James Gustafson opened the meeting at 7:00 pm.

Please stand for the PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.

This meeting was held in accordance with the Open Public Meeting Act and as such, proper notice of this meeting was published in The Observer and The Courier News and providing same to the Borough Clerk.

It is the policy of the South Plainfield Zoning Board of Adjustments, not to hear any new applications after 10:00 pm and no new witnesses after 10:30 pm.

### ROLL CALL:

Present:

Absent:

James Gustafson, Vice Chairman Ken Bonanno Maria Campagna Darlene Cullen, 1st Alternate Cindy Eichler Frank Lemos April Wasnick, 2<sup>nd</sup> Alternate Gino Leonardis, Chairman Robert Hughes

Also attending: Larry Lavender, Esq.; Nicholas Dickerson, PP, AICP; Bob Bucco, PE, CME, CPWM

#### MINUTES: October 3, 2017 meeting.

Mrs. Eichler made motion, seconded by Mr. Lemos to accept the above listed Meeting Minutes. Those in favor: Mr. Bonanno, Mrs. Campagna; Mrs. Cullen; Mrs. Eichler; Mr. Lemos; Mrs. Wasnick; and Vice Chairman Gustafson. Those oppose: None.

#### RESOLUTION:

#### A. Case #31-17 -- Dave Butrico (Mike Buteas – Representative/Contractor) Block 407: Lot 41.01: R-10 Zone 153 Somerset Street

Mrs. Eichler made motion, seconded by Mrs. Cullen to accept the above listed Resolution. Those in favor: Mr. Bonanno; Mrs. Campagna; Mrs. Cullen; Mrs. Eichler; Mr. Lemos; Mrs. Wasnick and Vice Chairman Gustafson. Those oppose: None

#### B. Case #32-17 -- Jordon & Veronica Cohen Block 228: Lot 23: R-7.5 Zone 142 Gubernat Drive

Mrs. Campagna made motion, seconded by Mr. Lemos to accept the above listed Resolution. Those in favor: Mr. Bonanno; Mrs. Campagna; Mrs. Cullen; Mrs. Eichler; Mr. Lemos; Mrs. Wasnick and Vice Chairman Gustafson. Those oppose: None

### C. Case #04-16 -- Robert Cusick Block 311: Lot 9: R-10 Zone 1055 New Market Avenue

Mrs. Eichler made motion, seconded by Mrs. Cullen to accept the above listed Resolution. Those in favor: Mr. Bonanno; Mrs. Campagna; Mrs. Cullen; Mrs. Eichler; Mr. Lemos; Mrs. Wasnick and Vice Chairman Gustafson. Those oppose: None

**HEARING(S):** (3 residential and 2 commercial applications)

#### A. Case #33-17 -- Lisa & Joseph Dato Block 127: Lot 4: R-7.5 Zone 182 South Madison Drive

The applicant is requesting to construct an addition and a garage to a pre-existing non-conforming situation. Variance being requested: <u>Lot Width</u>: Existing 65' -- Required 75' -- Variance 10'; <u>Side Yard Setback</u>: Existing 7.8' -- Required 8'; <u>Side Yard Setback</u>: Requesting 1.9' -- Required 8' -- Variance 6.3'

Lisa and Joseph Dato – 182 South Madison Drive, South Plainfield, New Jersey – applicants are sworn in. Mrs. Dato stated that currently have two (2) bedrooms upstairs and two (2) bedrooms downstairs. Have a 2 year old daughter, with another on the way - due in January 2018. Possibly will have a third. Would like to have all bedrooms upstairs and would like to remove the bedrooms downstairs to create a large play area for their children. Would like to have the first floor open to be able to see the children at all times.

Vice Chairman Gustafson reconfirmed with Mr. & Mrs. Dato that they would like to reconfigure their home and construct an addition. Mr. & Mrs. Dato stated correct.

Vice Chairman Gustafson asked if the existing house has an add-a-level. Mrs. Dato stated it's a raised ranch... two (2) bedrooms, living room, bathroom, small kitchen downstairs and upstairs has two (2) bedrooms, bathroom and a living room area.

Vice Chairman Gustafson asked the house currently has two (2) floors. Mrs. Dato stated yes. Vice Chairman Gustafson asked who the previous owner was. Mr. Dato stated Walter Hassell. Vice Chairman Gustafson stated there is an add-a-level and he can name the contractor.

Vice Chairman Gustafson stated the two (2) bedrooms downstairs would be converted to a playroom and convert the open space upstairs into bedrooms. Mrs. Dato stated yes. Vice Chairman Gustafson continued... there is a proposal for a garage. Mrs. Dato answered yes.

Mr. Lavender asked who created the drawings. Mrs. Dato stated her father. He is a contractor.

Vice Chairman Gustafson stated that the reconfiguration of the house isn't an issue... it is the garage.

Vice Chairman Gustafson asked if there is a rear addition or a cantilever. Mr. & Mrs. Dato do not know what a cantilever is. Vice Chairman Gustafson shows the area in question on the plans to Mr. Dato. Mr. Dato confirms that they are requesting a rear addition.

Vice Chairman Gustafson stated that the addition on the left side of the house is in line with the existing house which has a setback of 7.8'. However, the proposed garage on the right side will have a setback of 1.9'.

Vice Chairman Gustafson asked if the garage will be utilized as a garage for a car or storage. Mr. Dato stated as storage. Vice Chairman Gustafson continued... will there be a garage door... especially with the side porch? Mr. Dato stated didn't really think about it... primarily for storage.

Mr. Lavender asked how wide the driveway will be. Vice Chairman stated eleven feet (11') but they cannot get a car pass the porch.

Vice Chairman Gustafson stated that the add-a-level on a pre-existing non-confirming home is common and there are many in town. The concern is the garage being 1.9' from the property line. Obviously, the esthetics look nice, but the reality is that a garage door may not fit. There is an eleven foot (11') driveway with an eight foot (8') garage door but two feet (2') off the property line.

Mrs. Campagna asked if it is an attached garage. Mr. & Mrs. Dato stated yes. Mrs. Campagna continued... but not going use it as a garage – more of a shed. Mr. Dato stated we might put a small car in the garage but basically use it for storage. Mrs. Campagna's concern is that the garage will be less than two feet (2') from the property line... even

if it was a shed. According to the survey, there is a metal shed in the rear. Does not know if they are keeping it or not... but the garage can be moved back so it is at least five feet (5') away from the house but not attached to the house. However, not comfortable with the two feet (2').

Mrs. Campagna asked if the addition in the back is a two (2) floor addition. Mr. Dato stated no... just the first floor. Mrs. Campagna continued... it the kitchen being extended? Mr. Dato stated correct. Mrs. Campagna reiterated that the house will be two (2) floors but the back addition is one (1) floor... the first floor will 'stick out'. Mr. Dato stated correct.

Vice Chairman Gustafson asked what will be the exterior of the house... will be resided? Mr. Dato stated correct. Reside the entire house... windows and doors will be changed. Vice Chairman Gustafson continued... is there any consideration for moving the proposed garage? Mrs. Dato asked as a detach garage? Vice Chairman Gustafson stated not necessarily. Possibly, narrowing the garage which a car will not be able to be parked. Mrs. Dato stated they are up for suggestions. Vice Chairman Gustafson stated unless the porch is removed, a car will be unable to park in the garage. Mr. Dato reiterated it is for storage and is open to narrowing the garage.

Sal Ciatto – father of Mrs. Dato and the builder – is sworn in. Mr. Ciatto stated that the porch is being removed and the stairs will go from the garage floor into the house.

Vice Chairman Gustafson asked Mr. Ciatto what are the plans for the front of the garage since an eight to nine foot (8' – 9') door will not fit. Mr. Ciatto stated that an eight foot (8') door will fit. Vice Chairman Gustafson continued... currently the driveway is on the property line. Mr. Ciatto stated yes... but it is eleven feet (11'). Vice Chairman Gustafson asked if there is a proposal to remove the driveway and to bring it to today's code of being five feet (5') from the property line. Mr. Ciatto stated no.

Mr. Lavender stated that the Boards concern is to have a functional garage door if the garage gets narrowed.

Mr. Ciatto stated the garage will be four feet (4') into the existing house.

Mr. Lavender confirms with Mr. Ciatto that the actual garage door opening will be eight feet (8') wide. Mr. Ciatto state sure.

Vice Chairman Gustafson asked when you pull into the garage are the stairs into the house going to be where you would 'u-turn' around. Mr. Ciatto stated when you pull into the garage, there will be no room on the right to get out. On the left, there will be four feet (4') of room and you come back towards the front of the property... but the stairs will be facing the rear of the property.

Mr. Lavender stated that the garage will be 1.9' from the property line. How far is the neighbor's house from the property line? Ideally would be eight feet (8') or more from the property line on his size. Mr. Ciatto stated it may be five to six feet (5' - 6').

Vice Chairman Gustafson stated they are all tight in the area. Mr. Ciatto stated the driveway is on the right when you're facing the house. The neighbor's driveway is also on the right of their property.

Mr. Lemos stated that today the driveway is to the property line. The new ordinance is that it is to be five feet (5') from the property line. Putting a building 1.9' from the property isn't right.

Mr. Ciatto stated if they cut back the driveway by five feet (5') the driveway would only be six feet (6') which is impossible.

Vice Chairman Gustafson asked how much can be remove to increase the 1.9' side yard. Mr. Ciatto stated he can only remove about a half a foot.

Mr. Lemos asked why does the garage have to be attached. Mr. Ciatto stated it could be attached but moved way back. Esthetically, it looks nicer this way.

The Board Members gave the applicant a few minutes to discuss their options amongst themselves.

Mr. Dato stated they will remove the proposed garage.

Mr. Lemos asked now that the garage is removed, are you going to extend the rear addition. Mr. Ciatto stated no... we will leave the additional as 9' x 36' and have the stairs where proposed except it will go to the back yard. Will remove the side door and porch.

Vice Chairman Gustafson opened the discussion to the audience. No questions or concerns from the audience.

Vice Chairman Gustafson stated that in the neighborhood, there are many raised ranches. With the compromise of removing the garage, sees no issue of the expansion as shown on the plans subject to the condition that the siding will be all new to match the windows and roof.

Vice Chairman Gustafson calls for a motion of approval. Mrs. Eichler made motion, seconded by Mr. Lemos. Those in favor: Mr. Bonanno; Mrs. Campagna; Mrs. Cullen; Mrs. Eichler; Mr. Lemos; Mrs. Wasnick; and Vice Chairman Gustafson. Those oppose: None

#### B. Case # 10-16 -- GMP Contracting LLC Block 297: Lot 4: M-3 Zone 2240 South Clinton Avenue

The applicant is requesting Preliminary and Final Site Plan approval to use the existing building for maintenance and service of its vehicles as well as outdoor storage of dump trucks, pick-up trucks and tractor-trailer. Bifurcated application. Use variance granted September 20, 2016. Returning for preliminary and file site plan. Continued from August 15, 2017.

Victor Deutch – Deutch & Associates LLC, 1000 US Highway 9, North, Suite 204, Woodbridge, NJ 07095 – attorney for the applicant and substituting for Seven S. Polinsky, Esq.

Vice Chairman Gustafson stated he did not attend the previous two (2) hearings and has not listened to the tapes. He will preside over the case but will not vote. Mr. Deutch stated that is acceptable.

Vice Chairman Gustafson and Joanne, Board Secretary discuss and inform the applicant that there are only four (4) Board Members eligible to vote. Mr. Deutch stated that is acceptable and would like to proceed.

Mr. Deutch addressed the Board. Concluded a hearing on August 15, 2017. Mr. Bucco and Mr. Slachetka were at the previous meeting. At that meeting, there were a number of items to be addressed and to comply with the site plan ordinance sufficiently to permit the Board Members to vote on the Site Plan. After that meeting, the project engineer, Mr. Kastrud, was required to make the necessary revisions to meet the concerns and issues of the Board. Those plans were submitted in time to get onto tonight's agenda. We have received a review memo from Mr. Bucco but have not received from the Planner. Mr. Slachetka stated that he did not have enough time to review and compare the plans. Mr. Deutch continued... he does not believe that is a problem since Mr. Slachetka's previous comments were in agreement with Mr. Bucco. Mr. Slachetka asked if his comments on the previous memo have been addressed.

Mr. Deutch stated that the documents from the first hearing is the Najarian Associates - Board Engineering review which included the initial July 28, 2017 memo and received a follow up memo dated yesterday. It is confirmed all Board Members have the memo before them. Mr. Bucco stated they did not get the plans until Friday. Mr. Deutch continued.... There is a Planner's memo dated July 27, 2017, a Site Plan application and an Environmental report from the initial submittal. Is unaware of a fire or police memo. Several Board members stated there are. Mr. Deutch continued... you have a Notice of Publication of the Site Plan, Affidavit and there are no additional notice required for this hearing. An application was submitted to the Middlesex Planning Board last year and have preliminary approval. Cannot get final approval until the site details are finalized by the Zoning Board. At present, knows of no conflicts. Have submitted the first set of plans of which are superseded by those under consideration tonight and those are plans dated October 9, 2017 - certified by Mr. Eckerd. It is his understand to go over items discussed on August 15, 2017 and to clarify any questions in order to get approval.

Vice Chairman Gustafson stated it is his understand that this is for Final Site Plan approval.

- Mr. Deutch stated he will outline what the applicant is seeking:
  - Approval of bulk variance resulting in pre-existing conditions and not created by this applicant through any new development... lot width, front yard, side yard. All left intact.
  - Two (2) additional variances. Only due to the pre-existing conditions.
    - First, the Board Engineer suggested that the warehouse building is an accessary building and the height cannot exceed fifteen feet (15'). The warehouse building is eighteen feet (18'). The height is shown on the zoning analysis box shown on page 2 of 7 of the plans. This building was a subject of a 2000 approval and the resolution is part of the GMP application submitted. It may not require further relief. If the board believes that is incorrect, would ask that the application be amended to include the variance height requirement. Vice Chairman Gustafson stated the Board Professionals will address that when they review their comments
    - Secondly, the existing sign and flag pole location require variance relief to the extent they will remain in their current location. They are located in the front yard setback area. The application should be further amended to include that variance.
  - Approval for request from the waivers of Site Plan Requirements: Environmental Impact Statement; Traffic Impact Statement; Stormwater Management and Drainage calculations. Withdrawing the request for lighting and landscaping. That has been provided
  - Seeking Preliminary and Final Site Plan Approval subject to conditions that have been or may be established:
    - Referencing Mr. Bucco's letter dated October 16, 2017:
      - Item E-4 Additional fencing details.
      - Item G-7 Dimensions of the main access aisle between the office and proposed visitor parking.
      - Item H-3 Spot elevations regarding handicap parking and the path between the handicap space and the office as well as the dimensions of the pavers accessing the office entry.
      - Item L-1-6, 7, 11, 14, 16, 18 Primarily required corrections or fixes. Mr. Kastrud will testify on these items.
      - Continued issue of a Recycling Plan which asking to be waived. The application includes that GMP will comply with recycling ordinance. It is his understanding that GMP has a private carter that takes everything away. Borough has some reporting requirements regarding the disposition of waste and recycled materials on an annual basis. It has been suggested by the Engineer and the Environmental Commission that a narrative recycling plan be provided. Vice Chairman Gustafson stated that is the minimum. Mr. Deutch continued... that they will do the narrative recycling plan as a condition of approval.

Christian M. Kastrud, PE, CME - Kastrud Engineering LLC, 1952 Route 22, East, Bound Brook, New Jersey – is still sworn in from the August 15, 2017 meeting. Mr. Kastrud addressed the Board using a rendering of several pages of the site plan over each other – Exhibit A-2 – Site Rendering Plan dated 10/17/2017 demonstrated the requested changes and recommendations from the previous meeting:

- South Clinton Avenue Middlesex County have given approval with the condition of improving the street scape... curbing, entrance / exit and sidewalk. Proposing new sidewalk along South Clinton Avenue which comply with all ADA requirements.
- Location of the existing sign. It will remain the same. Will have a more decorative column and will comply with the sign ordinance. Will be lit with a ground mounted light.
- Flag pole will be lit with a ground mounted light.
- Provided lighting plan for the front area... office, warehouse, parking area and area around.
  - No lighting in storage area in the rear of the property.
- Landscaping...low planting along front of the building and around the side.
  - Grass area in front street, flag pole, sign area.
    - o Trees along Parker Avenue.
- Eight foot (8') chain link fence with green slats along property lines. Six feet (6') along Parker Avenue.
  - Mr. Lemos asked if fence has barbwire. Mr. Kastrud stated no.
  - Vice Chairman Gustafson asked if they are new, green and in. Mr. Deutch stated correct. Mr. Deutch continued... that is in response to comment #6 on page 4 of Najarian's report.
- Dumpster moved back behind the first fence. It will not be behind the employee or visitor parking. Back in the warehouse area.
- Rear is storage area.
- Area marked for machines... dozier, dump truck etc.

- Tractor trailer moved to the area marked for machines. Therefore, no tractor trailer will be parked along Parker Avenue fencing.
  - Vice Chairman Gustafson asked Mr. Kastrud:
    - Is there still the exit out the back onto Parker? Yes. Located in the southwestern corner.
    - Is it a slide gate? No... swing gate.
    - Is that part of the improved fencing? Yes. Mr. Porchetta stated that the fence was there but he improved it.
    - Will it be screened? Mr. Porchetta stated yes.
  - Mr. Slachetka asked if the improvements being mentioned part of the existing plans. Mr. Kastrud stated some are... the dumpster location. The flag pole and sign were a drafting error but is staying. They were never thought to be removed... there were there then disappeared but they are staying.
  - Mr. Slachetka stated the fencing have been identified as having slats. Is that the fence shown on Sheet 2 of 7 as existing fencing? Mr. Kastrud stated correct. Mr. Slachetka continued... the next set of plans, will it show the fencing with the slats? Mr. Kastrud stated yes. Mr. Deutch stated that can be made as a condition of approval.
  - Mr. Slachetka asked on Sheet 2 of 7 shows the tractor trailer parked along the fencing. Tractor trailers will not be parking there anymore? Mr. Kastrud stated correct. That area will be landscaped.
  - Mr. Slachetka asked where the jersey barriers are will be landscaped? Mr. Kastrud stated that is correct.
  - Vice Chairman Gustafson asked where are the jersey barriers going? Mr. Porchetta stated they will be inside the fence and landscaping on the outside of the fence on Parker.
- Mr. Kastrud stated that other than the lighting, all the items previously discussed are not on the October 5, 2017 submission.

Vice Chairman Gustafson reiterated the landscaping that is behind the fence will not be on the outside of the fence. Fence around the property will be eight (8) or six (6) feet with slats. Mr. Kastrud stated not all the fencing. Mr. Porchetta stated yes, all the fencing. Vice Chairman Gustafson continued... the fencing along the southerly line will it be fixed. Mr. Porchetta stated that fence is not his but has been maintaining it. He can place his fence in front of it.

Mr. Kastrud continued... collected all the roof runoff into leaders and have directed it into storm sewer system on South Clinton Avenue which happens to be one of Mr. Bucco's comments.

Mr. Kastrud reiterated the improvements are the sidewalk out front, grass, landscaping, improvement to the front of the building, keeping the sign but making it more decorative, lighting the flag pole and sign, the additional landscaping on the side and the parking lot from the west end of the warehouse will be removed and repaved. Some areas Mr. Porchetta would like to go thicker because he has very heavy machinery.

Vice Chairman Gustafson stated that is referred to as Phase 1. Mr. Kastrud stated correct. Vice Chairman Gustafson asked what is the timing. Mr. Kastrud corrected himself... there will be no phasing. Vice Chairman Gustafson stated the phasing will be clarified on the plans. Mr. Kastrud stated correct. The phasing was included from the fire use.

Vice Chairman Gustafson asked what is tentative date for all the improvement. The Board can verify that there has been improvement. Mr. Porchetta stated once he receives the approval he was going pave. He was going to do it two (2) weeks ago, but didn't want to get into trouble but would like to get it done before the end of the season.

Vice Chairman Gustafson asked what the sub-straight will be. Mr. Porchetta stated where there is asphalt currently, will have new asphalt. Vice Chairman Gustafson asked the back area. Mr. Porchetta stated that will be stone and will be done at the same time.

Mr. Bucco asked to provide the detail of the paving on the plans. Mr. Bucco asked if Mr. Porchetta will be using Blue Stone or DGA. Mr. Porchetta stated DGA. Mr. Bucco would like that indicated on the plans.

Vice Chairman Gustafson stated as a condition will Mr. Porchetta agree to maintaining the stone. Mr. Porchetta stated absolutely.

Vice Chairman Gustafson asked the area marked on the plans for the machinery, is it an accurate? Mr. Porchetta stated right now, only has one (1) machine in the yard. Vice Chairman Gustafson asked what is the worst-case scenario. Mr. Porchetta stated five (5) or six (6).

Mr. Lavender asked what is the tallest machine. Mr. Porchetta answered twelve feet (12'). What type? Mr. Porchetta answered it could be an excavator... a dozer. Mr. Lavender asked what is the largest. Mr. Porchetta stated the twelve footer (12') is the off-road truck. Vice Chairman Gustafson asked as a condition of approval would like a list of the five (5) or six (6) types of machinery.

Mr. Deutch asked for a clarification regarding the list of machines. The machines changes over time. Vice Chairman Gustafson stated it's to show what type of machinery and what would be the max.

Mr. Lavender stated that it is for reference and asked if it is for an extended period of time. Mr. Porchetta stated no... nothing for an extended period of time.

Vice Chairman Gustafson reiterates as condition of approvals - list of machinery, nothing left open or high, no machine for an extended period of time.

Mr. Porchetta stated he would not be able to fit all his equipment in the back-storage yard.

Mr. Deutch would like to start review of Mr. Bucco's report dated October 16, 2017 starting on page 6.

Vice Chairman Gustafson asked if everything from page 1 through 5 is record keeping. Mr. Bucco stated yes

- Mr. Deutch continued... starting on page 6:
  - D-3 -- Item L Freestanding sign. Mr. Kastrud stated it is located on the easterly side and shown on Exhibit A-2. Mr. Porchetta will put decorative posts around the existing white posts with a sign that will comply with the sign ordinance but not with the location.
    - Vice Chairman Gustafson stated that he would like Mr. Bucco to double check that the sign does not impede with the sight triangle, the lights and the flag pole too. Mr. Bucco asked if the items are being moved or just improving them and keeping them out of the sight triangle. Mr. Kastrud stated correct.
    - Mr. Kastrud stated both South Clinton and Parker are fairly straight roads and do not have sight issues.
    - Mr. Kastrud stated they may have to rearrange some of the landscape items for the sight triangle on Parker.
  - Page 7 E-2 -- Item 13 County Board requirements. Mr. Kastrud stated they were issued a letter in October 2016 approving the plan with three (3) conditions. Bond, construction cost estimate and improving site frontage. If proposing a sidewalk to use the County's details, details for the depressed curb for the entrances to be replace and any inlets that are to be modified are to be updated to the new Stormwater Regulations and Eco Head Pieces. Mr. Bucco asked for a copy of the letter. He never received it.
  - Page 7 E-4 -- Item 20 Landscape and fence. Previously discussed. Mr. Bucco stated north and south side there is an eight foot (8') chain link fence with green slats. A six foot (6') fence along Parker on the west side. A swing gate on the south corner of Parker with slats. Vice Chairman Gustafson asked in the southern area by the customer parking, if Mr. Porchetta will fence the area. Mr. Porchetta stated it is fenced already. It's the neighbors fence. Mr. Porchetta asked if the Board would like him to put a fence up. Would like to clean the area up because it doesn't make his property look nice. Mr. Deutch stated he does not want to do something that will create controversy with the neighbor. Mr. Porchetta stated he would like to beautify the area the best he can. Mr. Slachetka stated that the fence shown on the plans from contractor office is clearly off the property line. Mr. Bucco stated that the neighbor's fence is encroaching on the applicant's property as shown on the plans on the south side.
  - Page 8 F-1 -- County Improvements. Previously discussed. Mr. Kastrud stated that curbing and sidewalk will be done.
  - Page 9 -- G-1 -- Mr. Kastrud stated he will specify on the plans the fence and gate details.
  - Page 9 G-5 -- Dumpsters. Mr. Kastrud stated the dumpsters have been moved to behind the first fence by the warehouse. Once confirmed by the hauler of the dumpster size, the dumpster area may be shifted slightly or parking may be shifted slightly to west. Will be shown on the plans.

- Page 9 G-7 -- Parking stalls. Mr. Kastrud stated the stalls have been labeled. However, the dimension from the building to the stalls is missing. The distance is just over thirty feet (30'). It is twenty-two feet (22') to the concrete pads. Mr. Bucco asked Mr. Kastrud to add the information onto the plans.
- Page 10 G-9 -- Height. The warehouse is eighteen feet (18') and the ordinance is fifteen feet (15'). Mr. Deutch stated it is pre-existing. However, if it requires a variance, it is being requested.
  - Vice Chairman Gustafson asked Mr. Bucco if he has any concerns regarding the height. Mr. Bucco stated it is pre-existing.
  - Mr. Lavender stated that the notice that was given does cover the height variance.
- Page 11 H-2 -- Drainage. Mr. Kastrud stated the roof leaders have been connected to the existing storm sewer system. Since they are filled with silt, Mr. Porchetta will clean them out and will flow to South Clinton Avenue. Same water, different avenue.
- Page 11 H-3 -- Spot Elevations. Mr. Kastrud stated has an updated survey. Will have the survey added to the plans showing the grades along with accessible route between the handicap spaces and the building.
- Page 11 I-1 -- Parker Avenue. Mr. Kastrud stated that Parker Avenue will be the main entrance and exit for equipment. Has laid a turning template onto the plans. Larger tractor trailers may encroach on coming traffic on Parker. On South Clinton Avenue, will be right up to the double yellow line if they were even to come in that direction. Certainly, large enough for emergency vehicles.
  - Mr. Bucco asked that this is shown on the plan.
- Page 12 L-1-6 -- Mr. Kastrud will update the plans.
- Page 13 L-7 -- Previously addressed. Vice Chairman Gustafson clarified that the jersey barriers will be along the westerly property line. Mr. Kastrud stated correct.
- Page 13 L-8 -- Manhole. Mr. Kastrud stated there is a low area between warehouse and office space. Mr. Porchetta put in a manhole with a grate on top of it which connects to an existing pipe to Astor Place. It will solve the drainage issue for the property to the north and this property.
  - Vice Chairman Gustafson asked who is the owner of lot 2 (northern property). Mr. Kastrud stated another entity owned by Mr. Porchetta.
- Page 14 L-11 -- Curb. Mr. Kastrud stated he will coordinate with the Middlesex County Planning Board and Mr. Bucco. Will put on the plans.
- Page 14 L-13 -- Sight Triangle. Mr. Kastrud stated it will be on the plans.
- Page 14 L-14 -- Previously discussed.
- Page 15 L-16 -- Soil Erosion and Sediment Control. Mr. Kastrud stated he will add the detail to the plans.
- Page 15 L-18 -- Illustrative Construction Detail. Mr. Kastrud stated he will coordinate with the Middlesex County Planning Board and Mr. Bucco. Will put on the plans.
  - Mr. Bucco asked that the onsite curbing be labeled. Mr. Kastrud stated not proposing any curbing along the edge of the property but will have concrete wheel stops.
- Page 15 M-1 -- Architectural Building Elevations. Mr. Bucco stated that the previous Board Resolution indicated to have architectural building elevations. Mr. Kastrud stated that Mr. Porchetta has been making improvements. Mr. Kastrud is not sure if an architect was consulted. Mr. Porchetta stated yes and permits were taken out.
  - o Mr. Bucco stated if permits were issued, the work done and received approval then that is satisfied.
- Page 16 M-2 -- Milling and Paving. Previously discussed.

Mr. Slachetka stated all his comments have been addressed.

Vice Chairman Gustafson stated there is not anything negatively impacting the location of the sign. Mr. Slachetka stated that there are no details to the sign. Therefore, the Board has limited information to grant the variance.

Vice Chairman Gustafson asked Mr. Kastrud for some clarification regarding the sign.

- It will be a ground monument sign.
- Ground mounted lighting.
- Mr. Porchetta stated he is staying in the existing footprint but will make the sign shorter.
  - Mr. Bucco asked that the details of the sign are on the detail sheet of the plans.
- A single sign.

Mr. Deutch stated the variance is for the location. Mr. Bucco stated correct.

Mr. Lavender reviews the conditions:

- Fencing.
- Slats.
- Gate repair. Slats.
- Asphalt will be replaced.
- DGA dirty stone.
- Tractor trailer will not be parked against the fence.
- List of equipment. Kept in lowest position

Vice Chairman Gustafson reiterated:

- Fencing will be replaced or repaired and will have green fuzzy slates.
- Machinery in the back.
  - No machinery stored in the front employee/visitor parking as a condition of approval.

Mr. Slachetka stated that the project description on Sheet 2 of 7 – the note regarding outdoor storage should be more accurate.

Vice Chairman Gustafson stated the machinery to be stored in the back of the warehouse will not be in the upright position.

Mr. Lavender asked where the dumpster is being moved to. Mr. Kastrud stated behind the first fence.

Vice Chairman Gustafson stated if the need arises, Mr. Porchetta may extend the fence up to the handicap stall in the front. Vice Chairman Gustafson continued... are there sprinklers. Mr. Porchetta stated yes.

Vice Chairman Gustafson asked what is the timing of completion of the work. Mr. Porchetta stated that he intends to get the paving done before the end of the season. As soon as spring breaks, the remainder of the landscaping to begin. It is agreed upon the completion date to be August 30, 2018.

Mr. Lemos asked if the gate behind the office is locked at night? Mr. Porchetta stated all the gates are locked at night. Mr. Lemos continued... do they have a Knox Box? Mr. Porchetta answered yes.

Mrs. Campagna stated that she had stopped by the site and Mr. Porchetta gave her a tour. When Mr. Porchetta stated he would like to get the improvements done -- already has made big improvements -- he is a man of his word. Wants to get the work done as possible before the weather turns bad. She is in favor of the application with the conditions previously stated.

Vice Chairman Gustafson opens the discussion to the audience. No audience members present.

Vice Chairman Gustafson calls for a motion of approval. Mrs. Campagna made motion, seconded by Mrs. Eicher. Those in favor: Mrs. Campagna; Mrs. Eichler; Mr. Lemos; and Mrs. Wasnick. Those oppose: None

#### INFORMAL HEARINGS: None

OLD BUSINESS: None

NEW BUSINESS: None

CORRESPONDANCE: None

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION: None

#### ADJOURNMENT: 8:48 PM

Respectfully Submitted, Joanne Broderick Recording Secretary