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        E X H I B I T S
```

        EXHIBIT NO.
        A-1
    MR. VENEZIA: Roll call, please?
MS. DEGENARO: Robert Venezia?
MR. VEnEZIA: Here.
MS. DEGENARO: Pamela Hughes?
MS. HUGHES: Here.
MS. DEGENARO: Paul Santorelli?
MR. SANTORELLI: Here.
MS. DEGENARO: Paul Giglio?
MR. GIGLIO: Here.
MS. DEGENARO: August Stohl?
MR. STOHL: Here.
MS. DEGENARO: And Mark Engel?
MR. ENGEL: Here.
MR. VENEZIA: Thank you. Ladies and
Gentlemen, this is the May 23 rd 2019 regular
meeting of the West Long Branch Zoning Board of
Adjustment.
(Mr. Venezia read the Open Public
Meetings Act.) Minutes?
MS. DEGENARO: Almost.
MR. VENEZIA: We will have them for the next meeting?

MS. DEGENARO: I would hope so. There is not many.

MR. VENEZIA: The minutes of the April
meeting, April, March meeting will be forthcoming, so we will hold them off until our next meeting in June. Items of business for tonight, we have a carryover from last month Dos Santos and Severio at 74 Summers Avenue. MR. IRENE: Do you want to come on up? Okay. So, Mr. Chairman, this matter was continued from our meeting last month, I think it was April 25, 2019. This is Mr. Severio. MR. SEVERIO: Yes. MR. IRENE: Yes. I know I put you under oath last time, but $I$ am going to put you under oath again. (Mr. Severio, sworn.)

MR. IRENE: And we have, everyone who is here this evening, if we conclude, can participate in the vote except for Mr. Engel because he was not here last month and did not have an opportunity to listen to a tape or read a transcript. Because no one provided it. So, where are we Mr. Severio? My recollection is that the matter was continued to give you an opportunity to review the plan to see if maybe you could mitigate some of the extra coverage. THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.

MR. IRENE: Okay.
THE WITNESS: You have the new plan
which shows the driveway.
MR. IRENE: I don't know. Do we?
THE WITNESS: I gave it to you guys.
MR. IRENE: Do you have one?
MR. SEVERIO: I have one here.
MS. DEGENARO: I only received her tax payment, but $I$ would know where the folder is.

MR. IRENE: Why don't we take a minute?
MS. DEGENARO: Sorry. It was never
given to me.
MR. IRENE: So we have a Pool Variance Plan prepared by Robert C. Burdick, $B-U-R-D-I-C-K, P . E$. and Stanley Hans, $H-A-N-S$, Jr., PLS consisting of one sheet. It's dated September 27, 2018, which was the original date on the plan that we marked as A-1 last time and this is revised through May 15th 2019. So, Chris Ann, we are going to mark that as, what are we up, to A-2?

MS. DEGENARO: I believe so, yeah.
MR. IRENE: A-2, please. Okay. Mr. Severio, do you want to tell the Board what's changed on the plan?

MR. SEVERIO: Well, basically, last time, you know, you say that $I$ had too much coverage already. So the only thing I can come up with is a little bit of the driveway, which is about, the plan shows about 456 square feet. I believe it is a little bit more than that, but, you know, that is the only thing that $I$ can change, because $I$ can change nothing else.

MR. VENEZIA: So, where on the diagram, on the existing asphalt driveway is going to be removed?

MR. SEVERIO: Yes.
MR. VENEZIA: That whole area.
MR. SEVERIO: The left side of where you see over there, you know, the arrows, that side is going to be removed. And the only thing $I$ ask, you know, if you guys give me the okay, the only thing $I$ would like to do is hold onto until they finish the job and then $I$ will remove the driveway.

MR. IRENE: So, do we know what the new coverage proposed is, Mr. Severio, as a result of that? Did he give you the calculations on here somewhere? Here it is, 45.8; is that right?

MR. GIGLIO: It shows minus 456, yes,
45.8.

MR. VENEZIA: So it went up 6.3.
MR. IRENE: Your plan says the existing
coverage is 42.5 percent where 30 percent is the maximum allowed. Your original initial plan was proposed at 48.8, and now, as a result of the elimination of one leg of the driveway, it's now proposed at 45.8; is that right?

MR. STOHL: Under, General Notes, I think that is first 48.8 is the original number. It should be 45.8; is that correct?

MR. IRENE: If you look at No. 5, Mr. Severio, so it looks like your engineer changed it in the schedule in No. 4 where he shows proposed 45.8, but he did not change it in note No. 5 underneath. It says 48.8 .

MR. SEVERIO: Yeah, I see it.
MR. STOHL: That should be 45.8.
MR. SEVERIO: I have a feeling that if he just -- I don't think he ever came over to my house. I don't know. I don't think so. I submit the plan for him as a change. He might not change the rest. That is what $I$ am thinking.

MR. VENEZIA: So your driveway is on this diagram is to the right of the existing asphalt driveway listed?

MR. SEVERIO: Well, if you face the house, the left side.

MR. VENEZIA: It is the left side.
MR. SEVERIO: Yeah, the right side would be the garage. That straight line across, that is where the garage is.

MR. IRENE: So you are removing the left side of what was the horseshoe coming out?

MR. SEVERIO: Yes. Yes.
MR. VENEZIA: I need clarification on that, the coverage. Is it reversed?

MR. IRENE: No. So, what happened is, they are showing 42.5 percent as existing.

MR. VENEZIA: Right.
MR. IRENE: Now, we are assuming last
time, $I$ think, that it predates the Zoning Ordinance that limits lot coverage. There was a Resolution from 2006, which we are going to mark as Exhibit A-3. The 2006 Resolution for the subject property $A-3$. That granted variance relief for the setback, I believe it was side yard setbacks of the house. There is no
reference to a lot coverage variance in that Resolution and I don't believe, but I am not certain, $I$ don't believe that there was a lot coverage limitation in existence at the time, so I am going to assume the coverage predates the Zoning Ordinance limitation, unless some of these things were recently added. I don't know. It's just driveway and house and the deck.

But the Applicant shows on their plan 42.5 percent lot coverage existing. Thirty percent maximum otherwise allowed in the zone now and the initial proposal on the first plan that came before us last month was 48. --

MR. STOHL: Eight.
MR. IRENE: -- 8 percent. That has now been revised down to 45.8 percent. As a result of the elimination of the left leg of the horseshoe driveway. Is that right, Mr. Severio?

MR. SEVERIO: I think so. The whole thing is only three percent, that whole driveway?

MR. IRENE: That's what your plan says.
MR. SEVERIO: Okay.
MR. IRENE: Not the whole driveway. He is taking off that one left leg.

MR. SEVERIO: Yeah, but it's pretty big.
MR. IRENE: Does he show the square
footage on here?
MR. SEVERIO: Four hundred fifty-six.
MR. IRENE: Right, but I mean, he
doesn't show the overall square footage of all of the structures. I don't know.

MR. IRENE: No, he does it to the right. What's that? There it is. It's all the way over to the right, Mr. Severio, see it? That's where he breaks out all of the square footage.

MR. SEVERIO: Okay.
MR. VENEZIA: Can Mr. Engel have a voice in this?

MR. IRENE: Sure he can. He can
participate. It's just if we finish him, he can't vote.

MR. ENGEL: Is there any possibility, I
know we are talking about expense here, is there any possibility of resurfacing the driveway with a more pervious type of material, you know, either pervious asphalt, section concrete, whatever would qualify as a more pervious material? $I$ know -- would -- is that feasible for your budget and your concerns?

MR. SEVERIO: It's definitely not in the budget, but, you know, if it comes down to it, you know, my drive is pretty big. That is the, you know.

MR. IRENE: One of the issues is going to be, and you can certainly, the Board can do whatever it likes, you can impose whatever conditions you like. But keep in mind that, generally, when we are talking about coverage and we can look at our Ordinance definition, even gravel is considered coverage. Technically, water can perc through gravel. For a couple of reasons, one, it's going to silt up and become like concrete anyway. Even some of these surfaces that allow water to perc through, if you don't properly maintain them, you lose the ability for the water to perc through. The other reason is an aesthetic issue. Even though water can perc through a slotted deck, you wouldn't allow someone to put a slotted deck across an entire property because it violates the God awful ugly rule.

So, when we talk about coverage limitations, one is for water perc and the other is for aesthetics also.

MR. GIGLIO: He was talking about the new asphalt. We haven't had a chance to examine that as a Board.

MR. IRENE: If the Board sees fit to mitigate any adverse impacts, if you wanted to do something like, that you could impose the condition. I don't know. You would have to maintain it to make sure it continues to do that.

MR. GIGLIO: That is a big job.
MR. IRENE: Was there any consideration of reducing the size of the pool, before you start something things with the driveway?

MR. SEVERIO: You guys asked me to consider something.

MR. IRENE: Right.
MR. SEVERIO: Some change and I figured the driveway, you know.

MR. IRENE: No. No. That is certainly
fine. I am not criticizing that. I think the Board would commend you for looking at that. Was there any consideration to reducing the size of the pool as well?

MR. SEVERIO: We could.
MR. IRENE: Okay. Did you consider
other sized pools or was it just the one that you picked?

MR. SEVERIO: That was the only one, you know, because it's actually not that big, you know, but when the guy came over my house, we picked that one and, you know, we never, you never looked at another one.

MR. IRENE: How about what is around the pool, is it just three feet all around and that is it?

MR. SEVERIO: Yes. That's what it comes from.

MR. IRENE: The coping.
MR. SEVERIO: Yeah.
MR. IRENE: You've gotten closer to
where you are now, I mean, if you could, obviously, the Board, if you could hit it so you are swapping out, that would be easy, not easy, that would be a lot easier for the Board if you were maintaining the existing, because the existing is already over by quite a bit, you know? So that tends to be what the Board looks for. Can we swap out what is proposed with some of the things that are there? Unfortunately, most of your structure now is the house and the
driveway.
MR. SEVERIO: Pretty much.
MR. IRENE: And the deck.
MR. SEVERIO: The only thing that I
figured was that it was possible to remove it right now because $I$ don't need the driveway.

MR. VENEZIA: Was there a pool in the size of, yours is proposed at 16-by-36. Is there a 16-by-32?

MR. SEVERIO: I would have to find out. They only have, it's not like a custom-made. It's not like a cement pool.

MR. GIGLIO: I am a little confused on something on this chart here and maybe somebody can explain this to me. The middle portion where it shows the 942 square 6.2 percent above the total?

MS. HUGHES: Pool.
MR. GIGLIO: That is the pool, the whole pool 6.2 percent?

MR. SANTORELLI: That's what it says.
MR. GIGLIO: So mitigating it down to a smaller really isn't going to reduce much at this point.

MR. VENEZIA: Another two percent.

MR. GIGLIO: Right. So I think the concentration definitely has to occur somewhere on the driveway.

MR. IRENE: Well, he has got to be able to get into his garage.

MR. VENEZIA: Right.
MR. IRENE: Is it a front-entry garage or a side-entry garage?

MR. SEVERIO: Front.
MR. IRENE: So, what's the -- isn't that concrete -- isn't that driveway on the --

MR. SANTORELLI: That is the front step.
MR. IRENE: No, I am talking about on the side.

MR. GIGLIO: Going up to the shed you are talking about?

MR. IRENE: Yeah.
MR. SEVERIO: That is where I park my van.

MS. HUGHES: I have a question. The shed is also an issue on this plan, correct? We have to deal with the shed, because if you are willing to make the shed smaller and conforming to the old shed Ordinance that would eliminate a little bit of surface.

MR. IRENE: Well, if the shed goes away, that is 200 square feet. Who can do the math to figure out what that does to the total?

MR. STOHL: That is not a lot.
MR. GIGLIO: No. Point eight? Point eight, right, Paul?

MR. SANTORELLI: Should be somewhere in there.

MS. HUGHES: Because the other issue is, right now, as it is, the shed is too close to the property line, because it is so tall. I am trying to find the Ordinance, the shed Ordinance.

MR. VENEZIA: The height of the shed from the setback.

MR. GIGLIO: We already talked about last time.

MS. HUGHES: If it's 100 square feet or less, and it's not taller than 8 feet, it can be two feet from the property line. But if it's taller than 8 feet, it has to be set back half of the height.

MR. SANTORELLI: Is that still at the 100 square footage or is that any size?

MS. HUGHES: You know, it doesn't say.

MR. IRENE: No. I think, once you go over the 100 , it has to be set back the full height.

MR. SANTORELLI: Right. If it's over the 100, yeah.

MS. HUGHES: It doesn't say that. It
says, if the shed is in excess of 8 feet, the shed must be set back from the side and rear at least the distance equal to half of the height of the shed, but it doesn't say anything about how many square feet. The square feet only pertains to the first paragraph, which says, if it is 100 square feet or less and no more than 8 feet in height, it can be two feet from the property line. So Paragraph B does not reference square feet. It only references height.

MR. IRENE: Okay.
MS. HUGHES: What are we talking about
here? Do we want to squeak out more? Do we want to get it down further from the 45.8?

MR. SANTORELLI: Didn't we set a limit last time, something we were hoping to achieve or did we ask them?

MS. HUGHES: You know, I don't remember.

MR. VENEZIA: What is that, Paul?
MR. SANTORELLI: I said, didn't we ask
for an amount of lot coverage or did we say, just try to reduce it? Did we give an amount? MR. VENEZIA: He asked for an amount and we were like, you know, you got to come up with an amount.

MR. SANTORELLI: That is what $I$ was trying to remember, okay. Thank you.

MR. VENEZIA: There were some other issues, too, we were talking about the water that was being pumped out and what kind of plan you were going to come up with that also.

MR. SEVERIO: Right now, it's not doing it anymore, so.

MR. VENEZIA: What?
MR. SEVERIO: It stopped.
MR. VENEZIA: With all of the rain we had?

MR. SEVERIO: I guess the gentleman talking over here did something. I don't know. Maybe the lady next-door complaining about, you know.

MS. HUGHES: So, what we are discussing over here is the pool adds 942 square feet. So
before the pool, he is starting with --
MR. SANTORELLI: We are starting with
6380 with driveway, AC, rear deck, front steps
and the building which is the shed and the home.
And we have this right now. We are adding 942,
so we have the 6380 plus the 942 minus the 456
of what's taking off the driveway. Would
everyone feel more comfortable if we were
removing what we were adding and just making a
clean swap 942 for 942 ?
MR. STOHL: I would be more comfortable
with that, yes.
MR. VENEZIA: Where's the swap coming
from again? That becomes a discussion of where
would you get the rest of the lot coverage come
from?
MR. SANTORELLI: Half would be 471.
MR. VENEZIA: You know, with the
driveway being removed. The existing driveway
being removed.
MR. STOHL: If you took out a little bit
more of the driveway out in front of the door.
Do you use that part of the driveway for turns
or what is that and made it more of a walkway
rather than a driveway?

MR. SEVERIO: Just park in the front of the house and go into the front door, basically.

MR. VENEZIA: Can you do the parking in
front of front door without that --
MR. IRENE: Bubble?
MR. VENEZIA: The bulb or the roundabout, thus giving you a little more?

MR. GIGLIO: You are saying to square it off?

MR. GIGLIO: How much extra is that going to give?

MR. SANTORELLI: That might get you --
MR. GIGLIO: Point 2?
MR. STOHL: No, I think it's going to be more than that.

MR. VENEZIA: That might be another 160 square feet.

MR. GIGLIO: Point 4?
MR. VENEZIA: Now you are over 600 .
MR. IRENE: Do you want to open to
interested parties, Mr. Chairman, while the Board is kicking this around?

MR. VENEZIA: Is there anyone in the audience that would like to make a comment on this or a question?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Could we get a copy? MR. IRENE: Sure. Do we have an extra one for the interested parties to take a look at?

MR. VENEZIA: And this is what we are talking we've been going off for the last few minutes.

MR. IRENE: Referring to $A-2$.
MR. STOHL: So, my thinking before, the reason $I$ asked is that the part of the driveway that remains, the bump-out in front of your door, if you remove that as well and you replaced it with a walkway, you wouldn't park there, but you could walk there and make it look very nice. I do think that would be an equal swap. That would be pretty close or close enough for me in terms of putting a pool in and removing half of the driveway to mitigate that, especially with the water issues that go on in Town. Does that make sense?

MR. SEVERIO: You are talking about taking the whole front of the door, like leave it straight across the garage?

MR. STOHL: Yes. Straight across the garage and give yourself a walkway.

MR. SANTORELLI: Give yourself a walkway three-foot wide or whatever to the driveway from the front door. Leave it paver or concrete or you know.

MR. SEVERIO: I don't want to, but --
MS. HUGHES: We have to get it down a little bit from the 45.8 , because you are really supposed to be at 30 and you are starting with 42.5.

MR. SANTORELLI: Which was before the Ordinance.

MS. HUGHES: Which was before the Ordinance.

MS. HUGHES: If we can keep it at 42.5 or somewhere close to that, it would be more consistent with what the Zoning or the Ordinance calls for today.

MR. IRENE: Was the driveway there when the house was built, do you know, the existing driveway today?

MR. SEVERIO: No, I put that driveway in.

MR. IRENE: When did you do that? Do you know?

MR. SEVERIO: When I built the house.

MRS. DOS SANTOS: 2006 .
MR. IRENE: When the house was built. That presumably pre-dated the limitation. I didn't know if the driveway was added sometime thereafter. Apparently, no.

MR. VENEZIA: Is any of this in
disrepair of the driveway or is the driveway still solid?

MR. SEVERIO: It's -- the driveway is fine. I don't need, you know, the only reason I did like the circle one because when $I$ built the house, they made me put the house 40 feet back. So I figured, you know what, just make it, you know, circular driveway make it easier that way, but if my house was just like everybody else, I would have made the driveway, you know, just straight across. But $I$ did it the other way, you know, $I$ thought what $I$ was taking out over here would be enough to compensate for the pool.

MR. IRENE: The problem is, you are over now presumably that is all pre-existing, so it would have a right to stay, assuming that is the coverage that exists 42.5 , but even going to the 45, what is that, one-and-a-half times what's allowed? Thirty and 15. It's 150 percent of
what otherwise is allowed. So what the Board is trying to see is, whatever you are proposing to add, swap out existing so you get a net wash then you are maintaining what preexists, but you are not increasing it further. That is what they are grappling with here to make it make some sense. If it can be a wash then it matches what exists now. So that's why a couple of the Board Members were just suggesting to take out that entire bulb, so you have the straight-on driveway coming to the house, leave what's on the right and just have a walkway so you can get to the front door from the driveway. That would almost --

MR. SANTORELLI: That is pretty close, yeah, close to a swap.

MR. VENEZIA: Yet, on the right-hand side of the building on the west side, you have plenty of areas to park. That is all concrete. MR. SEVERIO: As far as parking, you know, I got plenty of park over there. If people comes over, they can park on the street. If it comes down to it and that's what $I$ need to do, that's what I need to do, but I would love to leave it.

MR. IRENE: It's up to the Board. We are going to go back to the interested parties, I would suggest. If the Board wants to grant a number greater than the existing 42.5 then he will have to hit that number. If the Board wants to swap at 42.5 then he will have to hit that number however he does it. It's up to the Board. And then you have to deal with the setback issue, too, of the shed.

MR. SANTORELLI: Right.
MR. IRENE: Although, there was some issue about having permits last time?

MR. SANTORELLI: No, it wasn't permits. It was the setback.

MR. IRENE: It was a stop.
MR. SEVERIO: Right now, it's supposed to be six. I'm five-and-a-half. And $I$ think the reason why the guy stopped, I tried to explain to you last time, when he came in, the driveway, my neighbors back over there right now, when he did the driveway, he asked me, can I push the driveway a little bit, and $I$ say, that is fine. There is no need for me. Right now, it looks closer, but it's not. It's actually five-and-a-half, almost 6 and that is
what $I$ supposed to be because it's 12 feet high and 6 feet on the side.

When the inspector comes in, right now
if you look at the grass, there is only about maybe three-and-a-half, four feet of grass next to the shed, but my property goes more than that. That is why, you know, when he saw that, he said you got to stop and that is why I stopped.

MR. VENEZIA: How big is the shed?
MR. SEVERIO: It's bigger. The concern
is the height. Whatever the height, it's supposed to be half.

MR. VENEZIA: It's supposed to be half if it's under 100 square feet.

MS. HUGHES: No. Two feet if it's eight feet or shorter. Half if it's taller than eight feet.

MR. VENEZIA: And you are saying that
you are five-and-a-half feet --
MR. SEVERIO: Yeah.
MR. VENEZIA: -- away the from property line.

MR. SEVERIO: Yes, sir.
MR. VENEZIA: And where six -- you are

12 feet high where 6 is required.
MR. GIGLIO: I think what he was saying
is that his fence line is actually further to
the right.
MR. IRENE: Property line.
MR. SEVERIO: There is no fence there
right now.
MR. IRENE: Don't think it was
dimensioned on the plan, unfortunately. It's 5.5 feet where 6 feet is required.

MR. SEVERIO: Yes.
MR. IRENE: You can't move that. That
is in the ground.
MR. SEVERIO: It's on piles.
MR. IRENE: You are asking for a
six-foot side yard setback, right?
MR. SEVERIO: Yes.
MR. IRENE: You are asking to leave it
at 5.5 where 6 feet is required?
MR. SEVERIO: Yes.
MR. IRENE: Interested parties?
MR. VENEZIA: Any interest? Sir, would you like to just come on $u$ and state your name?

MR. SCATUORCHIO: Frank Scatuorchio, 264
Monmouth.
(Frank Scatuorchio, sworn.)
MR. SCATUORCHIO: Our main question was a couple of the other issues that Mrs. Hughes started to get into, so on this public input for just this one topic of the --

MR. IRENE: The application in its
entirety. This is your time.
MR. SCATUORCHIO: Survey. If I recall correctly, they were to have a Survey done.

MR. IRENE: Survey of what?
MR. SCATUORCHIO: Survey of the property. The property lines are in question. Mr. Severio believes it's one line and I have a difference of opinion.

MR. IRENE: Okay. Do you have a Survey? He has got a Pool Variance Plan prepared by his Surveyor.

MR. IRENE: You think the setback of the pool is different?

MR. SCATUORCHIO: No. No. Property line regarding where the fence is.

MR. IRENE: But if the property line is different, is that going to affect the setback of the pool? That is why I am asking. Then he needs a variance on the setback because he has
to relocate the pool.
MR. SCATUORCHIO: That is what the reason why. I came in last time around with concerns about the tree.

MR. IRENE: Right.
MR. SCATUORCHIO: And then the tree is
95 percent on one side and 95 percent on the other side, give or take. The line is indistinct. That is what $I$ am trying to get at. Where a re-marking or re-establishment of that rear and side yard property lines would help to define exactly where the --

MR. IRENE: I think there was, my notes show there was a stipulation that the rear line was going to be staked prior to the installation of the pool and the rear fence to ensure he had the proper setback.

MR. SCATUORCHIO: That is what I
thought. I am making sure.
MR. IRENE: Alright. That was your concern.

MR. SCATUORCHIO: One, two.
MR. IRENE: Okay.
MR. SCATUORCHIO: Again, stipulations regarding any draining water, because Mr. Giglio
gave me a little education last time around a couple of feet of water has got to get washed out of it every year, if $I$ recall correctly, and where it goes. And what else? Well, just the overage on the lot coverage as a general concern. I see you are working on it, so we are waiting to hear what you got.

MR. IRENE: If he swaps out, it is a pre-existing, non-conforming. MR. SCATUORCHIO: I hear where you are heading, so that's why we didn't harp on it. Thanks.

MR. IRENE: Thank you.
MR. VENEZIA: When your Surveyor came to prepare this, did he do the stakeouts? Do we know?

MR. SEVERIO: There is nothing there right now. If he did it, it's not there.

MR. IRENE: Many times, they won't do it, unless you pay for it and have you sign a waiver. There is an extra cost to have the stakes put in the ground.

MR. SEVERIO: We didn't deal with this guy. We deal with the pool guy and he hires this people.

MR. IRENE: Right. That is fine. But you heard from last time, and $I$ think you agreed to it, but $I$ know the Board --

MR. SEVERIO: Oh, I am going to have to, because the fence. I have to.

MR. IRENE: Right. And you want to make sure that the setback of the pool conforms. You don't want to put it in the ground and find out you are short, so.

MR. SEVERIO: No.
MR. IRENE: No, it's prudent to do that. It's smart to do that.

MR. VENEZIA: To have the stakeouts.
MR. IRENE: Yeah. Absolutely. If the Board seeks to grant relief, it would be a condition of approval. And $I$ would assume that Mr. Severio would do it anyway when he puts the pool in because he wants to make sure he conforms with the required setbacks for the pool anyway. He needs to know where to put the fence. Your fence guy probably wants to have it staked out, too.

MR. VENEZIA: With the issue of the pool water where that is going to be drained, he still has plenty of his backyard to drop it in.

MR. SCATUORCHIO: It's noted. We will restate it.

MR. VENEZIA: Yes, sir?
MR. IRENE: Sir, could you come up and tell us who you are, please?

MR. JULIANO: Nick Juliano.
(Nick Juliano, sworn.)
MR. JULIANO: With the pool water, we run it out to the street.

MR. IRENE: Right.
MR. JULIANO: Right. It doesn't go on anybody's property. There is hoses that are long enough and $I$ will supply him with the hoses, because I have them. And this way, no one will complain about any water issues.

MR. IRENE: I think that is what he has to do with it.

MR. JULIANO: Yes, no, that's exactly what he has to do with it.

MR. VENEZIA: From my recollection, you are his nearest west side.

MR. JULIANO: West side.
MR. VENEZIA: He has no issue with the shed.

MR. SEVERIO: That is where the shed is.

MR. IRENE: Last time you spoke about the shed, do you have any issue with this setback issue deviation with the shed?

MR. JULIANO: No, I do not.
MR. IRENE: So, we are back to the swap out. Basically, to the point where, as it was suggested, maybe just squaring off that section of your driveway near where it comes up, what comes from the street straight up instead of going where listed as, existing asphalt driveway and the construction access, you know, and using the construction access until the pool is done. But to square off that area -- Bonnie would have been very good there. I think you are going to be very close.

MR. SANTORELLI: Yeah, it looks like it should be close to that area. I don't have a scale or anything.

MR. STOHL: For me, it would be close enough.

MR. SEVERIO: The only thing with that, if $I$ take the asphalt, $I$ still going to have to put something there, because the stair on the front of the house, it's about five feet long wide.

MR. IRENE: You put asphalt or concrete running from in front of the stairs to the remaining driveway.

MR. SEVERIO: That's what I mean.
Something.
MR. SANTORELLI: Paver walk concrete.
Whatever. Standard three foot from there to the driveway.

MR. IRENE: Here is the issue, unless the Board is going to try and revise the plan for him, which it sounds like you are making a suggestion, you are going to have to pick a number and then he is going to have to figure it out. I don't know how to put in words, well, you are going to take out some of this and whatever that coverage is, is what you are getting. So, if you're saying, look, remove a deck and we could say, remove that deck and whatever that is, the resulting coverage would be it. This is a moving line here, so $I$ think what you are down to is talking about the coverage you are going to permit, whether it's match the existing or something else.

MR. VENEZIA: Mr. Irene, if we did say to, specifically, to say on that portion of the
driveway to take it completely out.
MR. IRENE: But remember, he still has to have sufficient hard surface to walk from the remaining driveway to his --

MR. SANTORELLI: Front porch.
MR. IRENE: -- front steps. Unless we are all going to get out our slide rules and dimension that out.

MR. VENEZIA: If we could say allowing for $a$ four-foot up to four feet from the existing steps for a walkway to the new section or to the new proposed driveway, you know, you are talking --

MR. IRENE: Okay. Four feet by what length?

MR. IRENE: We are talking about the length of the steps.

MR. IRENE: I mean, $I$ can try and put all of that in words. I have no idea what the numbers are going to be when you are left with that. I can try and describe it, as you've done, Mr. Venezia. I mean, we can talk about remove the entire --

MR. SANTORELLI: Square off the driveway the from street.

MR. IRENE: Yeah, again, you are describing the words. Ideally, you would have a plan that would be marked up, which I am not sure we want to do that. I will do whatever the Board wants to do, obviously. We will do our best. What I don't want to have happen is have somebody in construction kick him back when they say, that's not what the Board said. Whatever you feel comfortable with.

MR. SANTORELLI: The problem is, without some type of numbers, I don't have a scale. MR. VENEZIA: That is a big portion that we are talking about.

MR. SANTORELLI: Yes, it is.
MR. VENEZIA: I think it is as big if not bigger than what he has proposed at 456 to be removed.

MR. SANTORELLI: You are almost equaled out there. It's hard to say.

MR. VENEZIA: Plus or minus 25 square feet. Once again --

MR. SANTORELLI: You need some type of walkway, so you are not in the mud.

MR. VENEZIA: That's why we are saying to bring it up to 4 feet, square off from the
existing porch now to the edge of the new
driveway.
MR. SANTORELLI: We don't have any way
to give measurements right now without a scale
or some measurement.
MR. VENEZIA: Would you be in agreement
with something like that?
MR. SERVIO: I don't have an option,
right?
MS. HUGHES: Probably not, because you
don't want to take out your deck in the
backyard, right? I mean, that is a portion,
too, but you probably want your deck or maybe
you don't. Maybe you say $I$ would rather have --
MR. SEVERIO: No, I want my deck.
MRS. DOS SANTOS: The patio. We wanted
to do a patio at this point.
MS. HUGHES: Right.
MR. SEVERIO: Doesn't matter. Patio is
still covered.
MRS. DOS SANTOS: That's what $I$ am
saying. We can't do a patio, if we remove the
deck.
MR. IRENE: This can't go together or we
would have to give another Open Public Meetings

Act Notice. You could set the number --
MR. GIGLIO: Stay at 43.
MR. IRENE: No, Mr. Severio could achieve that number wherever he chooses to achieve it.

MR. SANTORELLI: Probably, rough guess, 22 to 25 feet from where you would cut the driveway to the front steps, but that is just with a rough scale.

MR. VENEZIA: The driveway is already cut.

MR. SANTORELLI: From where the new cut would take place to where the front steps would be, you would be somewhere between 22 to 25 feet.

MR. VENEZIA: The cut is already there, correct?

MR. SANTORELLI: No.
MR. VENEZIA: Cutting off of the driveway?

MR. SANTORELLI: Yes. Where you would have the new --

MR. GIGLIO: Would it be easier to sit back and set the number at 43 and let them work it out with their engineers?

MS. HUGHES: That's what we were talking about over here.

MR. GIGLIO: Sounds like the way to go. Say here it is, 43, and let them work it out.

MR. ENGEL: We are actually taking a stab on a piece of paper. The engineers on the site, they know.

MR. GIGLIO: Engineers are at the site.
MR. ENGEL: We are just looking at it from a bird's eye view.

MR. GIGLIO: Done.
MS. HUGHES: I am good with that. I do just have one more. Are we concerned about water or?

MR. GIGLIO: No.
MS. HUGHES: I am concerned about the tree because, you know, if you look to the left of the page, it does say, proposed limit of disturbance, and he has a line going around the area where it will be disturbed, the ground will be disturbed to put in this pool. So I would just ask, if you would have your guy put one of those plastic temporary orange fences around that tree, just so that the people working on the property, you know, property don't
accidentally back up into this tree. Set something just to protect it. That's all.

MR. VENEZIA: Caution construction
fence?
MS. HUGHES: Yeah.
MR. GIGLIO: Orange plastic.
MS. HUGHES: It's not an expensive
fence. It's very temporary. You just put that up, so the guys working on the property.

MRS. DOS SANTOS: Plus the trees, that is his baby. That's why we moved the pool all the way over there.

MR. IRENE: Ma'am, we didn't swear you in.

MS. DEGENARO: Mike, we had an exhibit for the tree.

MR. SANTORELLI: Just tell him what to say.

MS. DEGENARO: We had this exhibit that
Bonnie wrote at the last meeting, so the actual new exhibit should be three and four, so we could go back to that.

MR. IRENE: Hold on one second. What was that exhibit number?

MS. DEGENARO: The tree last meeting was

Exhibit 2. She wrote OFS-2.
MR. IRENE: There is a photograph of a
tree. Time out. This was a photograph submitted by Mr. Scatuorchio, so that was OFS 1 and OFS 2.

MS. DEGENARO: That is separate. I
wanted to make sure.
MR. VENEZIA: We are still uncertain with the number. If we give him the number of 43, and this bubble being taken out or this area being taken out doesn't come up to the 43 then where are we?

MS. HUGHES: We are no where because we told them to do 43, so whatever they, you know, if we are telling him 43, he can, you know --

MR. IRENE: He can lose a piece of the deck, he can put in a smaller pool. He can do whatever he needs to do to get to 43 and it's his option as to where he would like to swap out the coverage.

MR. VENEZIA: Presently, it's 42.5.
MS. HUGHES: You have flexibility that way, like you can go back to your pool guy, and you can say, gee, what is the next size smaller pool and maybe you don't take away as much of
the driveway. Like you get to choose instead of us telling you, it has to be the driveway.

MR. GIGLIO: Kidney shape.
MS. HUGHES: Oh, yeah. That is an idea, too.

MR. VENEZIA: This is all going to be contingent of the engineer going back and taking a look at it and this is 43 percent now. It's not like, you know.

MR. SEVERIO: You guys don't think taking the front part of the house that isn't enough?

MR. SANTORELLI: I think it might be close. I think it might be close to the 43 percent, but it's hard for me to say without having to scale it out and do the math.

MR. GIGLIO: We don't have exact measurements.

MR. SEVERIO: If that doesn't work then
I have no place else to even -- then $I$ have to demolish the house.

MS. HUGHES: We don't want you to do that.

MR. SANTORELLI: That's not what we want to happen.

MR. VENEZIA: I want to make sure we are on the same page here. If you come up here, I want to now, if we can all gather up here. We are talking about this here.

MR. SEVERIO: Yes.
MR. VENEZIA: We are talking about this area in here and this area, right?

MR. SEVERIO: Yeah, that is what I submitted this time.

MR. VENEZIA: And this. Now, this means bringing this line straight up --

MR. SEVERIO: Yes.
MR. VENEZIA: -- to the --
MR. GIGLIO: Property.
MR. SANTORELLI: Yeah, so you have enough on each side of the garage, like normal driveway.

MR. VENEZIA: And allowing like a sidewalk to be.

MR. STOHL: From the stairs.
MR. VENEZIA: From the stairs.
MR. SANTORELLI: Somewhere between -MR. VENEZIA: This is the stairs here, sir.

MR. SEVERIO: Yes, sir.

MR. VENEZIA: Here to here. So you are coming anyone parking in here.

MR. SEVERIO: There would be no parking in front of the house, you know, just the garage. That is fine.

MR. VENEZIA: Not necessarily. Isn't
this a big enough area?
MR. SEVERIO: Oh, yeah. It's pretty big.

MR. VENEZIA: Walk out and go to your sidewalk here.

MR. SEVERIO: But are you saying that is okay or do you still think that is good enough?

MR. SANTORELLI: We don't know. We can't do the math here. That's the problem. If the engineer comes up and says, oh, 42.5 and that his 43, whatever the number is, then you can decide.

MR. SEVERIO: Yeah, let me just ask a question, okay? If we make that change and still that doesn't, you know, it's not what you want then we are back to zero.

MR. IRENE: Then you got to look at a smaller pool or taking a piece off the deck or you got to look at eliminating the shed or you
got to look at something else, because that shed shouldn't have been added. Even though the 42.5 is existing, the shed is adding additional coverage to the site also. So that is the issue.

The issue is the Board presumably is going to grant and allow you to either swap out, which you could do, because you have a right to maintain your existing coverage, although the shed shouldn't part of that number or if the Board allows you to go to 43, you got a variance for a slight increase, but how you get there is up to you.

MR. GIGLIO: Right. You work with the engineer while you are doing it.

MR. SEVERIO: I didn't have a number to work with. When $I$ was here last time, you guys asked me to make a change. I thought I made a change.

MR. GIGLIO: It's unprecedented, let's put it that way, to give a number.

MR. VENEZIA: I am going to open it up back to the audience, if there is anyone else that would like to say anything.

MR. SCATUORCHIO: Frank Scaturochio,
once again. I have a question. Thirty percent lot coverage you state that it was not a regulation at what point in time?

MR. VENEZIA: When the house was built.
MR. IRENE: That is my understanding. I don't know exactly when the impervious coverage went in. Ms. Heard is our institutional knowledge person, who has all of that information. Unfortunately, she is ill tonight. I don't believe the lot coverage was in effect in 2006. And the reason $I$ say that is, there is a Resolution from 2006 that we marked into evidence that granted variance relief for side yard setback to the house. So, if the house and the driveway were going to exceed, presumably there would have been a lot coverage variance referenced. I don't believe the lot coverage were imposed sometime after 2006. MR. VENEZIA: I believe Mrs. Heard said that. That is our recollection.

MR. SCATUORCHIO: The reason I brought it up, my memory goes back a little further. I often look at that regulation, but $I$ will check. MR. IRENE: Well, if that is the case, the house and the driveway should never have
been built to that size. For some reason, I thought 2011.

MR. GIGLIO: 2011. That is what Bonnie said.

MR. IRENE: Could be wrong.
MR. VENEZIA: Mr. Juliano?
MR. JULIANO: No, I am good.
MR. VENEZIA: I believe the Board is prepared to vote on this with the change that we just discussed when it came up to the podium. I don't want to go through all of that and then you say, $I$ don't want to do that.

MR. SEVERIO: That is my only option, I guess. If you think, you know, give me the number that you guys are looking for, you know, we are good. Then we are good.

MR. VENEZIA: Are you ready?
MS. HUGHES: I would make a motion to grant the application with the stipulations as discussed. One being the shed is accepted at five-and-a-half foot setback, rather than the six inches that is required. The rear property line would be staked before the pool started, that the large tree would have some protection around it before the job starts and that the
total lot coverage would wind up at 43 percent which would then give you the option to design to 43 percent.

MR. STOHL: I don't think there was any other stipulation.

MR. IRENE: That is all I have.
MR. SANTORELLI: I will second.
MS. DEGENARO: Robert Venezia?
MR. VENEZIA: Yes.
MS. DEGENARO: Pamela Hughes?
MS. HUGHES: Yes.
MS. DEGENARO: Paul Santorelli?
MR. SANTORELLI: Yes.
MS. DEGENARO: Mr. Giglio?
MR. GIGLIO: Yes.
MS. DEGENARO: August Stohl?
MR. STOHL: Yes.
MR. IRENE: So it carries. Thank you
very much. So you understand, Mr. Severio, they grant you the approval for the setback on the shed and they grant you lot coverage.

MR. SEVERIO: Okay.
MR. IRENE: For 43 percent. And you can design that however you choose to do so. If eliminating those portions of the front driveway
get you there, great. If not, you got to find a little bit more somewhere else. They think by their rough sketch they can get you. You got to work it out with your engineer.

MR. VENEZIA: His engineer and our
engineer.
MR. IRENE: His engineer will design the plan and our engineer will look at it.

MR. SEVERIO: Thank you very much.
MR. IRENE: Thank you and have a good night.

MR. VENEZIA: Gentlemen of the Board, we still have a Resolution.

MS. DEGENARO: Mike, you said carried.
Do they need to give another plan?
MR. IRENE: No. So what's going to
happen is, next month, the Board will review a Resolution. I am going to put in words what the Board just did. The Board is going to adopt the Resolution. When they get the Resolution, you can go ahead and pull your permits. Before you do that, the Resolution is going to say the plan has to be revised so the total coverage adds up to no more than 43 percent, okay?

MRS. DOS SANTOS: Okay.

MR. VENEZIA: Chris Ann, the Minutes are going to be important, especially on something like this from last month. There is a few things that $I$ had forgotten.

MS. DEGENARO: I have them all. If I need help from you to email Stephanie --

MR. VENEZIA: No problem.
MS. DEGENARO: -- that might have to happen, because $I$ am not getting a lot of time to do things.

MR. VENEZIA: Let me know.
MR. IRENE: We also have to get caught up on the Annual Report. It predates you.

MS. DEGENARO: Pam and I talked about that on the phone today.

MR. IRENE: Seventeen and '18.
MS. DEGENARO: It's not as much as I thought it was.

MR. IRENE: I sent you a sample.
MR. VENEZIA: If you could locate in your packet or your memory, your email, the Resolution for the Cannan. Going into this matter, it's the Stacy Cannan matter. It's on Block 79, Lot 12 on the map for the Borough. It is a Resolution containing nine pages. Is there
any questions on Page 1? Corrections or
additions? Page 2? Page 3? Page 4? Page 5?
Page 6? Page 7? Page 8? And Page 9, which is
a certification page. What is the pleasure of
the Board?
MR. SANTORELLI: I will make a motion to
accept the Resolution.
MR. GIGLIO: I will second that.
MS. DEGENARO: Robert Venezia?
MR. VENEZIA: Yes.
MS. DEGENARO: Pamela Hughes?
MS. HUGHES: Yes.
MS. DEGENARO: Paul Santorelli?
MR. SANTORELLI: Yes.
MS. DEGENARO: Paul Giglio?
MR. GIGLIO: Yes.
MS. DEGENARO: August Stohl?
MR. STOHL: Yes.
MR. IRENE: That is it.
MR. VENEZIA: I believe that is it for the evening. Do we have a motion to close the meeting?

> MR. SANTORELLI: Motion to adjourn?
> MR. GIGLIO: I will second that.
> MR. IRENE: Ayes have it.

