MINUTES OF
PLANNING BOARD/BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
OF HIGH BRIDGE BOROUGH

Meeting Date: September 21, 2026 - **Meeting Time:** 7:30 P.M.
Meeting Location: 95 West Main Street, High Bridge, NJ 08829

1. CALL TO ORDER:
This is a regular meeting of the Planning/Zoning Board of the Borough of High Bridge. Adequate notice of this meeting has been given in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act in that a Notice was published in The Star Ledger and the Hunterdon Review on January 13, 2026. Notice of and agenda for this meeting has also been posted on www.highbridge.org and posted on the bulletin board in Borough Hall.

2. FLAG SALUTE: Led by Chairman Musnuff

3. ROLL CALL:
Brosnan, present; Conroy, absent; Koffman, absent; Lee, absent; Mart, absent; Musnuff, present; Ryder, present; Suozzo, present; Epstein, present; Osborne, present. Also, present were Board Attorney Kevin Van Hise, Board Engineer William Burr, Deputy Planning Board Secretary Adam Young and two members of the public.

4. **PUBLIC COMMENTS:** It is the policy of the Planning Board that all public comments on an issue shall be limited to 3 minutes per person and no person may make more than one (1) comment per subject. Comments may be made on any subject pertaining to Board issues. Comments pertaining to Public Hearings should be saved for that section of the agenda. No debating between residents. Comments should be addressed to the Chairman and Board members at the public microphone. NONE.

5. READING AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES: August 17, 2026.
Motion to dispense with the reading of the prior meetings' minutes:
Motion/Second: Ryder/Brosnan Voice vote: Six yes votes, motion passed.

Motion to approve August 17, 2026, meeting minutes. Motion: Ryder Second: Brosnan
Brosnan, yes; Conroy, absent; Koffman, absent; Lee, absent; Mart, absent; Musnuff, yes; Ryder, yes, Suozzo, yes; Epstein, yes; Osborne, yes. Six yes votes, motion passed.

When asked why the August 17th minutes listed September 21st as the next meeting instead of August 31st, it was clarified that September 21st was the only session scheduled at that time; the August 31st meeting was an emergency special called later. Because of this, only the August 17th minutes were on the current agenda for approval, while the August 31st minutes will be considered at the next meeting.

The Board also agreed to adopt a procedural change going forward: all future meeting minutes must explicitly specify who chaired/presided over the meeting.

Board of Adjustment Meeting begins at this point.

6. BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT NEW BUSINESS:

Only those who voted in the affirmative can vote on the resolution.

A. Motion to approve Resolution PB13-2026: **RESOLUTION OF THE BOROUGH OF HIGH BRIDGE PLANNING BOARD / ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT GRANTING VARIANCES FOR A HOME ADDITION ON PROPERTY LOCATED AT 84 CHURCH STREET (BLOCK 4.40 LOT 1)**
Item 6A was deferred to a future meeting because the prepared resolution was not yet ready.

B. Public Hearing for PBapp-06-2026, 56 Mine Road, High Bridge, NJ 08829, Block 4 Lot 5 for variances. Owners: John and Nicole Cahill

Motion to open public hearing: Motion: Suozzo Second: Brosnan

Brosnan, yes; Conroy, absent; Koffman, absent; Lee, absent; Mart, absent; Musnuff, yes; Ryder, yes, Suozzo, yes; Epstein, yes; Osborne, yes. Six yes votes, motion passed.

The Board attorney confirmed that public notice requirements were satisfied and jurisdiction was established, after which both applicants were sworn in under oath to present their application into the record.
Applicant Nicole Cahill requested a 30-foot 9-inch front yard setback variance to construct a low-profile, 420-square-foot deck on her home at 56 Mine Road. Built in the late 1800s, the house is an existing non-conforming structure. The proposed deck will replace a severely deteriorated side porch that was set back 20 feet 3 inches from the right-of-way line. It will wrap around to the rear of the house, extending 21 feet 6 inches by 14 feet beyond the original footprint at a matching height of 96 inches above grade. Cahill emphasized that the deck is designed to complement the home's aesthetics. Neighboring views will be naturally screened by existing fences, garages, and trees. Additionally, she confirmed that the project requires no tree removal or new lighting and will leave an existing historic cistern untouched.

Chairman Musnuff asked about the age of the house, to which the applicants replied that architects estimated its construction between 1850 and 1875. In discussing the site plan, Chairman Musnuff requested clarification on the deck's placement. The applicants explained that, looking from the road, the deck extends along the left wall of the house, but does not stretch all the way to the side wall on the opposite side. When Chairman Musnuff inquired about the cistern, the applicants confirmed that the non-functioning cistern beneath the walkway will remain covered under the deck, receiving only minor runoff drainage. A photograph of the proposal was then officially entered into the record as Exhibit A-1.

The applicants addressed a question regarding the source of the drawing's measurements, explaining that local contractor Batch Building based the proposal on an original property survey from Fletcher Engineering. A copy of this drawing was entered into the record as Exhibit A-2. Following the submission, Board member Musnuff noted his familiarity with the property and confirmed that much of the yard features steep terrain. The applicants confirmed that the house sits close to the road due to the property's steep topography. They noted that the surrounding area is heavily wooded, backing directly onto the Columbia Trail with roughly half an acre of trees buffering the nearest neighboring property to the left, resulting in virtually no visual impact.

In response to a follow-up question about the cistern from Board Member Brosnan, the applicants explained that the cistern is empty and functions solely as a dry well to redirect surface runoff from the front walkway, with no standing water or connection to their primary water supply.

As per the Chairman's request to confirm compliance for the record, it was verified that the applicants had submitted certified mail receipts prior to the meeting, confirming all required notices were satisfied with no public objectors present.

Board Member Ryder asked about the cistern cover and structural footings. The applicants explained that the area currently consists of lawn and grading. They confirmed that a cast iron cover will be installed and blended into the surrounding stone. Additionally, the applicants stated that multiple contractors evaluated the site and confirmed the proposed deck footings will not interfere with or impact the cistern structure.

Board Member Brosnan inquired whether any lighting was proposed for the deck; the applicant confirmed that no additional lighting will be added.

Board Member Suozzo inquired about tree removal; the applicant replied that no trees would be removed for construction. They further noted that the deck stays on the flat plateau, leaving the backyard's steep slope unaffected.

Board Engineer William Burr asked the applicant to review the details of the proposed deck for the Board's clarity. The applicant demonstrated that construction would begin on the side of the house at the site of the old, smaller porch, the deck's closest point to the right-of-way, at 20 feet 3 inches before extending backward and wrapping around the house. It was noted that the house itself is already non-conforming, sitting approximately 15 feet from the road. The applicant further confirmed that the deck will remain entirely on the flat plateau behind the house, leaving the steep rear slope undisturbed.

Seeing no members of the public present to speak on the application, Chairman Musnuff noted for the record that there were no public comments.

Motion to close the Public Hearing: Suozzo Second: Brosnan Voice vote: Six yes votes, motion passed.

Motion to approve PBapp-04-2026: Ryder Second: Brosnan

Brosnan: Yes, the setback requirement was established after the house was built and the deck's profile aligns well with the existing structure, making it a reasonable variance and largely a formality.

Ryder: Yes.

Suozzo: Yes, he will adopt Mr. Brosnan’s comments.

Epstein: Yes, will second what has already been said and has nothing to add.

Osborne: Yes, for all the reasons previously stated.

Musnuff: Yes, that the proposed deck extends out the back of the house with minimal impact, disturbs no one, and serves to improve the property.

Six yes votes, motion passed.

7. PUBLIC COMMENTS: It is the policy of the Planning Board that all public comments on an issue shall be limited to one (1) minute per person and no person may make more than one (1) comment per subject. Comments may be made on any subject pertaining to Board issues. Comments pertaining to Public Hearings should be saved for that section of the agenda. No debating between residents. Comments should be addressed to the Chairman and Board members at the public microphone. NONE.

8. ADJOURNMENT: Motion to adjourn: Brosnan Second: Suozzo. Voice vote:Six yes votes, motion passed.

Next Meeting Date: October 19, 2026
Meeting Location: 95 West Main Street, High Bridge, NJ 08829
Meeting Time: 7:30 P.M.