

The Keyport Unified Planning Board held a Regular Meeting on October 22, 2025, which was called to order by Juan Carlos Oviedo at 7:00 PM, the Sunshine Law Notice was read followed by the Flag Salute.

Present: Mayor Araneo, Councilmember Merla, J. Oviedo, W. Kane, C. Demarest
W. McDermott, H. Aumack, K. Bartolome (arrived 7:50PM), S. Dixon

Absent: T. Burke, D. Pacheco

Professionals: Board Attorney Marc Leckstein, Trevor Taylor, CME, Christopher Dochney,
CME, Planner

MINUTES: SEPTEMBER 25, 2025

Motion made by Mayor Araneo, second by Councilmember Merla with ayes by all present.

**RESOLUTION: KUPB 25-07 STEVEN BRYCE
65 FULTON ST
BLK 134 LOT 38
VARIANCE APPLICATION**

Motion to approve made by C. Demarest, second by H. Aumack

Ayes: Mayor Araneo, Councilmember Merla, Chairman Oviedo, W. Kane, H. Aumack, C.
Demarest, W. McDermott, S. Dixon

**RESOLUTION: KUPB 25-04 146 THIRD ST
146 THIRD ST
BLK 129 LOTS 1 &2
USE VARIANCE AND BULK VARIANCE**

Motion to approve made by K. Bartolome, second by W. Kane

Ayes: Chairman Oviedo, W. Kane, H. Aumack, C. Demarest, W. McDermott, S. Dixon, T.
Bartolome

**APPLICATION: KUPB 25-01 ABROHOM SCHLAFF
ZONING APPEAL/INTERPRETATION
3 CASS STREET
BLK 33 LOT 16**

MOTION TO CARRY TO THE DECEMBER 4TH MEETING:

Motion to carry without further notice to the December 4th meeting was made by H. Aumack, second by C. Demarest with ayes by all present.

Mayor and Councilmember Merla stepped down from the dais because they cannot participate in any use variance applications.

**APPLICATION: KUPB 25-08 OUTFRONT MEDIA
83-87 ROUTE 35
BLK 8 LOT 9
USE VARIANCE/SITE PLAN**

Exhibit A1 – Site Plan
Exhibit A2 – Survey
Exhibit A3 – Outdoor Advertising Permit
Exhibit A4 – Six-page simulation page with Photo
Exhibit A5 – Four-page Benefit package
Exhibit A6 – Protocols
Exhibit B1 – CME Letter

D. Nellis stepped down from being the secretary she lives within 200 feet of application. Michele Clark, Borough Clerk continued with this application.

The Mayor and Councilman stepped down from the dais not because they don't care about the application, or have no interest in the application. They legally cannot participate in the application because this is a use variance application.

Matthew Weiss, Applicant Attorney – The applicant is before the Board regarding property located along Route 35 South, identified as Block 8, Lot 8 in the Highway Commercial District. The applicant, Outfront Media, is proposing to install and operate a single pole, back-to-back, double-faced, off-premise, out-of-road, front-of-the-site digital billboard within that district.

The property is currently owned by Outfront Media and presently contains an existing static billboard consisting of one vinyl advertisement on each side. The proposal seeks to replace the existing static structure with a digital billboard. Outfront Media will continue to operate the proposed sign and currently holds a valid New Jersey Department of Transportation (NJDOT) permit authorizing the operation of a digital billboard at this location.

Since billboards are not a permitted use within the Highway Commercial Zone, the applicant is seeking a use variance for this application.

The proposed digital billboard will measure 10.5 feet by 36 feet. The sign will be mounted at a height of approximately 24 feet above grade, which is between one and two feet lower than the existing structure due to grading variations at the site.

The proposed digital sign face will be significantly smaller than the current configuration, reducing from two static panels per side to one digital panel per side. The billboard will be oriented toward Route 35, a heavily traveled roadway through the Borough.

Ron Tourtellot, Sr. Real Estate Director for Outfront Media, described his responsibilities for the company. The property is located on the west side of Route 35, north of the Broadway overpass, within a heavily commercial area that includes an auto body shop and other businesses along the corridor. Mr. Tourtellot testified that the existing billboard structure has been in place since at least 1947, with aerial photographs confirming its continued existence since 1969. The lot is owned entirely by Outfront Media and contains no other improvements. Mr. Tourtellot stated that Outfront Media holds a valid NJDOT outdoor advertising permit for the location which authorizes the operation of a digital, multi message sign. NJDOT issues the permit once, and the company renews it annually each May. Mr. Tourtellot agreed to provide the Board with documentation of the most recent renewal for confirmation.

There were site renderings present that depicted both the existing conditions and the proposed billboard. Mr. Tourtellot described how the advertisements would show on the board and how the information would get to the company. There was further discussion the type of advertisements and how the Borough could use the board for their information as well as emergency information. This would be at no cost to the borough. Mr. Leckstein asked if they would agree that it would be condition of approval if approved; yes.

There was discussion regarding the amount of feet from one billboard to another.

Motion to open to the public at 7:35PM was made by W. Kane, second by C. Demarest with ayes by all present.

Michael Lane, 51 First Street, asked if the board would be static images only; yes NJDOT regulations only allow static images there would be no full-motion video, scrolling, flashing, or animation of any kind. Each message will display for eight (8) seconds before changing instantaneously to the next static image. The complete cycle of advertisements will run on a 64-second loop.

The applicant testified that image changes are made electronically and remotely, rather than manually, and that the message changes are compliant with state requirements. The purpose of the digital technology is to allow content to be updated efficiently without requiring physical replacement of poster panels.

There was further discussion regarding the advertisements on the board.

Motion to close at 7:50PM to the public was made and carried

(see attached court reporters document)

Motion to approve application was made by W. Kane, second by H. Aumack

Ayes: Chairman Oviedo, W. Kane, H. Aumack, C. Demarest, W. McDermott, S. Dixon, T.

Motion to take a five-minute break was made and carried at 8:05PM was made and carried.

Meeting continued at 8:15PM Mr. Leckstein stated that all the Boardmembers were present.

APPLICATION: WILLOW RECOVERY (Continued)
46-48 HIGHWAY 36, LLC
BLK 106, LOT 1
SITE PLAN/USE AND BULK VARIANCE

Exhibit A1 – Application
Exhibit A2 – Site plan dated 4/10/25
Exhibit A3 – Architect dated 1/21/25
Exhibit A4 – packet of pictures of the site
Exhibit A5 – Supplemental report
Exhibit B1 – CME letter dated 6/11/25
Exhibit B2 – Email from T. Vecchio

D. Nellis mentioned that Mr. Kane and Mr. Demarest listened to the recording and were eligible to vote on the application.

David Himmelman stated that all their professionals have returned for this hearing. Mr. Himmelman stated that Mr. Bosin did meet with the Police Chief. There was a discussion regarding letting all the professionals be heard and then open to the public, the Board agreed to this.

Mr. Boozan spoke about the conversation with the Police Chief regarding the security of the facility as well as the clientele that would be at the facility.

There was discussion regarding the how the staff is trained and how the clients are monitored. Mr. Himmelman asked if the clients drive themselves to the facility; no.

Mr. Himmelman asked that Mr. Boozan explain the difference between a detox facility and a rehab facility. Mr. Boozan explained that a detox facility the client stays approximately 5-7 days and residential is usually 30 days with daily meetings.

Frank Aiello, Architect described exhibit A6. He explained that most of the project is interior there is only minor cosmetic on the exterior. Mr. Aiello described the interior of the building.

There was discussion regarding clients leaving the facility without assistance. Mr. Himmelman explained that Community Affairs have to review the plans and approve before Department of Health approves location.

Mr. Himmelman spoke about the CME report dated June 11, 2025 in regards to the ADA access path from the parking space. There was further discussion regarding the handicapped spots and access to the facility.

Mr. Leckstein read the email from Mr. Vecchio stating the water main on Van Dorn appears to be an old 6-inch line and may not be able to handle fire flow for sprinkler system, may need to hook up to 8-inch line on Highway 35. According to plans there is no fire department access road around one half of the building due to parking spaces, and maybe as small as 10 feet wide. There is no FDC connection on plans or access to that area for fire department operations. Mr. Aiello explained he feels 6 inch would be more than adequate, they will make sure all the calculations would be provided with the water pressure to Mr. Vecchio.

Christine Cofone, Planner stated that she is familiar with the property. She explained what variances are required for this application. Ms. Cofone spoke about the positive criteria of the application. She explained that she feels the positives outweigh the negative criteria for this location.

There was discussion regarding the public's concern from the adjacent properties. Ms. Cofone explained what was permitted uses for this location. There was further discussion regarding the neighborhood and the adjacent houses to this location.

Mr. Leckstein asked about the home behind the facility regarding smoke breaks, Ms. Cofone stated that the smokers would not be by that home.

Discussion regarding the training that the security would have. Mr. Dixon asked if highway commercial is a typical spot for this type of facility; Ms. Cofone stated she has had them in mixed zones.

Mr. Dixon questioned the recovery of a client going to the facility close to a highway and a gentleman's club; Ms. Cofone stated that there are facilities near highways, the clients are going to struggle in central NJ. Mr. Himmelman reminded the board that this is a short-term detox facility, the clients are only there between five and seven days.

There was further discussion regarding the surrounding businesses at this location and the security for the facility.

Mr. Taylor asked if a patient comes in and doesn't get accepted what would happen; Mr. Bosin explained that the person that dropped them off would have to come and pick them up or the facility would provide transportation.

There was discussion regarding the parking spaces and the height of the fence.

Motion to open to the public at 9:35PM was made by W. McDermott, second by C. Demarest with ayes by all present.

Gail Carton- O'Connell, 230 Van Dorn asked if the behavioral health person and security the same person; yes. Ms. O'Connell asked where the nearest facility is located presently; Mr. Boozan replied Hazlet. Ms. O'Connell asked about the signage on the building; it would say Willow Recovery

David Reilly, 425 Florence question the security or behavioral; Mr. Boozan explained that are trained security not clinician but their title is Behavioral technicians. Mr. Bartolome asked if these employees would be doing just security; no. Mr. Reilly confirmed that it is not a lock down facility. Mr. Leckstein stated that this came up in the last hearing. What happens if a client freaks out and needs to get out, what do you do then; Mr. Boozan explained that they don't allow them to leave without someone picking them up. There was further discussion regarding safety precaution and the possibility of one of the clients leaving the facility unattended.

Mr. Reilly explained that there is only one side street parking, he feels that parking is going to be an issue.

Julio Bichao, 241 Van Dorn St read formal protest statement regarding having this facility at this location. He explained he has a seven-year-old daughter and a four-year-old facility and his house is next to this facility. There was discussion regarding what is allowed at this location. Mr. Himmelman asked if he was aware of what could possibly be placed at this location when he purchased his home; no.

Rich Zielinski, 247 Van Dorn spoke about what was previously at the location for the last 25 years.

Roy Halvson, 249 Van Dorn stated he has heard everything about the patient's safety, he asked what about the residents.

There was discussion regarding the fire door at the facility and the client's access to be able to leave the facility using this exit.

Suzanne Ryan, 407 Atlantic Street, people detoxing have a hard time she has seen people leave against their will, people would claw at the walls to get out. When someone is detoxing, they need quiet how would that work with the facility being 19 feet from the highway. She spoke about the number of beds at the facility as well as what medical coverage would be accepted. She explained she believes in the program but not in a residential neighborhood or on a highway.

Debbie Zielwski, 247 Van Dorn – lived there 25 years explained that they have never had flooding now it floods. Not sure if adding additional people to this area would help with the flooding. Mr. Taylor explained there is no increase to impervious coverage.

Mr. Taylor recommended that they place a sign no left turn at the location. The applicant will look into signage. Mr. Leckstein mentioned if application was approved would the applicant agree to no parking off site and no left hand turn from driveway to Van Dorn; yes.

Ted Galloway, 258 Van Dorn spoke about the fire door exit being locked without a crash bar. Mr. Aumack explained that the fire alarm will open the door. Mr. Galloway stated that the clients could pull the fire alarm and that would open the door.

Mr. Galloway explained the noise on 36 and the back up is solid at 4pm what happens when someone leaves.

Chairman Oviedo asked how were they going to deal with the noise; Mr. Boozan stated they never had a complaint regarding the noise. Mr. Leckstein mentioned to the Board that they have to keep in mind that a bar can open on this site and it would create more noise.

Chairman Oviedo asked about the noise for their clients. Mr. Himmelman explained that they have other facilities operating on a highway. Mr. Boozan stated that if they needed to, they would sound proof.

Mr. Leckstein mentioned to the board that they couldn't deny the application for other reason than the noise.

The Board discussed carrying the application to the December 4th meeting to finish the application.

Mr. Leckstein explained to the residents that the application will be carried to the December 4th meeting without further notice for the residents to finish their statements and questions.

Motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:35PM was made by Chairman Oviedo, second by W. McDermott with ayes by all present.