

**Zoning Board Minutes**  
**Regular Meeting- In-person**  
**March 8, 2022**

Announcement by the Chairman that the meeting is in compliance with the Open Public Meetings Act, Chapter 231, Public Law 1975. Adequate notice of this meeting has been provided to the Coaster and Asbury Park Press. All notices are on file with the Board Secretary.

Board Members in Attendance: Christopher Avallone, Daniel Harris, Jill Potter, Tim Szlyk, Brittany Ashman, Wendi Glassman, Bonnie Nach, John Scully

Board Members Absent: Russell Lewis

Board Members Recused: none

Board Staff: Jack Serpico, Board Attorney; Irina Gasparyan, Board Secretary

---

**A. Minutes:**

1. Minutes of the Feb 8, 2022 Regular Meeting

**Motion by:** Avallone      **Seconded by:** Harris      **All in favor**

**B. Applications:**

1. **ZB-2021-09**  
**503 8<sup>TH</sup> Ave, LLC**

**503 Eighth Avenue, Block 3703, Lot 4, R1 Zone**

Preliminary & Final site plan & Minor Subdivision with d(2) variance of a pre-existing non-conforming use.

Andrew Karas, attorney

Walter Hopkins, lic engineer for applicant

Hopkins: described site & proposed development – existing main house & carriage house to remain.

Exhibit A-1 Site plan last revised 8/30/22

Miller: discrepancy between site plan & testimony as to units

Hopkins: have breakdown of bedrooms- 8x 1 bedroom, 2x 2-bedrooms

Peter Siegel, applicant, sworn in

Siegel: 7 apts in main, 3 in carriage house (1x 2bd)

Avallone: 10 cars parked there?

Siegel: I think everyone except 1 parks there

Avallone: why would we allow you to make the site worse?

Karas: intensity of existing house is not changing. Not knocking down the house, not changing.

Siegel: asked why, shortage of housing, nice new house going to go up that's conforming w area, not increasing use, now going to bring existing house more into conformity than it is now. I would not agree that it is intensification of the non-conforming use.

Open to public Q's

Reggie Fimlin, 8<sup>th</sup> Ave: why wait to fix up the house & put up new?

Siegel: we have been fixing up main house interiors. Quite immediately started spending money on house. wanted to create more parking.

Rita Marano

Enrique Wegel, 506 8<sup>th</sup>

Walter Hopkins (testimony cont)

Miller: walk thru parking design once more

Jason Fichter, board engineer

Fichter: turning radius if concerned with how turn ask to provide

Harris: are parking spaces going to be numbered? Would like to see numbered & assigned. Any need handicap?

Siegel: happy to number them if that's what's wanted. We usually manage using parking stickers. None of tenants handicap

Hopkins: we can provide turning radius as condition of approval but I can say there is safe radius

Miller: I may recommend wheel stops anyway

Ashman: concerned about driveway, between 2 buildings, looks like bollards but looks tight.

Hopkins: one of suggestions was to curb the area & would agree to that

Karas: what's width of driveway

Hopkins: 12'

Karas: that's what's standard

Avallone:  
5-minute recess  
Walter Hopkins, lic professional planner

Hopkins:

Karas: special reasons that you've gone over. Also case law that's exactly like what were looking at- looking to see if there is substantial vs insubstantial increase in non-conformity. Looking at increased conflict in neighborhood.

Ashman: what would stop you

Serpico: you would stop that. We would assure that there is no multifamily application

Hopkins: in my opinion, no substantial detriment to negative criteria

Harris: when put in curb cut are you taking away street parking?

Hopkins: yes, but adding 2 spaces on site

Avallone: talked about historic aspect of site

Miller: they're keeping the historic structure

Serpico: In D2 line of cases, zoning boards looking for visual, allowed to use the visual aspect to consider of whether or not to grant.

Karas: one of the things that supports this application is the aesthetics  
Open to public Qs of planner testimony

Enrique Wegel: density, parking

Hopkins: density is exactly half of what's allowed in the zone. Curb cut on grand would take away 1 off site space, but adding 2 onsite so in theory there's 2 people parking on street

Reggie Fimlin: main building will not change at all for new structure?

Hopkins: only change is portico would come out & shed taken away  
Close Public Q's

Hopkins: continue w/ refuse testimony; stormwater- underground percolation system

Fichter: when say decrease in impervious is that including new lot? I think we need to handle stormwater for both lots. When dep wrote stormwater regs, so if take mother parcel & fall under threshold, then few years later develop subdivision, & it puts you over the threshold, take into account whole lot.

Hopkins: of course wouldn't try to circumvent that. We could put in systems in new lot to handle it.

Fichter: I just want to see something that will handle it. Bottom line is how to accommodate entire lot

Ashman: Have you thought about making pervious pavement?

Hopkins: as condition of approval, we would be happy to accommodate

Ashman: so is there anything else could do?

Fichter: in theory could handle both lots stormwater on one lot, or separate the 2 lots. just have to do analysis to adjoining properties

Hopkins: agreeable to work with Insite to meet those

Hopkins: lighting- we would comply with recommendations of board professionals. Utilities- all underground for single family. No signage proposed. Mechanical equipment- there is no ac in either building

Karas: page 7 of planner report- no objections to recommendations. Landscape- agree to all recommendations in report. Pg 8- agree to all.

Hopkins: we would attempt to comply with additional landscaping recommendation.  
Miller: since shifting parking area would have room  
Exhibit B-1: CCH report  
Karas: reviewed all items in Insite board engineer report  
Exhibit B-2: Insite report  
Hopkins: agree to all & will address stormwater. Agree to add handicap parking  
Szlyk: possible to do single curb cut rather than double. What's the reason for removing the holly tree?  
Karas: every effort can be made to save the trees  
Glassman: would retention of trees make it unbuildable lot?  
Siegel: it would just increase cost  
Miller: Portico  
Hopkins: I don't think we would be able to save it. Fire dept would probably have problem with it  
Avallone: Like to see the items mentioned next time you come.

**Motion to carry to 4/26/22 without notice:** Avallone    **Second:** Ashman  
**All members vote in favor**  
**Application CARRIED**

E. **Adjournment:**  
**Motion to adjourn:** Avallone    **Second:** Potter    **All in favor**  
Meeting adjourned: 10:07 pm