



April 8, 2026

Elk Township Planning/Zoning Board
680 Whig Lane
Monroeville, NJ 08343

Attn: Ann Marie Weitzel, Board Secretary

Re: Dylan and Hannah Oldt
Block 55, Lots 8 & 9
925 Aura Road
Minor Subdivision
R – Rural Residential District
Elk Township Application SD-26-01
Bach Associates Proj. #ETPB2026-2

Dear Chairman Afflerbach and Members of the Board:

We have reviewed the application and supporting documents submitted by Dylan and Hannah Oldt for a minor subdivision (lot line adjustment) to increase the size of Lot 8 by taking acreage from Lot 9. The existing properties front on Aura Road between Granary Lane and Clayton Avenue (CR 608) within the R Rural Residential District. Currently, Lot 8 consists of a 45,204 sf area with a 1-story frame dwelling, bituminous driveway and associated site improvements. Existing Lot 9 currently consists of a 2-story frame dwelling with rear deck, stone driveway, frame garage, two (2) sheds, and associated site improvements.

We have received the following materials in support of this application:

1. Land Development Application for Minor Subdivision and variance submitted March 2, 2026.
2. Elk Township Land Development Checklist.
3. Listed of waivers requested.
4. Plan entitled "Proposed Minor Subdivision Plan, 923 and 925 Aura Rd, Sheet 29, Block 55, Lots 8 & 9", prepared by Ewing Associates, dated 9-15-25, no revision.

Completeness

The application is presently incomplete. The applicant has requested waivers from the following checklist items:

- #13 requires metes and bounds description showing dimensions, bearings, curve data, length of tangents, radii, arcs, chords and central angles for all lots, center lines and rights-of-way, utility easements and centerline curves on streets. **Waiver recommended for completeness only.**

- #19 requires proposed street names and new block/lot numbers approved by the tax assessor. ***Our office has no objection to a waiver being granted for this item.***
- #36 requires a copy of any protective covenants, easements and restrictions of record. Include current Tile Policy. ***Our office has no objection to a waiver being granted for this item.***
- #38 requires Photographs of the site taken from the opposite side of the street and to show any unusual physical aspects of the site. And for a variance, any other vantage that would be instructive. ***Our office has no objection to a waiver being granted for this item.***
- #49 requires the location of all existing trees or tree masses, indicating general sizes and species of trees in accordance with Township Ordinances. ***Our office has no objection to a waiver being granted for this item.***
- #50 requires a tree Protection Plan, limits of clearing in accordance with Township Ordinances. ***Our office has no objection to a waiver being granted for this item.***
- #55 requires contours at 20 foot intervals for the entire tract and within 100 feet (USGS Topographic maps are sufficient) and conformance with the grading plan requirements in section 96-66M prior to the issuance of any building permits. ***Our office has no objection to a waiver being granted for this item.***
- #57 requires a grading plan showing existing and proposed spot elevations, based upon the datum, at all building corners, all floor levels, center lines of abutting roads, top and bottom curbs, property corners, gutters and other pertinent locations sufficient to assure that the project will not have an adverse affect on the existing drainage pattern. ***Our office has no objection to a waiver being granted for this item.***
- #58 requires soil erosion and sediment control plan consistent with the requirements of the soil conservation district. ***Our office has no objection to a waiver being granted for this item.***
- #59 requires location of soil borings to determine soil suitability and indication of whether topsoil will be transported to the site and/or be removed and transported outside the municipal boundary. ***Our office has no objection to a waiver being granted for this item.***
- #66 requires A written commitment from the Elk Township Municipal Utilities Authority of sufficient capacity to provide sewer and water service for the project when complete (if within sewer service area). ***Our office has no objection to a waiver being granted for this item.***

- #67 requires if on-site sewerage disposal is required (septic system), the results and location of all percolation tests and test borings. ***Our office has no objection to a waiver being granted for this item.***
- #73 requires a letter of interpretation from the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection ***Our office has no objection to a waiver being granted for this item.***
- #75 requires utilities, preliminary plans and profiles of proposed scale of not more than one (1) inch equals fifty (50) feet horizontally and one (1) inch equals five (5) feet vertically showing connections to existing and proposed utility systems. ***Our office has no objection to a waiver being granted for this item.***

The applicant did not request waivers but has not provided the following checklist items:

- #22 requires a list of all other requirements or standards of the Township Unified Development Ordinance that are not met by the application and for which a waiver or variance is sought. ***Waiver not recommended. The applicant shall amend their application to include use variances for Lots 8 and 9 as they will exceed the maximum gross density of 0.5 units per acre (§96-70D(1)).***

We have determined that the application is **INCOMPLETE** at this time. The above items must be addressed for the application to be deemed "Complete" and scheduled for a public hearing. If a waiver is granted for completeness only, the information shall be provided as part of the compliance submission.

OWNER/APPLICANT:

Applicant/Owner: Dylan & Hannah Oldt
(Lot 8) 925 Aura Rd
Monroeville, NJ 08343

Owner: Timothy & Lindsay Harrison
(Lot 9) 923 Aura Rd
Monroeville, NJ 08343

ZONING:

The property is within the R - Rural Residential Zoning District which permits agricultural uses and buildings, single-family dwellings, public parks and playgrounds, woodlands, conservation areas, and accessory uses that are customarily incidental and subordinate to the primary use on site.

The following table indicates the bulk standards for the entire lot based on the current R Residential standards.

Section	Required	Existing Lot 8	Existing Lot 9	Proposed Lot 8	Proposed Lot 9	Compliance
§96-70D(1) Max Gross Density	0.5 du/ac	0.96*	0.43	0.54**	0.67**	Lot 8: Variance Lot 9: Variance
§96-70D(2) Min Lot Size	80,000 sf	45,204*	100,976	81,164	65,014**	Lot 8: Complies Lot 9: Variance
§96-70D(3) Min Front Yard Setback	50 ft	75.14	36*	75.14	36*	Lot 8: Complies Lot 9: Preexisting Nonconformance
§96-70D(4) Min Rear Yard Setback	40 ft	326.30	352.63	326.30	352.63	Complies
§96-70D.(5) Min Side Yard Setback	20 ft	47.39	39.31	47.39	39.31	Complies
§96-70D.(5) Min Side Yard Setback (aggregate)	50 ft	77.25	204.74	109.86	85.43	Complies

Section	Required	Existing Lot 8	Existing Lot 9	Proposed Lot 8	Proposed Lot 9	Compliance
§96-70D.(6)(a) Min Width at Building Line	150 ft	140*	±230	±220	152.08	Complies
§96-70D.(7) Min Lot Depth	200 ft	457.87	409.48	441.24	409.48	Complies
§96-70D.(9)(a) Min Lot Frontage	135 ft	161.67	232.08	241.67	152.08	Complies
§96-70D.(10) Max Height	35 ft	<35	<35	<35	<35	Complies
§96-70D.(11) Maximum Building Coverage	15	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.02	Complies
§96-68D(12) Max Impervious	20	13.4	5.3	7.5	8.2	Complies

* Indicates preexisting nonconformance

** Indicates variance required

VARIANCES:

Bulk Variances:

1. Lot Size §96-70.D(2) – The applicant is proposing a lot area of 65,014 square feet for proposed Lot 9 where a minimum of 80,000 square feet is required. **A variance is required.**
2. Front Yard Setback §96-71.D(6) – The applicant is proposing a front yard setback of 36 feet for proposed Lot 9 where a minimum front yard setback of 50 feet is required. *It shall be noted that this is a preexisting nonconformance.*

Standard of Proof for “C” Variances

The applicant must provide testimony to justify the requested variances. For a C(1) variance, the applicant must demonstrate that the strict application of the zoning regulations to the property create a hardship or result in exceptional practical difficulties by reason of the exceptional shape of the property or the exceptional topographic conditions uniquely affecting the property, or the structures lawfully existing upon the property.

For a C(2) variance the applicant must show that the proposed variance advances the purposes of municipal land use law and that the benefits of the deviation would substantially outweigh any detriments. The applicant should address whether the proposed variance will substantially impair the intent of the Master Plan or zoning plan and whether there are any potential impacts to the public good.

Use Variance:

1. Maximum Density §96-70D(1) - The applicant is proposing a density of 0.54 dwelling units per acre for proposed Lot 8 where a maximum of 0.5 dwelling units per is the maximum permitted. *It shall be noted that existing density of 0.96 dwelling units per acre is a preexisting nonconformance. **A D(5) variance is required as the proposed density is being increased.***
2. Maximum Density §96-70D(1) - The applicant is proposing a density of 0.67 dwelling units per acre for proposed Lot 9 where a maximum of 0.5 dwelling units per acres is the maximum permitted. **A D(5) variance is required as the proposed density is being increased.**

Standard of Proof for “D” Variances

For “D” variances it is the applicant’s obligation to present the “Positive” and “Negative” criteria to justify the variance. The applicant must prove to the satisfaction of the Board that there are “special reasons” for the Board to exercise its jurisdiction to grant the requested relief, demonstrating that the site is particularly suited to the proposed use and that the proposal will advance the purposes of Municipal Land Use Law (N.J.S.A. 40:55D-2) and the Township’s Master Plan and Zoning ordinances (POSITIVE).

The applicant must also show that the variance can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and that the variance will not substantially impair the intent and purpose of the zone plan and zoning ordinance (NEGATIVE). The applicant should provide testimony demonstrating that the proposal will meet the variance criteria.

REVIEW COMMENTS:

1. As of May 1, 2012 all minor subdivisions need to conform to the Title Recordation Law for filing maps. All proper certification needs to be shown on the minor subdivision map even if the subdivision will be filed by deed.
2. In accordance with Title 46 Chapter 26B-2.b.(12), the plan shall show the certification by the land surveyor.
3. In accordance with Title 46 Chapter 26B-2.b.(13)(c), the plan shall show the certification by the municipal clerk.
4. In accordance with Title 46 Chapter 26B-2.b.(14), the plan shall show the certification by the municipal engineer.
5. In accordance with Title 46 Chapter 26B-2.b.(8) “a minimum of three corners distributed around the tract shall indicate coordinate values.”
6. The applicant shall submit legal descriptions for each of the proposed lots and road widening easements.
7. The applicant’s Land Surveyor is responsible for ensuring that all lots, dedications and easements have proper closure and shall submit lot closure reports to our office for review.
8. A certification that the new lot number has been assigned by the tax assessor must be provided.
9. Per §96-47.1.B.(1)(a), “For all minor subdivision plans, each deed of conveyance for any of the subject lots shall include the following deed notice: ‘Notice: On the date of the creation of this lot, Elk Township permitted and may continue to permit by ordinance, farming activities which some may deem offensive such as, but not limited to, aerial and ground application of pesticides, use of power-driven equipment, such as tractors and irrigation pumps, grazing of livestock, etc.’”

When revised plans are resubmitted, they are to be accompanied with a point-by-point response. We reserve the right to make additional comments pending the receipt of revised documentation.

Should there be any questions or if additional information is required, please contact the undersigned at (856) 546-8611.

Dylan and Hannah Oldt
Block 55, Lots 8 & 9
925 Aura Road
Minor Subdivision
R – Rural Residential District
Elk Township Application SD-26-01
Bach Associates Proj. #ETPB2026-2
April 8, 2026
Page 8 of 8

Very truly yours,
BACH ASSOCIATES, PC



Steven M. Bach, PE, RA, PP, CME
President



Candace Kanaplue, PP, AICP
Associate

Cc: Brandon E. DeJesus, Esq., Board Solicitor
Dylan & Hannah Oldt, Applicant/Owner
Timothy & Lindsay Harrison, Owner
M. Brian Hall, Esq., Applicant's Attorney
Erik Valentin, PLS, Applicant's Professional

\\BDG-SERVER\Project\ELK 2026 PLANNING BOARD\ETPB2026-2 Oldt Minor Subdivision\Docs\Oldt Minor Sub Review #1.docx