

BOROUGH OF SPRING LAKE HEIGHTS LAND USE BOARD

Minutes

April 9, 2025

Meeting Commences at 7:00 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, Councilwoman King, Michael Milano, Brian Brendle, Adam Anzzolin, , Councilwoman Degnan-Spang, Tom Martin

Board Members absent: Nancy Maclearie, Roy Francolino, Anna Kuntz Dennis Pearsall, Joseph Layton

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

1. Application:

CARRIED FROM MEETING OF DECEMBER 18, 2024

- 1. Application #2024-12 James & Maura Hannigan**
804 Greenwood Avenue, block 80 lot 44 R4 Zone
Bulk Variances for expansion of existing single family home

James Kinneally, Esq., attorney for the applicant- the applicant came to the Board in December for the addition to go from 2 bedrooms to 4. Owned the house for 30 years. They came to the Board without a lawyer or engineer. I have two witness – James Hannigan and Mike Intile, Engineer and Planner

Mark swears in: Christine, Jerry, Mike Intile and James Hannigan

Exhibit A-1 – Vacinity Map

Kinneally – applicant wants to add to existing home, seeking variances for front setback to the existing and proposed and setback to the front porch existing and proposed and variances for building coverage, and sidewalks. No sidewalks in the area and will contribute to the fund.

Hannigan- owned the home since 1991 – has 2 bedrooms and one bath- want to retire and have the children and grandchildren visit but not working with 2 bedrooms and 1 bath want to go to 4 bedrooms and 3 baths.

Mark – for the record, there is no public in attendance

Mike Intile – Professional Engineer and Planner with Crest Engineering – states his credentials. Licensed Engineer and Licensed Planner since 1990 and has prepared plans for residential and commercial projects for 30 years

Eileen – accepts credentials.

Intile- shed measures 8 feet by 10 feet and was included in the coverage, have room for a driveway
Exhibit A-1 – Vicinity Map (described the properties in the area of the home – looked at the setbacks
And porches for homes on the north and south sides of the street and behind the home)

This structure is 1 ½ stories with a driveway and a shed in the R4 Zone. The area is similar to other lots
This lot measures 60 by 115 – there are other lots slightly smaller. This requires 5 variances.

- 1- Technical variances for the sidewalk requirement – there are none in the area. The dry well will be installed.
- 2- They have 26.8% building coverage, where 25% is permitted. It is for the 124 Addition
Total coverage is 36.4% Good with the setbacks on the sides and rear
- 3- Front porch setback where 22 feet is required. Propose 25 feet. Most in the area don't meet the setbacks. Lots in the vicinity have less. Lot 43 has a setback of 24.7 feet and Lot 97 has 24.6 feet
808 Greenwood has a Resolution but is under coverage 24.5% and have a front porch and is consistent with coverage
- 4- Side yard setback variance requested

Have no objection to putting in the dry well as stated in the Engineer's Report

The Planning Justification – for C2 Variance – not a hardship, per MLUL it enhances the intent per G, the advancement of residential use, consistent with the neighborhood, contributes to the well being of the neighbors, encourages single family use. Not a detriment – it is consistent and well suited to the area with a single family home. The benefits outweigh the detriment. In the neighborhood, it is mostly 4 bedrooms. 1,575 square foot footprint. It is an existing non-conformity for the principle structure. Has 36.4% impervious coverage. Not a substantial impairment to the ordinance coverage. It is in line with advancing the purpose of the MUL – benefits outweigh the detriments. The addition will be an upgrade for the neighborhood. The entire neighborhood benefits and consistent with the Neighborhood.

Adam – no new information submitted. How did you calculate the coverage for the other homes?

Can you back that up?

Intile – the surveyor did the back up information. Used GIS software for the calculations of adjacent Properties. Measure the footprint around the building, not the square footage

Brian – we didn't give variances for these properties, did we? You did the calculations

Intile – I don't know if they obtained variances, just know the analytic data

Brian – are any brand new homes?

Intile – 808 is under construction, they came to the Board but are under building coverage -24.75%

There are others in the neighborhood that do not conform

Brian – you used satellite data, how do we know its accurate?

Intile – the one behind them, lot 26, has sideyard setback issues

Brian- Home referred to is on a smaller lot, if its over, its because the lot is smaller

Eileen- just changed that zone, now 25 foot setback instead of 30 feet.

Brian – because most are at 25 feet

Intile – it's a challenge for smaller lots

Eileen – its tight, to the limit

Intile- its 1.8% over on building coverage, the side setbacks are conforming

Sara – didn't change the plan?

Intile – it's the original plan

Jerry- if approved, can set conditions. The AC needs to stay in the back yard. Need soil borings for the

Dry well. Can offset the building coverage. Need to make a contribution for the sidewalk
Kinneally- agree to everything the engineer requests. I have no other witnesses
Brian – first time I heard of using data for footprints. Don't have a problem with the porch but its
Almost over 27%, have given variances to small lots but not 2% or more.

Kinneally – its slightly over the 25%

Christine – its 124 square foot increase. Architect isn't here to testify if possible to reduce 124
Square feet.

Intile – the architecture affects the coverage

Sara- have an issue with the staircase outside of the house

Intile – stoop is on the right side

Sara – staircase was supposed to go to the west side, house was built in 1950

Tom- how far on the side?

Intile – 15.7 feet to the building on the west side, it allows for open air flow where garage would be on
the right side

Tom- every case is on its own merits, not setting a precedent?

Mark- yes, each application is on its own merits, just as other applications that come before the Board.

Jerry – if want a garage then need to come back

Intile – shed is in setback- 8 feet by 10 feet, is included in coverage, have room for a driveway

Motion to approve: Tom Martin

No second

Mike – there was no attempt made to reduce the 125 square foot as requested

Intile-not true, I worked with the architect and realized that we had to go back to the original plan
For the family.

Tom Martin withdraws motion

Motion to carry application to May 21, 2025: Tom Martin Seconded by: Councilwoman King

All members voted in favor to carry application

Carried to meeting of May 21, 2025

Motion to adjourn: Tom Martin Seconded by: Councilwoman King

All Members voted in favor to adjourn

Meeting adjourned: 7:55 PM

