

**BOROUGH OF INTERLAKEN  
MINUTES- PLANNING BOARD  
APRIL 17, 2023 7:30 P.M.  
BOROUGH HALL, 100 GRASSMERE AVENUE**

---

A meeting of the PLANNING BOARD of the Borough of Interlaken, Monmouth County, New Jersey was held on April 17, 2023, at 7:30 p.m. in the Borough Hall.

Chairman Papp opened the meeting, announced that the meeting was being held in accordance with the Open Public Meeting Act and that Notice of the meeting had been published in the Coaster. The announcement was followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

---

ROLL CALL:

Present: Chairman Papp, Vice Chairwoman Umfrid, Mr. Tilton, Mr. Wasilishen, Mr. Weaver and Ms. Kane

Also Present: Board Attorney Kevin Kennedy and Planning Board Secretary Gina Kneser

Absent: Mr. Blasucci, Ms. Dalton, Ms. Kapp and Ms. Heinz

UPON MOTION of Mr. Weaver seconded by Ms. Kane carried, the Board carried the approval of the February 27, 2023 minutes to the May 15, 2023, meeting.

ROLL CALL:

In Favor: Chairman Papp, Vice Chairwoman Umfrid, Mr. Tilton, Mr. Wasilishen, Mr. Weaver and Ms. Kane

Opposed: None

Ineligible: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Mr. Blasucci, Ms. Dalton, Ms. Kapp and Ms. Heinz

APPLICATION

404 Grassmere Avenue

Block 7/Lot 3

Potoczniak & Faulkner

Addtion

Mr. Potoczniak and Mr. Faulkner, Applicants, joined the table.

Board Attorney Kennedy asked if anyone had questions regarding the application Notice. With no questions, Board Attorney Kennedy stated that the Notice was in order and the Board has jurisdiction to hear the application.

Board Attorney Kennedy marked the following exhibits:

- A-1 Application Packet
- A-2 Architectural Plans prepared by Mary Ortman, Architect dated 02/06/2023 no revisions  
Including page SP1 Revised 03/27/2023
- A-3 Survey prepared by Morgan Engineering & Surveying dated 07/18/2022
- A-4 Sketch indicating the proposed addition on a copy of the survey
- A-5 Leon S. Avakian review memorandum dated March 23.2023 revised April 4, 2023
- A-6 Photo collection (5 photos)

Board Attorney Kennedy asked the applicants to confirm that the applicants own the property at 404 Grassmere Avenue, a single-family home since roughly August 2022.

Mr. Potoczniak confirmed and stated that the applicants (Mr. Potoczniak and Mr. Faulkner) are considering an addition to the back of the home that would expand the kitchen and add an ensuite bath and closet to the second floor. To do that the applicants are asking the Board to consider two variances. The exceptional narrowness of the non-conforming lot, and the relevant size of the lot present a hardship in what the applicants think is the reasonable use and development of the property. The zone district minimum is 75ft. The lot is 50ft wide and as a result of that reduced width, the lot size is also half than what would be required of zoning. The ordinance says the lot should be 15,000sqft. The lot is 7,302sqft. The Planning Board Engineer's review affirms that the zone district requires a side yard setback of 15ft. The existing side yard setback on the west side is 4.4ft and the narrowness presents an exceptional difficulty. The applicants are asking for relief in the addition to the house. Relief from the minimum side yard setback of 15 ft. The engineers' review further indicated the zone required maximum impervious surface coverage of 45%. The existing impervious coverage is 59.5%, much of which is the existing deck over pervious material. The applicants are proposing adding .1% of impervious coverage to the lot that would total 56% vs. 55.9%. That it is. It is that additional coverage that would also go to the side yard setback that is being requested. So the applicant is asking relieve both from the side yard setback as well as from the maximum lot coverage. The .1% increase is diminimus. And the applicant aims to minimize any expansion on the existing nonconformities. The applicants propose that strict application of the zoning ordinance presents exceptional practical difficulties relevant to what the applicants believe is the reasonable development of the property. The applicants propose that the above variance can be granted without causing a substantial detriment to the public good and without substantially impairing the intent and purpose of the zoning plan and ordinances. Overall Mr. Potoczniak stated that they moved to Interlaken because they appreciate the harmony and character

of the town and in considering the requested variances have overall aimed to maintain that character and harmony though good design and arrangement.

Mary Ortman, Architect for the Applicant, was sworn in. Mary Ortman stated her business address as 719 Trenton Avenue, Point Pleasant Beach, NJ and that she is licensed in State of New Jersey in her own practice. Ms. Ortman has not been before the Interlaken Board before but has in Point Pleasant, Bayhead, and Mantoloking.

Mary used illustrated drawings to present the proposal to the Board.

Board Attorney Kennedy marked the drawing as A-7, Illustrated SP1 original dated 2/6/2023 with revision issued to correct the coverage numbers.

Ms. Ortman stated that the design is an expansion to the kitchen on the first floor. It is a two-story addition and would include an ensuite bathroom and a walk-in closet on their second floor. What is being added to the kitchen, needing to be near the kitchen, is against the non-conforming setback and is shown in orange. The addition is projecting eight feet out from the rear existing exterior wall and is the width of the kitchen. It is about 14 feet. The addition sits in place of what is already a deck, so the increase in coverage, which was stated before is a diminimus .1%, is because the project is replacing what is already covered with building coverage. The difference is just that the existing deck is set in a few inches from the existing corner of the house. What is shown in grey is the existing deck. There are two levels. That deck and the smaller part would be remaining off the new rear exit from the kitchen. The driveways and walkways are partially pavers and concrete and leads to the current area. There is a brick patio which is also used by the applicant to turn their car around, so they are not reversing and backing out of that long driveway. The first-floor plan shows the size of the kitchen. The existing footprint of the deck is shown and the second-floor addition is that section is also shown. The existing kitchen is a one-story structure seen on the back. So is being added is an extension to the kitchen. It is a projection of 8ft by 14 ft replacing the deck and upstairs would be a new bathroom and walk-in closet that is accessed from the existing master bedroom. The addition is built up over the existing basement entry which is off of that lower deck. The last sheet is the elevations. The addition is two-story. Materials would match the existing house with the same style of windows. The height is 26ft to the ridge which is conforming to the maximum height restriction. The kitchen will have French doors leading to the existing deck and a little shed roof on the back which can be seen on the side the projection.

Chairman Papp questioned the door on the back of the house.

Ms. Ortman stated that the door is the original door. The deck goes down a couple of steps and then down a few more steps to the basement.

Chairman Papp asked what the exterior finish would be.

Ms. Ortman stated that it would be cedar siding to match. The same style windows will be used. The intention is to have a seamless addition with the look that it has always been there. It will be the same materials and the same roofline which will be lower and will not be seen from the front.

Vice Chairwoman Umfrid questioned whether the size of the space used by the deck will remain the same. Will the area used for the deck just become smaller with no expansion.

Ms. Ortman stated that Vice Chairwoman Umfrid was correct.

Vice Chairwoman Umfrid questioned whether the window of the house next door shown in the presented photographs will be obstructed by the new addition?

Ms. Ortman stated that it would be hard for her to say judging by the angle of the photograph but does not believe it would.

.

Vice Chairwoman Umfrid questioned the revision to the coverage.

Ms. Ortman confirmed the revised copy was distributed. The existing is 55.9% and it will increase by .1% to 56%. The reason is that the addition is a few inches over from the deck causing a slight increase of coverage.

Mr. Tilton asked whether the drainpipes would tie into the existing ones.

Ms. Ortman stated that she did not know if there were existing dry wells. There will be gutters and leaders on the addition.

Chairman Papp stated that the Board has concerns on the smaller lots regarding the stormwater runoff. It needs to be clarified.

Vice Chairwoman Umfrid ask who the fence belongs to that runs between the two properties on the west side.

Mr. Potoczniak stated there was no fence on the west side. In lieu of the fence there is a tall row of hedges.

Chairman Papp asked if the fence on the East side belonged to Mr. Potoczniak.

Mr. Potoczniak stated it was not his fence.

Vice Chairman Umfrid questioned the shrubs on the west side.

Mr. Plotnick stated that the shrubs belonged to the applicant and that a landscape architect would be consulted in the future regarding the shrubs to keep it attractive for themselves and also the neighbors.

Chairman Papp opened the floor for questions from the public. With no public present closed the floor.

Chairman Papp asked for a motion to include reference to the stormwater run off and any sort of drywells are required that should be in the resolution.

Mr. Tilton made motion seconded by Mr. Wasilishen.

Board Attorney Kennedy stated that, typically if acceptable to applicants and the Board makes the approval it will be conditioned upon compliance with all the promises, commitments, and representations the applicant made tonight and typically, in accordance, would comply with, Board Engineer, Peter Avakian's review memorandum and also have the grading and drainage stormwater management details to be reviewed with the Board Engineer. As a condition of the approval the applicant has to get the engineer's say how that system will be mitigated system. Obviously, any outside approvals that are necessary, if any, need to be obtained. Any and all necessary permits within one year. The Board has said that grading and drainage details will be submitted to the Board Engineer.

Board Attorney Kennedy noted that sometimes the Board talks about the landscaping and sometimes there is a listed obligation that the applicant will perpetually replant landscaping as necessary, so it serves as an extension buffer.

Chairman Papp asked the Board if a future landscape plan should be presented for approval.

Mr. Potoczniak agreed to a landscape approval requirement.

Mr. Tilton stated that there is already a lot of landscaping. He has been on the deck and does not see why the Board has to impose a requirement for approval.

The applicants confirmed to Board Attorney Kennedy that all the conditions of compliance were acceptable with all the promises, commitments and representations made compliance with the Board Engineers review memorandum, the grading, drainage and stormwater details being approved by Borough Engineer and obtaining any necessary outside approvals and any necessary permits with a shelf life of one year to get permit or request extension were acceptable.

The applicants thanked the Board and left the meeting.

Board Secretary Kneser stated that the next meeting will be May 15, 2023.

UPON MOTION of Mr. Tilton, seconded by Mr. Wasilishen carried, the Board approved the variance.

ROLL CALL:

In Favor: Chairman Papp, Vice Chairwoman Umfrid, Mr. Tilton, Mr. Wasilishen, Mr. Weaver and Ms. Kane

Opposed: None

Ineligible: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Mr. Blasucci, Ms. Dalton, Ms. Kapp and Ms. Heinz

UPON MOTION of Mr. Weaver, seconded by Ms. Kane, carried, the Board adjourned the meeting.

ROLL CALL:

In Favor: Chairman Papp, Vice Chairwoman Umfrid, Mr. Tilton, Mr. Wasilishen, Mr. Weaver and Ms. Kane

Opposed: None

Ineligible: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Mr. Blasucci, Ms. Dalton, Ms. Kapp and Ms. Heinz

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_  
Thomas Papp, Chairman

Attest: \_\_\_\_\_  
Gina Kneser, Secretary