

**BOROUGH OF INTERLAKEN
MINUTES- PLANNING BOARD
OCTOBER 20, 2025 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 October 20, 2025, at 7:30 p.m. in the Borough Hall.

Chairwoman Umfrid 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 and Asbury Park Press. The announcement was followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Vice Chairwoman Umfrid, Mr. Tilton, Ms. Dalton, Mr. Wasilishen, Ms. Kapp and Ms. Heinz

Also Present: Planning Board Attorney Kevin Kennedy, Planning Board Engineer/Planner Peter Avakian and Planning Board Secretary Gina Kneser

Absent: Chairman Papp, Councilman Blasucci, Ms. Kane and Ms. Cernigliaro

Ms. Kapp noted there was a clerical error and a misspelling to the minutes.

UPON MOTION of Ms. Kapp seconded by Ms. Heina carried, the Board approved the corrected minutes of the October 20, 2025, meeting.

ROLL CALL:

In Favor: Vice Chairwoman Umfrid, Ms. Dalton, Mr. Wasilishen, Ms. Kapp and Ms. Heinz

Opposed: None

Ineligible: None

Abstain: Mr. Tilton

Absent: Chairman Blasucci, Councilman Blasucci and Ms. Kane

APPLCATION

300-306 WINDERMERE AVENUE

Subdivision

McRAHO,LLC

Board Attorney Kennedy asked if anyone had any questions, comments, or concerns regarding the public notice for the meeting. Board Secretary Kneser and Board Attorney Kennedy have reviewed the notice. It is the opinion of Board Attorney Kennedy that the Board has jurisdiction to proceed.

Board Attorney Kennedy stated that the owners involved are John Hoyle, Kimberly Hoyle, McRAHO, LLC, Brian and Emily McEvily, and Deron and Mary Merla Ramos. Board Attorney Kennedy asked the Board if there were any questions or comments regarding potential conflicts of interest. There were none.

Board Engineer/Planner Avakian was sworn in by Board Attorney Kennedy.

The following items are entered into the record:

- A1 Application Package
- A2 Statement of Ownership
- A3 Preliminary and Final Subdivision Plat (one sheet) prepared by Insite Engineering, dated November 4, 2024, last revised June 10, 2025
- A4 Boundary and Topographic survey prepared by Insite Surveying dated August 10, 2024, last revised June 9, 2025
- A5 Leon S. Avakian review memorandum dated September 30, 2025

Jennifer Krimko, attorney for the applicant, representing Ansel Grimm and Aaron, presented the application. This is not a typical subdivision where a large parcel is divided into buildable lots; rather, it is the opposite. Three homeowners along Windermere Avenue (Lots 36, 38, and 39) formed an LLC to purchase Lot 37, which is primarily waterfront with a small strip extending via a driveway to Windermere Avenue. These homeowners are seeking a subdivision to divide Lot 37 and attach a piece to each of their existing lots, effectively reducing the number of lots from four to three. There is no proposal for any new construction, and any existing nonconformities will either remain or improve as a result.

Ms. Krimko prepared an exhibit, marked into record as A6. A6 is an aerial rendering, which was distributed to the Board. This rendering shows existing lot lines (solid yellow) that will remain unchanged, existing lot lines being eliminated (dashed red), and new proposed lot lines (dashed yellow). A6 illustrates how portions of Lot 37 fronting the lake will be attached to the adjacent lots.

Ms. Krimko introduced Patrick Ward, a licensed engineer and planner in New Jersey, to testify in both capacities.

Mr. Ward, from Insite Engineering at 1955 Route 34, Wall, NJ, was sworn in by Kevin Kennedy and confirmed his licenses and certifications are current and in good standing.

Mr. Ward displayed the survey to the Board, highlighting the four lots. Mr. Ward explained that Lot 36 is unusually shaped, and Lot 37, which has small street frontage but opens up on the peninsula, is being subdivided.

Mr. Ward noted Lot 37 is a separate buildable lot. Mr. Ward then described Lots 38 and 39. The proposal is to divide Lot 37, the most unusual lot, so that Lot 36.01 will acquire a small waterfront area. The central portion of Lot 37 will be absorbed into Lot 38.01, and Lot 39 will benefit from the small peninsula feature.

Ms. Krimko clarified that Lot 38 currently has a circular driveway with one leg on Lot 37 via an easement. By subdividing and moving the lot lines, this encroachment will be eliminated, making the driveway entirely on Lot 38.01.

Mr. Ward confirmed that the notice mentioned a variance for a circular driveway. To the extent the Board interprets a circular driveway with two curb cuts as more than one driveway, the ordinance allows only one. These are existing conditions, and no changes, construction, or disturbance are proposed.

Board Engineer/Planner Avakian clarified that his review report cited two instances as variances, but they are not. The driveway moving onto the new Lot 38.01 will be 11 feet from the property line, an improvement from its current 4.3 feet, thus becoming compliant at more than 5 feet from the property line.

Ms. Krimko added that a small bump-out where garbage cans are located will not be changed.

Board Engineer/Planner Avakian acknowledged that the circular portion of the driveway is an existing nonconformity and will remain unchanged.

Ms. Krimko asked Mr. Ward if the proposed condition creates any new variances, to which Mr. Ward confirmed that the new lot line will not create any new nonconforming condition.

Regarding the tidelands claim indicated on the survey, Ms. Krimko explained that this is a state-filed map showing the area was once tidally flowed.

Mr. Ward confirmed this. A tidelands claim is usually only a concern for title companies or if construction is planned in that area, requiring the purchase of the claim or a license. Since no construction is proposed and the property line curves around it, there is no impact. No approvals are required.

Mr. Ward confirmed no further applications are required. While the Board typically expects DEP applications for waterfront properties, none are required here since no construction is proposed that would trigger a permit. Mr. Ward clarified that DEP regulates disturbance or construction, not subdivisions alone.

Ms. Krimko stated that even if portions of the property are in a floodplain or flood hazard area, no changes are proposed that would trigger permits or approvals.

Board Engineer/Planner Avakian explained that the flood insurance rate maps for Interlaken Borough show a velocity zone for Deal Lake at elevation 10, which extends the flood hazard elevation significantly into the property, affecting two homes and much of the property, but not the subdivision itself.

Ms. Krimko reiterated that any future construction by a lot owner would necessitate appropriate permits from the municipality and DEP, as well as adherence to the Borough's floodplain ordinance. As nothing is currently proposed, no such approvals are being triggered. The primary goal is to adjust invisible lot lines to ensure a house can never be constructed on Lot 37.

Board Engineer/Planner confirmed that existing structures in the area are unaffected by this subdivision.

Ms. Krimko emphasized that the purpose of this application by the current homeowners is to prevent construction on Lot 37, and approving the subdivision guarantees this outcome.

Vice Chairwoman Umfrid inquired if the owners of the LLC were present.

Ms. Krimko confirmed that the owners of the LLC are the owners of the lot and are all members of the LLC.

Vice Chairwoman Umfrid then asked why the property was purchased before coming to the Planning Board to assess feasibility and what the owners' intentions are for the property.

Ms. Krimko, as their representative, explained that the property was purchased to prevent development, as the owners did not want another home built on Lot 37.

Ms. Krimko also stated that this is a variance-free subdivision and, as Board Attorney Kennedy can confirm, case law indicates that as long as the applicant conforms to the subdivision ordinance, which they do, the Board is essentially compelled to grant the subdivision, with no grounds for denial. The purpose of the hearing is to ensure compliance with the subdivision ordinance, which Board Engineer/Planner Avakian has reviewed and confirmed.

Board Engineer/Planner Avakian added that the elimination of Lot 37 addresses the nonconformity of frontage on Windermere Avenue, which is a benefit.

Ms. Krimko stated there are no plans for construction at this point. Should any homeowner propose development, the homeowner would need municipal and DEP permits. The subdivision serves several purposes: to provide two property owners with more waterfront and the third with waterfront access, and to prevent a fourth party from building a house that would obstruct the homeowners' views.

Vice Chairwoman Umfrid opened the floor for further questions from the Board.

Ms. Heinz mentioned that she had always heard this lot was difficult to build on due to DEP laws and observed that Lot 36 already has a structure.

Ms. Krimko explained that the structure on Lot 36 has been there historically, and that its construction over property lines is unknown, it was done with the permission of the property owner. Ms. Krimko clarified that while development may be difficult and limited under current strict DEP regulations, these regulations can change. No construction is proposed at this time.

Ms. Dalton asked if, in the future, if property 39 were sold, could that piece of property be subdivided.

Ms. Krimko replied that it could not for several reasons, including that the Board would likely not grant it due to the lack of frontage. This ensures that Lot 37 will always remain part of another lot and can never be a standalone lot as it is today.

Board Engineer/Planner Avakian added that from a planning perspective, this application makes the most sense. Board Engineer/Planner Avakian acknowledged that while Lot 37 may be difficult to develop, similar lots have been developed, and without the reconfiguration of property lines, there is sufficient depth for a house to be built more than 50 feet from Deal Lake.

Ms. Krimko stated that even if a variance is needed it would be one that would be justifiable under a hardship condition. Again, this is a variance free application that gives the Board the ability to eliminate a buildable lot.

Vice Chairwoman Umfrid asked if the Board had any questions. There were no questions.

Vice Chairwoman Umfrid asked if the public had any questions. There were no questions.

Ms. Heinz stated that her questions may not be relevant but asked if the applicant is planning on clear cutting or taking a lot of trees down.

Ms. Krimko agreed the question is not relevant but answered that the applicants are not proposing to do anything and just like any other homeowner in the Borough would have to do if they were ever going to take a tree down, the homeowner would have to get necessary permits. More importantly the trees along the waterfront are protected by the DEP, and as the Board knows are subject to the same limitations of everyone living in Interlaken.

Ms. Dalton stated that, as part of the Shade Tree Commission, she has gone to Mr. Ramos' house about a tree on this property. The property had been very overgrown and was not a usable piece. Mr. Ramos has cleaned it up and maintained it very well. It really is nicely maintained.

Vice Chairwoman Umfrid asked Board Attorney Kennedy if a provision can be included in the resolution, that if the project is passed, that nothing can be built on the portions of the property that is being added to each one of these Lots 306, 302 and 300.

Board Attorney Kennedy stated that when talking about Lot 37, it starts with the premise that this is a lot line adjustment which is really effectuated through a minor subdivision. If approved and the Board authorizes Lot 37 to be divided up, the remnants are not going to be stand-alone lots. The lots will be consolidated.

Ms. Krimko stated that the division is going to be done by a plat, so that it will be recorded that the divided portions will be part of the lots.

Ms. Krimko asked if Vice Chairwoman Umfrid was suggesting that nothing may be permitted to be built on the property. The owner would certainly have the right to apply to the DEP to construct a dock.

Vice Chairwoman Umfrid stated that she was questioning a home being built.

Ms. Krimko stated that the homeowners would not be permitted to do that. A Use Variance would be required. There could only be one house on each property.

Vice Chairwoman Umfrid questioned the effect of a future sale of the property.

Ms. Krimko stated that there are four lots. There will be three lots. Lot 37 will not exist. The lot will be divided and will be merged with each lot.

Board Attorney Kennedy stated that Lot 37 will be divided up, and the divided portions will not be separate stand-alone pieces. The divided portions will be consolidated with the Ramos property, the Hoyle property and the other properties.

Ms. Krimko stated that each parcel will only have one lot number.

Vice Chairwoman Umfrid stated that the merge eliminates her concern regarding future building on the parcel.

Vice Chairwoman Umfrid stated the LLC can be dissolved.

Ms. Krimko stated that the LLC might want to go invest in something else, but the LLC will no longer own any of the land that is before you.

Board Attorney Kennedy summarized the conditions of the resolution stating that the application is a lot line adjustment to be effectuated through a minor subdivision and some of the standard conditions the Board typically talks about are: compliance with all the promises commitments and representations the applicants' team made tonight, obtaining any necessary approvals if necessary, compliance with Board Engineer/Planner Avakian's memo in which the Board is going to accept that the two variances that were listed on the memo as variances are not variances and the subdivision is to be perfected in accordance with New Jersey law and in accordance with the time frame and that the tax assessor approves the lot designations.

Ms. Krimko stated that for title purposes a plat is the only thing that makes sense and that the tax assessor has already made the approval. Documentation of the approval will be provided.

Board Attorney Kennedy asked Board Engineer/Planner Avakian about the condition in his review letter pertaining to the existing curb and sidewalk being replaced if deemed necessary.

Board Engineer/Planner Avakian stated that that is a typical condition. The Borough is entertaining a borough wide sidewalk improvement project so the Board and the applicant can coordinate that requirement.

Board Attorney Kennedy stated that the divided portions are not stand alone and future proposed construction must go through the normal everyday process that everyone else has to go through whether it be the Borough, County or State.

Board Attorney Kennedy asked Ms. Krimko if the conditions stated were acceptable to the applicant.

Ms. Krimko agreed.

Board Attorney Kennedy asked if the conditions were acceptable to the Board. There were no comments or concerns.

Vice Chairwoman Umfrid asked Board Engineer/Planner Avakian if he had any questions or concerns. Board Engineer/Planner Avakian stated that there were none.

UPON MOTION of Mr. Tilton to include the stipulations as discussed, seconded by Ms. Dalton, carried, the Board approved the application.

ROLL CALL:

In Favor: Vice Chairwoman Umfrid, Mr. Tilton, Ms. Dalton, Mr. Wasilishen, Ms. Kapp, and Ms. Heinz

Opposed: None

Ineligible: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Chairman Papp, Councilman Blasucci, Ms. Kane and Ms. Cernigliaro

Vice Chairwoman Umfrid thanked Ms. Krimko and the applicant.

Ms. Krimko thanked the Board. The applicants left the meeting.

APPLICATION

205 BUTTERMERE AVENUE

Block 34/Lot 18.01 & 19.01

Schulz

Ms. Krimko, Attorney for the Applicant, rejoined the table with homeowner/applicant, Jaime Schulz.

Board Attorney Kennedy asked if anyone had any questions, comments, or concerns regarding the public notice for the meeting. Board Secretary Kneser and Board Attorney Kennedy have reviewed the notice. It is the opinion of Board Attorney Kennedy that the Board has jurisdiction to proceed.

Board Engineer/Planner Avakian was sworn in by Board Attorney Kennedy.

The following items are entered into the record:

- A1 Application Package
- A2 Zoning Permit dated September 2, 2025
- A3 Zoning denial letter dated September 2, 2025
- A4 Resolution of this Board regarding subject property dated December 16, 2013
- A5 Plot Plan prepared by MGC Associates dated July 28, 2025
- A6 Survey of the property prepared by Charles Surmot dated July 31, 2024
- A7 Leon S. Avakian review memorandum dated September 30, 2025

Jennifer Krimko stated that the application is simply that the applicant has a fully developed lot and the homeowners are seeking to put in a very small pool, with no pool patio at all, recognizing how important coverage is. Jaime Schulz is here on behalf of the family.

Jamie Renee Schulz was sworn in by Board Attorney Kennedy and confirmed to Board Attorney Kennedy that she was the owner who lives in the single-family home and has for 12 years.

Ms. Krimko stated that the applicant came to the Board twelve years ago for the application for the addition. The application was seeking a building coverage variance because the house was a ranch and a second floor could not be built.

Ms. Schulz stated that her husband has MS and that it is important to have a one-story rather than a second story. Ms. Schulz stated that her husband is good now, but they do not want stairs for the future.

Ms. Schulz confirmed to Ms. Krimko that in addition to Ms. Schulz's husband's condition and the desire to have the pool for purposes of giving him a safe place to exercise and maintain strength in the warm weather. Ms. Schulz has a granddaughter that she watches quite a bit would benefit from the pool, but in her husband's situation, having a pool would be a really good thing for him to exercise and to work out. In a sense it would give a serene atmosphere for someone with MS. Ms. Schulz's granddaughter would benefit also but it is really for Ms. Schulz's husband.

Ms. Krimko stated that the applicant, recognizing the lot was at max coverage already, is not proposing anything else other than the swimming area. No pool patio, nothing else.

Mr. Tilton asked whether the term pool patio meant coping. What is going around the pool?

Ms. Krimko grass would be around the pool.

Ms. Schulz stated that she believes there will be a 12-inch coping.

Board Engineer Avakian stated that a concrete walk is not required.

Ms. Krimko confirmed to Mr. Tilton that no fountain is proposed.

Ms. Schulz confirmed to Board Engineer/Planner Avakian that the hot tub will be removed.

Upon questioning, Ms. Krimko advised Board Engineer/Planner Avakian that the pool equipment will be moved to the back with a 10ft plus setback so there will be only one variance necessary.

Ms. Krimko stated that the drainage structures the applicant is proposing are specifically designed to accommodate the square footage above 45% so there will be no impact to the neighbors at all. A lot of towns don't even count pools as coverage. For example, in Ocean Township the pool does not get counted as impervious coverage. The pool water is generally about 8 inches below the coping, and the pool acts as a retention basin in and of itself. There is no runoff.

Ms. Krimko and Mr. Tilton had a brief discussion regarding Ocean Township pool requirements for walkways and setbacks.

Board Engineer/Planner Avakian stated that the drainage structure is very appropriate for this application. The plan really does minimize any impact the impervious coverage overage and asked Ms. Schulz to briefly explain the vegetation along the rear property line.

Ms. Schulz stated that Leland Cypress is situated all around this along the back and the sides.

Board Engineer/Planner stated that landscaping is a benefit because in some instances when you have a request that is not conforming, the borough requests vegetation.

Ms. Krimko stated that the application does not require any variances for the setbacks of the pool. The pool equipment will be relocated. The aluminum fence that is shown 5ft off the property line is the neighbor's fence. The applicant will construct a fence. Should the Board approve it, pools are required to be fully enclosed by a pool fence, so the plans do show a proposed fence along the rear property line.

Ms. Umfrid asked if the applicant's engineer would answer questions and give information regarding underwater lighting, landscaping around the fence and sound amplification.

Ms. Krimko stated that a typical pool light is proposed, nothing more than that within the pool. No sound amplification related to the pool is proposed. No lighting is proposed now but any lighting would be landscaping lighting to illuminate the pool area. The property, as testified by Ms. Schulz, is currently circled by cypress so no additional landscaping is necessary.

Gary Chiang, 237-1 Burrs Road, Burlington NJ 08016 joined the table.

Mr. Chaing was sworn in by Board Attorney Kennedy and confirmed that he is testifying as a licensed engineer and that his licenses, qualifications and certifications are currently up to date and in good standing.

Mr. Chaing testified that the soil test was provided by the soil company and the bottom of the pool is above 2ft and agreed with Ms. Krimko that not only the drainage, but the bottom of the pool structure is above 2ft highwater mark.

Mr. Chaing confirmed to Ms. Krimko that the proposed drainage structure will accommodate all the additional impervious that is proposed plus everything over.

Ms. Kapp asked for the pool depth.

Ms. Krimko referred to the topographical plan stating that the coping is elevation 23.7ft and the bottom is 15.5ft.

Mr. Chaing stated that it is a 6ft pool.

Board Engineer/Planner Avakian asked Mr. Chaing that drainage wise there is a moderate rise over the existing property and nice slope toward the property line. If there is any impact on the neighboring properties?

Mr. Chaing stated that there is an existing retaining wall at the back which at existing grade is actually a little lower so when the water gets caught along the wall it will swale to the existing and proposed yard inlet that is going into the drain system.

Board Engineer/Planner Avakian stated that this is on the plan and shows a wall less than a foot from the coping.

Ms. Krimko confirmed to Ms. Kapp that the coping was 7.7inches.

Ms. Krimko stated that the proposal is really not changing the grade all that much.

Board Engineer/Planner Avakian stated that the Board is not used to hearing a pool application that is compliant with Borough regulations, so the Board appreciates that.

Ms. Heinz asked if there would be a pool alarm, as one of her neighbors has an alarm that goes off at all hours.

Ms. Schultz stated that an alarm was not planned. There can be an alarm on your house that lets you know if anyone goes outside.

Ms. Krimko also suggested that a safety cover can be used.

Vice Chairwoman Umfrid noted no public was present for questions or comment.

Board Attorney Kennedy summarized the conditions of the resolution. The Board typically talks in terms of compliance to all the promises commitments and representations the applicants team made tonight, compliance with the Leon S. Avakian review memorandum, compliance obtaining any necessary outside approvals, the applicants usually have a 12month time frame within which to obtain the permits after resolution adopted, a professional certification requirement that the design professional confirm that the improvement was installed in accordance with the approved plans and accordance with the testimony and in accordance with the testimony.

Ms. Krimko confirmed with Board Attorney Kennedy that an 'As Built Survey' would be an appropriate certification.

Board Engineer/Planner Avakian stated that the drainage plan was satisfactory and did not need additional review.

Board Engineer/Planner Avakian requested that a detailed plan of the pool fence be submitted and confirmed to Ms. Krimko that this could be done as part of the construction permit process.

Board Engineer/Planner Avakian stated that the underwater pool lights should be compliant.

Board Attorney Kennedy stated that the applicant agrees that the existing landscaping will be maintained and there will be no sound amplification system.

Mr. Chaing stated that the pool company uses a cartridge filtration system.

Board Engineer/Planner Avakian stated that that is what the Borough likes to see for filtration and backwash so there is no worry about any discharge into the sanitary sewer.

Ms. Krimko stated that revised plans will be submitted to show the compliant pool equipment location and will include the fence details, if the type of fence is chosen by the time of submittal. The plans will also include a note that the hot tub will be removed.

Board Engineer/Planner Avakian stated that the pool is compliant with the requirement that the pool be no higher than 12 inches.

Board Engineer/Planner Avakian stated that the dry wells will be approved with the construction permit.

Board Attorney Kennedy added to the list of conditions that there will be no adverse runoff, the landscaping will be maintained and that the bottom of the pool complies with the 2ft seasonal groundwater requirement.

The Board had a brief discussion regarding pool alarms. Board Attorney Kennedy asked that the subject be added as a potential topic for a future meeting.

Ms. Krimko confirmed to Board Attorney Kennedy that the aforementioned conditions were acceptable.

Vice Chairwoman Umfrid asked if the Board had any additions or corrections. The Board had none.

UPON MOTION of Mr. Wasilishen to include the stipulations as discussed, seconded by Ms. Heinz, carried, the Board approved the application.

ROLL CALL:

In Favor: Vice Chairwoman Umfrid, Mr. Tilton, Ms. Dalton, Mr. Wasilishen, Ms. Kapp, and Ms. Heinz

Opposed: None

Ineligible: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Chairman Papp, Councilman Blasucci, Ms. Kane and Ms. Cernigliaro

Ms. Krimko and the applicant thanked the Board and left the meeting.

Board Secretary Kneser stated that the next meeting is November 17, 2025.

Vice Chairwoman Umfrid asked that it be noted that when the Board needs to discuss that Council review not allowing use of environmental sensitive areas on peoples' property to be included in the coverage calculation.

Ms. Heinz noted that the Board should not go for so many months without a meeting.

The Board discussed having lessons on the meeting dates without any applications.

UPON MOTION of Mr. Wasilishen, seconded by Ms. Kapp, carried, the Board adjourned the meeting.

ROLL CALL:

In Favor: Vice Chairwoman Umfrid, Mr. Tilton, Ms. Dalton, Mr. Wasilishen, Ms. Kapp, and Ms. Heinz

Opposed: None

Ineligible: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Chairman Papp, Councilman Blasucci, Ms. Kane and Ms. Cernigliaro

Approved: _____
Vice Chairwoman Umfrid

Attest: _____
Gina Kneser, Secretary