MILLSTONE TOWNSHIP ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES
July 22, 2026

The Millstone Township Zoning Board of Adjustment regular meeting was called to order by Chairman Mostyn on Wednesday, July 22, 2026 at 7:30 p.m. in the Municipal Meeting Room, 215 Millstone Rd., Millstone Township, NJ 08535. Notice of this meeting was provided in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Law.

Secretary Sims read the Open Public Meetings Act Statement.

There was a salute to the Flag and an observance of a moment of silence offered for those serving and those who have served our country in the past.

Roll call for the below members was called:

Present: Chairman Mostyn, Ms. Arpaia, Mr. Cadigan, Mr. Ferrara, Mr. Lambros, Mr. Sinha, Mr. Borgese (Alt. I) and Mr. Kausch (Alt. II).

Absent: Mr. Barthelmes.

Attending: Greg Vella, Esq., Board Attorney; Greg Blash, PE, PP, Board Engineer: McKinley Mertz, PP, AICP, Board Planner; and Danielle Sims, Board Secretary.

Mr. Borgese was seated for Mr. Barthelmes.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Chairman Mostyn opened the meeting up to members the public for comments on matters not before the Board. With no members of the public coming forward, Chairman Mostyn closed the public comments session.

MINUTES:

Minutes from June 24, 2026

The Minutes from June 24, 2026 were carried to the next meeting.

ANNUAL REPORT REVIEW:

The Zoning Board of Adjustment received the Annual Report of 2025 in advance of the meeting. The Board reviewed the decisions and made no recommendations at this time as they have already provided comments and recommendations to the Board Planner as the Planning Board is currently working on the Master Plan Reexamination.

RESOLUTION(S):

Resolution ZB2026-08 Annual Report of the Millstone Township Zoning Board of Adjustment
Review of decisions made by the Zoning Board of Adjustment in 2025.

Based on their discussion about the Annual Report, and no further comments from the Board, Ms. Arpaia made a motion to adopt Resolution ZB2026-08, which was seconded by Mr. Ferrara. Resolution ZB2026-08 was adopted on a roll call vote: Chairman Mostyn, Ms. Arpaia, Mr. Cadigan, Mr. Ferrara, Mr. Lambros, Mr. Sinha and Mr. Borgese: Approved, 7-0.

Bridge Asset Management – Hen Vaknin
Block 17, Lot 4 – 663 State Highway 33
Use Variance and Minor Site Plan - Request for Submission Waivers Z26-04

The Board received the Resolution in advance of the meeting for their review. With no comments from the Board, Mr. Lambros made a motion to adopt the Resolution granting the Submission Waivers, which was seconded by Mr. Sinha. The Resolution was adopted on a roll call vote: Ms. Arpaia, Mr. Cadigan and Mr. Lambros: Approved, 3-0.

SUBMISSION WAIVERS REQUEST(S):

Akshar Patel
Block 50, Lot 24.02 – 2 Parker Ct.
Request for Submission Waivers for Bulk Variance Application Z26-08
Proposal to construct a 20` x 12` x 15` (height) shed and a 10' x 15' greenhouse on a 14' x 20' concrete pad within the front yard area of a lot on a corner lot. Request for Submission Waivers for Completeness determination.

The Board reviewed the requested submission waivers. The Board recommended a better aerial image than what was provided and some additional photos of the area proposed to be used for the shed and greenhouse. The applicant will need to provide notice to those on the 200' list, as required.

Mr. Ferrara made a motion to grant the requested waivers to deem the application complete, which was seconded by Mr. Cadigan. The requested waivers were granted on a roll call vote in favor: Chairman Mostyn, Ms. Arpaia, Mr. Cadigan, Mr. Ferrara, Mr. Lambros, Mr. Sinha and Mr. Borgese. None opposed. 7-0.

APPLICATIONS:

352 Monmouth Road, LLC
Block 62, Lot 20.05 – 352 Monmouth Road
Appeal of a Zoning officer's Decision and Use Variance Application # Z26-06
Appeal of a Zoning Officer's Denial of a Zoning Permit for a behavioral health treatment center specializing in substance use disorder and mental health services. Property was previously granted a Use Variance for office use under Z12-06. Alternately, the applicant is seeking Use Variance for the proposed behavioral health treatment center.

Mr. Vella, Esq. reviewed the proof of service in advance of the meeting and confirmed that the Board has jurisdiction to hear the application.

The following witnesses were sworn in and are under oath:

Greg Blash, PE, PP – Board Engineer
McKinley Mertz, PP, AICP – Board Planner
Allison Coffin, PP – Applicant's Planner
Sean Farrell – Supreme Treatment, Director of Operations

The following exhibits were previously marked in evidence and include newly marked exhibits:

APPLICANT'S EXHIBITS

A-1 Jurisdictional Notice (Proof of Service)
A-2 Application, Checklist(s) and Administrative Forms

A-3 Operations Statement, one (1) page, prepared by Kevin Daily of Supreme Treatment Center, dated 5/5/26
A-4 Copy of Zoning Denial dated 5/1/26
A-5 Copy of As-Built Plan, one (1) sheet, prepared by Crest Engineering, dated 12/20/22
A-6 Copy of Prior Resolution Z12-06, dated 2/27/13

BOARD'S EXHIBITS

ZB-1 Planner's Review dated 7/17/26
ZB-2 Engineer's Memo dated 7/22/26

Mr. Peter Licata, Esq. appeared on behalf of the applicant.

Sean Farrell of Supreme Treatment, proposed tenant of 352 Monmouth Road was sworn in. He explained that the site would be used as clinical space for therapy for outpatient services. To be a patient at this specific site, you would require some length of sobriety, medically stable, in order to attend a counselling session. A LMSW (Licensed Master Social Worker) or CADC (drug and alcohol counselor) therapist. Mr. Farrell clarified sobriety refers to any kind of substance. Any participants must have completed detox and sustained substance free for at least 30-days. It is an outpatient setting, so they would have completed inpatient services elsewhere. There would be no storage or administration of any medications and there would be no nurse practitioners. The site would be open from 8:30 am to 4:30 pm Mondays through Fridays and 8:30 am to 12:30 pm on Saturdays. There would be 3-4 counselors and 3-4 staff members on site at any given time. There would not be any overnight stay on the site. There are 25 parking spaces, including two handicap parking spaces. The participants would be scheduled, individual or group sessions, no walk-in sessions would be available. There would not be more than eight patients per session. Mr. Farrell believes there would be sufficient parking on site for the proposed use.

Mr. Farrell explained they do a lot of their advertising online, typically using "Google my Business" to guide to the local area. The admission team would screen participants when scheduling appointments. At intake, a licensed admissions counselor will do another evaluation and make an assessment upon entry. He stated that they typically service about 20 clients per month. Emergency situations are not expected, but would utilize typical emergency services, such as EMT/Fire. There are six rooms on the first floor, which would be used for the sessions (both group and individual therapy sessions). The basement area would be for storage. Clients would participate in a four (4) hour session block (8:30 am to 12:30 or 12:30 pm to 4:30 pm).

If a patient needs more services than this facility could offer, he would work to get the patient the services they need. He has a very personal connection with these services and understands the sensitivity of this.

The proposed facility would not require large truck deliveries, but may require a small "Amazon" delivery truck delivery on occasion.

Mr. Kausch asked why this particular site suited the needs of the applicant. Mr. Farrell stated that the site is by itself. The facility is designed to attract locals and being off the normal tract, would allow a little more confidentiality, due to the wooded location.

Alllison Coffin, PP, was sworn in and provided her qualifications. Ms. Coffin has appeared many times before this Board and the Board accepted her credentials as a professional licensed planner. She reviewed the prior 2013 use variance and site plan approval. The applicant proposes to use the site as a licensed behavioral health counseling center, consisting of one on

one and group counseling, no medical services will be provided. She reviewed the proposed hours discussed by Mr. Farrell and noted that there would not be more than eight employees on the site at any time. The 25 parking spaces, in her opinion, would be sufficient for the proposed use.

Ms. Coffin provided testimony regarding office uses and compared the proposed use to a professional office use, noting the definitions for a professional office use. Ms. Coffin believes the Zoning Officer aired on the side of caution in issuing the Zoning Denial. She stated that Licensed Counselors are professionals with NJ State licensing.

Ms. Coffin reviewed the definition of licensed counseling. There is no language in the prior use variance resolution restricting the office uses. She reviewed the definition of a “Drug Treatment center” under NJAC 10661.2, which was repealed by the State in 2017. This was replaced with “Substance Use Disorder Treatment Facility”, defined as an independent clinic, whether freestanding or a distinct part of a facility that is licensed or approved by the New Jersey State Department of Health or is similarly licensed by DHS Division of Mental Health and Addiction Services to provide healthcare for the prevention and treatment of drug addiction or drug abuse in accordance with NJAC 8:43A-26 and/or 10:161B (this later one has since been repealed). The proposed use does not meet the criteria. It provides no health care, employs no medical staff and does not store or administer medication. She believes the use falls under the definition of a professional office use.

Chairman Mostyn agreed that the Zoning Officer aired on the side of caution with the minimal detail provided. Attorney Vella inquired if the facility is required to be licensed.

Mr. Farrell stated that they are required to be licensed with the State for outpatient treatment facility. They do have another site on Rt. 33 (across from Gus’s Diner). He stated that there is a need in this area for this type of service and they have had success in the area. There is additional need in the area.

Mr. Lambros explained that any use not listed as permitted in the code, is considered not permitted. This is a different type of client and addressed in a different type of way

Ms. Coffin stated she believes the ordinance would allow for other professional office uses and that this proposed use would fall under the same category.

Mr. Vella explained that this is a residential zone and professional offices are not permitted. The prior resolution granted pre-existing non-conforming use for an office. If the zone actually permitted professional offices, the Zoning Officer may have acted differently in reviewing the Zoning Permit Application. He explained that the applicant is expressing the proposed use is similar to what was previously approved, but not exact.

Ms. Coffin clarified that the site was granted use variance approval for office use.

Mr. Vella explained the applicant’s two requests, and Appeal of the Zoning Officer’s Determination and the other, a Use Variance for the proposed Counseling Use.

Ms. Coffin explained that there are special reasons that this specific site is appropriate for the proposed use, it is particularly suited. It is a similar use to the previously approved use variance. The site is functionally the same as the previously approved use. The site’s location is an existing office and offers a degree of privacy that other sites may not offer.

Ms. Mertz asked if the business model was not working, if they would be required to come back to the Board if they expanded the services.

Ms. Coffin explained that this site is an existing office building and is particularly suited as it offers the desired privacy.

Mr. Farrell stated that if a client came to the site under the influence, they would contact an emergency contact, EMT's, and the client would be discharged from this particular program. They would not let a patient leave the site if they were under the influence. At this level of service, they do no expect this to happen. This program is voluntary, not court mandated. IT is not the stage of "new-found sobriety."

Freedom Recovery is under the same umbrella, they are independent from Supreme Treatment. The site in Manalapan is on Route 33. Mr. Borgese stated that the Manalapan site is not a secluded site. Mr. Farrell explained that some clients would prefer the privacy of a secluded facility.

Chairman Mostyn opened the matter to the public.

James Nukem of 5 Blacksmith Lane appeared and was sworn in. He asked if the clients will be bussed into the site or will come in their own cars. Mr. Farrell stated they will typically come in cars. Mr. Nuken stated there are many accidents from people that are exiting the site. Mineral Springs has been closed many times due to accidents. He expressed that he understands the need for the use, but believes it should be in a commercial zone, not a residential zone. He is concerned with security since the Township is serviced by State Troopers. He is also concerned with the value/sell ability of his home with a treatment facility in the area.

Elizabeth Sause of 350 Monmouth Rd asked about the length of services for their clients. Mr. Farrell stated it could be thirty days or it could be six months. The initial admissions evaluation is done over the phone by the call center. The clients in their care are invested in a program. The State does perform inspections of the site. He explained that they operate a boutique outpatient service. The reason their model is successful is because they go in depth with master level clinicians.

Andy Kiley of Freehold, NJ appeared and was sworn in. He will be the property manager of the site. Mr. Vella confirmed with Mr. Licata that he is not a client of Mr. Licata. Mr. Kiley explained that he is a child of an alcoholic. He wishes his family had services like what the applicant is offering. He believes that this facility would be a great asset to this community.

With no other members of the public appearing, Chairman Mostyn closed the matter to the public.

Mr. Licata did not have any closing statement.

Ms. Mertz acknowledges that the Zoning Officer reviewed the definition in her memo, although she acknowledges that the same may have been repealed. She explained that the Board must consider the Master Plan in making their decision. The driveway (traffic) safety issues brought up would exist whether the site was an office or any other use. The applicant has testified that they would not be considered a drug treatment center as they do not administer any medicine. The definitions in the ordinance for offices are not exactly helpful in this application.

Mr. Vella explained the "pre-exisitng non-conforming use" previously granted will need to be considered and the Board will also need to take into consideration if the proposed tenant use is more impactful than the prior approval. This was previously granted a use variance.

Mr. Blash explained that his recommendation would be that if the Board votes on the application as a use variance, that the applicant be required to submit a site plan.

Mr. Vella explained that the Board will first need to determine if the Zoning Officer made a proper decision.

Mr. Lambros stated that he always wants to do what he can to protect the town and its residents. The code enforcement officer (Zoning Officer) makes a determination based on the information given, based on codes and regulations.

Mr. Lambros made a motion to deny the applicants appeal and to uphold/affirm the Code Enforcement Officer's (Zoning Officer), which was seconded by Arpaia. The proposal is not consistent with the prior use variance approval. The motion was approved to DENY the appeal on a roll call vote in favor: Chairman Mostyn, Ms. Arpaia, Mr. Cadigan, Mr. Ferrara, Mr. Lambros, and Mr. Borgese; those against: Mr. Sinha. Approved motion to deny: Motion passes, 6-1.

Ms. Arpaia made a motion to grant the requested use variance with the conditions discussed during the course of the hearing, including submission of a site plan, which was seconded by Mr. Ferrara. The Board voted to approve Use Variance Application Z26-06 on a roll call vote in favor: Chairman Mostyn, Ms. Arpaia, Mr. Cadigan, Mr. Ferrara, and Mr. Sinha; those against: Mr. Lambros and Mr. Borgese. Motion passes, 5-2.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

With no other matters on the agenda, Chairman Mostyn adjourned the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Danielle B. Sims

Danielle B. Sims, Board Secretary