

PLANNING BOARD
CITY OF SOUTH AMBOY

RESOLUTION PB- 8 -15
RESOLUTION GRANTING SITE PLAN, USE, DENSITY, STORY, SETBACK AND
COVERAGE VARIANCES RELATED TO CONSTRUCTION LOCATED ON BLOCK 68,
LOT 1, LANDS OF THE CITY OF SOUTH AMBOY

WHEREAS, application has been made by Southeast Sayreville Development Corporation (“Applicant”) to the Planning Board of the City of South Amboy (“Board”) for Site Plan, use, story, set back, density, and impervious and building coverage variance approval related to the construction of a three-story residential structure on property located at 355 Main Street, South Amboy, (Block 68, Lot 1) (the “Property”); and

WHEREAS, Applicant is the contract purchaser of the Property; and

WHEREAS, the Property is located in the RA Zone; and

WHEREAS, Applicant seeks to construct a three-story multi-family apartment building with 8 two-bedroom units, which will include certain use, density and parking and bulk variances (the “Application”), which Application was amended to include 4 one-bedroom and 4 two-bedroom units; and

WHEREAS, the Application seeks a use variance to permit the construction of a multifamily building in the RA zone where same is prohibited; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant seeks a variance for density, where 7 units per acre are permitted and 32 units per acre is proposed; and

WHEREAS, the Application requires a variance for impervious coverage where 60 percent is the maximum and 67.75 percent is proposed; and

WHEREAS, the Application requires a variance for building coverage where 25 percent is the maximum, and 45 percent is proposed; and

WHEREAS, the Application seeks a front yard setback variance from Thompson Street, where 25 feet is required and 23 feet is proposed; and

WHEREAS, the Application seeks a variance for stories, where 2 ½ is permitted, and three stories is proposed; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant was represented by Ron Shimanowitz, Esq.; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board held public hearings on April 22, 2015 and May 27, 2015 and has carefully considered the Application as well as the testimony and exhibits presented by the Applicant; and

WHEREAS, during the hearing the Applicant amended and revised the Application to be for 8 residential units, with 4 two-bedroom units and 4 one-bedroom units; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant presented the testimony of Noel Young, P.E., John McDonough, P.P. and Ralph Mocchi; and

WHEREAS, the Board has made the following findings of fact:

1. Applicant seeks use, density, story, setback, impervious coverage and building coverage variances to permit the construction of a three-story multi-family building with 8 apartments.
2. During the hearings, the Applicant's attorney acknowledged receipt of the review letter of the Board's Planner, Angelo J. Valetutto, dated April 20, 2015.
3. During the hearings the Applicant presented the testimony of Noel Young, a professional engineer, who was accepted as an expert in engineering by the Board.
4. Mr. Young testified as to the site plan submitted as part of the Application.
5. Mr. Young testified that the Application was for parking on the ground floor, with two stories of residential units above parking, with four apartments on each floor.

6. Mr. Young testified that the Application would provide 19 parking spaces, whereas only 16 were required.
7. Mr. Young testified that the total lot coverage would be less than the previous use, thereby reducing stormwater runoff.
8. Mr. Young testified that the Applicant would comply with all of the comments contained in the April 20, 2015 report by Angelo Valetutto, P.E., P.P.
9. The Applicant presented the testimony of John McDonough, P.P. a licensed Professional Planner.
10. Mr. McDonough testified about the existing conditions in the neighborhood and offered his opinion as to how the Application was compatible with the existing conditions.
11. Mr. McDonough testified that the Property is within a half mile of the train station.
12. Mr. McDonough testified about other non-residential uses in the area, along with several multi-family uses.
13. Mr. McDonough testified that there were existing approvals in place for first-floor commercial and three residential units above, but market conditions did not warrant or support that construction.
14. Mr. McDonough testified that the existing building is located near the train station and within walking distance of the downtown, and in his opinion the proximity of the train station makes the property more suited to higher-density uses such as proposed by the Application.
15. Mr. McDonough testified that a special reason advanced by the Application is that it promotes the general welfare as it is compatible with the existing development of commercial and multi-family uses in the area, and would be less traffic-intensive than the existing commercial-use approval.
16. Ms. McDonough testified that an additional special reason advanced by the Application was redevelopment of previously developed land.
17. Mr. McDonough testified that as to the negative criteria, in his opinion there were no safety concerns with the proposed development. Secondly, residential is a benign use that does not create pollution. Finally, there will be ample landscaping, and the character of the area will not be substantially altered.