

STAFF PRESENT: Anthony J. Harvatt, II, Board Solicitor
William Cathcart, Board Engineer
William J. Galestok, Board Secretary
Lisa A. Schubert, Recording Secretary

CORRESPONDENCE:

Handouts:

List of Mott MacDonald vouchers dated March 28, 2022.

List of Board Solicitor vouchers dated April 5, 2022.

List of Board Engineer vouchers dated April 7, 2022.

The New Jersey Planner: January/February 2022; Vol. 83, No. 1.

Chairman Hanson read the agenda for the benefit of the public.

3. Use & hardship variance & preliminary & final site plan applications to install a pole sign, encroaching into the front yard setback and exceeding the allowed height, submitted by Pacific Outdoor Advertising, LLC for the location known as Block 793, Lot 11.03, 797 Route 109.

This application was continued to the May 5, 2022 meeting.

Mr. Harvatt explained there would be new newspaper publication of the application and the four (4) people with the corrected addresses would be noticed.

Mr. Kennedy made a motion to approve the minutes from the March 3, 2022 meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Brand. Motion carried.

Mr. Kennedy made a motion to approve the Board Solicitor vouchers. The motion was seconded by Mr. Sweeten. Motion carried.

Mr. Brand made a motion to approve the Board Engineer vouchers. The motion was seconded by Mr. Utsch. Motion carried.

Mr. Brand made a motion to approve the Mott MacDonald vouchers. The motion was seconded by Mr. Kennedy. Motion carried.

Mr. Kennedy made a motion to approve the resolutions from the March 3, 2022 meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Sweeten. Motion carried.

2. Use & variance applications to convert an existing detached garage into an apartment encroaching into the side yard setback and deficient in distance between buildings, submitted by Christina Sees for the location known as Block 682, Lot 4, 1000 Rose Hill Parkway.

Mr. Jeffrey Barnes, Esq., represented the applicant.

Ms. Christina Sees, applicant and Mr. Mark Halbruner, PE, & Architect, was sworn in by Chairman Hanson.

Mr. Barnes explained the property is an irregularly shaped lot with a single family dwelling and a detached garage. He explained his client purchased the property in 2011. He explained at the time it was listed on the MLS and shown by the realtor as a garage apartment. He explained there is no stove in the garage, but there is a kitchen of sorts. He explained that during Covid, his client had called the Township to find out if she could rent the garage for extra income and was told there were no approvals for an apartment in the garage. He explained his client didn't rent the garage and wanted to do things right. He explained that his client would like to have her parents use the garage. Explaining the garage is only one floor and it would be easier for her father to utilize as he does have health issues.

Mr. Barnes explained what is proposed would not change the setbacks. He explained that his client would like to continue to use of the garage as an apartment for her parents as she was under the impression this was already approved as such.

Ms. Sees explained when she purchased the property, she thought she was purchasing as if the garage was an apartment. She explained when she looked at the property and went in the garage, it was finished and there were kitchen counters, but no stove. She explained she is a first time home buyer and closed by herself.

Ms. Sees explained she has done some renovations to the property.

Ms. Sees explained she was laid off during Covid and went on unemployment, but thought for additional income, she would rent the garage. She had sent an email to the Township asking if she could do this and was told there were no permits on record. She explained she doesn't want to abandon the use. She explained that now she would just like this area to be used just for her parents.

The Board asked Ms. Sees if she would have a problem with a deed restriction this could be used for family use only? Ms. Sees explained she didn't have a problem with a deed restriction.

The Board asked if she intended to install a full kitchen? Ms. Sees explained she was not installing any kitchen facilities.

The Board asked if there were separate utilities going to the garage? Ms. Sees explained the utilities to the garage are from the house.

Mr. Barnes explained there was a fire inspection done.

Mr. Halbruner reviewed the existing conditions with the Board. He explained this is a larger lot, but there are two deficiencies that are existing. What is before the Board tonight would not change those deficiencies.

Mr. Halbruner explained a use variance is required because the structures are detached. He explained an addition could be done attaching the two structures, but then it ends up with a lot of building mass and reduces light, air and open space.

Mr. Halbruner explained this application provides light, air and open space, promotes the appropriate density requirements, there is no increase in density, would not impact the adjacent properties and there would be no detriment to the zone or zone plan.

The Board asked if the garage is or would be heated? Ms. Sees explained it is currently heated with electric heat. She explained there is a garage door, but also a single door and two windows.

This portion of the hearing was opened to the public.

Mr. Wes Wright was sworn in by Chairman Hanson.

Mr. Wright explained to the Board he is a neighbor to this property and has no problem with the application. He explained he is also in favor of having the deed restriction.

This portion of the hearing was closed to the public.

Mr. Brand made a motion to conditionally approve the use variance application. The motion was seconded by Mr. Sweeten.

VOTE:	Mr. Kennedy	YES	Mr. Brand	YES
	Mr. Utsch	YES	Mr. Sweeten	YES
	Mr. Doherty	YES	Mr. Basco	YES
	Chairman Hanson	YES		

Motion carried.

Mr. Kennedy made a motion to conditionally approve the variance application. The

motion was seconded by Mr. Brand.

VOTE:	Mr. Kennedy	YES	Mr. Brand	YES
	Mr. Utsch	YES	Mr. Sweeten	YES
	Mr. Doherty	YES	Mr. Basco	YES
	Chairman Hanson	YES		

Motion carried.

A memorializing resolution will be prepared by the Board Solicitor for the Board to review and approve at the next scheduled meeting.

4. Extension of hardship variance approval, submitted by James Bratten, IV for the location known as Block 468, Lots 1, 2 & 16, 948 Fay Avenue.

Mr. James Bratten, applicant, was sworn in by Chairman Hanson.

Chairman Hanson read the letter Mr. Bratten had submitted.

Mr. Bratten explained he is seeking an extension of the variance. He explained that hopefully sewer will become available and the extensions would become irrelevant.

The Board discussed extensions are usually granted for an additional three (3) years.

There was a discussion regarding the number of extensions granted. It was explained the approval was covered under the Permit Extension Act.

Mr. Kennedy made a motion to approve the extension to expire April 2025. The motion was seconded by Mr. Sweeten.

VOTE:	Mr. Kennedy	YES	Mr. Brand	YES
	Mr. Utsch	YES	Mr. Sweeten	YES
	Mr. Doherty	YES	Mr. Basco	YES
	Chairman Hanson	YES		

Motion carried.

A memorializing resolution will be prepared by the Board Solicitor for the Board to review and approve at the next scheduled meeting.

5. Hardship variance application to construct a 24 x 44 addition and 12 x 16 screened in porch exceeding the allowed building coverage, submitted by Laurence Morier, III & Debra Morier for the location known as Block 752.04, Lot 4, 4 Melody Court.

Mr. Bruce Conwell, Esq., represented the applicants.

Mr. Laurence Morier, applicant, was sworn in by Chairman Hanson.

Mr. Conwell explained there is an existing single family is on an undersized lot. He explained his client would like to construct an addition and a screen room. He explained all setbacks would be met, but the building coverage would be exceeded by 2%. He explained the existing zoning requires one acre for a single family dwelling. He explained most of the lots on this street are deficient in the lot area requirement. He explained what is proposed would be a 'T' shaped addition to the rear of the house.

Mr. Morier explained him and his wife used to live on Washington Street in Cape May. He explained that house was multi-story and due to a health issues, he and his wife need a single story house. He explained with their children and grandchildren, the house is small and they need the extra room.

Mr. Conwell explained the property was purchased by their son and a contract of sale was given when the application was submitted. He explained that since the application was submitted, his clients have purchased the property and a deed was submitted showing his clients are the current owner.

This portion of the hearing was opened to the public. There were no public comments. This portion of the hearing was closed to the public.

Mr. Brand made a motion conditionally approve this application. The motion was seconded by Mr. Kennedy.

VOTE:	Mr. Kennedy	YES	Mr. Brand	YES
	Mr. Utsch	YES	Mr. Sweeten	YES
	Mr. Doherty	YES	Mr. Basco	YES
	Chairman Hanson	YES		

Motion carried.

A memorializing resolution will be prepared by the Board Solicitor for the Board to review and approve at the next scheduled meeting.

Mr. Brand made a motion to adjourn at 6:35 P.M. The motion was seconded by Mr. Kennedy. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa A. Schubert,
Recording Secretary

A verbatim recording of said meeting is on file in Township Hall.

THESE MINUTES HAVE NOT BEEN FORMALLY APPROVED AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE OR MODIFICATION BY THE PUBLIC BODY AT ITS NEXT MEETING. THIS BOARD WILL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY MIS-STATEMENTS, ERRORS OR OMISSIONS OF THESE MINUTES, AND CAUTIONS ANYONE REVIEWING THESE MINUTES TO RELY UPON THEM ONLY AT THEIR OWN RISK.