Frank Sippel, Mayor
fsippel@townshipoflower.org

Kevin Coombs, Deputy Mayor
kcoombs@townshipoflower.org

Thomas Conrad, Ward 1
tconrad@townshipoflower.org

TOWNSHIP OF LOWER
2600 Bayshore Road
Villas, New Jersey 08251

Joseph Wareham, Ward 2
jwareham@townshipoflower.org

Roland Roy, Jr., Ward 3
rroy@townshipoflower.org

Michael Laffey, Manager
mlaffey@townshipoflower.org

LOWER TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD

A regularly scheduled meeting of the Lower Township Planning Board was held on July 16, 2026, the Lower Township Municipal Building. The meeting was called to order at 6:00 P.M. by Vice Chairman Chris McDuell. The Recording Secretary stated that adequate notice of said meeting was given in compliance with the Open Public Meetings Act of 1975.

MEMBERS PRESENT:	Chairman Michael Rosenberg
	Christina Lewis, Mayor's Designee
	Gunär Arenberg
	Steve Morris
	Anthony Vetrano
	Richard Roach/Alt I
	Alyce Parker/Alt II – Excused at 7:36 P.M.
MEMBERS EXCUSED:	Mayor Frank Sippel
	Marissa McCorkel
	Lindsey Selby
MEMBERS ABSENT:	Vice Chairman Chris McDuell
	Councilman Roland Roy
STAFF PRESENT:	Avery S. Teitler, Board Solicitor
	William J. Galestok, Board Secretary
	Patrick L. Wood, Recording Secretary
	William Cathcart, Board Engineer
	Kathryn M. Steiger, Planning Clerk

CORRESPONDENCE:

Handouts:

- List of Board Engineer Vouchers, dated July 08, 2026
- List of Board Solicitor Vouchers, dated June 16, 2026

Mr. Teitler read the agenda aloud for the benefit of the public, followed by advising the public on meeting procedures, rules, and process for each application. The instructions summarized how public comments are heard and conducted, noting that to allow for all public comments, a three-minute time limit would be imposed to address the Board. Mr. Teitler then advised that if the meeting is still in session at 9:00 P.M., any unheard applications on the agenda will be held over for the next month's meeting. At 9:30 P.M., the meeting will be adjourned. In the event an application is in the process of presentation, with no decision, it will also be held over for the next month's meeting.

1. Minor subdivision application for the creation of two (2) newly described lots. Submitted by Margaret A. Cragin for the location known as Block 500.07, Lot 9.04 and Block 500.05, Lot 1, 555 Nummytown Road & 620 Saxon Road

Ms. Margaret A. Cragin, applicant, was sworn in by Mr. Teitler.

Mr. Teitler explained the application, requesting approval for a subdivision that will create two (2) separate lots, has been reviewed by the Minor Site Plan Committee and approved, noting this qualifies as a By-Right subdivision.

Mr. Galestok advised that, per the Engineer's report, corrections to the survey are required prior to filing with the County. Ms. Cragin agreed to comply with the corrections.

Mr. Cathcart reported the survey lacks information, and will require review of the corrections, prior to production of the Mylars.

In response to Ms. Cragin's question regarding timing, Mr. Teitler advised there is a 190 Day time frame from approval.

This portion of the meeting was opened to the public. No comments were made from the public. This portion of the meeting was closed to the public.

Mr. Morris made a motion to approve the minor subdivision application, seconded by Mr. Vetrano.

VOTE:	Mrs. Lewis	YES	Mr. Morris	YES	Mr. Roach	YES
	Mr. Arenberg	YES	Mr. Vetrano	YES	Ms. Parker	YES
	Chairman Rosenberg	YES				

Motion approved.

The Board Solicitor will prepare a memorializing resolution to review and approve at the next scheduled meeting.

2. Minor subdivision and hardship variance application for the creation of two (2) newly described lots. Variance relief requested for lot area, lot frontage, and lot width. Submitted by GT Renovation LLP for the location known as Block 469, Lot(s) 5+6, 947-949 Carol Avenue

Mrs. Erika Lezama-Simonson, Esq., is representing the applicant.

At 6:07 P.M., due to a conflict of interest, Mr. Arenberg recused himself from the meeting.

Mrs. Lezama-Simonson presented an explanation of the project as follows:

The application is not for any bulk or use variances and will not cram an oversized home on an undersized lot. A single-family dwelling (SFD), constructed by the applicant, already exists on the site, which can attest to the quality, scale and impact to the neighborhood. Originally, two (2) 50x100 lots existed that were eventually merged into one 100x100 lot. The purpose of this request is to restore as originally created, enabling the construction of a small, modest home on the newly created lot. The project will comply with all bulk and setback requirements.

Mr. Todor Mitev, member of the applicant's LLC, was sworn in by Mr. Teitler.

Mr. Vincent L. Orlando, L.L.A., P.E., P.P., C.M.E., was sworn in by Mr. Teitler, and provided credentials, which were accepted by the Board.

Mr. Orlando testified that, originally, two (2) lots existed, which were merged into one (1) by law for adherence of minimum requirements of the zone. The existing SFD meets all bulk requirements, stating a concrete pad will be removed, if approved. A small, modest SFD is planned that mirrors the existing structure and will comply with all zoning requirements. The project fits well within the community.

Mrs. Lezama-Simonson submitted exhibits, reflecting the neighborhood, with most lot sizes of 10,000.

Mr. Orlando opined the project encourages appropriate use of land, with the general welfare enhanced, visually desirable, and more efficient use of land. Setbacks, etc., will be within compliance, with adequate air, light, and open space. There are no substantial detriments.

In response to the Board's question regarding lot sizes, Mr. Orlando testified there are 50x100 lots approximately two (2) blocks away.

Mr. Cathcart reported that neighborhood information was provided. No trees exist on the property. This presents as simply drawing a line down the center of the property for the subdivision.

The Board discussed historic timing of merging the lots, citing the possibility of the Loechner doctrine for rationale of the merger.

Mr. Galestok reported the County comments was acceptable, dated April 28, 2026. Fire Safety is acceptable.

Mr. Galestok advised the date of the merger is 1983, due to the township ordinance change.

This portion of the meeting was opened to the public. No comments were made from the public. This portion of the meeting was closed to the public.

Mrs. Lezama-Simonsen summarized the project will not harm the neighborhood, is not a detriment to the area, and requested approval of the application.

Mr. Galestok advised the new home should be indicated on the plan prior to filing. Mr. Teitler stated that would be a condition of the approval. Mr. Orlando agreed to create a separate plot plan for the proposed new lot and dwelling.

Prior to voting, Mr. Teitler provided a summary of the application and requested variances.

Mr. Morris made a motion to conditionally approve the minor subdivision and hardship variance application, seconded by Ms. Parker.

During the vote, the following Members gave findings of fact along with their decisions:

- Mr. Morris Decline Although a strong proponent of housing, the absence of other 50x100 lots in the area does not have a positive impact

VOTE:	Ms. Lewis	YES	Mr. Morris	NO	Mr. Roach	YES
	Mr. Arenberg	YES	Mr. Vetrano	YES	Ms. Parker	YES
	Chairman Rosenberg	YES				

Motion approved.

The Board Solicitor will prepare a memorializing resolution to review and approve at the next scheduled meeting.

3. Preliminary & final major subdivision application for the creation of eight (8) newly described lots. Submitted by Garry Gilbert for the location known as Block 422, Lot(s) 2.02+2.03, 225 Breakwater Road

At 6:30 P.M., Mr. Arenberg rejoined the meeting.

Mr. Andrew D. Catanese, Esq., is representing the applicant.

Mr. Joseph H. Maffei, P.E., P.P., C.M.E., was sworn in by Mr. Teitler, and provided credentials, which were accepted by the Board.

Mr. Garry Gilbert, applicant, was sworn in by Mr. Teitler.

Mr. Maffei testified the application request is to create seven (7) lots to construct single family dwellings (SFDs), and one (1) remaining lot to construct a duplex. The lots meet all zoning requirements. Public water and sewer will be available.

Noting these will be fully conforming lots, requiring no variances, Mr. Catanese requested Mr. Maffei comments on a variety of aspects applicable to this project regarding, but not limited to, the County report, Board Engineer comments, driveway configurations, extension to St. John's Avenue, and water basins. Mr. Maffei explained the water basin will be included on one of the lots, the cul-de-sac will filter east to Sheridan Avenue, the duplex will have a double wide driveway, drainage will not be on Shore Road. Mr. Maffei acknowledged a discrepancy between the presentation material and exhibits, noting a correction is necessary. Mr. Maffei clarified the length of the driveways will be 18 feet wide, not 12 feet, and were redesigned to avoid backing out onto Breakwater Road, and confirmed meets RSIS (Residential Site Improvement Standards). A revised Site Plan was submitted into evidence.

Mr. Cathcart reported that most comments on stormwater, access to county road, size of cul-de-sac, and fire hydrants were answered, noting no test for the diameter of the cu-de-sac, per the township's ordinance.

Mr. Galestok informed the Fire Safety report was acceptable and opined the cul-de-sac must comply to all regulations and/or ordinances.

Mr. Maffei responded to the following questions from the Board:

- Mr. Maffei clarified a shed on the property's border actually belongs to the neighbor, not the applicant.
- No variances are required, therefore, a housing "set aside" is not applicable

This portion of the meeting was opened to the public.

Below are members of the public, in attendance, and were individually sworn in by Mr. Teitler, followed by a summary of their testimony:

Mr. William Adams, resident of 229 Breakwater Road

Mr. Adams spoke with the applicant. Originally there was approval for three (3) homes, now there are eight (8) homes. Will trees be removed, which are leaning towards his property, and replaced with a privacy fence? Concern about backing out onto Breakwater Road, since there have been five to six (5-6) accidents, and would like to have the County reduce the speed limit to alleviate the issue. A neighbor had to move a driveway, due to the number of accidents.

Mr. Maffei noted any change to speed limits are handled by the County.

This portion of the meeting was closed to the public.

Prior to voting, Mr. Teitler provided a summary of the application, which is a unusual major subdivision, requiring no variances, essentially characterized as a "by-right" subdivision, subject to all requirements that will create eight new lots.

Mr. Morris made a motion to approve the preliminary and final subdivision application, seconded by Mr. Vetrano.

VOTE:	Mrs. Lewis	YES	Mr. Morris	YES	Mr. Roach	YES
	Mr. Arenberg	YES	Mr. Vetrano	YES	Ms. Parker	YES
	Chairman Rosenberg	YES				

Motion approved.

The Board Solicitor will prepare a memorializing resolution to review and approve at the next scheduled meeting.

4. Minor subdivision and hardship variance application for the creation of two (2) newly described lots. Variance relief requested for lot area, lot frontage, lot width, and side yard setback encroachment. Submitted by Marc Kelleher for the location known as Block 88, Lot(s) 19-22, 32 E. Pacific Avenue

Mr. Andrew D. Catanese, Esq., is representing the applicant, and stated that, due to a conflict, the applicant is unable to attend tonight's meeting.

Mr. Catanese summarized application and described the subject property, which is an oversized lot located in the Mainland Residential (R-3) Zone. The purpose is to subdivide into two 50x100 lots. The existing home will remain, requiring variances for area and width, due to the location of the structure on the lot, with the newly created lot having a 1.5 story dwelling constructed.

Mr. John E. Halbruner, AIA, was sworn in by Mr. Teitler, and provided credentials, which were accepted by the Board.

Mr. Halbruner reconfirmed Mr. Catanese's description of the subject property, noting the existing structure and single-family dwellings (SFDs) in the area. The Township of Lower was contacted to purchase the adjacent lot, however; no response was ever received. A modest 1.5 story dwelling is planned for the newly 50 x 150 lot. The intent is to keep the project consistent with the neighborhood, while also preserving the existing dwelling. Mr. Halbruner then submitted a neighborhood study into evidence of the surrounding lots, noting 37% are equal to/less than the proposed, 22% meet or exceed lot area. Half of the properties are the same size, with this project keeping in the context of the neighborhood.

Mr. Halbruner highlighted the variances requested, stating this advances C1 and C2, is an appropriate use of land, promotes general welfare, air, light, open space, is consistent with the surrounding area, creates a visually, desirable environment. The proposed dwelling is consistent with a modest building on a modest lot.

Mr. Catanese submitted conceptual renderings of a 1200 square foot dwelling, well within requirements, into evidence, with Mr. Halbruner reviewing the floor plan and restating this will be a small-scale home, consistent with the area. There are no substantial detriments to the Zoning Plan and/or neighborhood – the positives outweigh the negatives.

In response to the Board's question regarding area structures, Mr. Halbruner stated the most dwellings in the area are one (1) story, and is one (1) of the oldest sections of the township. Mr. Halbruner testified the general dimensions of the home will be approximately 1200 square feet, in response to Mr. Galestok's inquiry. This is not an exact style, and may have an optional fourth (4^{th}) bedroom, noting the drawings show three (3) bedrooms.

The Board and Mr. Catanese discussed the adjacent vacant lot, with Mr. Catanese restating written attempts, with the Township of Lower to purchase the lot, were unanswered.

Mr. Cathcart reported most questions were answered, non-existence of trees on the property, with the subdivision being relatively simple.

Mr. Galestok reported the Fire Safety report is acceptable, with the 06/03/2026 County comments waived.

This portion of the meeting was opened to the public.

Below are members of the public, in attendance, and were individually sworn in by Mr. Teitler, followed by a summary of their testimony:

Mr. Joseph P. Rinehold, Sr., resident of 42 East Pacific Avenue
Has been a resident for approximately 37 years. This will change the neighborhood, is significantly closer to his property, and is concerned about privacy. A second-floor window impacts privacy, has questions on setbacks, would like more information on height and locations of the windows, since it will direct effects to his property.

This portion of the meeting was closed to the public.

In summary, Mr. Catanese stated this will maintain the character of the neighborhood, keep the size of the dwelling consistent with the neighbor. A much larger, taller dwelling could be constructed, which is an under utilization of the lot, and would have a greater impact to Mr. Rinehold's property.

Prior to voting, Mr. Teitler provided a summary of the application request that included the variances and setbacks.

Mr. Arenberg made a motion to conditionally approve the minor subdivision and hardship variance application, seconded by Mr. Vetrano.

During the vote, the following Members gave findings of fact along with their decisions:

- Mr. Morris — Approved — Applicant made a very persuasive case
- Mr. Arenberg — Approved — Lots are oversized
- Mr. Roach — Approved — Previous comments stated

VOTE:	Mrs. Lewis	YES	Mr. Morris	YES	Mr. Roach	YES
	Mr. Arenberg	YES	Mr. Vetrano	YES	Ms. Parker	YES
	Chairman Rosenberg	YES				

Motion approved.

The Board Solicitor will prepare a memorializing resolution to review and approve at the next scheduled meeting.

At 7:13 P.M., Ms. Parker momentarily excused herself from the meeting.

5. Minor subdivision and hardship variance application for the creation of two (2) newly described lots. Variance relief requested for lot area, lot frontage, lot width, accessory lot coverage, and accessory rear yard encroachment. Submitted by Michael Popdan for the location known as Block 257, Lot(s) 14+15, 23 E. Wilde Avenue

Mr. Ronald J. Gelzunas, Jr., Esq., is representing the applicant.

At 7:15 P.M., Ms. Parker rejoined the meeting.

Mr. Gelzunas summarized the application, noting the intent is to retain the existing dwelling is undergoing major renovation. The intent is to leave the garage on the other lot and construct a single-family dwelling.

Mr. Michael Popdan, applicant, was sworn in by Mr. Teitler.

Mr. Paul Kates, P.E., P.P., C.M.E., C.F.M., was sworn in by Mr. Teitler, and provided credentials, which were accepted by the Board.

Mr. Kates described the property location and zone, noting a 750 square foot single family dwelling and 580 square foot garage on the lot. The purpose is to subdivide, retain the existing structures, and construct a 1050 square foot dwelling on the new lot. This will provide adequate light, air, and open space, population density. The new lot will require a coverage variance. Promotes general welfare and will be consistent and in character with the neighborhood. The existing structure is in disrepair and will be improved. There are many trees, vegetation, poison ivy, on the property, which will be cleaned up.

In response to Mr. Galestok's question on the garage, Mr. Popdan testified the garage is to remain, however; the kitchenette, water, and sewer have been removed, and will be used as a garage when renovated.

Mr. Galestok clarified that building coverage and accessory coverage do not get added together, therefore, the lot coverage variance is not applicable. Mr. Galestok advised a demo bond will need to be posted to remove the structure, if not completed by the Construction Official.

Mr. Cathcart reported the applicant has addressed most items, with the coverage issue now resolved. Subdivision is relatively simple.

This portion of the meeting was opened to the public. No comments were made from the public. This portion of the meeting was closed to the public.

Mr. Gelzunas summarized for the Board, noting the Board heard similar justification with other applications. This is the best option to preserve neighborhood by controlling houses sizes, reasonably priced, with a "win/win" result, rather than a radical change.

Prior to voting, Mr. Teitler provided a summary of the application and variances required.

Mr. Teitler agreed to Mr. Wood's recommendation to include conditions of the approval for a demo bond for the garage, and requiring the applicant to complete an Affidavit the garage will not be habitable.

Mr. Galestok reported the County waived comments and the Fire Safety report of May 13, 2026, was deemed acceptable.

The Board inquired if a violation would occur if the garage is found to be occupied. Mr. Teitler advised

Ms. Parker made a motion to approve the minor subdivision application, seconded by Mr. Vetrano.

During the vote, the following Members gave findings of fact along with their decisions:

- Mr. Morris Approved Good use of property

VOTE:	Mrs. Lewis	YES	Mr. Morris	YES	Mr. Roach	YES
	Mr. Arenberg	YES	Mr. Vetrano	YES	Ms. Parker	YES
	Chairman Rosenberg	YES				

Motion approved.

The Board Solicitor will prepare a memorializing resolution to review and approve at the next scheduled meeting.

At 7:36 P.M., the Board took a recess.

At 7:36 P.M., Ms. Parker was excused for the remainder of the meeting.

At 7:45 P.M., the meeting was resumed.

6. Preliminary & final major site plan, conditional use, and hardship variance application for the creation of an indoor recreational sports complex. Conditional use required for indoor recreation and hardship variance relief requested for minimum parking. Submitted by Aviation Sports Complex, LLC for the location known as Block 410.01, Lot 36

Mr. Ronald J. Gelzunas, Jr., Esq., is representing the applicant.

Mr. Gelzunas provided a brief overview of the application, which is seeking preliminary and final site plan approval for the complex, containing a "doomed" structure and welcome center for indoor recreational purposes.

Mr. Gelzunas stated to satisfy one condition of the application requires presentation to the Board and one small variance is required, which will be further explained in the business plan.

Mr. Teiter swore in the following applicants:
- Mr. Jaime Sutton, principal member of the applicant LLC
- Mr. Robert Buglak, principal member of the applicant LLC

Mr. Paul Kates, P.E., P.P., C.M.E., C.F.M., was previously sworn in by Mr. Teitler.

Mr. Sutton testified as follows:

The intent is to develop an indoor sports complex, with a dome that is approximately 100,000 square feet and manufactured by Broadwell Air Dome, which is globally active. The Dome is developed to withstand 160 MPH wind gusts, and carries a 100% safety rating. The engineer designs and installs the dome, which is approximately 400x250, with two air lock doors, approximately 15,000 square feet. Bath and locker rooms are planned, with food vendors, arcade, etc. Initial plans are 4:00 – 10:00 P.M. for soccer, basketball games, tournaments (e.g.: basketball, volleyball), multi-use hard core surface (pickleball, basketball, volleyball).

The proposed 300 spaces for parking are more than adequate, since in all likelihood, 150 spaces will be in use during an event. Research indicates that 12 volleyball courts generate 250 parking spaces. Further discussions with the Delaware River Bay Authority (DRBA) confirmed availability for an additional 150 spaces of overflow parking, when needed. This also enables walking to the event, rather than creating more traffic with shuttles. Staffing will handle parking and directing traffic to ensure usage and direct overflow. The website will also list ride sharing and approved spaces. There are no concerns for inadequate parking spaces.

Safety and security will be addressed via First Aid Staff, with medical staff on site, and in the Welcome Center. Emergency access into the Dome, wide enough for an ambulance, is planned.

Mr. Sutton stated there is a big need for this type of complex in the area, and will be a tremendous asset. This is further validated by numerous letters of intent received from local schools that include accommodations for Special Needs students, and sports organizations, expressing strong interest for access and usage of the complex.

In addition to visiting other sports complexes, Mr. Sutton advised the Board that various

CEO's and/or CFO's of similar companies were consulted during this process for guidance and best practices, planning, and budgetary purposes

Mr. Gelzunas and Mr. Sutton confirmed the lease has been approved by the DRBA and Cape May County for this project.

The Board, Mr. Sutton, Mr. Kates, Mr. Teitler, and Mr. Galestok engaged in a lengthy discussion on various issues summarized below:

- Mr. Sutton advised it usually takes six (6) months to manufacture the dome, with approximately three (3) months to construct. The Welcome Center and other site improvements (stormwater drainage, parking lot, etc.) will take approximately one (1) year to build.
- Development includes parking, storm water management, traffic pattern, a new primary access sight. Mr. Kates advised the intent is to keep everything on site and limit in/out traffic.
- The site can be used by the local schools, with a projected hourly fee of $350 for outside teams. Two/three fields are planned for soccer and volleyball.
- Initial discussions with Wildwood Convention Center are very positive, giving the opportunity to have more teams participate in sporting events.
- Public access for Lower Township Recreation Cener will be available, and the County would subsidize.
- Security staff for outdoor parking is planned and one security staff will be indoors. Training will be conducted to staff for incidents.
- Proposed hours of operation are 9:00 A.M. to 10:00 P.M., but will remain flexible, as some adult teams have expressed interest for later use. Mr. Galestok clarified that the Planning Board can limit the hours of operation and limit the types of recreation (e.g.: rides, games, etc). Weekend hours of operations are proposed from 9:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M., mainly for volleyball.
- Possibly use as a training site for the local police is an option.
- Field hockey and flag football team events are an option.
- Daily use by groups – i.e.: pickleball – will require structure outside of local schools. Possible clubs and/or memberships will be an option by "Pay-4-Play."
- The possibility of a weight room in the Welcome Center may be an option at a later date.
- Insurance is an issue for "pick-up" games. General liability insurance will be obtained.
- Spectator seating, via benches, will be available. Currently working with the company for multi-level seating, since space is lost when seating is installed. Some netting will be installed on one side.
- Storm Water Management is being addressed, due to requirement
- Parking will be free during the week, but charged on the weekends. Contact with area motels is in process for a shuttle service
- The Dome will be white, with an option of offering sponsorship logos on the material.

Mr. Kates testimony reconfirmed the location, placement of the Dome, size of the parcel, Industrial Zone identification, size of the Dome, Welcome Center, parking details, and options of having food trucks on site. Traffic concerns would not impact, with entrances for emergency vehicles. Fire hydrants are available, with trees cleared for parking.

Mr. Kates noted the uniqueness, since no traditional lot and block, or metes/bounds, are available. Parking is more than adequate. In conclusion, this promotes the general welfare of the community, with no negative detriments.

Mr. Gelzunas and Mr. Kates testified this is in harmony with other development. The County will deal with Breakwater Road for traffic. In response to parking for the buses, Mr. Kates advised that will be handled in the overflow area. Mr. Sutton also confirmed that based on planning/organization process, the number of expected buses will be known. There is adequate space for drop-off purposes.

For reference purposes, Mr. Sutton opined the Downingtown, PA facility is the most similar to this project.

Hours of operations were revisited, concluding a revised time frame from 7:00 A.M. to 10:00 P.M., were more appropriate.

Mr. Cathcart reported almost all items were addressed. In reviewing comments from previous concerns, one item is how to avoid traffic entering the back way and leaving. The storm water management will take care of itself. Mr. Sutton advised that staff will be positioned appropriately to avoid using other access. Mr. Cathcart stated this response satisfied the concern.

Mr. Galestok stated a June 3, 2026 Fire Safety report is acceptable. Mr. Galestok noted the UCC is approved by the State of New Jersey. The Cape May County report of July 14, 2026, notes a traffic study is required and a separate sheet illustrating the surrounding uses of the site.

This portion of the meeting was opened to the public. No comments were made from the public. This portion of the meeting was closed to the public.

Mr. Teitler noted that Ms. Parker would be precluded from future voting for this application, due to being excused from the meeting prior to this application's presentation.

Mr. Gelzunas concluded the only variance is parking, which was amply supported, via testimony. It is designed to be perfectly under control and the testimony fully supports the application. This is new to Lower Township, no other facility like this in the County, and provides benefits to Lower Township and all of Cape May County. Needs and benefits have been demonstrated.

Mr. Galestok clarified the parking variance (400-17) is a General Business overlay, which is a C Variance, not a D Variance. He further noted that a side yard setback variance is non-applicable.

Prior to voting, Mr. Teitler provided a summary of the application for a 1) preliminary and final major site plan approval; 2) Conditional use; and 3) Parking variance.

Mr. Wood inquired to include the hours of operation into the conditions.

Mr. Morris made a motion to approve the preliminary and final major site plan, conditional use, and hardship variance application, seconded by Mr. Vetrano.

During the vote, the following Members gave findings of fact along with their decisions:

- Mr. Morris Approved Parking is not an issue
- Mr. Arenberg Approved Consider charging for parking
- Mr. Roach Approved Great addition to the community
- Chairman Rosenberg Approved Improvement to the County

VOTE:	Mrs. Lewis	YES	Mr. Morris	YES	Mr. Roach	YES
	Mr. Arenberg	YES	Mr. Vetrano	YES	Chairman Rosenberg	YES

Motion approved.

The Board Solicitor will prepare a memorializing resolution to review and approve at the next scheduled meeting.

At 8:51 P.M., Mr. Teitler announced the meeting will conclude at 9:30. Agenda items, 7, 9, 10, and 11 will be held over until the next meeting. Unless there are changes, no further noticing is required.

7. Minor subdivision and hardship variance application for the creation of two (2) newly described lots. Variance relief requested for lot area, lot frontage, and lot width. Submitted by Robert Salasin for the location known as Block 236, Lot(s) 17+18, 125 Rose Lane

Mr. Charles W. Sandman, III, Esq., is representing the applicant.

Mr. Sandman summarized the application request, stating this is a minor subdivision that will create two 50x100 lots. The existing structures on the site will be removed.

Mr. Robert Salasin, applicant, was sworn in by Mr. Teitler.

Mr. Salasin stated that he intended to construct two (2) single family, Cape Cod style dwellings, approximately 1700 square feet, one on each lot. The planned dwellings are consistent with the neighborhood.

Mr. Arthur Chew, P.E., was sworn in by Mr. Teitler, and provided credentials, which were accepted by the Board.

Mr. Chew stated that both lots will not front on Rose Lane and will have sufficient off-street space for parking requirements. Mr. Chew affirmed the Cape Cod style of the structures.

Mr. Chew submitted A-1, an Aerial Zoning Analysis, into evidence. Referring to A-1, Mr. Chew stated that 50% of the lots in the study area are undersized from conformity. Mr. Chew stated that there would be no substantial detriment to the public good and that the proposal is a general benefit.

The Board inquired into where the driveways will be located. Mr. Chew stated that the corner lot's will be on Rose Lane, and the other will be on the interior.

Mr. Chew stated that no bulk variance relief is required.

The Board stated that there were some discrepancies regarding the setbacks on the plat. Mr. Salasin stated the plan will be corrected to reflect the correct setbacks and the six foot (6ft) setbacks will be set in between the proposed lots.

Mr. Cathcart referred to Deblasio & Associates Engineer Review letter dated June 16th, 2026. Mr. Cathcart stated that the application was a straight forward subdivision, with changes needing to be made to the plan that were brought up and agreed to during the hearing. Mr. Cathcart also stated that the corner lot building envelope will need to be corrected.

This portion of the meeting was open to the public.

Ms. Trina Forscinito, resident of 28 Glenwood Avenue, was sworn in by Mr. Teitler. Ms. Forscinito stated that the block in question was too small and the roads abutting were too narrow to accommodate denser development. Ms. Forscinito stated that two (2) houses are far too much for a crowded area, which is only this way due to the large number of seasonal rentals allowed by the Township. Ms. Forscinito further stated that the proposal was not great for public safety.

Ms. Christine Vilardo, resident of 124 Frances Avenue, was sworn in by Mr. Teitler. Ms. Vilardo stated that there is a school bus stop on this road and that Glenwood has multiple parking issues. Ms. Vilardo stated that the area has multiple native gardeners and that two (2) houses cannot provide more light, air and open space. Ms. Vilardo questioned if these structures would be rentals. Ms. Vilardo finished by stating her concerns over safety, green space, and impervious coverage.

This portion of the meeting was closed to the public.

The Board inquired if four (4) bedrooms on one (1) lot need more parking. Mr. Sandman stated that RSIS (Residential Site Improvement Standards) does not require it.

Mr. Sandman stated that the applicant cannot help the issue with other existing homes not having off-street parking.

The Board inquired if season rentals require variance relief? Mr. Wood stated that there are no restrictions regarding rentals within the residential zone. Mr. Teitler stated that there are no restrictions on property rights that this Board can impose.

Mr. Salasin attested that of the thirty to forty homes he has recently sold, none have been rentals.

The Board inquired into the number of stories the new structures would be. Mr. Salasin answered that they would be 1.5 stories.

Mr. Vetrano made a motion to conditionally approve the minor subdivision and hardship variance application, seconded by Mr Arenberg.

VOTE:	Mrs. Lewis	YES	Mr. Morris	YES	Mr. Vetrano	YES
	Mr. Arenberg	YES	Mr. Roach	YES	Chairman Rosenberg	YES

Motion approved.

The Board Solicitor will prepare a memorializing resolution to review and approve at the next scheduled meeting.

Mr. Vetrano made a motion to approve the Minutes from the meeting of May 21, 2026, seconded by Mr. Arenberg. Motion carried.

Mr. Vetrano made a motion to approve the Board Engineer vouchers, seconded by Chairman Rosenberg. Motion carried.

Mr. Roach made a motion to approve the Board Solicitor vouchers, seconded by Mr. Morris. Motion carried

Mr. Vetrano made a motion to approve the Resolutions from the meeting of May 21, 2026, seconded by Mr. Roach. Motion carried.

At 9:19 P.M., Chairman Rosenberg made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Roach. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Patrick Wood,
Recording Secretary

A verbatim recording of said meeting is on file in Township Hall.

THESE MINUTES HAVE NOT BEEN FORMALLY APPROVED AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE OR MODIFICATION BY THE PUBLIC BODY AT ITS NEXT MEETING. THIS BOARD WILL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY MIS-STATEMENTS, ERRORS OR OMISSIONS OF THESE MINUTES, AND CAUTIONS ANYONE REVIEWING THESE MINUTES TO RELY UPON THEM ONLY AT THEIR OWN RISK.