

August 7, 2020

Chairman Michael Giancarlo
and Members of the Planning Board
Borough of Hillsdale
380 Hillsdale Ave.
Hillsdale, NJ 07642

Regarding: **Block 1510, Lot 30 Borough of Hillsdale**
281 Raymond Street: Variance Application PZ 04-20
John Kellenberger: Owner & Applicant

Dear Chairman Giancarlo and Members of the Board:

We are in receipt of a variance application, a survey, a plot plan, an architectural plan, a landscape plan and photographs that were submitted to the Borough on or around August 7, 2020. The survey is prepared by Blue Marsh Associates, Inc. and dated June 29, 2020. The architectural plans are prepared by Joseph J. Bruno, AIA and consist of three sheets dated January 14, 2020 and revised to May 30, 2020. The Plot Plan is prepared by Dynamic Engineering and dated May 11, 2020. Finally, the landscape plan is prepared by William L. Koenig, ASLA, dated June 25, 2020 and revised to July 2, 2020.

This variance application involves both “c” (bulk) and “d” (use) variances for construction of various additions on the subject property.

The Mayor and Council representative should recuse themselves from the application due to the necessary “d” variance.

General Site Description

Lot 30 consists of 10,744 SF (0.25 acre) and is located on the west side of Raymond Street, south of the Raymond Court intersection, in the R-3 Residential Zone District (minimum lot size 10,000 SF). The property is improved with a two-story frame dwelling. An asphalt driveway provides access from Raymond Street to the dwelling.

Application

The applicant proposes to install an inground swimming pool and to construct various additions to the dwelling. It appears that the proposed swimming pool conforms to ordinance requirements and does not require any variances.

The applicant is proposing a two-story addition containing approximately 450 SF per level on the south side of the dwelling. The ground story consists of a garage addition and the first level contains two bathrooms, a walk-in closet, and a bedroom addition.

The applicant also is proposing a new bathroom and elevator on the ground level of the house containing approximately 160 SF. On the first level, the addition appears to include additional kitchen and dining space, as well as the elevator and consists of approximately 210 SF.

The applicant is also proposing a swimming pool and play area in the back yard, as well a new front portico and a new concrete paver driveway.

The front portico will encroach into the required front yard setback area, and the proposed improvements exceed the maximum permitted Floor Area Ratio (F.A.R.)

Completeness Review

The application was reviewed against the Checklist for Variance Applications. The application is missing the denial letter from the Zoning Official.

The applicant should provide the necessary plans for the Board with the below noted corrections/amendments. The application is complete and can be scheduled for a public hearing.

Zoning Review

The Plot Plan includes a bulk table. It appears that the following variances are required:

Proposed Variances

1. **Front Yard Setback:** Portico 27.2 ft. proposed vs. 30 ft. minimum required, a difference of 2.8 ft.
2. **Floor Area Ratio:** 33% proposed vs. 30% maximum permitted, a difference of 3%.
3. **Patio to Lot line:** Pool Apron 7 ft. scaled versus 10 ft. minimum required.
4. **Patio Area vs. Building Footprint for side/rear setbacks:** Patio Area 74% versus 20% permitted to infringe into rear/side yard setback areas.

General Comments

1. The application is for variances to construct additions to an existing dwelling and for site improvements.
2. The bulk table on the Plot Plan should be revised to include the Rear Yard Setback from the house as well as the required pool setback.
3. The computations for Impervious Coverage must be corrected for “Gravel Area under Deck.” A wood deck over a gravel surface is still considered 50% impervious.
4. The Plot Plan Zoning Schedule should include a check that the sum of patios, unroofed decks and porches does not exceed 20% of the gross principal dwelling area footprint per Section 310-55H(5).
5. We suggest that pavers be used between the pool apron and the rear paver walk in lieu of “Proposed Reinforced Gravel” and any resulting bulk variance be considered by the Board as they provide a smoother, more permanent walking surface.
6. Two trees are scheduled for removal (one missing on Plot Plan), but are being compensated via a comprehensive planting plan included with the application.
7. Seepage tanks are required to compensate for the 1,200 Sf of new impervious coverage. Two “Proposed Dry Wells” are shown on the Plot Plan, but no details are provided. Their location appear to conflict with the landscape plans. Seepage pits must be located at least 10 ft. from property lines, therefore, any underground tanks associated with the dry wells must be relocated.
8. The limits of the proposed 6 ft. high shadow board fence are not shown clearly.
9. The old depressed curb in the street must be replaced. All site construction details must be provided on the Plot Plan for review and approval.
10. The driveway has a slope of +9% from the garage floor to the depressed curb in the street. This steepness may cause some difficulty in the use of automobile doors.
11. A Soil Movement Permit must be obtained for the approved site improvements.

We trust these comments will assist the Board members in their review of the application.

Very truly yours,

C. P. STATILE, P.A.

Christopher P. Statile, P.E.
Planning Board Engineer

CPS/mr

cc: Joe Bruno Architect

John Kellenberger, Applicant

Duncan Prime, Esq., Attorney for Applicant

1120.052