MANCHESTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 29, 2025,
1 COLONIAL DRIVE, MANCHESTER, NEW JERSEY

The Regular Meeting of the Manchester Township Planning Board was called to order by Chairman, William Barron, at 6:15 pm on Wednesday, January 29, 2025.

A Salute to the Flag and Pledge of Allegiance was repeated.

This meeting has been advertised as required by the enactment of Sunshine Law.

ROLL CALL:

William Barron	Chairperson	Present
Felicia Finn	Vice Chairperson	Present
Timothy Umlauf	Mayor's Designee	Present
James Vaccaro	Council Liaison	Present
James Teague	Member	Present
Timothy Poss	Member	Present
Sandra Drake	Class II Member	Present
William Peck	1st Alternate	Absent
Joseph Coronato, Jr., Esq.	Board Attorney	Present
Mat Wilder, PE, PP	Board Engineer	Present
Nicholas Dickerson, PE, AICP	Board Planner	Present

MEMORIALIZATIONS:

Administrative Review
Property Address: 2100 Hwy 70
Block: 6 Lot: 1965
Applicant: M&T Bank
Case# PB-2024-19

Mr. Barron introduced the Resolution and stated that the Applicant was seeking to remove a walk-up ATM and install a drive-up ATM.

Mr. Coronato explained that the applicant was going to switch a teller window to a drive-thru ATM and install a new walk-up ATM.

Mr. Barron asked for a motion to approve. Ms. Finn made that motion, seconded by Mr. Vaccaro.

Roll Call: W. Barron-yes, F. Finn-yes, T. Umlauf- yes, J. Vaccaro-yes, J. Teague-yes, T. Poss- yes, S. Drake-yes; William Peck- abstain; Motion carries

APPLICATIONS:

1. Preliminary and Final Major Subdivision
   Property Address: 3086 & 3066 Ridgeway Road
   Block: 21 Lots: 1 & 2
   Applicant: Ocean Pond Realty, LLC
   Case # PB-2024-15

   Mr. Barron introduced the application and stated that the Applicant is proposing to subdivide the existing two lots into 18 new lots, including 17 residential lots and one surface basin lot.

   Mr. Coronato introduced Donna Jennings, Esq. as the attorney for the Application.

Ms. Jennings introduced herself and provided her credentials. She is an attorney with the Wilentz firm. She explained that the application was for a Preliminary and Final Major Subdivision, and they are before the Board to request minor deviations.

Mr. Coronato stated that the Notice of the Hearing was acceptable, and the Board can accept jurisdiction.

Ms. Jennings introduced the Applicant's engineer for the project as Yehuda Back, PE.

Mr. Back provided his credentials and stated his address as 176 Hillside Blvd, Lakewood NJ. He has been a licensed Engineer since 2017 and has worked in Ocean County. He received his Civil Engineering degree from NJIT. He started working for New Line in 2017. The Board accepted his credentials, and he was sworn in.

Ms. Jennings asked Mr. Back to confirm that he had been to the site, and he did.

Mr. Back stated that his firm prepared the plans. He introduced Exhibit A-1 as the existing conditions of the site. The property is located at 3066 and 3086 Ridgeway Rd. The property is 14.54 acres and located in the R-20 zone. He explained the orientation of the property on plans to the Board. He said that the property is surrounded by commercial and residential uses. He stated that water and sewer are available at Ridgeway Rd. with a sewer extension. He stated that there is an existing JCP&L easement on the property.

Mr. Back introduced Exhibit A-2 as the Layout and Dimensions of the project and is sheet 2. He explained that bulk variances are required. There will be 18 lots with 17 single family residential homes and 1 basin. Single family residential is a permitted use in the zone. Delos Place is the new road proposed, and it is proposed to have a 50' right of way and curbs and sidewalks on both sides.

Mr. Back introduced Exhibit A-3 as the minimum improvable lot area for lots 2, 4 & 5. The zone requires 11,200 SF of improvable lot area. Proposed lot 2 has 8,600 SF, proposed lot 4 has 8,900 SF and proposed lot 5 has 8,900 SF. They are corner lots with dual frontage and 40 ft. setbacks.

The Exhibits were corrected to A-6- Lot 2 Improvable Lot Area, A-7- Lot 4 Improvable Lot Area and A-8- Lot 5 Improvable Lot Area.

Mr. Wilder explained that the R-20 zone does not have an exception for corner lots like other zones do.

Mr. Back stated that lot 1.14 is a basin lot and is proposed to have 16,000 SF. The average requirement is 30,000 SF. The Lot width is 125 ft. They will adjust the lot line of lot 1.10. He stated that each house will have a drywell. To comply with the 100-year storm requirement, they will have an underground surface basin at lot 1.14. Lighting will comply with JCP&L. They are requesting a Waiver from a full EIS because there are no Environmental Constraints. There is water on Ridgeway Rd. Hydrants will be proposed. Sewer will be brought to the site by extension. Sight triangle and other easements have been met. They have submitted applications to all outside agencies. They have reviewed the technical review letter from Morgan Engineering and will comply with the comments.

Mr. Back entered the following exhibits:
A-3- Drainage Plan sheet 6 of 23
A-4- Aerial Overlay of the Site Plan
A-5- Color Rendering of what the project will potentially look like

Mr. Wilder said there was a correction to his letter for the driveway slope. As far as the stormwater design, he is concerned with the drywell. He asked if they had looked at what a conforming application would look like. Ms. Finn agreed with Mr. Wilder. Mr. Wilder said that the application would then be fully conforming. Mr. Umlauf said that they could join lots or leave them as open space.

Ms. Jennings stated that the applicant has a right to ask for relief.

Mr. Wilder asked if the drywells were designed for 100-year storm. He has not been provided with anything to show that the basins are large enough. The current stormwater management requirement is excessive, and the applicants professionals should meet with the Town about it.

Mr. Umlauf said that he has an issue with approving the application with conditions.

Ms. Jennings said that the applicant is not going to get building permits without meeting the conditions.

Nicholas Dickerson referred to his November 5th letter and asked about the dual frontage on Shorin way being gone. Mr. Back said that there is a gap and there is no frontage on Shorin Way. It is private property and is about 5-10 ft.

Ms. Finn asked if they are proposing trees or shrubbery along Shorin Way for privacy. Mr. Back said that they were not as of right now. It does not back up to a backyard, only to a side yard. Mr. Dickerson asked if there were no connections and Ms. Jennings said no. Mr. Finn asked if in between Shorin Way and the last lot, they do not touch? Mr. Back referred to Exhibit A-4. Mr. Coronato explained the lots to Ms. Finn. Mr. Umlauf asked if the stormwater easement would affect them putting up a fence. Mr. Wilder said that they would have to enlarge the easement or put the easement a foot off the property line to be able to put up a fence. Mr. Umlauf said that if they wanted to put up a fence it would be 15 feet in the rear yard. Mr. Wilder, Mr. Umlauf and Mr. Coronato spoke more about the fence.

Mr. Coronato explained that they are trying to make the neighborhood as functional as possible. He asked if they were able to eliminate one lot, how would it affect the development. He also asked if they were able to eliminate two lots, how that would affect the development. Mr. Back said that he does not know what that would improve. Ms. Finn stated that she felt that the applicant is creating their own problem.

Ms. Jennings stated that the MLUL provides a right to ask for a variance because all property is unique. Mr. Back stated that if they shaved the lots on Exhibit A-4, it would not help with stormwater management with the new regulations. They would end up with oversized lots. Ms. Finn asked how much and Mr. Back stated that they would increase to 31,000 SF. Mr. Wilder stated that it would allow them to create a basin and avoid all the easements in the back and the application would comply. Ms. Finn asked why they would not comply if there was a way to not need a variance. Mr. Umlauf agreed. Mr. Coronato said that the Board would like to see the elimination of one lot. Ms. Jennings said that she would talk to her client.

Mr. Barron and Mr. Coronato called for a 5-minute recess at 6:51 p.m. Mr. Barron called the meeting back to order at 7:05 p.m.

Ms. Jennings stated that she could not reach her client and that they would like to carry the application to be able to talk with her client. They still want to hear the public comment. Mr. Coronato said that they can still do public questions for the engineer and the traffic engineering testimony.

Mr. Barron asked if they had smaller handouts for the Board members and Mr. Back and Ms. Jennings said they did.

Mr. Barron asked if they could get water. Mr. Back said that they are talking to public works. Mr. Barron stated that they will need a will-serve letter.

Mr. Coronato stated that he would like to see a surface basin. He said it might eliminate some concerns, and it would save money.

Mr. Barron asked if there were any more questions from the Board.

Mr. Umlauf asked if they talked with Jackson and he also asked what happens if they cannot get water. Mr. Wilder said that they would have to come back before the Board for an amended approval.

Mr. Teague asked if the project involved Renaissance Blvd. for ingress and egress and Mr. Back said that it did not.

Mr. Barron opened for questions of the engineer to the public.

Alice DeVito of 2016 Fourth Ave was sworn in. She asked to confirm that there will be 17 single family residential homes and asked if they would have garages. Mr. Back confirmed both. Ms. DeVito asked if there would be basements and Mr. Back said that he is not sure. Ms. DeVito asked what improvable lot area was and Mr. Back explained that it is what can be built on a lot. Ms. DeVito asked if a recreation area is proposed and Mr. Back said that he is not sure. Mr. Wilder said that they are not proposing that. Ms. DeVito asked if there is an HOA and Mr. Back said yes, but that it was just for maintenance of the basins, and there would be no clubhouse.

Kathy Neary of 14 Ascott Lane was sworn in. She asked about access to the properties because it looked like it could be accessed by Renaissance Blvd. She wanted to know if the access would only be on Ridgeway and Mr. Back confirmed that the only access in on Ridgeway Rd.

William Foor of 3101 Wilbur Avenue was sworn in. He stated that he has concerns with Stormwater Management. He said that there is significant water ponding in the area of lots 16.705 and 16.706. Mr. Coronato asked Mr. Foor to show the Board, and he did that. He said that Wilbur Avenue floods constantly and that there is a high-water table. The previous owner let them know that the area is wet all the time. He said that they did not do borings at the high water table. He asked if they did calculations for that runoff and Mr. Back said they had not done calculations from Wilbur. Mr. Foor said that the water table is very high and that he had to install French drains in his basement. The 18-inch perforated pump was bubbling over and flooding onto lot 17.104. Mr. Back stated that it would only be in case of failure. Mr. Foor said that the only failure would be clogging. Mr. Foor stated that both properties are going to have water in their basements. He asked if there could be a performance bond posted to prevent and address that.

Mr. Wilder said that there is a limit of offset runoff, and he would like to see the offsite topography. Mr. Foor said that the flow is very much down that way. There is a significant amount of water. Wilbur drainage is a significant issue. He has to maintain flood insurance. He stated that the backing up of lots 103, 104 and 106 is directly onto the easement. He asked if decks would be allowed into the easement. Mr. Back said that JCP&L asked if they would include this and account for that. Ms. Jennings said that there would be deed restrictions. Mr. Foor asked if the easement could be extended to the west. Mr. Back said that is included in the easement and cannot be cleared.

Mr. Foor stated that the Board made other applicants do full EIS statements in the past.

Margaret Marranca of 6 Fawnhollow La was sworn in. She said that she has a question about the water issue that Manchester Township has. She is under the impression that the Township is maxed out. She wants to know where the water would come from for this project. Mr. Coronato explained that there is a recently approved development down the road, referred to as the “Parkwood Square” project, that is extending infrastructure from Jackson Township that will benefit this application.

Richard LaReau of 5 Shorin Way was sworn in. He states that when they bought the property 24 years ago, the property next door was an antique shop. He showed the Board on the map where the land with pine trees and brim are where the fire hydrant is. He said that that is his land. He asked if the applicant realized that the existing line of trees’ root system will be adversely impacted by the proposed project. Mr. Back said that he is not sure yet because he has not been back there. Mr. LaReau asked if the applicant is proposing any trees or shrubs and Mr. Back said not at this time. Mr. LaReau said that there is a water issue on Wilbur that causes ponding on several lots in the area. He is surprised that a lot more is not Wetlands because it is wet all the time. He said that the drainage against Ridgeway and the applicant's road will be right next to the county basin. Mr. Back said that they must do mandatory mounding analysis, and they have been in touch with them. Mr. LaReau said that the builders of Morgan Court were very upfront about the size of the houses and the price. Mr. Back said that they will be 5 to 8 bedroom homes. Mr. LaReau said that the homes on Morgan were 3500 SF.

Joe Markowski of 103 Eleanor Rd was sworn in. He asked if the development has a name. Mr. Back said, "Ridgeway Estates." Mr. Markowski asked if the water for the project would be tied into Parkwood and not a whole new pipe to Jackson and Mr. Back said yes. Mr. Markowski asked if there is a way we measure how much water is pumped through. Mr. Wilder said that it is a lot monitor that the state has. The Bureau of Safe Drinking Water statement monthly reports are all available online.

Mr. Barron closed the public questions for the Engineer.

Mr. Wilder asked how long the new road is proposed to be. He asked if it is in excess of 1200 ft. because the property is in CAFRA zone, but does not need a CAFRA Permit, unless it is triggered by a road longer than 1200 ft. Mr. Wilder said it looks like the proposed road is 1700 ft. Mr. Back said yes, maybe it is.

Ms. Finn said that the Board wants to see a full Environmental Impact Statement.

Mr. Wilder said that they did an abbreviated EIS, but there is a potential for high ground water and he would need to see the offsite topography to make sure.

Mr. Barron asked if the Board could ask for a full EIS and Mr. Wilder said that the Board has requested that before on smaller projects. Mr. Barron said that it is impacting a lot of areas around it and they think the applicant needs to provide an full Environmental Impact Statement. Ms. Finn and Mr. Umlauf agreed.

Mr. Umlauf asked if there is anything that could be done within the JCP&L easement and Mr. Back stated that it can be used for passive recreation. Mr. Umlauf said that the owner would only be able to utilize 10,000 Sf of the property but will pay taxes on the full lot.

The Board and professionals spoke freely about what could be done broadly within the JCP&L easement.

Ms. Finn asked Mr. Wilder to explain the CAFRA permit issue. Mr. Wilder said that the CAFRA requirements are different for every property, and they depend on where the property is in reference to the water line, as well as whether they have a road or sewer. Mr. Coronato said that it would be a condition of approval that the applicant would need to obtain CAFRA approval if required.

Ms. Jennings called up John Rea, PE, traffic Engineer, for the applicant. He was sworn in. His credentials were accepted by the Board. Mr. Rea has provided testimony to this Board on many occasions. Mr. Rea stated that he prepared the traffic study and the GAP study.

Mr. Rea explained the location of the project and said that there is the Ridgway Blvd intersection to the North and the Rt 70 intersection to the South. It is in between the traffic signals. He performed an old traffic study and a new one. It is a very busy road. He said that in peak hours in the afternoon, there is a 56 second delay. There would be approximately 6 trips in the peak afternoon hours. At that time, the level of service would be an F. That does not mean failure, it just means more than 50 seconds. He said that he would explain why they were asked to provide a GAP study. They performed it at 3:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. in the evening. They measured the gaps in the north and south bound traffic. The flow periodically provides gaps. You would need a gap of 7 seconds to get out of Ridgeway Rd. Between 3 and 4 p.m. there were 66 gaps. Between 4 and 5 p.m. there were 60 gaps and between 5 and 6 p.m. there were 95 gaps. All of these gaps were over 8 seconds and many of them were 15-16 second gaps. He said that the sight distance is good there. The County will require a sight triangle. They had thought about potentially have two cul-de-sacs, but from a traffic perspective a P design is better. There would only be one point of access to the development and loop system is better for emergency vehicle access.

Mr. Barron asked about the time of the study. Mr. Rea said that it was at 3:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. on June 27, 2024 and January 27, 2024. Mr. Barron asked if it was done in the morning as well. Mr. Rea said yes and that the morning is not an issue. In the PM hours there were 1871 vehicles and in the morning hours there were 1433 vehicles. He does the counts on weekdays. It is a little more fitting with traffic zones on Ridgeway.

Mr. Finn asked Mr. Wilder if he found that acceptable. Mr. Wilder asked Mr. Rea where the studies were done. Mr. Rea said two where done from the right lane and 1 was done at the left turn lane. Mr. Wilder asked if there would be a left turn lane and Mr. Rea said that there would not be. Mr. Wilder stated that the 95 gaps during peak hours would lessen the burden. Mr. Barron asked if they would be designating a right turn lane and Mr. Rea said no because it is not required.

Mr. Umlauf said that he drives it every day and it is frequently back up to the Renaissance light or the Ridgeway Liquor light. Mr. Rea said that it is not standard but it can happen occasionally.

Mr. Barron opened to the public for questions of the traffic engineer.

Alice DeVito of 2016 Fourth Avenue came up again. She asked if Mr. Rea did the traffic study including the proposed development with potentially 7-10 residents per lot because they are 5–8-bedroom homes. Mr. Rea said that it is usually more children not of driving age.

Richard LaReau came back before the Board and asked why the traffic study is not online. Ms. Kisty said that she puts most of the documents up on the website for convenience for the residents, but it is not required. The documents are always available for review at Townhall and he could always call and ask questions if he needs to.

Mr. LaReau said that he has an issue with safety because there are a lot of accidents.

Mr. Wilder said that the Township is limited in their purview of review because Ridgeway is a County Rd.

Mr. Rea said that it is not unusual for a major signalized intersection to have a lot of accidents. Mr. LaReau said that it is not usual for the amount that occurs there now to happen. Mr. Coronato said that you must keep in mind that there is going to be development because it is permitted. The Board has limited say and they have to work with both the residents and the applicants.

Mr. Lareau said that he understood. He asked if the executive order for the government workers to return to work cause more traffic. Mr. Rea said that he does not think so. Every developer in Ocean County pays a traffic impact fee that goes toward traffic improvements.

Mr. Foor came before the Board again. He asked if Mr. Rea did the traffic study in June and the GAP study in January and whether he thinks that is accurate and Mr. Rea said that it is pretty comparable and does not impact the GAP.

Mr. Barron closed questions from the public of the traffic engineer.

Ms. Jennings stated that this would conclude their testimony until she has an opportunity to consult with her client.

Mr. Wilder said that the applicant needs to provide offsite topography, a full-blown Environmental Impact Statement and a revised plan that eliminates one lot.

Ms. Jennings also reminded them of the jurisdictional determination from CAFRA.

Mr. Coronato asked Ms. Jennings to see if her client will agree to a basin to avoid the 50 ft. easement and Ms. Jennings agreed to ask.

Mr. Coronato carried to the application to the March 3rd meeting of the Planning Board without the requirement of re-noticing.

Mr. Lareau asked why they do not have to send a new notice and Mr. Coronato explained that they do not have to because a public announcement at the hearing is ok by law.

Mr. Barron asked for a motion to carry the application to the March 3rd meeting with no requirement to re-notice. Ms. Finn made that motion, seconded by Mr. Vaccaro.

Roll Call: W. Barron-yes, F. Finn-yes, T. Umlauf- yes, J. Vaccaro-yes, J. Teague-yes, T. Poss- yes, S. Drake-yes; Motion carries

ADMINISTRATION SESSION:

Mr. Barron called for payment of the bills.

Mr. Umlauf read the billing report into record:

We are in receipt of (4) invoices from Colliers Engineering, totaling $1062.50 and 5.75hrs and (1) from Morgan Engineering totaling $240.00 and 1.00hr in total combined $1,392.50 & 6.75hrs. The services are in support of:

Project No.	Project
MTPB24-014	Crestwood Village
MCP0106	Ocean Pond Realty, LLC
MCP0107	3250 Wilbur LLC
MCP0104	Parkwood Square
MCP0109	2582 Ridgeway LLC

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

Mr. Umlauf found the charges to be reasonable and appropriate and recommended approval.

Mr. Barron asked if there were any questions from the Board. There were none.

Mr. Barron asked for a Motion to pay the Bills.

Mr. Vaccaro made that Motion and Ms. Drake seconded that Motion.

Roll Call Vote: ALL IN FAVOR
NONE OPPOSED

Approval of September 3, 2024 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Barron called for a motion to approve the September 3, 2024, meeting minutes.

Ms. Finn made that Motion and Mr. Vaccaro seconded that Motion.

Roll Call Vote: ALL IN FAVOR
NONE OPPOSED

Approval of October 7, 2024 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Barron called for a motion to approve the October 7, 2024, meeting minutes.

Mr. Vaccaro made that Motion and Mr. Umlauf seconded that Motion.

Roll Call Vote: ALL IN FAVOR
NONE OPPOSED

PROFESSIONAL REPORTS:

Mr. Barron called for professional reports.

Mr. Coronato asked Mr. Barron to come back to him.

Mr. Wilder said that the County needs to look at traffic.

Mr. Dickerson announced that the first visioning meeting for the Plan Endorsement took place this month. There will be an additional outreach session in approximately 30 days. This is an opportunity for the public to chime in on what they would like to see.

Mr. Coronato said that there is an Ordinance for the Board to review. Ordinance 25-01- AN ORDINANCE OF THE TOWNSHIP OF MANCHESTER, COUNTY OF OCEAN, STATE OF NEW JERSEY, AMENDING VARIOUS SECTIONS OF CHAPTER 245 OF THE CODE OF THE TOWNSHIP OF MANCHESTER. This has to do with the overlay zone laid out over much of Manchester. At the November meeting we removed much of that. The areas now included in the ordinance were left out accidentally and the Township would like to add them to the areas to remove the overlay zone.

Mr. Wilder said that this would remove the donut hole portion that is left.

Mr. Barron called for a vote to approve the Ordinance change.

Ms. Finn made that motion without comment, seconded by Mr. Umlauf.

Roll Call: W. Barron-yes, F. Finn-yes, T. Umlauf- yes, J. Vaccaro-yes, J. Teague-yes, T. Poss- yes, S. Drake-yes; Motion carries

OPENED TO THE PUBLIC

There was no public comment.

MR. BARRON CLOSED PUBLIC PORTION

Mr. Barron asked for a motion to adjourn, Mr. Vaccaro made that motion, seconded by Mr. Umlauf.

ALL IN FAVOR, NONE OPPOSED.

ADJOURNMENT: 8:13 p.m.

At 8:14 p.m. the Board returned back on record to announce that there would be no February meeting because there is nothing on the agenda.

The Board Adjourned again at 8:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Amanda Kisty
Amanda Kisty
Secretary to the Board