





**Vice-Chairman Palko** made a motion to deem the application complete. **Mr. Hine** seconded the motion.

**In Favor: All.**

**REGULAR MEETING (IF DEEMED COMPLETE):**

Weems

No. 21-02

Block 519, Lot 8  
21 Jennings Road  
Bulk Area Variance

**Mr. V. James Castiglia**, the applicant's Attorney, and **Mr. Matthew Scott Weems**, the applicant, were both present. Mr. Weems was then sworn in. Mr. Castiglia explained that the applicant proposes to construct an in-ground pool. He requires a variance since the property is a corner lot, and the pool will be located in the front yard. Assistant Engineer, Jim Lutz, recommended a swale be constructed, and has been in direct contact with the applicant regarding the construction of the swale.

**Mr. Scott Weems**, the applicant, stated that he received a zoning denial because he owns a corner lot, and will not meet the front yard setback requirement.

**Ms. Hartmann** explained that although the applicant lives on a corner lot, he still has one front yard and two side yards. Since the pool is being constructed on the side yard that fronts Krasco Road, the applicant is unable to adhere to the 50-foot front yard setback requirement, which then warrants the need for a variance. She then asked if the applicant has been cutting down trees on the property in preparation for the pool.

**Mr. Weems** stated that he has cut down two trees. The trees that were cut down were hazardous. One was a leaner, and the other one was dying.

**Ms. Hartmann** asked Mr. Weems to obtain a tree removal permit for the trees that have been removed.

**Ms. Samantha Anello** asked the applicant to verify the reason for the location of the pool is because of the freshwater wetlands adjacent to the property and the location of the well and septic.

**Mr. Weems** stated that is correct.

**Mr. Kienz** asked what kind of fencing is proposed around the pool area, and will it conform with the requirements.

**Mr. Weems** stated the fencing will conform with both the Zoning and Building Department requirements.

**Chairman Williams** asked Mr. Weems if he was proposing any screening for his pool.

**Mr. Weems** stated he is not.

***Chairman Williams opened the meeting to the public.  
The public portion was closed.***

**Vice-Chairwoman Galfo** made a motion to approve the application. **Mr. Small** seconded the motion.

**In Favor: Mayor Wilsusen, Vice-Chairwoman Galfo, Vice-Chairman Palko, Mr. Hine, Mr. DiFrisco, Mr. Deutsch, Mr. Small, and Chairman Williams.**

Gramp

No. 21-03

Block 456, Lot 45  
31 Clifton Road  
Bulk Area Variance

**Mr. Gramp** was present, but his professional was not online at the moment. Mr. Gramp was asked to contact his professional and get him back online. The Board will go on to the next application, and will come back to the Gramp application.

Turek

No. 21-05

Block 174, Lot 2  
125 Castle Rock Road  
Use Variance

**Mr. Dennis DiFrisco** asked to recuse himself as a Board Member for this application, since he is a neighbor of the applicant. He would, however, like to speak during the public portion as a member of the public.

**Mr. Bernd Hefe**, the applicant's Attorney, was present. He stated that this property has six structures on it, and the applicant will be removing two of the structures while rebuilding two of the other structures. The total number of proposed structures will be four; the primary structure, two rental structures, and a detached garage. The original application included a subdivision, which has since been removed. The only variance required is a use variance due to the number of primary structures on the property.

**Ms. Hartmann** stated that there is an additional variance required for the accessory structure that will be located in the front yard.

**Mr. and Mrs. Christopher and Lisa Turek**, the applicants, were present and sworn in. They purchased the property in August of 2020. The property consists of the primary structure, two rental structures which are now vacant, a detached garage, a shed, and an uninhabitable cabin. The primary structure and garage are in disrepair, so there will be a new primary structure, two refurbished rental homes, and a new detached garage.

**Mr. Hine** asked if the new primary structure would have an attached garage.

**Mr. Turek** verified that it would.

**Mr. Hine** asked if the detached garage will be re-built and moved, how far off of the street will it be located?

**Mr. Hefe** stated that Mr. Ken Fox, the Architect and Planner, will be providing testimony regarding the detached garage and why it will be located where it is.

**Mr. Turek** stated that the garage attached to the main house will be used for his car and his wife's car. The detached garage will be used for some storage and tenant parking for the rental properties in order to keep cars off the street.

**Ms. Hartmann** commended the applicants for providing off street parking for their tenants, but asked why it had to be located 5 feet away from the neighboring property line.

**Mr. Turek** stated he believes Mr. Fox located it where it is because of the slope and terrain. Mr. Fox will be testifying as to the reasons why it is located where it is.

**Mr. Ken Fox**, the applicant's Architect and Planner, was present and sworn in. He then shared his screen and presented the survey showing the existing conditions. He then shared Exhibit A-1, Sheet Z-1, a colorized version of the plat plan that was previously submitted, and Exhibit A-2, Sheet Z-2, a series of photographs of the site. He explained that the existing detached garage is currently over the property line, and due to the slope and topography of the property, it made the most sense to relocate the detached garage where it is shown on the plat plan. There were also several restrictions on the property that had to be considered such as the location of the existing septic systems and the riparian buffer. He continued by explaining that if the detached garage was moved back from the road any further, it would require a higher retaining wall, and higher elevation, prompting additional variances.

**Ms. Samantha Anello** asked if Mr. Fox had reviewed the Mott MacDonald memo of May 19, 2021.

**Mr. Fox** stated he did.

**Ms. Anello** stated there was a slight discrepancy between the lot improvement disturbance and what the limits seem to be on the engineering plan.

**Mr. Fox** confirmed the number is 2,651 square feet.

**Ms. Anello** then proceeded to go over the other items listed in the memo. She then asked Mr. Fox if there would be a guide rail or safety rail installed to prevent vehicles from going over the retaining wall.

**Mr. Fox** stated there currently is not, but they will add one to the plans.

**Mr. Hine** asked if the current tenants parked near the rental homes.

**Mr. Fox** stated that they would park in the street shoulder or haphazardly near the structures. The whole purpose of the detached garage is to get the tenant parking off the street.

**Mr. Hine** asked for clarification that the new garage will be utilized by all of the tenants for vehicle parking in order to keep vehicles from being parked on the road.

**Mr. Fox** stated that is correct. He then continued with the Planning testimony. The property is an existing, non-conforming property due to the number of primary structures. By removing a few of the existing structures and making improvements to the structures that will remain, it will lessen the non-conformity and substantially improve the aesthetics and functionality of the property. He then provided proof of hardship and discussed the positive and negative criteria. The property does require the following "c" variances: side yard setback, front yard setback, and accessory structure in the front yard.

***Chairman Williams opened the meeting to the public.***

**Mr. Jules Senske**, a resident at 267 Espanong Road, was present. He asked what will keep the tenants from parking on the road.

**Mr. Hefe** stated that it will be part of their lease agreement enforced by the landlord.

**Ms. Colleen Lyons**, a representative from the Lake Hopatcong Commission, was present and sworn in. She stated that she is pleased with many of the aspects of the application, but wanted to make sure that the septic could handle a three-bedroom home. She then asked about a sandy area at the edge of the lake. The sandy area will require a permit and approvals from the NJDEP.

**Mr. Fox** stated that the sandy area is existing, and if the applicants decide to change it or improve it, they will require the necessary permits and approvals.

**Mr. Dennis DiFrisco**, a neighboring property owner, was present and sworn in. He praised Mr. & Mrs. Turek for wanting to improve the property, and strongly encouraged the Board to approve the application.

***The public portion was closed.***

**Vice-Chairman Palko** made a motion to approve the application. **Mr. Small** seconded the motion.

**Mr. Hine** asked if the resolution could include a condition in which the detached garage will be utilized only for tenant parking.

**Mr. Kienz** asked if Mr. Hine would like a restriction filed as part of this.

**Mr. Hine** stated that he would love that.

**Mr. Hefe** stated that the applicant cannot and does not want to agree to a Deed restriction. Those houses may not always be used as rentals. They will agree to putting it in the lease agreements and as part of the resolution, but not as a Deed restriction.

**Ms. Hartmann** asked why it would make a difference if the rental houses were occupied by tenants or family members. She feels that the detached garage will end up being used for storage instead of vehicles.

**Mr. Hefe** asked if on street parking is permitted on that road.

**Chief Castimore** stated that street parking is permitted in some areas on that street.

**Ms. Hartmann** argued that parking for two vehicles may be allowed on the street for a single family property, but this property has the potential to have 6 cars parking on the street.

**Mr. Fox** stated that the concern appears to be for the detached garage to be used for parking vehicles and not use for storage.

**Mr. Hefe**le agreed to the detached garage only being used for the parking of vehicles and not storage as a condition of the resolution.

**Mr. Kienz** also recommended that the Board waive site plan approval for this application.

**In Favor:** Vice-Chairwoman Galfo, Vice-Chairman Palko, Chief Castimore, Mr. Mr. Deutsch, Mr. Small, and Chairman Williams.

**Against:** Mr. Hine.

**Mr. Hefe**le asked if the applicant could get started on the project and not have to wait for the resolution to be memorialized.

**Mr. Kienz** asked Ms. Anello and Ms. Hartmann if any changes needed to be made to the plans that would hold up the project.

**Ms. Anello** stated that the plan requires minimal changes and would not require them to wait. They do, however, require a soil erosion permit before they can get started, and Mr. Fox testified that the application has already been submitted.

**Ms. Hartmann** stated that the applicant only needs to add the property owners within 200' on the plans.

**Mr. Kienz** asked about a Permit by Rule.

**Ms. Anello** stated that the applicant just needs to meet the requirements; there is no need to apply.

***The Board agreed to allow the applicants to proceed with the permit application process prior to the memorialization of the resolution.***

Gramp

No. 21-03

Block 456, Lot 45  
31 Clifton Road  
Bulk Area Variance

**Mr. Michael Gramp**, the applicant, and **Mr. Robert Murphy**, the applicant's Architect, were both present and sworn in.

**Mr. Murphy** explained that the applicant is proposing to construct a rear and side addition, as well as a covered porch in the front. This application requires front yard and side yard setback variances. The proposed addition on the back of the house will be a one-story great room, and the proposed side addition will be a two-story addition.

**Ms. Hartmann** asked why there is a full bathroom proposed in the great room addition. She pointed out that the addition could easily be converted into a bedroom.

**Mr. Murphy** stated the bathroom was a request from the applicant.

**Mr. Gramp** stated that there are currently five people in his family sharing one bathroom, so the second full bathroom is being constructed to accommodate his family's growing needs.

**Ms. Samantha Anello** asked for clarification on the number of bedrooms and if the septic will be able to accommodate the number of bedrooms.

**Mr. Gramp** stated that the home currently has three bedrooms, and they will be increasing the number of bedrooms to four. They will also be installing a new septic to accommodate the extra bedroom.

***Chairman Williams opened the meeting to the public.  
The public portion was closed.***

**Vice-Chairwoman Galfo** made a motion to approve the application. **Mr. DiFrisco** seconded the motion.

**In Favor: Mayor Wilsusen, Vice-Chairwoman Galfo, Vice-Chairman Palko, Chief Castimore, Mr. Hine, Mr. DiFrisco, Mr. Small, and Chairman Williams.**

***Mr. Deutsch was unavailable to vote.***

Camp Six, Inc.

No. 21-06

Block 198, Lot 4  
Espanong Road  
Interpretation

**Mr. Bernd Hefe**, the applicant's Attorney, was present. He stated the only thing they are proposing to do is plant fruits and vegetables. He imagines there will be a number of waivers the applicant will be requesting.

**Ms. Hartmann** stated the Board will still require the rudimentary items on the checklists to be provided.

**Mr. Hefe** agreed.

**Ms. Anello** recommended an abbreviated Environmental Impact Statement also be provided.

**Ms. Hartmann** agreed.

**Mr. Hefe** agreed to provide one.

**Ms. Anello** asked if the lot is wooded.

**Mr. Hefe** stated there are trees that will need to be removed.

**Ms. Anello** stated the tree removal should be included as part of the EIS since it will be a change in land use as it pertains to stormwater runoff.

**Ms. Hartmann** stated there should also be a tree inventory and a tree removal plan. No trees are to be removed until a permit is received.

**Mr. Hefe** stated he will have that conversation with the applicant tomorrow morning.

**Mr. Kienz** asked if there would be sale of any product from the site.

**Mr. Hefe** stated there would not be selling product from the site.

**Mr. Kienz** stated that it's been published in all of the newspapers, and if the applicant has any intention of doing that, it should be done through the restaurant.

**Mr. Hefe** was unaware of this, and will inform the applicant. He then asked if the application could be put on the agenda for completeness and be heard the same night.

**Ms. Hartmann** stated that it is too late in the season for them to do any planting at this point, so there really is no rush.

**Vice-Chairwoman Galfo** asked if the applicant plans on raising farm animals on the property.

**Mr. Hefe** stated he knows nothing about that.

**Chairman Williams** opened the meeting to the public.

**Mr. Jules Senske**, a resident at 267 Espanong Road, was present.

**Mr. Kienz** stated that this application has not been noticed, and should not be discussed at this point in time.

**Mr. Hefe** agreed, and asked Mr. Senske to give him a call tomorrow to discuss his concerns.

**The public portion was closed.**

**RESOLUTIONS:**

Matari	No. 20-14	Block 473, Lot 12 2 Blue Heron Lane Bulk Area Variance
--------	-----------	--

**Vice-Chairwoman Galfo** made a motion to approve. **Mr. Hine** seconded the motion.

**In Favor: Mayor Wilsusen, Vice-Chairwoman Galfo, Vice-Chairman Palko, Chief Castimore, Mr. Hine, Mr. DiFrisco, and Chairman Williams.**

Salvatore	No. 20-19	Block 562, Lot 2 45 Hillside Avenue Bulk Area Variance
-----------	-----------	--

**Vice Chairwoman Galfo** made a motion to approve. **Chairman Williams** seconded the motion.

**In Favor: Mayor Wilsusen, Vice-Chairwoman Galfo, Vice-Chairman Palko, Chief Castimore, Mr. Hine, Mr. DiFrisco, and Chairman Williams.**

**MEETING MINUTES DATED APRIL 26, 2021**

**Vice-Chairwoman Galfo** made a motion to approve. **Vice-Chairman Palko** seconded the motion.

**In Favor: Mayor Wilsusen, Vice-Chairwoman Galfo, Vice-Chairman Palko, Chief Castimore, Mr. Hine, Mr. DiFrisco, and Chairman Williams.**

*Chairman Williams then discussed the Board going back to in-person meetings starting with the June 28, 2021 meeting since Governor Murphy has lifted the social distancing requirement.*

*It was determined that the Board shall resume in-person meetings beginning with the June 28, 2021 meeting.*

**ADJOURNMENT:**

**Chief Castimore** moved to adjourn at 8:59 PM.  
**Vice-Chairwoman Galfo** seconded.

**In Favor: All.**

*Respectfully Submitted by:*

---

**Stephanie McCormack**  
**Secretary to the Planning Board**