

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

SAYREVILLE PLANNING BOARD

Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025

RENZI LEGAL RESOURCES

Court Reporting, Videography & Legal Services

2277 STATE HIGHWAY #33, SUITE 410

HAMILTON SQUARE, NEW JERSEY 08690

TEL: (609) 989-9199 TOLL FREE: (800) 368-7652

[www.RLResources.com](http://www.RLResources.com) No. 446517

1 BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

2

3 THOMAS TIGHE, Chair

4 BARRY MULLER, Vice Chair

5 DAN VOLOSIN

6 JAMES WILLIAMS

7 NOREN SHAH

8 JUDY LAHRMAN

9 CHRISTINA SITACA

10 JOHN ZEBROWSKI, Councilman

11 KEITH KANDEL, Mayor's Designee

12 BETH MAGNANI, Secretary

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 A P P E A R A N C E S:

2

3 LAW OFFICE OF DAVID B. HIMELMAN

4 BY: DAVID HIMELMAN, ESQ.

5 620 Cranbury Road

6 East Brunswick, New Jersey 08816

7 Tel: (732) 659-6130

8 E-mail: davidh@dbhattorney.com

9 Attorney for the Applicant

10

11 STEVEN CONSIDINE ARCHITECT, LLC

12 BY: STEVEN CONSIDINE

13 63 Prospect Street

14 Bernardsville, New Jersey 07924

15 Tel: (888) 204-5189

16 Architect

17

18 SWICK, STAHL & MCGURK PLANNING ASSOCIATES

19 BY: COLLEEN MCGURK, AICP, PP

20 33 North Lakeside Avenue

21 Jackson, New Jersey 08527

22 Tel: (732) 998-7147

23 E-mail: ssmplanning associates.com

24 Planner

25

1 A P P E A R A N C E S:

2

3 VMS PLANNING, LLC

4 BY: VEENA M. SAWANT, AICP, PP

5 200 Perrine Road, Suite 200

6 Old Bridge, New Jersey 08857

7 Tel: (973) 525-2220

8 Old Bridge Township Planner

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1                   AUTOMATED VOICE: Recording in progress.

2                   ALL: I pledge allegiance to the Flag of  
3 the United States of America and to the Republic for  
4 which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible,  
5 with liberty and justice for all.

6                   CHAIR: Good evening, call to order of the  
7 Borough of Sayreville Planning Board on August 20, 2019  
8 -- 2025. Beth, has this meeting been advertised in  
9 according with the Open Public Meetings Act?

10                  THE SECRETARY: Yes, Chairman, it has.

11                  CHAIR: May I have a roll call, please?

12                  THE SECRETARY: Mr. Kandel?

13                  MR. KEITH KANDEL: Here.

14                  THE SECRETARY: Ms. Lahrman?

15                  MS. JUDY LAHRMAN: Here.

16                  THE SECRETARY: Mr. Muller? Mr. Shah?

17                  VICE CHAIR: Here.

18                  MR. NOREN SHAH: Here.

19                  THE SECRETARY: Ms. Sitaca?

20                  MS. CHRISTINE SITACA: Here.

21                  THE SECRETARY: Mr. Volosin? Mr.

22 Williams?

23                  MR. DAN VOLOSIN: Here.

24                  MR. JAMES WILLIAMS: Here.

25                  THE SECRETARY: Councilman Zebrowski?

1 MR. JOHN ZEBROWSKI: Here.

2 THE SECRETARY: Chairman Tighe.

3 CHAIR: Here.

4 THE SECRETARY: We have a quorum.

5 CHAIR: Moralization of resolutions.

6 THE SECRETARY: We have one this evening,  
7 but we'll come back to that after the preliminary  
8 investigation study.

9 CHAIR: Okay. We need an acceptance of  
10 the last month's meeting minutes. Do I have a --

11 VICE CHAIR: Motion to accept.

12 CHAIR: -- motion and a second?

13 THE SECRETARY: All in favor?

14 ALL: Aye.

15 THE SECRETARY: Opposed?

16 CHAIR: Beth, communication agenda?

17 THE SECRETARY: None this evening.

18 CHAIR: Site plans subdivision?

19 THE SECRETARY: We have one this evening.  
20 Application Number PB24-01 Chiql LLC, Freddie Jimenez  
21 and Lucia Perez, 00 and 60 Cleveland Avenue, Block 360,  
22 Lots 191 through 194.

23 CHAIR: Good evening.

24 MR. DAVID HIMELMAN: Good evening, Mr.  
25 Chairman. You ready?

1 CHAIR: (Inaudible).

2 MR. HIMELMAN: Okay, great. Good evening,  
3 Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board and your  
4 professionals. David Himelman, I'm the attorney for  
5 the applicant. And Mr. Chairman, I have a brief  
6 opening remarks and then we can proceed with our  
7 professional witnesses, if that's good with you.

8 CHAIR: That's perfect.

9 MR. HIMELMAN: Great. Okay. So as you  
10 know, the applicant has applied to the board for  
11 subdivision and bulk variance approval. And for the  
12 record, the property is identified as Block 360, Lots  
13 191, 192, 193, and 194, of course, on the current tax  
14 map in Sayreville.

15 And for the -- for the record, the  
16 properties are identified as 00 and 60 Cleveland  
17 Avenue. The parcels in question contain a total track  
18 area of 10,000 square feet. And as you know, the  
19 applicant proposes to subdivide the property where Lots  
20 193 and 192 abut one another. And we want to construct  
21 a 2-story family dwelling within the lots identified as  
22 193 and 194.

23 As you know, the property is entirely  
24 within the R-5 (Single-Family Residence District) Zone.  
25 The proposed use of the proposed dwelling is permitted

1 use in the zone. I wanted to give the board a little  
2 background as to sort of why we're here on this.

3 In doing my research on this, there  
4 apparently was never a subdivision of the subject  
5 property lots even though there were several  
6 conveyances that occurred. The recorded deeds reflect  
7 that the LLC was the grantee from the estate. And in  
8 2003, the LLC conveyed title to 60 Cleveland Avenue to  
9 the Jimenez's, the co-applicant. That would be Blocks  
10 191 and 192.

11 Unfortunately, when the transfer of title  
12 occurred from the lots from the BD estate in 2021 and  
13 2022 from the applicant, it appears that they were  
14 improper conveyances as the lots were have deemed  
15 merged at that point. So under New Jersey law, they  
16 should have been -- should not have been conveyed as  
17 though the properties were subdivided. So that's why  
18 we're really here.

19 When the applicant took title to 00  
20 Cleveland, which is Lots 193 and 194, they essentially  
21 acquired a non-conforming lot, which you couldn't  
22 construct a dwelling without a variance. And quite  
23 frankly, this was identified by your zoning officer,  
24 Mr. Mashanski.

25 And when the applicant had first come in,

1 he had -- he and I spoke about this, and when the  
2 applicant first applied, he and I spoke about this, and  
3 he informed me that technically the lots had merged and  
4 therefore a subdivision was required. So that's really  
5 why we're here.

6           As you know from the application  
7 materials, the proposed lot that we are looking to  
8 subdivide, that we're putting the proposed dwelling on,  
9 we need a variance for minimum lot area which is the  
10 corner lot, where 6,000 feet is required and 5,000  
11 square feet is proposed. We also have minimum lot  
12 width and front yard minimum variance, which -- which  
13 are preexisting, existing non conformities.

14           And Mr. Chairman, we also identified  
15 another variance, which was not originally identified  
16 previously, and that's for the maximum building  
17 coverage, which we're gonna have to also include as our  
18 relief, and we will have the architect go through that.  
19 So I have two witnesses, Mr. Chairman. One is our  
20 architect, Steven Considine. And then we have Colleen  
21 McGurk, who's our planner.

22           And obviously we will go through your  
23 board -- your board planner and engineering memorandums  
24 as required and address their comments.

25           CHAIR: So who do you want to start with?

1 MR. HIMELMAN: So I think we'll start with  
2 our architect. Okay. You can come up. We'll have to  
3 have him sworn in and qualified.

4 CHAIR: Yes.

5 MR. ZEBROWSKI: Please raise your right  
6 hand. Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth,  
7 and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

8 MR. STEVEN CONSIDINE: I do.

9 MR. ZEBROWSKI: You're sworn.

10 MR. CONSIDINE: Steven Considine -- what?

11 MR. ZEBROWSKI: Go ahead.

12 MR. CONSIDINE: 63 Prospect Street,  
13 Bernardsville, New Jersey. I'm -- have been a licensed  
14 architect in New Jersey since 1989. I have a master's  
15 degree in urban planning from Pratt Institute, and I  
16 have testified as an expert witness before hundreds of  
17 municipal boards in the State of New Jersey.

18 CHAIR: Can we get a motion to accept his  
19 credentials?

20 MS. LAHRMAN: (Inaudible) motion to  
21 accept.

22 CHAIR: Second? All in favor?

23 ALL: Aye.

24 CHAIR: You can continue. Thank you very  
25 much.

1 S T E V E N C O N S I D I N E, SWORN, WITNESS.

2 EXAMINATION BY MR. HIMELMAN:

3 Q. All right. Steve, I just wanted to ask  
4 you a preliminary question. So tonight, I know you're  
5 gonna testify on the proposed plan that you signed and  
6 sealed. And just for the record, I think that was last  
7 revised, was that April 10th, is that correct?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Okay, great. All right. So would you  
10 give the board an overview of the proposed project?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. And work -- we'll work through the  
13 professional review memorandums as well. Thank you.

14 A. So the client would like to construct a  
15 single family, two and a half story house on the lot.  
16 If it was an interior lot, there wouldn't be a  
17 variance, but because it's on the corner, there's an  
18 extra 10,000 square feet which is required for a corner  
19 lot.

20 So the client -- we designed the house  
21 based off of the -- complying with all the setbacks,  
22 which would be 20 feet in the front yard and because  
23 it's a corner lot, you have two front yards, so it's 20  
24 and 20. And the side yard of eight, and then a rear  
25 yard of 25. Now the client, we now discovered that our

1 original assumption of the building coverage at 20  
2 percent was based on the 6,000 square foot lot. That's  
3 a -- was an error on our part. It's actually the 5,000  
4 square foot lot, which would bring us to a maximum  
5 building coverage of 1,210 square feet -- 1,000 square  
6 feet and our building is 1,210 square feet.

7           And I'll explain why the building is this  
8 size. So if you add up all the setbacks, the building  
9 width would be 22 feet wide which is what we are. If  
10 you add up all the set -- front to rear setbacks, the  
11 building would be 55 feet, which is what we are. So we  
12 are in compliance with all the setback but that yields  
13 us a result of a building with a footprint of 1,210  
14 square feet, so we would need a variance for that extra  
15 210 square feet.

16           And the reason why the -- the client  
17 wanted to maximize the building footprint was because  
18 on the ground floor, we have a built-in garage which  
19 takes up at least 20 feet. So on the first floor, the  
20 client has a built-in garage, a kitchen, a dining room,  
21 and a living room, and a half a bath. There's no other  
22 type of -- there's not a bedroom there or anything. So  
23 these are all pretty much standard and in -- in today's  
24 living, these are all rooms that we normally would've -  
25 - would give into a house.

1           On the second floor, we have a four --  
2 four bedrooms, two and a half baths, and I think it's a  
3 laundry room. So overall, the house is just a standard  
4 single family house, four bedrooms, two and a half  
5 baths with a garage.

6           The height of the building is conforming;  
7 it's only 28 feet. The style of the building, I would  
8 say is sort of like a modern contemporary with a  
9 pitched roof in the back and a gable roof in the front.  
10 There's not a lot of conformity on the street to copy a  
11 style because there's -- there's just no conformity  
12 whatsoever. So this was a normal style house that we  
13 would build in any neighborhood in New Jersey.

14         Q.       Okay. Steve, if I could just ask you a  
15 couple questions and -- and referring to first the  
16 memorandum by -- for Morgan, a municipal engineer,  
17 who's the board engineer, of course. And they wanted  
18 us to address a couple of things in testimony. Let's  
19 just go through that.

20         A.       Okay.

21         Q.       Okay. So turning to I guess it's Page 3  
22 of 6 of the memorandum -- Mr. Chairman, August 11th  
23 from Morgan. So with regard to -- I'm referring to "D.  
24 Engineering Comments", with regard to prior approvals,  
25 you're not aware of any, correct?

1 A. No.

2 Q. Okay. Neither am I. Existing easements  
3 or proposed easements, I don't believe there are any,  
4 correct?

5 A. Not that I'm -- I am aware of.

6 Q. Okay. And the -- any outside agency or  
7 approvals that will be -- that will be needed for this?  
8 I'm assuming they're --

9 A. No, I don't believe so.

10 Q. Well.

11 A. Except for soil erosion and sediment  
12 control.

13 Q. And -- and I'm assuming water and sewer  
14 department and fire.

15 A. Right. Yeah.

16 Q. And of course, the construction official.  
17 Okay.

18 A. Of course.

19 Q. And we will, and also we would need a soil  
20 removal --

21 A. Sure --

22 Q. -- permit.

23 A. Yeah, absolutely.

24 Q. Okay. Great. Turning further into --  
25 right. So there was an issue with regard to the, I'm

1 referring now on also on Page 3 of 6, architectural  
2 plan comments. There was an issue about the  
3 discrepancy on the height.

4 A. Right.

5 Q. And I think we corrected that, and we  
6 submitted a revised --

7 A. Right --

8 Q. -- schematic to that, correct?

9 A. Right. So the height of the building from  
10 the grade to the ridge is 28.67 feet.

11 Q. Very good.

12 A. Yeah.

13 Q. Okay.

14 A. That's in compliance with the height  
15 ordinance.

16 Q. All right. And I know you -- I know the  
17 plans reflect there's a basement. I just need you to  
18 confirm that there'll be no bedrooms will be placed.

19 A. No -- no bedrooms in the basement.

20 Q. Okay. Also with regard to the proposed  
21 fireplace, which protrudes from the western wall, can  
22 you just describe that and whether or not -- 'cause  
23 it's, apparently the engineer indicated that it's not  
24 depicted in plain view.

25 A. In plan view?

1 Q. No, in plain view.

2 A. No, the plan --

3 Q. The plan view, I'm sorry.

4 A. Okay. So I don't know what he means by  
5 that, but it's clearly shown on the -- on the floor  
6 plans that we have a -- a bump out for the -- the flue  
7 is not so much a working fireplace, it's more a  
8 decorative item. So you're gonna have a -- an electric  
9 fireplace on the inside, which really doesn't require a  
10 flue. But as part of the style of the house, we  
11 decided to add this element to it, but it's not  
12 functional.

13 Q. Okay. Turning now further into --

14 A. It's only one foot deep.

15 Q. It's only one foot deep. Okay -- okay.

16 Very good. Okay. Turning now to Page 4 of the Morgan  
17 memorandum. So there are several comments under  
18 subdivision plan comments. I don't believe that under,  
19 that's A -- A through H -- A through G, I think we're  
20 in agreement to reflect all that, correct?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. Okay. Turning to the grading and drainage  
23 comment.

24 A. Right.

25 Q. And I know that the -- you had a

1 discussion with the board engineer about the issue of  
2 the drainage and maybe you could briefly discuss that  
3 and what -- what our issue is there.

4 A. Well, the lot itself is relatively flat,  
5 except that on the -- as it -- as it -- as it goes down  
6 towards, I think it's -- what's the name of the street,  
7 the side street? It tends to go on a slope, otherwise  
8 it's a pretty flat lot.

9 The issue with the -- the grading and the  
10 drainage was there's a current condition at the corner  
11 where water pools after a heavy rain and it -- but it's  
12 not as a result of the lot itself, it's a result of the  
13 topography of the streets and the -- since there's no  
14 storm water management system, the water just pools  
15 there. So he wanted us to address that in the  
16 development of the property.

17 Q. Right. And specifically --

18 A. He -- his opinion would be to -- a way to  
19 address that pooling of water would be to install a  
20 catch basin in the street. The one problem which I  
21 expressed to the engineer that I have with that is that  
22 my client would be a private client working in a public  
23 street.

24 Number 2, because it's -- there is no  
25 stormwater system and it's just a basically a tank in

1 the ground, it won't -- not be maintained because who's  
2 gonna maintain it and if it's not maintained, it's  
3 gonna get clogged with debris and it's gonna end up  
4 flooding anyway. So that was my concern, which I would  
5 ask the board to alleviate us of that, but that's up to  
6 you.

7 Q. Okay. We can, Mr. Chairman, we can come  
8 back to that.

9 CHAIR: Okay.

10 BY MR. HIMELMAN:

11 Q. I'm assuming, but, okay. Turning now to  
12 the other comments under also on Page 5 under nine, I  
13 think you and I reviewed these with the -- with the --  
14 with the applicant and other than the issue just  
15 described --

16 A. Yeah --

17 Q. -- on the -- on the drainage base and I  
18 think for the most part we are in agreement with those.

19 A. I think that, yeah, I think that we would  
20 provide all the additional sidewalk handicap ramp and  
21 upgrade, fix the curbing as required.

22 Q. Right.

23 A. So I don't -- I don't think that's a  
24 problem.

25 Q. Okay. Very good. Okay. Steve, thank

1 you. Is there anything else you want to add, or you  
2 think we've covered it? Okay, great.

3 CHAIR: You have any questions?

4 MR. HIMELMAN: Mr. Chairman, we'll open it  
5 up to your board and your professionals.

6 MR. VOLOSIN: I just a couple -- a couple  
7 of quick questions. The comment that pertained to the  
8 fireplace, when I look at the site plan, it just  
9 doesn't show that one foot bump out. It's shown on the  
10 floor plan, so I was just looking to have that added.

11 A. Yeah, sure.

12 MR. VOLOSIN: And then as it relates to  
13 the -- the drainage issue, so what our recommendation  
14 is -- is a sump inlet is an inlet that doesn't have a  
15 bottom, and it sits on stone. During really big rain  
16 events, the area's going to flood. I'm not asking the  
17 applicant to put it in inlet and tie it into nearby  
18 storm sewer, but it will help. After a rain event, the  
19 flooding dissipate in a relatively quick matter.

20 I certainly understand the concern about  
21 the maintenance, but what I will note is that a 100  
22 feet away, down Garfield place, so you can see it from  
23 this site, there is a bank of 10 storm water inlets in  
24 Garfield place. The reason being for those inlets, I'm  
25 not sure, but there's already municipal storm sewer

1 that the borough is maintaining.

2 I don't see any issue with an inlet in  
3 this location that the borough would maintain.  
4 Regarding working within the right of way, obviously  
5 the applicant would've to get a road opening permit,  
6 the same type of work that would be for the  
7 installation of sidewalk.

8 The issue is that, and if you look at, if  
9 you're familiar with the area, the reason the sidewalk  
10 has been failing is because water is ponding there.  
11 And if they upgrade the handicap ramp, you're still  
12 gonna have water ponding there and the concrete's gonna  
13 fail again. So I think it is important to address an  
14 issue. Is it a -- a perfect fit? It's not, but I  
15 think it's a reasonable fix that will help the area.

16 And like I said, the water would drain in  
17 relatively quick fashion compared to what it does  
18 today, which is it -- it bleeds through the broken up  
19 concrete.

20 MR. HIMELMAN: Mr. --

21 MR. VOLOSIN: -- that -- that was my  
22 recommendation for (inaudible).

23 MR. HIMELMAN: Mr. Chairman, I understand  
24 where your engineer, your board engineer is coming.  
25 Our concern was doing work within the right of way in

1 the public area, but obviously we get a road opening  
2 permit. Our concern was not so much the -- the  
3 construction or install of this, you know, what you're  
4 recommending. I think the problem is it's not -- it  
5 wasn't connected, it's not connected to the storm  
6 sewer.

7 So we were concerned that it's gonna fill  
8 up and then since it's not connected to anything, it's  
9 -- it may not act as a water retention the way you're  
10 suggesting, but we're -- we're open to that. I just --  
11 we were concerned about from an engineering  
12 perspective, if this was gonna be effective.

13 CHAIR: Because you wanted to install a  
14 tank and this is an open-end?

15 MR. VOLOSIN: Correct. This has no  
16 bottom.

17 CHAIR: No bottom.

18 MR. VOLOSIN: (Inaudible).

19 CHAIR: So it's gonna permit -- permit.

20 MR. HIMELMAN: No, I get that. And we'll  
21 -- we'll, we can work with you. Again, we're not  
22 opposed to the condition, we're just suggesting that we  
23 were concerned about the effectiveness and the -- the  
24 design, but we can work with your board engineer on  
25 that.

1                   VICE CHAIR: (Inaudible). I know you sort  
2 of glossed over Section 8-A through G.

3                   MR. HIMELMAN: Yes.

4                   VICE CHAIR: When you were discussing  
5 Section D-1 about existing and proposing easements, you  
6 said there were none. But I am asking for a site  
7 triangle easement in accordance with the borough  
8 standard so that will be provided?

9                   MR. HIMELMAN: Yes.

10                  VICE CHAIR: Great. I don't have anything  
11 further, Mr. chairman.

12                  CHAIR: Anybody else have any questions?  
13 Go ahead.

14                  MR. WILLIAMS: Just yeah, real quickly,  
15 would you mind commenting on whether any fencing or  
16 landscaping is proposed on the corner lot just to kind  
17 of confirm for the record?

18                  A.           We're just gonna see and -- and grasp the  
19 lot for the moment. And then if the client wanted to  
20 do landscaping, I'm sure he would at some point, but  
21 there was -- it's nothing, not -- not intended at the  
22 moment.

23                  MR. WILLIAMS: Okay, that's fine. Just  
24 asking 'cause corner lots sometimes, you know, for  
25 privacy and -- and other reasons just to make sure --

1                   MR. HIMELMAN: I mean, I would presume  
2 that a basic landscaping plan would -- would wanna be  
3 installed because for obvious reasons it's attractive.  
4 So, but we didn't put it on the plan per se, but I  
5 think that's ultimately what the applicant will do.

6                   MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. Thank you.

7                   CHAIR: Seeing no more questions, you  
8 wanna bring up your?

9                   MR. HIMELMAN: We are gonna bring up our -  
10 - our planner, Colleen McGurk, who will testify on the  
11 justification for the -- the variances. And we --  
12 Beth, I know we have we've got the -- the slide  
13 presentation, right? And I think the board members  
14 have that, right?

15                   THE SECRETARY: That's correct.

16                   MR. HIMELMAN: Okay, great. All right.  
17 Good evening, Colleen.

18                   MS. COLLEEN MCGURK: Hi. Good evening  
19 board members.

20                   MR. HIMELMAN: So we'd have to have her  
21 sworn in and qualified. Thank you.

22                   MR. ZEBROWSKI: Do you swear to tell the  
23 truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so  
24 help you God?

25                   MS. MCGURK: I do.

1 MR. ZEBROWSKI: She is sworn.

2 C O L L E E N M C G U R K, WITNESS, SWORN.

3 EXAMINATION BY MR. HIMELMAN:

4 Q. Okay. Would you just give a brief  
5 background of your CV and your professional  
6 qualifications so we can have you qualified as an  
7 expert in planning?

8 A. Certainly. I received my master's in  
9 urban planning from Boston University. I have worked  
10 as a professional planner for over 25 years. Most of  
11 my experience was at the municipal level as serving as  
12 a township planner, but I started my business, Swick,  
13 Stahl and McGurk Planning Associates in 2019. I've  
14 testified before multiple boards including South  
15 Brunswick, Old Bridge, Edison, Metuchen, et cetera.

16 I'm a member of --

17 CHAIR: Can I have a motion to accept her  
18 credentials?

19 A. -- AICP. My license is current.

20 CHAIR: (Inaudible) Second. All in favor?

21 ALL: Aye.

22 A. Thank you.

23 CHAIR: Thank you.

24 BY MR. HIMELMAN:

25 Q. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ms. McGurk, I

1 know that you have looked at the -- the variances that  
2 we are seeking, particularly on the -- the lot size.  
3 So if you would go through your planning justification  
4 and the research that you did and obviously in support  
5 of the relief, and then we can of course refer to the  
6 board and the professional if any questions. I'll turn  
7 it over to you. Thank you.

8 A. Okay. Thank you -- thank you. Yes, I  
9 have reviewed the application, the site plan, the  
10 ordinance, the 2013 master plan, staff memos and  
11 visited the site. So tonight we're asking the board to  
12 approve a minor subdivision with bulk variances. The  
13 property in question, Block 360 Lots 191 through 194,  
14 contains 10,000 square feet, and is located at the  
15 intersection of Cleveland Avenue and Garfield Place at  
16 00 and 60 Cleveland Avenue.

17 The property is within the R-5 zoning  
18 district, which requires a minimum of 5,000 square  
19 feet. So this is an oversized lot for this zone with  
20 twice as much of the amount of required square footage.  
21 We are proposing to subdivide the property into two  
22 lots with 5,000 square feet each and 50 feet of the  
23 amount of required square -- and 50 feet lot width,  
24 sorry.

25 Lots 193 and 194 would contain the new

1 single family dwelling. But since this is a corner  
2 lot, a minimum of 6,000 square feet is required and 60  
3 feet of lot width instead of the 5,050 lot width,  
4 that's for all interior lots. So we are requesting  
5 three bulk variances for the corner lot, lot area, lot  
6 width. And the max building coverage, 20 percent is  
7 allowed, whereas we are proposing 24 percent.

8 And I guess also we're adding in the  
9 electric fireplace, 20 feet of front yard setback is  
10 required, whereas we are proposing 19. So we meet the  
11 lot depth of a hundred feet, and we meet all of the  
12 setbacks required front side rear, except for the front  
13 setback on Garfield Place and the building height.

14 We're also proposing 38.90 percent for the  
15 total impervious coverage, which is well below the max  
16 permitted of 45 percent. There is also an existing  
17 variance condition on Lots 191 and 192 due to the  
18 existing single family dwelling location, which will  
19 remain on the property. The existing front yard  
20 setback is 12.68, which does not meet the current  
21 ordinance requirement of 20 feet. The dwelling was  
22 built in 1927, so prior to zoning standards.

23 The proposed 2-story dwelling that consist  
24 of four bedrooms. We are providing two off street  
25 parking spaces, one's facing the driveway and one in

1 the garage. The surrounding uses consist of single  
2 family dwellings, and the appearance of the proposed  
3 dwelling will fit in with the neighborhood.

4           If we could take a look at the exhibit.  
5 The first slide is just a photo of 60 Cleveland Avenue  
6 and it all shows -- shows the vacant area on the  
7 corner, 00 Cleveland. Next slide, that's the corner.  
8 It shows the intersection of the property. Next slide,  
9 and that's looking southward towards Washington just  
10 showing down the street and the different types of  
11 houses that are located on that street. That, again,  
12 is the intersection of Garfield and Cleveland so you  
13 get an idea of what the property looks like.

14           Next slide, and this is the tax map. So  
15 the tax map shows a historic development pattern which  
16 was created from a formation of 25 foot wide lots and  
17 the various combinations that occurred from this,  
18 mainly 5,000 square feet. If we look at the  
19 surrounding area, out of the six corner lots, four are  
20 5,000 square feet, our lot is 10,000, and the adjacent  
21 lot is also 10,000. And if we look at Block 360, the  
22 entire block, 71 percent of the lots are 5,000 square  
23 feet. Only 29 percent are larger than 5,000 square  
24 feet. None of the corner lots are 6,000 square feet.  
25 Again, this is due to the original lot pattern of 25

1 foot wide lots, which would've created mainly 5,000,  
2 7,500 or 10,000 square feet.

3           The Borough's 2013 master plan states  
4 quote, "Primary uses facing the single family  
5 residential districts include preserving the integrity  
6 of the existing family neighborhoods." Unquote. This  
7 proposed development will accomplish this goal by  
8 constructing a permitted use at a scale that is in  
9 keeping with the neighborhood, which is preferable to a  
10 much larger dwelling on the existing 10,000 square feet  
11 lot.

12           With regards to special regions, the  
13 project meets several goals of the MLUL, including goal  
14 A, to encourage municipal action to guide the  
15 appropriate use of development of all lands in the  
16 state in a manner which will promote the public health,  
17 safety, morals, and general welfare.

18           The proposed development will be  
19 attractive with a modern design. It is a permitted  
20 use, and the proposed lot sizes would fit in with the  
21 neighborhood and would be a good use of the property,  
22 which is an oversized lot for the R-5 zone. The  
23 setbacks are being met and the site triangle as shown  
24 on the site plan will be clear of any obstructions and  
25 there will be more than adequate visibility.

1                   Goal E, to promote the establishment of  
2 appropriate population densities and concentrations  
3 that will contribute to the well being of persons,  
4 neighborhoods, communities, and regions and  
5 preservation of the environment. The proposed single  
6 family dwelling would be built at the appropriate  
7 density.

8                   Goal G, to provide sufficient space in  
9 appropriate locations for a variety of agriculture,  
10 residential, recreational, commercial, and industrial  
11 uses, and open space, both public and private according  
12 to the respective environmental requirements in order  
13 to meet the needs of all New Jersey citizens.

14                   The property is oversized for the zone,  
15 and the proposed dwelling would be -- would provide a  
16 benefit to the community by creating new housing stock  
17 for the residents of Sayreville that would fit in with  
18 the existing neighborhood. And the proposed dwelling  
19 is fully conforming with all aspects of the ordinance  
20 requirements.

21                   The proposed development also meets the C-  
22 2 hardship balancing analysis. Do the benefits of the  
23 proposed use outweigh any detriments associated with  
24 the requested bulk variances for undersized lot and  
25 width and building coverage. Yes, the lot area and

1 width and building coverage are similar to the  
2 surrounding lots. This development is more in keeping  
3 with the surrounding lot sizes and will fit in with the  
4 character of the neighborhood.

5           The proposed first floor would consist of  
6 1,210 feet, 10 square feet, which is consistent with  
7 the type of single family dwellings that are built in  
8 today's market. Creating new housing stock would be a  
9 benefit to the community. The development, the  
10 dwelling and proposed layout would create a desirable  
11 visual environment and would be consistent with land  
12 use patterns.

13           As far as the front yard setback, the  
14 proposed electric fireplace does create the additional  
15 variance, but it measures one foot by six feet so this  
16 would be de minimis, and I don't see any negative  
17 impacts that this would create.

18           And it is my professional opinion that  
19 this application can be granted without substantial  
20 detriment, and the benefits of the proposed use  
21 substantially outweigh any potential negative impacts  
22 to the zone.

23           The adjacent properties are not being  
24 impacted since the majority of the required setbacks  
25 are being met. This proposal was appropriate given

1 that it is a better zoning alternative than the current  
2 underutilized property and the additional housing will  
3 benefit the community.

4           There is no substantial detriment to the  
5 public good and the variances can be reconciled with  
6 and will not substantially impair the intent and  
7 purpose of the zone plan and the zoning ordinance  
8 because the development is consistent with  
9 recommendations and the state development --  
10 redevelopment plan for metropolitan planning areas.  
11 One, which is this is located in, and the MLUL would be  
12 advanced by the proposed deviation from the zoning  
13 ordinance requirements. That is all I have.

14           MR. HIMELMAN: Thank you, Ms. McGurk, for  
15 that well thought out and reasoned planning  
16 justification. Mr. Chairman, I don't have any further  
17 questions of Ms. McGurk, but you guys might.

18           CHAIR: Do you have any questions to the  
19 planner?

20           MR. VOLOSIN: I have one question. Did  
21 you do an analysis similar to the lot size for building  
22 coverage on undersized lot -- undersized lots?

23           A. Well, I found out tonight that we had  
24 building coverage variance, but I did look. I -- I  
25 have a list of all the square footage of the homes in

1 the block. The max though. So there were -- there  
2 were quite a few that were 1,700 square feet.

3 MR. VOLOSIN: Okay.

4 A. But that's the total square footage.

5 CHAIR: Anybody else?

6 MR. WILLIAMS: Nope, I'm good. I -- I was  
7 wondering the same thing actually and no, I'm good. I  
8 think they touched on all the variances and all the  
9 proof, so. Thank you.

10 MR. HIMELMAN: Thank you very much.

11 CHAIR: Dave?

12 MR. HIMELMAN: Mr. Chairman, yep. So just  
13 to conclude, we obviously would request that the board  
14 act favorably upon the subdivision and obviously  
15 incorporating the bulk variances. And we think we've  
16 provided the sufficient justification from a planning  
17 standpoint. I anticipate that we've addressed your  
18 professional, your planner, engineer's comments and we  
19 hope that the board would act favorably upon the  
20 application and thank you.

21 CHAIR: All right. At this point I'll  
22 need a motion to open up to the public.

23 THE SECRETARY: (Inaudible).

24 CHAIR: Second. All in favor?

25 ALL: Aye.

1 CHAIR: The aye's have it. Anybody from  
2 the public like to speak? Come on up. State your name  
3 and your address.

4 MS. MARGARET HEEKIN: Good evening. My  
5 name is Margaret Heekin. I live at 50 Driftwood Drive  
6 in Parlin.

7 CHAIR: Okay.

8 MS. HEEKIN: And you'll forgive me my  
9 ignorance, I understand that there's some work that's  
10 about to begin -- begin, or there's been some talk  
11 about the mini mall that -- that it's sinking.

12 CHAIR: That's different, that's a  
13 different.

14 MR. HIMELMAN: I think you're here on the  
15 -- are you here on the investigation study?

16 MS. HEEKIN: No.

17 MR. HIMELMAN: Matter.

18 MS. HEEKIN: I'm woefully behind the curve  
19 and I'm wondering.

20 CHAIR: This is -- this is only to speak  
21 of the two houses that they want to put.

22 MS. HEEKIN: Oh, okay.

23 MR. HIMELMAN: On Cleveland.

24 MS. HEEKIN: All right. I just have some  
25 questions about what's going on.

1 CHAIR: Well, we'll get to that.

2 MS. HEEKIN: Okay.

3 CHAIR: All right.

4 MR. HIMELMAN: Thank you.

5 MS. HEEKIN: I'm sorry.

6 MR. HIMELMAN: No -- no worries.

7 CHAIR: Does anybody have any questions on  
8 this matter? Anybody want to speak on this matter?  
9 Anybody from the public like to speak on this matter?  
10 If not, I'll take a motion to close the public.

11 MR. WILLIAMS: Motion.

12 MR. SHAH: Second.

13 CHAIR: All in favor?

14 ALL: Aye.

15 EXECUTIVE SESSION

16 CHAIR: The ayes have it. We're back in  
17 session. Gentlemen, ladies, what's your pleasure?

18 MR. KANDEL: Motion to approve bulk  
19 variances in the --

20 CHAIR: Both variances?

21 MR. WILLIAMS: (Inaudible) I asked be  
22 incorporated (inaudible).

23 CHAIR: Anybody else have any questions on  
24 that?

25 MS. LAHRMAN: (Inaudible).

1 CHAIR: All in favor?

2 THE SECRETARY: Roll call. Mr. Kandel?

3 MR. KANDEL: Yes.

4 THE SECRETARY: Ms. Lahrman?

5 MS. LAHRMAN: Yes.

6 THE SECRETARY: Mr. Shah?

7 MR. SHAH: Yes.

8 THE SECRETARY: Ms. Sitaca?

9 MS. SITACA: Yes.

10 THE SECRETARY: Mr. Williams?

11 MR. WILLIAMS: Yes.

12 THE SECRETARY: Chairman Tighe?

13 CHAIR: Yes.

14 THE SECRETARY: Application approved.

15 MR. HIMELMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and

16 Members and the Board Professionals. Thank you very

17 much and always a pleasure seeing you.

18 CHAIR: Better than being viewed.

19 THE SECRETARY: Thank you so much. Okay.

20 Next on our agenda is the preliminary investigation

21 study for the need -- area in need of redevelopment or,

22 and or rehabilitation Mini Mall Drive, Intersection of

23 Ernston Road. The report is dated August 20th, 2025,

24 prepared by Veena Sawant, from VMS Planning LLC.

25 Veena.