

BOROUGH OF PINE BEACH
LAND USE BOARD
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
November 15, 2022

The Pine Beach Land Use Board held a meeting on November 15, 2022 in the Municipal Building, 599 Pennsylvania Ave., at 7:30pm. Mrs. Lill called the meeting to order and read the Opening Statement: In compliance with the Open Meeting Law, P.L. 1975 C231, the notice of this meeting was sent to our official newspapers, the Asbury Park Press and the Star Ledger, and also posted on the bulletin board at the Pine Beach Municipal Building and the Pine Beach Post Office. The statement shall become a part of the official minutes of this meeting. This meeting is a judicial proceeding. Any comments or questions must be limited to issues that are relevant to what the board may legally consider in reaching a decision; and decorum appropriate to a judicial hearing must be maintained at all times.

Mrs. Lill led the Flag Salute.

Attendance/Roll Call:

Mayor Cuneo (present)	Mr. Higham (present)	Mr. Keesling (absent)
Mrs. McDonnell (absent)	Mrs. Saxton (present)	Mr. Slickers (present)
Mrs. Wnek (present)	Mrs. Lill (present)	

Approval of Minutes:

Approval of the October 18, 2022 minutes

Mrs. Saxton states that on page six of the current minutes states the sunroom was on slab, this should be changed to crawl space. Additionally further into minutes it is mentioned again slab and should be corrected to crawl space.

A motion was made by Mrs. Saxton to approve the amended minutes to reflect the changes mentioned. Motion is seconded by Mayor Cuneo, all are in favor.

Mayor Cuneo (second-yes)	Mr. Higham (yes)	Mr. Keesling (absent)
Mrs. McDonnell (absent)	Mrs. Saxton (motion-yes)	Mr. Slickers (yes)
Mrs. Wnek (yes)	Mrs. Lill (yes)	

Old Business:

Resolution 2022-09 approval of Gregory-Potaski 301 Lincoln Ct. 107x7 lot frontage and height bulk variance application from 10/18/22 hearing.

A motion was made to open for discussion on Resolution 2022-09 by Mayor Cuneo and seconded by Mrs. Wnek. All were in favor.

Mrs. Saxton would like to amend the resolution to include that the attic may not be transitioned to habitable space by the current owner or any owner hereafter.

Mr. Brady agrees to add this language into the resolution.

A motion was made to approve resolution with the amendment that was read onto the record by Mrs. Saxton and seconded by Mrs. Wnek. Roll Call vote:

Mayor Cuneo (no)	Mr. Higham (yes)	Mr. Keesling (absent)
Mrs. McDonnell (absent)	Mrs. Saxton (motion-yes)	Mr. Slickers (yes)
Mrs. Wnek (second-yes)	Mrs. Lill (yes)	

Resolution 2022-10 approval of Caemmerer 717 Riverside Dr. 23x10 lot coverage and setbacks bulk variance application from 10/18/22 hearing.

A motion was made by Mayor Cuneo to approve resolution 2022-10 as written, seconded by Mr. Slickers.

Mayor Cuneo (motion-yes)	Mr. Higham (yes)	Mr. Keesling (absent)
Mrs. McDonnell (absent)	Mrs. Saxton (abstain)	Mr. Slickers (second-yes)
Mrs. Wnek (yes)	Mrs. Lill (yes)	

New Business:

Hearing of application for Block 70 Lots 1&2 – JCM Electric LLC/ David Moss, Motor Rd. and Merion Ave.

Robin La Bue
Rothstein, Mandell, Strohm, Halm, Cipriani, P.C.
98 East Water St.
Toms River, NJ 08753

Robin LaBue attorney on behalf of JCM Electric, was sworn in by the board's attorney. Mrs. LaBue states that the applicant is seeking a variance for an isolated lot on Motor Rd and Merion Ave in the R75 zone. Applicant is seeking to build a single family residential home. Mrs. LaBue continues that the proposed home is consistent with the neighborhood. Variance approval is needed due to the lot being undersized in lot area, frontage, width, and due to corner lot there are two frontages, one frontage needs a set-back variance. Mrs. LaBue introduces the board to the applicant's professional witness Brian Leff.

Brian Leff
BML Studio LLC
11 Periwinkle Dr.
Barnegat, NJ 08005

Brian Leff, President of BML Studio in Barnegat, was sworn in by the board's attorney and testified his credentials for the board. Mr. Brady accepts his credentials as an expert in professional planning.

Mrs. LaBue asked Mr. Leff to describe the subject property. Mr. Leff continues that the subject tract consists of two undersized tax lots. Lots 1 & 2 on block 70 in the Borough of Pine Beach. When combined the total lot area is 6,250 sqft. Located in the south east corner of the intersection of Motor Rd. & Merion Ave. and is currently undeveloped. Applicant is proposing to develop the tract with a two story modular single family home. Access and off street parking will be provided with a driveway on Merion Ave. and side access garage. The lot will be graded towards the adjacent roadways for drainage. The property is located in the R75 district which is intended for single family use. The relief being sought is minimum lot area, 9,375sqft is required and 6,250ft exists. The minimum lot frontage, 75ft is required and 50ft exists and is proposed on Motor Rd. The minimum lot width, 75ft is required and 50ft is proposed. Front setback on Merion Ave. where 25ft is required and 16.3ft is proposed. Variance request is due to the geometry of the tract. Lots are to be consolidated, no additional land to be acquired. Mr. Leff continues that the adjacent property owners were offered the land with no real interest. Mr. Leff testifies that he believes the variance the applicant is seeking will not have any negative impact on the neighborhood. The building envelope if conforming would only be 15ft wide. The initial plan that was submitted had

conforming setbacks on both Merion Ave. and Motor. The plan that is proposed was amended to add a larger buffer to the rear setback between the neighboring properties. Proposed home will not interfere with the site triangle or create any visual impairment for motorists. Request will enable this tract to be developed in a manner that is consistent with the intent of the zoning ordinance. In Mr. Leff's professional opinion the relief being requested is appropriate and may be granted without any significant impact to the zoning ordinance or zoning plan. Mr. Leff also believes the proposed structure does not have any impact on the health safety or welfare of the public or the adjacent community. Mr. Leff believes this would be a C1 variance based on the geometrical configuration of the lot. Mr. Leff states that the proposed conforms to the neighborhood and uses block 69 lots 4 & 5 as an example of a similarly constructed home.

Mr. Brady introduces a photo submitted by a board member of an adjacent property and labels it B1.

Mrs. LaBue asks the witness if the property can be developed if the variances the applicant seeks are not granted. Mr. Leff states it is highly unlikely that a single family home could be developed without a variance. Mrs. LaBue has no further questions for the witness, Mr. Leff.

Mrs. Lill asks Mr. Leff what the reasoning behind why he believes this lot could not be developed. Mr. Leff states that the measurements of the lot cannot be changed and therefore does not meet the minimum requirement. With the (2) front setbacks being conformed to, the envelope for development would be 15ft wide. A single family house that is 15ft wide or deep would probably be a challenge and look out of place in the neighborhood, and would be more like a shed than a house.

Mrs. Saxton asks why the driveway was moved to a side entry. Mr. Leff responds that after speaking with the neighbor and submitting new plans it did not leave a large enough parking space on the street.

Mrs. Lill clarifies with the witness that the hearings from previous months were adjourned so the board has not reviewed or accepted any previous set of plans. Mr. Leff explains that the original plans were given to the board secretary, the meeting was then adjourned. After the adjournment the applicant met with the neighbors and submitted new plans for the hearing. These requests were from neighboring property owners and not from the board members.

Mr. Brady asks the witness that the new plans reflect a side entry garage, this change also pushes the driveway further from the Merion and Motor intersection, is this correct?

Mr. Leff responds, yes this increases the distance and safer for traffic circulation.

Mr. Brady asks the witness if they have done a new measurement of the edge of pavement to the property line, the measurement is not consistent.

Mr. Leff does not know the actual measurement of the distance between the edge of pavement and the property line.

Mr. Rohmeyer answers that the edge of pavement to the closest property line, at the corner is about 6ft and at the eastern furthest edge is approximately 15ft.

Mr. Rohmeyer asks the witness about the three design waivers on his letter. Second one is the type of driveway being asphalt; the first one is a request for contour lines 50ft around the property to see the drainage in the area. From an engineer's standpoint the corner lot is flat and drains towards the corner. There is an inlet there and he feels the waiver can be granted. The third waiver is regarding the tree clearing, the ordinance requires no more than 30% trees to be cleared. For this application it is proposed that eleven of the twenty trees be cleared, which is 55%. If the board has any issue with this, one suggestion to mitigate would be the board can request additional trees to be planted if application is approved.

Mr. Slickers comments that with the site triangle there is limited space to re-plant trees.

Mayor Cuneo asks the witness that some of these trees that are proposed to be taken down are in the Borough's right-of-way. Why are you proposing to remove these?

Mr. Leff responded that the one tree is located where the proposed driveway is so the driveway would need to be relocated.

Mr. Rohmeyer adds that if they were to be granted permission to remove that tree the board can require them to plant another in an approved location. The plans do not have the specifications of the tree in question that lies within the Borough's right-of-way.

Mr. Leff responds that the tree proposed to be removed on Motor Rd. maybe able to be preserved and not removed.

Mr. Rohmeyer states that there are approximately five other trees on the lot that do not fall within the foundation line and if the board would like to hold the applicant to the 30% they may be able to save these.

Mr. Leff agrees to speak to the engineer to try and save some of these trees and meet the Borough's requirements.

Mrs. Lill asks for the documentation of the adjacent property owner's interest to buy or sell.

Mrs. Wnek responds that they did submit the letters they sent but no documentation of a response from the adjacent property owners.

Mrs. LaBue confirms no acknowledgment from adjacent property owners of interest in the lots.

Mr. Brady reminds the board that any variance granted runs with the land and so does the hardship of the land. The insufficient square footage and width of these lots are hardships that run with this land. The buy and sell letters submitted are from August 16th and included in the affidavit. Mr. Brady marks the affidavit from the applicant engineer for the buy and sell letters as A1.

Mayor Cuneo asks if the documentation of these letters are not submitted then do we have proof they were done?

Mr. Brady responds that the attorney is testifying to the proof of these letters.

Mrs. LaBue explains that there is an affidavit of the letters being sent on August 2.

Mr. Rohmeyer continues with his engineer comments. The building height is proposed to comply, site triangle at intersection has nothing proposed, no fencing or walls proposed, off street parking standards are proposed to be met, consolidation of lots is a recommendation of the board and consolidation of lots by deed must be filed with Ocean County Clerk. Applicant will be responsible for a fee to update the tax map, is the applicant agreeing to this fee?

Mrs. LaBue responds yes applicant agrees to fee.

Mr. Rohmeyer continues that the applicant is proposing to maintain the overall drainage and grading plan on site. The proposed grading change includes regrading with yard swales of less than 1ft.

Mr. Rohmeyer asks the applicant if the property demonstrates a C1 hardship for this application.

Mr. Leff answers yes. Mr. Rohmeyer continues the negative criterion that was mentioned and the witness feels there is no substantial detriment to the public good or no negative impact on the zoning plan.

Mr. Slickers asks the board engineer to speak on the conditions of the line of site and the corner property.

Mr. Rohmeyer states they meet the requirements, no proposed fencing or landscaping. Mr. Rohmeyer sees no issue regarding the site line with the structure that is proposed. Mr. Rohmeyer asks the witness what the reason for the front yard setback variance being requested is.

Mr. Leff responds that it is being requested to comply with the side yard setback of 10ft and to respect the air light and open space request of the adjacent property owner. The front yard setbacks are established to maintain a consistent pattern. On Merion Ave. Mr. Leff observed no consistent set back pattern and uses the property across Merion Ave as an example of this condition.

Mr. Rohmeyer asks the witness, do you feel the proposed layout of the home and its location is the most appropriate for this property? Mr. Leff responds yes he does.

Mr. Brady asks the witness about the photo submitted, B1, has been testified to be on an undersized lot. The home in B1 is a single story home. Mr. Brady asks the witness to comment on the one story home versus the two story home proposed by the applicant.

Mr. Leff states that the adjacent home on Motor is two stories and the neighborhood is split 50% of single and two-story homes. He believes it would be consistent to the neighborhood.

Mrs. Wnek states that there are a few capes that may qualify as a 1.5 story building.

Mr. Leff, in his professional opinion, feels the proposed two-story home is appropriate for the neighborhood.

Mr. Higham asks the witnesses if the proposed structure is for a 2 bedroom home. Mr. Leff response yes. Mr. Higham questions what the second story is then for?

Mrs. Saxton adds that the exhibit B1 is a photo of 300 Merion Ave. and the Ocean County tax records has the lot as conforming and 100ft by 75ft.

Mrs. Wnek states that she believes this lot to be irregular. It has a longer jog to one side of it so the square footage is met.

Mr. Rohmeyer states that where the property lies on the lot is still similar in the setback.

Mr. Brady swears in the property owner Mr. David A. Moss of 2 Hilltop Dr., Bayville N.J.

Mr. Brady asks if Mr. Moss is the principal of JCM Electric.

Mr. Moss states yes he is. Mr. Moss continues he has done a lot of research in the area, there are similar lots in Beachwood that have has homes built and sold on these lots.

Mr. Brady asks Mr. Moss about the 1 story versus the 2 story.

Mr. Moss states that the original design is a cape style home with the option of a second story that can be finished if allowed. If not allowed the second story can be used for mechanicals or storage.

Mr. Higham responds that if this space is finished in the future and bedrooms are added, how do we require more off street parking to be added. There will be many cars along the street.

Mr. Moss states that the plans for the second story have not been submitted; he intended to see what the board had to say about the space before proposing a plan for the second story.

Mr. Higham asks why there are no plans even if the intention was for mechanicals or storage.

Mr. Moss expresses that if the board would not allow this second story to be finished then he would agree to propose a ranch style home.

Mr. Rohmeyer adds that if they were to add the additional bedrooms the off street parking they are proposing is still meeting the standards of three spots including the garage.

Mayor Cuneo asks what the heights of the ceilings of the second story are.

Mr. Moss does not have the measurements.

Mrs. Saxton mentions that there are windows over the garage and a dormer in the front of the home. These elements leave the option open for the future owner to finish this space and make it livable.

Mr. Moss adds that this cape style fits into the neighborhood better than the ranch style.

Mr. Higham asks the applicant if he has more then one property in Pine Beach.

Mr. Moss' response is he only owns one property in Pine Beach.

Mrs. LaBue asks her applicant if he has developed any other properties.

Mr. Moss answers that he has been developing properties his whole life and holds many licenses. This is his first variance application.

Mrs. Wnek asks for the elevations for where the driveway pulls in facing the east, she would like a description of what the elevation is for Motor Rd.

Mr. Moss states that you would see the siding from Motor Rd. He can have a gable or a window.

Mrs. Wnek expresses that the side of the home that faces Motor Rd. is the entry to the town and the other side that is missing the elevation on the plans is the side that the neighbor will face. She asks the applicant to describe this side.

Mr. Moss describes the side facing the neighbor is vinyl siding only and the Motor Rd. The side will have a variation on window sizes in the bedrooms.

Mrs. Lill asks for a motion to open the hearing for public discussion. A motion was made by Mayor Cuneo to open to the public, seconded by Mrs. Wnek. All were in favor.

Nicholas Puleo of 305 Merion Ave., Pine Beach

Mr. Puleo was sworn in by the board's attorney. Mr. Puleo comments that his adjacent home on Merion Ave. and many others are ranches in this neighborhood. His second concern is the distance of the driveway to his home. The distance is proposed to be 44ft to the property line.

Mr. Higham asks Mr. Puleo where his home is located on the survey provided. Mr. Puleo answers he is on western Merion Ave. side of the current lots.

Mr. Rohmeyer states that the distance from the proposed edge of driveway to lot 11 is 14ft approximately.

Mr. Puleo asks if there are trees that will be removed between his lot and the proposed home.

Mr. Higham responds with the tree plan that the trees between the driveway and Mr. Puleo's home is to remain.

Mr. Puleo expresses his concern that the neighborhood is mostly ranches on Merion Ave.

Marc S. Galella

R.C. Shea & Associates

244 Main St.

Toms River, NJ 08754

Mr. Gallela is the attorney for the objectors. He represents the adjacent property residents, 902 Motor Road, Steve and Bonnie Thieme. He also represents Clifford Gasior of 906 Motor Rd. After meeting with the applicant the plans were amended to reflect the conforming side setback of 10ft, Mr. Gallela is here to make sure this 10ft setback is maintained, and other than that his clients had no other objections.

Mr. Slickers asks the objector's attorney if the only objection was the 10ft setback, this was modified so there are no longer any objections.

Mr. Gallela once the property was moved closer to the front yard and into the front setback the adjacent property had no further objections.

Dorothy Kulina of 901 Motor Rd., Pine Beach

Ms. Kulina is sworn in by Mr. Brady. Ms. Kulina is the across the street neighbor to proposed home, states that she moved to Pine Beach for the small town and woods that surround her neighborhood. She has an objection to a two story home being built on this lot. She adds that Motor Rd. is already difficult and has many accidents, adding more houses and subsequently cars are dangerous for these corner lots. Her additional concern is for the grading on this corner lot. She states that currently at the corner of Merion Ave. the drainage is poor and it often floods and freezes. The neighborhood is consistent with ranches and smaller homes and she is in favor of smaller homes. If every non-conforming lot is built on there are no more open spaces and it is not the town she moved into. She is not in favor of the proposed home being so close to a congested school zone.

Clifford Gasior Motor Rd., Pine Beach

Mr. Gasior is objecting to building on the undersized lots. To prevent the over building of the town and increase the density will negatively affect the quality of life. If the applicant can build a conforming "tiny home" it may add character to the area. His other concerns are for the tree plan and the lack of second story plans being submitted.

Mrs. Lill asks if the adjacent property owners who have received the buy-sell letters can testify their interest.

Mr. Galella attorney for adjacent owners of 902 Motor Rd. states they did receive the letters and are not interested in buying the properties nor selling their current property.

Mr. Puleo also confirms he received the letter and is not interested.

Robert Patrick of 805 Motor Rd., Pine Beach

Mr. Patrick is sworn in by Mr. Brady. Mr. Patrick is the neighbor across from the proposed home. Mr. Patrick states that the home is proposed in an already high traffic area due to the school lining up on this road. Mr. Patrick is concerned that approving this variance will open the door for others to obtain similar approval in a dense area.

Dorothy Kulina of Motor Rd. asks the applicant where the residents of the proposed home would have a yard to use.

Mayor Cuneo asks Dorothy Kulina if she would be more favorable or a ranch being built on this lot. Dorothy Kulina responds that she doesn't want anything built there but if it had to be approved a smaller ranch with less residents would be favorable for the neighborhood. More residents would bring more cars parked to what she feels is a dangerous roadway.

Hearing no further comments from the public, Mr. Lill asks for a motion to close public comment. Mrs. Saxton makes a motion to close to public comment, seconded by Mr. Higham. All in favor.

Mr. Slickers asks the board attorney about the precedents of this variance with the other undersized lots on Motor Rd. The approval of this proposed home would change the neighborhood conformity.

Mr. Brady answers that each application stands on its own. It does not necessitate this board to grant a variance or approval for another piece of property that may be similar. However, there is an issue with the character of the neighborhood.

Mrs. Lill adds that when these lots were created the Borough was selling 25ft lots but since we have changed the zoning ordinances.

Mr. Higham comments that we are not stopping the owner from building a 15ft home that is conforming.

Mrs. Lill adds that the applicant to build a home conforming to the setbacks would still need a variance because it is on an undersized by square footage lot and lot coverage, these are hardships that will go with this property. A tiny home can be built in the envelope of 15ft but the lot does not meet the Borough's minimum square footage.

Mrs. Saxton adds that the decision the board makes has an impact on the community they serve. In NJMLUL a C variance cannot impose substantial detriment to the public good or substantial impairment to the intent and purpose of the municipality's Master Plan or zoning ordinances. The on-street parking could be a detriment to the neighborhood.

Mr. Brady expresses that the applicant has met the requirements for off-street parking.

Mr. Rohmeyer adds that the board does need to keep the previously stated LUL into account. The witness testified to the hardships, residential use is what is intended in the area, no detriment to the

zoning plan. No negative impact to the adjacent properties, no impact air light and open space to adjacent property. Minimum sqft of a 1-story home is 1,050 sqft.

Mrs. Lill adds that the testimony from the neighboring property owners reflect that there are mostly ranch homes in the area. A one story ranch would be more consistent with the neighboring properties.

Mrs. Lill asks what are the exterior dimensions of the home.

Mr. Rohmeyer states that they are proposing 23.67ft wide and 56ft long, 1,325 sqft in total. The minimum footprint of 1,050 sqft can be met if they kept the length but made the home narrower by 5ft. A 15ft wide and 75ft long footprint would fit in the envelope.

Mrs. Lill adds that a variance would be required for any home to be built on this property and if conformed to existing ordinances. We need to consider the aesthetics of the home as well.

Mr. Rohmeyer comments that the applicant would be able to construct a narrower footprint within the building envelope.

Mr. Slickers adds that even with this change variances are needed for lot width, lot frontage, and lot area. These three are fixed with the property.

Mr. Rohmeyer asks if the applicant is willing to adjust the footprint.

Mr. Moss says he is willing to hear the board's suggestions and recommendations, but after months of discussion, this was the best plan he came up with. The proposed footprint is more conforming to the neighborhood.

Mrs. Saxton states that listening to the neighbor's comments raises concerns that new owners could start to expand the home and add to the exterior of the home.

Mr. Higham places on the record that with no plans on the second floor it leaves the option open for adding more bedrooms.

Mayor Cuneo makes a motion to vote on the approval on the application as submitted, seconded by Mr. Higham.

Mayor Cuneo votes no due to the plans being incomplete and the proposed tree removal being on the Borough's right of way is an issue and there is no definite solution to this problem.

Mr. Higham votes no due to no plans for the second story. The height is not clear and the tree to be removed in the driveway is in the right of way as well as the percentage of trees proposed to be removed. As the plans stand his vote is a no.

Mrs. Saxton bases her vote on the detriment of the public safety concerns, busy road Motor and Merion and school zone. Quality of life and privacy for the neighbors, the proposed home will make it a very tight community, the driveway shows it can accommodate, people are not going to squish cars into the driveway, there will be on street parking making it a police issue. The stress this places on the neighbors, she doesn't feel it would be good for the neighborhood. Her vote is no.

Mr. Slickers' concern is the characteristics of the neighborhood. Knowing there are other lots in this area, if approved as submitted this will change the character or the neighborhood. There is an opportunity to make the home more conforming. Some people would like to see this as a vacant lot but that is not considering the property owners rights. The reason to deny is the size of the proposed home and the conformity of the neighborhood. His vote is no on that bases.

Mrs. Wnek comments that the way the plans read now is an improvement over the initial design. She applauds the discussion for the conversation with the neighbors and the attempt to incorporate

some adjustments and make more conforming. The front yard setback could be improved; the second story does not fit in with the neighborhood. The safety crowding and the buses, the testimony from the neighbors does carry weight in terms of the neighborhood characteristics. Her vote is not as submitted but there is room to adjust to conform.

Mrs. Lill appreciates the effort the applicant put into the application to be conforming; the tree being removed from the Borough's right of way needs to be resolved before approving. Mrs. Lill voted no because she is not in support of a two story structure on an undersized lot. She feels it is over built for the lot. There are many small ranches in this neighborhood as indicated by the neighbors who testified. Maintaining the frontage on Merion the way it is designed is beneficial. There are no problems with the sight lines; a one story structure would be consistent with the neighboring homes. The lack of information on the second story makes her deem this application as incomplete for a second story.

Mayor Cuneo (motion-no)
Mrs. McDonnell (absent)
Mrs. Wnek (no)

Mr. Higham (second)
Mrs. Saxton (no)
Mrs. Lill (no)

Mr. Keesling (absent)
Mr. Slickers (no)

Mrs. Lill asks the applicant if he is interested in proposing a different structure for the lot. Mr. Moss asks the board if they have an answer on what he can build and Mr. Brady adds that the board can only approve an application that is proposed. The vote is to deny the application as proposed. The substantial differences are for the setback, tree location, and the second story.

Mrs. LaBue comments that the board has given the applicant lots of feedback and will return with another plan.

Vouchers for payment:

A motion was made by Mayor Cuneo to pay vouchers pending funds, seconded by Mr. Higham. All were in favor.

Vouchers to be paid: \$ 5,599.50

Further business:

Mrs. Saxton asks that the speculation on an application that was granted of a former variance. She would like to see the resolution for the address.

Mayor Cuneo asks her to give the address to the secretary and she will pull the file for the next meeting.

Mrs. Lill adds that some communities are having issues with commercial use of residential homes such as weddings or events. There is an ordinance approved in other areas and she will bring it to the council for review.

Mayor Cuneo states there are no short term rentals in the Borough of Pine Beach. A CO is required for any property rentals.

Adjournment:

Mrs. Wnek made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mayor Cuneo. All were in favor.

Minutes submitted 12/15/2022
Hannah Jacobus