

MANCHESTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2022  
1 COLONIAL DRIVE, MANCHESTER, NEW JERSEY  
VIRTUAL ZOOM MEETING

The Regular Meeting of the Manchester Township Planning Board was called to order by Chairperson Barron at 6:00 P.M. on Monday, February 7, 2022.

A Salute to the Flag and Pledge of Allegiance was repeated.  
This meeting has been advertised as required by enactment of the Sunshine Law.

ROLL CALL:

William Barron	Chairperson	Present
Felicia Finn	Vice Chairperson	Present
Rory Wells	Mayor's Designee	Present
Michele Zolezi	Councilwoman	Present
Bill Foor	Member	Present
James Teague	Member	Present
Timothy Poss	Member	Present
Frank Stavalo	1st, Alternate	Absent
Todd Luttmann	2nd. Alternate	Present
Gregory Hock	Board Attorney	Present
Robert Mullin	Board Engineer	Present

OATHS OF OFFICE:

Michele Zolezi-Class III Member-Council Liaison- Term expiring on December 31, 2022  
Sworn in by Mr. Hock.

AMENDED APPOINTMENT OF THE SECRETARY.

- a. Ms. Finn nominated Amanda Kisty as Secretary to the board  
January 10, 2022 to December 31, 2022, seconded by Mr. Teague
- b. Roll Call Vote for Secretary:  
Mr. Barron-yes, Ms. Finn-yes  
Messrs. Wells-yes, Zolezi- yes, Foor-yes, Teague-yes, Poss-yes, Stavalo-absent, Luttmann-yes

AMENDED APPOINTMENT OF THE ALTERNATE SECRETARY.

- a. Ms. Finn nominated Erin Mathioudakis as Alternate Secretary to the board  
January 10, 2022 to December 31, 2022, seconded by Mr. Luttmann
- b. Roll Call Vote for Secretary:  
Mr. Barron-yes, Ms. Finn-yes  
Messrs. Wells-Temporarily unavailable (internet connection), Zolezi- yes, Foor-yes,  
Teague-yes, Poss-yes, Stavalo-absent, Luttmann-yes

MEMORIALIZATIONS: NONE

APPLICATIONS:

1. Application#2021-270 for Minor Subdivision with Bulk Variances  
Applicant: Ronald Raisin  
Block: 1.29 Lot: 1  
Property Address: 112 Southampton Blvd.  
Attorney: Paul R. Edinger, Esq.  
Case# 2021-00270  
Carried from the January 10, 2022 meeting with new Notice required

Mr. Mullin: Asked if the applicant is asking for completeness waivers as listed in his review letter dated, October 11, 2021.

Mr. Buletza: Yes. The applicant is requesting the following waivers:

1. Metes and bounds descriptions showing dimensions and bearings of the existing and proposed lots.
2. Metes and bounds descriptions showing dimensions and bearings of all existing right-of-way centerlines.
3. Soil logs and permeability test results.
4. Serviceability statements from utilities.

Mr. Mullin: No objections to the waivers but the Board has a right to deny the request for waivers. He believes the waivers can be granted without issue.

Mr. Hock: Requested that if the Board feels that it is appropriate that they make a motion to approve Waivers.

Mr. Barron called for a Motion to Approve the Waivers of Completeness:

Michele Zolezi made a Motion to Approve the Waivers, seconded by Ms. Felicia Finn.

Roll Call Vote to Approve Waivers of Completeness:

Mr. Barron-yes, Ms. Finn-yes

Messrs. Wells-yes, Zolezi- yes, Foor-yes, Teague-yes, Poss-yes, Stavalo-absent, Luttman-yes

Mr. Hock: Swore in the Applicant, Mr. Ronald Raisin and the applicant's engineer, Mr. John Buletza, PE.

Mr. Edinger: Asked for Mr. Buletza to provide his credentials.

Mr. Buletza: Graduate of the University of Pittsburgh in 1984 and NJIT in 1991. Licensed Engineer in NJ, Licensed Professional Planner in NJ, CME in NJ, has been licensed since 1998 and has appeared before Zoning and Planning Boards many times before.

Mr. Barron: Mr. Buletza's credentials were accepted and approved.

Mr. Edinger: Called Mr. Buletza as a witness. Asked if he was familiar with the site.

Mr. Buletza: Yes.

Mr. Edinger: Asked if the property was on the corner of Southampton and First Ave.

Mr. Buletza: Yes.

Mr. Edinger: Have you reviewed the application.

Mr. Buletza: Yes.

Mr. Edinger: Asked Mr. Buletza to describe the area.

Mr. Buletza: The property is located in Pine Lake Park in Manchester in the R-10 zone. The property itself is 27,000 SF and the minimum require SF in the R-10 zone is 10,000 SF. The applicant is proposing and L shaped subdivision into three lots. Two of the lots are proposed to be 100 x 100 and the third lot is proposed to be 75 x 100. Lot 9.01 is proposing variance relief for lot area of 7,500 SF where the minimum lot area required is 10,000 SF, Lot frontage of 75 ft. where 100 ft. is required, Lot width of 75 ft. where 100 ft. is required, and minimum improvable area of 4,225 SF where 5,800 SF is required.

Asked Ms. Kisty if he could share his plans.

Ms. Kisty: Yes. Had Data processing share the application documents.

Mr. Edinger: Asked to show the location of the property.

Mr. Buletza: Said that it was an L shaped lot. They have approval from the Tax Assessor for lot numbers and street addresses.

Mr. Edinger: Asked whether 5.01 and 1.01 would conform.

Mr. Buletza confirmed.

Mr. Edinger: But lot 9.01 does not. Please Explain.

Mr. Buletza: 9.01 does not comply in area at 7,500 SF where 10,000 SF is required, Frontage at 75 ft. where 100 ft. is required, Lot Width at 75ft where 100 ft. is required, and improvable lot area at 4,225 SF where 5,800 SF is required.

Mr. Edinger: In regard to the frontage on 9.01, is it feasible to take frontage from lot 5.01 to make 9.01 conforming?

Mr. Buletza: Neither of the conforming lots have available area to take from to make 9.01 conforming. Lot 12 is also an undersized lot owned by the Township.

Mr. Edinger: Is there a single family home on the property now?

Mr. Buletza: Yes, there is a 1 story frame dwelling currently.

Mr. Edinger: Is the existing dwelling proposed to be demolished?

Mr. Buletza: Yes. The application is requesting that the house is built on 9.01 before the existing dwelling is demolished.

Mr. Edinger: What is the purposed of that?

Mr. Buletza: To move the tenants from 112 Southampton to the new house proposed on 9.01 then demolish the existing house so that the tenants would not be homeless.

Mr. Edinger: What about the other existing structures.

Mr. Buletza: They are proposed to be demolished.

Mr. Edinger: Are there similar undersized lots in Pine Lake Park?

Mr. Buletza: Asked to show the tax map from the Application documents. Sheet #7.02. Proposed subdivision is in yellow. Asked to look at Southampton, which runs north and south. Our layout currently exists if you mirror our subdivision across Southampton Blvd. There are nine (9) 75 x 100 ft. lots in the area shown in orange. Added that Municipal Ordinance 245-31E6B specifically mentions allowing undersized lots to be created.

Mr. Edinger: What are those requirements?

Mr. Buletza: On that applies to our lot are the height and size limits. The requirements go from 2.5 stories to 1.5 stories and 35 ft. to 25 ft. if the lot is undersized.

Mr. Edinger: Based on your review of the lots in the area, is it consistent?

Mr. Buletza: Yes, it is consistent with development in the neighborhood.

Mr. Edinger: Would it be contrary to good planning?

Mr. Buletza: No.

Mr. Edinger: Is it consistent with the overall make-up of the neighborhood?

Mr. Buletza: Yes.

Mr. Edinger: Did you receive the Engineer review letter?

Mr. Buletza: Yes.

Mr. Edinger: Did you review it?

Mr. Buletza: Yes.

Mr. Edinger: Please go through the letter.

Mr. Buletza: We submitted letter of waiver and reviewed the descriptive comments for plan revisions in zone table, which were revised. The applicant was asked to provide curb and sidewalks and to describe the proposed storm water management plan for 9.01. I put a note on the plan. Ordinance 245-31E (6) requires that if building coverage variance is required then the applicant would need to provide a storm water management plan. The Applicant agrees if a building coverage variance is required for lot 9.01 that they will provide a compliant storm water management plan.

The project was approved by the Ocean County Planning Board on 11/17/21 and the applicant can provide the Board and the Board engineer with the approval.

The project was approved by the Ocean County Board of Health subject to removing the current septic and the plan to remove or abandon in place.

The Manchester Township Tax Assessor already approved the block and lot numbers and proposed new addresses.

That is all that was covered in the letter.

Mr. Edinger: Based on review of the letter, you are consistent with the letter.

Mr. Buletza: Manchester Department of utilities will get that. And the Subdivision will be perfected by map.

Mr. Edinger: Based on the site plan and subdivision do you think the request can be granted without detriment to Zoning?

Mr. Buletza: Yes.

Mr. Edinger: The project is not inconsistent with what exists?

Mr. Buletza: Yes.

Mr. Edinger: Closed questions for Mr. Buletza.

Mr. Barron: Thank you.

Mr. Mullin: Asserted that he had questions.

Mr. Barron: Go right ahead.

Mr. Mullin: 245-31E (6) B regarding building height. You're proposing to create an undersized lot that is not existing.

Mr. Buletza: Understood. Added #2 on the plan left of the title per 245-31E6 and 245-45C that if variance is required from building coverage at 9.01 the applicant shall mitigate with a recharge system.

Mr. Mullin: The Ordinance was revised to essentially require all lots to have recharge system which would require an additional variance. The request for building height was already removed.

Mr. Buletza: Impervious coverage will conform or they will come back to the Board.

Mr. Mullin: It would then become a Zoning Board issue.

Mr. Hock: Confirmed.

Mr. Mullin: The Engineer review letter was from October 11, 2021 and the plans had been revised since. In the interest of time, no new letter was issued. I have another question. Is there a 50 x 100 ft. lot to the north?

Mr. Buletza: I don't know.

Mr. Edinger: I believe the applicant was advised that the lot owned by the Township was not available. I received communication from Mr. Dasti that lot 12 was not available. Mr. Raisin, do you know about the small lot to the north?

Mr. Raisin: Yes.

Mr. Edinger: Had you made a proposal to the Township to purchase it?

Mr. Raisin: Yes.

Mr. Edinger: Can you tell me what they said?

Mr. Raisin: They had initially said the price was \$10,000.00 for the lot, but then they came back and said that the lot was not for sale.

Mr. Edinger: So my recollection is correct?

Mr. Raisin: Yes.

Mr. Edinger: Does that address the question?

Mr. Mullin: Yes.

Mr. Hock: Asked Mr. Mullin is he was done.

Mr. Mullin: Confirmed.

Mr. Hock: Asked about the color coding on the lots and what the radius was.

Mr. Buletza: Said it was two blocks to the left and right and 1 block to the north.

Mr. Hock: Asked if Mr. Buletza had any information on how these non-conforming lots came to be.

Mr. Buletza: No, but he can tell you from the lot numbers like 1.14 and 19.01 that he would imagine that they were from a subdivision.

Mr. Hock: Understood. How many lots in the area are conforming? He said he was trying to give the board a percentage to give the scheme of what 9 lots represents.

Mr. Buletza: Said he would count them.

Mr. Hock: Just a ballpark within the 250-500 ft. radius.

Mr. Buletza: Just 75 ft. lots or all undersized lots?

Mr. Hock: All undersized lots vs. conforming or oversized lots.

Mr. Buletza: B:1.41- 9 conforming and 1 undersized, B: 1.28-7 conforming lots and 5 undersized lots, B: 1.07-4 conforming lots and 1 undersized lot, B: 1.40- 10 conforming lots and 1 undersized, B:1.29-8 conforming lots and 1 undersized lot, B:1.06- 3 conforming lots and 3 undersized lots, B: 1.38- 8 conforming lots and 2 undersized lots, B:1.31- 8 conforming lots and 2 undersized lots, B:1.04-4 conforming lots and 1 undersized lot. In total, 61 conforming lots in the study area and 17 undersized lots.

Mr. Hock: What is the percentage as a whole for conforming vs. non-conforming lots?

Mr. Buletza: 28%.

Mr. Hock: 78 lots.

Mr. Buletza: Correct. 21.8%

Mr. Hock: So a little less than 80% are conforming?

Ms. Zolezi: Asked to reiterate the percentages.

Mr. Hock: 21.7% non-conforming vs. 78.2% conforming lots. That's it.

Mr. Barron: Asked if the Board had questions for the Engineer.

Mr. Teague: Asked what the orange lots were on the map.

Mr. Buletza: 75 x 100 ft. lots that are the same as lot 9.01.

Mr. Wells: The percentage of undersized lots included lots of all sizes and not all of them have structures on them right?

Mr. Buletza: No.

Mr. Wells: The Township property doesn't have a structure on it right?

Mr. Buletza: No.

Mr. Wells: So of the 28%, not all of them have structures but the 75 x 100 ft. lots probably do. To be clear the intent is to go from 1 structure to 3 structures?

Mr. Buletza: Yes.

Ms. Zolezi: So we actually have an existing conforming lot?

Mr. Buletza: Yes. One existing oversized lot.

Ms. Zolezi: Conforming?

Mr. Buletza: Yes. Oversized.

Ms. Zolezi: We don't typically have subdivision that create variances.

Mr. Barron: Opened to the public to ask the engineer questions.

No questions from the public. Closed Engineer questions from the public.

Mr. Hock: Anything else from Mr. Buletza?

Mr. Edinger: No.

Mr. Barron: Open to the public to ask questions to the applicant.

No public questions. Closed.

Mr. Raisin: Thank you. Question about the 50 x 100 ft. lot. Is it “ok” to pay to purchase?  
Mr. Hock: This is not the Board to ask that questions.  
Mr. Edinger: Agreed.  
Ms. Zolezi: Asserted she would be more likely to grant the application if that lot was purchased.  
Mr. Hock: Yes. If available.  
Mr. Foor: What was the reason given by Mr. Dasti?  
Mr. Edinger: I can’t recall but I think he said the Township had plans for the property.  
Mr. Barron: Asked how long ago he proposed to purchase the property.  
Mr. Edinger: How long Mr. Raisin?  
Mr. Raisin: March, April or May of last year.  
Mr. Hock: Asked the Board if they were ready to open to the public for comment.  
Mr. Barron: Opened to the public for comment. None. Application was closed to the public for comment.  
Mr. Barron: Asked for a Motion from the Board.  
Mr. Poss made a Motion to deny the application, seconded by Mr. Foor.  
Roll Call Vote to Deny Application#2021-270 for Minor Subdivision with Bulk Variances:  
Mr. Barron-yes, Ms. Finn-yes  
Messrs. Wells-yes, Zolezi- yes, Foor-yes, Teague-yes, Poss-yes, Stavalo-absent,  
Luttman-yes

Mr. Wells had to leave the meeting do to other prior obligations.  
Ms. Finn asked to recuse herself from the next application.

Mr. Barron: On to the next application

Application for Minor Subdivision with Bulk Variances  
Applicant: Nicholas and Kate Ortense  
Block: 1.318 Lot: 35, 37 & 38  
Property Address: 1309 Monmouth Ave  
Engineer: Kenneth Schlatmann, PE  
Case#2021-00271

Mr. Hock: Is the Applicant here?  
Mr. Schlatmann: No. He is not here.  
Mr. Barron: Is that possible.  
Mr. Hock: No. The applicant needs to be here.  
Schlatmann: I will call Ms. Ortense.  
Pause.  
Ms. Ortense is coming on.  
Mr. Barron: Thank you. Mrs. Ortense?  
Kate Ortense: Hi, how are you?  
Mr. Hock: What is the relationship to the applicant?  
Mrs. Ortense: He is my husband. He had an emergency with his aunt out of state in Vermont.  
Mr. Hock: We can accept that.  
Mr. Mullin: Can the applicant comment on the subject of whether the taxes are paid and the status of survey. Are they requesting waivers from these completeness requirements?  
Mr. Hock: Mr. Barron, will the Board make a Motion to waive the completeness items?  
No motion is made.  
Mr. Hock: Asked Mr. Mullin if he thought that there was enough information provided that the Board could hear the application.  
Mr. Mullin: Yes.  
Mr. Hock: Any motion to waive would just be to start the hearing.  
Mr. Barron: Does that answer any questions? Can we get a Motion to waive or not to waive the completeness items?  
Michele Zolezi made a Motion to Approve the Waivers, seconded by Ms. Todd Luttman.  
Roll Call Vote to Approve Waivers of Completeness:  
Mr. Barron-yes, Ms. Finn-abstain  
Messrs. Wells-absent, Zolezi- yes, Foor-yes, Teague-yes, Poss-yes, Stavalo-absent,  
Luttman-yes  
Mr. Hock: Swore in the Mr. Schlatmann.

Mr. Schlatmann: Credentials: Licensed Professional Planner in NJ. Moved to Pine Lake Park in 1982 and has been in Manchester ever since. He has been before this Board for Silverwoods and Manchester Plaza for Hovnanian.

Mr. Barron: Credentials as an expert are accepted.

Mr. Hock: You may proceed.

Mr. Schlatmann: The top portion of the plan shows the existing three (3) lots on Monmouth Avenue, east of Pemberton in Pine Lake Park. The largest lot has 125 ft. of frontage and the other two lots in the application have 25ft. and 50 ft. The Applicant is proposing to take 25 ft. from the larger lot with the existing home and consolidate it with the two smaller lots. The new lot would be developed. The Applicant is asking for relief from the existing non-conforming and would comply with all other front, rear and side setbacks. The existing non-conformities include the rear setback of 24.4 ft. for the principal structure where 26 ft. is required and the rear setback for deck, which measure at an 18 ft. rear setback. The rest of the application is conforming. The application will conform with the rest of the letter.

Mr. Barron: Any questions? None. Mr. Hock?

Mr. Hock: Deferred to Mr. Mullin.

Mr. Mullin: Asked about the ownership of lots 37 and 38.

Mr. Schlatmann: Yes. They were purchased by the applicant.

Mr. Mullin: He would have no objection to a waiver for the sidewalk but asked for comments regarding the fence encroachment.

Mr. Schlatmann: There is a 1 ft. fence encroachment and that he would advise the next door neighbor about her encroachment.

Ms. Ortense: Confirmed that is the neighbors' fence.

Mr. Mullin: Concluded his questions.

Mr. Hock: Are you aware that there are several open Notices of Violation on this property?

Ms. Ortense: Claimed that she worked it out with the Zoning Officer and have since complied.

Mr. Hock: He is here tonight. Would you agree to have compliance and the issue resolved prior to getting final subdivision approval as a condition of approval?

Ms. Ortense: Yes.

Mr. Hock: Applicant is agreeing to no Map being signed without compliance.

Ms. Ortense: Yes.

Mr. Barron: Opened to the public for questions and comments.

None.

Closed to the public. Any other comments?

Mr. Mullin: Is there are time limit on the violations?

Mr. Quinn: There is a Court Summons issued with a court date of 3/9/2022

Mr. Mullin: I defer to Mr. Quinn.

Mr. Hock: They would just never obtain resolution compliance and never have the subdivision perfected if they do not comply.

Motion made to approve Application #2021-271 for Minor Subdivision with Bulk Variances:

Michele Zolezi made a motion to approve the application, seconded by Mr. Todd Luttmann

Roll Call Vote to Approve Application#2021-271 for Minor Subdivision with Bulk Variances:

Mr. Barron-yes, Ms. Finn-abstain

Messrs. Wells-absent, Zolezi- yes, Foor-yes, Teague-yes, Poss-yes, Stavallo-absent,

Luttman-yes

#### ADMINISTRATIVE SESSION:

Mr. Barron: Called for a Motion to approve the Minutes from the December 6, 2021 meeting.

Motion to approve December 6, 2021 Minutes made by, James Teague, seconded by Timothy Poss

ROLL CALL: Chairperson Barron-Yes, Ms. Finn-Yes, Ms. Zolezi-Abstain

Messrs. Foor-Abstain, Teague-Yes, Wells-Absent, Poss-Yes, Stavallo-Absent, Luttmann-Yes

Mr. Barron: Called for a Motion approve the Minutes from the January 10, 2022 Reorganization meeting.

Motion to approve January 10, 2022 Reorganization meeting Minutes made by, James Teague, seconded by Felicia Finn

ROLL CALL: Chairperson Barron-Yes, Ms. Finn-Yes, Ms. Zolezi-Abstain

Messrs. Foor-Yes, Teague-Yes, Wells-Absent, Poss-Yes, Stavallo-Absent, Luttmann-Yes

Mr. Barron: Called for a Motion approve the Minutes from the January 10, 2022 Regular meeting.

Motion to approve January 10, 2022 Regular meeting Minutes made by, James Teague, seconded by Todd Luttmann

ROLL CALL: Chairperson Barron-Yes, Ms. Finn-Yes, Ms. Zolezi-Abstain

Messrs. Foor-Yes, Teague-Yes, Wells-Absent, Poss-Yes, Stavalo-Absent, Luttmann-Yes

#### PAYMENT OF BILLS:

Bill report given by Mr. Foor

We are in receipt of four invoices from Collier Engineering and Design total of 21 hours and an amount of \$3,629.87. We are in receipt of six invoices from Mr. Hock, ESQ for 7.4 hours and \$1,100.00. The total of the invoices is \$4,739.87. The services are in support of:

Project No.	Project
MCP001	General Planning Board Service
MCP023	TMR Enterprise Major Site Plan
MCP074	Preliminary and Final Site Plan for 2132 Route 37 (Two invoices)
MCP076	Preliminary and Final Site Plan and Major Subdivision -2065 Highway 37 (Two Invoices)
MCP0083	Amended Site Plan – Community Reform
MCP0084	Minor Subdivision – Ronald Raisin
MCP0085	Minor Subdivision - Nicolas Ortense (Two invoices)

The services are in support Correspondence; Application and Ordinance Review; Resolution Compliance and Preparation for and Attendance at Planning Board Meetings.

I find the charges to be reasonable and appropriate and recommend approval.

Motion made to pay bills by James Teague, seconded by Timothy Poss

ROLL CALL: Chairperson Barron-Yes, Ms. Finn-Yes, Ms. Zolezi-Yes

Messrs. Foor-Yes, Teague-Yes, Wells-Absent, Poss-Yes, Stavalo-Absent, Luttmann-Yes

#### PROFESSIONAL REPORTS:

Mr. Mullin: None.

Mr. Hock: No, just executive session.

Mr. Barron: Asked Mr. Foor about comments from the Environmental Committee- None.

Asked Ms. Finn if she had any comments? - None.

#### OPEN PUBLIC PORTION:

Hearing none. Closed public portion.

Mr. Hock: Announcement to the Public. We are going into executive session. When we come out of executive session there will be no business conducted. There is a separate link for the adjournment on the website, but this is really the end of the meeting.

MOTION TO ENTER EXECUTIVE SESSION: by Michele Zolezi, seconded by Felicia Finn.

ALL IN FAVOR

NONE OPPOSED

ENTER EXECUTIVE SESSION: 7:49 P.M.

MOTION TO ADJOURN: by Felicia Finn, seconded by Michele Zolezi.

ALL IN FAVOR

NONE OPPOSED

ADJOURNMENT: 8:19 P.M.

Respectfully submitted  
Amanda Kisty  
Secretary to the Board