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Mr. Venezia reads the Open Public
Meetings Act.
Pledge of Allegiance.
MR. VENEZIA: Can we have a roll call,
please?
MS. DEGENARO: Robert Venezia?
MR. VENEZIA: Here.
MS. DEGENARO: Michael Schulz?
MR. SCHULZ: Here.
MS. DEGENARO: Scott LaMarca?
MR. LAMARCA: Here.
MS. DEGENARO: Paul Giglio?
MR. GIGLIO: Here.
MS. DEGENARO: Greg Malfa?
MR. MALFA: Here.
MS. DEGENARO: Mark Engel?
MR. ENGEL: Here.
MR. VENEZIA: Ladies and Gentlemen, this
is the December 19, 2019 regular meeting of the West Long Branch Zoning Board of Adjustment. In addition, I want to make note there is an emergency exit right here to my left, as I am pointing, and also the entrance that you came in. We are going to go right to the items of business, right to the variance of Almeida from

45 Lakeview Avenue.
MR. IRENE: Mr. Chairman, this is the Almeida application. It has been carried from a prior meeting of the Board without the necessity of re-Notice. We will let Counsel set up a Counsel table here. While they are setting up, we are going to swear in Mr. Gitto, our professional engineer.

Gregory Gitto, sworn.
MR. IRENE: Mr. Gitto has been sworn. We will let Counsel put their appearance on the record.

MR. LIEBERMAN: Yes. Good evening, everybody. My name is Stuart Lieberman and I am from the firm of Lieberman and Blecher. With me is Michael Camastra and we represent the Applicant in this case Leonardo Almeida.

MR. VENEZIA: You can have a seat, Gentlemen.

MR. IRENE: Couple of housekeeping matters. First, there was the review letter that we received from our professional engineer dated August 7 th 2019 revised December 18, 2019, and there were a couple of items
of completeness that we need to address, so why don't we just take a minute and address those. So do you want to run through them, Mr. Gitto, for the Board, please?

MR. GITTO: Sure. Item No. B5 is just they didn't provide a key map on the plan. We have no objection as long as you provide an aerial photo.

MR. CAMASTRA: Yeah, I have some aerial photos.

MR. IRENE: Hold onto it.
MR. GITTO: Item B9 which is proof of taxes are current.

MS. DEGENARO: Yes, they are.
MR. GItTO: Item B4 stream wetlands.
There are no floodplains or bodies of water around the project site, so we have no objection to waiving this.

MR. IRENE: Other than Franklin Lake.
MR. SCHULZ: I have a question. Can we stop there?

MR. GITTO: Sure.
MR. SCHULZ: You said floodplains adjacent to the property. The Shore Regional Girls Field Hockey team was built on a swamp.

Did you look into the field hockey field as being in a floodplain?

MR. GITTO: I did not do that as part of my review. I defer that question to the Applicant.

MR. IRENE: And we also indicate that they are, as $I$ understand it, we can confirm this by testimony conforming to lot coverage, so presumably there wouldn't be any issue with trying to mitigate any excess surface water flow from the property on any neighbors because there is not excess lot coverage.

MR. VENEZIA: Even with the pool being in the back?

MR. IRENE: My understanding is they conform to lot coverage. If it turns out, during the hearing, Mr. Schulz, that we need any other additional information on that we can certainly request it. Right now, we are looking to get through the completeness waivers, if the Board sees fit to grant them, so we can then move onto the merits, hear the information, hear the information on some of those issues and if it turns out the Board requires anything further on any of these
issues that we've waived in terms of completeness, we can ask for anything additional, okay?

MR. GITTO: Number B25 is a list of variances required or requested. They have it listed on their plan which variances they requested.

MR. IRENE: Okay.
MR. GITTO: So I have no objection to a waiver. Signed Affidavit of owner's consent. The owner and the Applicant are the same, so $I$ have no objection to granting that completeness waiver. Application for Environmental Commission Site Plan review, the Applicant requested a waiver for that condition.

MR. SCHULZ: Can you stop there again? MR. GITTO: Sure. MR. SCHULZ: This has been like floating around for months now. The environmental report does not take a long time to do. I don't understand why they want a waiver on the environmental. It's right next to a lake, and again, it's right next to Shore Regional Field Hockey field which was filled in. It was a
swamp. Here we are, again, I don't understand why they didn't do their homework and get an Environmental Commission report. It's no big deal. It doesn't hurt.

MR. IRENE: Is it required on all
applications or only site plan?
MR. GITTO: It is. It is required. MR. IRENE: It's up to the Board. If you want to proceed on the merits and if we get into the testimony and you find that you want some, there may be some environmental impact and you want environmental information and you want more information, they will have to go home and get that information and come back. So it's your call. MR. SCHULZ: I will address it again during testimony, but $I$ don't understand how the engineer waives or says it's okay to waive the environmental forms when $I$ think this is a perfect example. Where is it? You are asking for a waiver. You are asking for a waiver. I don't understand this. It's not a hard form to fill out. You don't need a professional to fill it out, but you are asking for a waiver for it.

MR. LIEBERMAN: I understand what you are saying. What we are talking about are improvements that have already generally been approved by the Board, permits have been generally been issued and so the scope of the variances that are requested we thought was of the nature because they are relatively minor that they wouldn't implicate the environmental review. But $I$ understand what you are saying. MR. SCHULZ: There is nothing that has been approved by this Board in regards to this. MR. LIEBERMAN: I understand. Permits have been issued.

MR. SCHULZ: Permits have been issued, but nothing has been approved by the Board.

MR. LIEBERMAN: I understand that.
MR. IRENE: What is the Board's
pleasure?
MR. VENEZIA: Any conversation on this as far as the waiver, especially with what Mr. Schulz has mentioned the waiver of the Environmental Commission report?

MR. ENGEL: I am in concurrence with Mr. Schulz. I would like to hear testimony and then based on how we interpret that and we can
have some conversation on that.
MR. IRENE: If everyone agrees, you are
inclined to grant the waivers to proceed to the
merits. Once we are in the merits, if you
decide you need additional information, you
always have the right to request that. Is that
where we are? Everybody is okay?
MR. LAMARCA: I make a motion.
MR. IRENE: You want to make a motion to
grant the completeness waivers?
MR. LAMARCA: Yes.
MR. GIGLIO: I will second it.
MS. DEGENARO: Completeness waiver?
MR. IRENE: Just for the completeness
waivers, right.
MS. DEGENARO: Robert Venezia?
MR. VENEZIA: Yes.
MS. DEGENARO: Michael Schulz?
MR. SCHULZ: Yes.
MS. DEGENARO: Scott LaMarca?
MR. LAMARCA: Yes.
MS. DEGENARO: Paul Giglio?
MR. GIGLIO: Yes.
MS. DEGENARO: Greg Malfa?
MR. MALFA: Yes.

MS. DEGENARO: And Mark Engel?
MR. ENGEL: Yes.
MR. IRENE: Any other housekeeping
matters before we swear in the first witness? We are good? Counsel, when we call your first witness, should we mark the plans that have been submitted with the application so we don't forget to do that? Do you want to mark those? We've got the Survey prepared by James B. Goddard, PLS of C.C. Widdis Surveying, LLC. It's got a date of August 9, 2019, but it's dated in the signature block, it's dated in the signature block of October 9, 2019. Mark that as Exhibit $A-1, ~ p l e a s e ? ~ D o ~ y o u ~ h a v e ~ t h a t, ~$ Chris Ann?

MS. DEGENARO: I have it. MR. VENEZIA: Mr. Irene? MR. IRENE: My thought was, Mr. Chairman, if we could mark the sets of plans that were submitted and anything else we can mark and identify as we go. I don't want to lose sight what we have with the application. MS. DEGENARO: That is A-1, Mike. MR. IRENE: A-1. Goddard Survey dated in the signature block 2019. If you look in
the signature block right next to his name, it says, October 9, 2019. I'm sorry. October 19. There was also, and again, just so they are marked so we can show the change, if need be, there was a proposed pool house plan submitted by James J. Monteforte, AIA, eight sheets, April 4, 2017, revised through June 20, 2017. That is the big set. That is the one. That will be A-2. Looks like this. That is it. MR. IRENE: And then subsequent to that, we received the cabana as-built plans prepared by Cathy Zuckerman, R.R. of CDZ Architects, LLC, one sheet and somebody help me with the date.

MR. VENEZIA: 11/19/19.
MR. IRENE: That is A-3.
MR. GITTO: 11/1/19.
MS. DEGENARO: It's 11/19/19. That is
A-3.
MR. IRENE: Did you want to mark
something else at this point?
MR. CAMASTRA: One of the
aerials Google Earth. One set of closer and one is zoomed out.

MR. IRENE: Is there a date on there?

Sometimes it prints on the bottom.
MR. CAMASTRA: 2019. The
photograph has the year.
MR. IRENE: What year?
MR. CAMASTRA: 2019 .
MR. IRENE: One sheet.
MR. CAMASTRA: Two sheets
stapled.
MR. IRENE: She is going to mark that A-4, please?

MR. CAMASTRA: Mike, I also have pictures of the pool house.

MR. IRENE: Okay. Is somebody going to identify those? We will mark them subject to identification.

MR. LIEBERMAN: Yes.
MR. IRENE: We will mark them. Just
make sure you keep one at Counsel's table, so whichever witness can identify can identify subject to identification. We have a photograph of the pool house; is that right? MR. CAMASTRA: Yes. Set of four photographs.

MR. IRENE: Set of four photographs all of pool house.

MR. CAMASTRA: Correct.
MR. IRENE: A-5 is a set of four
photographs of the pool house subject to somebody identifying it and when it was taken or the cabana or whatever we are referring this structure.

MR. GIGLIO: Do you have any more aerials? I am a little confused because this aerial is prior to the pool.

MR. VENEZIA: It sure looks it, even though it says, 2019, on it

MR. GIGLIO: It's prior to the pool and the house.

MR. ENGEL: How long has the pool been there?

MR. LIEBERMAN: Everything was built in the last year.

MR. CAMASTRA: It looks like the --
MR. LIEBERMAN: The pool was built in 2017.

MR. GIGLIO: It should be here then, if you look at the current Google map aerial.

MR. IRENE: It does say, Imagery
Google.
MR. GIGLIO: It's missing the fence for
the field hockey.
MR. IRENE: Here is what we are going to do, keep it marked as Exhibit A-4 just to show the location of the property. Not to list the site. We have the current Survey for that, all right?

MR. LIEBERMAN: We are ready to get
started. I think our first witness is going to be Joan Widdis.

MR. IRENE: Do you want to come on up Ms. Widdis?

MR. GIGLIO: Mr. Irene, I wanted to bring something about the aerial. This has to go back before 2000. The fence for the field hockey for Shore Regional was put up in 2000 . This is doesn't show the fence at all.

MR. IRENE: We know it doesn't show the fence, the pool, the cabana.

MR. GIGLIO: It shows nothing.
MR. IRENE: We're not accepting it to represent what exists at the site. We are only showing the location of the property, vis-à-vis, the lake and the field next door. How is that? Obviously, we discount what it depicts on the site?

```
        Joan Widdis, sworn.
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. LIEBERMAN:
    Q. Ms. Widdis, by whom are you employed?
    A. C.C. Widdis Surveying.
    Q. And you are a principal of that Company;
is that correct?
    A. I am.
    Q. And did your company and Mr. Goddard is
employed by your company; is that correct?
    A. That is correct.
    Q. He is a licensed Surveyor in the State
of New Jersey; is that correct?
    A. Yes.
    Q. And your company prepared Surveys for
        use before planning boards, zoning boards and other
        legal purposes; is that correct?
    A. Yes, it is.
    Q. And what has been identified for --
    what's been marked for identification purposes as A-1
    represents a Survey that was prepared by your
    company; is that correct?
    A. Yes.
    Q. And your personal knowledge and
    familiarity with what is located on this document; is
    that correct?
```

A. Yes.

MR. LIEBERMAN: At this time, I would request Ms. Widdis's credentials be accepted as a Surveyor.

MR. IRENE: Are you a Surveyor?
MS. WIDDIS: No. I am not a Surveyor.
MR. LIEBERMAN: I will introduce her.
I want to introduce the Survey.
MR. IRENE: It's fine. It's signed and sealed as a Licensed Surveyor. Is that the only purpose?

MR. LIEBERMAN: That is the only thing. I wanted her to go over the Survey.

MR. IRENE: Has she been to the property?

THE WITNESS: I've been to the property several times, yes.

MR. IRENE: Were you there before the, when the Survey was drawn or after it?

THE WITNESS: Yeah.
MR. IRENE: If you were there after the Survey was drawn, I'm not sure -- you just want to confirm the Survey is accurate?

MR. LIEBERMAN: Well, $I$ want her to walk through the Board what's there. There was a
question what's there and how it lays out. MS. WIDDIS: I did all of the work on it.

MR. IRENE: We will accept Ms. Widdis as
a fact witness because she's been to the property.

MR. LIEBERMAN: Right.
Q. What's been marked as A-1, your company prepared dated October 19, 2019; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you be able --
A. Revised to that date.
Q. Would you identify for the Board what is depicted on the Survey starting with the two-story framed dwelling and working towards the back? What is there?
A. There is an existing two-story framed dwelling and attached paver patio and to the rear there is an existing pool house with an in-ground pool with a wood deck attached and concrete patio.
Q. And that is what we need the variance for today. That's what we are asking for a variance for, right?
A. Correct.

MR. IRENE: No. For the pool house. I
thought you were talking about the pool and the wood deck.

MR. LIEBERMAN: No. Just the pool
house.
A. The height of the pool house --
Q. Keep going.
A. All right. As you go back, there is a little pool pump area, there is a wood shed and then in the back there is a playhouse.
Q. And the playhouse was mentioned by the Board's Planner as needing a Survey as well; is that correct?

MR. IRENE: Variance?
A. It's been updated several times. We've been up there three or four times in the last couple of years.
Q. Okay. I wanted the witness to layout what was there. I don't know if the Board Members have any questions about what's there. I know that was something that we should do for the Board.

MR. VENEZIA: Do the Board Members have a question of this witness?

MR. IRENE: Interested parties?
MR. VENEZIA: Is there any interested party in the audience?

MR. IRENE: Who wants to question the witness? No. The record will reflect none. Next witness?

MR. LIEBERMAN: Thank you, Ms. Widdis.
Cathy Zuckerman, please?
MR. IRENE: So looking at the Survey where the Survey references a proposed garage, it appears that from the Survey that the garage is attached to the pool house.

MS. ZUCKERMAN: Correct, but it is not.
MR. IRENE: So we have already marked the plan that you prepared, the cabana as-built plan as A-3, so why don't we mark that? Do you have extra copies for the Board?

MS. ZUCKERMAN: I don't.
MR. IRENE: Has the cabana changed on
that plan?
MS. ZUCKERMAN: No. No. The Board has on the back of it. Do you want to swear me in first?

MR. IRENE: sure. Why not.
Cathy Zuckerman, CDZ Architects, sworn. MR. IRENE: We are going to get your credentials on the architect.

DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. LIEBERMAN:
Q. Ms. Zuckerman, you are employed?
A. My firm is CDZ Architects. I've been in
business for 30 years.
Q. You are a licensed architect in the

```
State of New Jersey?
```

A. Yes, I am.
Q. You've been a licensed architect for 30 years?
A. Yes.
Q. Your license is still good today?
A. Correct.
Q. No actions against you?
A. No.

MR. IRENE: Will the Board accept Ms.
Zuckerman's credentials in the field of architecture?

MR. VENEZIA: Yes.
Q. Why don't we start, Ms. Zuckerman, you prepared some as-built drawings in order to show the Board what's going on in terms of the cabana. Isn't that correct?
A. Yes, I did. Just to clear up the garage issue, so my garage drawings, which were submitted for building permit, there was mention of some confusion so we will straighten that. It is
detached. Nothing to do with this cabana. And it's fully conforming for its setbacks. As far as the setbacks is concerned, I was not the architect. I was brought into the picture after the fact of, I guess, little support from previous architect and the Almeidas asked me to measure and come up with an as-built drawing based on what was actually built compared to the drawings that they were building from.
Q. That's because there was a question about the height and we needed to get an answer to what it actually was?
A. Correct.
Q. What did you find?
A. The ground slopes on one side from the front of the cabana to the back of the cabana. And the side still slopes. This is when Joan Widdis went out and shot the roof and came up with some numbers that we used and so $I$ can just tell you that from the pool side -- on my drawings, it should be taken from average grade. So on one side of the building is 17 feet and on the other side of the building it's 18'8 to the top of the ridge. On the pool side 17 feet to the top of the ridge is what we get and on the side facing the street 18'8. So I guess Joan came up with
a number of 2'8, around.
MS. WIDDIS: 17.5.
MR. ZUCKERMAN: 17.5.
Q. When you say the average?
A. Average grade, correct.
Q. What is allowed by the zone? What is the zone?
A. Fifteen feet. So $I$ want to make a couple of comments, you know, because $I$ was new to the site when $I$ went out to do my as-built. It's beautiful. I don't know if you've ever seen it, but it's surrounded fully by the school, commercial property and parking lots in the back, obviously, the lake. There is one neighbor to the east, but it's beautifully maintained and if it makes a difference it's quite an improvement, I felt, to the neighborhood.

It was built, I guess there is some confusion as to the architectural drawings as to where that average grade was taken from. It doesn't say average grade. I could see you how it could be a bit confusing. It just says 15 feet and the builder, I believe who can testify, took it from top of foundation instead of what was labeled as average height.
Q. The builder can testify to that.

MR. IRENE: Before what we talk about what the builder is going to testify to, let's go back and mark this plan that you referred to. This is going to be A-4, right?

MS. ZUCKERMAN: It is the same that you already marked.

MR. IRENE: It is not. It's got a garage on it. The cabana is the same, right? It's not. We are talking about the garage. Hold on. All that's being offered for is to show that the garage is going to be detached from the pool house. The pool house on $A-4$ is the same as the pool house depicted on $A-3$, correct?

MS. ZUCKERMAN: Two separate dwellings, but yes.

MR. IRENE: Let's mark Exhibit A-4.
MS. DEGENARO: A-4 was the Google
site.
MR. IRENE: I'm sorry. A-6. Thank you.
So how is A-6 captioned? What is the plan called?

THE WITNESS: Detached garage architectural drawing. It's A-1.

MR. IRENE: No. It's called, detached garage.

THE WITNESS: Detached garage and the back side is labeled.

MR. IRENE: I don't need the back side.
We have the back side. Ms. Zuckerman, here is how it works. I ask a question, you answer the question. If we keep talking over one another, we are not getting anywhere. So, please, A-6 is the plan. It's called, detached garage plan. It's one sheet, right?

THE WITNESS: Yep.
MR. IRENE: What is it dated?
MS. ZUCKERMAN: It's dated 4/29/19.
MR. IRENE: 4/29/19 and that was
prepared by you.
MS. ZUCKERMAN: Correct. Thank you so
much. That is that. The other one you referred to is on the back. The other one that's on the back is A-3 the cabana as-built plans 11/11/19. All right. Great. We are caught up to where we are with our exhibits. Q. Why don't you go back to A-3 now. A. Okay. Q. And explain the significance of it, in
terms of what we need to know, what is height? We
know 15 feet is allowed. What is the height?
A. According to the Surveyor, it is
two-and-a-half feet over, 17.5.
Q. And that is measured from
where-to-where?
A. Average grade around the foundation to
the ridge.
Q. And, by the way, why don't you also
identify A-5?
A. I took these photos.
Q. So A-5 consists of one, two, three, four
pictures. What is the first picture we are looking
at?
A. The first picture is the side of the
cabana that faces the pool. That is the northern
face.
Q. And that is the one with the four --
that is the one with all of the windows and the
triangular configuration, right?
A. Faces the pool. The pool is in the foreground. The second picture is the side that faces the lake or the side that faces the front yard, faces the south. That is the back.
Q. Is this the back, the one with the

```
recycling containers?
    MS. DEGENARO: Where does that face?
    A. Faces the street side. It faces south.
    MR. VENEZIA: From the back door of the
    main house, you would see this?
    MS. ZUCKERMAN: Correct. Right.
    Q. What is the next picture?
    A. The next picture is facing the soccer
fields, I guess. Yeah, both of these pictures are
taken from the west side.
    Q. One at a time. The one with the soccer
net is facing what, please?
    A. The west.
    Q. Facing the west?
    A. Correct.
    Q. Is that the soccer field?
    MR. LAMARCA: Field hockey field.
    A. The last picture is the same elevation,
just the other end of the building.
    Q. When did you take those photographs,
please?
    A. They were taken, oh, I would say,
probably the summer.
    MR. IRENE: This past summer.
    THE WITNESS: Yeah.
```

MR. LIEBERMAN: Summer of 2019 .
MR. IRENE: Summer of 2019 . Those photographs continue to fairly and accurately depict the pool house, cabana as it exists today?

THE WITNESS: Correct.
MR. ENGEL: Do you have a photograph of the east-facing wall of the property?

THE WITNESS: I do not.
MR. ENGEL: The one that borders what the diagram shows as concrete pavers?

THE WITNESS: I do not have a picture on that side, no, but $I$ do depict it on my drawings accurately.
Q. Please show what depicts that
accurately? The side elevation on the top left?
A. Correct.

MR. ENGEL: Thank you.
MR. IRENE: Back to the height then, so we have the height of the structure calculated from average grade as being 17.5 feet measured to the ridge line?

THE WITNESS: Yes. Joan actually certified that. I would prefer --

MR. IRENE: We will get her back in a
minute. As far as what's depicted on your plan that we've marked as Exhibit A-3, the cabana as-built plan, we have a cupola, and we have Mr. Gitto here to help us out, too. MS. ZUCKERMAN: It's not included. MR. IRENE: Is that excluded from the Ordinance calculation of height? Okay. Great. So we just got to get to the ridge line. When we are done with her testimony, Mr. Chairman, we can bring back Ms. Widdis and she can confirm the height, okay?
Q. Do you have an understanding of the wood stockade fence issue, because the Planner had indicated --
A. No, but I think Joan does.
Q. We can call Joan on that as well. Do
you have an understanding about the tree house issue because on the Planner's letter there was a question about that.
A. Do not.
Q. So we should just call Joan back to resolve that. And the pool house kitchen issue, we can resolve.

MR. IRENE: Is there a kitchen in the pool house?

MS. ZUCKERMAN: It is a bar server.
MR. VENEZIA: Sitting area.
MS. ZUCKERMAN: I believe there is a
sink and refrigerator, but maybe Mrs. Almeida can answer.

MR. LIEBERMAN: We can swear my witness in.

MR. VENEZIA: I have a question for you. On Photos 3 and 4, you could see the different grade of the property --

MS. ZUCKERMAN: Right.
MR. VENEZIA: -- where it's two blocks
it goes down to four or five blocks on the end. Would that affect it on the corner? Does that meet --

MS. ZUCKERMAN: So that's where I labeled it the 18. That is the highest point. That's 18.8, actually.

MR. VENEZIA: Which is 18.8?
MS. ZUCKERMAN: From the lowest --
greatest to lowest where the ridge would be say the highest. And actually, I was surprised because he actually could have leveled this grading off a little bit more and made it not quite two-and-a-half feet because it's a stone
foundation. Could have filled out a little bit, but $I$ don't think he touched it because he was over the garage whatever. We work that out. We did calculate that as part of the average.

MR. VENEZIA: Would that far corner conform with the height requirement?

MS. ZUCKERMAN: The lowest point.
MR. VENEZIA: Yeah.
MS. ZUCKERMAN: No, it doesn't. It's 17. It still doesn't. Joan, again, it's hard for me to reach that ridge. It's 16-and-a-half.

MR. VENEZIA: I see where you are saying the average --

MS. ZUCKERMAN: Right.
MR. VENEZIA: -- is 7. If you went in the middle is probably where it starts sloping at 17.5.

MS. ZUCKERMAN: Yeah.
MR. LAMARCA: And if you walk the property, it does go. It's all over the place, so it's hard to get a benchmark.

MS. ZUCKERMAN: I think they were trying for drainage purposes and for water table he
could tell you, they were trying to relate to the pool which put them in that position. MR. LIEBERMAN: I have Ms. Widdis here that $I$ am going to bring back to very definitely answer those questions. Does anybody have any further questions of this witness?

MR. VENEZIA: Anybody in the audience?
MR. IRENE: Let the record reflect none.

MR. LIEBERMAN: Ms. Widdis, would you come back to answer?

MR. IRENE: Ms. Widdis, you understand you remain under oath?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
CONTINUED DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. LIEBERMAN:
Q. There was a request for some definite measurements that the Board asked. Are you able to explain what the measurements are at the various sides of the structures and how it is that we get to that average?
A. Yes, the field guys, when they went out there, they picked up the elevation wall of the buildings, including the house and the shower. They get elevations around the four corners of the house

```
and we take those elevations and divide it by the --
add them together, divide it by four and we come up
with the average grade. The roof height by the roof
elevation, you get the roof elevation and then we
take the average grade and subtract it and that's how
we get our height.
    MR. IRENE: At one point, somebody
    mentioned 17.5 and another point somebody said
    17.6.
    MS. WIDDIS: 17.6 is actually correct.
    MR. IRENE: 17.6 feet. Got it. Thank
    you.
            MR. VENEZIA: On the plans, it's shown
    51.68 on one corner and 53.55 on the other
    corner. Is that the grade you are talking
    about?
        MS. WIDDIS: Correct, yes.
        MR. IRENE: So we don't forget, do you
        want to address the elevated playhouse or tree
        house or whatever it's called?
            MR. LIEBERMAN: I was going to go to
        that and the fence also.
    Q. The comments from the Planner that we
received reflected some issues concerning the
playhouse, specifically, the height, as I understand,
```

```
was the concern and because of the height --
    MR. GITTO: It's related to the setback.
    Q. So what is the height -- what did you
measure the height of the tree house or the playhouse
to be?
A. They picked up two average grades over there. We divided that by the roof elevation and we came out to 11.96 as the roof height.
MR. IRENE: 11.96.
MS. WIDDIS: Correct.
Q. Do you have an understanding of what the --
MR. GITTO: I'm sorry. Is that based on average grade?
MS. WIDDIS: Yes.
Q. And is it correct that 10 feet is what would have been permitted?
A. I think it's 15.
MR. GITTO: Fifteen feet is allowable
for an accessory structure. The issue is the size because the setback has to equal the height.
Q. Do you have an understanding of what the current setback is?
A. Yes.
```

MR. IRENE: It's on the plan, right?
A. It's on the plan.

MR. IRENE: Referring to the Survey, it's 10.18.

MR. GITTO: There is no dimension to the rear property line. Do you have a dimension to the rear property line?

MS. WIDDIS: It's not on that plan? No, but $I$ could find out. We could scale it.

MR. IRENE: Could you scale it?
MS. WIDDIS: I don't have an engineer scale with me.
Q. Why don't we keep going to see if we can scale it and talk about the fence. With regard to the fence, the Planner reflected in his letter that there was, that the fence trespassed another property or went beyond the property lines. Do you have an understanding as to what is going on with the fence based on what you saw?
A. When $I$ was preparing the plan, I thought I had picked up that point and that is why it's over. Q. What you are talking about is, you are talking about your Survey, which is A-1, right, and you are talking about the right-hand portion as you are looking at it.

MR. GITTO: North Eastern.
A. Northeast corner.
Q. Northeast corner right over here, the very end, so is that, in actuality, over the property line?
A. The way it is shown, it is, yes. I spoke to Leonardo and he told me, when he was out there, the guys did stake it out for him, so I am going to double check to see if that was a 10-foot offset that he may have done. The way it shows on here, it's over.
Q. But do you know whether or not you picked up the right points on that?
A. I am going to check my file and then I would know for sure.
Q. You know, because that sort of just came up. My client says it is on the property line that they adhere to it, but the Surveyor's Survey reflects something different. We are trying to reconcile.

MR. IRENE: If that fence is on the property line, you don't have a setback problem from the rear line with the playhouse.

Obviously, the Board has no authority to give people variances or any other relief to put their fence on somebody else's property.

MR. LIEBERMAN: We understand that. We believe it isn't the problem.

MR. VENEZIA: You are saying it is a quarter of an inch -- quarter of a foot over. It's point 28 , point 15 , point 22 over on someone else's property.

MR. IRENE: No. It's more than that, Mr. Chairman. If the property line shown on the Survey marked $A-1$, that fence encroaches, at its furthest point, assuming it encroaches into Lot 7, probably 12, 13, 14 feet.

MR. CAMASTRA: It's into the 15-foot wide sanitary sewer easement.

MR. IRENE: Right. An easement is on somebody else's property. It's not a property onto itself.

MR. IRENE: I was comparing it to the 10.18 setback of the pool house -- of the playhouse.
A. The playhouse looks like it's nine feet to the rear.
Q. I thought that maybe I could ask my client to explain, but maybe depending what happens tonight, obviously, we're not going to have the fence extend over the property line and maybe we could have

```
our engineer discuss that with the Board's Engineer
to prove that is not the case afterwards, because we
have no intention of trespassing. We didn't think
that we did. If we did, we are going to rectify it.
                            MR. IRENE: Whose property is Lot 7? Do
    we know? Is that part of the School or
    is it residential?
    THE WITNESS: No. It is a commercial
    property. It used to be Gagliano's.
    MR. VENEZIA: I think Gagliano's was the
    other property.
    Q. Just to go back to the playhouse issue,
that does require a variance because it's two feet,
because this is a two feet -- it misses the required
setback by two feet; is that correct?
    A. By two feet, correct.
    MR. IRENE: Are we talking about the
    rear or the side?
        THE WITNESS: The side.
        MR. IRENE: The side is 10.18 where
    11.96 is required. Were we able to come up
    with a number for the rear?
        MR. CAMASTRA: About nine feet.
        THE WITNESS: Yes, nine feet.
        Q. I don't think it was anything else that
```

you mentioned in the letter from two days ago that we
haven't covered with the Survey.
A. I don't think so.
MR. LIEBERMAN: I don't have any further
testimony from this witness at this point.
MR. IRENE: Is the fence, if we are
talking about fences, the fence that's on the
western property sideline, is that the
Applicant's fence or is that the School's
fence?
MS. WIDDIS: That is the School's fence,
okay.
MR. IRENE: When we are talking about
fences encroaching, we are only talking about
the one on the northern property line? The
rear property line? What we are talking about
is the question about the encroachment of the
fence was the fence along the rear property
line or the northern property line. I just
asked Ms. Widdis what information she has about
the fence on the western property line, the
sideline and she indicated that's the School's
fence.
MR. LIEBERMAN: That is right. That is
not our fence.

MR. MALFA: Wood stockade fence? The wood stockade fence is not the School's, to my knowledge.

MR. GIGLIO: The School's is metal fencing.

MR. MALFA: The wood stockade fencing would be the fencing this gentleman put in. The School doesn't have wood stockade fence. MR. IRENE: My suggestion is going to be, because, again, the Board has no authority to permit someone to put their fence on someone else's property. If, in fact, the Board sees fit to grant the relief, it is going to contain a condition of fence. Any fence encroachment will be removed, unless the Applicant can obtain a license or an easement from whoever's property the fence may be encroaching into then he can leave it there. That is all.

MR. LIEBERMAN: There is no other way. That is the way it is. You can't trespass on somebody else's property.

THE WITNESS: Inside the property line. We tell them to put it in six inches in, so the footings are inside as well.

MR. LIEBERMAN: What $I$ want to do also
then is, why don't we mark this also? This is that playhouse, so that the Board Members can see what we are talking about.

MR. IRENE: A-7. And, Ms. Widdis, while
you are there, can you identify that? Does that photograph fairly and accurately depict the playhouse as it currently exists?

MR. LIEBERMAN: I'm going to just call
Mr. Almeida to come up and talk about the playhouse and the fence, so that you can explain a few things about that. Why don't you just come up?

MR. IRENE: For the record, first time around, we asked if anybody had any questions for Ms. Widdis. Anybody have any questions for her this time? Let the record reflect no response. Thank you.

MR. VENEZIA: This will be A-7.
MR. IRENE: That photo is A-7, yes.
Leonardo Almeida, 45 Lake View Avenue, West Long Branch, sworn.

DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. LIEBERMAN:
Q. Mr. Almeida is the Applicant in this
case. Mr. Almeida, in terms of the wooden fence, what is your understanding? First of all, the wooden

```
fence that they asked about before, that is yours.
It's not the School's?
    A. It's ours.
    Q. I apologize. I made an error on that.
I didn't mean to. I apologize. Do you have an
understanding as to whether or not it was installed
on the property line? Let me restate the question.
    Do you have an understanding if, at any
point, it's not on the property line, you have to
conform it and make sure it's within your property
line?
    A. Yes.
    Q. Do you understand that?
    A. Yes.
    Q. Do you have an understanding as to
whether the fence was installed, whether it was an
effort was made to stay within the property lines and
how that was done?
    A. Yes.
    Q. How was that?
    A. Which exact side are you asking about?
This borders the School's field.
    Q. Yes.
    A. So, if you look, you see the fence like
this. The School's field, their fence is inside my
```

```
property.
```

MR. VENEZIA: What is he referring to?

$$
A-1 \text { ? }
$$

MR. CAMASTRA: Correct.
MR. VENEZIA: I just didn't know which,
if we were looking at something different.
A. On the front side of the property, their
fence is inside the field.
Q. Their fence is whose?
A. The High School.
Q. The School's?
A. So around the property going towards the back of the property, their fence is inside of my property two feet because that is the way the field, it was marked, so they need, they need that section.

MR. IRENE: I thought someone just said that was your fence.

THE WITNESS: Okay. Hold on. There is two fences. My fence is actually inside my property 2.1, which is supposed to be out two feet, but $I$ didn't want to mess with the School field because they need that space, otherwise their field.
Q. Do they have a metal fence?
A. They do have their metal. We never

```
touch it.
    Q. Tell me about the metal fence.
    A. It's in my property. Then I put my
fence two feet inside my property not to touch. We
never touch the fence of the School.
    MR. IRENE: Am I missing a fence on the
    Survey?
    MR. GITTO: Based on the Survey, you are
        showing one fence. There is a wood stockade
        fence.
            THE WITNESS: So there is a fence right
        here.
            MR. IRENE: Is it there on the Survey?
        A. No. It's not on the Survey. It's never
marked because it is the School. Their fence is
there. We never touch.
                            MR. IRENE: Is there anything else
    that's on your property that is not on this
    Survey?
    A. No.
    MR. IRENE: I am not trying to be
    facetious, Mr. Almeida, but that was the whole
    purpose of the exercise was to make sure
    whatever was here was accurately reflected on
    the Survey. Up to this point, it sounds like
```

that was the case, but now we find there is a fence that was not shown on the Survey. We need to confirm there is nothing else on the Survey that is not shown on this Survey. MR. LIEBERMAN: Just to answer his question, my understanding, it was omitted because they didn't own it. It was the School fence, but it shouldn't have been on there, because it's on their property. So it should have been on theirs.

MR. IRENE: I don't know which is which. I only see one, but okay. Everything else, all of the other structures that exist on your property are shown on the Survey?

MR. ALMEIDA: Yes, shown on here.
MR. IRENE: Alright Great. Thank you. MR. ENGEL: In the back of the property, there is also going across the back outside of what's marked as your property line, it also shows a wood stockade fence. It appears to be from the Survey, the bottom right corner of it outside of your property line. Is that -- does that Survey accurate reflect the fact --

MR. LIEBERMAN: This is where it says 15-foot wide sanitary sewer easement, is that
where you are referring?
MR. ENGEL: Yes, that side of the
drawing. Right above that going vertical on the drawing is a wood stockade fence that looks to be outside of the solid black line that is your property line; is that accurate?

THE WITNESS: No, it's not accurate. Our fence follows exactly the darker mark as it shows on the Survey.

MR. ENGEL: Okay.
MR. GIGLIO: Right, that is correct. The smaller line to the left of it is where your property really ends.

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. GIGLIO: The fence is on the outside of the property?

THE WITNESS: No. No. This fence where it shows the wood stock fence.

MR. IRENE: The smaller line to the left that you are referring to is the side of the 15-foot wide sanitary sewer system. So we don't know about the fence. That's why I suggested earlier they are going to confirm. If, in fact, the Board sees fit to grant the relief, it has nothing to do with the fence.

One of the conditions of approval, I would suggest, and it's up to the Board, as I would say, that all fences that are owned by the Applicant will not encroach outside of his property, unless he obtains a license or easement from the adjoining property owner. We leave it at that.
Q. We are going to get it cleared up. We've given the Board Members a picture of the playhouse which is marked as A-7. Would you describe that playhouse for the Board? In other words, how is it configured? Is there trees?
A. Our idea was to build a small playhouse around keeping the tree where it was. That is the height we could do it.

MR. GIGLIO: I'm assuming the playhouse is outside. Are you applying for a variance relief to keep it there or are you proposing to move it to make it conform?

MR. LIEBERMAN: That was just spotted by the Planner in the recent letter that we got. We are requesting a variance for the two feet.

MR. ENGEL: Is that documented on paper anywhere here or are you verbally adding to the discussion now?

THE WITNESS: We are.
MR. LIEBERMAN: We are. We are Noticing under the provision.

MR. IRENE: There is a catchall
provision in the Notices and there was one in this Notice as well for things that come along during the proceeding that no one had anticipated. So, I mean, if it's the kind of thing where you think it would be a material thing that they should Notice the neighbor on, that is up to you.

MR. ENGEL: I don't know how it could not have been anticipated since the Survey of the property clearly shows it outside of the allowed setback area.

MR. IRENE: I think the issue is the allowed setback area would be a minimum of 10 feet, but it's based on the height and they didn't pick up the height. I am not excusing it. I am simply, if you're asking me how do I assume it came about, that's probably how it came about.

MR. VENEZIA: We don't know if this is an accurate plot plan. We are knocking holes in it.

MR. ENGEL: If I might interrupt the proceedings, I think, I just summed up what my thoughts are, okay? I mean, I have no problem with the contingencies, as Mr. Irene has laid it out, should the Board, under the proofs, see fit to grant the variance. My major concern is there are certain documents, such as a plot plan, such as aerial photos which purport to be in the property's current state which are clearly incomplete, missing items and not really giving us an idea of what it is we are giving variances on, okay? I accept your descriptions, okay, that you've testified to. I have no problem with that. I am an engineer. I make my decisions based on what $I$ see and what has been officially presented in the record, you know, for our consideration. Right now, we've got a Survey property which, by your own admission, is incomplete and not accurate as regards to fence placement, as regards to the proposed garage placement. It's incomplete in that it does not show dimensions of the property lines, which is important for us to consider as far as setbacks go.

The playhouse was not previously
mentioned in the documentation, although $I$ accept that legally it could be brought up as a verbal item now and the aerial photo, even though it's marked as 2019, is clearly years out of date as it does not show --

MR. GIGLIO: Or merged because the Auto Zone was put up last year.

MR. ENGEL: It's not accurate and up-to-date. Don't know why. Why is inconsequential. With all of this, it is very difficult for us to accurately and fairly consider. We understand. We appreciate that a lot of preparation has gone into this so far. You've been waiting a lot. We've had to defer this a couple of times. I understand that. But in order for $u s$ to give you a fair assessment, we need some of this stuff to be revised, accurate and up-to-date. That's my feeling right now. I find it hard to really give an objective evaluation.

MR. GIGLIO: Credence.
MR. ENGEL: If the stuff $I$ am looking at and referring back to as $I$ listen to your words doesn't reflect what you described. MR. LIEBERMAN: I understand that.

MR. ENGEL: I don't know how the rest of the Board feels. I hate to sound harsh, but I am inclined to ask that we, you know, defer any further discussion on this until we see more accurate up-to-date Survey and photography. I don't know, how does the rest of the Board feel?

MS. WIDDIS: Excuse me. Can $I$ say
something?
MR. IRENE: Only if Counsel wants to call you up.

MR. LIEBERMAN: It's Ms. Widdis for the record.

MR. IRENE: Ms. Widdis, you understand you are still under oath. Before we let Mr. Almeida go, though, just so we don't forget, the wood shed is going to be removed, correct?

MR. ALMEIDA: Correct.
MR. IRENE: Ms. Widdis, you are under oath.

MS. WIDDIS: As far as, we've been out there multiple times, so everything I showed on here is correct. I know, you know, they don't know, he said that he spoke with the guys. I'm sure he did and stuff, but, you know, sometimes, too, when they go put the stake in, if it's not
staked out, they don't follow exactly where it is, something could be pulled, something could have been incorrect. We have points. I have a hundred points and everything $I$ put on here is correct. As far is the fence, sometimes, you know, if you're not doing it, you don't really understand.

MR. ENGEL: But if it's not staked out then wouldn't it be, forgive my ignorance because $I$ don't know how the business works, wouldn't it be your responsibility to get it staked out if you wanted to prepare a Survey that is accurate?

MS. WIDDIS: Well, our Survey is
accurate. This is what's there. This is what we picked up when we went out there. Yeah, the fence is probably over in accordance to this plan. Maybe he misunderstood in the field. We didn't stake it out for the fence. Nobody asked us to stake it out. Usually, they go out and put stakes on the line like every 50 feet as needed.

MR. IRENE: If it turns out that that northern property line, the rear property line is not accurate, and $I$ think the assumption is
that it is and that the fence encroaches outside. If it turns out that the northern property line is where the wood fence is then this conforms to the rear yard setback.

MR. ENGEL: Yes, but we don't know that. MR. IRENE: I understand. What I am saying is, if, in fact, the request for the variance is at the nine feet that is being shown at this plan, okay, that is the worst case scenario. It's either there or better. The other thought would be, if it's that much of a problem for the Board Members, you may want to hear the testimony from the other witnesses about what it's adjacent to. It's apparently a commercial parking lot. If you're still upset with the one-foot setback deficiency off the side line and the two-foot setback deficiency off the rear line, you can deny the relief and he can either relocate it or he could take a foot off the top of the structure to make it no greater than $10-f e e t ~ h i g h ~ a n d ~ h e ~ w o u l d ~ c o n f o r m ~$ to the setback. It's entirely up to the Board. If you want them to come back as a result of that then that is the Board's call.

MR. ENGEL: You know, I don't want to
absolutely deny them the relief, because it could be that once they get all of the paperwork in order, the Board would see fit that this is something reasonable to grant. I would prefer that they come back with accurate stuff because that way we give you guys the fairest chance possible to have your requested relief granted. MR. IRENE: That is entirely up to the Board. You could also, if, in fact, assuming for the moment this is accurate and if you were inclined to grant the relief, you could grant them on the condition that they confirm that those are the numbers. Remember, if you give them a setback of nine and they end up being eight, they are going to get kicked back. MR. GIGLIO: Exactly. MR. IRENE: So it is entirely up to you. THE WITNESS: The playhouse doesn't have a foundation, so, I mean, it could easily be moved.

MR. IRENE: I don't know that the Applicant wanted to hear you say that. If that is the case, we may not have much of a basis for the relief.
THE WITNESS: It doesn't have a
foundation. Even when we picked up the elevation, because we get it to the corner of the houses. I think the garage was the effort, so they took the elevation on each side of the playhouse at the ground, but it's four feet --

MR. IRENE: Mr. Chairman, do you want to take a few minutes and break and let counsel speak to his client and see what they want to do? One issue may be if that can be made to conform? We are spending a lot of time on the playhouse. If the Board wants to proceed on these plans, if you don't want to proceed then we don't want to go around in circles anymore. If you do want to proceed then we can get into the merits.

MR. VENEZIA: I want -- prior to, I want to talk to Ms. Widdis. What is your license credentials?

MS. WIDDIS: I don't have any license. I've been working in the field, approximately, four years preparing the plans, auto-cad and doing pretty much everything and going out in the field. I've been in the business for 40-plus years. I've been reading blueprints since $I$ was 14 pretty much.

MR. LIEBERMAN: The document is sealed
and it's by a Surveyor. There does seem to be a question as to the fence line on the northern side.

MR. VENEZIA: As Mr. Irene said, let's
take a five-minute break and come back in five minutes.

Break from 8:45 p.m. to 8:49 p.m.
MR. VENEZIA: Roll call?
MS. DEGENARO: Robert Venezia?
MR. VENEZIA: Here.
MS. DEGENARO: Michael Schulz?
MR. SCHULZ: Here.
MS. DEGENARO: Scott LaMarca?
MR. LAMARCA: Here.
MS. DEGENARO: Paul Giglio?
MR. GIGLIO: Here.
MS. DEGENARO: Greg Malfa?
MR. MALFA: Here.
MS. DEGENARO: Mark Engel?
MR. ENGEL: Here.
MR. IRENE: Okay. Counsel, we are back.
MR. LIEBERMAN: Okay. Thank you. I
talked to my experts and my client and this is how I would like to proceed, if the Board would
be willing to entertain the application in this light and nexus. In terms of the fence, we will move the fence if it's trespassing, because I can't tell you if it is or isn't. If the Board was inclined to approve this and if it was subject to us moving it to where it doesn't trespass, we certainly would do that because we have to anyway. We can't break the law. We can't have the fence trespass. That is as to that issue.

As to the playhouse, we would agree to either have it conform with the law or take it down. That is basically it. So if that is, you know, a condition, we could be willing to do. It's not that important to my client and we would do that if that's what the Board wanted if that was okay.

As to the, as to the pool house, I did want to put on the planning testimony. I have a Planner here to go over the variance relief that's requested which concerns the height issue which we haven't talked about and that is how this whole thing started. If the Board is willing to hear testimony, I know the Board isn't telling me how to do their vote, but if
they would be willing to hear testimony along those lines, I would like to proceed. MR. IRENE: That is your application. MR. SCHULZ: Just to go back to your comments --

MR. LIEBERMAN: Yes, sir.
MR. VENEZIA: I have no problem.
MR. SCHULZ: If the fence in the back is
wrong, it will be reset where it should be reset. Number 2, that playhouse, if there is violation for setbacks, the playhouse will be removed.

MR. LIEBERMAN: Or amended.
MR. IRENE: So they are not asking for relief for the playhouse. MR. SCHULZ: Okay.

MR. IRENE: If, in fact, the Board sees
fit to grant the relief with regard for the height of the cabana or pool house structure, one of the conditions in the Resolution of Approval will say, the Board is not granting any relief for the playhouse. The playhouse has to be made to conform or removed.

MR. LIEBERMAN: If the Board were inclined to grant relief along those lines, we
would be happy with that.
MR. GITTO: If I could add something? MR. IRENE: Sure. Please. MR. GITTO: If the Board were so inclined to approve the application, would a revised as-built Survey depicting what the location of the playhouse and the fence -MR. IRENE: Yeah, my suggestion would be, if we get to that point, they would have to confirm that if the playhouse remains that it conforms and they would have to confirm the relocation of the fences if they need to be relocated. So that would all have to be done in the as-built to show that nothing is required. MR. VENEZIA: So a new Survey. MR. IRENE: Yeah, a final, final. MR. LIEBERMAN: A final, final Survey. MR. IRENE: The alternative would be, they simply pull those fences in all of the way and they eliminate the playhouse entirely. I don't know if, at that point, you would need it, because the playhouse is gone. If it's going to conform, I'm sure Mr. Miller will want to see the zoning permit application, he will want to see it conforms. Either conforms or remove,
okay? So, yes. You have a Planner.
MR. LIEBERMAN: Yes.
Justin Auciello, sworn.
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. LIEBERMAN:
Q. Sir, by whom are you employed?
A. Coffone Consulting Group.
Q. You are a licensed Planner in the State of New Jersey; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. How long have you been doing that?
A. I've been licensed for 23 years and it's current and active.
Q. And have you been recognized as an expert before any land use Boards in New Jersey?
A. Hundreds. Well, I'm sorry. On hundreds of occasions in 18 Counties.

MR. IRENE: You've appeared before this
Board?
THE WITNESS: About four or five times.
MR. IRENE: Will the Board accept Mr.
Auciello's credentials?
MR. VENEZIA: I have no problem.
MR. AUCIELLO: Thank you.
Q. You are here to provide planning
testimony concerning the pool house; isn't that
correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And the pool house requires a c2 variance; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Would you go over the criteria in the

Municipal Land Use Code and in the Local Zoning Ordinance and give an opinion within a reasonable degree of certainty as to whether the variance should be granted or not, please?
A. Yes. Absolutely. As the Board knows, we are here tonight for a variance for the pool house height. It ws constructed at a height of 17.6 feet, whereas, in the R10 zone, the maximum height is 15 feet. I think it's important just to state for the record this is a use that is accessory use. So a pool house is a permitted use in the zone. We're not here for the use aspect. We are here for the height.

I think it's also important to reiterate for the record, from the planning standpoint, the surrounding area, obviously, the pool house is towards the rear of the property so the house is towards the south. To the west is the sports field. To the north is a commercial property and a parking lot and to the east is a residential property. So within that context, I believe that the benefits of this application or the variances do outweigh the detriment and $I$ would like to proceed under the flexible C criteria. Again, the subject property is located at the end of Lake View Avenue. It's towards the end of the neighborhood. I think that the de minimis height that exceeds the maximum 15 feet, in my opinion, is de minimis in the context of the area and also of the property. So the zone, of course, also envisions this type of use as accessory.

My opinion, as a planner, I think the height, even though we do require the variance, it does not violate the provisions of light, air and open space and $I$ also believe that despite the height there will still be a sufficient space on this property.

Pools, pools are also a neighborhood norm, so $I$ certainly don't think the pool and the pool house really are out of character. Also, as you saw from the architectural plans, the height exceeds, you know, this is a pitch roof, so the violation area is a relatively, you know, small percentage of the total surface area. The pool house is also mostly shielded by the house and right to the east is a
residential property. So, you know, I really don't see this rising to any level of substantial detriment. The design, of course, is quite attractive. It's a barn-type design. I think it fits in with the surrounding. It's certainly not out of character the with surrounding. With that said, I believe we advance Criteria C, Criteria G and Criteria $I$ of the Land Use Law, Municipal Land Use Law. So that is a positive criteria. The negative criteria, it's showing of whether or not the proposal will present a substantial detriment to public good and whether the proposal will present a substantial, will impair the intent and purpose of the Master Plan Zone Plan and the Zoning Ordinance. As I had previously said, I certainly don't think that the granting of this variance would lead to a substantial detriment to the public good.

I think, again, the height is appropriate in the context of the layout of the property and its surroundings, as $I$ said, in the positive criteria. There really isn't much of a consequence here in the height in relationship to the surroundings. So with respect to the second prong of the negative criteria, whether or not this variance

```
will impact the Zone Plan, the Zoning Ordinance,
again, the accessory use is permitted in the zone.
We are here for the height. And I certainly don't
think that we are with the height that exceeds the
height today, we are not really going to fracture the
zone plan. This structure does have a residential
appearance and I believe, in my opinion, it's of low
impact.
    So I think, you know, to conclude, the
benefits of this application certainly outweigh the
detriments and I don't see, you know, certainly think
that we do, you know, advance the purposes of your
zoning as well.
    Q. Okay.
    MR. LIEBERMAN: Mr. Irene, I just want
    to make sure, I am not going to ask the expert
    to provide testimony as to the garage, right?
    That could be handled by acknowledgment on the
    record that it's not connected to the other
    structure; is that correct?
    MR. IRENE: My understanding, from the
    testimony of Ms. Zuckerman, is that the
    garage is going to be detached.
    MR. LIEBERMAN: That's correct.
    MR. IRENE: And as a result, no one is
```

asking for any relief for the garage and, apparently, it conforms.

MR. LIEBERMAN: That was my
understanding, too.
MR. IRENE: As long as it conforms, it is okay. If it doesn't, you are going to be coming back.
Q. Your opinions are within a reasonable degree of certainty; is that correct?
A. That is correct, yes.

MR. LIEBERMAN: I don't want to take any more testimony.

MR. VENEZIA: I have a comment and a question also. You know, the 17.5 looking at the neighborhood, the elevation a bit from the other street to the east of it.

THE WITNESS: Halsey.
MR. VENEZIA: Will take it away. I
mean, it's 17.5. Well, it shouldn't have been, but it's in backyards. It's not blocking any house. You put it in the best words that I could have put it on there, $I$ am concerned with the residential appearance that you are talking about and $I$ am sure we are going to hear some more testimony on this, but it looks like a
house, you know, sitting area, den to a cellar, recreation, a bath-and-a-half, a sink area that can easily be converted. I am just so concerned that this is a second -- a two-family house. MR. IRENE: So one of the issues that we have is a definition of a dwelling unit. So, in this case, this pool house or cabana or whatever you want to call it is a detached structure. It has space which you call the living room or recreation room, it has space where you could put a bed, right? It has a sanitation facilities, bathroom and it appears to have some sort of kitchen area. We didn't get details whether it was cooking facilities. On one plan, it looked like it had a center island stove. You are testifying it is an accessory structure. THE WITNESS: Correct.

MR. IRENE: You are testifying the
Applicant is not intending to use it as a separate dwelling unit which he couldn't without D variance relief.

THE WITNESS: Correct.
MR. IRENE: And my understanding was, permits were issued for the structure for the pool house on the plans, but the only thing that
threw you to us was it was built too high.
THE WITNESS: Correct.
MR. IRENE: Assuming all of that is the case, and someone can correct me if that is wrong, but assuming all of that is the case, generally, what the Board would do in this case based on your testimony, it's simply going to be used as an accessory structure can't be used as a separate dwelling unit. If it were, the Applicant would need a D1 use variance relief for a second principal dwelling. The Board would normally just so that there is no issue with Mr. Almeida ever sells it in the future nobody thinks they got a separate cottage or apartment back there require a Deed restriction indicating that it is a single-family dwelling up front and you have this accessory structure pool house which is accessory to the principal dwelling. It is not a separate dwelling. Does anybody have any objection?

MR. LIEBERMAN: We've agreed to that. MR. AUCIELLO: Yes. MR. VENEZIA: Is there anyone in the audience that wants to say anything on that part Deed restriction or the appearance of a
residential appearance, that it is a pool house. MR. LIEBERMAN: For the record, my client is right here. Sir, Mr. Almeida, you do agree that you will sign the Deed restriction. MR. AUCIELLO: Yeah, 100 percent. MR. LIEBERMAN: Indicating this can't
ever be used for dwelling purposes and can only be used as a pool house.

MR. IRENE: Does that address your concern, Mr. Chairman, that is the way the Board has handled it in the past.

MR. VENEZIA: Any other interested parties? Any questions? Mr. Miller.

MR. MILLER: West Long Branch Zoning Officer. I just want to know why was it constructed higher than the 15 feet that was approved?

THE WITNESS: I will defer to my attorney or our attorney.

MR. IRENE: I don't know if Mr. Auciello could answer that. Is the contractor here?

MR. LIEBERMAN: I did bring the contractor here in case we needed him. I mean, I anticipated the question. MR. IRENE: Paul Kulpak.

Paul Kulpak, sworn.
MR. IRENE: Do you trade under a name?
MR. KULPAK: No, under my name.
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. LIEBERMAN:
Q. Thank you. Sir, you are a contractor;
is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you were the contractor retained by Mr. Auciello to construct, among other things, the pool house; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And did you construct anything else at that site as well?
A. No.
Q. It appears to be that the building was constructed in a manner that the Board considers to be over two feet above what the zoning allows for and would you be able to explain to the Board how it came to be that way?
A. Came to be that way when we were digging the foundation and we hit water at about four or five feet down and couldn't go any deeper. There is just no way to do it. And we poured the foundation according to the blueprint eight feet tall and then built the building on top of it and the building on
top of it is 15 feet and that is what $I$ was going by,
by the 15 -foot margin of the tallest part of the
building. We didn't realize the foundation was going
to push it out two-and-a-half feet more than it was
supposed to.
Q. So, in other words, when you did this, you believed that you were not building it in a matter that was inconsistent?
A. No.
Q. So it was an accident?

MR. ENGEL: Consequential to the fact that you hit water sooner than you might have expected to? THE WITNESS: Oh, much. MR. VENEZIA: How deep is that cellar? THE WITNESS: It's eight feet. The part of it is eight feet. Most of it is at four. MR. VENEZIA: Is the length of the whole --

THE WITNESS: The cellar is at four
feet, yes. Just in the very center it's eight feet and it's, $I$ think, maybe a 10-by-10 area. It is a wine cellar.

MR. IRENE: What is in the four-foot section? Is it like a crawl?

THE WITNESS: Like a crawl space.
MR. SCHULZ: I got two questions. Are
you licensed by the State of New Jersey?
THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. SCHULZ: Do you have your number on you?

THE WITNESS: I have it on my phone. I can give it to you.

MR. SCHULZ: You are licensed by the State of New Jersey.

THE WITNESS: I am.
MR. SCHULZ: The other question is, when
you were building this, were there times the building inspector came over there and said it's too high? I just can't understand how you built it to 17.6 and there is no inspections.

MR. KULPAK: I had all of my inspections.

MR. SCHULZ: So again, how did you get to 17.6? I don't understand it. Mr. Miller, can you explain that this gentleman said he had inspections, but here we are six months later it's complete. At some point in time, it was in violation.

JAMES MILLER, sworn.

MR. LIEBERMAN: So we asked the same question, by the way.

MR. IRENE: Mr. Miller is our Zoning Officer. He has been sworn. Do you want to answer the question, Mr. Miller?

MR. MILLER: Yes. I will have to consult with our construction officer. When I received the complaint, that is when $I$ addressed the issue.

MR. SCHULZE: When did you address the issue? Like, let's say, what month? Was there more building after you addressed the issue?

MR. MILLER: It was around April 11, 2019 .

MR. SCHULZ: April 11th.
MR. MILLER: Yes.
MR. LAMARCA: How far was the project, do we know, how close was it finished?

MR. MILLER: It was shingled at the time.

MR. LIEBERMAN: It was done.
MR. SCHULZ: I don't understand.
Somebody could complete a project that is illegal after the fact there is a stop work order.

MR. IRENE: You know, the people who are doing the inspections may be relying upon the numbers that the professionals are supplying to them.

MR. GIGLIO: I agree.
MR. IRENE: They are not out there with a tape measure. They rely upon the fact that somebody is giving them a set of plans saying it's 15-foot tall and if they don't build it to 15-foot tall and somebody does an as-built and it's 17.6 therein lies the problem.

MR. VENEZIA: When did we find out it was 17.6? In April?

MR. MILLER: When $I$ first did my inspection, it appeared to be 20-feet high. Once we got the as-built that's when it was discovered it was the height.

MR. IRENE: When you hit water, Mr.
Kulpak, and realized you couldn't go down as far as you wanted, if you don't shrink the building, doesn't that mean you are lifting everything up?

MR. KULPAK: Yes.
MR. IRENE: Didn't you think that was going to change the height?

THE WITNESS: No. I was looking at the
structure of the building and it says it's 15
feet from the plate to the ridge.
MR. IRENE: Right.
MR. KULPAK: And that was my
understanding for whatever the height was
supposed to be.
MR. IRENE: Right. If I lifted the
plate up two feet, isn't that going to lift the
height?
MR. KULPAK: There is nothing to tell me
how high up the foundation could be. The
foundation is supposed to be eight feet on the
outside.
MR. IRENE: Right.
MR. KULPAK: The foundation got pushed
up, but it was still eight feet.
MR. ENGEL: Sounds like a
misunderstanding or miscommunication where the
15 feet started.
MR. IRENE: You don't measure it from
grade?
MR. KULPAK: No. I was going by the
blueprint.
MR. IRENE: If you took the blueprint
that said we have a 15-foot tall structure and
lifted up three stories, are you still 15-foot tall?

MR. KULPAK: It's still on top of the foundation.
Q. So, sir, did you believe that you started measuring at the top of the foundation wherever that was?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that what you are saying? That was his belief.

MR. LAMARCA: So you didn't build the foundation, correct? The mason came?

MR. KULPAK: No. The mason did.
MR. LAMARCA: You just figured his height was set so you were going to build your 15-foot building on top of it?

MR. KULPAK: Correct.
MR. GIGLIO: And $I$ bet it was a single pour, right, where you pull the walls away. Single pour floating foundation waterproof.

Done. Done in one day?
THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. SCHULZ: Was Pat's Construction involved in this and was Monteforte Archietect involved in this?

MR. LAMARCA: Well, Jimmy drew the plans, right?

MR. SCHULZ: Yes? No?
MR. LIEBERMAN: I will get you an answer.

MR. IRENE: It looks like what exists
now is different than the initial plan that we have.

MR. LIEBERMAN: This is Mr. Almeida for the record. Why don't you answer that question?

MR. IRENE: You understand you remain under oath, Mr. Almeida?

MR. ALMEIDA: Yes. So Monteforte did the drawings and Pax Construction did the mason.

MR. SCHULZ: During the framing, did Monteforte inspect it?

MR. ALMEID: No, they did not. So they relied on the approval of every inspection we have from Long Branch, so they came and inspected the construction and they gave us approval to go next step.

MR. IRENE: Was the structure constructed in accordance with the Monteforte plans? It looks like it's a different structure.

MR. ALMEID: No, it was. It's exactly.
MS. ZUCKERMAN: It's not clear on
Monteforte's drawings where it's taken from.
MR. LAMARCA: The problem is nobody
shoots heights. Once the foundation is in, they
build the building and nobody is shooting a height to check it.

MS. ZUCKERMAN: The top plate looks the same as grade on his drawings. You can't tell the two apart. It's not clearly labeled.

MR. LIEBERMAN: Does the Board have any other questions of this witness?

MR. IRENE: Was your question answered, Mr. Miller?

MR. MILLER: Yes, it was.
MR. IRENE: Thank you. Any interested parties have any questions of Mr. Kulpak? Let the record reflect no response.

MR. LIEBERMAN: We were expecting a lay witness, but the person isn't here right now.

MR. IRENE: Any interested parties? Any interested parties that wish to comment? Let the record reflect no response. Mr. Miller, anything further?

MR. VENEZIA: I would like to call Mr.

Miller up on $\begin{aligned} & \text { few things. }\end{aligned}$
MR. IRENE: You were sworn, Mr. Miller,
right? You understand you are still under oath? MR. MILLER: Yes.

MR. VENEZIA: Expedite this a little
bit, Mr. Miller, how many accessory buildings are allowed on a property?

THE WITNESS: Two accessory buildings, excluding the garage.

MR. VENEZIA: The garage is not counted.
MR. MILLER: Right.
MR. VENEZIA: Right now there is --
MR. MILLER: There is three accessory
structures. The pool house --
MR. VENEZIA: We've already --
MR. MILLER: -- the shed and the
playhouse.
MR. VENEZIA: We've talked about taking away the shed. That will get them down to two. The property lines --

MR. GIGLIO: The garage conforms.
MR. VENEZIA: -- the property lines, do you see a problem back there? Are they abutting against the parking lot as detailed in this plot plan?

MR. MILLER: I do agree that the fence needs to be moved within the property lines, but no.

MR. VENEZIA: Is there any other
concerns that you have on this?
MR. MILLER: No. I think we addressed everything that $I$ had.

MR. VENEZIA: Any other questions?
MR. SCHULZ: The shed would come down, so that once the shed comes down, it would be conforming, but the amount of structure is there.

MR. MILLER: Yes. They did apply for the zoning permit to comply with the shed.

MR. SCHULZ: They have to, right.
MR. MILLER: Yes.
MR. IRENE: Mr. Miller, while we have
you, do you know if any variance relief had been granted for the dwelling prior, because $I$ see it looks like we have a deficient side yard setback.

MR. MILLER: I would have to look into the file.

MR. IRENE: You are not aware offhand. It may be pre-existing, non-conforming. We
don't know. Obviously, nothing being proposed today is affecting the dwellings because there is no exacerbation. I was just curious because looking at the Survey, Plot Plan from Mr.

Goddard, it shows a deficient side yard setback on the western side.

MR. MILLER: Yes.
MR. SCHULZ: Mr. Miller, I have another
question for you. Do you know if a fence permit was created for the fence they installed?

MR. MILLER: Yes, it was.
MR. SCHULZ: If it's incorrect --
MR. MILLER: We are not in the position to determine where the property lines are. It wasn't brought to our attention until we got an updated Survey and that's when it was brought to our attention.

MR. SCHULZ: If this fence has to be
moved, do they have to get another fence permit?
MR. MILLER: We can update the zoning
permit that was applied in the last two weeks.
MR. IRENE: Mr. Gitto said it would be
prudent if you feel fit to grant the relief to comply with the Survey.

MR. GIGLIO: Quick note, I don't know if
something can be taken on the side, but the gentleman explained how field hockey fence does encroach on this property. I don't know if somebody can notify the school system to have that checked because if that is true it might be nice to get that fixed, so it's straightened out in the future. Just a side note.

MR. IRENE: Well, I think he also
indicated it's there because the width of the field. I don't know how long that's been there. He may not care.

MR. GIGLIO: I am being fair on both ends.

MR. IRENE: If he doesn't care, they have a right to leave it.

MR. CAMASTRA: He is okay. I appreciate it, Paul.

MR. GIGLIO: I have a daughter and so
does Mr. Malfa who plays field hockey there and we happen to know about that a lot. If that is off that much, $I$ don't think it's going to affect anybody.

MR. VENEZIA: I have two concerns that we want to address from the Board Members prior comments. One is the drainage because of the
plan, as Mr. Schulz said, prior to that the field hockey was a swamp and we were concerned with drainage somewhat.

We have, in the past, had the person or the Applicant put a small dry well in to let the water go at the two down spots on the side of the field which would be, what, that would be the north side of the building?

MR. IRENE: West side.
MR. VENEZIA: West side of the building is to have two areas where the water deposits and is dissipated at a lower level. It's simple things. It is to put a small dry well in.

MR. LIEBERMAN: You mean, basically, a drain?

MR. ALMEIDA: I did drainage already on the side of the house that borders with the field. I did the drainage. We divert the water in a way that doesn't bother the field and whatever water goes from my property to the field it is natural. It is rainwater. That is it. And we have the fence with the trees and the landscape like prevents the water to go on the field.

MR. IRENE: When was that done, Mr.

Almeida?
MR. ALMEIDA: That was done in 2017, when we built the pool.

MR. IRENE: Was that plan submitted with the permits, so that somebody could look at it?

MR. ALMEIDA: Yeah.
MR. GITTO: I haven't seen a plan.
MR. ALMEIDA: That was done when we did the pool. That was a pool company.

MR. SCHULZ: I got a question on the pool house. It is showing the downspouts. They go no place. That's what $I$ am talking about.

MR. ALMEIDA: You are talking about.
MR. SCHULZ: The pool house. How many
downspouts are on the pool house?
THE WITNESS: There is three.
MR. SCHULZ: Three, two in the back and one in the front?

MR. ALMEIDA: Yes.
MR. SCHULZ: What $I$ am asking that water somewhere there be tanks installed to catch the water and not just run.

MR. ALMEIDA: Not just run. We can do that. For that purpose, we did not do it. It runs on my property and this made it on the
property before it goes to the field.
MR. GITTO: Since you are installing a
616-square foot garage, could you also install one that would mitigate the garage?

MR. ALMEIDA: Oh, yes. Yes.
MR. LAMARCA: At the same time.
MR. GITTO: Once they updated their
Survey and provided a design for Resolution of Compliance, we could review that?

MR. VENEZIA: What will we call that when we put that in a Resolution?

MR. GITTO: I would say a dry well to mitigate the increase in runoff. Increase in the impervious surface.

MR. VENEZIA: Address Mr. Engel's concern earlier about what you were mentioning. Are you okay if we get a new plan and everything has to conform?

MR. ENGEL: As long as the requirements for the revisions are part of the condition for if we grant the relief then $I$ am fine with that. As far as the roof height itself goes, yeah, obviously, mistakes were made in planning it, but I accept the fact that a two-and-a-half foot overage is not damaging to the neighborhood.

MR. VENEZIA: Especially on a dead end,
last house adjacent to a field.
MR. ENGEL: Yeah. Right. With the amount of trees and stuff, $I$ don't think a two-and-a-half foot roof is going to. Sand boxing my remarks to just the roof and stuff, I have no problem with granting -- I have no problem with granting variance relief for the height of the roof.

MR. IRENE: And the setback. They are tied together. The height of the pool house roof and the setback with all of the conditions that we discussed, so we are talking about the playhouse being relocated to conform or be removed, a condition that the fences will all of the encroachments will be removed, they will be relocated or the Applicant will obtain either a license or an easement from whoever's property is being encroached on to allow them to remain. We mentioned the playhouse. There will be a dry well system installed for the pool house and the garage is going to be submitted on a drainage plan for review and approval by the Board Engineer.
We also are going to remove that wood
shed. There is going to be a confirming Survey done to show all of these things have been achieved and is there anything else.

MS. ZUCKERMAN: Deed restriction.
MR. IRENE: Deed restriction. We don't
want to forget about that one. A Deed
restriction to confirm that the pool house is an accessory structure and will not be used as a separate dwelling unit.

MR. SCHULZ: Environmental report. I want an environmental report.

MR. IRENE: Okay. The report from the Environmental Commission. Not an environmental impact statement. What the checklist originally required.

MR. MALFA: Can $I$ just ask a question? MR. IRENE: Sure.

MR. MALFA: I don't know if $I$ can direct this to Mr. Almeida. Do you have any problems with flooding at all on the property?

MR. ALMEIDA: We do have one problem. The parking lot, you know, where our neighbor, so it floods my pool when it rains a lot because they don't have any drainage there. So the most of the water you might see on the field, it's
from the parking lot because it's, you know, asphalt and it's just coming out.

MR. MALFA: Understand. The reason I am asking is because $I$ know being on that field before when it moderately rains or maybe even light rains, it floods. The field drain floods. Obviously, being very close to the lake, to a water table, so now when you start digging holes and then you start putting things in those holes, the water has got to start running off somewhere else.

The reason I am asking is because now you have a cellar or a basement, a pool that was dug, now the garage is like --

MS. ZUCKERMAN: Slab-on-grade.
MR. MALFA: Hopefully, the dry well will
be enough. Again, $I$ know it floods there. Just the disturbing of the water table was kind of my concern and where is it going to go? And again, I guess, you know, the environmental report might shed more light on that.

MR. IRENE: If $I$ can make a suggestion, rather than mandating a dry well, why don't you just provide a grading and drainage report subject to review and approval by the Board

Engineer? This way, if he looks and says, you know the dry well isn't going to work because the water is going to come up instead of go down, they can propose a swale or grate or whatever they want. That way, we're not locking it into something that may or may not work. You propose what you think will work, let him look at it and bless it.

MR. LIEBERMAN: That is what $I$ would do. MR. IRENE: Is that the motion, Mr.

## Engel?

MR. ENGEL: Yes.
MR. IRENE: Is there a second?
MR. LAMARCA: I will second.
MR. IRENE: As Mr. Engel stated it,
granting the approval with the conditions.
MR. LIEBERMAN: Sir, could I stop you for a second?

MR. IRENE: Sure.
MR. LIEBERMAN: There was a question
raised, before you vote, and $I$ just want to let him get the answers.

MR. MILLER: Clarification for the proposed two-car garage, is that going to be for commercial use or residential use?

MS. ZUCKERMAN: Residential use.
MR. LIEBERMAN: Mr. Almeida, it's
residential use.
MR. ALMEIDA: It's residential use.
MR. LIEBERMAN: No commercial?
MR. ALMEIDA: No commercial.
MR. MILLER: Are you satisfied?
MR. LAMARCA: The garage has all of its approvals, right?

MR. IRENE: They are not asking for relief. He doesn't require relief, doesn't have his approvals yet, doesn't require any from us.

MS. DEGENARO: Robert Venezia?
MR. VENEZIA: Yes.
MS. DEGENARO: Michael Schulz?
MR. SCHULZ: Yes.
MS. DEGENARO: Scott LaMarca?
MR. LAMARCA: Yes.
MS. DEGENARO: Paul Giglio?
MR. GIGLIO: Yes.
MS. DEGENARO: Greg Malfa?
MR. MALFA: Yes.
MS. DEGENARO: Mark Engel?
MR. ENGEL: Yes.
MR. IRENE: It carries. Thank you.

Anything that's been marked that we don't have please leave with Chris Ann. Mr. Chairman, we have several Resolutions tonight.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am going to lead off with the Turlecsky Resolution for the approval of bulk variance relief on the fence. Did everyone have a chance to review? Any questions on it? Corrections or additions? Motion?

MR. ENGEL: I will move to accept this motion as written. MR. GIGLIO: I will second it. MS. DEGENARO: Robert Venezia? MR. VENEZIA: Yes. MS. DEGENARO: Scott LaMarca? MR. LAMARCA: Yes. MS. DEGENARO: Paul Giglio? MR. GIGLIO: Yes. MS. DEGENARO: Mark Engel? MR. ENGEL: Yes. MR. VENEZIA: Second Resolution is a bulk variance for Stephen and Kerry Bray about a pool and it was on 30 Community Drive. Did everyone have a chance to review that? MR. ENGEL: Yes, sir. MR. VENEZIA: Any questions? A

## discussion? Comments?

MR. ENGEL: No, sir.
MR. VENEZIA: Can $I$ have a motion?
MR. GIGLIO: Accept the motion.
MR. GIGLIO: I will second.
MS. DEGENARO: Robert Venezia?
MR. VENEZIA: Yes.
MS. DEGENARO: Scott LaMarca?
MR. LAMARCA: Yes.
MS. DEGENARO: Paul Giglio?
MR. GIGLIO: Yes.
MS. DEGENARO: Mark Engel?
MR. ENGEL: Yes.
MR. VENEZIA: The third and final one
for this evening is the denial of the
application of the Jengo on the premises of 68
Locust Avenue in West Long Branch. Did everyone
have a chance to read that? Any additions, corrections, comments? Seeing none and hearing none, does anyone want to make a motion?

MR. ENGEL: I will move.
MR. IRENE: No, you can't. You voted the other way. It's only those people who voted to deny the application and I am looking at Chris Ann's notes. So Mr. Venezia and Mr.

LaMarca, Mr. Giglio. Ms. Hughes is not present tonight. So those three, did anyone make a motion to adopt that?

MR. LAMARCA: I will make a motion to
adopt the Resolution.
MR. VENEZIA: I will second it.
MR. VENEZIA: Yes.
MS. DEGENARO: Scott LaMarca?
MR. LAMARCA: Yes.
MS. DEGENARO: Paul Giglio?
MR. GIGLIO: Yes.
MR. VENEZIA: We have one thing to talk about is the Minutes, the review of the Minutes for last month.

MS. DEGENARO: Got hammered with the time in between and she said she'll have this meeting and the November meeting done for us for the next meeting.

MR. VENEZIA: Is there anyone here that is not going to be here next month? We have two that won't be here.

MR. IRENE: If Mr. Engel moves up to fill the alternate or fill the vacancy.

MR. IRENE: Remember, Chris Ann is going to remember, everybody, you have to be here half
hour early. The re-org is 7. So we don't forget, one other matter, if $I$ may, on the Gabbay matter, Mr. Falvo's application, they dropped off -- Mr. Gabbay pro se handing himself dropped off a form of complaint with Chris Ann that does not look like it was filed with the Superior Court, but $I$ believe they have since filed it. I am simply going to ask for authorization from the Board to defend that matter assuming it goes forward. What was dropped off with Chris Ann was an un-filed complaint. I think they filed it.

MS. DEGENARO: Yes. I think I emailed column east.

MR. IRENE: The complaint you got didn't have any exhibits.

MS. DEGENARO: It did have exhibits. The exhibits were the things in the plan.

MR. IRENE: I need to know what you got, without discussing it, because then we have to go into closed session and litigation can $I$ simply get --

MR. ENGEL: I authorize our Board Attorney to --

MR. GIGLIO: I second that.

MS. DEGENARO: Robert Venezia.
MR. VENEZIA: Yes.
MS. DEGENARO: Michael Schulz?
MR. SCHULZ: Yes.
MS. DEGENARO: Scott LaMarca?
MR. LAMARCA: Yes.
MS. DEGENARO: Paul Giglio?
MR. GIGLIO: Yes.
MS. DEGENARO: Greg Malfa?
MR. MALFA: Yes.
MS. DEGENARO: Mark Engel?
MR. ENGEL: Yes.
MR. IRENE: We just want to add that to the Minutes the Board authorized Mr. Irene to defend the Gabbay matter. That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

MR. VENEZIA: I think that is it.
MR. IRENE: Motion to adjourn? All in
favor?
Hearing ends at 9:40 p.m.

