

Mr. Popovitch asked if they purchased the home as a two family dwelling.

Ms. Chin replied yes.

Mr. Popovitch asked if the home was used as a two family dwelling for investment reasons.

Ms. Chin replied yes.

Mr. Jackson asked if the home has separate meters.

Mr. Popovitch replied yes.

A-2 was marked into evidence. MLS listing from 1989.

Mr. Popovitch asked if the home was taxed as a two family dwelling with separate water and sewer bills since at least 1989.

Ms. Chin replied yes.

Mr. Popovitch had copies of random water and sewer bills referring to apartment 1 and apartment 2.

A-3 was marked into evidence, random water and sewer bills.

Mr. Popovitch asked if she questioned if the home was a valid two family residence when she purchased the home.

Ms. Chin replied no.

Mr. Popovitch asked Ms. Chin to explain the interior of the home.

Ms. Chin replied there is a unit downstairs and upstairs.

Mr. Popovitch asked if there are separate kitchens, living quarters and if there are separate locked entrances.

Ms. Chin replied yes.

Mr. Popovitch asked when the meters were installed.

Ms. Chin stated that according to JCP&L the second meter was installed in 1965.

A-4 was marked into evidence. Letter from JCP&L.

Mr. Popovitch asked if any improvements were made to the home since she owned it.

Ms. Chin stated she has replaced the water heaters and boilers.

Mr. Popovitch questioned if each unit is serviced separately.

Ms. Chin replied yes.

Mr. Popovitch asked if she obtained permits for the work.

Ms. Chin replied yes.

Mr. Popovitch questioned how long ago the work was done.

Ms. Chin replied 2-3 years ago. She stated she also installed central air in 2003.

Mr. Popovitch asked if anyone from the town questioned if the home was a legal two family while inspecting the work.

Ms. Chin replied no.

Mr. Popovitch asked how this issue came about.

Ms. Chin stated she wanted to put her house on the market as a two family home and Mr. Burke told to she had to come before the Board.

Mr. Popovitch asked if she lives downstairs.

Ms. Chin replied yes.

Mr. Popovitch asked if she has rented the house out since Mr. Burke brought this to her attention.

Ms. Chin replied no.

Mr. Popovitch stated his client didn't want to be in violation.

Mr. Popovitch had no further questions for Ms. Chin.

There were no public questions for Ms. Chin.

Mr. Ganim asked Ms. Chin to describe the upstairs.

Ms. Chin stated there are two bedrooms, living area and a kitchen.

Mr. Ganim asked her to describe the downstairs.

Ms. Chin replied there are two bedrooms, full kitchen, dining area and a living room.

Mr. Popovitch called Mr. Steven Schwab as his next witness.

Mr. Stephen Schwab 1100 Trenton Avenue was sworn in.

Mr. Popovitch asked if he was here at the request of Ms. Chin.

Mr. Schwab replied yes.

Mr. Popovitch asked how long he has lived in his home.

Mr. Schwab replied since 1955.

Mr. Popovitch asked if 1106 Trenton Avenue was a single family or a two family home.

Mr. Schwab replied a two family house. There were no ordinances in those days.

Mr. Schroeder asked if it was a two family home in 1955.

Mr. Schwab replied yes.

Mr. Popovitch asked if the home was always a two family.

Mr. Schwab stated he has always considered it a two family.

Mr. Ganim asked if there has ever been a problem with the home operating as a two family such as parking on the street or disturbances.

Mr. Schwab replied no it is a nice area.

Mr. Ganim asked if there are any other two families on the street.

Mr. Schwab replied yes. There are houses with garage apartments.

There were no public questions for Mr. Schwab.

Mr. Popovitch called his last witness.

Ms. Donna Rafferty 859 Arnold Avenue was sworn in.

Mr. Popovitch asked if she was familiar with the property and how.

Ms. Rafferty replied she rented an apartment from 1996-2003.

Mr. Popovitch asked if Ms. Chin and her husband owned the property while she lived there and where did she live.

Ms. Rafferty replied yes and she rented the downstairs apartment and people would come and go in the upstairs apartment.

Mr. Popovitch asked if she ever questioned if it was a valid two family.

Ms. Rafferty replied no it was a two family home.

There were no public questions for Ms. Rafferty.

Mr. Popovitch stated there has been testimony of reliable witness stating that the home was a two family dwelling in 1955 which was before the 1958 ordinance. It was probably a lot looser than it is today. The testimony alone is valid to show the two family use. If the Board has any doubt about granting the variance the taxes have been paid as a two family since 1973. His client has owned the property for twenty years. Mr. Popovitch asked the Board to grant a Certificate of Continuance or grant a use variance for the two family use. This application does not impact the zone plan or zoning ordinance. There have been no problems with parking on the street. Lastly, there are no neighbors here to complain.

Mr. Schroeder asked Mr. Jackson if either decision would protect the applicant equally.

Mr. Jackson replied the Certificate of Continuance is stronger because it shows the pre-existing use.

Mr. Ganim asked Mr. Popovitch to explain why the property record card from 1973 shows an assessment jump from 1972 \$14,100 1973 \$24,200.

Mr. Popovitch replied it is hard to say there could have been an increase in value or an in house re- assessment.

Caucus

Mr. Schroeder stated that it is quite obvious by testimony that this home has operated as a two family since 1955. There is documentation from the power company stating there have been two meters since 1965. There is sufficient evidence that this has long been a two family home.

Mr. Ganim questioned if in the future the owner wanted to do an addition to the property would they have to come back before the Board.

Mr. Jackson replied yes because it would be an expansion of a non-conforming use.

Mr. Sutphen made a motion to approve the application for a Certificate of a Non-Conforming Use, seconded by Mr. Seebald.

Roll Call Vote

Mr. Sutphen- Yes Mr. Sabosik- Yes Mr. Seebald- Yes Mr. Ganim- Yes
Mr. Plum- Yes Mr. Scarpello- Yes Mr. Schroeder- Yes

Mrs. Kasper arrived at 7:36.

09-39- Helb- Block 27 Lot 4- 98 River Ave- Rear Yard Setback & Interpretation of Ordinance(7:36-10:04)

Mr. Joseph Brennan Jr., attorney, represented the applicants Mr. and Mrs. Helb.

Mr. Brennan explained that they are here for an interpretation of the ordinance for the rear yard of properties along the Manasquan River and if necessary a rear yard variance. Mr. Helb is a licensed engineer, planner and surveyor.

Mr. Helb was sworn in as an applicant and an expert.

Mr. Jackson paused at the fact that the applicant and the expert are one of the same.

The Board accepted the witness as an expert.

Mr. Schroeder asked if they were looking for the interpretation first.

Mr. Brennan replied yes.

Mr. Jackson wanted the applicant to state what they wanted the Board to interpret.

Mr. Helb replied that the property is unique. It is one of nine out of sixty nine lots along the river that have frontage on the street and the river. The ordinance reads that lots on the river have to have 75ft of lot width. The ordinance is specific that lot width is the distance measured horizontally between the side lot lines therefore there is no rear yard.

Mr. Jackson stated that ordinance 19-3 page 1926 states that front shall mean an open unoccupied space extending the full width of the lot situated by a setback line and a street right of way of that lot.

Mr. Brennan stated they are looking at ordinance 19.63B pg 1934.1 lots fronting the Manasquan River shall have a lot width not less than 75ft.

Mr. Jackson questioned what he wanted the Board to do in terms of interpreting the ordinance.

Mr. Helb replied the interpretation of the building inspector is rear yard is rear yard. He is interpreting it as a side yard.

A-1 Survey dated 9/1/2009 was marked into evidence.

Mr. Helb explained that the lot width definitions stated side yard lot line to side yard lot line. Mr. Helb replied 75ft is required and he has 100ft. It is a side yard not a rear yard.

Mr. Jackson stated that zoning officer states front yard is defined by street.

Mr. Helb replied lot width is measured from side yard to side yard. This has to be a side yard.

Mr. Seebald stated either way there is something in violation.

Mr. Schroeder replied the applicant is stating that the front yard is the front yard and the rear yard is the side yard and there is no rear yard.

Mr. Helb replied it is the side yard. This is uniquely laid out out lot, 9 lots out of 69 on the Manasquan River have the same issue.

Mr. Jackson asked what he does with the 10ft setback on that part of the property.

Mr. Helb replied nothing.

Mr. Jackson asked what the neighbor does with the property.

Mr. Helb stated the neighbors have trees.

Mr. Jackson asked if normal backyard activities are conducted on the river side.

Mr. Helb replied yes.

Mr. Jackson stated this is a unique situation.

Mr. Ganim questioned when the property was subdivided in 1994 what did he identify as the side yard and the rear yard.

Mr. Helb replied the Planning Board determined the rear yard and granted a variance for a 10.46ft rear yard setback.

Mr. Jackson stated that maybe the Board should hear the variance first.

Mr. Holman questioned that there is no rear yard.

Mr. Jackson stated that once the Board interprets an ordinance it is binding on the zoning officer.

Mr. Sabosik stated the word frontage is ambiguous. It doesn't mean that is the front yard.

Mr. Ganim stated it identifies the location and reduces the building coverage and the lot coverage.

Mr. Jackson stated that the applicant is prepared to go forward with the variance application.

Mr. Schroeder stated if the Board deems it is a pre-existing non-conforming structure it can't be expanded without a variance.

Mr. Jackson read the denial letter from Mr. Burke.

Mr. Seebald asked if they were touching the main house.

Mr. Helb stated that the main house is remaining the same and the garage meets the front yard setback and the side yard setback. They also meet building and lot coverage.

Mr. Jackson read ordinance 1973 which states that a non-conforming building may be altered only upon application to the Board of Adjustments.

Mr. Holman questioned if it is possible for a lot not to have a rear yard.

Mr. Schroeder responded that according to the zoning officer there is a rear yard somewhere. An exception may be a flag lot along the river.

Mr. Jackson respectfully requested the applicant to make the application for the variance.

Mr. Brennan replied they will not withdraw the interpretation but will leave it at this point.

Mr. Schroeder asked the applicant to move forward with the proposal.

A-3 was marked into evidence. The photos were number 1-6.

#1 shows the existing two story structure from the front.

#2 is from the river looking at the two story structure.

#3 is a picture of the side yard showing the area between the house and the neighbor to the east. That is the area that has the 10.64ft separating the structure to the property line.

Mr. Ganim stated you are calling that the side but that is what the Board is calling the rear.

Mr. Jackson asked if the bulk would be increasing due the addition.

Mr. Helb replied no.

Mr. Brennan stated the side of the house will not be extended in any way.

Mr. Jackson asked if there will be any addition windows, views or balconies.

Mr. Helb referred to picture #2 stating that the entire second story will be removed and there will be a balcony across the back of the home. Mr. Helb stated the current height of the structure is 30ft and they are increasing it to 31.5ft.

Mr. Helb further explained that picture #4 shows the corner where the new garage would be towards the river, which meets all the setback requirements.

#5 is a head on picture where the garage will be placed. There is tremendous amount of wind and rain that comes from the river they need to enter the house from the garage.

#6 shows the side which separates his home and 100 River Ave. The addition will not encroach any further than the existing setback of 10.64ft. They are moving the side entrance to the rear of the home and they are not putting in a sidewalk on that side of the home.

A-4 was marked into evidence a site plan dated 10/7/09.

Mr. Helb explained that all other stipulations required by the zoning district are met.

Mr. Seebald asked if he was considering both side yards setbacks.

Mr. Helb replied yes it is a corner lot.

Mr. Seebald stated something has to be a rear yard. You need a variance on one side or the other.

Mr. Helb replied in his mind it is a diminimus variance from its impact to the zone plan or the master plan.

Mr. Seebald stated there is a rear yard setback somewhere.

Mr. Brennan replied they are going ahead with the variance application.

Mr. Schroeder stated Mr. Helb feels if we interpret the ordinance his way he wouldn't have to be here. There would be no rear yard all side yard.

Mr. Jackson said or you could agree with Mr. Burke.

Mr. Sabosik asked if there was an elevation that showed the front of the house.

A-5 North - South elevation of the property was marked into evidence.

A-6 East - West Elevation was marked into evidence.

Mr. Schroeder asked where the air conditioning units are placed.

Mr. Helb replied they meet all setbacks.

Mr. Schroeder stated yes but your neighbor has a wrap around porch. How will it impact your neighbor?

Mr. Helb felt it would have a minimal impact.

Mr. Sabosik questioned the height of the attic.

Mr. Helb replied it is unfinished with a normal height of 7ft.

Mr. Ganim asked if there are windows in the garage.

Mr. Helb replied there are only windows in the garage door. He has very little storage and they need space for bikes and kayaks.

Mr. Sabosik questioned if he was coming out 12-15ft past the existing porch.

Mr. Helb replied yes.

A-6 shows the east west elevation which gives a view from River Ave.

Mr. Schroeder asked what he was doing with the trees.

Mr. Helb stated the trees in the front will be removed and replanted.

Mr. Schroeder asked if he would be willing to remove the trees.

Mr. Helb stated that is not part of the application.

Mr. Brennan stated that would hate to have a condition imposed to remove trees in this green society.

Mr. Helb stated there are other trees on the property that are 40-50 years old. The trees help shade the property in the summer.

Mr. Ganim asked it was necessary to keep the shed now that he will have garage.

Mr. Helb stated he has very little storage and he does use the shed for storage of patio furniture.

Mr. Sutphen wanted to question the portion of the garage that will block the neighbors view.

Mr. Helb replied the neighbor can't see the river except through his property. His neighbor's setback on his porch matches the setback for the garage. There is not a view easement on the property. Mr. Helb stated he has riverfront property and his neighbor does not. He also stated that he identified the garage as part of his Planning Board application in 1994.

Mr. Sutphen stated that the neighbors view will be cut off from the garage.

Mr. Helb replied yes.

Mr. Sabosik asked if he went into the complexity with the Planning Board concerning the garage.

Mr. Helb replied there was a drawing submitted which showed where the garage would be built.

Mr. Jackson asked if he had any streetscape photos that would show the plantings at the present condition.

Mr. Helb replied that is not part of this application.

Mr. Helb stated picture #6 shows some of the trees. Mr. Helb stated there are 50-60ft oak trees on his property which block his view but the trees provide shade. His neighbor has trees that are 30ft high blocking his view up the river.

Mr. Jackson stated maybe the Board should wait to see what the neighbor says.

Mr. Sabosik questioned if he was going to have a three zone air conditioning unit.

Mr. Helb replied yes for economy reasons. They are modern units that meet all noise ordinance requirements.

Mr. Sabosik asked if they will all be the same tonnage.

Mr. Helb replied no.

Mr. Scarpello questioned the efficiency level on the air conditioning units.

Mr. Helb replied 15.

Mr. Ganim stated all of the windows are going to be replaced; hardy board is going to be installed and a new roof.

Mr. Helb replied yes.

Mr. Ganim asked if the driveway would be stamped concrete.

Mr. Helb replied yes to match the existing walks.

Mr. Ganim asked if he was going to install a rail on the rear deck.

Mr. Helb stated it is not required by code.

Mr. Ganim stated this is a beautiful plan.

Mr. Helb state he plans to retire here. He loves Point Pleasant and wants to improve his property.

Mrs. Kasper asked if the existing house on the east side is one or two stories.

Mr. Helb replied two stories

Mrs. Kasper asked if he knew the existing height.

Mr. Helb stated it is just over thirty feet.

Mrs. Kasper questioned if the house at 100 River Ave went as far back as the proposed house.

Mr. Helb replied no they have a rear yard.

Mr. Helb explained that the uniqueness of his property is this is one of nine lots along the river with this type of lot. Mr. Helb further stated that he is requesting two diminimus variances.

Mr. Jackson stated he wouldn't call it diminimus you are proposing 10.64ft where 30ft is required.

Mr. Helb stated they are not aggravating the setbacks. Mr. Helb feels it meets the requirements of the zone plan, its location is unique and the structure is unique where it sits on the lot. The variance is justifiable.

Mr. Brennan asked if he felt it would be a detriment to the public.

Mr. Helb replied no.

Mr. Brennan asked if he is improving the interior layout of the home.

Mr. Helb replied yes. He will use the second story now and later in life they will use the first floor.

Mr. Sabosik question if Mr. Helb took a survey showing that he is one of nine properties with this type of lot and if he had that information with him.

Mr. Helb replied yes.

Mr. Jackson asked if he could state some of the addresses.

Mr. Ganim asked if there was any other location for the garage.

Mr. Helb replied no.

Mr. Brennan stated the plan was made to make it a diminimus variance.

Mr. Helb stated some of the block and lot numbers of other properties along the river with the same problem. 27/4 27/7 9/51 20/1 112/64

Mr. Sabosik asked if all of the homes on those lots are configured the same as his house.

Mr. Helb replied yes. Mr. Helb stated he has been working on the plans for four years.

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

Mr. Schroeder opened the meeting for public comments.

Mr. Charles Zulla 100 River Ave was sworn in. Mr. Zulla explained that he had purchased the home about 6 ½ years ago as a long term investment. Mr. Zulla stated that the plans are beautiful. His personal issue would be the view from his property. His home was constructed with a second floor balcony, which is on the side of the Helb's property, and a wrap around porch to have open views of the river. His view from the side porch is going to be a very long house. Mr. Zulla stated he is not sure if that is the best place for the air-conditioning because his porch does have double side doors which they leave open. He would like the Board to consider preserving his view. Mr. Zulla stated that in 1997 Mr. Helb was denied a 6ft fence. He has since put in plantings which create a living barrier.

Mr. Jackson asked if he wanted to have his photos marked into evidence.

Z-1 is from his front yard looking toward the river.

Z-2 shows the view from street showing plantings.

Z-3 is the view of the river from the porch.

Mr. Jackson asked if the house was constructed would that obstruct your view of the river.

Mr. Zulla replied yes.

Mrs. Kasper asked if from the second story balcony if can they see the river.

Mr. Zulla replied no he currently has no view.

Mr. Ganim asked if he new about the garage was presented in 1994 Planning Board application.

Mr. Zulla replied no.

Mr. Ganim asked if he can see the river beach from his porch.

Mr. Zulla replied yes.

Mr. Ganim stated his view is really looking down River Road.

Mr. Sabosik stated the garage would affect the porch view.

Mr. Holman stated that he will still have a river view.

Mr. Seebald stated he doesn't live on the river.

Z-4 was marked into evidence a diagram of what is planted on the property and where.

Mr. Jackson asked Mr. Zulla what he thinks the Board should do.

Mr. Zulla replied restrict the garage construction and the length of the structure. It is tremendous. If the trees weren't there he wouldn't mind as much.

Mr. Jackson asked if some kind of view easement was put in place would that be something to mitigate your concerns.

Mr. Zulla replied yes.

Mr. Ganim asked if the shed blocked his view.

Mr. Zulla replied no.

Mr. Brennan stated that if the applicant didn't make the renovation he could plant trees or shrubs which would in turn block the view.

Mr. Schroeder questioned why Mr. Helb would do that.

Mr. Brennan stated that Mr. Zulla is complaining that he doesn't have a view but legally they can plant trees.

Caucus

Mr. Schroeder stated this is a very difficult application. There was also a request to interpretation the ordinance. Mr. Schroeder feels that the zoning officer made the correct decision but he does agree with Mr. Helb that the rear yard functions as a side yard.

Mr. Ganim made a motion to validate Kevin's decision that the east portion of the yard is the rear yard, seconded by Mr. Sutphen.

Roll Call Vote

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

Mr. Schroeder stated that the Board now has an application before them to approve a non-conforming use.

Mr. Sutphen stated his opinion is after reviewing the plan and design that it is too much house for that area. His first impression was it was too much for where they want to put it.

Mr. Sabosik stated that besides the fact that the size is huge for the lot Mr. Zulla has to look at 60ft of house that is 32ft high.

Mrs. Kasper has a problem with the orientation of the house. It is blocking anybody else's ability for open air and open space.

Mr. Sabosik stated the neighbor has a double door on his patio and the applicant is proposing three air conditioning units on that side of the house.

Mr. Ganim questioned how they could say it is too big for the lot. He is allowed 20% and proposing 15% of lot coverage.

Mr. Sabosik replied he is taking full use where he has a rear yard of 10ft off the property line. He is going to have a 32ft house, which is huge for anyone next door to him.

Mr. Schroeder stated he is expanding a currently non-conforming use.

Mr. Ganim stated he already has a second story that is not going to change anything.

Mr. Jackson advised the Board to be careful stating a house is too big when it is under lot coverage. The comments are not off base because you are concerned with where house is being developed on this lot. The applicants argument is this is a unique lot and he needs relief.

Mr. Schroeder stated he is concerned with the design of the home.

Mrs. Kasper issue is he already has 40ft which he can build in. Now he is taking the 40ft and shifting it back he is taking advantage. He is taking away there light, air and space of other neighbors.

Mr. Ganim stated the only change in the footprint is the garage. The house is there.

Mr. Seebald stated he is concerned with the back roofline. There is now 20ft of non-conforming house on this lot. Mr. Seebald feels 60ft of house is a lot to look at.

Mr. Sabosik stated it is currently not a full two story house. They are expanding the non-conforming use.

Mr. Jackson spoke with the applicant's attorney and they would consider removing the trees or providing a view easement.

Mr. Schroeder has mixed feelings. It is a huge expansion of a non-conforming use.

Mr. Seebald would not have a problem if the garage wasn't bumped out and it is too much length.

Mr. Plum feels the garage is too big.

Mr. Brennan thinks there may be a misinterpretation of the second floor. The envelope of the second floor is not changing except for the garage. It is height of the second floor is 30 ft and it is going to 31.5 ft.

Mr. Schroeder stated you are making it higher and increasing the non-conformity.

Mr. Helb stated there will be less square footage. The roofline is less volume in that area.

Mr. Schroeder stated the Board has the right to decide what is appropriate for the neighborhood.

Mr. Schroeder thanked Mr. Helb.

Mr. Seebald doesn't like the garage area.

Mr. Seebald made a motion to deny, seconded by Mr. Sabosik.

Roll Call Vote

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

09-40- Manning- Block 223 Lot 5- 1210 Curtis Avenue- Front Yard Setback (10:06-10:17)

Mr. Larry LaMore, builder and Ms. June Manning, applicant were sworn in.

Mr. Schroeder stated that the application is requesting to build a second story over basically the existing footprint. However, the front yard is in violation, 24.57ft is proposed where 25ft is required. Mr. Schroeder asked Mr. LaMore if there was anything he could do to comply.

Mr. LaMore stated he left the bump out in order to give the house design.

Mr. Schroeder questioned the siding on the second floor.

Mr. LaMore replied they would be residing the entire home.

Mr. Seebald stated the application is cut and dry.

Mr. Ganim stated the porch is in violation. They are proposing 16.6ft where 19ft is required.

Mrs. Kasper asked if there is an overhang on the porch already.

Mr. LaMore replied no.

Mr. Holman questioned if the porch is covered now.

Mr. LaMore replied no.

Mr. Sabosik asked if they were adding the roof for aesthetic reasons.

Mr. LaMore replied yes.

Mrs. Kasper asked if there were other homes on the street that have porches that protrude out.

Ms. Manning replied yes.

Mr. Ganim stated a variance is needed for the porch. The applicant is proposing 16.6 ft where 19ft is required.

Mrs. Kasper stated the Board needs to address the porch.

Mr. Jackson stated that proper notice was given for the Board to grant the variance.

Mr. Holman stated the porch is 2 ½ ft in violation.

Mr. Ganim asked if they wouldn't mind agreeing to never enclosing the porch.

Ms. Manning replied she only wants a roof.

Caucus

Mr. Schroeder does not see any problems with the application.

Mr. Sabosik stated the Board needs to address the covered porch.

There was no public remaining in the audience to comment.

Mr. Seebald made a motion to approve the application as submitted and a variance for a covered porch which is never to be enclosed, second by Mr. Sabosik.

Roll Call Vote

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

Resolutions

09-21- Christenson- Block 306 Lot 62- 1656 Center Street- Reconsideration of Board's prior denial

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

Roll Call Vote

Mr. Sutphen- Yes Mr. Sabosik- Yes Mr. Seebald- Yes
Mr. Ganim-Yes Mr. Scarpello- Yes

09-33- Losa- Block 18 Lot 52- 2605 Herbertsville Road- Height of an Accessory Structure

Mr. Seebald made a motion to memorialize the resolution, seconded by Mr. Ganim.

Roll Call Vote

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

09-34- D'Ambrosia- Block 255 Lot 2- 1002 Meli Drive- Lot Coverage, Building Coverage & Rear Yard Setback

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

Roll Call Vote

Mr. Sutphen- Yes Mr. Sabosik- Yes Mr. Seebald- Yes Mr. Ganim- Yes
Mr. Plum- Yes Mr. Schroeder- Yes

09-36- Osborn- Block 27 Lot 6- 105 Maxson Avenue- Side Yard Setback & Lot Coverage

Mr. Seebald made a motion to memorialize the resolution, seconded by Mr. Ganim.

Roll Call Vote

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

09-37- Jennings- Block 316 Lot 10- 2428 Bridge Avenue- Use Variance

Mr. Seebald made a motion to memorialize the resolution, seconded by Mr. Ganim.

Roll Call Vote

Mr. Sutphen- Yes Mr. Sabosik- Yes Mr. Seebald- Yes Mr. Ganim- Yes
Mr. Seakan- Yes Mrs. Kasper- Yes Mr. Scarpello- Yes

Vouchers

King, Kitrick & Jackson, LLC

Jordan- \$250.80

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

Ocean Star

Fayad- \$12.26 Christenson- \$14.25
Grace- \$7.78 Damerau- \$7.78

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

Requisitions:

Fayad- \$175.24
Grace- \$185.97

Motion to pay was made by Mr. Sutphen, 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 10:24pm

Respectfully submitted,

Sharon Bestine
Zoning Board Secretary