Christopher J. Noll, PE, CME, PP *President & CEO* William H. Kirchner, PE, CME, N-2 *Vice President* Rakesh R. Darji, PE, PP, CME, CFM *Vice President/Treasurer* Benjamin R. Weller, PE, CME, CPWM, S-3, C-3 *Secretary* 



Joseph P. Orsino, Jr. CET, *Vice President* Harry R. Fox, NICET III G. Jeffrey Hanson, PE, CME Joseph R. Hirsh, PE, CME, CPWM C. Jeremy Noll, PE, CME, CPWM Marc H. Selover, LSRP, PG

March 3, 2023 70623 00

Attn: Ms. Maryalice Brown, Secretary Southampton Township Zoning Board 5 Retreat Road Southampton, NJ 08088-3591

## Re: Application Review: Bulk Variance

23-9021203: Hart Pole Barn 133 Landing Street Block 902, Lots 12.03

Dear Board Members,

We have received an application to construct a 2,400 SF detached garage (60' wide by 40' deep) on the above residentially developed property. We offer the following comments:

### **General Information**

Owner / Applicant: Brett & Julianne Hart 133 Landing Street Southampton, NJ 08088

# **Submitted Materials**

The application included the following documents:

- 1. Southampton Township Planning Board & Zoning Board Application Form.
- 2. A Zoning Permit Application was not submitted to Zoning.
- 3. Plan of Survey, Lot 12.03, Block 902, Southampton Township, Burlington County, N.J., prepared by Maser Surveying LLC dated 07/20/2022 Sheet 1 of 1.
- 4. Architectural Plans signed by James Koppenhaver, PE, and dated 08/24/2022, 6 Sheets.

### **Completeness Review**

We recommend that the Board find the application COMPLETE for its review and consideration of approval.

# Zoning Requirements: Rural Residential (RR) Zone

Use Requirements:

1. Detached garages for single-family detached dwellings are a permitted accessory use in this zone.

*Dimensional Requirements:* The last column in the following table indicates how the proposed development on this lot conforms to the area and bulk requirements in this zone.

Dimensions	Required	Existing	Proposed	Status
Lot				
Min. Lot Area (SF)	87,120	84,811	84,811	PE
Min. Lot Frontage (FT)	100	175	175	С
Min. Depth (FT)	150	463.6	463.6	С
Max. Total Prin. Building Coverage	10%	3.7%	3.7%	С
Max. Total Impervious Coverage	20%	13.0%	Т	Т
Max. Accessory building coverage	1.5%	0.2%	3.1%	V
Garages				
Max. Floor Area (SF)	1,260	NA	2,400	V
Max. Vehicle Number	3	NA	6	V
Min. Rear Yard Setback: (FT)	25	NA	>200	С
Min. Side Yard Setback: (FT)	6	NA	15	С

C = Conforming; NA = Not Applicable; PE = Pre-Existing, non-conforming condition; T = Testimony required; and V = Variance required.

#### Variances

- 1. The proposed 2,400 SF detached garage requires c(2) bulk variances for:
  - a. Exceeding the maximum permitted 1,260 SF floor area for garages (§ 12-4.1.c),
  - b. Exceeding the maximum permitted space for storage of 3 vehicles (§ 12-4.1.c), and
  - c. Exceeding the maximum permitted accessory building coverage (§ 12-3.9.d.9).

The Applicant must provide testimony to justify the requested variance. For c(2) variances the Applicant must demonstrate:

- a. That the purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law (MLUL) would be advanced by a deviation from strict application of the zoning requirement;
- b. That the variance can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good;
- c. That the benefits of the deviation would substantially outweigh the detriment; and
- d. That the variance will not substantially impair the intent and purpose of the zone plan and zoning ordinance.
- 2. The Applicant's plan did not show or provide dimensions for the new driveway required to extend the existing driveway 120' northwest to the proposed 60'-wide garage. Currently, the property has about 13% impervious coverage ( $\approx 11,060$  SF). If the Applicant were to build its proposed 2,400 SF garage and remove the existing 1,660 SF stone rear driveway, the impervious coverage would increase to 13.9% ( $\approx 11,800$  SF). This would leave the Applicant with  $\approx 5,162$  SF of permitted impervious coverage to build its new driveway without requiring a c(2) bulk variance for exceeding the property's maximum 20% permitted total impervious coverage (\$ 12-3.9.d.10).

If the Applicant were to remove the existing 1,660 SF rear driveway, we believe that it is possible to construct the new driveway without requiring such a variance. We recommend that any Board approval be conditioned upon the Applicant providing a scaled dimensioned sketch of the new driveway within the Ordinance threshold for the Board Engineer's approval.

#### **General Comments**

3. Because the proposed development appears to comprise less than 1 acre of additional soil disturbance and less than 0.25 acres of impervious surfaces, it is not a "major development" requiring adherence to NJDEP's stormwater management rules.

- 4. Applicant should provide testimony regarding the following:
  - a. Whether it will park or store any commercial vehicles in the proposed garage. If so, a use variance would be required, per §12-4.1c.
  - b. The location of the property's existing private well and septic system and confirmation that the proposed development will be sufficiently separated from these facilities.
  - c. Whether there will be any sink or toilet facilities in the proposed garage. If so, any Board approval should be conditioned upon the County Health Department's approval of the property's existing septic system.
  - d. The existing and proposed drainage patterns around the proposed garage building and whether there are any existing site drainage issues, the locations of the proposed garage's downspouts and leaders and stormwater flow, and whether that runoff will have any impact on neighboring properties.
  - e. The locations and types of any proposed exterior lighting and provisions to ensure there will be no glare to adjacent properties.
- 5. We note that the proposed development may require the Applicant to revise its shared driveway access easement with its neighbor, which is beyond the Board's purview.

#### **Administrative Comments**

- 6. Any approval is subject to applicant obtaining all required permits and approvals, including the following, and satisfying the review letters of the Board's Professionals.
  - a. Southampton Township Construction Office, and
  - b. All others that may be required

We reserve the opportunity to further comments as additional information becomes available.

Should you or the Applicant have any questions, please feel free to contact the undersigned.

Rakesh R. Darji, PE, CME, PP Zoning Board Engineer

Edward Fox, AICP, PP Zoning Board Planner

RRD/ EF 133\_landing\_st\_hart garage eri review letter\_03.03.23

ec: Brett & Julianne Hart, Owner <u>bwhart133@gmail.com</u> Tom Coleman, Esq., Zoning Board Attorney <u>tomcoleman@rclawnj.com</u>

