

SAYREVILLE PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES OF August 20, 2025

The meeting of the Sayreville Planning Board was called to order by Chairman Tighe and opened with a salute to the flag. Chairman Tighe announced that the meeting was being conducted in accordance with the Open Public Meeting Law, P.L. 1975, c231, Public Law, 1975.

Members of the Planning Board present were: Mr. Kandel, Ms. Lahrman, Mr. Shah, Ms. Sitaca, Mr. Williams, and Chairman Tighe

Absent Members: Mr. Muller, Mr. Volosin, and Councilman Zebrowski

Also present were: Mr. Alex Fisher, Esq., Mr. Wilder, PE, and Mr. Van den Kooy, PP

AT THIS TIME, THE MEETING WAS OPENED:

Chairman Tighe asked the Planning Board Secretary if the board meeting was being conducted under the Sunshine Law and if all publications were notified. The secretary had stated, Yes.

MEMORIALIZATION OF RESOLUTION:

Resolution ~ Recommending to the Borough Council that the Property known as Block 446, Lots 2.01 and 2.02; Block 445, Lots 1.01, 1.02, 1.03, 2.03, 2.04, 3.01, 4.03, 4.04, 4.05, 4.06, 5.03, and 5.04, and Block 449.07, Lots 1.01, 2.01, and 3.01 should be designated as an area in need of redevelopment

Mr. Shah made a motion to approve; seconded by Mr. Williams

ROLL CALL:

YES: Mr. Kandel, Mr. Lahrman, Mr. Shah, Ms. Sitaca, Mr. Williams, and Chairman Tighe

NO:

ABSTAIN:

ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES:

Mr. Kandel made a motion to accept the July 16, 2025, meeting minutes, seconded by Mr. Williams. Motion carried.

SITE PLANS/SUBDIVISION HEARING:

Application No. PB 24-01

Chilq, LLC/Freddie Jimenez & Lucia Perez

00 & 60 Cleveland Avenue

Blk: 360, Lots: 191-194

Please refer to the attached transcription for the full testimony and public portion.

Mr. Williams made a motion to approve; seconded by Mr. Shah.

ROLL CALL:

YES: Mr. Kandel, Mr. Lahrman, Mr. Shah, Ms. Sitaca, Mr. Williams, and Chairman Tighe

NO:

ABSTAIN:

Preliminary Investigation Study for the Area in Need of Redevelopment and/or Rehabilitation

Mini Mall Drive/Intersection Ernston Road

Dated August 20, 2025

**Prepared by: Ms. Veena M. Sawant, AICP, PP
VMS Planning, LLC**

Ms. Sawant presented the board with the following information:

The study area is located in the Southeast region of the Borough. 11.85 acres of land over 17 parcels, Block 445, Lots 1.01, 1.02, 1.03, 2.03, 2.04, 3.01, 4.03, 4.04, 4.05, 4.06, 5.03, and 5.04; Block 446, Lots 2.01 and 2.02; Block 449.07, Lots 1.01, 2.01, and 3.01

Located on either side of Ernston Road, adjacent to the boundary with Old Bridge Twp.

13 parcels are developed with various improvements:

- **Mini mall**
- **Restaurants**
- **Food stores**
- **Water tower**
- **Cell tower**
- **4 vacant parcels**
- **Highway Business (B-3) Zone**
- **Several site challenges present**

Redevelopment and Rehabilitation Objectives:

The renewal activities of a study area should be undertaken in conformity with, and should be designed to meet, the following objectives of an area investigation:

- **To improve the functional and physical layout of the project area for contemplated new development and the removal of impediments to land deposition.**
- **To bring to productive use vacant and underutilized parcels within the Study Area.**
- **To encourage the development of alternative uses on vacant, undeveloped, privately-owned parcels.**
- **Enhance economic growth and create new employment opportunities for the residents of Sayreville.**
- **Foster land uses that align with the Borough's Master Plan and enhance area compatibility.**

Criteria for area in need of redevelopment:

- **Criteria A – The generality of buildings are substandard, unsafe, unsanitary, dilapidated, or is so lacking in light, air, or space, as to be conducive to unwholesome living or working conditions.**
- **Criteria B – The discontinuance of the use of a building previously used for commercial, manufacturing, or industrial purposes; the abandonment of such buildings; or the same being allowed to fall into so great a state of disrepair as to be untenable.**
- **Criteria C – Land that is owned by the municipality, the county, a local housing authority, a redevelopment agency, or a redevelopment entity, or unimproved vacant land that has remained so for a period of ten years prior to adoption of the resolution.**
- **Criteria D – Areas with buildings or improvements which, by reason of dilapidation, obsolescence, overcrowding, faulty arrangement or design, lack of ventilation, light, and sanitary facilities, excessive land coverage, deleterious land use or obsolete layout or any combination of these or other factors.**
- **Criteria E – A growing lack or total lack of proper utilization of areas caused by the condition of the title, diverse ownership of the real properties therein or other similar conditions which impede land assemblage.**
- **Criteria F – Areas, in excess of five contiguous acres, whereon buildings or improvements have been destroyed, consumed by fire, demolished or altered by the action of storm, fire, cyclone, tornado, earthquake or other casualty in such a way that the aggregate assessed value of the areas has been materially depreciated.**

- **Criteria G – In any municipality in which an enterprise zone has been designated pursuant to the New Jersey Urban Enterprise Zones Act, L.L. 1983, c. 303, the execution of the actions prescribed in the act for adoption by the municipality and approval of the New Jersey Urban Enterprise Zone Authority of the zone development plan.**
- **Criteria H – The designation of the delineated area is consistent with smart growth planning principles adopted pursuant to law or regulation.**
- **Section 3 – The provision is referred to as Section 3 and is set forth under NJSA 40A:12A-3, which states in part that “a redevelopment area may include lands, buildings, or improvements which of themselves are not detrimental to public health, safety or welfare, but the inclusion of which is found necessary, with or without change in this condition, for the effective redevelopment of the area of which they are a part.”**

Criteria for area in need of rehabilitation:

- 1. A significant portion of structures therein is in a deteriorated or substandard condition;**
- 2. More than half of the housing stock in the delineated area is at least 50 years old;**
- 3. There is a pattern of vacancy, abandonment, or underutilization of properties in the area;**
- 4. There is a persistent arrears of property tax payments on the properties in the area;**
- 5. Environmental contamination is discouraging improvements and investment in properties in the area; or**
- 6. A majority of the water and sewer infrastructure in the delineated area is at least 50 years old and requires repair or substantial maintenance.**

Criteria for the study area:

Area in need of Redevelopment falls under Criteria C, Criteria D, Criteria H, and Section 3. Areas in need of rehabilitation fall under Criteria 3 and Criteria 4.

Mr. Shah made a motion to open the public portion; seconded by Ms. Lahrman. Motion carried.

Tenant from Mini Mall

He was concerned about his business and being evicted from the building due to this study. He stated the owner does not do any repairs and would like someone to discuss that with him.

Ms. Sawant and Mr. Fisher, Esq. explain in further detail that he will not be displaced due to this study. They explained the process in detail.

**Mara Heekin
50 Driftwood Drive**

Ms. Heekin was in favor of the need for redevelopment. She stated that the parking lot and building area are in very poor condition. There is a dumpster that is attracting rodents.

OLD BUSINESS/NEW BUSINESS/ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:

The next meeting will be on September 3rd.

The public portion was open and closed. No public was in attendance.

There being no further business to discuss, Ms. Sitaca made a motion to adjourn; seconded by Mr. Williams. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

**Beth Magnani
Planning Board Secretary**