

**MANSFIELD TOWNSHIP LAND USE BOARD  
NOVEMBER 17, 2025  
MINUTES**

The regularly scheduled meeting of the Mansfield Township Land Use Board was called to order by **Chair Jewell** at 7:30 PM.

The meeting was opened by stating that adequate notice of this public meeting had been provided in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act by:

1. posting a notice of this meeting on the bulletin board of the Municipal Building;
2. causing said notice to be published in the Daily Record;
3. Publishing on the Township web site
4. furnishing said notice to those persons requesting it pursuant to the Open Public Meetings Act; and
5. filing said notice with the Township Clerk.

Pledge of Allegiance was recited by all.

Roll Call

*Present:* Hayes, Reagle, Wielgus, Feller, Waegener, Cruts, Creedon, Jewell

*Alternates present:* Watters, Connelly

*Absent:* Farino

*Also present:* Engineer Quamme, Attorney Bryce, Planner Bloch

**MINUTES:**

**MOTION** was made by **HAYES** to approve the **minutes** of the **October 20, 2025** meeting.

**SECONDED: CREEDON**

Those in favor: Hayes, Reagle, Wielgus, Feller, Cruts, Creedon, Watters, Jewell

Opposed: None

Abstain: Waegener

**RESOLUTIONS:** None

**APPLICATIONS:**

**LUB-25-04 Daniel Van Luvender**, B 1805 L 7 – 125 Allen Rd – Pool/Poolhouse Setback Variance

[Chair Jewell stepped down and Co-Chair Creedon took his seat while Alternate Connelly sat in for Mr. Creedon]

Ms. VanLuvender stated they are here for a follow up from the last meeting to address three questions that their Engineer has addressed. The main items were the water irrigation to

remediate water, Board of Health approval for the bathroom in the bathhouse and the accessory structure calculation which were all submitted.

Engineer Quamme referred to his letter dated November 14 which still has some minor comments on the plan but two items to note was that the existing shed was not included in the existing calculations increasing the coverage percentage 14.62% and strongly recommends that the stormwater plans has a pop-up emitter near the road may cause potential road icing and suggested drywells on the property.

The applicants stated they are willing to comply with the minor comments. After expressing concern with the drywell being that the property already has a high water table, Engineer Quamme suggested having a topographic survey done and a soil test in the front which will prove that a drywell is not feasible and hooking into the road basin makes more sense.

Attorney Bryce explained that this would be a condition of approval and the final stormwater management plan approval by the Engineer.

Mr. VanLuvender pointed out some of that some of the minor comments are actually addressed on the plans. He also pointed out that the patio is just being covered which their Engineer stated should not be included in the coverage calculation.

Attorney Bryce looked it up in the codebook and read that the covered patio becomes part of the principal structure.

Engineer Quamme stated removing the 296 for the covered patio would reduce the accessory coverage to 13.39%. He requested that their Engineer should revise the calculation on the plans and show the drainage detail on the detail sheet.

Co-Chair Creedon **OPENED THE MEETING TO THE PUBLIC**

Co-Chair Creedon **CLOSED THE MEETING TO THE PUBLIC**

**MOTION** was made by **CONNELLY** to approve **LUB-25-04 Daniel Van Luvender, B 1805 L 7 – 125 Allen Rd – Pool/Poolhouse Setback and Coverage Variance**

**SECONDED: HAYES**

Those in favor: Hayes, Reagle, Wielgus, Feller, Cruets, Watter, Connelly, Creedon

Opposed: None

Abstain: Waegener

[All members resumed their original positions]

**LUB-25-02 Michael Bollard, B 1510 L 4 – 781 Route 57 – Preliminary & Final Site Plan/Use Variance**

[Mr. Hayes stepped down for the “D” variance]

Attorney Andrew Ball, reviewed the property details and non-conforming residential use with proposed residential and business improvements. Mr. Ball stated that their position is that this garage is consistent with an accessory use in the B-2 zone housing delivery trucks or other commercial vehicles. He stated that Mr. Bollard's business is conducted primarily off site. Mr. Ball also noted that the Planner's report indicated that if the Board determines this is a principal use the applicant would be willing to shift the structure 25 ft to the South to be compliant with the setback.

Attorney Bryce swore in Mr. Bollard, owner

Attorney Ball handed out Exhibit A-1 property record card to confirm year built which shows 1951 prior to 1964 zoning code.

Mr. Bollard stated that he plans to construct a detached garage primarily for storage and light commercial work but mostly for personal work. He explained that Motorly is a mobile repair service with the majority of work being done offsite. He confirmed that he has no employees, no storage tanks for any vehicle fluids. Any fluids removed from any vehicle will be disposed of at an approved recycling center. There will also not be any fuel storage tanks or bathroom facilities proposed.

Mr. Bollard described the existing vegetation and agreed that if the Board deems it necessary confirmed he will add any supplemental required plantings. He confirmed that the proposed garage is positioned where it is due to the location of the existing septic. Mr. Bollard confirmed that an above ground pool and addition of an overhang on the existing garage are proposed for storage of personal equipment.

A question arose regarding the proposal to change the location of the garage.

Attorney Ball explained that to ensure this is not deemed a D1 use variance the structure would be shifted 25 ft to comply with the rear yard setback requirement of a principal structure.

Engineer Quamme asked what would happen to the existing vehicles on the site.

Attorney Ball stated that those vehicles would be moved inside the building and the proposed driveway storage area on the side of the new garage.

Mr. Bollard stated that these vehicles are all project vehicles and would fit in the building bumper to bumper.

Attorney Bryce swore in Michael Roth of Roth Engineering, LLC and reviewed his professional experience as a licensed Engineer and Planner.

The Board accepted his credentials

Engineer Roth handed out Exhibit A-2, Existing Conditions Aerial Map, and summarized the subject property and surrounding properties. The second sheet of the handout labeled A-3 shows the Proposed Conditions zoomed in on the subject property.

Engineer Roth stated that the proposed garage structure for the homeowners business will be setback

133.8 ft to the front property line of which 75 ft is required, as mentioned earlier in order to qualify as an accessory building the garage can be shifted to the south to be setback 50 ft from the rear yard property line reducing the front yard setback by 25 ft but still complies.

Attorney Ball clarified that if the Board interprets it to be a principal structure then it will be shifted 25 ft.

Engineer Roth stated the structures setback is 33.1 ft. from the east side and 251.3 ft from the west side lot lines which comply with the 25 ft side yard setback requirement. He also noted that the height is proposed as 20 ft which complies to the maximum building height requirement. He then explained that the existing driveway will be expanded for access to the new structure with a parking area for outside vehicle storage and is partially within the front yard which a variance is required. The driveway will be gravel so a design waiver is being requested. Based on the proposed use this does not comply with the parking requirements but since the only one using it will be the owner/operator, a design waiver is being sought.

Engineer Roth noted the residential improvements of the swimming pool, which complies with the setback requirements, and the overhang addition to the existing garage which requires a D2 variance for the expansion of a non-conforming use, and C variance for the setback which is currently 21.4 ft to the rear lot line where 25 ft is required. The building coverage is increasing slightly and the impervious coverage is proposed at 27.7% but there are several areas where gravel will be removed so that there will be no stormwater development requirement. He also stated that they received a no impact letter from the Warren County Planning Board dated September 10, 2025 and will be submitting to the Upper Delaware Soil Conservation District. The testimony provided that there would be no increase to the traffic so no NJ DOT access permit is required with no changes to the existing driveway access.

Attorney Ball confirmed with Engineer Roth that the existing garage at its closest point is setback 13.2 ft which the garage addition is less of an impact than the garage itself.

Some discussion occurred regarding vehicle storage with some discrepancy of what's on the plan for business vehicle parking versus the testimony provided, and how to distinguish between personal and vehicles brought on site to be worked on.

Attorney Bryce asked about the number of vehicles used for the mobile repair business, customer vehicles and personal vehicles.

Mr. Bollard stated that he has about 5-6 personal vehicles, two trucks for his mobile repair business and anticipates about one customer vehicle a year to be fixed.

Some additional questions were raised about how the personal vehicles being stored in the garage and the personal project work and potentially one customer vehicle work will all be conducted within the proposed new garage.

Attorney Bryce explained that the existing residence is a pre-existing non-conforming use with a proposed secondary use. The question is does this become a second principal use, which is prohibited, or an accessory use which Mansfield defines as subordinate to the principal use and he reviewed the definition.

Attorney Ball requested a break for him to discuss with the client and Engineer.

[BREAK – 8:39-8:46p]

Attorney Ball stated that the owner has agreed to remove entirely working on any customer vehicles on the site and additionally remove a portion of the outdoor parking area and return it to grass. Only the two business repair vehicles and personal use vehicles will be parked in the driveway.

It was determined that the applicant should revise the plans and re-submit before any Board action is taken.

**MOTION** was made by **CREEDON** to continue **LUB-25-02 Michael Bollard**, B 1510 L 4 – 781 Route 57 – Preliminary & Final Site Plan/Use Variance to December 15 without further notice  
**SECONDED: FELLER**

Those in favor: Reagle, Wielgus, Feller, Cruts, Waegener, Creedon, Jewell

Opposed: None

Abstain: None

[Mr. Hayes rejoined the meeting]

**INVOICES:**

Boswell Engineering

Inv 208612	Weathertite	\$407.75
Inv 208611	Dunkin/Ariya	\$380.00
Inv 208609	Meadows at Mansfield	\$233.00
Inv 208608	Meadows at Mansfield	\$2,510.25
Inv 208597	Rockland APV Holdings Concept Review	\$349.50
Inv 208596	VanLuvender	\$699.00
Inv 208595	Annuals, Perennials & More	\$2,271.75
Inv 208594	Borealis Solare Concept Review	\$466.00
Inv 208593	General Planning Board	<u>\$116.50</u>
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$7,433.75</b>

Murphy McKeon

Inv 16025	Annuals, Perrenials & More	\$420.00
Inv 16026	Meetings & Administration	\$250.00
Inv 16027	Popeyes	\$52.50
Inv 16028	Rockland APV Concept Review	\$262.50
Inv 16029	VanLuvender	\$122.50
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,107.50</b>

GRAND TOTAL **\$8,541.25**

**MOTION** was made by **CREEDON** to authorize payment by the Township Committee for the

invoices submitted by the professionals.

**SECONDED: JEWELL**

Those in favor: Hayes, Reagle, Wielgus, Feller, Waegener, Cruts, Creedon, Jewell

Opposed: None

Abstain: None

**OLD BUSINESS:** None

**NEW BUSINESS:** None

**DISCUSSION/CORRESPONDENCE:**

Clerk Griffith mentioned the 2026 calendar for review

It was mentioned that the 2026 RFPs have been submitted and can be discussed in December for appointments at Re-organization in January.

**MOTION** was made by **HAYES** to adjourn the meeting at 8:59 PM

**SECONDED: FELLER**

Respectfully submitted,

JoAnn Griffith, Clerk