TOWNSHIP OF VERONA
COUNTY OF ESSEX, NEW JERSEY

MINUTES OF THE VERONA BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING
THURSDAY, MARCH 14, 2024

PRESENT:

Chairman Dan McGinley
Vice Chairman Scott Weston
Mr. Paul Matthewson
Mrs. Christy DiBartolo
Mr. Kevin Ryan
Dr. Edith Ries
Ms. Diana McGovern, Board Attorney
Ms. Kathleen Miesch, Board Secretary

CALL TO ORDER

- Meeting called to order at **8:07 P.M.** by Chairman McGinley
- Open Public Meetings Act Statement read by Kathleen Miesch, Board Secretary
- Roll Call is taken by Kathleen Miesch, Board Secretary

SWEARING IN OF NEW MEMBERS

- **Board Attorney Diana McGovern** swears in **Mr. Kevin Ryan** as a Regular Member with a term expiring June 30, 2025
- **Board Attorney Diana McGovern** swears in **Dr. Edith Ries** as Alternate #1 with a term expiring June 30, 2024.

- **Chairman McGinley** reads a statement of general information of the Zoning Board of Adjustment's role and responsibilities.
- **Chairman McGinley** announces that Application 2024-02: 698-700 Bloomfield Avenue, Block 1606, Lot 13 – TC Zone has been carried to the April 11, 2024 meeting at 8 PM in the Verona Community Center Ballroom. Applicant has requested to be carried as the Board has only five voting members this evening and they are entitled to seven for a Use Variance. The applicant has submitted a waiver for the requirement of a court reporter. The Chair asks for a motion to waive the requirement for a court reporter. **Mr. Weston** makes the motion and **Mrs. DiBartolo** seconds. All in favor. Passes unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairman McGinley asks for a motion to approve minutes from the Regular meeting held on February 8, 2024. **Mr. Ryan** makes the motion, **Mr. Matthewson** seconds. Dr. Ries, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Mathewson, Vice Chair Weston and Chairman McGinley all vote in favor. Mrs. DiBartolo abstains. The minutes of February 8, 2024 meeting are approved.

RESOLUTIONS

Resolution BOA-2024-03, Application 2023-17: 87-89 Fairview Avenue; Block 1502, Lot 50. Denying the Variance application to construct two (2) single-car garages (16 feet by 20 feet) in each of the side yards of the property; two (2) trench drains are also proposed - one for each garage.
Board Attorney Diana McGovern states that only the members who voted to deny the application can vote on the Resolution to deny. **Vice Chair Weston** makes the motion to approve the Resolution to deny. **Chair McGinley** seconds. **Vice Chair Weston** and **Chairman McGinley** vote in favor of the Resolution to deny the application.

NEW BUSINESS

VARIANCE APPLICATIONS:

Application 2024-01: 144 Elmwood Road; Block 902, Lot 27 - R-60 Zone Applicant requests zoning approval to remove an existing one-story screened porch, driveway, and paths and to construct two (2) one-story additions to the existing house, an attached garage, and a new patio.

Alan Trembulak, Applicant's Attorney, Montclair Real Estate Law Group appearing on behalf of the applicants. Mr. Trembulak has an application on behalf of John and Kathleen Wessling for a setback variance relating to property at 144 Elmwood Road, a corner lot at intersection on Elmwood Road and Woodland Avenue. The Wesslings have owned and lived at dwelling for 38 years and would like to construct a small one story addition to the rear of the house; remove an existing screened porch and replace with a new one story edition for a family room, bathroom, mud room and laundry, and the removal of the garage on the opposite side of the property and replacing with new garage. A C variance for the rear yard setback that requires 30 foot setback and we're proposing a 6.4 foot setback which is the existing setback of the screened in porch that will be removed. The Variance is needed because it is a corner lot and therefore have two front yards, one rear yard, and one side yard. The Zoning ordinance requiring a 30 foot setback. There is an existing non-conforming setback of 6.4 ft. which they would like to maintain with the new addition. A Planner and Mr. and Mrs. Wessling are in attendance. **Board Attorney McGovern** swears in **Mr. Sionas**, Principal Architect, licensed architect in the state of New Jersey, licensed Landscape Architect and Licensed Professional Planner. All licenses in good standard.
Mr. Trembulak offers **Mr. Sionas** as an expert in the field of Architecture and Planning – Accepted by the Board.
Mr. Sionas presents exhibits to the **Board members. Board Secretary** distributes and marks them as Exhibit A-1. Mr. Sionas describes the property as per the survey in the exhibit: a corner a lot, the property is 125 ft by 118 ft, rectangular shaped; .34 acres or 14,761 sq ft. The site has a slight slope from east to west, and slopes down from towards the west of the property, the lot is improved with an existing two and one half story wood frame house, attached two car garage, a driveway in various paved walkways. It's in the R 60 Zone. Most of the house is located in the rear yard setback. The setback line goes through the center of the main part of the two story section of the house. Mr. Sionas goes through the details of the aerial map. The side of the house that faces Woodland Avenue is where the existing two car garage is located. The Applicants are requesting to remove the existing screen porch and replace it with a year round family room, and the north side would be exactly where the screened in porch is now with the same setback, or .3" closer due to the angle. On the floorplan for the existing garage. The applicants have requested a larger garage. The proposal is to remove that garage and build a 24 foot by 24 foot two car garage that would be attached to the house. The applicants' preference is to replace that existing screen porch on the top right side of the floor plan with a year round family room. Because the property is a corner property, the front is actually on the side street and even though the front of the house faces Elmwood the left side of the house is actually considered the front of the house. The floor plan shows the proposal to demolish the existing screen porch, to construct a new one story enclosed family room that would be open to the kitchen. The family room wall on the right side will line up exactly where the screen porch northern wall. The proposal is also to construct a new mud room that would connect the garage into the house with a laundry room and a bathroom off this this first floor level; demolish the undersized garage and construct a new 24 foot by 24 foot two car garage. The new family room that will replace the screen porch, and the new attached garage would replace the existing garage.
The family room is proposed to be one story addition with an almost flat roof. A roof surrounded by a decorative 30 inch high railing around it to make it more attractive. The new garage will be 3 feet higher than an existing garage will be 5' 4 " wider than an existing garage. The rear yard looks like it's the front of the house, but based on ordinance, the right side of the north side is the rear yard. The family room that will replace the screened porch will align with the existing north wall of the screen porch. The family room will extend another 5'3 " to the west and will be 17' by 25'.

Mr. Trembulak asks **Mr. Sionas** to provide testimony as a Planner as to why the variance should be granted.
Mr. Sionas under MLUL the applicant is seeking relief from Verona Code 150-17.3. The Zoning chart indicates that the existing conditions and proposed conditions. A variance is needed because the project does not comply with 30 foot rear setback. The change has a minimal impact on neighboring properties because of keeping the roof below the second floor windows and under the C-2 criteria the benefits of granting the variance represent benefits which outweigh any detriments.

A desirable visual environment is being created with an attractive addition; sufficient space in the appropriate location for a variety of residential uses and open spaces; in order to meet the needs of all New Jersey citizens so we're creating this space with little to no impact on neighboring properties. New Jersey land use law is to provide adequate light. Air and open space.
The existing setbacks are being matched and not exceeding. Negative criteria - the variance can be granted without causing any detriment to the public good. The project is preventing detriment by keeping the new construction aligned with the existing north wall of the house. There will be minimal or no impact on the neighboring properties. The house is screened with existing shrubbery across the West side of the property. There will be a continuous five foot high fence on the north of the intended zone plan. It is a unique plot and is a larger lot than almost all the other lots in the neighborhood and what appears to be a side yard, as seen from the front of the house, is actually the rear yard, which is what causes the variance request.
Mr. Trembulak and **Mr. Sionas** state they are happy to answer any questions.
Chair McGinley states that Mr. Sionas gave a fantastic presentation. For the record, .03 inches is less than an inch correct? **Mr. Sionas** states yes under an inch.
Zoning Officer asks if the Roof over the new addition is decorative only, and not being used as a rooftop terrace. **Mr. Sionas replies it is** existing windows and no doors.
Chair McGinley asks if the Board has any other questions in relationship to the variance that is being requested.
Dr. Reis questions whether the roof over the new proposed addition is a flat roof.
Mr. Sionas replies it is a flat roof with a slight slope from existing house towards the back yard. The highest point of the roof to the underside the second floor windows, it slopes down.
Chair McGinley asks if they have reviewed the review from the Verona Environmental commission.
Mr. Trembulak states that they will be comply with tree removal ordinance. There are some comments related to Storm Water Management that will be addressed with building permit submission. The applicant will satisfy any requirements by Engineering. They find the roof drain comment different from other municipalities, but will comply.
Mr. Ryan states that the town just changed the Storm Order Management Ordinance to require that any new down spouts drain onto the property and not into the street. That is what they are most likely referring to. When the applicant applies for the permits with the construction official they'll go over both. The tree ordinance and the storm Water Management Ordinance have just recently been revised.
Mr. Sionas states that they have discussed with the applicant and will most likely propose a rain garden in the southwest corner of the property. There would be an overflow pipe that would go out to the curb. Okay, and you know once again. I'm very simple as having a living in a corner house. **Mr. Ryan** is sympathetic towards people with corner properties, irregular or small lots. Mr. Ryan seconds the Chairman's compliment regarding the presentation.
Mr. Trembulak states that they have nothing further to present. Based on Mr. Sionas' testimony he believes this is a minor variance and easily justifiable under a C-1 or C-2 criteria.
Chair McGinley asks if the Board has any additional questions. Seeing none, the Chair asks if there is anyone for the public who has a question of the applicants. Seeing none, the Chair asks if is there anyone for the public who would like to make a statement about this application. Seeing none, the Board moves to deliberations.

Mr. Ryan states that the only department that commented to the best of his knowledge was the Environmental Commission and they conceded that all of the plans were properly prepared. The only variance that is needed is the one that, and they have a number of suggestions they're really in regard to the construction official and approving permits. Mr. Ryan has no reason not approve the variance.
Vice Chair Weston is in agreement that it is a minor encroachment, less than an inch, and has no concern with that location
Chair McGinley asks if there are any more questions. The Chair states that the applicants is aware that they need to have the stormwater management plan and a tree removal permit if they need to remove any trees.
Chair McGinley entertains a motion on the application. **Mr. Ryan** moves the approval of the application and **Mrs. DiBartolo** seconds.
The **Board Secretary Kathleen Miesch** calls the role:
Dr. Ries – Abstains; **Mr. Ryan** – Yes; **Mrs. DiBartolo** – Yes; **Mr. Matthewson** – Yes; **Vice Chair Weston** – Yes; **Chairman McGinley** – Yes.

Chair McGinley - The motion passes; the resolution will be memorialized at the May meeting.

Application 2024-04: 68 Forest Avenue; Block 2102, Lot 45 - R-50 Zone Applicant requests approval to install one in-ground pool and a patio.
Board Attorney Diana McGovern swears in the applicant **Christopher Oghia**.
Mr. Oghia states that he is at the meeting to request 5 variances to install an inground pool in his backyard at 68 Forest Avenue where he lives with his wife and children. 5 variances are for improved lot coverage exceeding the maximum permitted coverage of 40 %, with a proposed coverage of 57.8%. The second variance is for the maximum aggregate areas covered by accessory structures in the rear yard, 15% is allowed, proposed is 23.4%. The third one is the minimum patio setback for property lines is 5 ft. and proposed 0 feet from side property for 3.3 feet from the rear property. The fourth one is the minimum pool setbacks from the side of rear property 10 ft and proposed is 5.3 ft from the side and 8.1 ft from the rear property line. The fifth one is the pool equipment pad needs to 5 ft from any property line and proposed is .6 ft away from the property line. They do not have a huge amount of space to work with they approached is as if they could have their perfect pool and that is the design they came up with. They moved in five years ago, and have tried to improve our house since they look at it as a forever home.
Mr. Matthewson asks if any of the topography is changing as it comes to the property line.
Mr. Oghia does not believe so, it should be pretty flat in the back.
Vice Chair Weston asks if the applicant has spoken to any of his neighbors, particularly the ones that are your direct neighbors. **Mr. Oghia** responds yes, and they were fine with it.
Board Attorney McGovern asks how high the applicant's fence is. **Mr. Oghia** responds 6 feet and has a gate.
Mr. Matthewson asks the applicant to verify that the patio goes right to the property line and if so how does the fence go around the patio?
Mr. Oghia states the patio would meet the fence. **Board Attorney McGovern** states that the fence is over onto the neighbor's property line and there's a letter in the application that the applicant has permission. **Mr. Oghia** states that the fence on the right side was something that they inherited and the neighbor actually put that fence up. The neighbor on left is fine as well.
Mr. Ryan asks how the property has been with all the rain as of late and the abutting properties.
Mr. Oghia states that they have French drains in basement but haven't had any water damage inside the property. It does table off a bit from the neighbor's yard in the back but believes the Engineer has come up with a system to drain it so that it wouldn't cause a problem but they haven't had any negative effects from the rain.
Mr. Ryan follows up and asks as far as the applicant can tell there are no issues with water flowing off their property. **Mr. Oghia** none.
Mrs. DiBartolo asks if the applicant can describe the grade changes from lot 49 down to Forrest Avenue;
Mr. Oghia states that there is a retaining wall along the very back of the property and lot 49 is higher than theirs. It definitely slows down towards the street. **Vice Chair Weston** clarifies that it is from the rear of the applicant's property towards Forrest Avenue? **Mr. Oghia** – yes.
Chair McGinley offers that from the numbers that are on the survey for your property, it says 461.2 in lot 49 on the right side, and it says 446.7 by the street which would be about a 14.5 foot slope, that would be 14.5 in approximately 150 ft. or approximately a 10% slope; a considerable slope. A Street cannot be built in Verona with a 10% slope.
Mr. Oghia states that the backyard is very flat. ,
Chair McGinley states that it is obviously a difficult application for the Board to look at considering the previous application was for a half inch. It is the combination of so many variances on your property with a fence over a property line on one side, a fence over a property line on the other side, railroad ties that extend into the right of way on Forest Avenue in front, and the air-conditioning units are within the Side yard Setback. The applicant probably inherited that list but it is not an undersized lot for the area. The Board has to consider in the scheme of things, in the entire town.
Mr. Oghia – asks if they If you eliminated the patio, would that be something that would help.
Chair McGinley states that it would be hard to say how many variances that would impact.
Mr. Matthewson asks what the size of the tree that's being removed.
Mr. Oghia states that he does not have that information but that it is a cherry tree that about the height the first story.

Chair McGinley states that one of the concerns he has is that when you actually get to the stormwater remediation phase at 60% coverage it could be a recommendation that could involve a lot more underground piping and some sort of structures underneath your existing front yard.
Mrs. DiBartolo asks is the applicant considered reducing the size of the pool.
Mr. Oghia That's something that they could consider. If they made it 18x20 he's not sure how much that would help. Maybe move the patio in on the right side.
Mr. Matthewson asks where the gravity wall is being built.
Mr. Oghia responds that the waterfall is on the right side.
Mr. Oghia states that they could eliminate some of the driveways if we don't park in the garage.
Vice Chair Weston asks what under the wood deck is. **Mr. Oghi** responds he believes it is dirt.
Chair McGinley offers that it appears that it would appear that removing the patio to the right, which is 5 ft by maybe 30 ft. would be about 150 sq ft. and that would change the numbers 2%. removing the proposed lot coverage from 57.8 down to maybe 55 is considerably more than the 40% permitted.
Chair McGinley we are at 7 variances needed.
Mr. Oghia asks if it makes sense to ask for an adjournment and come back with a smaller pool and maybe no patio
Board Attorney If the applicant came back with lesser variances and it improved what he handed in the notice would still be okay as long as no new variances are created. For example if the pool was made smaller, but moved it so that it created a different variance, the notice wouldn't be sufficient.
Chair McGinley states that Board appears to be wrestling with the fact that there's a number of variances. You have a lot of things going on on the property, we usually look at 40 % coverage when you pass 43% or 44% it starts to take a toll on the neighborhood.
Board Secretary advises that the agenda does not have an opening until June.
Mr. Ryan asks if the applicant was denied, could the applicant submit a new application, taking into account the reasons why this one was denied. **Board Attorney** states that it would have to be a substantially different application. There is something called res judicata in the law, if this board were to deny this application tonight the applicant cannot come back next month with a different application that's just slightly different and try again. The Board has the jurisdiction to look at the application and say it's pretty much the same thing that's not significant of enough change. It could have all the same variances but it's just a small reduction.
Vice Chair asks if that would be the Board's first order business to say it was substantially different.
Mr. Ryan states that the Board could grant a continuance and it would preserve notice. **Board Attorney** – yes.
Mr. Ryan asks if it is agreeable to do a continuance, does the Board make a motion to grant the continuance.
Chair McGinley Yes to a point specific.
Board Attorney explains that to preserve the notice if somebody wants to know what the outcome was and they meant to come today and then hear it was carried or they read it in the newspaper it's carried, they've got to know when it's carried to.
Board Secretary explains that when the notes from this meeting are published in the paper it specifically states that this particular application was carried to a specific date and then it's up to the person to look at that.
Mr. Oghia asks how it would work to continue.
Board Attorney would be allow you to be carried to the June meeting. The Board Secretary puts together a notice of action taken tonight, and this would be listed and described. Anyone interested in finding out or maybe showing up at that point would do so on your end. It just means that you have to get any new information that you want reviewed into the Board Office at least ten days before the hearing date. If more time is needed you must send a letter no less than ten days before the hearing. You would get your revised plans in but if you submit with the different variants, you're going to have to notice all over again.
Mr. Ryan asks if the term mitigating some of the items may be a more accurate tern.
Mrs. DiBartolo did you work with someone on the pool? **Mr. Oghia** Yes, the Pool Boss.
Mrs. DiBartolo states that they may have a landscape architect or somebody on staff that can help with it.
Chair McGinley brings to the applicant's attention of some things to be careful of i.e. driveway, Verona's definition of driveway is an open area of land, paved with bituminous concrete (blacktop), portland-cement concrete or other durable, hard, dust-free surfacing which will not wash into the public right-of-way, used as a means of ingress and egress to a property. A driveway shall not be considered an accessory structure. If you tear up the black top and put rock down. Applicant needs to be aware that you can't just do that and say I'm still going to use it as a driveway

Mrs. DiBartolo states that she thinks it would make sense to consult with somebody who's familiar with Verona and the intricacies of the code.
Mr. Ryan states that the Board cannot coach the applicant but can give the benefit of their thought process.
Chair McGinley asks the applicant if they are okay carrying to June 13th **Mr. Oghia** Yes.
Mr. Ryan makes a motion to carry the application to the June 13, 2024 hearing. **Mrs. DiBartolo** seconds. All in favor, no abstentions.

BOARD DISCUSSION
Mrs. DiBartolo addresses the Board that there is legislation in Trenton about Affordable Housing. The proposed bill has been passed through the full Assembly, and it has gone through the Senate Budget Committee which just passed it on Monday. It's going to the full Senate probably next week. The bill abolishes COA, and somewhat gives the control over to the courts to sort of mandate the whole process. It sounds like it's going to have a pretty big impact on builders and their ability to … Mr. Ryan states Builder's remedy, accessory structures …… Mrs. DiBartolo continues there's actually more and if you want to look at more information you can go to the New Jersey League of Municipality website and search for that bill. There is a slideshow presentation that outlines the differences. It might wind up limiting what the Board can do as a Board.
Mr. Ryan states that he believes the Council did pass a resolution expressing the displeasure of the Municipal Body with going forward with that particular piece of legislation. Although it was not a unanimous, Mr. Ryan believes it was a three to two vote, but it did pass the Resolution to formally send a letter to either the State Senate to the sponsor of the bill stating the official opposition of the Verona Governing body.

Mrs. DiBartolo states that it is A4/50 and asks the Board members to review it, and if they have a position on it, to make their position known.

Mr. Ryan offers that there was a discussion at the Council meeting about actually continuing the discussion and tabling the Resolution until a subsequent meeting, but there was a time factor there because this appears to be being fast tracked by the legislature. The proponents of passing the resolution immediately were conscious of the time. They felt that if they waited for another council meeting, which is only once a month, they would be late to the table. Mr. Ryan also believes the Cedar Grove Council, at a prior meeting, have also passed a similar resolution in opposition to the way this bill is currently structured. Mr. Ryan also stated that he does not know all of the nitty gritty but it offering what he does know and has read in different publications. It has not been universally embraced. After having been immersed in the affordable housing Situation in Verona for four of the last ten years I was on the council, it is a very you know serious issue.
…And just for your ratification, in Verona, we should be in compliance until 2025, but if this gets passed, then we now have another set of rules that we have to follow. The rules that we just came under, the Court basically had the final say, so I don't really know why they want to give it back to the Court again. Mr. Ryan suggests that the politicians haven't come up with a viable Board and a viable set of criteria for setting the numbers for what a town is responsible for in terms of affordable housing. It's a moving target but there should be some way of other than the builders sitting down with a judge and an arbiter, a special master/mistress, basically sits down all of the parties, and then you have the Affordable, and it's also the Affordable Housing Coalition, which also gets a say.

Board Attorney McGovern states that the Town Planner is involved, the Township Attorney… it takes a lot of people per town to work that number out.
Mr. Ryan adds that it is a big deal with a tremendous amount of legal fees; a very expensive proposition.
Mr. Ryan continues to Chair McGinley that if the Board wanted to take a position, he would think it would have to be done tonight because if, you waited until next meaning, your horse may already be out of it. That is if the Board wants to do it all … if you don't think it's necessary that is fine too. Mr. Ryan states that he threw that in there since the governing body has already stated their opposition to the Bill as currently written.

Mrs. DiBartolo states that her point bringing it up is to educate the Board over the next ten years we're going to see a whole lot of building happening, and we may or may not have and say over it.

Mr. Ryan states that this was discussed at an open session of the Council meeting. It was a very robust discussion amongst the five individuals. Some people just felt there were some flaws in the bill and just all of a sudden the way, the affordable housing issue has been around for 20 years, and now they want to fast track a piece of legislation at the tail end of a lame duck session of a legislature.

Mrs. DiBartolo states that if you look at the timing in that PowerPoint presentation, the requirements of the deadlines are very aggressive. You have three days to submit a rebuttal or something like that. Mrs. DiBartolo states she may be exaggerating but not by much.

Board Attorney McGovern states with the way municipalities get to things that is going to be tough.

Mr. Ryan states that 2025 is just around the corner and we still don't have a number. The next round is 2025 but we still do not have a target number to shoot for. We just ended the 2023 round in compliance. Between the huge complex that's going up, and the settlement with the Fair Share Housing Coalition, and also the Spectrum property, which is still sitting there but that's a part of the settlement agreement and there's been an area in town designated as a potential area for an overlay zone that would supersede whatever they come up within the Master Plan. We still have to pass a new Zoning Ordinance hopefully by 2025. The overlay zone is on Bloomfield Avenue, essentially from Montrose . . . Mr. Ryan's speculation would be it is prime for a Montclair style remedy, where they would put mixed-use with a certain percentage being affordable …Board Attorney McGovern states inclusionary housing … There is an ordinance in place with which does dictate that any development over a certain size has to have at least 15% affordable. That is on the books. It wasn't on the books when the other round was started, but it's there now, so anybody who comes in has to do that. The Spectrum people bought out their obligation. They gave $3 million and that's why everything is over here. Spectrum is full market rate with the provider. They gave the $3 million and it was put towards the purchase of the land.
Mrs. DiBartolo asks if there is a threshold of number of units that kicks in that Requirement.
Mr. Ryan states yes but he doesn't know what it is off the top of his head. **Board Attorney McGovern** states that there has to be a certain percentage of three bedroom, two bedroom, and one bedroom. There also has to be a certain percentage of low, a very low, moderate, there's a sliding scale.
Mr. Ryan offers that the things that got Verona bollixed up that they changed the way senior housing and Section eight housing was counted. The thought was that the Hill Top complex had Verona covered for all affordable housing obligations. Someone came in and looked at it, said no because affordable housing is not Section eight. A bunch of the units that were in that complex were eliminated them from the Affordable housing cluster so that put that's what put Verona behind the eight ball. If Verona had known that, they would have required Annin to put Affordable housing in. At that point Verona was told they were in compliance.
Board Attorney McGovern states that there was a period of time between 2008 until 2012, where nobody was doing anything, it wasn't active.
Mr. Ryan states that the Fair Share Housing Coalition went to court because they got tired of the dithering of the Council on Affordable Housing was created but never … they sat there until the advocates went to court and the court said no, we're taking it over. **Board Attorney McGovern** states that the whole thing started over 40 years ago. Mr. Ryan states with Mt. Laurel … but that's the whole history of affordable housing here in the Verona.
Chair McGinley states that it is good to know because we're eventually going to be approving houses where people are going to be running with pecks out to their garage hot water, cold water, we're good – it's now a house. **Mr. Ryan** states that these guys are going great guns, it probably will, they will start to occupy, by the summer, they're going to complete it in sections. They will probably start putting people in August, September. People ask about the impact on the schools but court doesn't care. It doesn't care about that, it is your problem.

Dr. Ries asks will most of the children go to FM Brown. **Mr. Ryan** states that he doesn't know if the BOE has decided that yet though either.
Dr. Ries states that things about Verona that they were so proud of is that children didn't have to cross Bloomfield Avenue. **Vice Chair Weston** states that if they do not change anything it would be FM Brown.
Mr. Ryan states that hopefully they will phase it in enough that the BOE will have time to react.

EXECUTIVE SESSION - Executive Session 9:47 PM. No official action was taken.

ADJOURNMENT – **Vice Chair Weston makes** the motion, **Chairman McGinley** accepts. Meeting is adjourned at **9:56 PM**

Respectfully submitted,

Kathleen Miesch – 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