ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MEETING MINUTES
April 24, 2025, AT 7:00 P.M.

Mr. Reisinger called the meeting to order by reading the following statement: "As Presiding Officer of the Colts Neck Zoning Board, I hereby declare that the notice requirements of the law has been satisfied by prominently posting a notice of this meeting on the Township Bulletin Board, and that there has been transmitted a copy of said Notice to the Asbury Park Press and the Two River Times and that a copy is on file in the office of the Township Clerk. This meeting is a quasi-judicial proceeding. Any questions or comments must be limited to issues that are relevant to what the board may legally consider in reaching a decision and decorum appropriate to a judicial hearing must be maintained at all times. I further order that this public announcement be placed in the minutes of this meeting.

Salute to the Flag:

Roll Call:

PRESENT: Resinger, Farrell. Buzzetta, Maguire, Mahoney, Nicoletta, Yodakis.

ABSENT: Dnistrian (unexcused), Kornbluh (arrived late)

ALSO PRESENT: Timothy Anfuso, P.P., and Ryan Amberger, Esq of Montenegro Law.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

None.

RESOLUTIONS:

None.

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS:

Appointment of Secretary to the Zoning Board of Adjustment: Krista Hill-Kane.

Motion to appoint Krista Hill-Kane as Zoning Board of Adjustment Secretary.

OFFER:	Farrell
SECOND:	Reisinger
AFFIRMATIVE:	Reisinger, Farrell, Buzzetta, Maguire, Mahoney, Nicoletta, and Yodakis.
NEGATIVE:	None

No minutes for approval; March and April minutes will be reviewed for May meeting.

APPLICATIONS: Old Business

ZB2046 Attamante _ Block 7.25, Lot 1 – 4 Mulberry Lane

Application to construct Rear porch (12' x 39.5'), rebuild upper deck (16' x 18') and resurface lower deck (17' x 12') in the A-2 Zone. Variances are required to permit a building separation of 10 feet where 20 feet required and 6.3 feet currently exists, a principal building coverage of 7.2% where 6.6% is the maximum permitted and a total lot coverage of 24.8% where 20% is the maximum permitted and 23.7% currently exists. Time to June 9, 2025.

Applicant continued under oath; exhibits A1-A7 previously entered; new exhibits are A8 which includes an updated Zoning Review from Mr. Tim Anfuso dated April 15, 2025.

Mr. Anfuso, in your packets tonight is a new Zoning Review dated April 21, 2025 as the Attamonte's, their contractors, and Mr. Anfuso were engaging in alterations to update the plans for an agreement on coverage numbers. The proposed lot coverage is now 23.4% where 23.7% currently exists and 20% is maximum permitted.

Mr. Amberger entered A9 into exhibitis, Zoning Review dated April 21, 2025.

Mr. Attamonte reviewed the plans. Rebuilding upper deck, resurfacing lower deck, and building covered structure over the patio adjacent to deck and house. We were previously exceeding building coverage so we have reduced the covered structures under the 6.6% and now the two non-conforming are the distance from the pool at 6.3' as we are improving to 10' and the total lot coverage we were previously proposed exceeded but now we are planning to return some spots on the driveway to green space to reduce that coverage.

Mr. Anfuso was sworn in for comment.

Mr. Anfuso noted the red area in the driveway is being removed, the width of the porch in the back is reduced to 9.5' down from 13'which brings the total building coverage into compliance.

Chairman Reisinger asked if Mr. Anfuso had any concerns.

Mr. Anfuso noted the most recent revisions were an overall improvement in the current situation.

Chairman Reisinger opened for questions to the public; no questions posed.

Chairman Reisinger appreciated the considerations made to begin addressing the board to review and noted to Mr. Attamonte his options once the board had updated, he could ask for a vote or a deferral to come back next month.

The board echoed the appreciation of considerations and noted the distance was still a consideration but since the Fire review had passed with no comment the improvement to the space would be noted.

Mr. Anfuso recommended that the driveway be removed prior to the issuance of certificate of occupancy for the new porch addition. Normally this would be required to remove prior to a permit but in this instance the amount of space is so small it would be up to the board.

Chairman Reisinger noted the board would follow normal protocol and require the removal.

Mr. Amberger asked if there was a voter eligibility list from the last meeting to which Mr. Anfuso confirmed there was.

Motion to approve ZB2046 Attamonte.

OFFER:	Maguire
SECOND:	Nicoletta
AFFIRMATIVE:	Reisinger, Maguire, Nicoletta, Yodakis.
NEGATIVE:	None

Chairman Reisinger wished the Attamonte's luck with their project.

APPLICATIONS: New Business:

ZB2048 Carroll: Block 29.06, Lot 5 – 14 Williamsburg North
Application to construct one-story rear addition and one-car attached garage. In the A-1 zone. Variances are required to permit proposed front yard setbacks of 91 feet where 97.75 feet is required; proposed side setbacks of 40'3" and 29'4" where 59.35 feet are required. Time to July 23, 2025.

Mr. Amberger noted Mr. Steib had reviewed and catalogued the exhibits as follows:
A1 Application of Thomas Carroll dated 3/13/25
A2 Survey prepared by Charles Surmonti dated 5/31/2011
A3 Architectural Site Plan and Floor Plans prepared by Parallel Architectural Group dated 1/13/2025
A4 Zoning Review by Township Planner, Tim Anfuso dated 1/29/2025
A5 Board of Health dated 3/31/25
A6 Board of Fire Council dated 3/25/2025
A7 Aerial Photo of Subject Property

Motion to accept application ZB2048 Carroll.

OFFER:	Nicoletta
SECOND:	Reisinger
AFFIRMATIVE:	Reisinger, Farrell, Buzzetta, Maguire, Mahoney, Nicoletta, Kornbluh, Yodakis.
NEGATIVE:	None

Chairman Reisinger requested the applicant and/or their representatives to step forward to begin testimony and be sworn in.

Mr. Thomas Carroll of 14 Williamsburg North was sworn in by Mr. Amberger.

Mr. Thomas Carroll thanked the board for being invited to speak. Mr. Carroll explained that he and his wife have been in their current home for 14 years and request the addition of a master suite and the addition of the garage. Mr. Carroll noted he and his wife love the town and their home, however they will be in their 80s this year and the addition of the master suite will make living in their home at their age possible. Mr. Carroll noted he and his wife, Barbara, have been happily married since 1971 and in December of that year they welcomed their first child, a 1971 Datsun 240z, which has been well cared for over 50 years and the new garage addition will allow all of their primary vehicles to be stored in addition to the Datsun.

Chairman Reisinger opened for public comment; none were noted.

Chairman Reisinger noted a concern noted in the Board of Health review for the septic and bedroom requirements to which Mr. Carroll noted they would be reducing the bedroom count to by removing the current smaller bedroom's closet as they utilize this space as a den, and it will ultimately leave the bedrooms at the same count as current with the addition.

Mr. Anfuso was sworn in and addressed the board.

Mr. Anfuso noted the main concern was the 90' rule. He noted you extend the minimum side lots street right of way and draw a baseline to connect, and measure 90* off that baseline to the widest portions of the house. The house and the street line are not parallel and this is why the skewed line with the 90' rule measuring from the front lefthand side of the house to the back right hand corner to the rear.

Mr.Anfuso continued, the house was preexisting nonconforming when the 90' rule was adopted, the house is already 102' wide which calls for 48' side set backs. By adding the garage addition, they're increasing the 90' rule to 112'9" down from 102'3" and this is making the preexisting nonconforming side setbacks more nonconforming, and the increase will make the front setbacks nonconforming due to the increased in setbacks from the 90' rule.

Chairman Reisinger asked if there was a residence adjacent to their lot, Mr. Carroll confirmed. Chairman Reisinger asked if there were further questions for the applicant, no questions were noted and the Chairman addressed each board member for comment and consideration.

No concerns were noted, Chairman Reisinger noted that Mr. Carroll could ask for a vote which could pass or be denied, if denial the applicant would need to start over. Chairman Reisinger asked Mr. Anfuso for any considerations of approval to which there were none. Chairman Reisinger noted the Board of Health considerations for the applicant.

Motion to approve application ZB2048 Carroll.

OFFER:	Buzzetta
SECOND:	Nicoletta
AFFIRMATIVE:	Reisinger, Farrell, Buzzetta, Maguire, Mahoney, Nicoletta, Kornbluh, Yodakis.
NEGATIVE:	None

Chairman Reisinger wished Mr. Carroll and the project well.

ZB2047 Colts Neck General Store: Block 30, Lot 14 – 171 Rt. 137

Application for Use Variance and Site Plan Waiver to raise the roofline on residential section to make a full second story to create a bedroom, office, and full bath with 8' ceilings. Variances are required for an expansion to a nonconforming use; proposed 2nd story has 59' principal front setback where 75' is required; proposed 2nd story has 13' of principal side setback where 20' is required. Time to July 28, 2025.

Mr. Amberger noted Mr. Steib had reviewed and catalogued the exhibits as follows:
A1 Zoning Review by Township Planner Tim Anfuso dated 9/21/2023
A2 Project Description with Elevations and Floor plans prepared by architect Robert A. Cooke dated 8/2/2023
A3 Variance Application dated 9/18/23
A4 Board of Health dated 4/21/2025
A5 Report of Fire Dept dated 4/21/2025
A6 Report of Planner Anfuso dated 4/16/2025
A7 Aerial Photo of Subject Property

Motion to accept application ZB2047 Colts Neck General Store.

OFFER:	Farrell
SECOND:	Buzzetta
AFFIRMATIVE:	Reisinger, Farrell, Buzzetta, Maguire, Mahoney, Nicoletta, Kornbluh, Yodakis.
NEGATIVE:	None

Richard C. Sciria partner with Hanlon Niemann & Wright, P.C and represent the applicant Mary Pahira, who is the lessee of the Colts Neck General Store. We are here today for multiple variances, the purposes are to raise a roofline to renovate bedroom, office and full bath with 8' ceilings in the 2nd story. The applicant is not seeking to create or add any rooms, it is really for structural improvements and repairs to the property the applicant is making no changes to the footprint of the property.

The expansion of the preexisting nonconforming use, this Store has been in existence for who knows how long and the B3 zone this is a mixed use commercial and residential on the top. The renovation increases the mass and volume of the structure due to the roofline being raised. We are here today to request the D2 variance for these repairs to be made. There is also a D4 variance floor area to ratio variance that needs to be approved since the renovations increase the size of the 2nd floor area by 95 sq ft strictly due to the renovations. The FAR maximum permitted under the ordinance is 0.15 where 0.232 currently exists; the increase will be to 0.238 with an increase of 0.006 to the FAR.

Additionally seeking site plan waiver approval under the township ordinances. The footprint is not going to be touched and the soil/ground is not going to be disturbed simply renovating the 2nd floor for safety issues and improvements. There are no effects to the items of the development

regulations. There are numerous preexisting nonconforming variances in the main building that have been preexisting and technically we have to apply for those.

We will have the following witnesses: Mary Pahira, applicant, and Colts Neck General Store lessee and owner of the business. Robert Downey is the contractor who is going to be doing the renovations and Ed Oneil who will be doing our architectural planning. I am ready to call my first witness if the Board is ready.

Mary Pahira was sworn in for testimony.

Mr. Sciria began speaking with Ms. Pahira. He requested the name of the property owner, Glenn Asher and asked her involvement. Ms. Pahira noted she and her family, husband and 2 kids, have lived their for the last 8 years and run the General Store. We are here today because of the structural issues with the upstairs, if you're outside you can see the wall upstairs bowing out. The building is 176 years old and balloon framing, and safety and structure need addressed. We are currently living all in the downstairs bedroom because there is no proper fire escape route which means the windows.

Ms. Pahira continued noted last August they reinforced the foundation for considerations to renovations that would come in anticipation of the updated weights.

Mr. Sciria, interjected, to clarify if Ms. Pahira lived at the property? She confirmed. And you lease from Mr. Asher, the owner of the property. Correct. Ms. Pahira was asked to explained a bit about the layout of the property to which she confirmed the first floor has the business and the back section has the residential and the 2nd floor has rooms where the renovations are needed. And just for preliminary on the application, you have the permission of Mr. Asher to proceed to which Ms. Pahira confirmed he had signed off and helped complete required paperwork.

Mr. Sciria revisited the motivation for the renovations to which Ms. Pahira noted it is primarily a safety concern, specifically for fire risk for her family and young children. She noted that the wall is visibly coming out when you are standing in the parking lot you can see the structure is not sound. Mr. Sciria noted 8 different photos that would be passed around for the board to review to show the renovations and relate that to the images that Ms. Pahira took April 23, 2025.

1st photo, the front of the store no changes.
2nd photo, where the little window is before the roof comes out to the right will have the roof line raised.
3rd and 4th photo, showing the wall bowing out indicating the structural concerns which are part of the repair.
5th photo, again focusing on the wall bowing out.
6th photo, backside of the building and will be impacted by the raised roof line. The windows in the 2nd floor indicate where the children's bedroom will be renovated for safety egress.
7th photo, image faces neighbor's house to show the roof line. Mr. Sciria asked if anyone passing by would notice the changes to the aesthetic of the store driving by. Ms. Pahira noted that it is not going to be an obvious change and that the renovations will match the current colors and siding.

8th photo, side view from back end with another angle.

August 2024 the foundation was completed in anticipation of making the renovations, all permitting had been received which Ms. Pahira confirmed. If approved by the board, when do you plan to start the work to which Ms. Pahira noted as soon as possible. Mr. Sciria confirmed that Ms. Pahira has a contractor, Mr. Robert Downey, prepared to do the work and he is present for the meeting.

Mr. Sciria asked if there were any considerations from the Board of Health or Fire for considerations that need to be completed to which Ms. Pahira said no.

Chairman Reisinger asked the board if there were questions for Ms. Pahira.

Mr. Kornbluh asked what other exterior changes would be made which Ms. Pahira showed on the photo images to note the roofline extension and that it would match current building.

Mr. Reisinger asked if the public

Kedar Phadke was sworn in by Mr. Amberger.

Mr. Phadke noted he shares a driveway and supports Ms. Pahira's application and believes the plan is an improvement. Chairman Reisinger asked for any additional comments from the public to which there were none. Chairman Reisinger thanked Mr. Phadke and Ms. Pahira.

Mr. Sciria called Mr. Downey for testimony.

Robert Downey was sworn in by Mr. Amberger.

Mr. Sciria asked who employed Mr. Downey to which he explained he is self-employed. Mr. Sciria asked him to describe his profession to which Mr. Downey noted he was a builder with over 40 years of experience and an actively licensed and bonded and insured general contractor. Mr. Downey noted they do small commercial jobs, build houses and complete a lot of home additions. Mr. Sciria confirmed that Mr. Downey is familiar with the application and plans to which Mr. Downey noted he was and that they had been the contractor for the foundation renovations as well, changing timber to steel for support.

Mr. Sciria asked if application was approved would Mr. Downey be completing the project? Mr. Downey noted as long as Ms. Pahira wanted him to work it. Mr. Sciria asked Mr. Downey to describe the renovations needed.

Mr. Downey discussed the foundational renovations that began in the basement, Ms. Pahira had hired an engineer. The rest of the structure, the residence and general store merge together and in the corner where they merge there is a concern with bowing wall. The balloon framing is creating the issue and the remedy is believed to be cutting the wall, plate it there so it is more traditional framing which would also add a fire block. When discussing it was apparent if a 5' wall is being revisited they should work it into a full 8' wall which allows more space. Mr.

Downey referenced A1 that the space is not utilized as you would hit your head, addressing the full wall gives more use. A3 shows that we are working to, as Mary said, stretch the building. It's more so in the front upper elevation, it would be doubtful to be seen from that front view but on the back side you can see how much is going to go up as the existing is noted with the proposed. The cedar shake, in red, is going to be continued and by the time the project is completed, you would not know anything had been completed.

Mr. Sciria asked how the renovations would help safety concerns. Mr. Downey noted it's a very old building and after seeing the issues in the basement, the structure changes from the foundation to the replacement of the existing balloon framing will prevent the bowing of the wall. Mr. Sciria asked if this would help with fire safety as well? Mr. Downey noted that the renovations will allow doors up on the 2nd floor renovation which allows for an exit. Additionally on the other side not shown in the elevation plans, they would install fire rated sheeting and hardyboard to help prevent fire spread.

Mr. Sciria asked how long the project was estimated to take to which Mr. Downey noted approximately three months which would involve a day or two of elements that would impact maybe four parking spaces and would put caution tape and guidance for how anyone could to the front door. A reconfiguration of the existing space, no additional bedrooms or bathrooms. Mr. Downey welcomed questions from the board.

Chairmain Reisinger revisited the subterranean structure work had been completed and satisfied, Mr. Downey confirmed they had been completed and the Fire inspections are completed.

Board Member, clarifying that the net difference on the roofline raising is 3'. Mr. Downey confirmed that currently it's roughly 5' and to redo that space they do not have the ability to put proper headers so the entire section would need to be removed and without raising the roofline the 3' there would be no way to install a proper egress window.

Mr. Anfuso asked if he were to drive by during construction, what would he see? When you look at east elevation you can see the two new 2nd story windows and railing whereas right now the 2nd story has a knee wall and then the roofline. Is just the roof coming off and the knee wall?

Mr. Downey explained that yes the roof and knee wall would be removed but the floor would stay. They would go over the cut of the knee wall to correct the balloon framing and plate it out. The 2nd story would be flat with no cantilevers and staying flush with the façade. Mr. Downey noted that if you did not go by for 3-4 months the next time you come through you may not even realize the change.

Board Member, all of the bedrooms will have egress doors or egress windows which confirm with regulations after the proposed renovations? Mr. Downey confirmed they would then conform. Board Member also asked Mr. Anfuso if the request would still conform with height regulations, Mr. Anfuso confirmed it would be conform.

Board Member, you mentioned increasing fire separation from the neighboring property. What is the type of fire separation from the general store now to the residential area?

Mr. Downey, in between the structures we will have to do something. The drawings are preliminary, and we will work with the architect to address.

Mr. Amberger swore Mr. Anfuso in.

Mr. Anfuso, looking at the survey of the property The General Store is basically at the property line. The section of the 2nd story will be maintaining 13' from the property line, I am unsure if the 2nd story will have to get fire rated since it is over the 5' from the property line. I don't know if the Building Department will make them do something on the first story for fire stopping.

Board Member clarified a use separation and not necessarily fire separation was what he was interested in, and we could address while reviewing.

Chairman opened for additional comments or questions; none were noted.

Mr. Sciria introduced Mr. O'Neill, and Mr. Amberger swore in Mr. Edward W. O'Neill Jr.

Chairman Reisinger noted Mr. O'Neill has appeared before the board in the past and asked if there were questions regarding his credentials. No questions or clarification was requested.

Mr. Sciria asked Mr. O'Neill if he was aware of the application being discussed, to which he confirmed. Mr. Sciria further requested Mr. O'Neill to walk through the variances/use variances required for this application.

Mr. O'Neill began his review by noting the application is requesting to increase the usable square footage on the 2nd story on the residential area of the property. Raising so that the ceiling height is above head height for code so that the spaces can be used, adjusting to make safety code improvements as well as fire and structural improvements due to the building's age.

The additional square footage really has to do with taking an irregular plan and making it regular so structurally things will need to align between 1st and 2nd floor because currently all you have is a finished attic and the roof is bearing on the outside wall and the walls are inset and not bearing any weight, they're just partitions. Once the roofline is raised, that is where the 95 square feet comes in. There is no increase in the building footprint, but it will increase the FAR because of that 95 sq ft.

Mr. O'Neill continued, this is a mixed-use building in the B-3 zone and that is not allowed, however the building is 176 years old and predates the ordinance. Typically, when this building was built, in the area with a store you lived behind or above it, this is the leftover of a bygone area and there is nothing the applicant is doing that is making the existing situation worse.

The variances because requested are the expansion of preexisting non-conforming use, the FAR issue which involves that 95 square feet, the front setback is 59 feet where 79 is required and this is for the existing first floor and nothing is changing, the side setback is 13 feet where 20 is required and again this is the first floor. The first floor is on the property line, and the second

floor is the 13' back and no change to that. There are no exterior changes proposed, the new changes are on the raised roof.

Mr. O'Neill continued, in the Master Plan the goal of the area is to create retail that serves the farm population and that is not changing. The Store does provide those services, and the use variances justifications are what believe to be consistent with the Master Plan. The residential component is preexisting both to Master Plan and Zoning Plan. The expansion is de minimus and the increase in FAR will not perceptually be noticed from outside the building, this is a bulk issue. There are no changes to the footprint and no proposed site improvements; no further violations to the setbacks. The building is iconic to town and the building will look at how it looks and continue as it always has.

Mr. O'Neill stated he doesn't believe granting the D variance would upset the Zoning Plan or Master Plan. I believe the changes are purely functional and I could constitute these as for a hardship as the 2nd floor is not safe and that, with the wall bowing, I'm unsure it's structurally safe. The balloon framing is a real concern, it's one of the funny things in the building code where if they just wanted to replace sheetrock they would be required and compelled to fire block what Mr. Downey is talking about doing and the Fire and Building Departments will not allow that fire threat.

Mr. O'Neill noted the C variances, C1C by reasons of extraordinary or exceptional use situations and it is that safety concern. C2 the application advances the preexisting historic conditions, again nothing is changing perceptually the positive criteria is appropriate to the Master Plan, visually the changes are desirable and will not create a big contrast and will require repainting to make the building all mesh together. I feel that's an improvement specifically to Point J that notes the preservation of historical sites and districts should be promoted.

Negative criteria again no footprint change, no grading change, no drainage change, no perceived bulk change, the two setbacks are preexisting and wont change, the historic character will remain essentially unchanged, the preexisting uses over a long period of time are promoted within the building code and state master plan as being good things, the FAR increase de minimus and wont be apparent to do, and again the use exists longer than any of us have been around.

Mr. Sciria requested discussion on the applicants' request to waive the site plan. Mr. O'Neill noted that if you compelled an engineer or architect to do the site plan, it would be as build as it would just be joining what is there because nothing is changing. Mr. O'Neill does not believe the expense, time and review would be unnecessary when nothing changes.

Mr. Sciria and your recommendation is that none of those items in the development regulations would necessitate an engineer/architect to develop a new site plan? Mr. O'Neill noted the only one that would even apply is the height which we're under and it does affect the FAR. Mr. Sciria noted he had no more questions.

Chairman Reisinger asked if there were any comments or questions for Mr. O'Neill, none were noted.

Mr. Sciria noted he has no further witnesses and kindly requests the application be approved. He believes the testimony speaks for itself, the neighbor in favor as well, and requests the application be approved as requested.

Mr. Anfuso noted he would like to go over his April 16th letter before closing.

Chairman Reisinger asked if there were any comments or questions regarding this application with the audience, none were noted.

Chairman Reisinger requested Mr. Anfuso to walk the board through the recommendations.

Mr. Anfuso noted the first variances, for the D variances, have received plenty of testimony for discussion from Mr. O'Neill. The second deals with site plan waivers, the ordinance envisions the board of adjustment to waive a site plan when it finds the proposal does not noticeably effect the item set forth in the development resolution to be considered as part of site plan approval" that is the quote from ordinance, and the standard that the board is supposed to be reviewing for.

Then Mr. Anfuso notes his letter includes the history of the project, which notes the expansion of the parking lot into lot 15, which is Kedar's property who provided testimony earlier. Notices of violations went out, the owner of The General Store and lot 15 at the time were related they came in with a joint application to improve the whole parking lot and construct a 5000 sq ft office building. They basically took an asphalt parking area and brought it up to today's standard which included lighting, landscaping, pavement and parking lot striping. This note was not to say it's worth doing that on this application because the scope of this application is so much smaller with only increasing the floor area by 95 sq foot. The comment does call out to the Board that hey an opportunity exists here, is there a level of improvement to the parking lot area to bring it closer to today's standards which included a couple of suggestions: pavement repair, parking lot resealing and striping, and trash enclosure since the dumpster currently sits in open air. Any type of modest improvement that keeps with the request being made.

Mr. Sciari noted a comment on the action of litigation between neighboring properties. Part of the stipulations of that settlement on February 2019, there was an amendment to the parking easement and provides for certain repairs in a maintenance fund for billable construction to those repairs. Mr. Anfuso noted this is a private agreement between the properties and that his comments are specific to the parking on the property's subject.

Mr. Anfuso noted comment 3, the handicap stall is not currently signed and should be brought up to ADA standards as it's a federal violation for applicant protection. Comment 4 notes no complete site plan review was conducted; comment 5 the project fronts on Monmouth County 537 and request a waiver to make sure the county has no interest in the project. Comments 6 and 7 are just standard comments, environmental commission didn't report, Board of Health noted any addition of bedrooms they'd need to review, Fire Official had no comment, and that there would be a contribution to the affordable housing fund prior to the issuance of a CO.

Chairman Reisinger asked for clarification on whether comment 5 is a requirement or only if the board notes it's a conditional of approval to which Mr. Anfuso noted he is going to make it a

requirement either way due to recent considerations of other applications which the county has been involved, Mr. Anfuso noted he does not have jurisdiction to approve something on behalf of the county and wants to see a no interest letter or confirmation from the county.

Chairman Reisinger noted when non-conforming applicants historically come before the board it does provide an opportunity to make the properties more conforming, not to jump through hoops but I see no issue with requiring parking lot detail to include ADA compliance and in my experience some of the parking does become problematic. Does anyone on the board have concerns with?

Mr. Yadav, I agree with minor improvements like compliant signage and striping. Mr. Farrell noted signage makes sense as this gives us the opportunity to discuss concerns, but he was unsure if striping would help as the parking lot is mostly gravel and I agree with the no interest letter.

Ms. Buzzetta asked if we could request the signage for the handicap spot? Chairman Reisinger noted absolutely we could request that and coverage for the dumpster and anything the board notes. Ms. Buzzetta confirmed she would require the ADA, paved/striped/signed and in compliance to be implemented.

Mr. Kornbluh noted that all of the comments would improve things for the business and didn't believe there would be an issue. Chairman Reisinger noted that it wasn't a believed issue but whether the board wanted to consider all of the comments Mr. Anfuso noted in the parking area due to the agreements and conflict of ownership but that the ADA should be a requirement. Board, any other comments questions?

Board Member, the general parking lot I don't have an issue with but some individuals do park out front and back out into 537 which is a concern. I agree with the board, not full-blown striping, but maybe something up front to watch for people backing out into 537.

No further board notations. Chairman Reisinger, asked Mr. Sciari if the applicant was required to submit a plan with signage to show ADA compliance as a condition of approval would the applicant have any objections?

Mr. Yodakis, signage and striping specific otherwise we would get into ramps and other considerations.

Chairman Reisinger noted, signage and striping for ADA compliance as necessary to meet requirements. No additional considerations or requirements, Mr. Sciari noted no objections to the conditions.

Chairman Reisinger repeated that the conditions of approval noting reviewed by the Monmouth County Planning Board with a granted waiver through a standard form and the requirement to make only the ADA striping and signage compliant plan for approval.

Motion to approve application ZB2047 Colts Neck General Store.

OFFER:	Kornbluh
SECOND:	Nicoletta
AFFIRMATIVE:	Reisinger, Farrell, Buzzetta, Maguire, Mahoney, Nicoletta, Kornbluh, Yodakis.
NEGATIVE:	None.

Chairman Reisinger congratulated and thanked the applicant and counselor.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

None.

DISCUSSION

None

MOTION TO ADJOURN

A motion was made at 8:13 p.m. to adjourn the meeting and unanimously carried.

I hereby certify that the above is a true and exact copy of the meeting minutes for the meeting conducted on April 24, 2025 and adopted by the Zoning Board of Adjustment of the Township of Colts Neck at its meeting held on April 24, 2025.

Krista A. Hill-Kane, Secretary
Zoning Board of Adjustment of the
Township of Colts Neck