MINUTES OF THE
SPRING LAKE PLANNING BOARD
MARCH 9, 2011

The regular meeting of the Spring Lake Planning Board was held on the above date at 7:30 PM in the Municipal Building, 423 Warren Avenue, Spring Lake, NJ.

Chairman Nick Sapnar called the meeting to order, led everyone in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag and announced that this meeting is being held in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act and adequate notice has been published and posted per Chapter 231 P.L. 1975.

The Board Secretary called the role for attendance. Present were Joseph Rizzo, Larry Iannaccone, Dr. Michael Burke, Cindy Napp, Nick Sapnar, Walter Judge, Priscilla Reilly, and Kathleen Scotto.

Mr. Rizzo had changes to the minutes as written.

Motion by Rizzo, seconded by Burke, that the minutes of February 9, 2011 be approved as amended. On roll call Board Members Rizzo, Iannaccone, Burke, Napp, Sapnar and Judge voted Aye. None No. Motion carried.

CAL 14-2010 FULCHER-WARREN
108 Sussex Ave
Front Yard Setback

Celeste Miller, Esq., attorney for the applicant at 108 Sussex Ave explained that Mr. Fulcher would like to put columns under an already existing second floor balcony. This would be a safety feature as well as aesthetically pleasing.

Richard Villano, Architect, was sworn in, accepted as an expert, went into detail about the columns and said that he would also be raising the height of the railing around the balcony to make it conform to regulations. The columns would be 10” round columns and no other additions are planned. Four columns are planned for the support.

Mr. Villano was questioned by the Board Members.

Ray Carpenter, P.P., P.E. was sworn in, accepted as an expert and explained why, from an engineering point of view, the columns are necessary to support the balcony.

Eleanor Twomey, 108 Vroom Ave, asked if the poles would be placed on existing bricks and was told that they would be.

George Fulcher was sworn in and testified that he has owned the property since July 12, 2010. He owns the property with his partner and they have 2 children.
Motion by Reilly, seconded by Burke, that the Board go into caucus. On roll call all Board Members said Aye. None No. Motion carried.

Mr. Rizzo wanted to discuss the impervious surface but Attorney McGill ruled that it had nothing to do with this application and it could not be addressed.

Motion by Judge, seconded by Reilly, that the application be approved with the condition that the balcony never be enclosed. On roll call Board Members Rizzo, Iannaccone, Burke, Sapnar, Judge, Reilly and Scotto voted Aye. None No. Motion carried.

**Cal 12-2010 AMBROSE**  
**100 Brighton Ave**  
**Front Yard Setback**

Chairman Sapnar announced that Board Member Judge has recused himself.

Michael Rubino, Esq. Attorney for the applicant, had the exhibits marked into evidence. He advised the Board that the applicants have a small balcony off the master bedroom and they are tired of the 'square' look of the house. They would like to remove the concrete patio and move the patio under the balcony to provide some shade but it would encroach into the front yard setback.

Colleen and William Ambrose were sworn in and Mrs. Ambrose testified that they bought the lot and built the house 20 years ago, but they live in Manhattan and use the house in the summer. After building the house they realized that they did not leave enough outside space for themselves. Now they have no patio and no shade. She would like the patio to come out 6' beyond the columns. Mr. Rubino asked if her neighbor to the west is aware of the plans and approves of them. Mrs. Ambrose said that she showed the plans to the neighbor and he thought they encroached too far and asked that she make the patio smaller, which she did.

There were no questions from the audience.

Paul Damiano, Architect, was sworn in and accepted as an expert. Mr. Damiano explained that he removed the existing patio and tried to create a covered space for the family with an extended area that would be uncovered. The patio is approximately 20'X20'. Mr. Damiano was questioned by the Board Members.

John Seniszyn, 104 Brighton Ave, contractor for the neighbor said that the neighbor has no objections to the proposal.

Mr. Rubino asked the Board to clarify what they are asking for and Mr. Sapnar said the Board is considering asking the applicant to cut the patio back to 4ft. so it is not so far into the setback so that instead of 16' setback it would be a 19.24' setback.

Motion by Burke, seconded by Rizzo, that the Board go into caucus. On roll call all Board Members voted Aye. None No. Motion carried.
Motion by Reilly, seconded by Rizzo, that the Board come out of caucus. On roll call all Board Members voted Aye. None No. Motion carried.

Motion by Rizzo, seconded by Reilly, that the Board approve the application with the stipulation that the patio be cut back 4ft and it can never be enclosed. On roll call Board Members Rizzo, Iannaccone, Burke, Napp, Sapnar, Judge, Reilly and Scotto voted Aye. None No. Motion carried.

Cal 11-2010 KENNY
120 Pennsylvania Ave
Front Yard Setback

Michael Rubino, Esq. attorney for the applicant had the exhibits marked into evidence and stated that the application is a request to build a garage on the northern section of the premises. The garages are presently part of the house and the Kennys would like to close the western garage doors and use that area as a great room and the other former garage as storage. This would mean that the front setback would be 22.9ft. The proposed garage would be 21ft. deep. The driveway would go straight into the garage and some of the present paved area would be grass.

Steve Kenny, the applicant, was sworn in and questioned by Mr. Rubino. He has owned the house since 2006. They would like to have more room for entertaining. Mr. Kenny was questioned by the Board Members.

Paul Damiano, Architect, was sworn in and went into more detail about the proposed garage and surrounding area. Mr. Damiano was questioned by the Board Members.

The Board is concerned about the impervious surface in the front yard and Mr. Kenny is willing to re-work the plans. Chairman Sapnar advised Mr. Kenny that he would like to see revised plans before making a decision and the application will be heard again on May 11, 2011 at 7:30 PM in this room and no further notice is required.

Motion by Burke, seconded by Judge, that meeting adjourn. On roll call all Board Members voted Aye. None No. Motion carried. Time: 9:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted:

_________________________
Board Secretary