



KNPB-R6060

February 4, 2025  
*Via Email*

MacKenzie Bittle, Planning Board Secretary  
Borough of Keansburg  
29 Church Street  
Keansburg, NJ 07734

**Re: Proposed 2-Story Elevated Dwelling & Bulk Variance Requests  
Shannon Campeau  
160 Highland Boulevard  
Block 68, Lot 5  
First Engineering Review**

Dear Ms. Bittle:

As requested, we have reviewed the above-mentioned application to demolish the existing 1-story dwelling and construct a new elevated 2-story dwelling located at 160 Highland Boulevard. The applicant, Ms. Shannon Campeau, has submitted the following documents in support of this application:

1. Plan entitled "Variance Plan for Proposed Dwelling - #160 Highland Boulevard, Lot 5, Block 68, Tax Map Sheet #12, Borough of Keansburg, Monmouth County, N.J.," prepared by Donna M. Bullock, P.E., of Morgan Engineering & Surveying, dated September 17, 2025, consisting of Sheet 1 of 1.
2. Plan entitled "Boundary & Topographic Survey, Lot 5, Block 68, Borough of Keansburg, Monmouth County, N.J.," prepared by David J. Von Steenburg, P.L.S., of Morgan Engineering & Surveying, dated May 5, 2025, consisting of one (1) sheet.
3. Architectural Rendering, Floor Plans & Elevations, prepared by Statewide Custom Builders, dated July 9, 2025, last revised July 15, 2025, consisting of four (4) pages.
4. Certification of Taxes, signed by Thomas P. Cusick, Tax Collector, Borough of Keansburg, dated
5. November 13, 2025
6. Planning Board Application dated September 26, 2025.
7. Development Permit Application Denial Letter, from the Keansburg Construction Office, signed by Kathy Burgess, Zoning Officer, Borough of Keansburg, dated October 16, 2025, consisting of two (2) pages.

#### **A. Project Description**

The subject property is an interior developed lot located within the R-5 Single-Family Residential Zoning District with frontage along Highland Boulevard to the north. Currently, the property contains an existing 1-story frame dwelling with a covered front porch and a rear concrete stoop and steps with an overhead awning. A concrete driveway extending from Highland Boulevard provides access to the property. The property is surrounded by single family residential dwellings to the south, east and west and is in the "AE" Flood Zone, with a flood elevation of 11 feet.



The applicant is proposing to demolish the existing 1-story dwelling and construct an elevated 2-story residential frame dwelling on piles with a covered front porch with associated deck with steps and a rear deck with steps. Other improvements include a new driveway and a shed in the rear yard. The first floor of the new 2-story dwelling contains an open concept living/dining/kitchen room, office space and a powder room while the second floor contains 3 bedrooms, 2 full bathrooms and a laundry room. Additional improvements include a new concrete patio in the rear yard. This application was denied a development permit for not meeting requirements for several variances related to setbacks, lot size, building and lot coverage as indicated in the denial letter dated October 16, 2025.

### B. Bulk Requirements

In accordance with Section 22-5.5 of the Ordinance, the existing and proposed bulk deficiencies for the proposed structure are noted as follows:

	DESCRIPTION	REQUIRED	EXISTING	PROPOSED
1	Minimum Lot Area	5,000 SF	3,062 SF <sup>(E)</sup>	<b>No Change</b>
2	Minimum Lot Frontage	50'	39.2' <sup>(E)</sup>	<b>No Change</b>
3	Minimum Front Yard Setback	25'	9.1' <sup>(E)</sup>	<b>16.5' <sup>(V)</sup></b>
4	Minimum Side Yard Setback	7.5'	2.4' <sup>(E)</sup>	<b>3.0' <sup>(V)</sup></b>
5	Minimum Side Yard Setback - <i>Total</i>	15'	13.3' <sup>(E)</sup>	<b>9.9' <sup>(V)</sup></b>
6	Minimum Rear Yard Setback	25'	31.8'	26.3'
7	Min. Gross Residential Ground Floor Area - 1-story - 2-stories	800 SF 600 SF	784 SF <sup>(E)</sup> -	- 1,516 SF
8	Maximum Lot Coverage – <i>Principal Bldg.</i>	25%	29.4% <sup>(E)</sup>	<b>31.5% <sup>(V)</sup></b>
9	Maximum Lot Coverage – <i>All</i>	50%	63.5% <sup>(E)</sup>	<b>74.8% <sup>(V)</sup></b>
10	Maximum Building Height	2 ½ Stories (35')	1 Story (16.4')	2 Stories (27.4')
11	Minimum Improved Off-Street Parking*	2	> 2	2

(E) – Existing Nonconformity

(V) – Variance

\*Exhibit 1, (Subsection 22-9.3) of the Ordinance requires a total of four (4) Off-Street Parking Spaces for the proposed 4-bedroom, two-family frame dwelling. Specifically, Section 22-9.3. a.5 states “A one-car garage and driveway combination shall count as 2 off-street parking spaces, provided the driveway measures a minimum of thirty (30’) feet in length between the face of the garage door and the sidewalk or thirty-five (35’) to the curblin. Two-car garage and driveway combination shall count as 4.0 off-street parking spaces, provided the minimum width of the driveway is twenty (20’) feet and its minimum length is as specified above for a one-car garage.”

**The proposed asphalt driveway is approximately 27’ wide by 22’ long between the base of the front deck and the back of the existing sidewalk and does not meet the minimum required thirty (30’) feet in length to the sidewalk or thirty-five (35’) feet to the curblin to count as one (1) off-street parking space. However, it appears the driveway as proposed can accommodate two (2) off-street parking spaces.**



### C. Dimensional “c” Variance Considerations

**Upon hearing testimony and input from the public (if any), the Board should evaluate the positive and negative criteria set forth below to determine whether the Applicant has met its burden of proof for a “c(1)” or “c(2)” variance for the bulk conditions and pre-existing non-conformities noted in the chart above, as well as variances per the below Sections of the Ordinance regarding construction of non-compliant structures, as listed below:**

1. Section 22-5-2.c of the Ordinance states that no building or structure shall hereafter be erected and no existing building or structure shall be moved, altered, added to or enlarged, nor shall any land or building or portion of a building or structure to be used, designed, or arranged to be used for any purpose unless in conformity with all of the regulations herein specified for the district in which it is located. **The applicant proposes to demolish the existing 1-story dwelling and construct an elevated 2-story residential frame dwelling on piles which does not meet the bulk regulations of the R-5 Zoning District.**
2. Section 22-7.3.e of the Ordinance states that any nonconforming structure shall be more than partially destroyed, then the structure may not be rebuilt, restored or repaired, except in conformity with this Chapter. Destruction to the extent that rebuilding, repair or restoration requires removal or demolition of any remaining portions of the damaged part of the structure such that the only major components of the original structure utilized in such building, repair or restoration are the foundation or exterior walls shall be prima facie evidence that the structure has been more than partially destroyed. **The applicant proposes to demolish the existing 1-story dwelling and construct an elevated 2-story residential frame dwelling on piles which does not meet the bulk regulations of the R-5 Zoning District.**
4. Positive Criteria for “c(1)” Hardship Variance

The finding of a “c(1)” hardship would address the following:

- a. *by reason of exceptional narrowness, shallowness or shape of a specific piece of property, or*
- b. *by reason of exceptional topographic conditions or physical features uniquely affecting a specific piece of property, or*
- c. *by reason of an extraordinary and exceptional situation uniquely affecting a specific piece of property or the structure lawfully existing thereon, or the strict application of any regulations...would result in peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties to, or exceptional and undue hardship upon the developer of such property.*

It should be noted that the finding of the hardship must be for the specific property in question (i.e., it must be unique to the area). Note also that a hardship variance cannot be granted by a self-created hardship or personal hardship of the applicant.

5. Positive Criteria for “c(2)” flexible variance

The finding of a “c(2)” flexible variance to permit relief from zoning regulations where an alternative proposal results in improved planning would address the following:



- a. *The purposes of the MLUL would be advanced by the deviation, and*
- b. *The benefits of the deviation from the zoning ordinance requirements would substantially outweigh any detriment.*

The finding of the benefits must be for the specific property in question—it must be unique to the area. The zoning benefits resulting from permitting the deviation(s) must be for the community and not merely for the private purposes of the owner. It has been held that the zoning benefits resulting from permitting the deviation(s) are not restricted to those directly obtained from permitting the deviation(s) at issue; the benefits of permitting the deviation can be considered in light of benefits resulting from the entire development proposed. Notwithstanding the above, the Board should consider only those purposes of zoning that are actually implicated by the variance relief sought.

6. The Municipal Land Use Law (NJSA 40:55D-70) requires the applicant to satisfy *both* components of the negative criteria:
  - a. *The proposal will not create a “substantial detriment to the public good”;* and
  - b. *The proposal will not create a “substantial detriment to the zone plan and zoning ordinance.”*

#### **D. Technical Engineering Review**

1. The proposed improvements do not conform with several bulk requirements in the R-5 Single Family Residential Zone. The applicant shall provide testimony to justify the granting of the required bulk variances.
2. It appears the shed as shown in the rear yard are located just 1.1 feet off the rear property line, which will require a rear yard variance for accessory structures, unless it is located at least 5 ft. from the property line in accordance with the R-5 Zoning District
3. The variance plan and the architectural floor plan shall be revised for consistency with respect to the front deck and number of bedrooms.
4. The architectural plan shall be revised to include side and rear elevations of the proposed 2-story dwelling.
5. The plan shall be revised to label the types (wood, vinyl, chain link, ect.) fences proposed along the sides and rear property lines.
6. Provide a pavement repair strip for the construction of the new curb cut to restore any disturbed pavement within the right-of-way of Highland Boulevard.
7. The plan shall be revised to indicate the locations of the associated AC units for the elevated two-story dwelling. In accordance with Section 22-8.4.a.6, electrical and mechanical equipment shall be screened from the public view, within and from the outside of the development, by a fence, wall or mature landscape materials, compatible with the exterior design of building.



8. The grading as proposed will direct excess runoff onto the adjoining property to the south which is unacceptable. We recommend the grading be revised to direct surface runoff from the edge of the rear concrete pad into side yard swales and ultimately towards the right-of-way of Highland Boulevard.
9. The grading plan shall be revised to depict all proposed roof gutters. The roof gutters are to be pitched from back to front of building to downspouts installed at both ends of the building, daylighting on splash guards and directed towards the right-of-way of Highland Avenue.
10. The proposed development will not disturb an area exceeding 1 acre, nor will it create more than a quarter acre of new impervious surfaces. Therefore, the project is not considered a “major development” as defined by NJAC. 7:8, and is not subject to the NJDEP stormwater quantity, quality and recharge requirements of a major development.
11. The property is located within the "AE" flood zone with a Base Flood Elevation (BFE) of 11.0 feet. We note the first floor is proposed at elevation 13.0 feet which is 2.0 feet above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) We defer further review to the Flood Plain Administrator and Construction Official for any applicable building requirements that may be required.
12. The project site is located in the Coastal Area Facilities Review Act (CAFRA) Zone. We note the project is not located within 150 feet of the mean high-water line of any tidal waters or the landward limit of a beach or dune; therefore, a CAFRA permit is not required. We defer further review to NJDEP.
13. JCPL requires the meter to be located at or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE 11.0'). The Plan shall be revised to depict the proposed location of the electric meters for the elevated two-story dwelling.
14. Due to the undersized property and deficient side yard setbacks, the proposed dwelling will be constructed in close proximity with the structures on adjoining lots. As such, a Residential Fire Sprinkler System 13D is recommended to be provided to reduce the speed of a fire from quickly spreading to the adjacent properties as indicated in the Borough of Keansburg Fire Official Letter dated October 14, 2022.
15. Investigate and determine the material of the existing water service. If determined to be a lead water service, then the same shall be replaced from the meter pit to the structure. A note to that effect shall be included on the plan.
16. The following construction details shall be provided and comply with the standards of the Borough Ordinance:
  - a. Driveway pavement detail
  - b. Depressed curb detail



17. If approved, the applicant will be required to post all performance guarantees and inspection escrow as stipulated in the Development Regulations.

We reserve the opportunity to further review and comment on this application and all pertinent documentation, pursuant to testimony presented at the public hearing. If you have any questions or require additional information, please call.

Very truly yours,  
T & M ASSOCIATES

FRANCIS M. MULLAN, P.E., C.M.E.  
BOROUGH OF KEANSBURG  
PLANNING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT ENGINEER

FMW:LZ

cc: Kevin Kennedy, Esq., Board Attorney, [kennedylaw@verizon.net](mailto:kennedylaw@verizon.net)  
Kathy Burgess, Zoning Officer, [kathy.burgess@keansburg-nj.us](mailto:kathy.burgess@keansburg-nj.us)  
Donna M. Bullock, P.E., Applicant's Engineer, [donnab@morganengineeringllc.com](mailto:donnab@morganengineeringllc.com)  
Shannon Campeau, Applicant/Owner  
Luce Zamor, Borough Engineer's Office