020.

- (a) **20-ZB-08V; Jaimini Patel; application was Approved.**
- (b) **20-ZB-15V; James D. Rodgers; application was Approved.**
- (c) **20-ZB-01V; Ramesh Harikrishnan; application was Approved.**
- (d) **20-ZB-18V; Evelyn Akushie-Onyeani; application was Approved.**
- (e) **20-ZB-14V; The Titan Group, LLC; application was Approved.**
- (f) **20-ZB-19V; New York SMSA L.P. d/b/a Verizon Wireless; application was App.**

ALL IN FAVOR: Mr. Cahill, Mr. Patel, O'Reggio, Jeff Tillery, Steven Weisman, Mr. Zimmerman and Chairman Bleich.

18. ADOPTION OF MINUTES FROM THE REGULAR MEETING OF JULY 9, 2020.

MOTION was made by Mr. Cahill to adopt the minutes; second by Mr. Weisman.

ALL IN FAVOR; ROLL CALL: Mr. Cahill, Roy O'Reggio, Mr. Tillery, Steve Weisman, Kalpesh Patel and Chairman Bleich.

19. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION was made by Mr. Weisman to Adjourn the meeting; second by Mr. Zimmerman.

ALL IN FAVOR: Mr. Cahill, Roy O'Reggio, Jeff Tillery, Steve Weisman, Mr. Zimmerman and Chairman Bleich.

NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING IS SEPTEMBER 10, 2020 AT 7:30 P.M.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:19 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,
Laura A. Buckley
Zoning Board Recording Secretary for Shawn Cahill, Secretary

I certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the Minutes from the Regular Meeting of August 13, 2020 same having been fully adopted by the Zoning Board of Adjustment of Piscataway on September 10, 2020.