

**MINUTES OF THE  
SPRING LAKE PLANNING BOARD  
September 14, 2016**

The regular meeting of the Spring Lake Planning Board was held on the above date at 7:05 PM in the Municipal Building, 423 Warren Avenue, Spring Lake, NJ. Chairman Nicholas Sapnar called the meeting to order, led everyone in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag and announced that this meeting is being held in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act and adequate notice has been published and posted per Chapter 231 P.L. 1975.

The Board Secretary called the roll for attendance. Present were Joseph Rizzo, Larry Iannaccone, Michael Burke, Walter Judge, Matt Sagui, Melissa Smith-Goldstein, Lisa DeBerardine, Stuart Patterson, Mary Ann Rooney and Chairman Nicholas Sapnar.

Resolution #21-2016 O'Connor/Godfrey

Motion by Sapnar, seconded by Judge to approve Resolution #21-2016 as amended. On a roll call Board Members Burke, Judge, Sagui, Goldstein, DeBerardine, and Sapnar voted Aye. Rizzo, Iannaccone Patterson, and Rooney Abstained. None No. Motion carried.

Resolution #22-2016 Rabin/Genieser

Motion by Sapnar, seconded by Judge to approve Resolution #22-2016. On a roll call Board Members Rizzo, Burke, Judge, Sagui, Goldstein, DeBerardine, Sapnar voted Aye. Iannaccone, Paterson, Rooney Abstained. None No. Motion carried.

Motion by Judge, seconded by Burke that the minutes the July 13, 2016 regular meeting be adopted. On a roll call all members vote Aye. None No. Motion carried.

CAL#7-2016 Valentine

408 Mercer Ave  
Block 60 Lot 18

Leonard Valentine, applicant, was sworn in. They have been full time residents since last October. They previously owned at the Hewitt-Wellington. They are proposing to renovate the garage. It is currently very unsightly. The garage will be reduced in size from 1,100 square feet to less than half of that.

Brendan McHugh, Architect, was sworn in and accepted. Items were marked into evidence. The Valentine's were excited about having a large garage. There were two reasons why they did not propose to keep the structure the way it was and renovate. It was a commercial garage and it is an eyesore in the neighborhood. They wanted it to fit into the neighborhood. They brought the size down to less than 500 square feet of garage and 100 square feet of storage on the side. They would give it an historic look with two gables and carriage house doors. The current structure impedes on what would otherwise be a nice rear yard. This garage is 1.6 feet off the property line and the garage of the neighbor to the rear is 1.7 feet off the property line. The overhang will be very close to the property line. The shingles do not currently match the main house but they will be renovating or

building new and will match the shingles. They are trying to save 4.4 feet of the rear yard that they would lose if they were to build a conforming garage.

Property owner from behind asked about gutters. There will be gutters.

Ray Carpenter, was sworn and accepted as an engineer. There was a discussion of the 50% rule for restoration. They are trying to bring the size of the garage and the area of the driveway into conformance. They will put gutters and leaders on the garage and totally eliminate any runoff from the new structure, which will eliminate the sizeable runoff from the existing garage. They could go with a "cape cod gutter", which sits flush with the wall and maintain the 1.6 foot setback. Current garage is 30.25 feet by 34.13 feet in depth, which will be reduced to 22.5 feet and 22.5 in depth. There is a fence on the rear of the property that runs to the structure. There was a discussion of property maintenance concerns. There will be a wood curb to define the edge of the driveway. There is an easement.

Mr. McHugh summarized options derived from Board input. They will reduce the eaves and remove the fence. He requested time to discuss additional changes with his client and it was granted. They offered to remove the rear wall and meeting the 6 foot rear setback. The only variance would be the side yard of 1.6 feet with the eave removed.

Mr. Valentine stated that they have a six car garage that they could renovate as is. They are trying to be better neighbors and improve the structure.

Alan Ferraro, 409 West Lake, was sworn in. He owns the cottage on the rear of their property that is directly behind the garage. Anything would be a great improvement. If the back wall were to come down, he would be in favor of the project.

Discussion of leaving an accessory structure, when the primary structure is demolished ensued.

Motion by Judge, seconded by Burke to go into caucus. All members voted Aye. None No. Motion carried.

Motion by Judge, seconded by Burke to come out of caucus. All members voted Aye. None No. Motion.

Motion by Judge, seconded by Sagui to deny the application. On a roll call Board Members Rizzo, Iannaccone, Burke, Judge, Sagui, Goldstein, DeBerardine, Patterson, Rooney and Sapnar voted Aye. None No. Motion carried.

CAL#8-2016 Mancuso  
309 Worthington Ave  
Block 117 Lot 5  
Carried from August 10, 2016

Michael Rubino, applicant's attorney, submitted items into evidence. He explained that Mrs. Mancuso has owned the property for 22 years. The house is about 60 years old. They wanted to be totally conforming. They were surprised to find out that there is a very high water table. They need variances

for the drywells. The Board Engineer and the applicant's engineer found additional run off to be addressed and that created additional variances.

Therese Mancuso loves Spring Lake and has been involved in the community. The current house is choppy and renovation would be difficult. They do not get any water in the half basement in the front of the house.

Charles E. Lindstrom, Engineer & Planner, was sworn and accepted. There is a two foot drop from the street to the rear of the property. Soil boring revealed that the water table in the front is 71 inches and behind the patio it is three feet down. In order to get enough capacity for the house, we need to get within 6.8 feet of the house, where 10 is required. They do meet the side setback and the front setback. In consultation with Mr. Hilla, they looked at raising the front porch so that in effect it would be 10 feet from the chamber. Mr. Hilla gave an alternative of moving the chamber closer to the front setback. Mr. Hilla stated that the further from the house the better. This would change the variance to 6.8 feet to the front setback instead of the house. They looked at changing grade but there would be multiple variances and retaining walls. They will be raising the grade on some parts of the property as much as 1 foot. They have added a retaining wall on the southwest corner and a yard drain. The goal is to contain all water on the property. The wall ends at the neighbors driveway, which is right on the property line and might effect there driveway if it continued. Mr. Hilla stated that they are making two efforts to contain the water—"belt and suspenders". This is a reasonable solution from both engineering and planning standpoint. It will not be visible to neighbors. They also have capacity for patio and driveway. They cannot reduce the water table to provide irrigation.

Brian Berzinskis, Architect, was sworn and accepted. The height of the crawl space will be the same height as the half basement and that had no water. Everything is conforming.

Discussion of the prohibition on retaining walls.

Motion by Judge, seconded by Burke go into caucus. All Board Members voted Aye. None No. Motion carried.

Motion by Judge, seconded by Burke to come out of caucus. All members voted Aye. None No. Motion.

Motion by Sapnar, seconded by Judge to approve the application with the revision to move the cistern toward the front so that it will be 10 feet from the house. On a roll call Board Members Rizzo, Iannaccone, Burke, Judge, Sagui, Goldstein, DeBerardine, Patterson, Rooney and Sapnar voted Aye. None No. Motion carried.

PASL(Preservation Alliance of Spring Lake) updated their proposal to incorporate the comments of the Planning Board Members. Motion by Sapnar, seconded by Rizzo that a letter be drafted and sent to the Council that this would be a benefit to the Community and should be explored further. All Board Member voted Aye. None No. Motion carried.

Discussion of non-conforming accessory structures occurred. The Zoning Officer has read the current ordinance to allow a house to be demolished and an accessory structure, whether it is conforming or not, would be allowed to remain. Board Members stated that a conforming accessory structure should

be allowed to remain. The Board wants the ordinance to be clear that when a new construction plan is submitted all structures should be conforming unless a variance is obtained.

The Board discussed Ordinance 225-20 (A) Non-Conforming Lots, Structures, and Uses. The wording includes "basement", which has denied some homeowners the ability to finish the basement of an existing structure. Motion by Sapnar, seconded by Burke to write a letter to the Council recommending the removal of the word "basement" in the ordinance. All Board Members voted Aye. None No. Motion carried.

Motion to adjourn by Judge, seconded by Sagui. All members Aye. None No. Motion carried.  
Time: 9:24 PM.

Respectfully Submitted:

  
Margaret McElynn