



**CITY OF ABSECON
Municipal Complex
500 Mill Road
Absecon, New Jersey 08201**

PLANNING & ZONING
Tina M. Lawler, Secretary

PH. (609) 641-0663 ext. 112
FAX (609) 645-5098

**MARCH 25, 2026
PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES**

The meeting was called to order by Chairman, Greg Seher at 6:00 p.m.

Flag Salute

Notification of Meeting

ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Aleli, Kolbe, LaMaine, Marrone, Parker, McCarty, Seher,

ABSENT: Kirk, Zacchi, Reilly

ALSO PRESENT: Brian Heun, board attorney and Jen Heller, board planner

REGULAR MEETING

OLD BUSINESS:

VOTE: Minutes of February 25, 2026 meeting

Motion to approve – Stan Kolbe – second – John Aleli

All were in favor

NEW BUSINESS:

Site Plan Waiver Application #2-2026 for Big Land III, LLC – 434 New Jersey Avenue – Block 202
– Lots 1 & 2 for approval to install two exterior freezers on a concrete pad base

Kris Facenda, attorney for applicant appeared. He explained that Jersey Cow would like to put two outside freezers on a concrete pad at this site as a temporary use. For this approval, a condition would be that they submit a full site plan application with their plans for a new building by July 1st.

Tom – feels bad that we had to bring you here tonight

requirements and she is okay with them submitting by July 1st for their full site plan application. Permits are still going to be needed for the freezers.

Greg – would like to have a timeline for finishing the project

Jen – ask that they consolidate the lots when the site plan is completed

Motion to approve this application with the condition that they submit by July 1st made by Larry LaMaine – seconded by – Tom Marrone

ROLL CALL: Aleli, yes; Kolbe, yes; LaMaine, yes; Marrone, yes; Parker, yes; McCarty, yes; Seher, yes

Appl. #1-2026 for SJH Group 1FJ LLC – Block 91 – Lot 12 on W. Faunce Landing Road for a two-lot minor subdivision approval

Brian Callaghan, attorney for applicant appeared along with Tom Dase, professional engineer and planner from Ponzio and Associates

Tom Dase – described the location of the property, which is a fully development neighborhood. The lots will meet all bulk requirements and we will submit a LOI DEP letter from the neighbor showing a 50 ft. buffer from the wetlands. We are asking for a waiver of the Impact Statement.

Jen – she deemed the application complete and said they would like two waivers.

Tom – they have already put a house on the single lot across on Spruce St. without any permits. How can we guarantee they won't do that after tonight if we approve this subdivision? He is very concerned.

Jen – we would need to have the plot plans reviewed and approved and permits would be needed.

Brian C. – they would like to have the option of building a house if they do not move one there.

Jen – the subdivision will get filed by plat and she recommends a Deed Notice being attached to each lot, saying any developer or future owner is responsible for the plot plan and any fees associated with it and also what is required in the plot plan. This should be filed at the county clerk's office with the plat, which also needs to show the DEP mapping and the LOI that was done and submitted for Sycamore Avenue property. Road opening permits will be required so they will need to find out when Faunce Landing was paved last. It does look rather new.

Brian Heun – the conditions are they need to comply with all requirements mentioned including permitting and the wetlands and buffers need to be shown on the plat and each plot plan.

Stan – suggested that they put a fence around the property on Spruce St. where they dropped a house on it for safety reasons. The main support is hanging over the property line and possibly over the curb.

Tom – they have said that as of tomorrow, a safety fence will be installed around the property. The construction official's emails have been ignored for about 5 days and the timing of this is ironic that they are getting back to us right before they are about to be heard at the Planning Board. He will believe it when he sees it.

Greg – unfortunately, we can't make that part of this application, but it can be enforced.

PUBLIC PORTION

Motion to open to the public – Christine Parker – second – Larry LaMaine
All were in favor.

Anthony Godleski – 305 Spruce St. – he bought his house in 2022 and he was told these three lots were undevelopable. It is definitely wet back there all year round and perk tests have failed. He said flooding occurs all the time. He never saw them advertised for sale either. Across on Sycamore it is all wetlands and there could be some endangered species there. He sees deer, turtles and a lot of other animals on the lots at times.

Tim Godleski – 305 Spruce St. – obviously these lots were never developed and there was good reason. We have all heard it for years, that there is water there and the levels are going up. It is actually wet out there now and we have had no rain. Why does it need to be developed now? We were told in the past that it couldn't be and now they can. Due diligence needs to be done.

Tom – they are here tonight just to subdivide it and create the two lots. The builder will have to abide by all the conditions that are given tonight. Our engineer looked at the properties for some time and discussed it with council and they did not see an issue now. He didn't want them thinking that the board does not care what they think.

Brian H. – the proposed lots comply with the size requirements and no variances are needed, but they will still have to follow the correct procedure for their permits and all other approvals. We are here to decide if these lots can be divided into two stand alone lots. They won't be able to build right away.

Pat Seel – 115 W. Faunce Landing Road – that area is a pond all the time and the creek does not move, something is blocking it. Our backyard has been flooded from the creek overflowing.

Tom – a lot still needs to be done on this property. Tonight, we are just creating the two lots. If this street is still under a moratorium, don't they need to get separate approvals?

Jen – yes, they will need to follow restoration requirements put it back the way it is. It can not just be a patch in the street. It has to be curb to curb. They will need sewer, water and gas, so it will be substantial for two lots. That will be handled at the time of the plot plan. They can create these lots, which will literally be a lot line on paper. Whether or not they can build, will be determined by the builder and the construction official and the engineers.

Steve Marienski – 314 Spruce St. – they were vacant for years because of the water that is there. The house there is sinking. Was there a perk test? How about the ability to service the sewer in that area? We were always told that those lots could not be developed and now when completed, there could be 4 new homes.

Greg – what you're asking is a city question. They sold these lots and it is nothing that we had a say in. It is up to the builder, city engineers and professionals.

Motion to close public portion – John Aleli – second – Larry LaMaine
All were in favor.

John – as a matter of law, it is a by-right subdivision. Many of the proposed concerns should be addressed in the Resolution.

Tom – he is outraged and flabbergasted that a house was just put on the one lot without any approvals or anyone knowing. It is hard to sit here and approve this, when your plans show a vacant lot next to it and it is not. How do we trust that you just won't come in and drop two more homes without the correct permits or approvals? That better not happen.

Brian Callagan – if houses are going to be moved for these lots, we will follow all the terms and conditions set forth in the Resolution and the city ordinances.

Brian H. – motion would be that the application is conditionally complete and an approval for a subdivision with no variances with a number of conditions which include:

1. Compliance of Jen Heller's report
2. Both the plot plan and the plat will show the wetlands delineations.
3. The plot plan will be submitted meeting all the requirements of the ordinance.
4. The applicant may NOT conduct any construction on the lot or move a house to the lot or any construction on the lots without fully complying with all ordinances and having all necessary permits issued.
5. The plans will be revised to show that the one lot is not vacant

Motion to approve this application made by John Aleli – seconded by – Stan Kolbe

ROLL CALL: Aleli, yes; Kolbe, yes; LaMaine, yes; Marrone, yes; Parker, yes; McCarty, yes; Seher Stated for the audience and applicant, that this is a by-right subdivision. Building is not allowed on these lots yet and this board and the city is not particularly happy with the previous work that was done without any approvals. His vote was yes though.

PUBLIC PORTION

Greg opened the meeting to the public.

Anthony Godleski – 305 Spruce St. – are you legally tied to say yes?

Greg – in certain circumstances, and in this instance, we would need a reason why that was not proper to subdivide and there is not. All your comments were heard, but the board's ability to act is limited.

Brian H. – by law an as of right subdivision is something that must be approved. That is the lots comply and no variances are needed. They can't come in and build whatever they want. They need their permits and they need to meet the setbacks and the like. He gave an example of an application in Hamilton Township that they had. The MLUL says they need to come before the board and you can't say no as long as the lots comply.

Greg closed the public portion.

Greg - since we discussed the issues with the first application today and whether we can avoid unnecessary work or costs for applicants in the future, I think it would be up to council to move an ordinance in that regard.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn – Larry LaMaine – second – Christine Parker

All were in favor.

Respectfully submitted,


Tina Lawler, Secretary

Approved: 4/29/26