

Chairman Clayton asked Mr. Pett how far his house is set back from Bayberry. Mr. Pett said about 30'.

Chairman Clayton said the slope of the roof slopes down toward Bayberry. The height won't be as imposing. Mr. Pett said the house next door will still be higher than his. It is up on a hill.

Mrs. Morrissey said you are adding a second garage. Are you keeping the first one? Mr. Pett said the first one will be knocked down.

Mrs. Morrissey asked if the large trees will stay. Mr. Pett said yes.

Mrs. Morrissey asked about the shed. Mr. Pett said that is new and it will stay.

Mrs. Morrissey asked how far the mud room will be from the deck. Mr. Pett said it will be right up against it.

Mr. Gray said you will remove the driveway on Bayberry. Mr. Pett said correct.

Mr. Gray asked if the driveway on Crestview will be widened. Mr. Pett said no it will be made smaller.

Mr. Gray asked about the concrete pad. Mr. Pett said that is a walk-in for the basement. That has been there for 20 years. It will be replaced with grass.

Mr. Gray asked if the existing deck will stay. Mr. Pett said yes.

Mr. Cinelli asked for the size of the existing garage. Mr. Pett said it is 12' X 22'. Mr. Cinelli said you are duplicating that. Mr. Pett said yes.

Mrs. Morrissey asked if there will be additional landscaping. Mr. Pett said yes.

Chairman Clayton asked if he will put in plantings where the driveway is being removed. Mr. Pett said yes.

Mr. Cinelli asked if he received Mr. Gerken's review letter of July 6, 2004. Has everything been resolved? Mr. Gerken said yes.

Mr. Pett said the impervious coverage will be less.

Chairman Clayton asked if all the siding will match. Mr. Pett said it is all going to be redone.

The application was open and closed to the public.

Mr. Gray moved to approve the application for bulk variance subject to the removal of the driveway on Bayberry and the removal of the concrete pad at the north end of the house. Plantings will be added subject to Board Engineer's approval. Mrs. Morrissey seconded the

motion, which was unanimously approved by a roll call vote. (Mr. Gray, Mrs. Morrissey, Messrs. Slocum, Kerr, Clayton and Cinelli voted yes.)

CASE #BA14-2004 – Date application complete: June 3, 2004

APPLICANT: JOHN & JUDY BACKES

PROPERTY: 1542 Sterling Drive, Block 890, Lot 26, R-10 zone

RELIEF REQUESTED: Bulk

Attorney Steinberg reviewed the file and stated the Board had jurisdiction to proceed.

Sworn by Reporter Arnone: John J. Backes

Mr. Backes said he has a newer survey and the original showing the side setbacks.

Entered into evidence:

A-1 Survey showing rough sketch of the addition dated May 12, 1998

A-2 Original survey dated 1977

Mr. Backes said front porches are becoming more fashionable. In 1984 we put an addition on. That addition sets back. We want to square the front of the house off. It will enhance the appearance of the house. The front porch needs a variance because it sits 29' from the road. It is zoned R-10. We exceed by about 6%.

Chairman Clayton asked for the size of the front porch. Mr. Backes said 23' X 6'.

Chairman Clayton asked for the size of the addition. Mr. Backes said the proposed addition would be from the side of the house going back. The addition to the southwest corner will be 11' 8" X 14' 8" and 4' X 14' plus 3' X 4' bathroom windows at the back.

Mr. Cinelli asked what the distance is from the Backes property to lot 30 and lot 22. Mr. Backes said the house to the left is 20' – 25' from the property line and his house is 10' from the property line. The house in the back, from the widest point of the house it is 37' to the edge of my property and the house is about 20' from there. Mr. Gerken asked about the other direction. Mr. Backes said he has 22' on the side and there is a fence. The neighbor's house is 15' – 18' from the property line.

Mrs. Morrissey asked if there was going to be a bathroom. Mr. Backes said the bathroom would be in the back.

Mrs. Morrissey asked if he was going to landscape the front. Mr. Backes said we will probably remove the landscaping and completely redo it.

Mr. Slocum asked, on the left elevation looking at your house, what is that that juts out. Mr. Backes said that is going to be the fireplace.

Mr. Kerr asked if the materials on the porch will match up. Mr. Backes said his plan is to completely reside the house.

Chairman Clayton asked if the porch will be open. Mr. Backes said yes, no screens.

Chairman Clayton said the roof slopes toward lot 22 that will soften it up.

Mr. Cinelli asked Mr. Gerken if he was ok with the survey that was handed in. Mr. Gerken said yes.

The application was open and closed to the public.

Mr. Kerr moved to approve the application for bulk variance. Mr. Slocum seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved by a roll call vote. (Messrs. Kerr, Slocum, Mrs. Morrissey, Messrs. Gray, Cinelli and Clayton voted yes.)

Case #15-2004 – Date application complete: June 4, 2004

APPLICANT: CAROLINE & JIM CALDWELL

PROPERTY: 1551 Logan Drive, Block 890, Lot 54, R-10 zone

RELIEF REQUESTED: Bulk variance

Attorney Steinberg reviewed the file and stated the Board had jurisdiction to proceed.

Sworn by Reporter Arnone: Mary Hearn, Architect
 Jim Caldwell
 Caroline Caldwell

Entered into evidence:

- A-1 Colored rendering of site plan with photos
- A-2 Proposed floor plans
- A-3 Colored rendering of proposed elevation
- A-4 Existing elevation

Ms. Hearn gave her credentials which were accepted by the Board.

Mr. Hearn said this house is a single story ranch located on Logan Drive. It is on lot 54, block 890. The property is 100' X 106.6'. Ms. Hearn explained they are adding a second story over the whole home. The house will look like 1½ story. That can all be done without variances. A variance is needed for the front porch. The porch will extend into the front setback. A 1.77' variance is needed at one corner. We are under lot and impervious coverage. The existing side

yard setback is 9.3' where 10' is required. The addition is not going on that side. The addition can be built without the front porch but we want it for esthetics.

Mr. Cinelli asked about the setbacks on lots 50 and 58. Ms. Hearn said to the west the house is 56' off of the property line and we have 9.3' for a total of 65'. To the east the house is 13' and we have an additional 39' from the property line for a total of 52'. The houses are 30' from the street. They all line up.

Mr. Cinelli asked Mr. Gerken to explain #4 under Comments in his review letter regarding grading. Mr. Gerken said when they apply for a building permit they have to submit a grading plan and furnish a copy of the survey.

Entered into evidence:

A-5 Copy of survey dated April 22, 1998

Mr. Slocum asked if the variance was created because the house is on an angle. Ms. Hearn said yes. Mr. Slocum asked if they had any idea why the builder put it on an angle. Ms. Hearn said she does not know. Mr. Gerken said the survey does support all the setbacks shown and he said he is satisfied. With the angle it is a very small sliver. It is only 1.78'.

Mrs. Morrissey asked if the trees are coming down. Mr. Caldwell said all the trees are staying.

Chairman Clayton asked if it will be an open porch. Ms. Hearn said yes and it will match the house.

Chairman Clayton asked if other homes are similar regarding the setbacks. Ms. Hearn said the houses are setback about 30' off the pavement.

Ms. Hearn said with reference to the second floor it sits behind the setback line. Would they have to come back for a variance? Mr. Gerken said they are getting approval for a two story structure.

The application was open and closed to the public.

Mr. Cinelli moved to approve the application for bulk variance subject to the grading being approved by the Land Use Office before a C.O. is issued. Mrs. Morrissey seconded the motion which was unanimously approved by a roll call vote. (Mr. Cinelli, Mrs. Morrissey, Messrs Slocum, Kerr, Gray and Clayton voted yes.)

Mr. Cinelli recused himself on the Hunt application.

CASE #BA16-2004 – Date application complete: June 4, 2004.

APPLICANT: ROBERT & BETH HUNT

PROPERTY: 2406 Beech Street, Block 854, Lot 17, R-10 zone

RELIEF REQUESTED: Bulk variance

Attorney Steinberg reviewed the file and stated the Board had jurisdiction to proceed.

Timothy B. Middleton, Esq. appeared for the applicant.

Attorney Middleton said this is an application to construct an addition and front porch to an existing home. This puts them over on building coverage. There is also a variance for impervious coverage needed. The house is a ranch located in Manasquan Park on Beech Street. They have lived there for 10 years. Mrs. Hunt would like to re-locate her mother to the home. A second floor is not feasible. This is a hardship. The structure will not allow a second story. There are no negative criteria. It will add to the esthetics.

Entered into evidence:

- A-1 Photo showing the front of the house
- A-2 Photo showing the rear of the house
- A-3 Photo showing the rear of the house
- A-4 Survey
- A-5 Architecturals

Sworn by Reporter Arnone:

Beth Hunt

Mrs. Hunt said she is the applicant. The house is located at 2406 Beech Street. It is located in the Manasquan Park part of Wall Township. She lives there with her husband and family. She has lived there for 10 years. The house is a one story ranch. It has three bedrooms and one bathroom.

Attorney Middleton asked if there were ever any additions put on. Mrs. Hunt said no.

Attorney Middleton asked if there was a garage. Mrs. Hunt said yes.

Attorney Middleton said you are proposing to add a 275 s.f. room to the rear of the house, a 10' X 12' bathroom to the south portion of the house and a covered porch in the front. Mrs. Hunt said yes. Attorney Middleton asked why the addition. Mrs. Hunt said it is for her mother. She needs to live with her. She said three bedrooms are not enough to accommodate all of them. The architect said to go off the back. The structure is not sound for a second floor.

Attorney Middleton asked how long Mrs. Hunt's mother has been living with her. Ms. Hunt said since May. Attorney Middleton said you agreed to take care of her. Mrs. Hunt said yes.

Attorney Middleton said the architect and builder said because of the structure not being sound it would be difficult to put on a second floor. Mrs. Hunt said that is correct.

Attorney Middleton said you are adding the front porch for esthetics. Mrs. Hunt said yes.

Attorney Middleton asked if any of the neighbors objected. Mrs. Hunt said no.

Mr. Slocum said to the right of your garage on the property line, is that a retaining wall with a fence. Mrs. Hunt said that belongs to the neighbor.

Mr. Slocum asked if there were any water problems. Mrs. Hunt said no.

Attorney Middleton said on the rear elevation to the left there are two doors they will be taken off. Mrs. Hunt said yes.

Attorney Steinberg said there will be no exterior doors. Mrs. Hunt said there will be a family room and there will be an exit from that family room.

Entered into evidence:

A-6 Photo showing where the doors will be eliminated

Attorney Middleton asked if there will be a second kitchen. Mrs. Hunt said no.

Mrs. Morrissey said you will continue the flower garden. Mrs. Hunt said she is going to move it to the front of the porch.

Mr. Slocum said you are losing your family room. Mrs. Hunt said the addition in the rear is creating a family room. Attorney Middleton said they are converting the existing family room into a bedroom and adding a new family room.

Chairman Clayton asked if the front porch will be open or closed. Attorney Middleton said open.

Chairman Clayton said the addition will match the existing siding. Mrs. Hunt said yes the whole house will be re-sided.

Chairman Clayton asked about the neighbor's setbacks to the property line. Mrs. Hunt said they are both closer to the road than she is. Attorney Middleton said they will meet all setbacks.

Chairman Clayton asked how far the house on lot 25 is. Mrs. Hunt said it is a large lot. It is very far away.

Chairman Clayton asked about the house across the street on lot 29. Is that about 30' from the road. Mrs. Hunt said her house is the farthest from the street.

Mr. Slocum asked about the lot to the rear of the property. Mrs. Hunt said that is not her property.

Mr. Gerken said the new bathroom will not need a new connection to the street. No utility opening is needed. Attorney Middleton agreed.

The application was open and closed to the public.

Attorney Middleton said the applicant has good cause for the addition. It is a hardship because of the structure of the home. The porch will enhance the esthetics of the home. There are no negative criteria.

Mr. Gray moved to approve the application for bulk variance. Mr. Kerr seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved by a roll call vote. (Messrs. Gray, Kerr, Slocum, Mrs. Morrissey and Mr. Clayton voted yes.)

MINUTES TO BE ADOPTED: Mr. Gray moved to approve the minutes of the study sessions and regular minutes of April 7, 2004, May 4, 2004 and May 5, 2004. Mrs. Morrissey seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved

There being no further business to come before the Board, a motion was made, seconded, and unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting at 8:45 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Betty Schinestuhl
Recording Secretary