

TUCKERTON LAND USE BOARD
Thursday, **NOVEMBER 20, 2025** @7pm in Borough Hall

Mr. Rocheskey called the Tuckerton Land Use Board meeting to order on Thursday, November 20, 2025 at 7:00 pm at Borough Hall.

Open Public Meeting Act Statement

“Provisions of the Open Public Meeting Act have been complied with as notice was published in the Tuckerton Beacon and the Asbury Park Press stating the time, date and place of this meeting.”

Flag Salute

Mr. Rocheskey led the salute of the flag.

Roll Call

Don Rocheskey, Chair	P	Paul Solimani, Vice- chair	P
Mayor Marshall	P	Keith Vreeland	P
James McAndrew	P	Calvin Morey	P
Rich Pear	P	Beth Obiedzinski – Garvin	P
VACANT (Alt #1)	-	Wayne Tonnesen	P
Robert Rue (Alt #2)	A	VACANT	

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Vreeland motioned, seconded by Mrs. Obiedzinski-Garvin to accept the October 2025 Land Use Board meeting minutes. It was so moved.

INVOICES

WOODLAND, MCCOY, AND SHINN

11/6/2025 709878 GENERAL BOARD REPRESENTATION \$250.00

T & M ASSOCIATES

11/4/2025 KMD495805 GENERAL ENGINEERING \$90.00

Mr. McAndrew motioned, seconded by Mr. Vreeland that the invoices be paid subject to the availability of funds. It was so moved by unanimous consent of the Board.

Correspondence

Letter from T and M Associates regarding an application for a minor subdivision with bulk variances for Egg Harbor Homes deemed incomplete.

Letter from Waters Edge Environmental notifying the Land Use Board of an application for freshwater wetlands Transition area waiver redevelopment will be submitted to the NJDEP.

Miss Cranmer gave out hard copies of the New Jersey Planner Sept/Oct 2025 Vol86, No.5.

New Business

CLAMTOWN GROUP USE VARIANCE BLOCK 49 LOT 7

Mr. Shin explained that there was one application scheduled for the evening: Clamtown Group. The application had previously come before the board a couple of years earlier for a use variance, which was approved. The applicant was now requesting an increase in the size of the previously approved building.

The matter remained a use variance for two reasons: first, the inclusion of a physical fitness facility, which is not a permitted use in the zone; and second, the property is split between residential and commercial zones, creating a split-lot condition that also requires a use variance. Mayor Marshall and council man Vreeland were required to step down from the dais.

Attorney Richard Visotcky of Kelly and Visotcky appeared on behalf of the applicant and property owners, ClamTown Group, LLC. The owners, Mark Targett and Tom Uccellini, were also present. The application concerns Block 49, Lot 7, located at the intersection of Locust Street and East Main Street. Visotcky explained that the site had appeared before the board two years earlier for a use variance associated with an 8,000-square-foot building. The current proposal seeks approval for a slightly larger 9,200-square-foot commercial building, with 4,000 square feet designated for the ClamTown CrossFit Center and the remaining space allocated for retail, a permitted use in the zone.

Brian Murphy Testimony

Brian Murphy of FWH Engineering, 1856 Route 9 Toms River, was sworn in as an expert witness. Mr. Murphy introduced a Google Earth image, identified as Exhibit 1. He described the property as being located on the south side of East Main Street and the west side of Locust Street. Surrounding uses include Mickey's Port of Call to the east, single-family homes to the north, a veterinary office and another single-family home to the west, and various commercial businesses across East Main Street. The site is currently wooded, and existing drainage flows naturally into the property.

Mr. Murphy explained that the proposed building will total 9,200 square feet, with 4,000 square feet designated for a CrossFit gym. He noted that gyms are not listed as a permitted use in any commercial zone and described this as likely an oversight in the ordinance. The use variance pertains only to the gym portion. He added that the zoning line splits behind Mickey's, where the residential zone begins; that portion will remain undeveloped. Approximately 55% of the site will remain as open space.

Mr. Murphy stated that the site is part of a main commercial corridor and is consistent with the character of the surrounding area. It has strong visibility, access to public water and sewer, and a sufficient lot size. He testified that the gym use is typical for the broader region and will continue to serve the community.

He addressed the positive criteria, stating that the project satisfies purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law by ensuring adequate light, air, and open space, with roughly one-third of the property remaining undisturbed. The building will be energy efficient and will improve safety related to fire and flood conditions. Storm water from adjacent properties will be retained on site, which will help alleviate drainage issues.

Regarding negative criteria, Mr. Murphy testified that any impacts from the development would be outweighed by its benefits. He noted that the gym would be less noisy and generate less traffic than many permitted uses. The proposal is consistent with the 2017 Master Plan's economic development goals, including support for mixed retail and commercial uses and the reuse of vacant properties.

Mr. Murphy clarified that the property is split-zoned, but all development is confined to the B2 commercial zone. The R100 residential zone will not be disturbed, and a 30-foot conservation easement behind Mickey's and the proposed building is under consideration to preserve existing trees.

Concerns regarding the CrossFit gym's hours of operation and its interaction with the retail component remain consistent with the prior use variance application. Access remains limited to Route 9, as previously committed.

Mr. Murphy stated that the board is primarily reviewing the gym use for variance purposes. The updated site plan dated May 23, 2025, was marked as Exhibit Two. It includes the location of the trash enclosure, storm water management facilities, and other details.

Access was shifted to Route 9, with a DOT access permit pending. An environmental impact statement was provided. Storm water management includes attenuating drainage from both Mickey's property and the applicant's property. Development is restricted along the L-shaped portion of the parcel, forming a 30-foot conservation easement.

Mr. Murphy explained that the retail portion is envisioned as part of a comprehensive wellness center, including nutrition services and a yoga studio. The plan includes 48 parking stalls; removing one results in 47, plus two EV stalls, totaling 49 credited spaces. Signage will comply with regulations. A point-by-point lighting analysis will ensure ordinance compliance.

The trash enclosure is located in the northeast portion of the parking lot adjacent to the building and also serves as the loading area. Turning radii for fire and emergency vehicles have been accommodated. Access remains exclusively from Route 9.

Mr. Murphy identified several waivers being requested:

- A reduced buffer along the north side consisting of a 20-foot wooded area with supplemental planting instead of the required 30 feet.
- A buffer waiver along Locust Street on the west side due to the placement of drainage basins.
- A landscaping waiver, as only 5.5% landscaping is provided because of undisturbed areas and parking requirements.

He clarified surrounding conditions: a veterinarian's office is located at the corner of Locust Avenue, with a residence behind it. The parking area is situated in front of the proposed building near Route 9, aligning with the veterinarian's property. The building aligns more closely with the nearby residential parcel. Parking is oriented north-south to reduce light spillover onto residential areas.

Mr. Murphy confirmed that he addressed comments from T and M's review letter and agreed with the remaining items. Key notes included:

- A garage door on the east side for equipment movement and ventilation.
- The addition of one AC unit, bringing the total to five.
- No generators are proposed.
- A black vinyl chain-link fence is proposed along the west side of the parking lot.
- No sprinklers are required.

A resolution from two years prior was marked as Exhibit B1, and a letter from Charlie Cunliffe, board engineer was marked as Exhibit B2. Mr. Murphy reiterated that the use variance had been previously addressed. Members of the public raised concerns about storm water conditions at the intersection of Locust and East Main Street and an existing depression area where runoff from Mickey's property collects.

Mr. Murphy testified that the storm water design reflects existing drainage patterns. Storm water from Mickey's property will be collected through the applicant's system, which includes above-ground basins on the north and west sides. Technical concerns about ponding and localized flooding on Locust Street will be addressed.

Lighting will incorporate cut-off shields to prevent spillover onto public or residential properties. Landscaping will be installed along the north side near residential areas for added security. Lighting color temperature will be 3000 Kelvin.

An environmental study by Trident Environmental identified no negative impacts on endangered or threatened species. There are no mapped wetlands on the site. Borough permits will be required for utility work and road restoration, and Route 9 access will require additional permits.

Two EV chargers are planned for the northwest corner of the site, including one for a handicap-accessible space. The handicap stall must be located near the building entrance. Concerns were raised about locating charging stations close to the building due to fire-suppression considerations.

Michael Millemann Testimony

Michael Millemann, 1729 route 9 Wall, NJ, an architect with Tokarski and Millemann Architects, testified before the board. Noting that he has been a registered architect since 1999 and has appeared before boards in multiple counties. Mr. Millemann prepared the architectural plans dated October 28, 2024, with the most recent revision on November 1, 2024.

He explained that the proposed building now totals 9,200 square feet and includes two additional tenant spaces of 600 square feet each. The design features a rubble stone base and metal siding intended to replicate board-and-batten construction, along with a gable roof. Insulated glass and storefront systems are planned for the entry, and clear story windows will provide additional lighting. The rear of the property contains no windows, only doors.

Renderings were submitted as Exhibits Three and Four. Exhibit Four depicts the structure as viewed from the corner of Locust and Main Street.

Mrs. Obiedzinski- Garvin suggested using fabric-style awnings and reducing the intensity of channel-illuminated lighting to give the building a more “homey, more maritime feel.” While she acknowledged that the building design was attractive, she questioned whether it aligned with the preferred aesthetic for Tuckerton.

Mr. Cunliffe clarified that the lighting on the building is intended for aesthetics rather than for walkway illumination. The signage will be backlit with a soft glow and remains under 100 square feet in total area, consistent with ordinance requirements. He added that the architectural elevation reflects the correct signage, whereas the rendering was based on an earlier version.

Windows are located only on the southern and western facades, serving to provide ambient light rather than supporting a mezzanine space. These windows help break up the plain facade. A garage door is included solely for the CrossFit unit to facilitate moving equipment in and out.

The selected colors—grays and tans—are intended to be aesthetically pleasing and complement the rubble stone elements. Culture stone is planned for the southern and western facades, which face the public right-of-way. At the rear, stoneware basin materials are proposed, along with a vegetative strip between the property and neighboring residential areas.

Mr. Millemann noted that the westerly edge of the building encroaches into the 30-foot buffer required when adjacent to residential properties across the street. Relief is needed for this

buffer due to the proximity of the structure. Although adding 1,200 square feet would provide an additional 15 or more feet of buffer, it would still fall short of the full 30-foot requirement. Additional landscaping could be incorporated into the buffer zone to help mitigate the impact.

John Rea Testimony

John Rea, a licensed professional engineer with fifty years of experience in traffic engineering, he is employed by McDonough and Rea Associates, 1431 Lakewood Road Manasquan, NJ. Mr. Rea prepared a traffic impact analysis dated November 19, 2024. Mr. Rea has served as an expert witness before more than 250 boards throughout the state. His analysis focused on ensuring that the site's access to Route 9 would function safely and efficiently. He explained that earlier plans for access from Locust Street had been eliminated, and all ingress and egress would now occur solely from Route 9.

Mr. Rea testified that an NJDOT access permit is required and has already been applied for. Preliminary comments from the agency have been received and are currently being addressed. His traffic study included weekday morning, weekday afternoon, and midday Saturday traffic counts at the intersection of Route 9 and Locust Street. The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual was used to estimate peak-hour traffic generation.

The proposed development includes 8,000 square feet devoted to gym, medical, or health and fitness uses, along with 1,200 square feet allotted to two small retail spaces. Anticipated traffic generation is approximately 30 peak-hour movements—about 15 to 16 entering and 15 to 16 exiting. Mr. Rea focused on weekday afternoon and midday Saturday peak hours along Route 9. Traffic volumes were projected to the year 2034 using NJDOT growth data.

Mr. Rea explained that levels of service range from A (best) to F (worst), based on the delay experienced by motorists attempting to enter the highway. The site driveway is projected to operate at Level of Service C during peak hours, which he stated is acceptable. Estimated delays for vehicles entering Route 9 range from 15 to 40 seconds, depending on turning direction and traffic conditions.

The site provides 47 parking spaces, with credit for two electric-vehicle spaces, totaling 49 parking stalls. Mr. Rea testified that projected traffic volumes are consistent with the parking supply, with an expected turnover ratio of two-thirds to three-quarters during peak periods. He noted that sight distance from the driveway is adequate in both directions and that proper sight-triangle areas will be established.

From a traffic engineering standpoint, Mr. Rea described the land-use proposal as sound. Circulation patterns and parking stall dimensions meet accepted standards. Preliminary NJDOT comments were characterized as relatively minor and technical.

During questioning, Mr. Rea stated that a single-family home and a garage are located across Route 9 from the proposed development. Traffic associated with other businesses in the area

was factored into the study's counts. He noted that Route 9 has shoulders that allow through-traffic to bypass vehicles waiting to make left turns.

Rea explained that the NJDOT requires a minimum 50-foot corner clearance between the tangents of curb returns at an unsignalized intersection. The current design exceeds this requirement, providing 100 feet of clearance. He testified that the proposed access point on Route 9 is optimally located.

Testimony was provided regarding property line restrictions affecting the placement of structures, particularly along the western side of the site. It was noted that a previous approval had granted Mickey's a driveway located along the westerly edge of its property, positioned close to adjoining property lines. The current application requires a use variance because of the CrossFit component; without the gym use, a standard retail building would fall under the jurisdiction of the planning board rather than the zoning board.

The Department of Transportation is reviewing the safety and placement of the driveway, considering the surrounding mix of residential and commercial uses along Route 9. Concerns were raised regarding turning templates for fire trucks and garbage trucks and whether those turning movements could conflict with vehicles entering or exiting the site. The existing 30-foot driveway width is considered adequate for the expected traffic volume.

The primary concern discussed was the potential for collisions during emergency situations, where drivers may be entering or exiting the property quickly. It was suggested that widening the driveway to 32 or 34 feet could be necessary if circulation templates reveal conflicts. However, the DOT limits the maximum allowable width of the driveway opening, including curb returns. Shifting the driveway slightly farther west may improve sight triangles and reduce the potential for conflict with traffic coming from Locust Street.

Possible on-site adjustments include increasing the turning radius within the parking lot to improve maneuverability. Adjustments to the curved of the driveway within the property boundary may also be feasible. It was noted that reducing the number of parking spaces, if required for circulation improvements, would still meet ordinance requirements due to credit for EV parking spaces.

Mark Targett Testimony

Mark Targett identified himself as a resident of 5 Maria Drive in Little Egg Harbor Township, New Jersey. He confirmed that he is one of the applicants and a co-owner of the property.

Mr. Tonnesen referenced a previous commitment suggesting an 8,000-square-foot plan and questioned why the current proposal sought additional space. Mr. Targett explained that the applicants reconsidered the unit layout because all the original tenant spaces were 2,000 square feet. They realized that smaller businesses might require only 600 or 1,200 square feet, and the redesign was intended to accommodate those smaller tenants.

Mr. Tonnesen asked whether their engineers had warned that the revised layout might create problems. Mr. Targett replied that they had inquired about what was legally permissible and worked within the constraints provided. Mr. Tonnesen then suggested that the applicants might be able to redistribute square footage among the proposed units—reducing widths in some places—to avoid increasing the total building size and therefore avoid triggering additional variances.

It was clarified that the previous approval was based on an 8,000-square-foot building. When the building size was increased to 9,200 square feet, the enlargement triggered the need for an additional variance. Mr. Targett asked whether the use variance applied specifically to the CrossFit gym, and the board confirmed that it did. The gym area remains at 4,000 square feet; only the building footprint increased.

Mr. Tonnesen stated that increasing the footprint impacted the buffer along Locust Avenue. Mr. Targett questioned whether the buffer issue was newly created or preexisting. Mr. Murphy explained there would still be a buffer issue. Land Use Board engineer Charlie Cunliffe responded that it was a valid question. The board's engineer explained that the applicants could still maintain an 8,000-square-foot building with two 600-square-foot tenants by reducing the widths of other units. Although such an approach might not fully resolve the buffer issue, it would create more separation and space for plantings along Locust Avenue. The professional reminded the board that, as a use variance application, they must weigh positive and negative criteria and that the applicant must secure five affirmative votes out of six voting members.

Mrs. Obiedzinski - Garvin asked whether the applicants had interested tenants for the proposed wellness-oriented uses, such as nutrition or holistic services. Mr. Targett responded that no deposits had been received, although he had spoken with a few potential businesses in general terms. The intention is to attract wellness-oriented tenants, but he acknowledged that if those uses do not materialize, any tenant lawfully permitted under the zoning could occupy the spaces.

Mrs. Obidzenski - Garvin commented that the wellness concept was positive but raised the question of what the applicants would do if wellness tenants could not be secured. Mr. Targett reiterated that he cannot control the market and would lease to any lawful tenant type permitted in the zone.

Public Forum

Mr. McAndrew motioned second by Mr. Tonnesen to open public forum.

Katherine Bates, a resident of 110 Locust Street, spoke regarding the proposed development. She explained that she and her family—her husband and five children—have lived in Tuckerton for four years. They reside in a historic property, which they have restored and maintained. Mrs. Bates emphasized that they take pride in their property, including cleaning up the corner lot near their home.

Mrs. Bates recalled that two years ago, the applicants proposed an 8,000-square-foot building, which the neighbors generally accepted. However, she expressed concern about the current proposal to expand the building, noting that the residents were not consulted regarding the increase in size. She stated that they do not want the building to be larger, citing that it is already too big for the location.

She raised concerns about a proposed black chain link fence, noting that light from the building would still pass through and impact her home, even with a buffer along Locust Street. She suggested that windows should be positioned on the east side of the building, rather than the Locust Street side, to reduce artificial light shining into residential properties.

Mrs. Bates highlighted the importance of maintaining existing trees and shrubs as a buffer. She referenced a prior statement by Mr. Tonnesen two years ago promising not to expand the building after approvals were granted, noting that the current proposal contradicted that promise. She emphasized that five newly planted trees would take years to grow and would not provide an adequate buffer immediately.

Mrs. Bates also expressed concern about parking. While she acknowledged that most parking would be set off on Route 9, she wanted assurance that no overflow parking would occur on Locust Street, which has only one access point and can be difficult to navigate during peak times.

Mrs. Bates stated that if the board wishes to address safety and driveway location, the size of the building should be reduced. She expressed frustration that the applicants had expanded the building beyond the initially agreed-upon footprint, which she felt was unfair to residents.

Mr. Norman Cramer and Mrs. Sandra Cramer, residents of 325 Heritage Street, spoke regarding the proposed development. Mr. and Mrs. Cramer live directly behind the subject property, with their backyard located just a few feet from the proposed lot. Mrs. Cramer stated that while they are not opposed to the lot being developed, they are concerned about the current plan, which they consider far too intense for the size and location of the property.

Mrs. Cramer emphasized that she and her neighbors were initially supportive of a gym on the lot, but they did not agree to a large metal building. She argued that such a structure does not align with the borough's master plan, which aims to preserve the historic character of the area. She expressed concern that the project would negatively impact the buffer zone at the rear of the property, stating that it should not all be removed and replanted.

Mrs. Cramer highlighted quality of life concerns due to the proximity of their home to the proposed development. She cited the location of the dumpster, noting existing issues with odor from Mickey's dumpster, which is only about 90 feet from their house. Mrs. Cramer insisted that any new dumpster must be relocated closer to Route 9, completely enclosed, and away from residential areas.

Mr. and Mrs. Cramer raised concerns about the placement of five air conditioning units directly behind their house, which would generate significant noise. Mrs. Cramer suggested relocating the units to the side of the building to mitigate the impact on neighboring properties.

Mrs. Cramer acknowledged the front parking arrangement as acceptable but expressed concerns regarding traffic, security, and privacy. She recommended a solid fence along the rear of the property and around the dumpster area to prevent people from walking through the backyard and to provide separation from the neighbors' properties.

Regarding drainage, Mr. Cramer questioned the relocation of storm water management from under the parking lot to the rear of the building near two residential homes. He expressed concern that this change could adversely affect neighboring properties. Mr. Cunliffe explained that state storm water rules and site constraints require them to handle runoff carefully, taking into account water from neighboring properties. Mrs. Cramer sought assurances that proper measures would be taken to protect the neighbors' properties.

Mrs. Cramer also asked about the maintenance and replacement of plantings in the buffer zone. Mr. Cunliffe clarified that plantings serving as buffers could be protected under a performance bond and maintained for two years following completion, ensuring compliance with the resolution and municipal land use regulations.

Mrs. Cramer concluded by emphasizing the need for careful consideration of the plan due to its potential impact on the residential area. She stated that she has lived in Tuckerton for 30 years, values her home, her neighborhood, and her neighbors, and desires to remain in her home. She urged the board to thoughtfully consider the residential impacts before approving the project.

Kathleen Dockery and Kathleen Cardell, residents of 106 Locust Street, provided testimony regarding the proposed development. She expressed concern about the removal of trees and the insufficient buffer along the street, stating that without proper screening, the new building would be fully visible from her property. Ms. Dockery recalled that before the proposed addition, the smaller building fit well with the neighborhood, and she had no objections to it at that time. She raised concerns with the property owner for neglecting maintenance, noting that the lawn had never been mowed and that tree limbs were left scattered, creating an unsightly appearance. Ms. Dockery emphasized that the proposed larger metal building is not compatible with the character of the neighborhood, which she described as a "Tuckerton-style" area.

Ms. Cardell agreed with her neighbors that the buffer zone is inadequate and expressed concern about parking overflow onto Locust Street from both the gym and Mickey's, arguing that neighbors should not be responsible for maintaining greenery that the property owner neglects.

She also raised objections to the potential visual impact of a chain-link fence and the possibility of empty retail spaces if retail tenants do not occupy the building. While she supported the

addition of a gym at this location, she opposed multiple vacant or underutilized commercial spaces.

Ms. Cardell highlighted concerns about drainage at the corner of the property, noting the presence of children walking to school and the need for proper maintenance to ensure safety. She also expressed apprehension about multiple dumpsters if additional businesses rent space in the building, pointing out that noise from delivery trucks at Mickey's already creates disturbances, particularly overnight.

Parking was another major concern for Ms. Cardell. She questioned how gym parking would be separated from Mickey's existing parking and noted that the site's limited parking spaces would be insufficient for peak hours, including class schedules and staff, potentially causing overflow onto the street. She expressed doubt that enforcement, such as ticketing or no-parking signs, would mitigate the problem.

Ms. Cardell urged that the new development maintain the aesthetic character of Tuckerton and avoid industrializing the area, referencing awning designs and architectural consistency with the existing neighborhood. She emphasized the importance of preserving the town's character, having lived in her home for approximately 35 years and expressing her desire to maintain the quality of life in the community.

Amanda Mower, a resident of 233 Center Street, Tuckerton NJ, spoke regarding concerns she had after listening to prior testimony. Although she does not live immediately adjacent to the proposed development, she expressed apprehension about the removal of the existing 30-foot buffer and the potential for replacing it with newly planted small trees, which she argued would not provide effective screening. She suggested that preserving existing mature native trees would be the best approach. While acknowledging that non-native trees like arborvitae grow quickly and serve as good screening, she emphasized that native species should be prioritized due to environmental considerations, including invasive species issues in the area.

Ms. Mower also raised questions about storm water management, noting existing issues with runoff and pooling on the undeveloped site. She asked whether alternatives, such as permeable paving or porous materials for the parking lot, could mitigate flooding. She noted that pooling currently occurs near the center of the site, which could be exacerbated by development. She expressed concern that the proposed larger building would increase impervious surfaces, thereby affecting both storm water runoff volume and quality.

She sought clarification regarding the storm water report, asking whether it accounted for the existing 8,000-square-foot building or the proposed larger structure. Ms. Mower stressed that increasing the building size changes the runoff dynamics and the ratio of impervious to pervious surfaces, potentially necessitating an updated storm water analysis. Mr. Murphy stated the storm water management report is based off what has been presented.

Ms. Mower raised questions regarding the master plan and the aesthetic impact of the building on the town. She expressed concern that continually granting variances could undermine adherence to the master plan, effectively prioritizing zoning by variance rather than zoning by ordinance. She noted that the proposed building exceeds the size of the previously approved structure, which has implications for storm water management, water quality, and the visual character of the town.

Regarding environmental concerns, Mr. Tonnesen inquired whether low-lying areas on the property might be vernal pools or wetlands. He was informed that environmental consultants had determined there were no wetlands or vernal pools on the site and that the site does not impact threatened or endangered species. She acknowledged that any final determination would fall under the jurisdiction of the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (DEP).

Mrs. Cramer also asked whether outside speakers or outdoor activities were planned for the building, and was informed there were none.

Ms. Mower raised traffic and development concerns, noting multiple large nearby developments in Little Egg Harbor that will contribute significant additional traffic on Route 9 and Center Street. She suggested that the forested 30-foot conservation easement, currently landlocked, could serve as a permanent protected area to prevent future encroachment or development.

Mr. McAndrew motioned, second by Mr. Tonnesen to close the public portion.

Mr. Visotcky requested a 10 minute recess to discuss some of the concerns of the residents with his clients. The recess was taken at 9:01PM.

The meeting resumed at 9:11 PM. Mr. Tonnesen inquired whether the proposed storm water basin could be moved to the other side of the property. They suggested that with appropriate grading and installation of drains in the parking lot, water could be piped to the opposite side. According to the topography, the elevation difference was minimal, about one foot. The board member proposed that moving the basin northeast, while adding drains and piping, would allow it to capture runoff from Mickey's property and maintain ample buffer on both sides.

Mr. Murphy confirmed understanding but noted that some adjustments would still be necessary to accommodate the buffer. The board member emphasized that this modification would increase vegetation and make the project more visually appealing to nearby residents.

Another participant highlighted that many neighbor concerns were related to the condition of Mickey's property and their trash enclosure, over which the applicant had no control. The applicant clarified that their own trash enclosure would be fully solid, unlike Mickey's, and that the proposed 4,000-square-foot development would generate minimal trash.

Mr. Visotcky further explained that the project would remain entirely within the B2 zone, preserving a third of the property as open space. This decision prevented another developer from using the same area and demonstrated compliance with engineering requirements. They noted that no bulk variances were being requested, aside from a buffer waiver. All side, front, and rear yard setbacks, building height, and lot area requirements were met. Additionally, the parking provided exceeded ordinance requirements, ensuring that vehicles from neighboring properties, such as Mickey's, would not occupy the new site.

Mr. Visotcky concluded by emphasizing that the project had addressed all engineering and zoning concerns to the board's satisfaction.

Mr. Visotcky addressed the chair and members of the board, stating that they had the opportunity to consult with their clients and professionals. Taking into consideration some of the concerns raised by the board and members of the public, they requested that the board carry the matter for a two-month period. This extension would allow time to make revisions to the plan and return before the board, noting that due to the holidays, a one-month timeline would be too tight. They suggested that the matter could be revisited at the meeting day in January.

Mr. McAndrew motioned, seconded by Mr. Tonnesen to carry the Clamtown Group Application to our January 15, 2026 meeting at 7PM with no further notice required. It was so moved by unanimous consent of the board.

Old Business

None at this time.

Informal Discussion

None at this time.

Adjournment

Mr. McAndrew motioned, seconded by Mr. Tonnesen to adjourn. It was so moved by unanimous consent of the Board. The meeting was adjourned at 9:19PM.

Sincerely,
Lindsay Cranmer
Tuckerton Land Use Board Secretary