NEW PROVIDENCE

SETTLED IN 1720

Al Morgan, Mayor
Keith J. Lynch, Director
Planning and Development
Deborah A. Timko, Technical Assistant

September 16, 2021

Mrs. Mathews 1283 Springfield Avenue New Providence, N.J. 07974

Re: 1283 Springfield Avenue Block 50, Lot 17, R-2 Zone Proposed: Sign

Dear Mrs. Mathews.

I have reviewed your application for a building permit for the project referenced above.

Application is hereby denied for noncompliance with the provisions of chapter 310, Article V, Section 310-33 B (2), 310-33 H (3), 310-33H (4g) and 310-33 L (2a), of the Municipal Zoning Ordinance for the following reason(s):

The proposed sign does not advertise this business at the location which is prohibited.

The proposed billboard/off-premise sign is prohibited.

The proposed sign is painted directly on the exterior wall of the building which is not allowed.

The proposed additional signage is 264 sq, ft, not at a public entrance and exceeds that maximum number of signs, whereas only 4% of the total area of the building façade fronting on a principal entrance, but in no case shall any individual sign be greater than 50 sq. ft. and only one sign per public entrance with a maximum number of two is allowed.

You may appeal this denial by applying to the Borough's Board of Adjustment. Please contact Margaret Koontz, Secretary to the Board, during business hours, 8:00am to 1:00pm, at (908)665-1124 for further information on how to apply.

Deborah A. Timko Zoning Review Officer

cc: Margaret Koontz, Secretary, Board of Adjustment; Bryan Flynn, Assessor;

> 360 Elkwood Avenue • New Providence • New Jersey • 07974 908-665-1098 • 908-665-8361 (Fax) www.newprov.org

VARIANCE APPLICATION And/or Direction of the Issuance of a Permit

Board of Adjustment – Planning Board Borough of New Providence

FC	DR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
Fe D B	ate Application Filed: ce Amount Paid: ate Application Completed ate Application Completed Notice Sent: lock No. Lot No.(s)
SI	ECTION 1. INFORMATION REGARDING THE APPLICANT
a١	Full legal name STEFANIE ILENE MATHEWS
	Mailing address 1283 SPRINGFIELD AVENUE, NEW PROJECT
	NT 17071
c)	Contact information: 917 974 8396 stefmathews@gmail.com
d)	The applicant is (check one): INDIVIDUAL (S) CORPORATION II
	PARTNERSHIP OTHER (specify)
Pri	he Applicant is a corporation or a partnership, information specified in Article 8D of the Land Use ocedures Ordinance must be included as a rider to this application. All corporate applicants must represented by an attorney.
e)	The relationship of the applicant to the property in question is (check one):
	OWNER TENANT OF LESSEE D PURCHASER UNDER CONTRACT D
	OTHER (specify)
	If the applicant is not the owner of the property in question, the Applicant must submit a copy of this application signed by the owner in the space provided in Section 7
SE	CTION 2. INFORMATION REGARDING THE PROPERTY
a)	The street address is 1283 SPRINGFIELD AFENUE
b)	The property is approximately 122 feet from the intersection of
	SPRINGFIELD ALE. and PASSALL ST.
	The property is Black No. (s) 50 Lot No. (s) 17 on the Tax Map and is

	located in the	Zone	(s).				
SE	CTION 3. IN	FORMATION ABOUT	REQUESTE	D RELIEF	See	Attache	d
a)	<u>Proposal:</u> With respect to said property, Applicant desires a variance or relief from the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance to permit the use of the property in the following manner (include all physical improvements such as structures, additions, landscaping, etc.):						
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						

					82 P 0.5		
b)	specific article	sted: The proposed uses, sections and criteria sought, the requirement	a, i.e. front yar	d setback,	of the Zoning	Ordinance from w	/hich
	Art/Sec	Criteria		_ Required		Proposed	
	Art/Sec	Criteria		_ Required	·	Proposed	
		Criteria					
	Art/Sec	Criteria		_ Required		Proposed	
c)	substantial de	Relief: The specific facts triment to the public go and the Zoning Ordin	ood and will no	that the reli	ef sought ca ally impair th	n be granted witho e intent and purpos	ut se of
							-
		,			-		
	Previous Requiproperty has be Board decision	ests: Relief from the peen previously request	provisions of the	e zoning o (yes or r	rdinance in o	connection with thi tach a copy of the	S

Section 3a

A mural painted on the wall of the Flip Consignment building at 1283 Springfield Avenue with the words "New Providence". This wall is facing the parking lot of the strip mall at the property adjoining 1283 Springfield Avenue. The mural is intended to celebrate the town of New Providence in a colorful and visually aesthetic art form and is not designed to represent any specific business, entity or individual.

Section 3b

	Criteria	Required	Proposed
Article V Section 310-33 B(2)	Advertising signs	Sales/rental signs	Town sign not sales/rental
Article V Section 310-33 H(3)	Signs Permitted under 310-33	Must be allowed by 310-33	Mural painted on wall at proposed location
Article V Section 310-33 H(4g)	Wall painted signs	No signs painted on walls	Painted directly on wall
Article V Section 310-33 L(2a)	Sign Size, number, location	4% total area, at public entrance, max of 2	264 sq feet, located on side of building, not for business/owner

Section 3c

The relief sought by this variance does not detriment the public good and does not impair the intent and the purpose of the zone plan. This mural is intended to celebrate the town of New Providence simply with the words "New Providence", and to be an aesthetically pleasing artwork for all residents and visitors to enjoy, brightening up a dull wall. This request is for an art mural rather than a traditional sign and we believe this creates a unique circumstance and benefit that is not fully appreciated or covered by the existing zoning regulations.

SEC	ECTION 4. NATURE OF APPLICATION (Check all appropriate items.)	
	() Interpretation of zoning ordinance or map () Appeal of action of Zoning Officer (attach copy of certificate) () C Variance () D Variance () Subdivision () Subdivision application to follow () Site Plan () Site Plan application to follow () Conditional Use () Walver of lot to abut street requirement () Exception to the Official Zoning Map	
SE	SECTION 5. PROPERTY DETAILS NOT APPLICABLE - NO CONST	DI SOTION
Th	The property is more particularly described as follows:	ROCTION
a)	a) Area of Plot: square feet. Area covered by existing structures that will n	emain:
	square feet. Area of proposed structures: square feet	Total
	area of plot to be occupied by structures: square feet. Percentage of plot	it to be
	occupied by structures:	
b)	o) Total floor area:square feet. Floor area ratio (total floor area divided by area of plot):	
c)	e) Setbacks: Required Existing Proposed	
	Front	
	One side	
	Other side	
	Both sides	
	Rear	
	(If corner lot, circle setbacks from side street.)	
d)	Height of existing structure to top of rooffeet.	
	Height of proposed structurefeet.	
	Height of(state cupola, chimney, etc.)	eet.
	Average setback from street(s) of buildings within 200 feet (required if setback variance is requested)	
f)	Other pertinent characteristics of property	

ECTIO	N 6. OTHER	INFORMATION	4			
a) <u>Attor</u>	ney: NA			Phone No.		
	ess					
E-ma	ail address:					
b) <u>Use</u>	of existing by FILP Co busines		emises, and if not o	wner-occup	ied, name of Le	widing
Pro	USP. C	uilding(s) and pr	remises, and if not on the charge report	wner-occupi	ed, name of Le	oped_
		7 Signa				
c) Adj	oining Property tract to purcha	Block and Lot r se by either app	number(s) of any ad licant or current owr	oining prope er	erty currently of	wned or under
SECTION	ON 7. VERIF	ICATION AND /	AUTHORIZATION			
info	ormation contai are that if any c	ned in the paper of the foregoing s	above statements resubmitted in connectatements are willfunction Applicant's Fignature	ection with the last false, I are re	n subject to pu	nishment.
b) <u>Ow</u>	ner (if owner is	not Applicant):	11.		_ hereby certif	y that I reside
at 44	2 taima	int the ch	atmompthe County of	- MOD	05	and the State
of 1	<u> </u>	and I am the	e owner of that certa	in lot, piece	or parcel of lar	nd known as
Block(s) <u>50 </u>	ot(s) 17	on the Tax Map of oplication, and that s	the Bolougi	nn is hereby au	ithorized by me.
proper	× H	Signature	D			16/84
FOR OF	FICIAL USE ON	· Y				2
This and	dication was appr	oved on		A resolu	tion setting forth t	he specifics of the
approva	and conditions, I	f any, was mailed o	on			
This app	dication was denie	ed on		A resolutio	n of denial was m	alled on
			Secretary of the Board	(

*

Wever Providence IN

Mae Mace, Mice People

Greetings from

BOROUGH OF NEW PROVIDENCE

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, Karate Quest, Inc., located at 1283 Springfield Avenue in the Borough of New Providence, has applied to the Zoning Board of Adjustment of the Borough of New Providence ("Board") for a variance pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70(d) and for site plan approval so that it can use a portion of the premises located at 1283 Springfield Avenue as a karate school, which property is designated as Lot 17 in Block 50 on the Borough Tax Map, and which lies in the C Central Business District; and

WHEREAS, the Board has carefully reviewed the application and testimony presented at a hearing which was conducted on February 21, 1995; and

WHEREAS, the Board has made the following findings of fact and has drawn the following conclusions of law:

FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. The applicant, Karate Quest, Inc., has leased a portion of the first floor of the building located at 1283 Springfield Avenue, which property is designated as Lot 17 in Block 50 on the Borough Tax Map and which is located in the C Central Business District.
- 2. The lot is rectangular in shape. It is 63' wide and 208' deep. It is improved with a two story frame structure.
- 3. The applicant, through its principal Yolanda Foti, has leased 1,600 square feet from the owner, Francis Weid, to use

for a karate school. .

- 4. The applicant requires the granting of a variance because the proposed karate school is an educational use and educational uses are only conditional uses within the C Central Business District.
- 5. Article VI of the Borough Zoning Ordinance provides that conditional uses shall be permitted provided they comply with the following general requirements:
 - a. The use is so designed, located and proposed to be operated that the public health, safety, welfare and convenience of the citizens will be protected;
 - b. Adequate landscaping and screening is provided;
 - c. Adequate off street parking is provided and ingress and egress is so designed so as to cause minimum interference with traffic on abutting streets;
 - d. The use conforms to all applicable regulations governing the district in which it is located; and
 - e. Any site plan required by the Municipal Land Use Law and the Subdivision and Site Plan Ordinance is submitted and approved.
- 6. Peter Steck, a licensed professional planner, testified that the proposed karate school, was in his expert opinion, an educational use. Mr. Steck testified that a recent book written by Harvey S. Moskowitz and Karl G. Lindbloom defined a "school" use as including a martial arts school. This Board finds that the proposed use is an educational use and as such is to

be permitted as a conditional use in the C Central Business District if the criteria set forth in the paragraph 5 are met.

- 7. Peter Steck testified that primary access to the karate school is from a door located in the rear of the building which connects to an outdoor parking lot. The parking lot provides nineteen 9 by 19 foot parking spaces. This provides ample parking for both the karate school, the adjoining beauty salon which is also on the first floor of the structure, and for the owner, Frances Weid, who resides on the second floor.
- 8. Mr. Steck testified that there were various special reasons why the requested variance should be granted. He testified that the use is small by nature. Its peak hours are after school and in the early evening while other Central Business District uses are winding down. He further testified that the proposed karate school would compliment the public education which the Borough provides as the school will teach various ideals as well as physical fitness. Mr. Steck further testified that the proposed use does not compete with any other use within the Central Business District and is located in an area where parents, who drop their children off for instruction, can also shop and thereby support other uses within the Central Business District.
- 9. Mr. Steck further testified that the use would not cause any substantial detriment to the Borough Zoning Plan or Zoning Ordnance. The site has adequate off street parking which is behind the structure. The use would not generate undue traffic on Springfield Avenue, nor would it impede traffic on this

thoroughfare. Children and adults can safely access the site through the parking lot. It would only operate until 8:00 P.M. and it would be closed on Sundays.

- 10. Yolanda Foti, the principal in Karate Quest, Inc., testified that she hoped to teach both physical fitness and various ideals associated with Hwarang-Do, which is an ancient Korean martial art. She testified that the maximum number of students at any one time would be sixteen and the school would have four instructors who would properly supervise the classes that are held.
- 11. Various parents testified in support of the application. The general sentiment expressed by these parents was that the school was well run, clean, properly supervised, and was being greatly enjoyed by their children.
- 12. The only individual who testified in opposition to the application was Frances Weid, the owner of the premises. This testimony was interesting in that Frances Weid signed the use variance application and therein acknowledged her consent, as the owner of the property, to this application.
- 13. Frances Weid testified that she lived on the second floor and was encountering excessive noise from the adults who are enrolled in the school. In this regard, one aspect of the instruction includes yelling when hitting. It is interesting to note that the lease between Frances Weid and Yolanda Foti makes no reference to the fact that adults would be barred from taking lessons at the karate school. Additionally, it is difficult to imagine how a karate school would be able to operate in the Borough

without the support of adults. Mrs. Weid testified that she wanted the variance approved only to the extent that children would be allowed to take lessons at the karate school.

14. William Shedlack, Mrs. Weid's son, testified that he noticed a great deal of noise when adults are receiving instruction at the karate school.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- 1. The proposed use is an educational use and as such is deemed a conditional use within the C Central Business District. Conditional uses are to be permitted if they meet various criteria which are set forth in our Zoning Ordinance. The applicant has generally met these requirements.
- 2. The applicant has proven that there are special reasons supporting the granting of the requested variance. The proposed use is new to the Borough and will not compete with any existing business. It is a small and self-contained use which fits nicely within the structure located at 1283 Springfield Avenue. The facility presents an excellent location for the proposed use as it is centrally located with ample and safe parking. Additionally, the proposed use will compliment other nearby uses as parents who drop their children off can shop while their children are taking lessons.
- 3. The proposed use would not have any substantial detrimental impact to the Borough Zoning Ordinance or Borough Zoning Plan. Nonetheless, there will be some adverse impact upon Frances Weid, the owner of the property, who resides on the second

floor. This impact will be self-contained to the noise which she hears while the school is in operation. Frances Weid, as the owner of the property, was the one person who was best able to protect herself from any detrimental impact which would be caused by the karate school. She did not have to lease the premises to Yolanda Foti for use as a karate school and she did not have to sign the variance application which is before this Board in her capacity as owner of the subject premises. This Board finds that the noise which Mrs. Weid will hear does not constitute a substantial detriment to the Borough Zoning Ordinance or to the Borough Zoning Plan and for that reason requested use variance can be granted.

4. The applicant's site plan is adequate.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED on this 20th day of March, 1995, that the application of Karate Quest, Inc. for the requested variance and site plan approval be and hereby is granted subject to the following conditions:

- 1. The applicant erect a sign inside its premises which specifically advises all students that ingress and egress is to be through the rear door which accesses the rear parking lot;
- 2. Instruction is to stop at 8:00 P.M. and is not allowed on Sundays;
- 3. The applicant must comply with all Borough, County and State laws, rules and regulations with respect to its occupancy of the premises.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Those in Favor: Roger Burns, Ann Chovan, Marilyn Eiland, Stuart Hirsch, Michael Karr, Frank McAneny, Monica Marino.

Those Opposed: None

The foregoing is a true copy of a Resolution adopted by the Zoning Board of Adjustment of the Borough of New Providence at its meeting on March 20, 1995.

ATTEST:

Cline E. Oloford
Secretary, Board of Adjustment

Thairman, Board of Adjustment

7

A





