Township of Hillsborough – PLANNING BOARD
Approved Public Meeting Minutes

December 11, 2025

Chairman Carl Suraci called the Planning Board Regular Public Meeting of December 11, 2025, to order at 7:08 pm. The meeting was held in the Courtroom of The Peter J. Biondi Building. All stood for the flag salute.

NOTICE OF MEETING

Chairman Suraci announced the meeting has been duly advertised according to Section 5 of the Open Public Meetings Act, Chapter 231, Public Law 1975 ("Sunshine Law"). Notice of the 2025 Annual Meeting Schedule has been provided to the officially designated newspapers, the Township Clerk, posted on the Township's website and available at the Hillsborough Township Municipal Complex.

Application documents have been made available on the Township's web site https://hillsboroughnj.portal.civicclerk.com/ . Complete applications files are available in the Planning and Zoning Department for inspection, in accordance with the public meeting notice.

ROLL CALL

Present -	Mayor John Ciccarelli	Present -	Bruce Radowitz
Present -	Robert Wagner, Jr	Present -	Angelo Vitale
Present -	Committeeman Shawn Lipani	*Absent* -	Patricia Smith, *Secretary*
Present -	Robert Peason, *Vice Chairman*	*Absent* -	Surajit Deb (*Alt. #1*)
Present -	Carl Suraci, *Chairman*	*Absent* -	Jason Smith *(Alt. #2)*
Absent -	Jason Flagg		

Also in attendance: David Kois, PP, AICP, *Township Planning Director*; Samantha Ball, *Assistant Planner / Sustainability Program Manager*; Eric Bernstein, Esq., *Board Attorney (Eric M. Bernstein & Associates)*; Mark Mayhew, PE, CME, *Board Engineer (Pennoni Associates*); Michael Lombardozzi, CSR, CCR, *Board Court Reporter.;* Alex Pallis, *Township Videographer (Fuerza Strategy Group)*

CONSIDERATION OF MEETING MINUTES

- **July 10, 2025** regular meeting minutes were reviewed.
  Mr. Bernstein lists the members who are eligible to vote on the matter.
  A motion to approve as written was made by Mr. Wagner, seconded by Committeeman Lipani.
  No comments.
  Roll Call:

Yes -	Mr. Wagner	Yes -	Vice Chairman Peason
Yes -	Committeeman Lipani	Yes -	Chairman Suraci
Yes -	Mayor Ciccarelli		

  Motion carries

- **October 09, 2025** regular meeting minutes were reviewed.
  Mr. Bernstein lists the members who are eligible to vote on the matter.
  A motion to approve as written was made by Vice Chairman Peason, seconded by Committeeman Lipani.
  No comments.
  Roll Call:

Yes -	Mr. Vitale	Yes -	Vice Chairman Peason
Yes -	Committeeman Lipani	Yes -	Chairman Suraci
Yes -	Mayor Ciccarelli		

Motion carries

Executive Session Minutes

- **February 13, 2025** executive session meeting minutes were reviewed.
  Mr. Bernstein lists the members who are eligible to vote on the matter.
  A motion to approve as written was made by Committeeman Lipani, seconded by Mr. Wagner.
  No comments.
  Roll Call:
  Yes - Mr. Wagner
  Yes - Committeeman Lipani
  Yes - Chairman Suraci
  Motion carries

- **June 05, 2025** executive session meeting minutes were reviewed.
  Mr. Bernstein lists the members who are eligible to vote on the matter.
  A motion to approve as written was made by Mr. Radowitz, seconded by Mayor Ciccarelli.
  No comments.
  Roll Call:
  Yes - Mr. Wagner
  Yes - Mr. Radowitz
  Yes - Committeeman Lipani
  Yes - Mayor Ciccarelli
  Yes - Vice Chairman Peason
  Yes - Chairman Suraci
  Motion carries

- **July 10, 2025** executive session meeting minutes were reviewed.
  Mr. Bernstein lists the members who are eligible to vote on the matter.
  A motion to approve as written was made by Committeeman Lipani, seconded by Vice Chairman Peason.
  No comments.
  Roll Call:
  Yes - Mr. Wagner
  Yes - Committeeman Lipani
  Yes - Vice Chairman Peason
  Yes - Chairman Suraci
  Motion carries

- **December 4, 2025** executive session meeting minutes were reviewed.
  Mr. Bernstein lists the members who are eligible to vote on the matter.
  A motion to approve as written was made by Mr. Wagner, seconded by Committeeman Lipani.
  No comments.
  Roll Call:
  Yes - Mr. Wagner
  Yes - Committeeman Lipani
  Yes - Vice Chairman Peason
  Yes - Chairman Suraci
  Motion carries

Mr. Kois states for the Boards edification all executive session meeting minutes are now up to date. He anticipates remaining regular meeting minutes, Nov. 13, Dec 04 and tonight's meetings complete in January 2026.

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTIONS

- **None**

PLANNING BOARD BUSINESS

- **Resignation of seat #9, Patricia Smith (Board Secretary)** – effective January 01, 2026.
  Ms. Smith was unable to be present for tonight's meeting.
  Chairman Suraci wishes her well stating he appreciated her time & years of service and hopes the Board will able to recognize her in-person in the new year.

  Committeeman Lipani wishes her well stating she finished her time in the executive session; he thanks her.

- **Alert – Cyber fraud emails**
  Mr. Kois informs the Board they have received reports of some applicants, in the past week, receiving fraudulent emails posing as the Township's Planning / Zoning Department. He suggests the public and all applicants please be alert and review emails carefully, specifically checking the email address. He states the Township will never ask you to wire money.

Mr. Bernstein states for the record with regard to the approval of executive session meeting minutes, this does not make the minutes of executive session public. He states they discuss pending litigation matters.

- **Amended Sunnymead Landfill Redevelopment Area – Preliminary Investigation Report**
  Chairman Suraci states the matter is to be adjourned to the January 22, 2026, Planning Board business meeting, with re-notice.
  Mr. Bernstein states the reason for this was due to a noticing issue, having been published in the wrong paper.

CONSIDERATION OF ORDINANCES

- None

BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR *(public comment for matters not on the agenda)*
Chairman Suraci opens to comments from the public. He reminds of the rules, comments only no questions (there will be an additional period for questions), no comments regarding warehousing direct or indirect*, and there is a five-minute limit per person. He asks that each person state their name and address for the record.
(*warehouse-related comments and questions should be expressed during the designated public hearing portion of the meeting)

Maria Januick – 720 East Frech Ave., Manville (residence) / 2155 Camplain Road, Hillsborough (property owner)

- Ms. Janucik asks, considering ordinance 2024-16 why was the Glen-Gery applicant permitted to cut-down over 2,000 trees upon their settlement agreement.

Mr. Bernstein explained the applicant was able to get a waiver as part of an inclusionary affordable housing development.

- Ms. Janucik asks if affordable house settlement agreements allow applicants to bypass township ordinances.

Members of the Board confirm this understanding is correct, Chairman Suraci gives a recent example.

Mr. Bernstein explains the appellate and supreme courts have held that municipal ordinances which impact affordable housing developments cannot be used to stand in the way of such developments.

- Ms. Janucik asks in the case of Glengarry if this means they do not have to replace or replant any of the removed trees.

Mr. Bernstein confirms her understanding is correct, that it is state law and not a result of a decision from any township board. He recommends contacting local legislators to express her concerns on the issue.

- Ms. Janucik asks what the recourse is considering the possible flooding issues.

Chairman Suraci recommends contacting the office of Roy Fryman, the district NJ Assemblyman located in Hillsborough.

APPLICATIONS – PUBLIC HEARING

- **303 Amwell Road (JMJ4 ABEEL LLC) – File 21-PB-17-MSP(V)** – (TOD: 032-21-26 w/Ext.) – Block 198, Lot 2.03 (formerly Lot 2.B) – 303 Amwell Road (f/k/a as 301 Amwell Road). Revised Application 10-06-23: Applicant seeking preliminary and final major site plan approval; ~~'e' bulk variance~~; and design waivers, to construct an ~~85,348~~ 80,000 square foot industrial building with revised associated stormwater management, parking, lighting and improvements, on Property located in the CDZ, Corporate Development Zone. Adjourned from September 12, 2024 without further notice. ***Application adjourned from June 12, 2025 agenda without further notice.*** **APPLICANT PROVIDED AN EXTENSION OF TIME THROUGH MARCH 31, 2026 AND HAS REQURESTED TO BE ADJOURNED TO A DATE TO BE DETERMINED BY THE BOARD, WITHOUT FURTHER NOTICE.**

  1. Approximately 7:24 pm - start of hearing
  2. Mr. Bernstein explains for the purpose of the record that this is a property the township is in the process of attempting to acquire which has a proposal for a warehouse on it. Outstanding issues needing to be resolved are the reason for the extension.
  3. A motion to extend the time of decision through March 31, 2026 and be adjourned to a date to be determined without further notice was made by Mr. Radozwitz, seconded by Mr. Vitale.
     There were no further comments.

Roll Call:

Yes -	Mr. Wagner	Yes -	Committeeman Lipani
Yes -	Mr. Radowitz	Yes -	Vice Chairman Peason
Yes -	Mr. Vitale	Yes -	Chairman Suraci

Motion carries

4. Hearing began at **TIME FROM DK NOTES**
5. **Public's Name** – street address
6. Public's question
7. 7:26 pm end of hearing

- **<u>Dukes Parkway East LLC (Crane Farm LLC) - File 24-PB-11-MSPV</u>** *(Ref: 86-PB-05-SRV)* **-** (TOD: 12-31-25 w/Ext.) - Block 58, Lot 67.02 - 236 Dukes Parkway East. Applicants seeking amended preliminary and final major site plan approval (determined to be consistent with a minor site plan) to restore the landscape buffer area with a timber guiderail along the buffer area and install new trees and shrubs; to amend the approved 1986 site plan to designate the "shed" as an office with existing amenities; and seeking "c" bulk variance relief from the Hillsborough Development Regulations Ordinance Section 188-69.A, which requires a minimum 60' buffer for outdoor storage proposed on a nonresidential property abutting a residential building or zone, where a 25' buffer is proposed, on Property located in the I-2, Light Industrial Zoning District.

1. 7:26 pm start of hearing.
2. **Robyn Wright**, attorney for the applicant, introduces herself, describes the property, discusses the business on the property and lists their witnesses.
3. **James Mantz** is sworn in and states his educational and professional background as a professional engineer and land surveyor.
4. Chairman Suraci states the Board accepts the witness.
5. Mr. Mantz presents Exhibit A-1, a 1986 site plan last revised June 11, 1986 and was prepared by Richard P Russ PE. There is an "approved plan" stamp dated May 1, 1986 and a "received" stamp dated June 12, 1986. He describes the conditions on the site plan including the buffer to the rear.
6. Ms. Wright asks him to discuss the proposed modifications and proposed site plan last revised May 19, 2025.
7. Mr. Mantz reviews Exhibit A-2, site plan block 58 lot 67.02 tax map sheet 12 prepared by himself. He explains it is a one sheet site plan which includes but is not limited to a parking buffer at the rear of the property, 31 possible parking spaces and outdoor storage areas.
8. Ms. Wright asks him to address stormwater management comments on the engineer's memo dated November 24, 2025. She reads comments into the record.
9. Mr. Mantz discusses a mistake made in his initial calculations of the impervious area compared to the approved area, summarizes his conversation with Mr. Mayhew in which they agree 0.43 acres was an appropriate estimate and states he has a proposal on how to address the issues. He explains they are still below the allowable impervious coverage in the zone but they are beyond what was approved in the 1986 site plan. He discusses his proposal to reduce the impervious coverage.
10. Ms. Wright asks if he is proposing to reduce amount of impervious coverage so there is less than a quarter of an acre added then propose a stormwater plan to the satisfaction of the Board engineer.

11. Mr. Mantz states that is correct.
12. Ms. Wright submits Exhibit A-3, handing out copies to the Board, and asks Mr. Mantz if it shows further modification to the buffer to the rear where the residential properties are.
13. Mr. Mantz confirms and explains the areas where pavement would be removed and replaced with grass or other plantings and the buffer area expanded to 35 feet. He reviews the second sheet of A-3 which shows the expanded buffer and how roof leader drainage will be diverted to a drywell.
14. Ms. Wright asks if he has any issues with the tree mitigation comments in the memo.
15. Mr. Mantz states he does not, they will comply with items one through four.
16. Ms. Wright asks for him to address the lighting comments.
17. Mr. Mantz reviews where lights are located and states they would agree to replace some as areas were dark at their last visit. He recommends security lighting and upgrading lights to LED with shields.
18. Mr. Mayhew refers to the clear site triangle easements shown on the 1986 drawing which, according to the county, have no deeds. He states the county has requested a condition of approval for the easements to be filed and asks if the applicant will agree to the condition.
19. Mr. Mantz discusses the 'old style' of the site triangles and states before agreeing to the county's condition he suggests the site triangles be configured more appropriately in accordance with current standards.
20. Mr. Mayhew states since it is a county road he will refer to the county's preference but would like to ensure there is a condition of approval that the applicant will receive county approval, pursue it and adjust their plan to reflect the county's required easement.
21. Mr. Mantz agrees.
22. Mr. Mayhew states with regard to stormwater management they are comfortable with the applicant's revised suggestion in that they would remove the amount of impervious coverage required to remove based on the revised calculations to limited proposed increases to *less* than a quarter acre to what was previously approved. This would put them in the township's non-major stormwater management criteria. He requests a portion of the drywell include a perforated pipe or plastic arch product to provide clear area for inspection; a soil test done witnesses by his office prior to design; provide an appropriate design of the basin overflow.
23. Mr. Mantz agrees and states he will contact the Planning office when they do the testing.
24. Mr. Mayhew next moves to comments regarding landscaping and lighting stating his major concern is the lighting impact for adjoining neighbors, acknowledging the plans to provide cut-offs on existing lighting that does not have them.
25. Mr. Mantz confirms.
26. Mr. Kois asks if there will be someone providing testimony to the outdoor storage and any associated noise and if the conservation easement is being agreed to.
27. Ms. Wright confirms they are agreeing to the conservation easement and the property owners will be able to address outdoor storage issues.
28. There is a motion and second to open to public questions. All are in favor. Motion carries.
29. **Paul Bokowski,** Campbell Rd., asks, in relation to the size and shape of the property provided on the site plan, if plans have been developed for alternative locations for the current non-compliant outdoor storage.
30. Mr. Mantz says he has not.
31. **Mike Cullene**, Dickerson Rd, asks for clarification as to where storage is permitted under this ordinance 188-69A.
32. Ms. Wright explains storage is permitted as long as there is a 60 foot buffer.

33. Mr. Cullene states he read it ordinance to mean the buffer is only required on the sides and rear which then prevents it from being put in the front without a variance. He asks for a compromise, placing the storage in the front.
34. Ms. Wright explains the back is the appropriate location given the circulation and position of the buildings and they are proposing screening.
35. Mr. Cullene asks if her read of the ordinance forces the storage to the sides and rear of the property.
36. Mr. Mantz explains the areas that are not viable locations for the storage making the rear most appropriate.
37. Mr. Cullene has no further questions.
38. **Paul Canden**, Campbell Rd., asks what noises would be allowable upon approval of the variance, specifically hours of operation and kinds of noise.
39. Mr. Mantz defers to the property owners.
40. Mr. Bernstein reminds the public the questions are to be relative to the witness's testimony.
41. Mr. Canden has no further questions
42. Mr. Bokowski returns to the mic asking if the shed is currently on the property and was it approved in any prior site plan.
43. Mr. Mantz confirms it is currently on the property and was not approved on previous site plans.
44. Mr. Bokowski ask, if approved, if the shed sits inside the required 60 foot buffer.
45. Mr. Mantz states he believes it would be very close to the line but does not have the exact dimension.
46. Mr. Mayhew finds the shed on the site plan and estimates it is approximately 71 feet off the rear property.
47. Mr. Mantz agrees and states he originally found this shed by field survey.
48. Mr. Mayhew addresses the noise issue bring to the Boards attention that a 20-30-foot-wide landscape buffer is not going to have a significant effect on noise mitigation. He offers a suggestion of sound padded fence which PSE&G recently utilized at another Hillsborough location.
49. Chairman Suraci points out the property owners may not be the owners of the fence.
50. Mr. Mantz states the fence is on the adjoining property.
51. Mr. Bokowski asks the height of the proposed lights and will they clear the proposed landscape buffering.
52. Mr. Mantz states they plan to replace the existing lights with LED lights at no higher than 15 feet and explains the lights will have cut-offs and will shine to the ground and not out.
53. Mr. Mayhew states the planning office will review the lighting to ensure it is appropriate height, cut-off and elimination. He explains 'cut-off' means how it affects the throw of illumination.
54. Mr. Bokowski asks if they will take into consideration the residences are two-story and have second-story living.
55. Mr. Mayhew states no, they will make sure the lighting meets the ordinance criteria which does not take int affect what adjourning properties look like.
56. Mr. Bokowski has no further questions.
57. There are no further questions from the public.
58. **Russ Chelak,** property owner, is sworn in. He confirms he is the property owner and owner of Moy Handling Systems, one of the businesses located on the property near the front. He describes the business, its operations, hours of operations, number of employees and status of the building when his business moved in. He explains the power

set-up of the shed building. Mr. Chelak confirms the business is light-industrial, permitted in the zone on a commercial property which was commercial and had an existing site plan when he purchased it.

59. Mr. Mayhew asks, in regard to the publics' noise comments, if his operation currently stores material in the rear of the property.
60. Mr. Chelak confirms they store vans, low-test weights and low-test lifting beams. He offers to address the existing noise concerns and explains a previous tenant had several weeks of deliveries while their equipment arrived and speculates this may be the source of the back-up alarm complaints.
61. Mr. Kois asks questions pertaining to the size of the items he will be storing and if anything will be taller than the building and if so, how are those items moved.
62. Mr. Chelak states there is a trailer on wheels taller than the eight foot fence and the storage container and shed used by S&R. He explains the small size and horsepower of the fork trucks.
63. Mr. Kois asks what time of day items are moved by the fork trucks.
64. Mr. Chelak states generally a 15-to-30-minute time span in the morning or mid-afternoon.
65. Committeeman Lipani asks for clarification as to which building on the plan is his and if there is low activity at his buildings after the trucks have left.
66. Mr. Chelak confirms there will be no manufacturing on site, and they are a Monday through Friday operation.
67. Committeeman Lipani asks how they handle snow removal onsite.
68. Mr. Chelak explains they clear enough to get in and out and based on the current climate, the rest of the snow is melted within a couple days.
69. Chairman Suraci opens to public questions for this witness.
70. **Mike Cullene,** Dickerson Rd, asks if they would be utilizing the area (he points to an area on the site plan) with vehicles with backup alarms.
71. Mr. Chelak explains their storage area is separated from S&R and the area he is pointing to belongs to S&R. He states if he is referring to the glenade storage area they do not store material there either.
72. Mr. Cullene has no further questions.
73. **Paul Bokowski,** Campbell Rd, asks if they share any storage area with S&R.
74. Mr. Chelak explains their storage areas are separate.
75. Mr. Bokowski explains he has witness trucks idling creating noise and fumes and asks if their standard practice is to allow truck idling as he has experienced is the case currently.
76. Mr. Chelak states they do not have diesel trucks and all their trucks are state inspected for emissions.
77. Mr. Bokowski asks if he allows for the trucks to idle as they are loaded and unloaded.
78. Mr. Chelak confirms.
79. Mr. Bokowski asks if that is a permitted use in the zone.
80. Ms. Wright reminds they are not here to evaluate the current use reminding it is a light industrial zone.
81. Ms. Ball asks Mr. Chelak to clarify where his outdoor storage is on the property.
82. Mr. Chelak explains it is the area marked as 'concrete pad' on the site plan and the storage trailer.
83. Ms. Ball asks clarifying if it is the concrete pad that is 1,060 square feet and the storage trailer that is 310 sq. ft.
84. Mr. Chelak confirms.
85. Vice Chair Peason asks if this includes the 390 sq. ft. concrete pad by the silos.
86. Mr. Chelak states that pad is primarily an access for a double-width door.

87. Mr. Kois explains of the importance of determining where the outdoor storage is for enforcement purposes if the Board confirms the application.
88. Mr. Mayhew asks about the concrete pad labeled as 168 sq ft. in front of the masonry building, 'condo c'.
89. Mr. Chelak confirms it is also storage associated with his property.
90. Mr. Bokowski asks if the storage trailer is meant as permanent storage or will it be moved around.
91. Mr. Chelak explains that is its parking spot and can leave and return but has not been moved in eight years so he does not anticipate it moving any time in the near future.
92. **Marish Gravski,** Campbell Rd, is asking questions on behalf of his mother who could not be in attendance. He asks if, in the past few years, there have been any complaints from neighbors or municipal complaints about the disarray of the property.
93. Mr. Chelak states he is onsite daily from 7:00 am – 3:30 pm and has not had a single neighbor come by to complain. He states there have been complaints from the township which have been resolved.
94. Mr. Gravski has no further questions.
95. Mr. Cullene asks if, when planning for storage, was any consideration given to making room in condos B and C.
96. Mr. Chelak states there is no vacant room in any of the buildings and does believe indoor storage is an option.
97. Mr. Gravski asks if he would consider using storage space on the side while showing pictures taken from his parents' property.
98. Mr. Chelak reviews the picture, states it appears to be the neighboring lot and explains how it does not show his.
99. Mr. Gravski has no further questions.
100. Mr. Bokowski returns to the mic stating the neighbors would like to work with Mr. Chelak and so have come up with some alternative area options. He presents an image for Mr. Chelak to review and asks he can confirm a circled area on the image is his storage area.
101. Ms. Wright objects.
102. Mr. Bernstein marks the image as Exhibit P-1, asks him to provide a copy to the Board for review and suggests Mr. Bokowski and Mr. Chelak have a private conversation about the P-1.
103. 9:00 pm Chairman Suraci calls for a short recess.
104. At approximately 9:12 pm Chairman Suraci calls the meeting back into order.
105. Ms. Wright calls her engineer up to discuss Exhibit P-1.
106. Chairman Suraci reminds Mr. Mantz he is still under oath.
107. Mr. Bokowski asks, referring to exhibit P-1, if the area he circled in black is the current outdoor storage area for Mr. Chelak's business and if the area in red belongs to S&R Pools.
108. Mr. Mantz confirms.
109. Mr. Bokowski asks if each business will only use their respective storage area and will not be sharing.
110. Mr. Mantz confirms stating that is his understanding.
111. Mr. Bokowski asks if there are other alternative areas which can be developed in order to move the storage out from the view of the adjoining neighbors and placed on the other side of the building.
112. Mr. Mantz states there are other areas and explains why he believes they are not viable for the storage needed.

113. Chairman Suraci asks for clarification if the parking spaces visible on the plans will be used as storage.
114. Mr. Mantz explains the parking spaces are to show parking is possible if needed.
115. Chairman Suraci asks Mr. Kois if they will be required to delineate the parking spaces.
116. Mr. Kois confirms and expresses concern that there are other areas on the plan that have not been properly delineated.
117. Chairman Suraci asks if what is shown on the plan is the minimum required parking spaces.
118. Mr. Kois explains it may be sufficient on the plan but if they are testifying, they are going to use parking spaces for storage then they will be deficient in parking.
119. Mr. Mantz explains that they are not going to delineate those parking spaces but if they need them then they will delineate them.
120. Mr. Bernstein asks what the parking requirement is.
121. Mr. Kois states it will depend on the square footage and each of the uses.
122. Mr. Mayhew states the tabulation on the original site plan shows 29 spaces are required with a note stating 31 spaces, including two ADA spaces, are provided.
123. Mr. Bernstein asks, based on the testimony, which of the 31 spaces are being used as parking and which are proposed storage.
124. There is a discussion about the various parking spaces, how they appear and are delineated in the original plans, proposed site plan and Exhibit P-1.
125. Mr. Mayhew states his office was under the impression the proposed parking spaces would be used as such and asks if he missed information stating otherwise. He then finds note four which he reads into the record: "The parking spaces and directional arrows on this plan are only shown to indicate that sufficient parking spaces are available on this site. The spaces and arrows are not proposed to be installed at this time." Mr. Mayhew apologizes to the Board and to Mr. Kois' office stating his office missed that note and were under the assumption the plan being reviewed would be built.
126. Mr. Mantz explains when he prepared the site plan it was with the understanding the focus of the application was buffer in the rear, not to formalize parking.
127. Mr. Bernstein reminds once a plan comes before the Board everything is open for discussion.
128. Mr. Mantz states he cannot speak for his clients but believes they can work with not storing in the spaces shown as parking on A-3 and suggests a discussion with his clients.
129. Mr. Bernstein asks for A-3 to be brought on screen again.
130. Mr. Mantz explains the parking space difference between A-2 and A-3.
131. Ms. Ball asks him to clarify which parking spaces are "real" parking spaces as note four does not specify.
132. Mr. Mantz states there are no real parking spaces, nothing delineated. He explains in front of Mr. Chelak's there is an area where four cars can be parked and S&R tends to park some cars on the westerly side but none are delineated as parking.
133. Ms. Ball asks if the ADA space is usable by someone with mobility issues.
134. Mr. Mantz states it is "not existing".
135. Vice Chair Peason asks if P-1 is representative of the current condition and if not please explain.
136. Mr. Mantz states it is not; he believes the photo was taken when the tenant was moving out and the rectangular shapes and crane are no longer there. He states currently only pick-up trucks and vans are in that area. He explains how they are using the concrete pad to the left in the picture and the trailer as storage.

137. Mr. Bernstein suggests before the next application that the applicant provide the Board with a current picture similar to P-1 so they may determine the viability of P-1 versus the current condition.
138. There is a discussion about what the purpose of the new photo is and what needs to be visible.
139. Mr. Bernstein states the applicant's engineer should provide to Mr. Kois and Mr. Mayhew's offices, in advance of the next meeting, a site plan, not just a picture, that shows the current situation on the site.
140. Ms. Wright reminds they have already provided a survey of the current site conditions.
141. Chairman Suraci suggests adding additional dimensions showing the distances off the back.
142. Mr. Bernstein asks Mr. Bokowski when, where and by whom his P-1 was taken.
143. Mr. Bokowski states it is from Google Maps satellite image screenshotted this week. He does not know when the satellite image was captured but believes it was after 2005.
144. Chairman Suraci states this will help determine setback lines for some key components as they do not have any going to the proposed outdoor storage area and may be helpful to have some for the 60-foot mark.
145. Mr. Bokowski states from the public's perspective they would like to see alternatives developed.
146. Mr. Bernstein interjects reminding he has been permitted to introduce P-1 but this is the applicant's application, and this is not the time or place for discussion of alternate opportunities. He suggests Mr. Bokowski arrange a meeting with Ms. Wright and her client to discuss alternative options outside of this hearing.
147. Ms. Wright states they are open to working with and hearing the public's concerns. She notes that currently the parking lot is gravel and so 'not delineated' refers to the lack of lines.
148. There is a discussion about carrying to and scheduling the next hearing. It is agreed that Mr. Chelak will return.
149. Mr. Vitale states he has been researching the screenshot image and has determined, via backdating on Google Earth, the image is from August 2023.
150. Ms. Ball and Mr. Kois explain how to access the dating on Google Earth and that there are images showing the history of the property.
151. Mr. Bernstein reminds Google Earth is not a witness before the Board and cannot be a witness but Mr. Kois' office can deal with it accordingly.
152. Chairman Suraci asks if there are any further questions from the Board.
153. There are none.
154. Chairman Suraci asks if there are any more questions from the public.
155. Mr. Gravaski asks if there are any parking space that are currently marked.
156. Mr. Chelak states the lot is gravel so it is not possible to mark it with lines.
157. Ms. White asks Mr. Chelak if the area designated as parking on A-3 would be used for parking, not storage.
158. Mr. Chelak confirms.
159. Ms. White asks if P-1 is an aerial view of the property and does not reflect current conditions.
160. Mr. Chelak confirms.
161. Ms. White asks if the storage areas are the storage trailer and the concrete pad.
162. Mr. Chelak confirms.
163. Mr. Gravaski asks if it would be possible to pave or asphalt the parking area and line or number spots.

164. Mr. Chelak says no, he does not believe so.
165. There are no further questions from the public.
166. There is a discussion about scheduling.
167. Mr. Bernstein states all exhibits must be submitted to the Board by 10 days in advance of the selected meeting date.
168. Mr. Bernstein explains to the public that this application will not be re-noticed.
169. Vice Chair Peason informs the public that meetings and the agendas are published on the Township website.
170. **Motion:** A motion to carry the application to January 8, 2026, without further notice and time of decision extension to March 31, 2026 was made by Mr. Radowitz, seconded by Committeeman Lipani. No comments.

Roll Call:

Yes -	Mr. Radowitz	Yes -	Committeeman Lipani
Yes -	Mr. Wagner	Yes -	Mayor Ciccarelli
Yes -	Mr. Vitale	Yes -	Vice Chairman Peason
		Yes -	Chairman Suraci

171. Motion carries
172. 9:57 pm end of hearing.

Chairman Suraci thanks everyone for another great year. He states the Board's reorganization meeting will be on January 8, 2026.

Mr. Bernstein advises the Board they will be seeing ordinances at the beginning of the year they are required under the law to review and approve so the Township Committee can adopt it before March 15, 2026.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn was made by Committeeman Lipani, seconded by Mr. Wagner. Motion carries unanimously.
9:58 pm meeting is adjourned.

Submitted by Robyn Bittle-Abramo
Recording Secretary