

Mrs. Kasper questioned the plans. Mrs. Kasper would like the plans to read 1st story and 2nd story, not basement and 1st story.

Mrs. Hagel assured the board that she is not adding a third floor.

Mrs. Kasper stated that calling it a basement is leaving room for a third floor. The area is not a basement.

Mr. Kitrick stated that can be a condition of approval.

Mrs. Kasper feels it needs to be a floor not a basement.

Mr. Ganim questioned if there is a basement in the house.

Mrs. Hagel replied no we just call it a basement.

Mrs. Thomson questioned the garage pass thru and if they park cars in the back or if it is need for storage.

Mrs. Hagel replied no. It is needed for access to the backyard since they live on the water and the home is already in the setbacks.

Mr. Kitrick stated that the 3 photos in A-1 show the side portion of the home.

Mrs. Kasper questioned how the attic is accessed.

Mrs. Hagel replied with pull down stairs.

Mr. Schroeder opened the meeting to the public.

Ms. Marie Hagemann 1617 Northstream Parkway stated she is in favor of the Hagel application. The addition will be a great access to the neighborhood.

Mr. Holman questioned why the garage door is needed in the back of the house.

Mrs. Hagel explained that they have wave runners.

Mrs. Thomson questioned if the garage doors are currently there.

Mrs. Hagel replied yes.

Caucus

Mr. Seebald stated it is 7500sq ft on a 50 ft lot. The air conditioner is hidden. Mr. Seebald sees no problem with the application.

Mr. Schroeder has a problem with the pool filter and heater.

Mr. Seebald replied it backs up to another pool filter.

Mr. Ganim does not have a problem with the air conditioner but the pool filter can be moved.

Mrs. Kasper agrees with Mr. Ganim. She would also like the plans to be re labeled.

Mr. Schroeder stated the house probably was conforming at one time.

Mr. Sabosik stated the house is impeccable. He also feels the air conditioning is hidden by the arborvitaes but the pool filter can be moved.

Mr. Schroeder agrees grant everything except the pool filter.

A motion was made by Mr. Seebald to approve the application with the following conditions.

Pool filter must be moved within the setbacks.

Plans to read 1st story opposed to basement.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Sutphen.

Roll Call Vote

Mr. Sabosik-Yes Mr .Sutphen- Yes Ms. Thomson-Yes Mr. Seebald- Yes
Mr. Ganim-Yes Mrs. Kasper-Yes Mr. Schroeder-Yes

09-23 Block 386 Lot 32- Schnappauf- 1511 Bel Aire Court East-Side Yard Setback and Rear Yard Setback(7:21-7:42)

Mr. John Schnappauf, owner, was sworn in.

Mr. Robert Stackle, builder, 5093 Arnold Ave, Wall, NJ was sworn in.

Mr. Schroeder questioned the applicant why he needed the canopy over his deck.

Mr. Schnappauf explained that currently there are metal poles with a canopy and with the wind rips it.

Mr. Schroeder stated you are requesting 12.72 where 25ft is required. Will that be blocking the view of any neighbors?

Mr. Schnappauf replied no.

Mr. Stackle stated that the roof will be at a lower elevation than what is currently there. There will also be a system in place for the proper drainage. It will be 3ft lower than the existing roof line.

Mr. Schroeder that 3 or 4 homes in the area have retractable awnings.

Mr. Stackle stated that you need to be home to retract the awning.

Mr. Seebald questioned if the area would ever be screened in.

Mr. Schnappauf replied not at this time.

Mr. Sabosik questioned why a motorized awning with a wind sensor couldn't be installed.

Mr. Schnappauf replied there are a lot of power outages in the area.

Ms. Thomson questioned what type of floor would be used.

Mr. Schnappauf replied wood.

Mr. Ganim stated that the plans show vinyl railings are the railings being replaced.

Mr. Schnappauf replied no they are installing the roof and columns at this time.

Mr. Ganim would like the rails to be replaced at this time.

Mr. Sabosik doesn't feel we can tell the applicant to put the rails up at this time.

Mr.Ganim questioned what will be used for the posts.

Mr. Stackle replied 6 x 6 vinly coated decorative posts.

Mrs. Kasper asked if the roof system is tied into the deck.

Mr. Stackle replied that the roof will be built to proper new construction code.

Mrs. Kasper questioned who's property the arborvitaes are on.

Mr. Schnappauf replied his.

Mr. Schroeder opened the meeting to the public. There was no public input.

Caucus

Ms. Thomson feels this is a big encroachment.

Mr. Seebald doesn't see a problem with the application. There is a problem with awnings on the water and it is very expensive to replace them. The vinyl railings are not an issue. It will look finished.

Mr. Sutphen has no problem with the canvas being replaced with a roof.

Mr. Sabosik stated it is windy over there.

Mrs. Kasper feels it is a huge encroachment. Everyone should be able to enjoy the water. She also wants to be sure the entire deck is not enclosed.

Mr. Schroeder also feels this is a large encroachment. They are taking a front yard and putting it in the back yard. An open air porch is a luxury not a necessity.

Mrs. Kasper is having an issue because it is on the water.

Mr. Schroeder doesn't see the need.

Mr. Seebald feels the location of the house makes it different.

Mr. Ganim stated the deck is already encroaching.

Mrs. Kasper questioned if it is approved will it be considered building coverage; which would require the applicant to come before the Board again.

Mr. Schroeder replied yes.

Ms. Thomson would like a restriction that it can never be enclosed.

Mr. Sabosik stated that the area is currently covered by fabric which is being ripped. The deck is already there. He would also like a restriction not to increase the use. He wants to treat the homeowner fair and just.

Mrs. Kasper stated it is a permenate structure and he is already encroaching.

Mr. Schroeder stated no one is here complaining.

Mrs. Kasper stated yes but when it is getting built it may look bigger than expected.

Mr. Schroeder stated that it will not affect the views.

Mr. Holman stated that arborvitae is blocking more than the open air porch will.

Mr. Seebald made a motion to approve the application with the following conditions.

The porch will remain an open air porch never to be enclosed with screens or windows.

Mr. Sabosik seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote

Mr. Sabosik-Yes Mr. Sutphen- Yes Ms. Thomson- No Mr. Seebald- Yes
Mr. Ganim- Yes Mrs. Kasper- No Mr. Schroeder- No

Mrs. Kasper stepped down.

09-24-Block 386 Lot 22- Jordan- 2114 Riviera Parkway- Side Yard Setback (7:43-7:47)

Mr. Matthew and Mrs. Alisa Jordan were sworn in.

Mr. Schroeder stated the applicants are proposing a 13 x 16 addition on there home with an existing side yard setback.

Mr. Jordan explained that currently there is a covered patio, which will be removed to install a 13 ½ x 16 room. The material and siding will match the existing home. The hardship is in order to remove the cantilever it would require major construction.

Mr. Holman questioned the height of the structure.

Mr. Jordan replied 15ft.

Mr. Ganim questioned if they were changing the front side.

Mr. Jordan replied they are taking it down it is ugly.

Mr. Sabosik agreed that removing the cantilever will cause numerous problems.

Mr. Jordan stated for aesthetic issues also.

Mr. Schroeder opened the meeting to the public. There was no public input.

Caucus

Mr. Seebald stated the application is cut and dry.

Mr. Schroeder feels it is a good looking addition.

Mr. Ganim made a motion to approve the application, seconded by Mr. Sutphen.

Roll Call Vote

Mr. Sabosik- Yes Mr. Sutphen- Yes Ms. Thomson- Yes Mr. Seebald- Yes

Mr. Ganim- Yes Mr. Scarpello- Yes Mr. Schroeder- Yes

Mrs. Kasper returned.

Mr. Sabosik stepped down.

09-25- Block 354 Lot 1-Stanford & Nersita-1836 Northwest Drive-Certificate of Continuance or Use Variance for Two-Family Dwelling (7:48-8:37)

Mr. Daniel Popovitch, attorney, represented the applicant in this hearing.

Mr. Popovitch explained that the application is for a Certificate of Continuance for a two-family residence built in 1966. According to the ordinance it was properly built as a two-family dwelling.

The following items were marked into evidence:

A-1 Property Record Card

A-7 Ordinance # 337

A-2 Ordinance #81

A-8 H231 Map Re subdivision of the Lots

A-3 Ordinance #71

A- 9 11/10/99 Survey

A-4 Ordinance # 204

A-5 Ordinance # 314

A-6 Ordinance #298

Mr. Popovitch stated that the ordinances were copied from the Ordinance book from an OPRA request.

Mr. Kitrick questioned if the copies were received due to an OPRA request from the Borough.

Mr. Popovitch replied yes.

Mr. Kitrick requested a letter of transmittal from the Clerk's office.

A-10 was marked into evidence, OPRA request returned via fax.

Mr. Kitrick stated that Mr. Popovitch provided a letter of transmittal from the clerk's office requesting copies of the ordinances. Therefore the Board can rely on the information provided from the Clerks office.

Mr. Popovitch referenced Ordinance #81. In 1938 the Borough introduced the first zoning ordinance requiring 4000sq ft to build dwelling houses.

Mr. Popovitch referenced Ordinance #171. In 1955 the square footage was changed to 5000sq ft.

Mr. Popovitch referenced Ordinance #204. In 1958 the borough required 10,000sq ft for 2 family dwellings.

Mr. Popovitch referenced Ordinance #314 which amended ordinance #81.

Mr. Popovitch referenced Ordinance # 298 adopted March 2, 1965 which established a planning board. Planning Board is in charge of Master Plans, Zoning Map and subdivisions.

Mr. Popovitch referenced #337 adopted October 3, 1967, which was a year after the dwelling was constructed.

The purpose of the subdivision map is to show the combining of the two lots which would have been done to legally build the two family dwelling on a conforming lot.

Mr. Popovitch called his first witness Ms. Bohner 1851 Northwest Drive.

Mr. Popovitch asked Ms. Bohner her knowledge of the house.

Ms. Bohner stated that the home was built the same time she built her home in 1966 or 1967. The home was built as a two-family home.

Mr. Popovitch questioned if the use was uninterrupted from 1966-67 – today.

Ms. Bohner replied yes.

Mr. Ganim questioned if she was ever in the home.

Ms. Bohner replied yes.

Mr. Ganim questioned how she entered the home.

Ms. Bohner replied the doors.

Ms. Thomson asked if the doors are in the same location today as they were when the home was built.

Ms. Bohner replied an addition was put on the home and believes one door may have been moved.

Mr. Schroeder questioned if over the years the home has always been a two-family home.

Ms. Bohner replied yes.

Mr. Schroeder opened the meeting to the public. There were no questions for Ms. Bohner.

Mr. Popovitch called Mr. Bowers as a witness, 1836 Northwest Drive, a tenant of the home.

Mr. Popovitch asked Mr. Bowers how long he has been a tenant in the home.

Mr. Bowers replied since 1995.

Mr. Popovitch questioned if the apartment was obviously a separate unit.

Mr. Bowers replied yes.

Mr. Popovitch asked who he originally rented from.

Mr. Bowers replied the Lees.

Mr. Popovitch questioned that if in 1995 there were obviously two separate entrances.

Mr. Bowers replied yes.

Mr. Popovitch asked if there were always two separate tenants.

Mr. Bowers replied yes.

Mr. Ganim asked if he pays his own utilities.

Mr. Bowers stated he pays for his cable, phone and electric is on a separate billing account.

Mr. Ganim asked if there are two gas meters.

Mr. Popovitch asked if he gets a separate electric bill.

Mr. Bowers replied a bill comes for the 1st floor and 2nd floor.

Mr. Ganim questioned if he has his own thermostat.

Mr. Bowers replied yes.

Mr. Ganim questioned what is in the garage.

Mr. Bowers replied a pool table.

Mr. Ganim questioned if there was another dwelling in the garage.

Mr. Bowers replied no.

Mr. Schroeder opened the meeting to the public. There were no questions for Mr. Bowers.

Ms. Thomson questioned if Mrs. Stanford is the second owner of the house.

Mr. Popovitch replied yes.

Mr. Popovitch calls his next witness Mrs. Mary Stanford.

Mr. Popovitch questioned who the home was purchased from.

Mrs. Stanford replied in 1995 from Sally Lees. Mrs. Stanford continued that she purchased the home with her cousin Maureen Nersita. Ms. Nersita was going to retire and move into the home also. Since that never happened, Mrs. Stanford is now looking to sell the home.

Mr. Popovitch asked if there were any records showing the home as a legal two-family home.

Mrs. Stanford believes the attorney had something but he has since passed away. The home was listed as a legal two-family.

Mr. Popovitch questioned the condition of the property when she purchased the home.

Mrs. Stanford stated there were always two entrances and two doorbells. The front door gives the appearance of a normal house.

Mr. Popovitch questioned if they made any improvements to the home.

Mrs. Stanford replied yes.

Mr. Popovitch asked if permits were obtained for the renovations.

A-11 – A14 were marked into evidence, photos of the home.

Mrs. Stanford replied yes.

Mr. Popovitch stated that in 1995 the Borough had a rental property inspection at the site.

A-15 – A-14 were marked into evidence, photos of the home.

Mr. Popovitch asked if the enclosed balcony was completed with permits.

Mrs. Stanford replied yes.

Mr. Popovitch asked if John Wardell inspected the home.

Mrs. Stanford replied she believes so.

Mr. Ganim asked if there are two meters on the property.

Mrs. Stanford replied one gas, one water, two electric meters. There are two heating and air conditioning units.

Mr. Ganim asked if the garage has a separate meter.

Mrs. Stanford replied no.

Mr. Ganim asked if there are any other two-family homes in the neighborhood.

Mrs. Stanford replied no.

Mr. Holman stated that there is a bathroom in the garage. Was the garage ever rented out?

Mrs. Stanford replied no.

Mr. Popovitch questioned if there has been a change to the original footprint.

Mrs. Stanford replied no.

Mr. Schroeder opened the meeting to the public.

Mr. Dominic Pace 1840 Northwest Drive questioned what would happen if the property gets subdivided.

Mr. Ganim replied that would reduce the property to a non- conforming lot.

Mr. Pace also questioned the fence issues on the property.

Mr. Schroeder explains they are code enforcement issues.

Mr. Popovitch stated that there was testimony from Ms. Bohner stating that the home was built in 1966 or 1967 with proper construction as a two-family dwelling. There was no other reason for the lots to be merged. Mr. Popovitch feels the Certificate of Continuance should be granted based on the facts.

Caucus

Mr. Schroeder stated they have verified a long standing two-family dwelling since 1966. Mr. Ganim doesn't agree. He feels the application is poor and the survey stated two story frame dwelling.

Mr. Seebald stated there has been testimony stating that the property has been a two family since 1966.

Mr. Schroeder stated the testimony from the neighbor.

Mr. Seebald stated and all the documents provided.

Mrs. Kasper stated she can understand the meter issue since family was supposed to live there.

Mr. Ganim feels this is an apartment building with two separate residences.

Mr. Seebald stated this is not a mother-daughter. This is a two-family home and always has been.

Mr. Kitrick stated that there was no testimony given that it is not going to continue as a similar use. That may change or could stay the same. It is unknown.

Mr. Holman feels that the way the doors are set up the home wouldn't work well as a one family.

Mr. Sutphen made a motion to approve the application, seconded by Mrs. Kasper.

Roll Call Vote

Mr. Sutphen- Yes Ms. Thomson-Yes Mr. Seebald- Yes Mr. Ganim- No
Mrs. Kasper- Yes Mr. Scarpello- Yes Mr. Schroeder- Yes

**09 -21 Block 306 Lot 62-Christenson- 1656 Center Street- Front Yard Setback
Dormer and Front Yard Setback Roofline Garage (8:40-10:05)**

Mr. Steven Pardes, attorney, represented Mr. John and Mrs. Connie Christenson. Mr. Pardes continued that the garage was subject to fire and the Christenson's would like to convert it to living area. This property is solely residential. The Christenson's have also proposed some dormers. The additions will follow the current footprint of the home. The property has an unusual shape. This is an existing structure which the Christenson's would like to make a residential use.

Mr. Pardes called Kenneth Kwiecinski, architect, was sworn in.

Mr. Pardes asked Mr. Kwiecinski if he was hired by the Christenson's.

Mr. Kwiecinski replied yes.

Mr. Pardes questioned what the applicants wanted to do.

Mr. Kwiecinski stated they would like to convert the garage into living space and will be adding a dormer.

Mr. Pardes questioned why the applicant needs the variance.

Mr Kwiecinski stated the dormer and the garage roofline will fall into the setbacks.

Mr. Pardes asked the objective of the plans.

Mr. Kwiecinski stated for aesthetics, it is a long ranch and this will break it up.

Mr. Pardes asked if the unusual shape of the lot is a hardship for the applicant.

Mr. Kwiecinski replied yes.

Mr. Pardes asked if the aesthetic enhancement to the property would be a detriment to the property, neighborhood or zone plan.

Mr. Kwiecinski stated no, it is a definite improvement to the property.

Mr. Sabosik asked why move it forward.

Mr. Kwiecinski stated it is existing.

Mr. Ganim questioned if there are any changes to the footprint. What can be done to protect them from people driving into the area?

Mrs. Kasper stated maybe a concrete block border can be added across the front plantings.

Mr. Kwiecinski stated they plan to landscape.

Mr. Ganim questioned if there are two garages at the house.

Mr. Kwiecinski replied yes.

Mrs. Kasper asked when the fire happened.

Mr. Pardes stated July 20, 2008.

Mr. Pardes stated there are collectable cars in the garage with a lift. It is a hobby of Mr. Christenson.

A-1 was marked into evidence, picture of a garage with a lift.

Mr. Ganim asked if the new porch will encroach.

Mr. Kwiecinski replied no.

Mr. Seebald questioned if this can be moved to the back of the house.

Mr. Kwiecinski stated they are using the existing footprint of the home.

Mr. Sabosik questioned if they are saving the foundation.

Mr. Kwiecinski replied yes for cost reasons.

Mr. Pardes added they are preserving the water view opposed to the street view.

Mr. Schroeder opened the meeting to the public.

Mr. Thomas DeJong, attorney for the objectors.

Mr. DeJong asked if there are any other plans to remove the fire damaged area without encroaching.

Mr. Kwiecinski stated no, they were going to go up but decided not to.

Mr. DeJong asked if they would take down the damaged area without replacing it.

Mr. Kwiecinski replied no.

Mr. DeJong asked if they were going to raise the concrete for flood elevation.

Mr. Kwiecinski replied it will be brought to the level of the current house.

Mr. Sabosik questioned what material will be used.

Mr. Kwiecinski replied wood framing.

Mrs. Kasper asked if the utility room is going to stay.

Mr. Kwiecinski replied yes.

Mr. Kasper asked if there were plans for a second story.

Mr. Kwiecinski replied no.

Mr. Ganim asked if the new roof will match the existing house.

Mr. Kwiecinski replied yes.

A-2 – A-4 were marked into evidence, exterior photos of the home.

Mr. Pardes had nothing further at this point.

Mr. Schroeder opened the meeting to the public.

Mr. DeJong stated he represented the residents of Center Street.

Mr. Kitrick asked who he represented.

Mr. DeJong stated:
Arnold Gentile & Kate Ginis, 1648 Center Street
Joseph & Mary Fumato, 1650 Center Street
Fredrick & Elizabeth Confessor, 1652 Center Street
Alice Rooney, 1653 Center Street

Mr. DeJong stated that the survey from January 2007 doesn't show the boat lifts or the pavers which would increase the lot coverage.

O-1 Calculations by Kevin Burke
O-2 Survey broken out into sections by Kevin Burke for calculations
O-3 Survey

Mr. Pardes stated that pavers do not count as building coverage.

Mr. Kitrick stated that 0-2 identifies area for lot coverage.

Mr. DeJong stated that there are pavers around the pool.

Mr. Pardes stated pavers do not increase lot coverage.

Mr. DeJong stated that in regards to the non conforming use.

Mr. Pardes stated this application is to rebuild the damaged area. The neighbors are objecting to commercial use of the property. There is no evidence of commercial activity on the property. This is unnecessary for the application. Mr. Christensen has collectable cars as a hobby. He does provide services off site, all work is done off site. He has a boat that is parked at the site occasionally. This information is misleading and beyond the Board.

Mr. DeJong would like to discuss the three businesses being run from the home.

Mr. Kitrick stated that may be but the issue is what is before the Board. The Board is not an enforcement body. The application is for the residential part and it is not relevant to the application.

Mr. DeJong stated that the resolution in 2001 has a clause that reads no commercial activity. Resolution #01-31 page 5 #9. Mr. DeJong stated there are commercial activities being performed at this site.

Mr. Kitrick questioned if the conditions of the 2001 resolution approval have been met. Have there been any violations from the zoning official. Mr. Kitrick also questioned if a permit was issued.

Mr. Pardes stated a permit was issued and there are no violations on file.

Mr. Kitrick stated that you are showing concern for the 2001 resolution. The obligation of the Board ends and no violations have been noted.

Mr. Pardes stated that there are no current violations and there have been no violations after investigations have been conducted. There are no indications of commercial activity.

Mr. DeJong stated that a condition of the 2001 variance was no commercial activity.

Mr. Schroeder asked if they have proof of commercial activity.

Mr. DeJong stated they have proof of businesses on the property and a commercial boat.

Mr. Schroeder stated this has been discussed before.

Mr. Kitrick stated it is not appropriate to visit the application for 2001. Testimony was provided at that time and the variance was granted with conditions. The Board and the Borough have no violations sited. Mr. Kitrick feels that Mr. DeJong is attempting to object based on current commercial activity. This application is strictly a residential application.

Mr. Ganim asked if there is a letter from the zoning officer.

Mr. Pardes replied yes.

A-5 was marked into evidence letter from John Wardell.

Mr. DeJong stated that there are three businesses on the property.

Mr. Kitrick questioned if there are employees.

Mr. Pardes stated Mr. DeJong doesn't show anything. There are no fixed businesses. This is taking a great deal of the Boards time. Mr. Christensen can have 3, 4, or 100 businesses with his home address. The Ordinance permits home businesses. Mr. Pardes also stated that the insurance company conducted an investigation after the fire and they found no commercial activity.

Mr. Ganim stated there are commercial items in the garage.

Mr. Schroeder stated that in order to be fair he would like to have Kevin Burke come to the meeting. This way there is no hear say involved.

Mr. Sutphen doesn't feel Mr. Pardes would perjure himself.

Mr. DeJong stated there should also be a use variance.

Mr. Kitrick stated we are not dealing with the commercial issue now.

Mr. Schroeder opened the meeting to the public.

Ms. Barbara Reid 1656 West End Drive was sworn in. Ms. Reid testified that Mr. Christenson starts a project and it never gets finished. There is still Tyvek flapping in the wind, pavers and trex are sitting around the property. There is no formalized plan for landscaping. There are boats in and out all the time. If the variance is granted it is one more open ended project. He needs to finish what he starts.

Mr. John Keating 1666 West End Drive was sworn in. Mr. Keating stated he has lived there since 2002 and has enjoyed seeing the building process go forward and the house take shape. It is pleasant to look at. The new addition will enhance the entire facility. There is no unusual traffic activity. Mr. Christenson's work is in a boat.

Ms. Gail Destefano 1668 West End Drive was sworn in. Ms. Destefano lives next door to the Keating's. The Christenson's have done a lot of work on the property. The boat is there on occasion. The house is beautiful. Mr. Christenson does projects one thing at a

time. There is no commercial activity. I use a car to get to work, Mr. Christenson uses his boat.

James Giordano 1623 Dorsett Dock Road was sworn in. Mr. Giordano stated that there is a resolution from 2001 from the Board stating that no commercial enterprise shall exist be carried on or be furthered at this site. Mr. Giordano stated that there has been testimony stating that commercial activity comes into this home periodically

Mr. Ganim questioned what determines commercial activity.

Mr. Giordano stated the Board needs to enforce its own resolution.

Mr. Kitrick stated he did not hear testimony about commercial activity. He heard testimony of the boat being docked there.

Mr. Giordano feels the applicant needs to apply for a use variance.

Mr. Pardes stated then everyone with a commercial vehicle can't park their car at their home.

Mrs. Kasper stated that what if a person came home with an engineering truck; they wouldn't be able to park at their home.

Mr. Giordano stated no, based on the resolution.

Caucus

Mr. Schroeder stated that the Board could vote on this tonight but he doesn't think the residents or applicant will get a fair shake. Mr. Schroeder would like to table this until next meeting and get Kevin Burke to attend.

Mr. Sabosik would like Kevin to have an itemized time log.

Mr. Kitrick would like each attorney to be prepared. He would also like the applicant to testify. The objector's attorney needs to bring documentation to the Board.

Mr. Pardes requested the hearing to be carried to the Boards commercial night July 15, 2009.

Mr. Seebald made a motion to carry the application to July 15, 2009, seconded by Mr. Sabosik.

Roll Call Vote

Mr. Sabosik-Yes	Mr. Sutphen- Yes	Ms. Thomson-Yes	Mr. Seebald- Yes
Mr. Ganim-Yes	Mrs. Kasper-Yes	Mr. Schroeder-Yes	

Resolutions

09-07- Block 171 Lot 2- Nolan- 821 Beaver Dam Road

Mr. Sutphen made a motion to memorialize the resolution, seconded by Mr. Sabosik

Roll Call Vote

Mr. Sabosik – Yes	Mr. Sutphen – Yes	Mr. Seebald - Yes	Mr. Schroeder- Yes
-------------------	-------------------	-------------------	--------------------

09-17- Block 376 Lot 4- Gilmore- 2205 Christine Court

09-18-Block 128 Lot 13-Christopher Hall Construction Specialties, Inc.-1153

Ridgefield Drive

09-19- Block 127 Lot 17- Kingman- 903 Ocean Road

09-20- Block 139 Lot 8- Benol- 1212 Lister Street

Mr. Sutphen made a motion to memorialize the resolutions, seconded by Mr. Sabosik.

Roll Call Vote

Mr. Sabosik- Yes	Mr. Sutphen- Yes	Mr. Seebald – Yes	Mr. Ganim – Yes
Mrs. Kasper- Yes	Mr. Schroeder- Yes		

Vouchers

King, Kitrick & Jackson, LLC

O'Brien v. PPBOA-\$1191 Sislian-\$288.75

McKeever- \$247.50 O & G, LLC-\$206.25

Motion to pay made by Mr. Sutphen, seconded by Mrs. Kasper. All were in favor.

Remington, Vernick & Vena

Rollano/ Rielly- \$570

Motion to pay made by Mr. Ganim, seconded by Mr. Sabosik. All were in favor.

Mr. Seebald made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Sabosik. All were in favor.

The meeting adjourned at 10:09

Respectfully submitted,

Sharon Bestine

Zoning Board Secretary