August 31, 2020

Long Branch Zoning Board of Adjustment
Ms. Courtney Lopez, Board Secretary
344 Broadway
Long Branch, NJ 07740

Re: Antonio Russo (ZB 20-03)
Engineering Review No. 1
Block 384, Lot 15; Zone R-3
164 Atlantic Avenue

Dear Board Members:

As requested, I have reviewed the following as it relates to the referenced application:

- Development Plan Application prepared by Christine L. Miseo, RA dated January 14, 2020;
- Survey of Property prepared by David J. Von Steenburg, PLS, of Morgan Engineering and Surveying dated January 15, 2020 consisting of one (1) sheet;
- Architectural Plans prepared by CL Miseo of Miseo Associates, PA Architects consisting of three (3) sheets last revised January 14, 2020.

The parcel prior contained a single-family home but is shown on the current survey as vacant. The applicant requests bulk variances to permit the construction of a single-family home on the property. The property is in the R-3 Zone. Vehicle access to the site is from Atlantic Avenue.

I offer the following for the Board’s consideration:

1.0 Off-site Improvements

1.1 Sidewalk and curb exist along the frontage on Atlantic Avenue. A note should be added to the plan indicating that any curb or sidewalk damaged prior to or due to the construction shall be repaired to the satisfaction of the City Engineer or the Public Works department. Details for this work should be included on the plans.

1.2 The plan proposes to shift the driveway to the east from the existing location. The existing driveway apron will be required to be removed and the new apron reconstructed in the new location. The plans should note the change required to the existing curb, apron and sidewalk to achieve this apron location. Details for the work should be provided.
2.0 Zoning

2.1 The applicant proposes to construct a single-family home on the parcel. The proposed use is permitted on the site. Section 345-104 outlines the requirements for the R3 zone. The existing lot contains the following non-conformities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area</td>
<td>9000 SF</td>
<td>7500 SF*</td>
<td>7500*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontage</td>
<td>75’</td>
<td>50’*</td>
<td>50’*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Existing Variance
**Proposed Variance or existing variance exasperation

Relief is required from these requirements unless variance approval was provided in the past.

2.2 The architectural plans depict a survey from March 1948 showing a prior home on the site. The zoning schedule indicates non-conformities on the site that relate to that survey as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard - single</td>
<td>10’</td>
<td>6.68’*</td>
<td>10’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>30% or 15’</td>
<td>20.68’</td>
<td>20’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Coverage</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>43.2%*</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Existing Variance
**Proposed Variance or existing variance exasperation

The applicant should address when the single-family home was removed from the property. The protection for non-conformities was lost once the home was removed unless relief was prior granted to the site. Please note the existing non-conformities are proposed to be eliminated with the proposed plan.

2.3 The architectural floor plan depicts A/C units on the side of the building. The location and setbacks to the A/C units should be provided on the site plan. As shown on the A/C units are proposed within the side yard. Relief is required for location of the units within the side yard setback.

2.4 Section 345-104 permits a height of 2 ½ stories or 30’. The grades are not provided. The architectural plans indicate that the proposed height is 30.0’ from the average grade. The height of the structure is measured from the average grade of the elevation around the proposed home. Neither proposed grades or the proposed finish grade of the home or garage is provided on the plans. The applicant should address if they propose to alter the existing the grade as a change in grade could alter the calculation of the building height.

2.5 Section 345-42 C(7) requires “In no case shall more than 20% of any front yard area be used for parking or driveways in any R Residential Zone.” The applicants should provide the dimension of the width of the proposed drive in the front yard. Although note dimensioned, a note is provided indicating the drive is to be the width of the
garage. The garage width is shown as 11’4”. Based on this width the coverage in the front yard is 22.6%. Relief is required.

3.0 Grading Plan

3.1 The City Grading Check List requires that a grading plan be provided. Existing grades are shown but not proposed grades as noted in comment 2.5 above. Since grades are not provided a grading review has not been performed in accordance with City requirements. If a grading plan is not required during the hearing, I recommend the resolution indicate a grading review was not performed so that one will be performed as part of the building permit process. A separate application and fee will be required to be provided to the City for the review due building permit application. I also recommend the condition require the applicant return to the Board should the Grading Review require changes from what is approved by the Board.

3.2 The applicant should address impact to the neighbors. The plan does not propose any mitigation. I note that the grading checklist requires the roof runoff for a 10-year storm be handled on-site for new homes and should be provided. If mitigation is required by the Board, the applicant should provide the calculations for the design and based on-site specific soil and water table conditions. Copies of the soil borings should be provided for review. I have no objection to this being a condition of any approval the Board may grant.

3.3 The existing grades suggest water may be trapped on each side of the home. Positive grading should be provided and directed away from the neighbors. Roof and driveway runoff should be directed toward the street if not directed toward a recharge system.

4.0 General Comments

4.1 The proposed layout labels four (4) rooms as bedrooms. The City ordinance requires 2.5 spaces be provided for the single-family structure up to four (4) bedrooms. RSIS requires that 2.5 spaces be provided for a four (4) bedroom structure and rounds down the count to 2.0 spaces. The applicant proposes a one car garage with a forty (40) foot long drive in front. RSIS counts the one car garage and driveway as two (2) spaces since as long as the drive is a minimum of eighteen (18) feet long. Therefore, the parking met. I note the forty (40) foot long drive is adequate to provide a third car on site to meet the City requirements as well.

4.2 The applicant should address the use of the basement and an attic is proposed. If they are proposed, the applicant should clarify if they will they be used for habitable space. The basement floor plan shown on the architectural plan appears to be a duplicate of the first-floor plan. Any habitable space in the basement or the attic may add to the bedroom count and may alter the parking requirement.
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4.3 The applicant should confirm that existing utilities are to be used. Existing utility connection should be shown on the plan. Any proposed additions to or changes to existing utilities should be shown on the plans and the associated disturbances shown. Limits of disturbance for any proposed utility or replacement of existing should be shown on the plan.

4.4 The plans indicate a proposed limit of disturbance. Soil Erosion and Sediment Control certification or exemption is required from Freehold Soil Conservation District. A copy of the certification/exemption should be provided. Copies of any plan used for the permit/exemption should be provided to the Board.

4.5 The architectural plans include a layout of the proposed improvements over the existing survey noted at the beginning of this report. The manner it is depicted suggests that the design is provided by David J. Von Steenburg, PLS. If the layout is provided by the Architect, the title block from Von Steenburg should be removed and the instead referenced as a base for the plot plan design. If it is designed by Morgan Engineering and Surveying, then the design should contain an engineer’s original signature and seal. In addition, the plan title should be changed to reflect the plan is a plot or site plan and not the topographic survey.

4.6 Construction details of the proposed improvements should be added to the plan.

4.7 If the application is approved, final plans should be revised to provide a signature block. The signature block should provide a location with a for location for signature and date of each the Board Chairperson, Board Secretary and Board Engineer.

I reserve the right to make additional comments once the above information is requested. If you have any questions or require additional information, kindly advise.

Very Truly Yours,

Elizabeth M. Waterbury, P.E, P.P., C.M.E.
City of Long Branch Zoning Board Engineer and Planner

cc: Michael A. Irene, Esq. via email
Christine Miseo, RA via email miseoarchitect@yahoo.com
Antonio Russo via email vra1222@aol.com
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