

**MANCHESTER TOWNSHIP ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
REGULAR MEETING
Thursday, August 22, 2024**

**Manchester Township
1 Colonial Drive
Manchester, NJ**

MINUTES OF MEETING

1. The meeting of the Manchester Township Zoning Board of Adjustment was called to order at 6:45 p.m. by Chairwoman Linda Fazio.
2. This meeting had been duly advertised, filed, and posted in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act.
3. A Pledge of Allegiance and Salute to the Flag.
Roll Call: Members Present: L. Fazio, M. Dwyer, H. Glen, S. Galbreath, D. Tedeschi
Members Absent: W. Cook, P. Dambroski, K. Vaccaro, G. Georgiano

Also Present: C. Reid, Board Attorney, Jason Worth, Board Engineer

Administrative Session:

Approval of Minutes: June 27, 2024, meeting

Motion to Approve made by M. Dwyer and seconded by S. Galbreath

Roll Call: M. Dwyer-yes, S. Galbreath- yes, H. Glen- yes, L. Fazio.

Payment of Bills:

MTZB-R8250 for T&M Associates in the amount of \$82.50 for Case ZB23-27.

MTZB-R89200 for T&M Associates in the amount of \$180.00 for Case ZB22-18.

MTZB-R8400 for T&M Associates in the amount of \$495.00 for Case ZB24-14.

MTZB-R8650 for T&M Associates in the amount of \$90.00 for Case ZB24-39.

MTZB-R8680 for T&M Associates in the amount of \$630.00 for Case ZB24-42.

MTZB-R8690 for T&M Associates in the amount of \$990.00 for Case ZB24-43.

Motion to Approve made by H. Glen and seconded by M. Dwyer.

Roll Call: H. Glen- yes, M. Dwyer- yes, S. Galbreath- yes, D. Tedeschi-yes, L. Fazio- yes.

Correspondence: none.

Professional Reports: none.

MEMORIALIZATIONS:

Memorialization of the Whispering Woods Hearing and a variance for the construction of a single family dwelling where a minimum lot area of 10,000 square feet is required and 7,500 square feet is proposed, where a minimum lot frontage of 100 feet is required and 75 feet is proposed, where a minimum lot width of 100 feet is required and 75 feet is proposed and where a minimum improvable lot area of 5,800 square feet is required and 2,600 square feet is proposed.

Applicant: Jeffrey Jerman Block 1.150 Lots 40 & 41 Monmouth Avenue. Approved at the July 25, 2024 meeting. Case ZB22-18.

Motion to Approve made by M. Dwyer and seconded by S. Galbreath.

Roll Call: M. Dwyer- yes, S. Galbreath- yes, H. Glen- yes, L. Fazio-yes.

Memorialization of a variance to construct a single family dwelling on an unimproved lot having an area of 5,000 square feet where 10,000 square feet is required, an improvable lot area of 2,600 square feet where 5,800 square feet is required, a frontage of 50 feet where 100 is required, a lot width of 50 feet where 100 feet is required, a rear yard setback of 24 feet where 26 feet is required, applicant is requesting waivers for curb and sidewalk. Applicant: Jeffrey Jerman Block 1.221 Lot 35 Eleventh Avenue. Approved at the July 25, 2024 meeting. Case 24-14.

Motion to Approve made by M. Dwyer and seconded by H. Glen.

Roll Call: M. Dwyer- yes, H. Glen- yes, L. Fazio- yes.

APPLICATIONS:

- | | | |
|---------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| 1. Case 24-16 | Jeffrey Jerman | First Avenue |
| | PO Box 922 | Block 1.10 Lot 10 |
| | Point Pleasant, NJ | Zone R10 |

Ms. Fazio reviews request for a variance to construct a single family dwelling on an unimproved lot having an area of 5,000 square feet where 10,000 square feet is required, an improvable lot area of 2,600 square feet where 5,800 square feet is required, a frontage of 50 feet where 100 is required, a lot width of 50 feet where 100 feet is required, a rear yard setback of 24 feet where 26 feet is required, applicant is requesting waivers for curb and sidewalk. Mr. Jeffrey Jerman- owner/applicant and Mr. William Stevens- Professional Engineer sworn in. Mr. Stevens credentials accepted. Mr. Reid reviews correspondence received, Ms. Fazio would like to exhaust the buy/sell component. Mr. Jerman depends on how it goes tonight. Ms. Fazio- many cases before us, not saying not going to hear it. Mr. Jerman- law states- first entitled to variance, offered procedure to MR. Reid. Ms. Fazio- taken first step, received Case number, exhausting all efforts, you were approached by neighbor, request appraisal, Mr. Jerman but I'm willing to sell, Mr. Stevens comments Mr. Jerman has accepted the offer, Mr. Jerman- condition approval to show this, Mr. Stevens comments really looking for the resolution. Mr. Reid- satisfy positive/negative criteria, entitled to relief that is what makes more valuable, several more applications to get through, not possible to develop all right away, to have volunteers sit unnecessarily when a transaction can be had, trying to move cases along, not fair to applicant and Board to delay process, Chair can ask for reasons. Mr. Jerman I disagree, they could back out of deal. Barbara & William Hanley- neighboring property owner, Mr. Reid you own jointly, Ms. Hanley. Mr. & Ms. Hanley sworn in. Mr. Reid- you've made an offer, Ms. Hanley yes 2 offers, \$100,000 for 50x100. Mr. Reid when will you move forward, when will you have a contract? Ms. Hanley- right away. Mr. Reid you will hire a real estate attorney, Mr. Jerman will draft it, how will you draft and execute? Ms. Hanley I will speak with my friend who is an attorney. Mr. Reid time table? Ms. Hanley- tomorrow. Ms. Fazio- Mr. Jerman is this acceptable, Mr. Jerman it is. Mr. Reid- not yet, Ms. Hanley you will get an attorney and move forward? Ms. Hanley- yes.

Mr. Jerman accepted offer can be condition of approval, approval would be moot, price is known. Mr. Reid- you don't need our approval, just like you wouldn't need it to sell a trinket. Mr. Jerman could come back with less, the resolution would have the money. Mr. Reid- can't force them. Mr. Jerman have to prove hardship, Mr. Reid come back and then you would need appraisals, Mr. Jerman – could carry, still have over 20 applications, running out of time. Ms. Fazio- exhaust all efforts. Mr. Reid- not disagreeing but move it forward, saves time, as we move forward, cases will move quicker. Mr. Jerman- not procedure by Law, anyone could say I'll buy.

Motion to Carry made by L. Fazio and seconded by M. Dwyer.

Roll Call: All in Favor.

2. Case 24-17	Jeffrey Jerman	Tenth Avenue
	PO Box 922	Block 1.185 Lot 20
	Point Pleasant, NJ	Zone R10

Ms. Fazio reviews variance request to construct a single family dwelling on an unimproved lot having an area of 5,000 square feet where 10,000 square feet is required, an improvable lot area of 2,600 square feet where 5,800 square feet is required, a frontage of 50 feet where 100 is required, a lot width of 50 feet where 100 feet is required, a rear yard setback of 24 feet where 26 feet is required, applicant is requesting waivers for curb and sidewalk. Mr. Jeffrey Jerman-owner/applicant and Mr. William Stevens- Professional Engineer sworn in. Mr. Stevens credentials accepted. Mr. Jerman introduces the following for exhibits:

A1: variance plan

A2: house plans

A3: picture board

A4: aerial (dated March 2024)

A5: packet

A6: affidavit of ownership

A7: buy/sell letters- 3 letters sent both regular and certified, Lot 5- no response, Lot 22- no response, Lot 30- no response.

Mr. Jerman similar 50x100, some approved some denied, appealed and reversed, this is exactly the same, same house, same variances, testimony shows common and typical. Mr. Jerman did you view the site and make the plans, Mr. Stevens- yes to both. Mr. Jerman can you summarize the property, Mr. Stevens- subject property, 50x100 located in the R10, south side of 10th in Pine Lake Park (PLP). Mr. Worth on A1, the only update is the 200' list any other changes, Mr. Stevens- no. Mr. Reid- review dates, Mr. Stevens- 10/24/2023, Mr. Jerman- no owners list when submitted, Mr. Worth correct no 200' list, Mr. Reid condition no change, MR. Stevens- correct. Mr. Stevens continues property located between Larchmont and Southampton Blvd, existing isolated lot. Mr. Jerman and utilities, Mr. Stevens- municipal water and septic. Mr. Jerman and the variances needed? Mr. Stevens- lot area, lot width, lot frontage, improvable lot area, and a de-minimis 2-foot rear yard setback, where 26' is required and 24' is proposed. Mr. Jerman with the bulk variances on 5000sq versus 10000sq, the 5000 is sufficient, Mr. Stevens- yes the home fits and the front and side yard variance met. Mr. Jerman and lot frontage and width enough, Mr. Stevens- it is, provides off street parking, 3 bedroom requires 2 parking spots, 44' in length drive, ample room for septic as well. Mr. Jerman and the de-minimis rear setback, Mr. Stevens

lot is narrow, to fit character of neighborhood, the alternate is to ask for side setback variance believe this is appropriate solution. Mr. Jerman de-minimis meaning? Mr. Stevens- not perceptible to the neighbors. Mr. Jerman does impose any constraint, r. Stevens- no fits on lot. Mr. Jerman can you describe the area and homes, referring to the A3 and your analysis. Mr. Stevens referring to A3, subject property on 10th, mixture of homes in area, 9 block analysis, shows 81 homes, ranging from 760sf to 3193sf. MR. Jerman and our home, Mr. Stevens- 1415sf. Mr. Jerman fits neighborhood, Mr. Stevens- correct, home not the smallest and no the largest. Mr. Jerman many different styles in area, Mr. Stevens it is, range is small to large. Mr. Jerman describe the home, Mr. Stevens- referring to A2- Cape home, fits undersized lot ordinance, not a full 2 story, under 25' in height, 3-bedroom, 3-bathroom home with partial basement. Mr. Jerman any violation to light, air or open space, Mr. Stevens- no there would not be. Mr. Jerman do we comply with the ordinance, Mr. Stevens- we do. Mr. Jerman under 25' height, Mr. Stevens- yes less than. Mr. Jerman without the variance, anything else with the property? Mr. Stevens as a Planner- residential only. Mr. Jerman any substantial detriment to the Master plan or zone plan, Mr. Stevens I do not believe there is. Mr. Jerman for all the reasons before, Mr. Stevens- yes. Mr. Jerman 5 houses on this side of the block and across, Mr. Stevens- yes. Mr. Jerman 5 houses on vast majority of streets in PLP? Mr. Stevens- yes generally, 3 houses toward Larchmont, they are 125' lots. Mr. Jerman any detriment to the neighbors, Mr. Stevens- none. Mr. Jerman new construction helps neighborhoods, Mr. Stevens yes generally good Mr. Jerman 50' lots are unusual why not before? Mr. Stevens- because of the septic, with new technology, we have alternate treatment system with small disposal field that allows development. Mr. Jerman extremely common now in towns like Brick, Beachwood, Berkley, Mr. Stevens- Lacey, yes. Mr. Jerman one approved in January submitting now, Mr. Stevens yes, same conditions. Mr. Jerman outside of acquiring additional land any way to mitigate, Mr. Stevens- no. Mr. Jerman why are these variances granted now? Mr. Stevens- law says entitled to build, Mr. Jerman so by the Court? Mr. Stevens- yes. Mr. Jerman as Professional Engineer and Planner, any reason not to grant? Mr. Stevens- no I can't see any. Mr. Jerman also willing to address concerns like a fence or parking, a reasonable request, Mr. Stevens- always, yes. Mr. Jerman proved both positive and negative criteria, lot never under common ownership, the buy/sell letter, Mr. Stevens- yes. Mr. Jerman negative criteria addressed, setbacks met, conform to area, Mr. Stevens- yes I believe met. Mr. Jerman when met any validity to deny, Mr. Stevens, no not in my opinion. Mr. Jerman house nothing out of the ordinary just new, 1000s of cases approved by Court, if proposed a monster house or tiny house, Board justified to deny, but nice house, designed by my wife, built many times in many areas. Ms. Fazio comments to the Board members, Law states each case individually so does your oath.

Mr. Worth only way to eliminate rear setback is to make house wider, can't move forward? Mr. Stevens- because of septic, 10' to property line, 15' to house, home pushed rear. Mr. Worth alternate layouts, make septic wider? Mr. Stevens we have looked but only rear yard available space, very difficult to service, hopeful for sewer in future. Mr. Jerman if the house was more to the front variance still needed? Mr. Stevens- yes front yard variance needed. Mr. Worth the grading and drainage on the property and will fill be used? Mr. Stevens- front out to 10th, create low point in rear and add drywell. Mr. Worth with grate, sized properly for roof and yard run-off, Mr. Stevens- will work with your office. Mr. Worth 2 parking spots for 3 bedroom, Mr. Stevens- yes. Mr. Worth Board could ask for additional, Mr. Jerman not called parking but willing to put stone in front, double benefit. Mr. Worth- comply with tree ordinance, Mr. Stevens- yes, plant trees. Mr. Glen houses on block- describe 5 on each side, Mr. Stevens- referring to A3: 10th and

Larchmont north side, 1432sf 1 story home, Mr. Glen I'll make it easier- all ranch homes, Mr. Stevens- correct. Mr. Glen but you say not out of character, Mr. Stevens this is less 25' in height, ranches could be more, Mr. Glen what about a garage, Mr. Stevens- no garage. Mr. Glen where will stuff be stored, bikes, lawnmowers, Mr. Jerman a shed in the rear and the basement, generally left to purchaser, many there with no garages. Mr. Glen how many do, Mr. Jerman don't mind a condition of a shed. Mr. Glen with the stone parking, how do we guarantee it's not paved, Mr. Jerman could condition with deed restriction. Mr. Reid deed restricts frowned upon. Mr. Glen so no guarantee, Mr. Jerman not on lot, adjacent roadway. Mr. Reid Zoning Officer can ensure Mr. Jerman does, MR. Glen- but he doesn't live there, Ms. Mathioudakis- becomes code issue, Mr. Reid not necessarily, but don't see why would want to pave, Mr. Worth- ordinance says pave, Mr. Reid- need permit to pave, Ms. Mathioudakis- yes. Mr. Glen so what are you saying. Mr. Reid next owner conditioned, Mr. Jerman actually could waive requirement, Mr. Reid part of relief if approved, Mr. Glen is ordinance with correct way, Mr. Reid no idea, Mr. Worth purely not erosion, Mr. Glen typical erosion, Mr. Worth 3", in NJ any drivable area will be impervious, Mr. Glen so pointless, Mr. Worth- eventually. Mr. Jerman benefit with stone in front, not a driveway. Mr. Worth in the basement, no bedrooms, no egress, no kitchens, Mr. Jerman- correct. Mr. Glen maintenance of septic, MR. Stevens- contract with manufacturer. Mr. Glen open pits, east access for kids, Mr. Stevens- confined entry, Mr. Glen cap above, Mr. Stevens access points closed and bolted. Mr. Galbreath permanent part of tank? Mr. Stevens- no but affixed. Mr. Glen safety concern, nothing to worry about, Mr. Stevens- no. Mr. Dwyer- septic system concrete with circular cap or steel manhole cover, Mr. Stevens- Star system, not 100% on the details. Mr. Galbreath can answer- if manhole with cement- can kick one off, Mr. Stevens- not like that at all, brought up to grade. Mr. Dwyer- not see tank, just access point at grade, not known there, Mr. Stevens- correct. Mr. Jerman if any company had this issue, they would be out of business. Mr. Galbreath not concerned with company, concerned with safety, it has happened.

OPEN TO QUESTIONS FOR THE ENGINEER FROM THE PUBLIC.

Shawn Yaccarino- 1116 10th- the stormwater will go out onto 10th? Mr. Stevens- a portion toward 10th and create low point in rear of property. Mr. Yaccarino rain all on South side when raining, garage floods, up to my ankles. Mr. Stevens- not going to change your drainage, Twon did drainage study, yours not in study. Mr. Yaccarino will make worse though, will go to Town, Mr. Worth contact DPW, Mr. Stevens this will help a bit. Mr. Yaccarino stone can't stop paving, septic manufacturer requirements with homeowner, Mr. Stevens- yes. Mr. Yaccarino how far septic off property line, Mr. Stevens 10' from property line, 15' from house.

Gail Apgar- 53 Columbus- the ranch house, this protrude forward or In line, Mr. Stevens pushed rearward. Ms. Apgar weird in neighborhood, Mr. Stevens- no meets setbacks, Ms. Apgar well I think it will, thought no basements? Mr. Worth in effect now, but not these applications. Mr. Glen parking area, deeper store, more storage, Mr. Worth more stormwater stored, Mr. Glen what's proposed, Mr. Worth 6". Mr. Glen deeper better? Mr. Worth similar road extension 2'w, 2'd along road, MR. Jerman in effect proposed here. Mr. Worth go deeper rather than shallow, Mr. Jerman over time tires kick away stone, more for stormwater, work out as Engineer. Mr. Worth if not for parking for drainage- make trench, stable yard. Mr. Stevens- hold pavement edge, stone for drainage, do both, I think we could, possibly mixed stone. Mr. Glen do away with

parking area, Mr. Reid- condition to submit to Mr. Worth, Mr. Glen roads not exceptionally wide for parking there. Mr. Reid testimony says over time storm water goes away. Mr. Jerman will work out with Engineer.

Robin Ferguson-1732 First- not on street parking, Mr. Jerman- no.

John Yannotta-1124 10th- doing construction, more dig down eventually paved, discussed septic, drainage, parking spaces, totally clear lot, some pretty large trees, only 3' from fence. Mr. Jerman never had any problems with tree company. Mr. Yannotta will there be a ditch, Mr. Jerman- no. Mr. Yannotta- going to make it like a gutter, all water is going to keep going. Mr. Worth will capture water, alternative is to do nothing. Mr. Yannotta- put in sewers, storms getting worse, something needs to be done, more and more water, more and more cars, fix the issue. Ms. Fazio Town addresses slowly, Mr. Yannotta slow is not the word for this.

CLOSED TO QUESTIONS.

OPEN TO COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC.

Marianne Borthwick- 100 Oakdale- sworn in- my question- do you actually build these homes, Mr. Jerman- yes, Ms. Borthwick- you yourself, Mr. Jerman- about half. Ms. Borthwick what are the guarantees on the septic, Mr. Jerman all approvals must be met through the Ocean County Health Department, can't just build. Ms. Borthwick-yes, you sell, you get it in writing. Mr. Worth- variance plans details the plans. Ms. Borthwick reason I ask is before with 75x100 told 50x100 OCHD would not approve, now there is a new system. Mr. Worth must apply to OCHD and have inspected before a certificate of occupancy is given. Ms. Borthwick and who monitors after, the OCHD, no, not their concern, understand has to go through- I know the Board has an obligation, but the drainage is worse but building on all these lots that was our drainage, that drainage, it's just not there any

more, I would like to thank Chairwoman, case by case basis, not all the same.

CLOSED TO COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC.

Ms. Fazio- recap- 1415sf, 3 bedroom, 3 bath home with 2 parking spot, revisit drywell size, septic, stone front on property, comply with tree ordinance, also shed, Star system- concern with maintenance, septic because narrow property, Mr. Worth- yes.

Mr. Dwyer- no bedrooms or kitchen in basement. Mr. Reid comments exhaust all prior to vote. Mr. Dwyer- only one kitchen in house? Mr. Reid- not sure of ordinance- no kitchens. Mr. Glen size of shed, Mr. Jerman- standard shed, Mr. Stevens- 8x10. Mr. Glen- siding and roof to match, MR. Stevens- sure. Mr. Glen will match, Mr. Jerman- yes. Mr. Glen- all improvements- drywell, parking area, any water run-off from property to remain. Mr. Worth- mitigate as best as possible but can't say with large serious storm, regular rain- captured, drywell, mitigated. Mr. Glen-any different from now or same as now. MR. Worth- impervious surface versus wooded, stormwater ordinance mt and exceeded, pushing to rear mitigate to large extent. Mr. Jerman- doing more than required by ordinance, conforming lots doesn't need to do this. Mr. Worth- 100x100, larger clearing, larger house, all elements contribute more. Mr. Jerman- yes. Mr. Reid- stone drive over time- impervious surface. Ms. Fazio- stone in front- not driveway, Mr Worth- any drivable surface is considered impervious. Mr. Dwyer an asphalt drive, humped toward sides, Mr.

Jerman- good idea. Mr. Reid- public wants to know effect. Mr. Stevens- generally driveway is flat, 2% slope not impossible to crown, grass swale to sides, could reduce water to 10th. Mr. Reid- listen to testimony- has swale. Mr. Worth on this property, Mr. Stevens- yes, takes on neighbors water and keeps ours, create low point on our property.

Mr. Reid- public comment is closed so technically no talking.

Rose Yannotta- 1124 10th- sworn in- say we will not get flooded, where do we go if it does? Mr. Stevens- as Engineer says builder builds, Township Engineer reviews. Ms. Yannotta- so we're stuck after you are gone, where do we go? Mr. Reid- questions also over. Mr. Worth comments before certificate is issued, Engineer reviews, confirms swale was built. Ms. Yannotta- right, but we need rain and then we have water. Mr. Worth don't know why you would have water if swale is built. Rose- let's hope not.

Mr. Reid and Mr. Worth review conditions: soils, drywell, no bedrooms, no egress/ingress, no kitchen in basement, shed 8x10 to match, drive paved with crown, stone area, Mr. Dwyer comments Engineer to work details, comply with tree ordinance, drywell calculations.

Motion to approve with conditions made by M. Dwyer and seconded by L. Fazio.

Roll Call: M. Dwyer- yes, L. Fazio- yes, H. Glen- yes, S. Galbreath- no, D. Tedeschi- no.

Motion for 5 minute recess made by L. Fazio and seconded by M. Dwyer. Roll Call: All in Favor.

Motion to return made by M. Dwyer and seconded by D. Tedeschi. Roll Call: All in Favor.

3. Case 24-18	Jeffrey Jerman	Fifth Avenue
	PO Box 922	Block 1.94 Lot 18
	Point Pleasant, NJ	Zone R10

Ms. Fazio reviews variance request to construct a single family dwelling on an unimproved lot having an area of 5,000 square feet where 10,000 square feet is required, an improvable lot area of 2,600 square feet where 5,800 square feet is required, a frontage of 50 feet where 100 is required, a lot width of 50 feet where 100 feet is required, a rear yard setback of 24 feet where 26 feet is required, applicant is requesting waivers for curb and sidewalk. Mr. Jeffrey Jerman- owner/applicant and Mr. William Stevens- Professional Engineer sworn in. Mr. Stevens credentials accepted. Mr. Jerman introduces the following for exhibits:

A1: variance plan

A2: house plans

A3: picture board

A4: aerial (dated March 2024)

A5: packet

A6: affidavit of ownership

A7: buy/sell letters- 3 adjacent owners, sent regular and certified. Lot 14 to West, no response, Lot 30 to rear- no response, Lot 20 to East- no response, sent contracts to buy 25 or 50, several attempts, never got anywhere.

Mr. Jerman- existing isolated undersized lot, similar to others, approved and denied, litigating denials, same, exactly the same. Mr. Jerman did you view the site and prepare the plans, Mr. Stevens- I have and I did. Mr. Jerman what variances are needed? Mr. Stevens- subject property 50x100, existing isolated lot on south side of Burnside, variances for lot area, lot width, lot frontage, improvable lot area, and de minimis rear yard setback of 24' where 26' is required. Mr. Jerman with the bulk variances on 5000sq versus 10000sq, the 5000 is sufficient, Mr. Stevens- yes the home fits with septic. Mr. Jerman 3-bedroom, 3-bathroom home, Mr. Stevens- yes 1415sf. Mr. Jerman with house on lot, front and side setbacks met, Mr. Stevens- correct. Mr. Jerman 50' frontage and width, wide enough, Mr. Stevens- correct, plan shows house with driveway and septic, meet setbacks. Mr. Jerman except the 24' de minimis rear setback, Mr. Stevens- due to the narrowness of the lot, decided rear yard setback request was better, alternative would be to make house wider with side yard setbacks. Mr. Jerman any detriment to the neighbors, Mr. Stevens- 24' in field is de minimis. Mr. Jerman improvable lot coverage impose any constraint, Mr. Stevens it does not. Mr. Jerman can you describe houses in area. Mr. Stevens A4 aerial, subject property in yellow, 9 block analysis- 76 homes, ranging from 386sf to 2940sf, proposed home is 3-bedroom, 3-bathroom home at 1415sf, not the smallest and not the largest. Mr. Jerman a variety of homes, 2 stories, ranches, Mr. Stevens- yes there is. Mr. Jerman a 50x100- 2 lots away, Mr. Stevens- yes, 50x100 developed lot with house- Lot 12. Mr. Jerman 75x100 next to it, Mr. Stevens- yes lot 9, also 50x100 lot on 4th immediately South- Lot 34, older homes in area probably on seepage. Mr. Jerman with architectural- describe- fits height, Mr. Stevens- Cape, not full 2 story, less than 25' in height, a 3/3 with partial basement. Mr. Jerman with side yards met to house, any violation to light, air and open space, Mr. Stevens- no, neighbors 50' to fence, substantial open space. Mr. Jerman without the variance, anything else with the property? Mr. Stevens as a Planner- residential only. Mr. Jerman- any detriment to the Master Plan or Zone Plan, Mr. Stevens- don't believe so, meets major setbacks. Mr. Jerman any detriment to the public good, Mr. Stevens- in my opinion, I don't believe so. Mr. Jerman comports with undersized lot ordinance, Mr. Stevens- we do, under 25' in height, meet % of upstairs to the downstairs. Mr. Jerman never before, why now? Mr. Stevens- technology allows it now, other 50' lots probably on seepage but room now for septic. Mr. Jerman approved in February and now last application, Mr. Stevens built a long time in Pinelands, more expensive system. Mr. Jerman outside of acquiring additional land any way to mitigate? Mr. Stevens- no, no other way to alleviate hardship. Mr. Jerman over the years when denied what happened, Mr. Stevens denial overturned. Mr. Jerman any reason not appropriate or to not approve, Mr. Stevens- gone a long way to fir character of neighborhood. Mr. Jerman suggestions like fence for neighbor or reasonable changes, Mr. Stevens- yes, correct. Mr. Jerman take care of drainage, pit in rear, Mr. Stevens- yes, portion to front, portion to rear to drywell, re-visit size, ordinance roof run-off, capacity for yard. Mr. Jerman- positive/negative criteria met through buy/sell letter, MR. Stevens- correct. Mr. Jerman negative criteria- no impact to light, air and open space and no negative impact to neighbors, Mr. Stevens- all correct. Mr. Jerman criteria met basis to approve, Mr. Stevens- correct. Mr. Worth relative to rear setback due to narrowness, only 50', rear setback to fit character of neighborhood, smaller house wouldn't? Mr. Stevens- try not to build homes that do not fit, build attractive, usable homes. Mr. Jerman undersized lot ordinance, Cape part 60% of first floor, can't fit 2 bedrooms upstairs without, smallest house that can be done, also can count porch area, that's reason can't make smaller.

Mr. Worth- grading and drainage, front toward road, rear to drywell, swales inside yards, Mr. Stevens- generally yes, a bit shallow side, will look at that. Mr. Worth all trees cleared any way to save, Mr. Stevens- no, Mr. Worth meet ordinance though, Mr. Stevens- yes. MR. Worth 2 parking spots, Mr. Stevens- yes. Mr. Worth septic, review and approved by OCHD, Mr. Stevens- correct. Mr. Worth no kitchen or bedrooms in basement, Mr. Stevens- correct. Ms. Fazio- possible fence, will it help? Mr. Worth- certainly can, additional screening and buffer. MR. Jerman- yes, if neighbor wanted, Ms. Fazio- thought it was a good idea. Mr. Worth any increase to stormwater, Mr. Stevens- any development, always some, according to study TR8, northeast of subject site, storm in 5th down Oakdale, this will not contribute to, road goes the other way. Mr. Tedeschi- driveway as pavers, maybe pervious pavers, Mr. Jerman pervious paver compaction, Mr. Tedeschi- not with pervious, Mr. Jerman fine with me if Engineer agrees. Mr. Stevens- concrete paver, Mr. Tedeschi- yes, Mr. Stevens- do stay permeable, acceptable solution.

Mr. Glen parking in front, Mr. Tedeschi- pervious pavers even sidewalks, Mr. Stevens- stone along road. Mr. Tedeschi stone not answer, compact over time, designed at 95%, Mr. Jerman Board Engineer agreeable, Mr. Stevens not happy with pavers in Township right-of-way (ROW), Mr. Worth homeowner maintains, MR. Reid Public Works (PW) approval. Mr. Jerman- not going to agree to that, Mr. Stevens understand condition by Engineer, Mr. Reid PW doesn't approve then stone. Mr. Tedeschi- understand. Mr. Reid need to get PW to agree. Mr. Tedeschi stone in ROW and pervious pavers. Mr. Reid- doing what you are asking, Mr. Jerman- need waiver for drive, Mr. Reid- correct.

Mr. Dwyer- shed for storage? Mr. Jerman same as before, minimum 8x10, Ms. Fazio- roof and siding to match. Mr. Dwyer- pervious pavers in street work versus stone, stone slopped, deeper trough toward house, Mr. Stevens- preferred solution, really just bigger driveway apron but need to work on it.

OPEN TO QUESTIONS & COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC.

John Yannotta-1124 10th- sworn in-if Board approves case by case basis, pavers versus stone, why not on ours? Rose Yannotta-1124 10th-sworn in- why talking about it now? Mr. Tedeschi- didn't think of it before. Mr. Reid- that application is over. Mr. Yannotta- shouldn't it revert, Mr. Reid- no that's not how it works, Ms. Fazio- case by case.

CLOSED FOR QUESTIONS & COMMENTS.

Ms. Fazio- reviews items: 3 bedroom, 3 bathrooms with crawl, drywell sized by Engineer, pervious pavers on driveway- waiver, Ms. Mathioudakis- waiver correct because of ordinance, Mr. Worth right- pavers in drive and ROW, Ms. Fazio will revert to stone if not approved, fence, Mr. Worth no one spoke to it, Ms. Fazio- shed, 8x10 to match, Mr. Dwyer- no bedrooms in basement, Ms. Fazio- no kitchen in basement, comply with tree ordinance, side yard swales, Mr. Reid- drywell capacity, no egress/ingress windows, pervious pavers. Ms. Fazio applicant will adjust.

Motion to approve with conditions made by M. Dwyer and seconded by D. Tedeschi.

Roll Call: M. Dwyer- yes, D. Tedeschi- yes, H. Glen- yes, S. Galbreath- no, L. Fazio- yes.

General Discussion:

Mr. Reid- one correction to resolution 24-14, wrong case number listed, first paragraph not available and applicant, changes will be made.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 9:44 p.m. on motion by M. Dwyer and seconded by L. Fazio. All in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Mathioudakis
Zoning Board Secretary