

BOROUGH OF SURF CITY LAND USE BOARD

813 Long Beach Boulevard

November 23, 2022

7:00 pm

Chairman Hartney called the meeting to order, all present joined him in a salute to the Flag.

The Board Attorney, Kevin Quinlan was present. Bob Romano was representing the Board Engineer.

Roll call reflected the following in the affirmative: Peter Hartney, Gavin Hodgson, Paul Hoover, Sandra Klose, Allen Mannherz, James Russell, David Wright, John Franzoni & Jaime Ryan. Absent: Richard Savianeso & George Wachter

The Open Public Meeting Statement was read by Chairman Hartney, as follows: in compliance with the "Open Public Meetings Act" of the State of New Jersey, adequate notice of this meeting of the Board of Surf City Land Use Board has been provided to three newspapers & published in the January 13, 2022, edition of the Beach Haven Times.

Chairman Hartney also read the following statement: this meeting is a judicial proceeding. Any questions or comments must be limited to issues that are relevant to what the Borough of Surf City Land Use Board may legally consider in reaching a decision. Decorum appropriate to a judicial hearing must be maintained all the time.

Mr. Russell moved to approve the October 26, 2022 regular meeting minutes. Mrs. Klose seconded the motion. With a vote in the affirmative, the minutes were approved.

Roll call reflected the following in the affirmative: Mr. Hartney, Mr. Hoover, Mr. Mannherz, Mrs. Klose, Mr. Russell, Mr. Wright, Mr. Franzoni & Mr. Ryan, Nays: none. Abstained: Mr. Hodgson. Absent: Mr. Savianeso & Mr. Wachter.

Mr. Russell moved to approve Resolution 2022-16. Mr. Wright seconded that motion. With a vote in the affirmative, the following resolution was approved.

WHEREAS, the Open Public Meetings Act, N.J.S.A. 10:4-6, is the law of the State of New Jersey providing for adequate public notice to be given for meetings of the Land Use Board of the Borough of Surf City; and

BE IT RESOLVED, by the Land Use Board of the Borough of Surf City that the Municipal Clerk be authorized and directed to proceed with providing adequate notice of the reorganization meeting and the first regular meeting of the year to be held on January 25, 2022 at 7:00 P.M.

Roll call reflected the following in the affirmative: Mr. Hartney, Mr. Hodgson, Mr. Hoover, Mr. Mannherz, Mrs. Klose, Mr. Russell, Mr. Wright, Mr. Franzoni & Mr. Ryan, Nays: none. Abstained: none. Absent: Mr. Savianeso & Mr. Wachter.

James Raban, Esq. was present to represent Step Into Liquid of 1008 N. Long Beach Boulevard, Block 32, Lot 21 for preliminary and final site plan approval. There was discussion in regards to the proposed structure. It was mentioned that a 3-story structure is being proposed, the bottom floor being a store front with a two-story apartment above.

Jim Brzozowski was sworn in as the applicants engineer. He stated that the existing structure is not large enough for business. He mentioned that the property is 3,981 square feet where 5,000 is required. There were questions about the parking. Mr. Raban stated that six parking spaces are required and they are proposing four off street spaces. It was mentioned that the parking surface will be made up of clam shells or stone.

Mr. Brzozowski further explained that the parking spaces will be 20 feet long each. The residential parked cars will back onto 10th Street. It was mentioned that there is a parking hardship due to the size and shape of the lot. It was stated that there will be curbing put onto the end of 10th street which will create more street parking.

There were questions in regards to the outdoor displays. It was made known that outdoor areas are not permissible and are therefore prohibited. Mr. Raban stated that the outdoor display areas can be taken off the site plan. The outdoor shower must also be added to the site plan. There were concerns about deliveries being made and the number of employees on site. Jeffrey Santoloci was sworn in as the property owner. He stated that only one employee would be present at a time to work the office, all other employees and instructors would be at the beach or other locations.

Mr. Russell moved to open public comment. Mr. Mannherz seconded the motion. With a vote in the affirmative, public comment was open. The vote reflected the following ayes: Mr. Hartney, Mr. Hodgson, Mr. Hoover, Mr. Mannherz, Mrs. Klose, Mr. Russell, Mr. Wright, Mr. Franzoni & Mr. Ryan, Nays: none. Abstained: none. Absent: Mr. Savianeso & Mr. Wachter.

Jeanie Hughes of 48 N. 11th Street had concerns in regards to the parking.

Mrs. Klose moved to close public comment. Mr. Russell seconded the motion. With a vote in the affirmative, public comment was open. The vote reflected the following ayes: The vote reflected the following ayes: Mr. Hartney, Mr. Hodgson, Mr. Hoover, Mr. Mannherz, Mrs. Klose, Mr. Russell, Mr. Wright, Mr. Franzoni & Mr. Ryan, Nays: none. Abstained: none. Absent: Mr. Savianeso & Mr. Wachter.

Mr. Wright moved to approve the application. Mr. Hoover seconded the motion. Roll call reflected the following votes:

Mr. Hartney: I have to vote against the application. I find that it is an over intensification of the property. There is significant concern about the parking and the flow of business at the property given outdoor displays, etc. In hearing the testimony of the public, the impact of the public, it

seems to have a negative impact of light and air concerning the structure and building size. it has too many challenges for this size of the property and the use proposed.

Mr. Hodgson: I vote yes. I found that the reason for overdevelopment, for open air and open light, I think that it does satisfy that. It's 35 percent lot coverage, it is no different than building a residential piece of property. It would be the same footprint, the same size, and there would be a variance process, but given the size of the lot, that is really the only reason we are here and for the site plan approval. I don't like that there is not a lot of parking, however I think that it adequately addresses the type of business going in there. For those reasons, I vote yes.

Mr. Hoover: I vote yes. I believe they met all the requirements they need to as Mr. Hodgson said. Its under 35 percent coverage and I feel they are doing the best they can with the size and shape of the property. I believe this is going to be an improvement to the area.

Mrs. Klose: I vote no. I think it is way too big. I am all for a nice little LBI surf shop on that tiny, little lot, but I think that this house with the two-story apartment on it is too much. I am also concerned about the parking.

Mr. Mannherz: I vote yes. Testimony has been given, parking has been set up as efficiently as can be. With retail business, the handicap spot and perhaps up to two other parking spaces. The application has demonstrated that no variances were needed except parking and lot size. I think that it is a clever way of utilizing the lot that is an odd shape. Part of the master plan is that we need to encourage businesses in Surf City as much as we can. And so, I vote yes.

Mr. Russell: I believe that Mr. Hartney put it quite eloquently why he voted and the way he voted. The lot is just too small for what is going on. I vote no.

Mr. Wright: I vote yes. I think they have done an excellent job with taking the property that is small and designed something that is under coverage and have done an excellent job in the business they have proposed there. I think we will have a good product.

Mr. Franzoni: I vote yes. I think it is an improvement for the town. We have an eyesore of a real estate office there right now. We are going to bring in some business to the shore area. I don't think it's that high of a trafficked area that it would be a problem. I think we are getting a lot of house on top of the store for that size lot, but if it meets the coverage, then it meets the coverage.

Mr. Ryan: I too am voting yes. When I look at the lot coverage, it is coming in under 30 percent. I think about what could be there if it was a residential property, it would easily be a three-story tall house. I would have expected it to become a house and not a business. I am really happy to see a mixed use go in there. I think it will be an improvement to the property. I see boulevard parking opening up as a result to closing up the depressed driveways. I think they have done an excellent job in using this awkward property in part of our Borough. Therefore, I vote yes.

Mrs. Klose moved to approve the bills. Mr. Mannherz seconded the motion. With a vote in the affirmative, the bills were approved to be paid. With a vote in the affirmative, public comment was closed. The vote reflected the following ayes: Mr. Hartney, Mr. Hodgson, Mr. Hoover, Mr.

Mannherz, Mrs. Klose, Mr. Russell, Mr. Wright, Mr. Franzoni & Mr. Ryan, Nays: none. Abstained: none. Absent: Mr. Savianeso & Mr. Wachter.

Mrs. Klose moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Mannherz seconded the motion. With a vote in the affirmative, the meeting was adjourned. With a vote in the affirmative, public comment was closed. The vote reflected the following ayes: Mr. Hartney, Mr. Hodgson, Mr. Hoover, Mr. Mannherz, Mrs. Klose, Mr. Russell, Mr. Wright, Mr. Franzoni & Mr. Ryan, Nays: none. Abstained: none. Absent: Mr. Savianeso & Mr. Wachter.

Respectfully submitted,



Jenna Letts

Land Use Board Clerk