Mr. Mullen called the meeting to order at 7:47 P.M.

Mr. Mullen asked all to stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. Mullen made the following statement: As per requirement of P.L. 1975, Chapter 231. Notice is hereby given that this is a Regular Meeting of the Borough of Highlands Zoning Board of Adjustment and all requirements have been met. Notice has been transmitted to the Asbury Park Press and The Two River Times. Notice has been posted on the public bulletin board.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Mr. Braswell, Mr. Anthony, Mr. Britton, Mr. Mullen, Ms. Tierney,

Mr. Kutosh

Absent: Ms. Ryan, Mr. Fox, Mr. Gallagher

Also Present: Carolyn Cummins, Board Secretary

Gregory Baxter, Esq., Board Attorney Joseph May, P.E. Board Engineer

ZB#2009-3 Pittsburgh Chili Kings Block 69 Lot 9 – 21 Atlantic Street Approval of Resolution

Mr. Mullen read the title of the following Resolution for approval.

Board had a discussion on the resolution.

Mr. Mullen recommended an amendment on condition number five of the resolution and that a condition number seven be added to the resolution regarding the use of the first floor.

Mr. Kutosh offered the following Resolution as amended and moved on its adoption:

9/3/09 FINAL

RESOLUTION APPROVING BULK VARIANCES FOR PITTSBURGH CHILI KINGS, LLC AT 21 ATLANTIC STREET

WHEREAS, the applicant, PITTSBURGH CHILI KINGS, LLC, is the owner of a single-family home at 21 Atlantic Street, Highlands, New Jersey (Block 69, Lot 9); and

WHEREAS, the attorney for the LLC filed an application to demolish the existing twoand-a-half story home, and construct a new three-and-a-half story single-family home; and

WHEREAS, all jurisdictional requirements have been met, and proper notice has been given pursuant to the Municipal Land Use Law and Borough Ordinances, and the Board has jurisdiction to hear this application; and

WHEREAS, the Board considered the application at a public hearing on August 6, 2009; and

WHEREAS, the Board heard the testimony of STEVEN SHERMAN, a member of the applicant LLC; his builder, MARTIN BRITTON; and his surveyor/planner, RICHARD STOCKTON; and

WHEREAS, the applicant submitted the following documents in evidence:

- A-1: Variance application (3 pages);
- A-2: Zoning Officer's permit denial dated 3/12/09;
- A-3: 2/26/07 survey by MICHAEL LYNCH, revised 4/16/09;
- A-4: Sketch plat by RICHARD STOCKTON dated 7/27/09;
- A-5 Architectural drawings on one sheet by DAVID C. WINTERS dated 7/17/09;
- A-6: Enlargement of tax map;
- A-7(a) through (g): Seven photographs of the subject property;
- A-8(a) & (b): Pictures of Lot 10 (neighbor to east);
- A-9: Picture of Lot 8 (neighbor to south);
- A-10: Picture of Lot 7;
- A-11(a) through (e): Five pictures of houses on the opposite side of the street of the subject:
- **AND, WHEREAS**, the following additional exhibits were marked into evidence as Board exhibits:
- B-1: Email from DALE LEUBNER to the Board Secretary with his flood plain review
 - comments;
- B-2: Board Engineer review letter dated 8/6/09 by JOSEPH MAY (4 pages);
- **AND, WHEREAS**, no persons appeared in opposition or to ask questions about this application; and

WHEREAS, the Board, after considering the evidence and testimony, has made the following factual findings and conclusions:

- 1. The applicant is the owner of a single-family home located in the R-2.02 Zone.
- 2. The applicant purchased this home approximately two years ago. At that time, they made the purchase in order to help out a local family. They initially planned to develop the property in order to live in it during the summers, but the horrible condition it was in dictated against such an investment. Accordingly, the owner decided that the best course to follow would be to demolish the existing structure and rebuild a new home.

- 3. The applicant seeks variances for the following preexisting conditions: Minimum lot area of 2,700 square feet where 4,000 square feet is required; minimum lot frontage of 30 feet where 50 feet is required; and maximum lot coverage (building) of 37% where 33% is permitted.
- 4. The applicant also seeks a rear yard setback of 12 feet for the second floor and 17 feet for the third floor, where 20 feet is required; and for side yard setbacks of 5.1 feet on both sides, where 6 feet and 8 feet are required.
- 5. At the time of filing the application, it was thought that a height variance would be required. After review of the documents and listening to the testimony, it is determined that the applicant meets the height requirements. Accordingly, no height variance is required.
- 6. The proposed house to be built is similar to other homes which MR. BRITTON, the builder, has constructed in the Borough.
- 7. Though the architectural plans are to scale, they are not finished. They will need to be completed in order for a building permit to be issued.
- 8. There will be four levels of the proposed home. The first level will include a one-car garage and storage. Though not shown, flood vents will be installed. The main entrance will be on this level, but on the side of the home, not on the portion facing the street. There will be no porch or cover over the entrance, though the applicant may recess the door.
- 9. On the second floor there will be a kitchen, dining room, deck in the rear, living room, a place for the washer and dryer, a half bath, and a pantry/ closet.
- 10. The third floor will contain the master bedroom, two full baths and a walk-in closet.
- 11. The fourth floor will contain the attic, the heater and air handler.
- 12. The compressor for the air conditioning system will be built on a platform at the rear of the home, but not in such a way as to further encroach on any bulk area requirements. It will also be above the flood plain limit.
- 13. The garage floor and storage area will be slightly elevated, possibly a few inches above grade.
- 14. The existing fencing is proposed to be removed.
- 15. The Board was concerned with drainage on the property. The applicant agrees that all drainage will be constructed in such a way as to flow toward the street and not toward any neighboring property.
- 16. The applicant's planner testified that the neighborhood contains lots which were originally 30 feet in width. These lot sizes were retained since 1903.
- 17. The existing structure is not occupied and is in serious need of extensive renovation or reconstruction.
- 18. There is currently 3.3 feet between the subject house and the house on Lot 10. The applicant's plan foresees 6.5 feet in distance, or a doubling of the current distance.
- 19. The front yard setback is currently 19.4 feet. The plans propose a setback of 20 feet, or a slightly greater setback than currently exists. If you calculate the

current setback from the existing front porch, the new setback will be substantially further than the existing setback.

- 20. The applicant's plans will provide 5.1 feet for both side yards between the subject and Lots 8 and 10.
- 21. Though the Board is satisfied that the applicant's plans envision a height of the structure which does not violate the Borough ordinances, documentation will be needed to confirm that the house, when constructed, does not violate the height requirements.
- 22. The positive criteria, testified to by the applicant's planner, include the removal of an old sub-standard home; construction of a new home in accordance with the Borough's current codes; and providing additional safety to occupants and their neighbors.
- 23. The applicant's planner further testified that there was no substantial detriment. In further testimony regarding the negative criteria, the planner testified that this is a permitted use, and that Subsections 2b, 2e and 2i in N.J.S.A. 40:55D are all provided for in this plan. MR. STOCKTON further testified that this proposal will preserve the neighborhood character, which is a purpose of zoning.
- 24. The Board observes that the newer homes being constructed in the Borough are larger, primarily because they are higher than the older homes. This is happening because of the flood plain requirements. This proposal is consistent with that approach.
- 25. The Board finds that the applicant has met both the positive and negative criteria and that, therefore, the proposed new home will not be a substantial impairment to the intent and purpose of the zone plan and zoning ordinance. The Board is empowered to grant these bulk variances pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55d-70c(2), since the purposes of the M.L.U.L. would be advanced, and the benefits of these deviations substantially outweigh any detriments.

WHEREAS, the application was heard by the Board at its meeting on August 6, 2009, and this resolution shall memorialize the Board's action taken at that meeting;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Zoning Board of Adjustment of the Borough of Highlands that the application of PITTSBURGH CHILI KINGS, LLC to demolish and thereafter construct a single-family home based on the plans submitted is hereby approved; and variances are hereby granted for the preexisting conditions of minimum lot area (2,700 square feet where 4,000 square feet are required), minimum lot frontage (30 feet where 50 feet is required), and lot coverage for the building of 37% where 33% is permitted. In addition, variances are hereby granted for side yard setbacks of 5.1 feet on each side where 6 feet and 8 feet are required; and for rear yard setbacks of 12 feet (as to the second floor) and 17 feet (as to the third floor) where 20 feet are required.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this approval is subject to the following conditions:

- 1. The air conditioning compressor will be in the rear yard and shall comply with the flood plain requirements.
- 2. Drainage shall be to the street, via the driveway, and not toward the neighbors.
- 3. A concrete driveway to allow parking for two vehicles outside the garage will be provided.
- 4. The property owner shall be responsible to construct and maintain the sidewalk and driveway apron.
- 5. The applicant must provide a post-framing certification of height, in order to confirm compliance with the borough zoning ordinance and obtain a Certificate of Occupancy.
 - 6. The fourth level may not be used as living space (storage is acceptable).
 - 7. The first floor will be used for parking and storage only.

Seconded by Ms. Tierney and adopted on the following roll call vote:

ROLL CALL:

AYES: Mr. Braswell, Mr. Anthony, Mr. Mullen, Ms. Tierney, Mr. Kutosh

NAYES: None ABSTAIN: None

ZB#2009-4 Sarosy, Marie Block 110 Lot 10 – 224 Linden Avenue Hearing on New Business

Present: Marie Sarosy, Applicant Carl Lindmark, Builder

Mr. Baxter stated that he has reviewed the notice, newspaper advertisement and service all of which are in proper order; therefore the Board has jurisdiction to proceed.

Mr. Mullen – this application is for a free standing two-car garage in the rear yard. A variance is needed for an accessory structure ground floor exceeding 30% of the ground floor area of the principal structure. The Zoning Officer believes that there is 55% versus the 30% requirement.

The following documents were marked into evidence:

- A-1: Variance Application;
- A-2: Zoning Permit Application dated 7/2/09;
- A-3: R. Stockton Survey dated 6/4/09:
- A-4: Survey with K. Franco Architect Notes with floor plans, elevations total of 4 pages;
- A-5: Revised page three of four of Exhibit A-4;
- A-6 a-c: Three Photographs;

B-1: Board Engineer Letter dated 9/1/09.

Marie Sarosy of 224 Linden Avenue, Carl Lindmark of 192 Grand Avenue, Atlantic Highlands and Joe May, P.E. Board Engineer were all sworn in.

Marie Sarosy stated the following during her testimony and response to questions from the board:

- 1. She had an old garage at street level and they removed it a few years ago and put in a driveway to the back of the yard. They wanted easier access to the house and they had two flights of rigid steps that they eliminated in the process. They eliminated the stone steps leading from the street to the first landing pad. So now they use the rear access of the house, its only three or four steps so it makes it easier for her to bring in groceries. He husband is now ill so the proposed will make his life easier.
- 2. They put the driveway in to eliminate the grade the walking up steps. They would now like to reinstall the garage because they lost their garage during the process of putting in the driveway. They would like to accommodate two cars.

Mr. Mullen - a 24 by 24 garage is a reasonable size for a two-car garage. The element of what you are requesting a variance for is the relationship between the area of the garage and the area of the house.

Mrs. Sarosy continued her testimony as follows:

- 3. The house is a small house its 1050 square feet,
- 4. They have limited resources and what they are trying to do is one project at a time. It is in their vision at some time to add a second story to the house in the future.
- 5. The existing house is a single-story home, they live on one floor. They do have a basement.
- 6. She has a relatively large lot. The relationship to the house and the size of the lot is that the house is way under the requirement for their zone.
- 7. A little at a time they would like to rehabilitate the entire property to put value in to the property and into the community.
- 8. The distance that she is setting the proposed garage away from the rear of her house is twenty feet.
- 9. Her property is 200 feet deep so there is plenty of room in the rear yard.
- 10. The garage itself is 576 square feet and the lot is 15,000 square feet.

Mr. Mullen – the building coverage is about 10.9%.

Mr. May stated that he scaled off the house from the survey and its 26 by 33 and the structure is 858 square feet. So building coverage is less than 11%.

Mr. Landmark stated that the height is 13 feet to the top of the ridge. He described the grade of the site by referring to A-3and the most extreme area is from the back right hand corner to the right which is around four feet, which he further explained. He was looking to put a four to six foot flat spot all away around the garage itself. The topography will not affect the height of the structure. He spoke about creating a swale for the water runoff from the garage and putting in pipe to out fall into the driveway.

Mr. May stated that the finished floor of the garage is going to be roughly $1.2 \frac{1}{2}$. He then explained that the concern is the elevation changes between the rear of the garage to the eastern property line and that neighbor's property with regard to water runoff.

There was a discussion concerning the water runoff and elevation to the rear of the garage.

Mr. May spoke about recommending the applicant consider putting in a wall that can be placed against the earth and be able to achieve that slope with without having to do such an extensive cut.

There were no public members in the audience therefore no questions or comments from the public with regard to this application.

The public hearing was closed.

Ms. Sarosy stated that she plans to run electric to the proposed garage but no water or sewer.

Mr. May recommended that item 2.5 of his review letter the applicants be required to provide a grading plan to the Borough Engineer for review prior to construction.

Mr. Braswell offered a motion to approve the application with condition of submitting a grading plan, seconded by Ms. Tierney and approved on the following roll call vote:

ROLL CALL:

AYES: Mr. Braswell, Mr. Anthony, Mr. Britton, Ms. Tierney, Mr. Kutosh,

Mr. Mullen

NAYES: None ABSTAIN: None

Approval of Minutes:

Ms. Tierney offered a motion to approve the August 6, 2009 Minutes, seconded by Mr. Braswell and all were in favor.

Ms. Tierney offered a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Kutosh and all were in favor.

The Meeting adjourned at 8:20 P.M.

CAROLYN CUMMINS, BOARD SECRETARY