		2
1	<u>APPEARANCES</u>	
2	KING, KITRICK, JACKSON, McWEENEY & WELLS BY: MARK G. KITRICK, ESQ.,	
3	2329 NJ 34 Manasquan, NJ 08736	
4	Attorney for the Zoning Board.	
5	STONE & MANDIA, LLC BY: RICHARD B. STONE, ESQ.	
6	685 Neptune Blvd. Neptune, NJ 07753	
7	Attorney for the Applicant.	
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 Next case, is CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: 2 Mr. Stone here. 3 MR. STONE: I think I'm here. Can 4 everybody hear me? 5 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: We hear you 6 7 fine. MS. DICKERT: Mr. Stone, give me one 8 I know there are some people who have second. 9 joined the meeting late. They've been coming 10 sporadically. I don't know they heard the 11 announced the matter of 217 McCabe Avenue has been 12 carried to the August 20th meeting. It will not 13 be heard this evening. If you wish to 14 participate, the information is on our website. 15 Hopefully we may be moving further at that time 16 but as of right now it's going to be held via 17 But again that was carried to August 20th 18 without further notice. 19 Okay, sorry, Mr. Stone. Go ahead. 20 MR. STONE: Okay. Mr. Rosenberg and 21 Members of the Board my name is Richard Stone. 22 It's been quite a while since I've appeared before 23

Tonight I'm privileged to represent the

this Board.

24

25

owners of property located at 306 Monmouth Avenue in Bradley. I anticipate that -- first, I'd like to thank your Board secretary. She's been very helpful along the way, particularly because this one of the first virtual applications that I've handled. Inaudible -- I would ask your patience.

I'm assuming that the Board has some preliminary information about what this application is about. I take you know that at one point the property owner, Mrs. Beth Cotler obtained a permit to do construction on the rear garage apartment. The plans for that construction were prepared by Mr. Thomas Sente (phonetic). I hope that you probably have his plans in the exhibit list. But we sad to know that Mr. Sente unfortunately passed away.

I have multiple witnesses depending upon how long the Board will allow me to proceed. I anticipate that there will two experts. One will be my engineer Mr. Larry Murphy, who will testify pretty much throughout the entire application. The second Ms. Allison Coffin, who you know is a planner. I'm sure that she's been qualified before your Board before.

And the application would ordinarily in my

opinion be rather straight forward except that unfortunately during construction there were field changes done to the construction of the property that expanded the construction as permitted.

And it's never the best situation to come before a Board having exceeded the permitted approval but those are the facts. and some point either now or later I will explain to you how that developed unfortunately, but it did. During the construction the property owners believe that what they were asking the builder to do were de minimis alterations and would be within the parameters of maybe a field changed. They were not. But I think that there probably would be -- I'm hoping there would be some give and take after I explain to you what the proposed application is.

Although there are variances required, most of which are 'd' variances and substantially many are already pre-existing nonconformities but are issues that I'm going to touch on, but I'm really going to rely most heavily upon the experts.

Number one there is an issue with regard to a two-car garage and the construction of the building would accommodate two vehicles on the inside of the garage space, but for the limited

garage door. However you're going to hear testimony that although the ordinance would ordinarily emphasize a two-car garage, the uniqueness of this property is that -- I'm sorry. I see is that somebody else that's about to talk?

CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: No.

MR. STONE: Oh, I'm sorry. The uniqueness of the property is that the requirement of the application would be for four parking spaces off street. Now I've been around Bradley Beach a long time and of course I know that off-street parking is always emphasized because of particularly summer when the parking is overcrowded.

This particular application you're going to see even if there's only one vehicle in the garage allows at least six off-street parking on the site. There maybe be at least seven, maybe eight parking spaces off street where only four are required. I'm going to let the experts explain that to you.

In addition to that the original approval was for the height of 24 foot on the garage, on the back garage unit. When the builder added to the construction he did two things. Number one he

put dormers and the dormers were not to create 1 living space on that elevated floor. 2 You'll hear testimony that that portion of 3 the floor is being set aside for attic storage or 4 mechanicals. It's not high enough to accommodate 5 a livable space and you really can't get to it but by a ladder. 7 The second reason the dormers were put on is that if anybody is familiar with the front 9 house, you notice that --10 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: Mr. Stone, I 11 have to stop you a minute. 12 Yes. MR. STONE: 13 We have a CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: 14 Councilman on who cannot be on in a Zoning Board 15 meeting. Am I correct, Mr. Kitrick? 16 MR. KITRICK: Who is that? 17 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: Mr. Gobatosey 18 (phonetic). 19 MR. KITRICK: I can't hear you. 20 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: Alan Gobatosey 21 is on page two. He's a councilman. He cannot be 22 -- a councilman cannot be at a Zoning Board 23 meeting; correct? 24

MR. KITRICK: Correct.

25

1	CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: Mr. Gobatosey
2	we're going to have to ask you to leave.
3	MR. STONE: Mr. Rosenberg, can I ask
4	you a question? I didn't take a count of the
5	number of members that participated in the earlier
6	meetings. How many members are there?
7	CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: We have a full
8	board here.
9	MR. STONE: Oh, okay. So the fact
10	that one of the member has to recuse themself
11	CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: You still have
12	seven left.
13	MR. STONE: I still have a
14	contingent, okay.
15	MR. KITRICK: Did somebody recuse
16	themself?
17	CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: Yes.
18	MR. KITRICK: Who's that?
19	CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: Mr. Mayer.
20	MR. KITRICK: Okay.
21	CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: Continue, Mr.
22	Stone.
23	MR. STONE: May I proceed, Mr.
24	Rosenberg.
25	MS. DICKERT: Mr. Gobatosey is still

```
on there.
1
                 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: Mr. Gobatosey is
 2
 3
    still on.
                 MS. DICKERT: Alan Gobatosey, yeah
 4
    you're not allowed to be here.
 5
                 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: Councilmen are
 6
    not allowed to be here.
 7
                 MR. STONE: I don't see his picture.
 8
                 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: No but his name
 9
    is there. Could you knock him off, Kristie?
10
                 MS. DICKERT:
                               I can.
11
                 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: Please because
12
    he's not supposed to be there.
13
                 MR. KITRICK: And we want the
14
    application to be able to proceed. We don't want
15
    any issues.
16
                 MS. DICKERT:
                                Okay.
17
                 MR. STONE: May I proceed, Mr.
18
    Kitrick?
19
                 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: Let's see. Yeah
20
21
    now you can.
                 MR. KITRICK:
                                Sure.
22
                 MR. STONE: Okay. So I want to make
23
    it clear. If you take a look at the plans and
24
    again I'll have the engineer explain this, excuse
25
```

me, if you take a look at the front house you'll notice that there's renewable energy solar panels on the front house. In order to accommodate the number of panels on the back house, it made sense at least to the property owner to spread out the roof so that they can accommodate a few more panels because as part of this application there's a representation that he intends to put renewable energy on the back house as well as the front.

But by doing that it elevated the house from the approved permit of 24 feet height to 25 feet eight inches. And that requires the variance and at some point during the construction it was determined by I guess your Code Enforcement Officer and he was correct that the expanded plan was outside the permits, and that brings me here today.

If you will allow me --

MR. KITRICK: All right. Look, let's deal with some legal issues first. Okay. So first of all I just want to address the issue that the Chairman brought before for those who are listening to the meeting. First of all the Zoning Board of Adjustment is a quasi-judicial board. And the applications that come before this board

are people who are appeal denials of submissions. And based on zoning ordinances they're appealing denials on the zoning ordinances and those ordinances are part of the Land Use Laws that are adopted by the Governing Body in a municipality. So you're actually appealing Governing Body's enactments of the zoning ordinances. That's why members of the Governing Body do not participate in Board of Adjustment matters.

Not the same as a planning board but that's what makes the zoning board unique. We're a quasi-judicial body because we're hearing appeals from the Governing Body.

So I just want to get that on the record.

That's the reasoning and also we want to make sure that those rules are followed with respect to the public and with respect to the applicant.

So there is an objector in this case. Mr. Coan has raised an objection. And he's raised a very specific objection as to the notice provision. And I think that's something that we should address at the beginning because I think it's relevant because it speaks to whether or not the Zoning Board takes jurisdiction this evening.

Mr. Coan had submitted his objection to as

notice. We're going to give Mr. Coan an opportunity to make his case, but is there anything that you want to add regarding the notices that you provided this evening.

MR. STONE: May I ask a question or two, Mr. Kitrick?

MR. KITRICK: Of course.

MR. STONE: Okay. So the first question I would ask is in regard to the issue of the recusal or you know the withdrawal of the councilman. I take it that although he didn't participate in any regard and the fact that he removed himself briefly into the application I don't believe that there's anything fatal about the fact that he was on and then removed himself. Would you agree with that?

MR. KITRICK: I concur.

MR. STONE: Okay. Now in regard to the notice requirement I have a couple of points I'd like to raise. So I have in front of me now the note that Mr. Coan provided. I have a question or two before I comment upon his objection.

I'm not aware and again I been around Bradley Beach for a long time and I noticed that

it was signed Thomas "T.J." Coan, Bradley Beach Public Advocate.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Does Bradley Beach have a position in its community organization of a Public Advocate?

MR. KITRICK: I don't know the answer to that.

Is there a point -- and MR. STONE: I'm not putting you on the spot, but I'm assuming that Mr. Coan is providing this as a citizen, which of course he has a right to do, but that fact that he would present something with a caricature of a public advocate, which suggests that he's speaking for the entirety of the Borough of Bradley Beach. And I think that it is inappropriate unless of course he's an appointed representative of the Borough of which I'm not I looked to see whether or not it was an aware. elected appointment or the Mayor appointed him or either the planning board or zoning board but to place his name gives some type of enhanced credibility to a position when he's a citizen. And of course he has a right as a citizen to make that objection.

I would just like to point out that I think that's inappropriate should the matter ever go up

on appeal.

Number two, I know that as an applicant's attorney the applicant has an obligation under the ordinance and under the Municipal Land Use statute to provide information so the public can review that information timely so that it might appropriately prepare for any issues that might arise. So that the public is aware.

It has always been my position that an objector has a similar obligation. And this rather extensive objection with attachments was received by my office early -- mid-afternoon.

And only because I contacted your board secretary to find out where I was and she was kind enough to advise that there had been an objection.

So as far as the written objection is concerned I object to that. If Mr. Coan wants to make a verbal objection, I think he has a right to do it as a citizen, not as a public advocate. I think that's inappropriate. So I'd like to hear what his objection is other than having to read it in a form. I don't know his qualification. I don't know whether or not he's an attorney. So does he have that skill. And I'd like to know whether -- if he has an objection, I'd like to

hear him place on the record so that I can respond to each one or at least have one or both of my experts do the same.

CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: Mr. Kitrick, is that where it should continue?

MR. KITRICK: Yes, that's fair. And I'm just going to swear Mr. Coan in because I do know he's not an attorney. So I'll swear him in.

T.J. COAN, sworn.

MR. COAN: I would strike the public advocate from the record. That's a self-proclaimed position because I've been watching out for the Borough of Bradley Beach for many years. And I believe successfully both in this forum and many other forums.

That being said I'd be happy to put my objections about this notice that was sent out. It appears to me to not be a truthful statement to the public. It's requesting variances to demolish the existing garage and construct a two-story structure, which will have a two-car garage on the first floor and a residential apartment above.

Well reading that and then riding by the

property after receiving the notice, you would assume that the existing structure is going to be torn down.

Well that's not the case. That demolition is already taken place but is not reflected in this notice.

Secondarily there's no mention of the loft. There's no mention of the loft stair access or there's no mention of the dormers. Also it indicates a two-car garage and clearly there's a one-car garage there. So you're not supplying a two-car garage.

So these are very misleading statements and it appears to be fiction to me. So I would appreciate if this was re-noticed properly letting all public members of the Borough of Bradley Beach to understand what the true application is and then come back at a July or August meeting.

In addition to that I would like to say that it's a very unique situation that the property has already been built. So I would recommend to the Board and to the public that we should probably have an on-site inspection.

Because we're not just looking at plans. We're looking at a structure that's built. So the Board

should have the right to go in and review that in an on-site inspection and the public also.

So I stand by my complaint. I would take off my public advocate tag as it is self-proclaimed, Mr. Stone. But I do stand by my arguments that this is a faulty notice created by your office and it appears to me to be fiction. Thank you, sir.

MR. KITRICK: And Mr. Stone can respond but you did address the public advocate.

MR. COAN: Yes, I did.

MR. KITRICK: Yeah you did address that but the one thing Mr. Stone brought up is the notice that you provided. Why did he only get that today through the Board secretary?

MR. COAN: Well Mr. Kitrick as a self-proclaimed public advocate I have always felt that the ten-day notice and burying a notice in the back of The Asbury Park Press on a Sunday is really not public notice. It's really not fair to the residents and I believe the state of New Jersey even though it's ten days it is -- it should be 30 days because to --

MR. KITRICK: I know. It's not.

| It's not. It's not so...

MR. COAN: Okay. That being said there's no -- I could have just shown up at the meeting and handed out my -- could I not, Mr. Kitrick?

MR. KITRICK: Yeah, I'm just asking you to address his -- he brought it up. Just address it.

MR. COAN: Well I gave him the courtesy of sending it at one o'clock this afternoon. In a regular scenario I would have come to the meeting and entered every objection and every exhibit at the meeting. I wasn't given that opportunity based on COVID-19. So as a lay person I felt it fair to give Mr. Stone the notice before the meeting and not during the meeting. And also have all my exhibits on the record for the board's secretary.

MR. KITRICK: Mr. Stone.

MR. STONE: Yes, let's get off the timing. Those of us who practice Municipal Land Use know that the statute provides a very strict notice where the applicant's notices have to be published, how they have to be served to the surrounding property owners and there's a reason for that. And I've always felt similar to Mr.

Coan's argument that objectors who are self-proclaimed public advocates who have familiarity with the system, he could have provided me with this objection three weeks ago. And he certainly knew about it then but he laid in wait for the applicant to move the application and he decided he was going to do the night of the application.

But let me deal with the objections of the notice. We believe if you take a look at the notice both published and served it more than adequately serves upon those interested parties what the substance of the application is about. So the fact that it references a demolition certainly the prior building before the permit was issued and constructed that building had to be demolished and it had to be reconstructed. That's exactly what happened.

In regard to the dormers that's one of the reasons we're here. We do not have to specifically reference the dormers because they don't exceed the height requirement. The height of eight inches above the 25 inch (sic) requirement is clear that we placed that into the notice requirement.

In regard to the garage, which Mr. Coan objects to, that it's a one-car garage, you will hear some testimony from one or both of the witnesses that the garage is of a size that it can accommodate with maneuvering the vehicles around two vehicles. It's 18 by 20, which would

accommodate two vehicles.

But because the request of a one-car garage is a 'd' variance and we believe that it's de minimis, it would be covered under the catchall language of any and all additional variances required. So any fair reading of this notice certainly puts the public on notice itself as to what relief is being sought by the applicant.

MR. KITRICK: I just have a question for you, Mr. Stone. I didn't quite follow the 'd' variance statement.

MR. STONE: Well in the event that during the course of the application the testimony is that the garage will only be used for one car instead of two cars. There has to be some testimony with respect to whether or not off-street parking is being accommodated. And if the testimony as I just referenced is that there will be at least seven total parking spaces where

four are required. That would be a 'd' variance and would be handled within the catchall provision of the notice requirement.

MR. KITRICK: Okay. So just so I understand. So you noticed for a two-car garage; correct?

MR. STONE: Yes, we did. And we have a two-car garage.

MR. KITRICK: Right. Okay. But in the scenario I think that you're laying out that if it's deemed to be a one-car garage then you would need a use variance and your position is the catchall language would cover that situation.

MR. STONE: I think with that limited scenario.

MR. KITRICK: So I would advise you the following: My position would be that if you did require a use variance that, and I don't know, we haven't heard any testimony and the board couldn't take a position that without hearing testimony. But if you needed a 'd' variance, my view is that the catchall language would not cover securing a use variance.

MR. STONE: May I do something? I have two of my experts that are available. May I

```
inquire that they can hear what I'm saying?
1
    Murphy, can you hear my?
2
                              Yes.
                 MR. MURPHY:
3
                 MR. STONE: And Ms. Coffin, can you
 4
    hear me?
5
                 MS. COFFIN:
                              Yes.
                            Okay.
                                    Larry --
                 MR. STONE:
 7
                                      Wait a minute.
                 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG:
 8
    Before they talk don't they have to be sworn in.
 9
                 MR. STONE: I'm going to ask them to
10
    be sworn in now.
11
                 MR. KITRICK: All right. So what's
12
    the purpose of having them --
13
                 MR. STONE: I would like them to
14
    explain a little bit more at length to respond to
15
    your question about the one-car garage notice.
16
                 MR. KITRICK: Well I'm not sure why
17
                                       I'm not
    we would need to hear from them.
18
    questioning whether you're going to be able to
19
    prove it's a two-car garage or it's going to be a
20
    one-car garage. All I'm saying is that if you
21
    need a use variance you have to notice for a use
22
23
    variance.
                              And I agree with that.
                 MR. STONE:
24
                 MR. KITRICK: And you know we call it
25
```

```
the catchall language I think that's appropriate
1
    if there are additional bulk variances --
2
                 MR. STONE: I agree but I misspoke. I
3
    misspoke.
4
                 MR. KITRICK:
                               Okay.
5
                 MR. STONE: I do not need a 'd'
 6
    variance for the garage. I need a 'c' variance
7
    for the garage.
8
                 MR. KITRICK:
                               Okay.
9
                 MR. STONE: I misspoke. I'm reading
10
    off my notes and that was an error on my part.
11
                 MR. KITRICK: Okay. All right.
12
                 MR. STONE: So I don't need a use
13
    variance for the garage and that's why it's within
14
15
    the catchall language.
                 MR. KITRICK: Okay. All right.
16
                 MR. STONE: That was a mistake on my
17
18
    part.
                 MR. KITRICK: I follow you.
19
                 Mr. Coan.
    Understood.
20
                 MR. COAN: I mean do we have a
21
    determination, Mr. Kitrick. I mean there's no
22
    mention of the loft in here. There's no mention
23
    of a two-and-a-half story structure. It's says a
24
    two-story structure. This is clearly a
25
```

```
two-and-a-half story structure with windows on the
1
    half story. So again this is not what the public
2
    -- the public needs to know exactly what is going
 3
         I find this to be a faulty notice.
 4
    would request that it be re-noticed and come back
5
 6
    and especially at this late hour, sir.
                               Mr. Stone, is the
 7
                 MR. KITRICK:
    proposal before the Board a two story or a two and
8
    a half story?
 9
                             Two and a half story.
                 MR. STONE:
10
                 MR. KITRICK: Okay. And --
11
                 MR. STONE:
                             Could I make a
12
                 I have a suggestion. It's about ten
13
    suggestion.
    after ten; am I correct? How late does the Board
14
15
    go?
                 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: We went to ten
16
17
    o'clock.
              We're giving you the courtesy right
18
    now.
                 MR. STONE: So I propose that -- I
19
    don't happen to agree with Mr. Coan.
20
    certainly I'm not going to complete my application
21
    tonight. I think we can all agree upon that.
22
    You've already heard three or four applications.
23
    It's been a long night. I think that we should
24
```

25

carry the application even though I don't think

it's necessary in order to assure that there's no 1 jurisdictional issue I will re-notice. 2 MR. KITRICK: Okay. 3 MR. STONE: So that we can remove 4 that, my opinion is that it's salacious but you 5 know if it was seven o'clock, I would press on. 6 And it's ten after ten and it's already been a 7 long night for everybody. 8 MS. PHILLIPS: I just want to say one 9 thing. You know it's going to be beautiful. 10 There's one door. Two cars go in there and 11 there's one door because they wanted lighting and 12 safety for their daughter to get in. So I guess 13 knowing this structure myself do you have to have 14 15 MR. KITRICK: I don't think we should 16 talk about the application. 17 MS. PHILLIPS: Does it have to have 18 two doors? That's going to be -- that's what I 19 want them to know the rest of the board. 20 MR. KITRICK: I just don't think we 21 should talk about the application right now. 22 MS. PHILLIPS: Okay. 23 Mr. Kitrick, I appreciate MR. COAN: 24 Mr. Stone's professionalism and I look forward to 25

```
the carried meeting and the new notice as stating
1
    the proper facts of the case. Thank you, sir.
2
                 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG:
                                      Mr. Stone, when
3
    would you like to carry it to? July?
 4
                 MR. STONE: I think you've already
5
    said that there's a meeting on the 16th; am I
 6
 7
    right?
                 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG:
                                      Correct.
8
                 MR. STONE: And when is the meeting
 9
10
    in August?
                 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: The 20th or
11
    something like -- August will be --
12
                 MS. DICKERT: It's the 20th.
13
                 MR. KITRICK: August 20th.
14
                 MR. STONE: I'm going to ask to carry
15
    it to the 16th.
16
                 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: But you're going
17
    to re-notice.
18
                 MR. STONE: Wait a minute. Hold on a
19
    second. One of my experts is not available on the
20
    16th. I have to carry it until August 20th.
21
                 MR. KITRICK:
22
                                Okay.
                 MR. STONE: Ms. Coffin is not
23
    available on the 16th.
24
25
                 MR. KITRICK: Okay.
```

```
MR. STONE: So I will re-notice and
1
    we'll mark it for 20th and I will waive any time.
2
    Can I do that orally, Mr. Kitrick?
3
                 MR. KITRICK: Yes, that's acceptable
 4
    to me, Mr. Stone.
5
                 MR. STONE: Okay. I'll waive any --
 6
                 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: He's re-noticing
7
8
    it, so...
                 MR. STONE: That's true. Okay.
 9
                 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: Kristie, he'll
10
    be the first case that night, please.
11
                 MR. STONE: Will I be the first case
12
    that night?
13
                 MS. DICKERT: What about the other
14
    ones that were carried?
15
                 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: Who was carried?
16
                 MR. KITRICK: They're July though
17
18
    aren't they?
                 MS. DICKERT: Oh, they're July. Give
19
20
    me one second.
                 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: The 217 McCabe
21
    that can be the second case.
22
                 MS. DICKERT: Okay. That will be the
23
24
    second case, yes.
                 CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: Mr. Stone will
25
```

_			
1	be the first case.		
2	MS. DICKERT: Cotler will be first,		
3	yes.		
4	MR. KITRICK: Okay.		
5	CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: And I think then		
6	August is going to be filled up.		
7	MR. KITRICK: All right. So it will		
8	be carried to August 20th with notice.		
9	MR. STONE: Hold on. Okay, let's put		
10	it on the 20th and then if there any issue with		
11	that, I'll call the board secretary and let you		
12	know. All right?		
13	MR. KITRICK: Okay. Very good.		
14	MR. STONE: Let me thank the members		
15	of the board. Mr. Kitrick, Kristie and everybody		
16	else and I look forward to the application. All		
17	right.		
18	CHAIRMAN ROSENBERG: Thank you.		
19	MR. KITRICK: Thank you.		
20	(Recording is concluded.)		
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

## CERTIFICATE

I, MICHELE A. MAC PHERSON, Transcriber and Notary Public of the State of New Jersey, hereby certify the foregoing to be the truest and most closely verbatim record able to have been rendered by me.

Michele a. Mas Herson

Transcriber

Michele A. Mac Pherson,

DATED: September 24, 2020

My Commission expires:

Pebruary 7, 2021