

BOROUGH OF SPRING LAKE HEIGHTS LAND USE BOARD

Minutes

April 19, 2023

Meeting Commences at 7:15 PM

Announcement Made by Secretary:

THIS MEETING IS CALLED PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF THE OPEN PUBLIC MEETINGS ACT, CHAPTER 231, PUBLIC LAW 1975. ADEQUATE NOTICE HAS BEEN PROVIDED TO THE COAST STAR AND THE ASBURY PARK PRESS POSTED ON THE BULLETIN BOARD IN THE MUNICIPAL BUILDING AND THE BOROUGH WEB-SITE. NOTICES ARE ON FILE WITH THE BOARD SECRETARY. OFFICIAL ACTION MAY BE TAKEN ON THE MATTERS LISTED.

A. Flag Salute

B. Roll Call

Board Members present: Chair Eileen Eilenberger, Brian Brendle, Michael Milano, Adam Anzzolin, Bruce Waitzel, Tom Martin

Board Members absent: Elizabeth Stader, Councilman Chris Willms, Roy Francolino, Joseph Tompey, Mayor Campion, Dennis Pearsall, Nancy Maclearie

Board Professionals present: Mark Kitrick, Esq, Adam Avakian, PE, Christine Bell, PP, Barbara Van Wagner, Secy.

C. Minutes: Meeting of March 15, 2023

Motion: Brian Brendle Seconded by: Chair Eilenberger

In Favor: Brian Brendle, Michael Milano, Chair Eileen Eilenberger, Adam Anzzolin

Opposed: None

D. Resolution:

Resolution #2023-15 Jeanene Personette, applicant Kathleen Getchell, Owner 927 Woodcrest Drive, block 83 lot 111 Application #2023-02

In Favor: Brian Brendle, Michael Milano, Adam Anzzolin, Chair Eileen Eilenberger

Opposed: None

E. Application:

Application #2023-04 – Antonio Riccione & Eliana Martin

1710 Highway 71, block 55 Lot 20, R5 Zone

Bulk Variances for a 2 ½ story addition to an existing single family home.

Board Professionals sworn in: Adam Avakian, PE and Christine Bell, PP

Applicant's Professionals and applicant sworn in: Antonio Riccione, William Merunka, PE, PP and

Tyler Sandmas, Architect. Michael Rubino, Esq, attorney representing the applicants

Rubino – presented the exhibits

Exhibit A-1 – Photo Board – 6 pictures taken by Mr. Rubino of the subject property and the adjacent properties

Exhibit A-2 – Architectural Plan

Exhibit A-3 – Engineering Plan

Rubino – (discussed the requested variances) The house sits 7 feet from the property line but is consistent with other neighboring houses. The addition will start 25 feet from the property line at the north side of house. The house sits 32 feet high measured from the curb. They want the addition to match with the existing parts of the house.

The plan shows a water infiltration system, the question is whether it is required for the whole house or not. At the end of the testimony we will go over the items in the letter.

Owner, Antonio Riccione – have two kids, 15 years old and a 7 year old daughter. Moved to SLH in 2015, love the town, schools, beach, living here for 7 years. The house was built in 1908, it's a small house and when family visits from Argentina, we need extra space. We discussed options with the architect, this is the best plan for us. Its an addition with little impact to the rest of the house. The front setback is at 25.61 feet. The laundry room is in the basement – want more space next to the kitchen for laundry and more kitchen space. If we make the setback, then we will have less space. Want to match existing so it doesn't look like a box next to the house.

Adam – would like to hear the professionals testify.

Rubino – want to discuss the 15 foot sewer easement

Riccione – 50 years ago they tried to bring the sewer to the school, so there is an easement in the back.

The chicken coop is now gone

Adam – have questions about the shed and the patio

Riccione – it was there when we bought the house

Board Questions: None

Public Questions: None

Tyler Sandmas, NJ Architect since 2020, also in Louisiana since 2014

Sandmas – this is a modest concept, the owner wants flexspace with 2 bedrooms and one bath upstairs, need functional space downstairs, only a few places to the north or back side. Use Zoning for the starting point. To get to 30 foot setback, it squeezes the space. The house next door is similar. Not creating a mass in the front and will still be well behind the other houses on Hwy 71. North has 23.9 feet and with addition will be 13.81 feet with the 20 foot by 13 foot addition. The main part of the house is 7 feet from the property line. The new addition will be 10 feet behind the man front façade. It will be a 2 ½ story addition. The first floor will have a pantry and laundry with the open kitchen and the second floor will have a tv/guest room for flex space. Can't go too far back because it messes with the kitchen window. Second floor propose another bedroom and bathroom. Third floor is half a story with 6 foot 1 inch high ceiling for a play room. It will match aesthetically with the existing roof line.

Eileen – there is a requirement for the third floor

Rubino- will comply

Eileen – front porch is not a front porch any longer – requires 30 feet not 22 feet.

Adam- huge discrepancy between the engineering and architectural plans regarding the gravel driveway coverage. 49.6% plus adding the gravel, engineer plans say 47%. There are four discrepancies between the plan.

Christine – if its 32.4 feet and its 32.5 feet, then need another variance

Adam – the survey is similar to the engineer's

Christine- ½ story definition says the third floor with a ceiling height of 5 feet or less for 40% of the floor below
Sandmas – need to look at it again

Adam – you can't give the answers we need. Mark needs to make the Resolution exact

Bruce – need to make it comply. The building height for the new addition needs to meet existing

Adam – 27.96 feet

William Merunka, RC Associates, Engineer and Planner. Engineer since 2018 and Planner since 2021

Merunka – the height is 32.37 feet to the ridge from the top of the curb. Driveway will be gravel

Riccione – pervious owner had mulch, so put in curbs to prevent mulch from running off

Merunka- the infiltration system is for the new roof area

Adam- the Board has traditionally asked for the total roof area for the dry well for the entire site

Merunka- will add infiltration system for the entire roof and will go in the back yard

Rubino – the numbers show that the building coverage is going from 13.36% to 19.89 and the impervious is going from 42.33 to 45.77%

Adam – it will have to be below 50% or will need a variance

Merunka – don't see any negative impact to the neighbors – both have 7 foot setbacks and will not be disturbing their views. (discussed criteria for C1 and C2 variances and building topographical conditions) there is a 2 ½ foot grade from the curb to the foundation. The roof is 32.4 feet high and they would like the addition to match for aesthetic reasons and the existing height is a hardship. The front setback if made to comply would only be a modest interior layout. The front setback exists at 7 feet. Propose 25.6 feet to the new addition. There is no negative impact to the Master Plan or to Zoning. The height variance can be granted because it matches existing and is a hardship.

Christine- C1 Criteria doesn't comply, it is an existing conforming lot. Can be granted under C2, di minimis variance, it is better zoning and is in character with neighboring properties. The addition is setback from the main part of the house.

Merunka- if upgrade the AC, will comply with codes

Eileen – the shed is over double the allowable size and height of the requirements for a shed

Christine – the shed can be granted a variance under C1 because of the easement on the property.

Public questions – none

Public comments – none

Tom- did you run this by the neighbors to the north

Riccione- yes, they are OK with it

Mark – (discussed the variances requested) Variance for the shed for the size and height, frontyard setback and height.

Bruce – motion to approve with variances for the addition for the height and setback and for the shed

Brian – vote yes, the architect did a nice job, the owner needed the space and the addition is tucked in

Bruce – yes, no negative impact

Tom- yes, like it, making the most of the space

Mike – yes

Eileen- approve

Motion to approve: Bruce Waitzel

Seconded by: Brian Brendle

In Favor: Brian Brendle, Michael Milano, Adam Anzzolin, Tom Martin, Bruce Waitzel,

Chair Eileen Eilenberger

Opposed: None

Motion to adjourn: Brian Brendle

Seconded by:

Voted in favor to adjourn: Chair Eileen Eilenberger, Brian Brendle, Michael Milano,

Adam Anzzolin, Bruce Waitzel, Tom Martin

Meeting adjourned at 8:20 PM