TOWNSHIP OF VERONA
COUNTY OF ESSEX, NEW JERSEY
MINUTES OF THE VERONA BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING
THURSDAY JUNE 13TH, 2024

PRESENT:

Chairman Dan McGinley
Vice Chairman Scott Weston
Mrs. Genevieve Murphy-Bradacs **Arrives at 8:17**
Mrs. Christy DiBartolo
Mr. Paul Mathewson
Mr. Bill Cuartas
Mr. Kevin Ryan
Dr. Edith Ries
Mr. Greg Mascara, Board Attorney

Ms. Kathleen Miesch, Board Secretary
Mr. Peter Ten-Kate, Board Engineer

CALL TO ORDER

- Meeting called to order at 8:05pm by Chairman McGinley
- Open public Meeting Act Statement read by Malak Metwaly, Board Secretary
- Roll call is taken by Malak Metwaly, Board Secretary

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairman McGinley asks for a motion to approve minutes from the Regular meeting held on May 9th, 2024. **Mr. Ryan** makes the motion, **Dr. Ries** seconds. Vice Chair Weston, Mrs. DiBartolo, Mr. Cuartas and Chairman McGinley all vote in favor. Mr. Mathewson abstains. The minutes of May 9th, 2024 meeting are approved.

RESOLUTIONS

Resolution 2024-08 – Application 2024-07 114 Park Avenue; Block 611, Lot 1
Granting approval to construct a rear rooftop terrace over a new attached masonry garage which will replace an existing wood deck, as well as move the driveway from east to west of the house. **Vice Chair Weston** makes the motion, **Mr. Ryan** seconds. Dr. Ries and Chairman McGinley vote in favor. Mrs. DiBartolo, Mr. Mathewson and Mr. Cuartas all abstain. Motion Passes.

APPLICATIONS

Application 2024-08: 48 Durrell Street; Block 1306, Lot 14.01 Zone A-3
Application has been carried from the May 9th meeting where no testimony was taken. Applicant has requested to be carried to the July 11th hearing. **Chairman McGinley** asks for a motion to carry application. **Vice Chair Weston** makes motion, **Mr. Ryan** seconds. Dr. Ries, Mrs. DiBartolo, Mr. Cuartas, Mr. Mathewson and Chairman McGinley all vote in favor. **Board Attorney, Greg Mascara** states any members of the public who are here for application 2024-08

48 Durrell Street. Application has been adjourned until the Boards July 11th, 2024 hearing in this room beginning at 8:00pm, no further notice will be required.

Application 2024-02 698-700 Bloomfield Avenue; Block 1606, Lot 13- TC Zone
Applicant Attorney, Angelo Cifelli, Jr. of the firm Prio, Zinna, Cifelli, Paris and Genitempo makes a brief opening regarding the applicant's intention to transform an empty building into a restaurant, next door to Parkside Social – which this applicant has also been operating in Verona for years. Things to be brought to the Boards attention are quirks of the zoning ordinance, if there were no residential units above the restaurant, it would be a permitted use with no requirement to be heard in front of the Board. If there were offices or retail stores above it would be permitted as a conditional use, the only reason we are in front of the Board tonight is because theres residential apartments applied for above the restaurant. We believe this application comports very strongly with Verona's master plan, which calls for a revitalization of Bloomfield Avenue. Specifically calling for mixed uses of this kind. Unfortunately, the zoning ordinance hasn't caught up with the master plan yet. With this brief introduction, I'd like to call my first witness the operator.
Board Attorney, Greg Mascara swears in Matthew Passero, West Caldwell, New Jersey. The Operating Partner.
Applicant Attorney, Angelo Cifelli, Jr. asks Mr. Passero to state his position with the applicant. **Matthew Passero** states he is the operating partner at Skopos Hospitality Group, the parents company to Parkside Social. **Applicant Attorney, Angelo Cifelli, Jr.** asks Mr. Passero how many restaurants he operates under that umbrella. **The Operator, Matthew Passero** states he's operated five restaurants in Northeast New Jersey. **Angelo Cifelli, Jr.** – Including Parkside Social in Verona? **Matthew Passero** – Correct. **Angelo Cifelli, Jr.** – How long have you been operating Parkside? **Matthew Passero** – Since 2021. **Applicant Attorney, Angelo Cifelli, Jr.** asks Mr. Passero to explain the plans for the new restaurant; operating hours, employees, etc. **The Operator, Matthew Passero** explains the interest in the restaurant space is the comparability's with our existing locations and potential new location. One being leveraging the infrastructure of the existing restaurant, in terms of staffing, management and personnel. We will have complimentary hours to our existing location, to stay in line with Parkside Social. **Angelo Cifelli, Jr.** – You mentioned there would be some economy of scale in having two restaurants literally right next door, is that correct? **Matthew Passero** – that is correct. **Angelo Cifelli, Jr.** asks Mr. Passero how long the building he wishes to occupy has been vacant. **Matthew Passero** states his assumption is between 10 to 15 years, if not longer. **Angelo Cifelli, Jr.** – That is all I have for this witness, I will defer to the Board for questions.
Chairman McGinley asks Mr. Passero what the complimentary hours to Parkside be.
The Operator, Matthew Passero explains Parkside's current hours, which do change seasonally are 4:00pm to 11:00pm during the week and until 12:00am on the weekends.
Applicants Attorney, Angelo Cifelli, Jr. redirects and asks Mr. Passero if he's ever received noise complaints or police complaints of excessive noise or gatherings in the time he's occupied the building. **Matthew Passero** states they've never received any complaints and the nature of their late night atmosphere is not something that Verona has. Our existing restaurant does clear out relatively early on weekdays and weekends. **Vice Chair Weston** asks how many chairs or seats would be available for customers in the proposed restaurant. **Matthew Passero** states there will be 48 to 50 seats. **Vice Chair Weston** asks Mr. Passero if he has a rough breakdown of how many tables that would be, including the bar area. **Matthew Passero** explains the bar itself

would relatively small with 12 to 14 bar seats with a few high tops on the bar side. The dining room area would maybe have 20 to 30 seats, without a specific table count off the top of my head. **Mr. Ryan** asks if Mr. Passero would be sharing the current liquor license with the proposed new restaurant. **Mathew Passero** – Yes, that's correct. **Mrs. DiBartolo** asks Mr. Passero to clarify how that would work with straddling a property line. **Matthew Passero** explains their liquor attorney has spoken with The ABC in terms of sharing the liquor license. As long as the properties are adjacent to one another, you're able to share a liquor license. The Finn and Crosby in Montclair is an example of two connected buildings sharing a liquor license between the properties. **Vice Chair Weston** asks if the properties will be connected inside. **Matthew Passero** – Yes, that's the goal. **Vice Chair Weston** – How many employees do you intend to have working during a Friday night shift. **Matthew Passero-** We'll have our general manager who is already at the Parkside Social, they'll be overseeing both locations, and our current chef will oversee both properties. In terms of staff, one bartender and two servers on the restaurant side because it is smaller. Two to three people in the kitchen depending on if the chef's at the new restaurant or Parkside. **Board Attorney, Greg Mascara** asks Mr. Cifelli, Jr. since theres one license, would you consider this one establishment or two. **Applicants Attorney, Angelo Cifelli, Jr.** explains from the perspective of this Board it would have to be two because they're separate, not expanding on the current restaurant. **Board Attorney, Greg Mascara** asks if there would be a 100 patron's combined capacity. **Matthew Passero-** Yes. **Board Attorney, Greg Mascara** asks Mr. Cifelli, Jr. to suggest to the Board that two separate establishments, therefor 100 on each side, 200 combined. **Applicant Attorney, Angelo Cifelli, Jr.** states that the establishments wouldn't reach 200. **Mr. Ryan** clarifies the two separate establishments will be sharing the same staff between the two restaurants with the same management team. **The Operator, Matthew Passero** explains their salaried managers will oversee both locations, something they've done with multiple restaurants in different locations. Geographically, as a regional manager in this case the properties are right next to each other. The hourly staff will be separate, different menus and things to learn. Keeping a way to keep hours up for our hourly employees by hiring a different staff, without competing for hours.
Mr. Ryan asks if the servers will be working both restaurants simultaneously or assigned on a specific day to work for either Parkside Social or the Mexican restaurant. **The Operator, Matthew Passero** – That is correct, they will be assigned. **Mr. Matthewson** asks Mr. Passero if they will be sharing a kitchen. **The Operator, Matthew Passero** states there will be a new kitchen in the restaurant. **Mr. Matthewson** asks where the kitchen will be located.
The Operator, Matthew Passero states the kitchen will be on the first floor.
Mrs. DiBartolo asks if the architect is present at today's hearing. **The Operator, Matthew Passero** – Yes. **Chairman McGinley** asks if Mr. Passero is the right person to talk to about snow and waste removal. **The Operator, Matthew Passero** – Yes, we already have a company for snow removal, depending when it snows; we have somebody assigned with the condition of the property. There is a dumpster in the rear of the property for waste removal. **Chairman McGinley** asks if the dumpster is up against the back of the building as seen on the revised plans. **The Operator, Matthew Passero** – Yes, that is correct. **Chairman McGinley** asks how frequently the waste will be addressed. **The Operator, Matthew Passero** explains depending on volume, most of their restaurants are at least three times a week. Increased or decreased with volume but the dumpster will not be overflowing with frequent pickups.
Chairman McGinley asks where Mr. Passero is advising his employee's park if they come by vehicle. **The Operator, Matthew Passero** states he would advise them to park where they're

parking currently. He is not too sure where the employees currently park, whether they're parking on Bloomfield Avenue or the side street Rockland Terrace. **Chairman McGinley** asks if Mr. Passero will be advising them to park in the lot. **The Operator, Matthew Passero** – No, they will not be using the lot to park. **Mr. Cuartas** asks who is using the lot, with it being a mixed residential and restaurant building. **The Operator, Matthew Passero** states the whole building is vacant currently but the apartment tenants and restaurant guests if they need parking. **Mr. Matthewson** asks if there are designated spots for residents. **The Operator, Matthew Passero** – Correct. **Mr. Matthewson** asks if that would be two spots per resident. **The Operator, Matthew Passero** – Yes. **Mr. Matthewson** clarifies there will be four of the eight parking spots dedicated for residents. **The Operator, Matthew Passero** – Yes, correct. **Mr. Cuartas** clarifies theres 7 total spots and one is ADA compliant. **The Operator, Matthew Passero** – Yes, correct. **Mr. Cuartas** asks how many spots would be left for the restaurant. **The Operator, Matthew Passero** states two or three spots depending on the apartment tenants needing parking or not. **Mr. Ryan** asks if theres current parking for the existing restaurant of Parkside Social. **The Operator, Matthew Passero** – Currently, no. **Dr. Ries** asks if people use the Mavis for parking when they go to the restaurant. **The Operator, Matthew Passero** states if people do park there it's not by their direction. Mavis is typically open until 6:00pm, Thursday nights till 8:00pm. When they're open, guests aren't parking on Mavis's property. **Dr. Ries** asks if they have attempted to gain any offsite parking that would be beneficial to the customers. **The Operator, Matthew Passero** states they've reached out to larger lots but haven't received many responses in return. They reached out to the property owner of where the Investors Bank is currently located but not in operation, with no success in receiving additional parking specifically from a private parking lot. **Dr. Ries** asks where they're expecting their customers to park. **The Operator, Matthew Passero** states along Bloomfield Avenue, typically businesses on Bloomfield Avenue are closed by the time the restaurants operating hours begin. There is municipal parking within a quarter of a mile. There's also side streets, Fairview Avenue has a lot of street parking as well. **Dr. Ries** clarifies if Mr. Passero is talking about the parking spaces behind the middle school as being municipal parking. **The Operator, Matthew Passero** states theres a municipal parking lot behind Bagelwich as well as the middle school parking. **Chairman McGinley** asks if their traffic study person is present for today's hearing. **Attorney, Angelo Cifelli, Jr.** states their traffic study expert is present and better suited to answer parking questions. **Mrs. DiBartolo** asks Mr. Passero about food deliveries. **The Operator, Matthew Passero** explains they have delivery windows typically mid-mornings to early afternoons depending on who's onsite. There's no set schedule for their employees, if someone's doing prep at 10:00am, they will have deliveries come at 10:00am. **Mrs. DiBartolo** asks if that would be in addition to the Parkside deliveries or two separate entities. **The Operator, Matthew Passero** states they would use the same vendor making it easier to do the same drops on the same days. **Mr. Cuartas** asks if they have experience running a mixed use development in their current or past venues. **The Operator, Matthew Passero** explains their restaurant in Nutley has a similar layout, two apartments upstairs and the restaurant downstairs. A past restaurant in Harrison, New Jersey was underneath a large residential building with 300 unit's upstairs, all mixed use. Also, a location in Jersey City with 4 apartments above the restaurant. **Mrs. DiBartolo** states Parkside has a rentable banquet room for specific parties. Asking if the same will be done at the new restaurant. **The Operator, Matthew Passero** explains the side room at the Parkside Social is for a la carte dining as well. From an events perspective, every room can be sectioned off as a private room. In the new space it's the bar side

and dining side, the dining side would double as an event space that can be rented out. Depending on the type, size or style of the party. **Mrs. DiBartolo** asks if it will be prior to 4:00pm. **The Operator, Matthew Passero-** No we don't typically run events outside of our operating hours. **Chairman McGinley** asks if the Board members have any other questions to owner representative. If not, is there anyone from the public who would like to ask a question of the owner representative based on the testimony he's presented this evening. **Vice Chair Weston** asks Mr. Passero where exactly the dumpster will be located. **The Operator, Matthew Passero** states the updated plans show the dumpster location being directly behind the building. **Mr. Matthewson** asks Board if theres a requirement for enclosures built around dumpsters.
Attorney, Angelo Cifelli, Jr. states they intend on fencing in the dumpster.
Chairman McGinley states the Board is ready to move onto the next witness.
Board Attorney, Greg Mascara swears in Joseph Staigar, 245 Main Street Chester, New Jersey. Board accepts Joseph Staiger as a Professional Engineer.
Attorney, Angelo Cifelli, Jr. asks Mr, Staiger to present the study to the Board.
Engineer, Joseph Staiger explains a traffic impact study has been prepared, performing traffic counts on Bloomfield Avenue and Rockland Terrace. In addition, performing parking counts on street, municipal lots and within reasonable convenient walking distance to the site, to determine how many vacant spaced would be available. The second aspect is projecting the amount of traffic the restaurant would generate in terms of volume and we superimpose that on the existing volume to determine the level of service. In traffic impact there is no change in the level of service, level of service is the characteristics of the flow conditions of an intersection. In grade school it ranges from "A" through "F". "A" being the best condition with minimal delay, "F" being the worst condition where the volume exceeds the capacity of the intersection itself. What we determined was that we are good levels of service, levels of service "A" through "C" we are in the upper range even with the additional traffic. We are asking for a parking variance on the site, we're required to have per the ordinance twenty seven parking spaces. Which matches the number of seats and square footage based on the empirical data traffic engineers use for determining parking demand. The ordinance is in line with what the experience has been in the field, twenty seven parking space; providing eight onsite with the deficiency of nineteen parking spaces. We're in a commercial area of your township, shared parking in multiple types of uses, particularly in a downtown business area is very common. Uses such as the Mavis Tire Center and elementary school that shut down at 3:30pm or 5:00pm, the proposed restaurant is going to be busier after 5:00pm when all of those businesses close. The parking demand in the general area is going to fluctuate, depending upon the demand of the various uses. We're proposing an evening use, with many of the other uses particularly retail, commercial or school uses are shut down or minimal activity. There is a compatibility to be able to use the municipal resources of parking as well as the parking on the streets. During the peak period of this restaurants operating hours of Friday and Saturday evenings the traffic study engineers went out and did counts. Maximum 900 ft away, which is a five minute walk to the site. Engineers went on Bloomfield Avenue, Rockland Terrace, Orchard Street, Linden Avenue and South Prospect Street. Engineers also took a look at Municipal lot number two off of Gould Avenue which is only a 3 minute walk. There is the municipal loop where the police station is, theres no signs that restrict parking, assuming these spaces are allowed to be used by the public. Lot number one in the report by Park Place is .3 miles, a nine minute walk with a significant amount of empty parking spaces. We took into account the spaces, concluding to having a minimum of thirty empty spaces on the streets mentioned and within lot two; all within a three to five minute walk of the site. Thirty spaces,

we're deficient by nineteen, we need twenty seven and we have eight onsite. Beyond that taking into account the municipal loop and lot one by Park Place, we have one hundred and nine parking spaces on the peak periods of Friday and Saturday nights. Therefore, Mr. Staiger believes the variance can be granted without any detriment to the zone plan or neighborhood because of the ample street parking to accommodate the additional demand. Regarding the exiting of space number one, Mr. Staiger backs out of the spot onto the street.
Chairman McGinley asks if space number eight also an existing curb cut. However, theres a section of three spaces. **Engineer, Joseph Staiger** explains space number eight is at the end with a 24 ft isle behind it, which allows the maneuverability to back up.
Chairman McGinley states looking at the directional arrows on the plan shows an in and out, in the southerly driveway and just an out in the northerly driveway behind spot number eight. Are there two driveways. **Engineer, Joseph Staiger** explains there are two driveways, currently it's a fully depressed curb. We're trying to provide some order to it and the landscaping. With a curved area behind the seepage pit, proposed depressed curve along the area to the south and a short exit area only to the north. We're improving upon the existing condition in terms of providing a full face curve and order of circulation. **Chairman McGinley** asks if one was to park in space number eight facing in, would they have to back out into Rockland Terrace. **Engineer, Joseph Staiger** explains theres 24 ft from the new curve along Rockland. 24 ft is the typical backup for perpendicular parking, you could back up from space number eight without leaving the property itself. **Chairman McGinley** asks the need for the northerly exit, assuming all of the parking spots are perpendicular. Theoretically, one could back out and in from the southerly driveway. **Engineer, Joseph Staiger** states they could close the northerly driveway and just keep the southerly area open. **Mr. Ryan** asks if Mr. Staiger has considered asking people who dine in the restaurant where they consider parking. **Engineer, Joseph Staiger** explains they park wherever's convenient and safe. **Mr. Ryan** states the two restaurants would be competing for the same parking spaces. Parkside Social doesn't have parking, now adding another restaurant competing for street parking. Theres still a concern if the restaurant is successful, there will be overflow of parking on the surrounding streets. The municipal lot off of Grove Street, the town has taken away available spaces and making them permit spaces. **Board Attorney, Greg Mascara** explains the applicant might require a variance, backing out into the street from parking space one is not permitted according to 150-12.8H. If there is approval we will have to add that in as a variance. **Engineer, Joseph Staiger** recommends that space be used by the general manager or someone that is familiar that will not be moving in and out all day long. **Attorney, Angelo Cifelli, Jr.** addresses Mr. Ryan's concern, stating a lot of Parkside's customers do Uber. **Mrs. DiBartolo** asks Mr. Staiger to discuss public transportation, many municipalities have a Transit oriented design which we need to look to, to reduce parking count. **Engineer, Joseph Staiger** states other than employees, not many patrons use buses to get to the facility but rather using Uber or other ride share methods which doesn't demand parking. **Mrs. Murphy-Bradacs** asks if Mr. Staiger has any information on how many people walk to Parkside. **Engineer, Joseph Staiger** explains the location and surrounding residential neighborhood, it will be easier for someone to walk than it is to park their car. **Board Engineer, Peter Ten-Kate** asks if the engineer would recommend a crosswalk from the drop off point to the sidewalk for safety to a handicapped spot. **Engineer, Joseph Staiger** states no one would be crossing that area, it would be a good visual to aid handicapped people. **Board Engineer, Peter Ten-Kate** states it will also prevent someone from parking adjacent to spot number one in the lot. **Chairman McGinley** asks if the Board has any additional questions for the traffic engineer. If not, does anyone from the

public have any questions for the traffic engineer on the testimony he's presented this evening. Seeing none, the Board is ready to move on to the next witness.

Board Attorney, Greg Mascara swears in Peter G. Steckae, Maplewood Avenue, Maplewood New Jersey. Board accepts Mr. Steckae as a Professional Planner.

Attorney, Angelo Cifelli, Jr asks Mr. Steckae to explain what resources were looked to while doing the report. **The Planner, Peter G. Steckae** explains he's examined the property's surrounding area while reviewing the zoning ordinance and master plan.

Attorney, Angelo Cifelli, Jr asks Mr. Steckae to give the Board the benefit of the outcome.

The Planner, Peter G. Steckae states although the property is vacant at the moment, it's a mixed use building. Previously having a dry cleaner on the first floor and two apartments on the second floor. The rear is partially paved and the applicant is planning on extending the pavement to get additional parking. The applicant is not altering the second floor, they will remain as two, two bedroom apartments. The first floor will be used a full service sit down restaurant with 46 seats, there will be a doorway open between the two buildings. This is a commercial corridor with residential uses down Rockland Terrace. There is meter parking on Bloomfield Avenue that operate from 8:00am to 6:00pm as well as Rockland terrace. In this zone, the ordinance allows retails stores, service establishments, financial institutions, and daycare centers. Full service restaurants are a permitted use, without the two apartments on the second floor this application would be a permitted use in the zone. We want to retain the apartments thus, asking for a mixed use variance. The ordinance allows for apartments over offices and retail but not over restaurants, we are requesting a D1 variance to maintain the apartments. We are also requesting a parking variance as indicated we're deficient by 19 spaces, although this property will never have sufficient parking. If every property along Bloomfield Avenue had its own onsite parking and complied with the code, there wouldn't be a town center that can be accessible by walking. Part of the analysis was looking at the master plan of 2022 talked about mixed use being an attractive use. As stated on page 48 of the master plan "Mixed use developments typically with active uses, such as retail shops, restaurants, or businesses on lower floors with more private uses such as apartments or office space on the upper floors have been increasing in popularity to single use commercial areas." Restaurants on the ground floor with apartments above were envisioned to be a mixed use. The master plan found it's a good type of use to have, adding vibrancy to the downtown and promoting economic development. Part of the master plan research was asking the public what they would like to see in their downtown, 61% of the respondents said more restaurants. In terms of the municipal land use law, there are three purposes that I cited to promote this use, 4055 D-2 purposes A, G, and M. Purpose A mentions encouraging municipal action to guide appropriate use of development in a manner which promotes the health, safety morals and welfare. Purpose G mentions providing sufficient space in an appropriate location. Purpose M mentions lessening the cost of development. The restaurant use is suited to the property without expanding the building, sharing of the liquor license and staff. No full buffering, the property does buffer residential use, and the resident has a substantial privet edge…not on our property but a good demarcation of where the commercial zone ends. We have storm water improvements that will be handled. **Chairman McGinley** asks if a variance needs to be added regarding the 15 foot buffer and 20% open space that are currently sitting on the book.

The Planner, Peter G. Steckae states the issues are subsumed into the use variance, they're to be considered but not as a separate variance request. The parking backing out issue is a design standard as opposed to a zoning standard. **Chairman McGinley** asks if the Board has any

additional questions for the planner. If not, does anyone from the public have any questions for the planner on the testimony he's presented this evening. Seeing none, the Board is ready to move on to the next witness.

Interjection-
Chairman McGinley states the time is now 9:25pm and the Board will not be able to hear **Application 2024-10 30 Pompton Avenue; Block 202, Lot 44 (*Starbucks*)** with two more applications to be heard.
Applicant Attorney, John Dusinberre states it would be wise to carry this application for the applicant to present a cohesive presentation at the July 11th, 2024 hearing. Confirming the Board has accepted the jurisdictional facts, so the Board has the authority to adjourn us. **Board Attorney, Greg Mascara** – Yes. **Applicants Attorney, John Dusinberre** states notice has been submitted, certification of notice publication in Star Ledger on June 2nd, 2024. **Board Attorney, Greg Mascara** clarifies for the record Mr. Dusinberre has confirmed the jurisdiction of this Board. **Applicants Attorney, John Dusinberre** – Yes, in terms of the overall approach. We recognize this property has multiple principle uses. One of the uses is the Acura dealership that is a non-conforming use. We've tailors this application as 2D-3 exceptions to what now has been a permitted use because of the extended town center zone. In creating that ordinance and applying it to this part of town, the governing body has given some relief to applicants without worrying about multiple uses. In this case, it's the substitution of one permitted use for another. A Starbucks is being proposed for the Chase Bank building, it will come with a new traffic light at the corner of Claremont and Pompton Ave.
Board Attorney, Greg Mascara announces this matter of the application 2024-10 30 Pompton Avenue, as Mr. Dusinberre suggested the application he will be presenting on behalf of Starbucks is adjourned until the July 11th, 2024 meeting with the applications consent. If there's anyone here that was to participate in that meeting they are free to go. There will be no new notice, the notice is this evening July 11th, 2024, 8:00pm, this room.
End of Interjection.

Board Attorney, Greg Mascara swears in Joseph Haines, Dassa Haines Architectural Group, 74 East Passaic Ave, Nutley New Jersey. Attended NJIT, license is in effect. Board accepts Joseph Haines as a professional Architect.
The Architect, Joseph Haines explains what's proposed on the first floor of the restaurant, 46 seats, 16 on the bar side and 30 on the dining side. Proposing two new bathrooms, one will be handicapped in the back left hand corner, there will be a service station in the back middle, and a full kitchen in the back right hand side. In the basement, a walk-in, on the second floor two existing two-bedroom units on the left and right side with a stairway in the middle. On the site plan, proposing on paving the green patches in the lot to maximize the amount of parking spaces on the back of the property. Driveway aprons will be left the way they exist currently to maximize parking as well as making it easy to exit through both sides without backing out. Revisions after the Boswell Engineering Report is including landscape buffer where the grass area is being proposed, to separate the side wall from the proposed additional parking area, also where there is no depressed curve. Within the planting area, proposing low shrubs, no higher than 24 to 30 inches. Also adding two light poles to provide lighting for the parking lot.
Chairman McGinley asks if the lights will be directed away from the residential section. **The Architect, Joseph Haines** states there will be shields on the lights on the Parkside side, on the

residential side it's heavily bushed, being shielded by the shrubs. **Chairman McGinley** states we can't rely on the adjacent property to maintain the shrubs if somebody new comes along. **The Architect, Joseph Haines** – Correct, they are shared shrubs right on the property line. **Attorney, Angelo Cifelli, Jr.** asks Mr. Haines if he has had a chance to review the June 12th, 2024 Boswell Engineering report. **The Architect, Joseph Haines** – Yes, I have. **Attorney, Angelo Cifelli Jr.** asks if theres any recommendations or comments that Mr. Haines feels the applicant can't comply to. **The Architect, Joseph Haines** states theres a few items to be addresses. Number 7, talking about the new impervious surface, installing a seepage pit and meeting the requirements for additional storm water. **Board Engineer, Peter Ten-Kate** states the items listed are to be addressed before engineering can approve the plan if the Board approves. **Chairman McGinley** asks about the seepage pit being bigger than what's needed.
The Architect, Joseph Haines explains the proposed seepage pit is 8 ft diameter by 4 ft deep, stone around, 2 ft on the bottom, and 2 ft on the sides. Calculated to be the approximate size needed based on the code. **Board Engineer, Peter Ten-Kate** explains item number 7 on the Boswell Engineering report they're required to have 314 cubic feet and the proposed seepage pit is 362 cubic feet, not being much over. **Chairman McGinley** asks if that is ok with the Board. **Board Engineer, Peter Ten-Kate** explains concerns on item number 28 on page 5 about reducing the curb cut. **The Architect, Joseph Haines** explains number 28 lists reducing the curb cut down to 30 ft, intending on leaving it as is to make sure parking spot number 1 is available without losing it. Going hand in hand with item number 29, the proposal right now is to leave the curb cut as is. Item number 30, provide species with planting and maturing size will be provided. Item number 35, specifying about the lights in legend simple – L1 states the light shield is to be mounted 15 ft high in a pole. Light traces are cut off at the shrubs, not exceeding 12 ft high. **Board Engineer, Peter Ten-Kate** states the recommended light fixture color temperature 4,000 is proposed and the recommended is 3,000 because the restaurant is adjacent to a residential property, the color temperature will be less harsh. **The Architect, Joseph Haines** – We accept that. Item number 37, we are proposing a dumpster directly behind our building by the stairwell going down to the basement. Currently, we do not propose screening around the dumpster but we will gladly put a 6 foot high screened fence enclosure. It will be a six cube yard dumpster that will be picked up three times a week. **Board Engineer, Peter Ten-Kate** asks about the ADA accessibility to the building and how the parking space is to be utilized. **The Architect, Joseph Haines** explains the hatched area next to the handicap space would have a walkway, possibly 4 ft wide that will go from that hatched area, adjacent to the handicapped spot out to the sidewalk. **Board Engineer, Peter Ten-Kate** asks if there will be handicapped access through the front door. **The Architect, Joseph Haines** explains there's a step into the front door, there will be a temporary ramp or help them gain accessibility to get into the building. **Board Attorney, Greg Mascara** asks about the applicant not willing to comply with item number 28. **Board Engineer, Peter Ten-Kate** states the Board has to decide if the curb cut, item number 28 should be left as is or will require a more defined opening. **Mrs. DiBartolo** asks about the occupant count which will affect the parking count. The maximum occupancy of this space is 46 occupants, not including staff. Can you testify to the fact that this will not exceed 46 occupants. **The Architect, Joseph Haines** States 50 is the maximum occupancy for the first floor. **Mrs. DiBartolo** states on the plan it looks like more tables can fit. **The Architect, Joseph Haines** agrees and states the number of exits in the building and the building not being sprinkled, the building code is going to require a maximum of 50 occupancy. **Mr. Ryan** asks Mr. Ten-Kate to clarify item numbers 28 and 29, if parking space number 1 is removed will your recommendation make the access and

egress from the parking lot better. **Board Engineer, Peter Ten-Kate** explains if theres a defined curb, it would be a more traditional parking lot and serve better for drainage. **Mr. Ryan** states since they are deficient in parking, 7 spots would be better for input and output as opposed to eight. **Mr. Cuartas** agrees and states he'd like to see more ADA compliance with potentially two spots securing the parking for residents and more mobility through the lot, taking trucks off Bloomfield or the side road eliminating more traffic through the corridor. **Board Engineer, Peter Ten-Kate** states he's not concerned with space 8 as he is with space 1 where the deliveries are that's going to cause a jam by the ADA space. **Board Attorney, Greg Mascara** asks Mr. Cifelli Jr. would he consider to reconfiguring the lot to make it 7 spaces. **Attorney, Angelo Cifelli Jr.** states he's spoken to his client and they're willing to comply. **Mrs. DiBartolo** states Uber Eats is a big part of business models with dedicated spaces inside restaurants, the pick-up and drop off is a big issue, especially when there's a fire hydrant in front. **Board Attorney, Greg Mascara** clarifies if the Board wants seven spaces plus a flex space or 6 spaces plus a flex space to make the lot more accessible. **Mr. Cuartas** explains the lot needs to be more movement friendly. Securing the ADA spot and residential spots to eliminate temporary traffic. **Board Attorney, Greg Mascara** asks if there's ability for tandem spots and not for restaurant customers. **The Architect, Joseph Haines** explains that would require a curb cut through the whole lot, which exists for the majority of it already. If left as is, there would be seven. **Chairman McGinley** states the applicant is willing to get rid of spot number one and go down to seven space. Asks if two ADA spaces will be required. **Board Engineer, Peter Ten-Kate** clarifies they're compliant with one. **Mrs. DiBartolo** asks if the dumpster will be dumped by truck and how. **The Architect, Joseph Haines** states it will be rolled out and picked up by truck. **Mrs. DiBartolo** clarifies it will not be impacting the proposed space. **The Architect, Joseph Haines** – It will not, it will be during off hours. **Mr. Cuartas** expands on having a handicapped spot for both Parkside and the new restaurant as a joint venture. **Board Attorney, Greg Mascara** states theres a possibility to ask council to add a handicapped spot on Bloomfield Avenue. **Chairman McGinley** states for the record the Board is only considering the property on the corner, not Parkside Social as part of this application. There is a reasonable agreement on increasing the number of variance parking spaces needed by one, remove parking space number one, one has to be ADA compliant and the other space can or cannot be reserved for the tenants. **Board Attorney, Greg Mascara** asks Mr. Ten-Kate if theres an EV requirement for creating new parking spots with four being residential. **Board Engineer, Peter Ten-Kate** explains it can be classified as a rehabilitation and asks if there will be designated spots for residential parking. There will be an overlap for the evening patrons and residents coming home at night. **The Architect, Joseph Haines** explains one parking spot for each apartment would be designated. **Board Engineer, Peter Ten-Kate** asks if the Board can request the residential parking spots to be spots numbered six and seven. **Attorney, Angelo Cifelli Jr.** states applicant has no problem with that. **Mrs. DiBartolo** asks about parking space calculations, 1.5 parking spaces per dwelling units is that correct. **The Architect, Joseph Haines** clarifies there is 1.5 parking space per dwelling plus .5 space for guest parking. Having the required 4 for the two apartments. **Mrs. DiBartolo** asks if they can designate two spots. **Board Attorney, Greg Mascara** explains the designation is an ownership matter but as a condition we will say they have to designate two spots. **Board Attorney, Peter Ten-Kate** asks if the Board can request that it be a full curb cut check for the entrance spots. The depressed curb up to that point will be a full curb. **The Architect, Joseph Haines** states approximately 30 ft that is discussed in item 29 of the Boswell Engineering review. **Mrs. DiBartolo** asks if theres air conditioning rooftop units or

window units. **The Architect, Joseph Haines** states there will be split systems for the new restaurant, units will be down in the basement and two condensers in the back. H-VAC units for the restaurant and a condenser for the walk-in, in the back. **Mrs. DiBartolo** asks about the environmental impact studies regarding hazard changes since it was a dry cleaner switching over to a mixed use. **Attorney, Angelo Cifelli Jr.** explains the environmental issues were addressed at the time of the purchase, whatever was required was done in order to take over. **Mr. Matthewson** asks about the kitchen exhaust coming out at ground height. Will there be a precipitator because the pushing crease is going to come out and go right up on that deck onto the walkway of the parking lot. **The Architect, Joseph Haines** – Yes, there will be a precipitator. The other option is going through the roof, against the building. As of right now, it will be coming out through the back. **Mrs. DiBartolo** asks if there will be a grease trap. **The Architect, Joseph Haines** – Yes, it will be located in the basement. **Board Attorney, Greg Mascara** asks Board if they're ok with the roof option. **Mr. Matthewson** clarifies that will be 3 or 4 feet above the roof, 10 feet away from any intakes. **The Architect, Joseph Haines** – Yes, correct. **Mrs. DiBartolo** states it would be preferable on the sidewall or it will come up on the rooftop terrace. **Mr. Matthewson** explains if its placed towards the middle of the roof, with the weight of the grease, it will come with a different level. **Chairman McGinley** asks if the Board has any additional questions for the architect. If not, does anyone from the public have any questions for the architect on the testimony he's presented this evening. Seeing none, thank you. **Attorney, Angelo Cifelli Jr.** states that is their full testimony. **Chairman McGinley** opens the floor to anyone from the public that would like to make a statement about the application.

Member of the Public, John Gillifi, 12 Rockland Terrace, Verona New Jersey.
John Gillifi states he appeared before the Board in 2016 regarding the prior business that held the property. They had restrictions added such as no outdoor dining, no one on the patio after 10:30pm, no music, no live bands, and no TV's. I'd like to see the same restrictions added if they decide to remove the apartments and extend the dining upstairs into the rooftop deck. **Chairman McGinley** clarifies the applicant would have to go back to the Board for a variance if they decide to do that. **John Gillifi** asks if the variance would apply if they decide to put a tent up for Cinco de Mayo, since it's a Mexican themed establishment. **Board Attorney, Greg Mascara** states the only permitted use in the back is only for parking, that would be an expansion. The back dining would be expanding the number of tables, therefore needing more parking, therefore needing a variance. **John Gillifi** states the next issue is the enclosure for the garbage. The dumpster for Parkside is on Mavis's property right by my patio. Will that dumpster remain there plus the one by the new restaurant. **Board Attorney, Greg Mascara** states the Board as no jurisdiction to dictate what the property owners must do on another property. If they wanted to agree with that they could and we can include it as a condition but we can't broach that topic because it's not part of this application. **John Gillifi** states concern about the parking mentioned by the applicants being used by other restaurants that are also within walking distance. Theres only parking on side of my street with meters on the other. The other concern being the hedges alongside the property, people back up into them causing debris to get trapped or come through them. A 4 ft fence should be put up to keep the debris on the asphalt, that can be easier to clean up. **Board Engineer, Peter Ten-Kate** asks Mr. Gillifi if he's talking about the far end of the parking lot. **John Gillifi** states yes, his property is the first house in the back of the new restaurant and Parkside and three quarters of Mavis's back property. **Attorney, Angelo Cifelli Jr.** states the applicant has no problem installing a 4ft fence. **Chairman McGinley** asks if

anyone else from the public would like to make a statement on this application. Seeing none, we will move to Board deliberation. **Chairman McGinley** states Board has come to an agreement with parking. It's a use variance putting a restaurant in there, no one has voiced any concerns with that particular variance. Stormwater management is required, we've added to the variance for parking saying it's a total of 27 are required and 7 are proposed, looking at a variance for 20 total. Conditions being leaving the northern driveway, including an ADA walkway to the sidewalk, eliminate space number one according to the Boswell 28-29 Engineering report, having a full curb so the driveway part is available…**Mrs. DiBartolo** asks if it makes sense to have the curb mimic the ingress and egress, negating the opportunity to have space one be a flex space. **Mr. Matthewson** asks what the flex space would be used for. **Mrs. DiBartolo** clarifies it would be for Uber Eats, etc. **Mr. Matthewson** states they would not park there. **Chairman McGinley** states the other conditions would be the adjacent dumpster. **Board Attorney, Greg Mascara** asks how many dumpsters will be on the location total. **Attorney, Angelo Cifelli Jr.** states two right now, we would have to wait and see how it works moving forward. **Chairman McGinley** states he will have to check the resolution for stipulations. **Board Engineers, Peter Ten-Kate** states the other condition has to be the color temperature of 3,000 not 4,000. **Chairman McGinley** asks if anyone recollects other conditions. **Mrs. DiBartolo** states the maximum occupancy being 46. **Attorney, Angelo Cifelli Jr.** clarifies the maximum occupancy is 50. **Chairman McGinley** stating there are seats for 46. **Mr. Matthewson** mentions the two designated sports for residents. **Board Attorney, Greg Mascara** confirms parking spots 6 and 7 will be reserved for residential parking. **Mrs. Murphy-Bradacs** mentions the 4ft fence and recommends it being aesthetically pleasing to the property. **Chairman McGinley** asks if there are any other additions to the approval resolution. **Mr. Matthewson** states if they go with a side wall kitchen wall exhaust, they must have a precipitator.

Chairman McGinley entertains a motion to approve this **Application 2024-02** with the conditions mentioned and listed.
Mrs. DiBartolo makes motion to approve **Application 2024-02. Vice Chair Weston** seconds.

The **Board Secretary, Malak Metwaly** calls the roll:

Dr. Ries –Yes, Mrs. Murphy-Bradacs –Yes, Mr. Ryan –Yes, Mr. Matthewson –Yes, Mr. Cuartas–Yes, Chairman McGinley –Yes.

Application 2024-04: 68 Forest Avenue; Block 2102, Lot 45 – Zone R-50
Applicant Attorney, William Rush states the applicant is proposing to install an underground pool and patio in the rear yard. This application was carried from the March 14th meeting, since then the plans have been revised, eliminating the need for two variances for the rear and side setback for the patio. Also significantly reducing the maximum improved lot coverage. Applicant reduced the size of proposed patio, relocating the equipment pad, eliminating the proposed wood deck and eliminating the part of the driveway that extends into the rear yard. The applicant is now requesting the following variances from section 150-75 (A) under the Verona code for swimming pools side setbacks, the proposed pool is 5.3 feet from the side property line and 8.1 feet from the rear property line. The code requires a minimum pool set back from the side and rear property lines of 10 feet. Applicant is also requiring a bulk variance from section 157.5 D4 for maximum improved lot coverage. The proposed maximum improved lot coverage is

currently 46.2%, the code permits maximum of 40%. The initial proposed coverage was 57.85 maximum lot coverage, the variance has been reduced by 11.6. The existing maximum improved lot coverage is 45.7%, the increase is only half a percent of what's currently existing on the property. Another bulk variance is requested from section 157.5 F4 for maximum aggregate coverage by accessory structure in the yard. Proposed maximum area coverage for accessory structures is 17.6%, the code permits 15%. The revised application has substantially reduced the intensity of what was originally presented to the Board by eliminating the wood deck, the driveway in the rear yard and the patio surrounding the pool. **Applicant Attorney, William Rush** asks applicant Chris Oghia where he lives. **Applicant, Chris Oghia** state 68 Forest Ave in Verona. **Applicant Attorney, William Rush** asks who Mr. Oghia lives with. **Applicant, Chris Oghia** states his wife and two children. **Applicant Attorney, William Rush** asks how long he's lived at 68 Forest Ave. **Applicant, Chris Oghia** states since January 2019, 4 and a half years. **Applicant Attorney, William Rush** asks what Mr. Oghia is proposing to the Board. **Applicant, Chris Oghia** states he wants to add an in ground pool in the backyard and a small patio **Applicant Attorney, William Rush** asks Mr. Oghia if he's planning on shortening his existing driveway. **Applicant, Chris Oghia** – Correct. **Applicant Attorney, William Rush** asks if Mr. Oghia garage is at the end of the driveway. **Applicant, Chris Oghia** – Yes. **Applicant Attorney, William Rush** asks if Mr. Oghia will be cutting off the driveway that would run directly to the garage. **Applicant, Chris Oghia** – Correct. **Applicant Attorney, William Rush** asks if Mr. Oghia has any objections to the Boswell Engineering review. **Applicant, Chris Oghia-** No. **Mrs. DiBartolo** asks about drainage and slopes in the neighborhood. **Applicant, Chris Oghia** states theres a French drain, eliminating any drainage issues. **Mr. Matthewson** asks about the location of the pool gate in the rear of the property. **Applicant, Chris Oghia** states the gate is along the left side of the house, no gate in the rear. **Dr. Ries** asks what's stopping the applicant from allowing the pool setback to be 10 feet. **Applicant, Chris Oghia** explains if the pool is shifted closer to the house, the right side would be narrower than they would aesthetically like. While maximizing the space as much as possible. **Dr. Ries** asks if applicant has considered a smaller pool. **Applicant, Chris Oghia** states the proposed pool size is preferable to his family. **Chairman McGinley** asks if the Board has any additional questions. If not, does anyone from the public have any questions regarding this application. Seeing none, Board moves to deliberation. **Mrs. DiBartolo** expresses concern about the high density zone of the property as well as water runoff. **Applicant Attorney, William Rush** states the Boswell Engineering review found the drainage system capacity acceptable. **Chairman McGinley** states his concern with how much is going on, on the property. With an 11 foot driveway on one side and a 3.6 foot to the property line on the other side, screen porches, a garage and the property line is skewed with fences. A pool addition would overwhelm the property. **Applicant Attorney, William Rush** asks the Board what pool size do they see fit for the property. **Vice Chair West** states he doesn't see an issue with the coverage but his concern is the rear and side setbacks. He would be more inclined if the pool placement was moved to the center, closer to the house. **Applicant Attorney, William Rush** states the applicant has taken all the comments in consideration and asks if this application can be carried before votes are taken. **Dr. Ries** states her concern about the structure and amount of accessories on the property. Stating the applicant should come back with a smaller pool and adhere more to the rules and regulations. **Application Attorney, William Rush** agrees with the Board, stating the applicant should revise plans with his engineer. **Board Attorney, Greg Mascara** states this matter is adjourned to July 11th, 2024, no further notice will be required.

Application 2024-06: 12 Lynwood Road; Block 1404, Lot 25 – Zone: R-50
Pool Builder, Michael Panayiotou addresses items 6B, 6C, 6E, 7, 15, 17, and 18 on the Boswell Engineering Review. 6B the proposed in-ground pool will be set back 8 feet from the side and rear property lines. There will be a three foot wide walkway that will meet the 5 foot minimum setback to patio ordinance. The rear porch and setbacks are 18 square feet in area that will remain. The pool structure is 278 square feet in the area and the total area of the accessory structure in the rear yard is 296 square feet. The rear yard is 1,996 square feet, the accessory structure coverage in the rear yard is 296 over 1,996 which is 14.8%, below the 15% threshold. The pool equipment pad is located on the side of the house, not considered in rear yard. The area of the equipment pad is 21 square feet, added to the total lot coverage of 2,234 square feet and 36.9%. The soil fill quantities are 2,373 cubic feet or 88 cubic yards. The total disturbed area will be in the rear yard of 1,996, plus the side of stone walkway of 96 square feet or less than 2,100 square feet being less than the 5,000 square feet. Soil erosion measures will be added to the plan along with the notes regarding any damage to town property. The current requested variance is the setback to the house, being compliant with the provisions on the review.
Chairman McGinley states for the record the setback to the rear property line is identified as 8 feet and the setback to the rear property line for a pool would be 10 feet.
Michael Panayiotou states he's redesigned the pool to conform to the rear and side setback based on the review given. The pool would have been unsuitably small for the backyard. The 12x24 is the smallest size available at them, there are other pools slightly smaller but because of the shape it wouldn't have conformed to the yard the same way the 12x24 would. The impervious coverage was reduced, the stone walkway will be removed, and the left hand side patio area has been reduced significantly, drainage will have a stone trench to minimize impact on the adjacent properties. **Mrs. DiBartolo** asks about adverse consequences to having a pool so close to the foundation wall. **Michael Panayiotou** states there is and the pool currently is the closest without taking any dirt from the exterior so close to the building. With the drainage built in past the wall will prevent water flow towards the building. **Board Attorney, Greg Mascara** asks about the safety issues with the pool being so close to the house, in regards to jumping off the roof. **Michael Panayiotou** states it could be a concern with future owners. **Board Attorney, Greg Mascara** asks if there's an industry compliance standard. **Michael Panayiotou** states it's on a town by town basis.**Board Attorney, Greg Mascara** asks for clarification on the deck. **Michael Panayiotou** states after the Boswell review, the back stairway and the 10x12 deck were taken into account and they will be removed. **Mr. Matthewson** asks if a seepage pit will be installed. **Michael Panayiotou** states there's a popup emitter, north of that is a deck drain connecting to the trench. **Board Engineer, Peter Ten-Kate** emphasizes the drainage cannot go into the neighbor's property. **Michael Panayiotou** – Agrees. **Mr. Matthewson** recaps stating there will be a 2 foot side variance, 2 foot side, no back patio setback variance for the 5.4, requiring 10 feet. **Chairman McGinley** moves to Board deliberation. **Chairman McGinley** states theres a lot going on, on a small piece of property. When needing a variance from the back, the side, the house and the coverage, it shows there are too many variances to be granted. **Michael Panayiotou** states he's tried to comply with everything besides the building setback. **Mrs. DiBartolo** asks if Mr. Panayiotou has taken into account the front porch. On the survey sheet 2 of 2, does not show the front porch. **Michael Panayiotou** clarifies looking at page 1 of 2, the front porch is marked as 54 square feet. **Chairman McGinley** asks if the front porch goes across the front of the house. **The Applicant, Rachel Wagner** states from the garage to the front

door. **Mrs. DiBartolo** challenges the 54 square feet at the front porch, being under the 40 regardless. For the record, it might not be an accurate number. In the neighborhood context there's decent sized sites without having similar problems of garages in the back and lots of impervious coverage. The property is in a sea of green from the back, giving it a bigger chance of approval. **Vice Chair Weston** states the two foot setbacks to the rear and side raises no issues to him unlike the 5.4 to the house being close and a safety issue but will not stop him approving the application. **Mr. Matthewson** states if the application gets approved the pop up emitter will have to be moved, being on the property line.
Zoning Official, Kathleen Miesch asks about the rear yard coverage, the patio would be included with the pool water. The included pool water comes to 13.9, adding the pool patio of 407 square feet would make the rear yard coverage 34%. Needing an additional variance.
Board Attorney, Greg Mascara asks if the math is wrong or the numbers weren't used.
Zoning Official, Kathleen Miesch states the number was not used. A patio is considered an accessory structure, for the rear yard the patio square footage and pool water area square footage need to be combined. **Mr. Cuartas** states he's having an issue with the rear and side building offset and the pool offset from the building. **Michael Panayiotou** asks if they were to encroach more on the rear and on the side and added more drainage to capture the water…
Mr. Cuartas states it's the splashing, flooding, structural component and electrical, it's a growing body of concern. **Board Attorney, Greg Mascara** states a condition will be listed as "Subject to Engineer's approval."

Chairman McGinley asks if anyone is prepared to make a motion on the application.
Mrs. DiBartolo makes a motion to approve **Application 2024-06**. **Vice Chair Weston** seconds the motion.

The **Board Secretary, Malak Metwaly** calls the roll:

Mrs. Murphy-Bradacs – No, Mr. Ryan – Yes, Mr. Matthewson - No, Mr. Cuartas – Abstain, Vice Chair Weston – Yes, Chairman McGinley – No.

EXECUTIVE SESSION – Not necessary.

ADJOURNMENT – **Vice Chair Weston** makes the motion, **Chairman McGinley** accepts. Meeting is adjourned at **12:25 PM**

Respectfully submitted,

Malak Metwaly – Board of Adjustment Secretary

PLEASE NOTE: Meeting minutes are a summation of the hearing. If you are interested in a verbatim transcript from this or any proceeding, please contact the Board Office at 973-857-4772