## MINUTES OF THE SPRING LAKE PLANNING BOARD AUGUST 9, 2017

The regular meeting of the Spring Lake Planning Board was held on the above date at 7:00 PM in the Municipal Building, 423 Warren Avenue, Spring Lake, NJ.

Chairman Nicholas Sapnar called the meeting to order 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 role for attendance. Present were Joseph Rizzo, Larry Iannaccone, Michael Burke, Cindy Napp, Walter Judge, Robert Drasheff, Melissa Smith-Goldstein, Lisa DeBerardine, Stuart Patterson, Thomas Burus, Nicholas Sapnar.

Motion by Judge, seconded by Rizzo, that the minutes of the July 12, 2017 regular meeting be adopted. On roll call Board Members Rizzo, Iannaccone, Napp, Judge, Drasheff, DeBerrardine, Burrus voted Aye. Members Burke, Goldstein, Patterson, Sapnar abstained. None No. Motion carried.

## RES#14-2017 Estate of Meehan

Motion by Judge, seconded by Rizzo to approve Resolution #14-2017 as amended. On a roll call Board Members Rizzo, Iannaccone, Judge, DeBerardine and Burrus voted Aye. Burke, Napp, Drasheff, Goldstein, Patterson and Sapnar abstained. None No. Motion carried.

CAL#3-2017 Hughes 203 Monmouth Avenue Block 34 Lot 1 Carried from July 12, 2017

Councilman Drasheff and Mayor's Designee Goldstein will step down because the application involves a possible "D" variance. Member Napp has a conflict of interest and recused herself.

Michael Rubino, attorney, suggested that the Board hear the application and then render a decision whether or not the tower would need a bulk or use variance. He read ordinance 225-34 A.

There was a general discussion of "D" variances. The Board decided to interpret the type of variance requested before the presentation.

Mr. Rubino views the tower as a cupola. Paul Damiano, architect, feels that it should be viewed as a spire. It is decorative because it could be loped off at 35 feet, there would be no loss of living space and it is limited by its cross section to less than 5% of the area below.

Motion by Sapnar, seconded by Judge that it is a roofed structure and therefore not an exception to 255-34(A). On a roll call Members Burke, Judge, DeBerardine and Sapnar voted Aye. Rizzo, Iannaccone, Patterson voted No. Motion carried.

Mr. Rubino marked some items into evidence. He stated that there are many unique structures on the street and his client would like to create an historical look for this house.

Kathleen Hughes was sworn in. They have been coming down the Shore for many years. They own two other houses on Monmouth and have restored them both. They won an award from the Historical Society for their restoration. She feels that the location of the lot coming from the beach calls for a Victorian house. The peaks will be decorative and add to the historic charm. The peaks will not increase their living space. They want the house to look like it has been there for 100 years. They rent out 214 Monmouth and live in 207 Monmouth. They will probably keep the houses for their children.

Paul Damiano, Architect, was accepted and sworn in. He testified that everything about the house, except for the cupolas, will be fully conforming. A high water table will push the house out of the ground a bit. The property is a gateway to the lake and they wanted to create a balance to the lake and Monmouth Avenue. There are houses of similar height on Monmouth Avenue. 119 Monmouth is 40 feet. 214 Monmouth is 47.9 feet. 207 Monmouth is 42.2 feet. 200 Monmouth, the Hewitt-Wellington, is 53.2 feet. They borrowed details from other historic houses, including the Van Gelder house, in Spring Lake. One spire will be 39 feet high. The spire on the corner will be 43.9 feet high to balance the Hewitt-Wellington. They are about half of the cross section that is allowed and they will be tapering up to a point. This will look historical, less modern and fit in with that street. They revised the original plan to obtain building permits. All of the site plan issues from the engineer's letter were addressed by the Zoning Officer before permits were issued. There was a discussion of roof materials.

Mr. McGill explained that the burden of proof is greater for a "D" variance but in this case the Board should consider aesthetics, benefit, the public good or negative, detriment, impairment; does it fit with the zone plan?

Robert Drasheff, 401 Sussex Avenue spoke on behalf of the Historical Society. Both the Preservation Alliance and the Historical Society have recognized the Hughes for the work they have done in the past. Barbara Harrign, President, and members of the Historical Society have reviewed the plans in depth and unanimously issued an opinion of support for the project for its aesthetic look and based on the previous work that the Hughes family did.

Motion to go into caucus by Judge, seconded by Rizzo. On a voice vote all members voted Aye. None No. Motion carried.

Motion to come out of caucus by Judge, seconded by Rizzo. On a voice vote all members voted Aye. None No. Motion carried.

Motion by Sapnar, seconded by Judge that the application be approved with the conditions that the items from Mr. Hilla's letter were addressed in the permitting process and that they will use cedar or wood for roofing if practical. On a Roll Call Board Members Rizzo, Iannaccone, Burke, Judge, DeBerardine, Patterson and Sapnar voted Aye. None No. Motion carried.

CAL#4-2017 Shell 1913 Adrian Avenue Block 123 Lot 3 & 4 Carried from July 12, 2017

m / h &

Michael Rubino, Attorney, marked items into evidence. He explained the application.

Lynn Shell was sworn in. She has owned the house for 10 years and moved here full time about a year ago. They have 6 children and 6 grandchildren who visit often. She really does not want to knock the house down. She feels that everyone wants a porch on a beach house. She wants it to look pretty. She wants a bedroom over the garage as a sanctuary.

Peter Morgan, Architect, was sworn and accepted. The porch will be 40 feet by 13 to 15 feet off the main façade. He matched up the porch with the house. He drew it shortened up and it looked very truncated. He hopes to make it look like it has been a part of the house and is sympathetic to what is in the neighborhood. The studio over the existing garage will violate the rear yard setback by just over 1 foot. The porch is angled so it does not go into the front yard setback. It only violates the side yard setback. They will provide an updated survey to confirm the height on the plan is accurate. Given the limited size of the addition, he does not think it will be necessary to upgrade the air conditioning. The current condenser is non-conforming and they would like to keep it. They will fix the sidewalk. There was discussion of the utility pole and the second floor deck.

Motion by Judge, seconded by Burke to go into caucus. On a voice vote all Members voted Aye. None No. Motion carried.

Motion by Judge, seconded by Burke to come out of caucus. On a voice vote all Members voted Aye. None No. Motion carried.

Motion by Sapnar, seconded by Judge to approve the application with the condition that the applicant comply with the recommendations of the Board Engineer and that the porch will not be enclosed. On a voice vote Board Members Rizzo, Iannaccone, Burke, Napp, Judge, Drasheff, Goldstein, DeBerardine, and Sapnar voted Aye. None No. Motion carried.

Motion by Judgee, seconded by Rizzo to adjourn. On a voice vote all Members voted Aye. None No. Motion carried. Time 9:03 PM

Respectfully submitted:

Margaret McElyhn Board Secretary