TOWNSHIP OF VERONA
COUNTY OF ESSEX, NEW JERSEY
MINUTES OF THE VERONA BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING
OF THURSDAY, MAY 14, 2026

Meeting held in the Ballroom of the Verona Community Center @ 880 Bloomfield Avenue, Verona, NJ 07044 @ 7:30PM

PRESENT:

Chairman Daniel McGinley	Mr. Tully
Vice Chair Weston	Ms. Tanweer, Engineer
Mrs. DiBartolo	Mr. Gregory Mascera, Board Attorney
Mr. Ryan	Ms. Kathleen Miesch, Zoning Official
Dr. Cuartas	Mrs. Dolores Carpinelli, Board Secretary
Absent: Mrs. Murphy-Bradacs, Mr. Mathewson	

CALL TO ORDER: Chair McGinley calls the meeting to order at 7:31 pm;
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE;
OPEN PUBLIC MEETINGS ACT STATEMENT read by Mrs. Carpinelli, Board Secretary.
ROLL CALL is taken by Mrs. Carpinelli, Board Secretary;

Chairman McGinley reads a statement of general information of the Zoning Board of Adjustment's role and responsibilities.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
Chairman McGinley asks for a motion to approve minutes from the Regular Meeting of April 16, 2026; **Mrs. DiBartolo** makes the motion, **Vice Chair Weston** seconds; all remaining commissioners voted in favor. **Motion Passes.**
Chairman McGinley asks for a motion to approve minutes from the Regular Meeting of April 21, 2026; **Mrs. DiBartolo** makes the motion, **Vice Chair Weston** seconds; Dr. Cuartas and Mr. Mathewson are not eligible to vote; all remaining commissioners voted in favor. **Motion Passes.**

RESOLUTIONS-
1. Memorialization of Resolution 2026-08 – Application 2026-06 – 18 Martin Road, Block 805, Lot 26. Granting approval to construct a new second story with side stair addition, one new HVAC unit, new patio and reconstructed patio.
Vice Chair Weston makes Motion to approve; **Mr. Ryan** seconds.

Roll Call Vote:

	AYES	NAYS	ABSTAIN	RECUSED	ABSENT
Mr. Tully			NE		
Dr. Ries	Y				
Dr. Cuartas			NE		
Mrs. Murphy-Bradacs					X
Mr. Mathewson					X
Mr, Ryan	Y				
Mrs. DiBartolo			X		
Vice-Chair Weston	Y				
Chair McGinley	Y				

Motion passes.

2. Memorialization of Resolution 2026-09- Application 2026-08- 5 Meadow Lane, Block 1805, Lot 30. Granting approval to construct a 359 square foot addition, new portico and HVAC.
Vice Chair Weston makes motion to approve; **Mr. Ryan** seconds.

Roll Call Vote:

	AYES	NAYS	ABSTAIN	RECUSED	ABSENT
Mr. Tully			NE		
Dr. Ries	Y				
Dr. Cuartas			NE		
Mrs. Murphy-Bradacs					X
Mr. Mathewson					X
Mr, Ryan	Y				
Mrs. DiBartolo			NE		
Vice-Chair Weston	Y				
Chair McGinley			NE		

Motion passes.

3. Memorialization of Resolution 2026-10; Application 2026-07- 29 Lynwood Road, Block 1403, Lot 72. Granting approval to construct an addition, deck, patio, portico, two HVAC units and a generator.
Mrs. DiBartolo makes motion to approve; **Dr. Ries** seconds.

Roll Call Vote:

	AYES	NAYS	ABSTAIN	RECUSED	ABSENT
Mr. Tully			NE		
Dr. Ries	Y				
Dr. Cuartas			NE		
Mrs. Murphy-Bradacs					X
Mr. Mathewson					X
Mr, Ryan	Y				
Mrs. DiBartolo	Y				
Vice-Chair Weston	Y				
Chair McGinley			NE		

Motion passes.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Application # 2026-04- 1 Clover Lane, Block 1403, corrected to Lot 27 (previously listed as Lot 25) - R-50 B (Medium-High-Density Single-Family) Zone. Applicant is seeking approval to construct a 3-foot fence.

WITNESSES: Owners- Mir Shithil & Alison Buske, 1 Clover Lane, Verona, NJ

Exhibit A-1; renderings and photographs depicting the proposed fencing design and its placement on the property. The exhibit included contractor photographs, renderings of the proposed installation, and views from Clover Lane.

Applicants sworn in by Board Attorney Mascera.

The applicants testified that the proposed fence had been redesigned to comply more closely with Board recommendations. The revised proposal consisted of a cedar plank fence approximately three feet in

height, utilizing four six-inch planks. The applicants stated the fence would maintain a natural appearance while providing a safety barrier.

The applicants testified that:

- The fence would include three gates.
- Existing shrubbery along Lynwood would remain.
- Additional shrubbery, likely boxwoods, would be planted along the Clover Lane frontage.
- The fence would remain behind the required 10-foot setback line.
- The fence alignment would generally follow the property line.
- The fence was intended primarily for child safety.
- The design was not intended to create a privacy enclosure.
- The large tree near the property line would be protected through use of "floating" fence planks leaving space around the trunk.

Board Questions Regarding:

- The relationship of the fence to existing shrubbery.
- Visibility and scale of the proposed fencing.
- The appearance of the fence from neighboring properties.
- Placement relative to the existing large tree near the rear property line.
- Potential impacts on the neighborhood streetscape.

The Board Engineer discussed the sight triangle issue at the Clover Lane and Lynwood intersection. The Engineer advised that a small portion of the fence appeared to extend into the sight triangle area, though the proposed three-foot height and open plank design would likely minimize visibility concerns.

Chair McGinley asks if any members of the Public have questions for applicant – Seeing none.

Board Deliberation:

Board members discussed the revised proposal at length. Several members commented favorably on the applicants' efforts to address prior concerns, noting the reduced height, open design, and incorporation of landscaping. One Board member expressed continued opposition to fences within front yard areas, stating concern regarding the long-term aesthetic impact on the neighborhood.

Additional discussion addressed:

- The visibility of the fence within the sight triangle.
- Existing vegetation already located within the sight triangle area.
- The low-traffic nature of the surrounding streets.

Vice Chair Weston makes motion to approve the application with a condition that shrubbery be planted in front of fence on Clover Lane as testified to; **Dr. Ries** seconds.

Roll Call Vote:

	AYES	NAYS	ABSTAIN	RECUSED	ABSENT
Mr. Tully	**Y**				
Dr. Ries	**Y**				
Dr. Cuartas	**Y**				
Mrs. Murphy-Bradacs					**X**
Mr. Mathewson					**X**
Mr, Ryan	**Y**				

Mrs. DiBartolo		X			
Vice-Chair Weston	Y				
Chair McGinley	Y				

Motion passes.

NEW BUSINESS

1. Application # 2026-09- 725 Bloomfield Avenue, Block 1608, Lot 10 TC Zone District.

Applicant is seeking approval to operate a drive-in teller service and ATM at the bank branch, erect a 25 Ft. flagpole and install a freestanding monument sign and allow for temporary signs occupying 50% of window space.

- Per § 150-17.14 A. Principal permitted uses. (3) Banks and other financial institutions, but not including drive in uses;
- A drive in use was permitted for this property per a Board of Adjustment Resolution dated 12/9/04. The use as a bank continued, however the property has not been used as a bank for more than 12 months; therefore, the nonconforming drive in use is abandoned after 12 consecutive months of non-use.
- **Use is permissible for walk-in business only; drive-in lanes for teller and/or ATM use is prohibited.**
- Per § 150-7.2 Accessory use and structure regulations in nonresidential districts. E. The height of the accessory structure shall not exceed two stories or 20 feet; the flagpole's external height is 25 feet –**A Variance is required;**
- Per § 150-5.3 D. Corner lots, sight triangle. On a corner lot, no obstruction that would be greater than 2 1/2 feet above the center-line grades of the intersecting streets shall be installed, erected, planted or maintained within the triangular area formed by the right-of-way lines at such corner and a straight line joining said right-of-way at points which are:

(1) Fifteen feet distant in business and commercial districts, **except for the Town Center District which shall be five feet**. If a variance is sought, the Applicant should testify to the site triangle as no measurable survey was submitted.

- Per § 150-7.9 X. Prohibited signs. (12) Ground signs, freestanding signs, pylon signs, outdoor advertising signs and billboards. **A Variance is required**

The application was deemed complete and proper notice was confirmed by Board Attorney.

WITNESSES: Alan Trembulak, Esq. Counsel for the applicant, Montclair Real Estate Law Group
Richard Spengler, President & CEO of Liberty Bank
George Williams, Professional Planner, Nishuane Group, Montclair New Jersey

EXHIBIT A-1 – Resolution dated December 9, 2004;
EXHIBIT A-2 - Resolution dated October 12, 2006;
EXHIBIT A-3 - Additional photographs depicting nearby properties with extensive window signage.

Mr. Trembulak explained that the property previously operated as a bank branch beginning in 2004, when approvals were originally granted to American Savings Bank of New Jersey, which included:

- A D-1 use variance permitting drive-through lanes and an ATM facility associated with the bank;
- A variance permitting a freestanding monument sign within the Town Center Zone.

He explained that banks remain a permitted use in the zone, but drive-through facilities and freestanding monument signs are not permitted without variance relief.

Mr. Trembulak provided a history of the site's occupancy, explaining that American Savings Bank was later acquired by Investors Bank, which continued operations at the site. Investors Bank was subsequently acquired by Citizens Bank, which eventually closed the branch in approximately late 2024. Liberty Bank later assumed the lease and reopened the branch earlier in 2026.

He stated that no substantial changes had been made to the building or site other than signage and installation of a flag pole.

WITNESS: Richard Spengler, President & CEO, Liberty Bank- sworn in by Board Attorney Mascera

Mr. Spangler testified regarding the operations and history of Liberty Bank.

- Liberty Bank took assignment of the lease in approximately August 2025;
- The property remained vacant between Citizens Bank's closure and Liberty Bank's occupancy;
- The building remained configured as a bank branch during the vacancy period;
- No significant changes were made to the building footprint or site layout.

He stated that Liberty Bank restriped and resurfaced the parking lot for safety purposes but made no other material exterior changes.

He explained that the applicant sought to resume operation of the existing drive-through lanes and install a new ATM in the same location previously utilized by prior banks.

- The ATM had been removed by Citizens Bank after the branch closure;
- The proposed ATM would be installed through the building wall in the same location as the former ATM;
- The drive-through lanes would function similarly to prior operations.

Board Questions and Concerns:

- Given the prevalence of online banking, is there demand for drive-thru banking
- Concerns associated with vehicles exiting the drive-through area onto Bloomfield Avenue
- Whether adequate bypass circulation exists during periods of queued vehicles
- Possibility of requiring "right turn only" exiting movements from the site.
- Pedestrian safety and potential conflicts between vehicles utilizing the ATM lane and customers approaching the ATM on foot.

The witness testified that drive-through banking and ATM access remain important customer conveniences, particularly for customers with children or those requiring after-hours access

The Board requested additional clarification regarding the precise ATM location.

- The ATM would be installed through the wall of the building;
- The ATM would be positioned before the teller window as vehicles enter the drive-through area;
- The ATM would occupy approximately the same location as the previous ATM.

Discussion also occurred regarding whether additional directional signage or circulation controls could improve safety if approvals were granted.

Mr. Spengler testified about proposed installation of a **freestanding monument sign** along Bloomfield Avenue.

- A similar sign had previously existed at the property pursuant to earlier Board approvals;
- The proposed sign would be internally illuminated;
- The sign would identify the bank and improve visibility because the building blends into the surrounding area.

Board Discussion:

- The size and height of the proposed sign; should dimensions be reduced
- Visibility impacts on pedestrians approaching the building;
- Potential obstruction of sight lines near the driveway entrance
- Appropriate setback distance from the sidewalk and right-of-way.
- Establishing setback requirements as a condition of approval and potentially requiring further review by the Township Engineer.

Applicant's counsel maintained that no ordinance setback requirement technically existed because monument signs are otherwise prohibited in the Town Center Zone.
The applicant nevertheless agreed to provide revised survey information and comply with reasonable engineering conditions if imposed by the Board.

The applicant sought approval for a **25-foot flag pole** installed near the corner of Bloomfield Avenue and West Lincoln Street.

Testimony established that:

- The flag pole was installed without obtaining prior permits;
- Flag poles are not permitted in the Town Center Zone;
- Accessory structures are limited to 20 feet in height.

Board members questioned the necessity of the flag pole and whether it was intended primarily for advertising purposes. Mr. Spengler testified that banks commonly display American flags and that the proposed flag would not advertise the business.

The applicant agreed to comply with all Township ordinances governing:

- Flag size;
- Number of flags;
- Placement requirements;
- Sight triangle regulations.

The applicant requested permission to install **temporary window signage covering up to 50% of two windows** located on the northwestern corner of the building.

- The signage would advertise temporary banking products and promotions;
- Examples included certificate of deposit rates, money market specials, or loan promotions;
- Signage would rotate periodically and not remain permanent.
- Smaller signage permitted under the ordinance could create additional driver distraction as motorists attempted to read smaller text

Board members questioned whether the applicant demonstrated sufficient hardship or justification for exceeding the ordinance limitation. Concerns were expressed that neighboring violations should not justify additional variance relief. Mr. Spengler responded that Liberty Bank could comply with the ordinance if required but believed the reduced signage area would be ineffective and could potentially create additional traffic distractions.

Additional testimony and discussion addressed:

- Existing parking lot lighting and confirmation that no new lighting was proposed;
- Waste disposal procedures, including daily off-site removal by the cleaning company;
- Potential pedestrian conflicts associated with walk-up ATM usage;
- Existing circulation patterns around the drive-through lanes;
- Historical traffic concerns previously discussed during the original 2004 approval process.

Board members debated whether prior Board approvals should influence the present application and discussed evolving traffic conditions along Bloomfield Avenue since 2004.

Chair McGinley asks if any members of the Public have questions for Mr. Spengler – Seeing none.

WITNESS: George Williams, Professional Planner. Sworn in by Board Attorney Mascera.

Mr. Williams testified on behalf of the applicant regarding the continuation of a bank use with an existing drive-thru ATM facility at 725 Bloomfield Avenue. He stated that his review included the municipality's 2022 Master Plan, Land Development Ordinance, prior approvals from 2004 and 2006, planning literature, applicable case law, and site visits. He emphasized that there would be no substantive changes to operations or site layout, aside from relocation of the monument sign and flagpole.

Noting the Board had previously determined:

- The ATM drive-thru was an appropriate accessory use to the bank;
- Traffic conditions at the intersection were manageable due to existing signalization;
- The signage package enhanced safety and visibility; and
- Benefits outweighed any detriment.

Mr. Williams testified that the site remained particularly suitable for the continued bank and drive-thru use because:

- The facility had operated successfully for decades;
- Existing traffic controls remained in place; and
- No negative impacts had resulted from the long-standing operation.

He further testified that approval would advance purposes of zoning by:

- Eliminating a vacancy on Bloomfield Avenue;
- Supporting public welfare and traffic safety; and
- Promoting a desirable visual environment and civic design.

Regarding the negative criteria, Mr. Williams opined that granting the variance would create no substantial detriment to the public good and no substantial impairment to the zone plan because the use had operated for decades without issue. He also cited consistency with Master Plan goals promoting economic vitality and appropriate redevelopment along Bloomfield Avenue.

Testimony pertaining to the C(2) variances included:

- Window signage exceeding ordinance limits would improve readability and visibility;
- Monument signage remained appropriate for the site based on prior approvals and branding needs;
- The additional five feet of flagpole height would have negligible visual impact and would not obstruct light or air.

Mr. Williams concluded that the requested relief represented a better zoning alternative and would not impair the zone plan or public good.

Chair McGinley asks if any members of the Public have questions for Mr. Williams – Seeing none.

Board Questions and Discussion

- Whether window coverage calculations applied cumulatively or per window;
- The appropriateness and placement of the monument sign;
- Potential traffic and safety concerns related to the ATM drive-thru and left-turn movements;
- Whether updated ATM details, lighting, and security measures should have been presented.

Applicant states that;

- ATM security cameras and lighting are federally required;
- Drive-thru ATM use is preferred by customers for safety reasons; and
- The ATM had historically existed at the site.

Board Deliberation:

- Supporting continued productive commercial use of the property;
- Accommodating modern operational realities of banking institutions;
- Protecting public safety and traffic circulation;
- Preserving the visual and pedestrian-oriented character of the Town Center Zone;
- Whether the monument sign should remain in its previously approved corner location;
- The proposed five-foot monument sign height, with some members favoring a four-foot height limit.
- Whether the flagpole should be restored to its previously approved location.
- Maintaining consistency with the Township's zoning objectives.

After Board deliberation concerning the location of the monument sign and flagpole, on behalf of the applicant, Mr. Trembulak requested that the application be modified to restore the monument sign and flagpole to their previously approved locations; the monument sign at the corner location of Bloomfield Avenue and East Lincoln and the flagpole in the small island at the entrance along Bloomfield Avenue.

Vice Chair Weston makes motion to approve the D (1) Use variance for the Drive-thru ATM and the three C (2) Variances with the following conditions: **Mr. Tully** seconds.

- Signage will be erected stating "No Left Turn" onto Bloomfield Avenue when exiting the ATM lanes.
- Allowing 50% temporary window coverage on the two identified windows, with all remaining windows complying with ordinance limits; and may be changed at the applicant's discretion without limitation.
- The Monument sign will not exceed 4 feet in height.
- Only one flag will fly at a time; not to exceed 5' X 8' and will not contain any advertising.
- Hours of Operation will be Monday- Friday 9:00am – 5:00pm and Saturday 9:00am – 1:00pm

Roll Call Vote:

	AYES	NAYS	ABSTAIN	RECUSED	ABSENT
Mr. Tully	**Y**				
Dr. Ries	**Y**				
Dr. Cuartas	**Y**				
Mrs. Murphy-Bradacs					**X**
Mr. Mathewson					**X**
Mr, Ryan	**Y**				
Mrs. DiBartolo	**Y**				
Vice-Chair Weston	**Y**				
Chair McGinley	**Y**				

Motion passes.

Chair McGinley asks for a 10-minute break at 10:05pm. Meeting resumes at 10:18

2. Application # 2026-10 – 257 Pompton Avenue, Block 104, Lot 1 C2 Zone District. The applicant is seeking to renovate a 1 ½ story building to create a two-story building with eight, one bedroom residential apartments with two of those units being designated for affordable housing units; parking; concrete walkway; tree removal; signage, HVAC fence. Removal of existing garage and driveways.

- Per § 150-17.11 A. (1.) Commercial and professional offices are permitted; proposed is a 2 story building with eight, one-bedroom residential apartments which is not a principal or conditional use - **Use Variance is required**
- Per § 150-12.8 C. (3) For parking stalls and aisles, there shall be provided a minimum stall width of nine feet and a minimum stall depth of 20 feet; stalls are proposed as 9 feet in width and 18 feet in length – A Variance is required;
- Per § 150-17.11 D. (7) Minimum rear yard setback: 50 feet; parking lot is proposed 23 feet from the rear property line – A Variance is required; Per § 150-5.3 E. (3) Corner lot, frontage upon two streets. A corner lot having frontage upon two improved streets shall have two front yards, one side yard and one rear yard. The rear yard shall be located opposite the narrower frontage. The narrower frontage is Vincent Place.
- Per § 493-24 Planning Board hearing required for removal of more than two healthy mature trees. NOTE: This application should be heard by the Board of Adjustment due to a Use Variance need. The Board of Adjustment shall hear the tree removal application;
- A tree removal and mitigation plan, sheet 3 of 8, has been submitted. 15 total trees are proposed to be removed. The plan does not designate the condition of same i.e. alive, dead, diseased, hazardous, etc.

# To Be Removed	DBH	Replacement Trees	Fees Calculated (Mitigation)	TOTAL
2 – Coniferous Evergreen	6"	2 Replacement	x $400.00	$ 800.00
1 - Coniferous Evergreen	10"	2 Replacements	x $400.00	$ 800.00
2 – Deciduous	6"	2 Replacements	x $400.00	$ 800.00
3 - Deciduous	12"	3 Replacements	x $400.00	$1200.00
2 - Deciduous	15"	2 Replacements	x $400.00	$ 800.00
4 - Deciduous	18"	8 Replacements	x $400.00	$3200.00
*1 - Deciduous	36"	4 Replacements	x $400.00	$1600.00
23		Application Fee $50.00 + $ 9,200.00 =		**$9250.00**

*Extraordinary tree - Removal of extraordinary trees shall be prohibited except upon the specific written recommendation of the Zoning Official after consultation of the Township Forester and **approval by resolution of the Township Council**;

Dr. Ries is recused from this application as she lives within 200 feet of the property.

The application was deemed complete and proper notice was confirmed by Board Attorney.

WITNESSES: Mr. Aloia, Applicant / Owner of 257 Pompton Avenue
Kurt Schmidt, Architect

Witness: Mr. Aloia is sworn in by Board Attorney Mascera.

He stated that he is the owner of the property located at 257 Pompton Avenue, which lies within the Township's C-2 Zone. He explained that the property had historically been used residentially and was configured as a multi-family dwelling at the time of purchase. He explained that a previous application for the property had been approved by the Board; however, subsequent review by the State of New Jersey resulted in modifications to the parking configuration along the state highway frontage.

As a result of the State's required modifications, the revised proposal now includes:

- Demolition of the existing structure;
- Construction of an entirely residential building;
- Eight one-bedroom residential units;
- Four units on each floor;
- Sixteen parking spaces;
- Two affordable housing units, satisfying the 25% affordable housing requirement.

Mr. Aloia testified further that:

- The project is intended as a rental development;
- No tax abatement or redevelopment designation is being sought;
- No balconies or exterior living spaces are proposed;
- Mailboxes would likely be located in the interior lobby area, subject to postal requirements;
- Garbage and recycling storage would be located at the rear of the property and screened.

Regarding landscaping, Mr. Aloia testified that existing trees would be replaced in accordance with Township requirements and that new trees and screening vegetation would be planted within the required buffer area.

Witness: Kurt Schmidt, 7 Shoney Trail, Denville, NJ; Architect – Sworn in and accepted as an expert in architecture.

Mr. Schmidt reviewed the architectural plans dated March 16, 2026, which were marked into evidence as follows:
EXHIBIT A-1: Architectural Floor Plans
EXHIBIT A-2: Architectural Elevations

Mr. Schmidt testified that the existing structure is a one-and-one-half-story residential building containing three apartments and a basement. He also testified to the square footage of each floor and stated apartment sizes would range approximately from 885 square feet to 968 square feet.

Mr. Schmidt described the proposed building elevations and materials in detail.

Maximum height approximately 28.5 feet; The building would feature a generally level design with minimal topographic variation.

Building materials and features would include:

- Vertical wood or synthetic wood siding in earth-tone colors;
- Horizontal cementitious siding in lighter earth tones;
- Brick accent materials in red or brown tones;
- White-framed insulated residential windows.
- The building would be fully sprinklered;
- The project would comply with applicable accessibility and adaptability requirements;

- An elevator is not required under current Department of Community Affairs regulations due to the number of units;
- All units would include laundry facilities.

The roof design would include parapet elements intended to screen rooftop HVAC condenser units from public view. He further testified that affordable housing units would be substantially similar in quality, amenities, and layout to the market-rate units.

Board Questions

Board members questioned the applicant and architect regarding:

- Similarity of affordable units to market-rate units;
- Accessibility compliance;
- Rental versus ownership structure;
- Proposed management of the building;
- Absence of common indoor or outdoor amenity spaces;
- Parking configuration;
- Variance relief requested;
- Landscaping and tree replacement.

Mr. Aloia testified that the principal variance request involved the residential use variance, as well as parking and setback-related relief.
He further testified that the revised design had already received State approval following parking modifications.

Chair McGinley asks if any members of the Public have questions for the applicant or Mr. Williams.

Public Questions:

Samuel John – Verona Resident questioned:

Why the previously approved mixed-use proposal was abandoned;
Whether the prior office/apartment plan remained viable;
Traffic and parking impacts associated with the revised all-residential proposal.

The applicant explained that the prior plan was effectively rendered infeasible after the State reduced the approved parking count and required site modifications.

Anthony Gardner – Verona Resident

Mr. Gardner questioned:

- The legal basis for granting the requested use variance;
- Traffic impacts on Vincent Place;
- Parking overflow concerns;
- The scale and intensity of the proposed residential use;
- Visibility and impacts of garbage storage areas.

Mr. Aloia responded that the State had approved the driveway circulation pattern and noted that vehicles exiting the primary parking area would be restricted to right turns toward Cedar Grove. The applicant further clarified that refuse containers would be screened and no dumpster was proposed.

Vincent Mustacchio – Vincent Place Resident

Mr. Mustachi questioned stormwater drainage from the proposed flat roof.

Mr. Schmidt testified that:

- Roof drainage would be handled internally;
- Stormwater would discharge into underground drainage infrastructure designed by the project engineer.

Scott Primmer – Vincent Place Resident

Mr. Primmer raised concerns regarding:

- Traffic circulation near the Vincent Place intersection;
- Safety impacts of the parking layout;
- Potential spillover parking onto neighborhood streets;
- Alternative building designs incorporating garage parking.

Mr. Aloia testified that he had considered alternate parking configurations but understood that such designs were not permitted under Township regulations.

At 11:04pm the Chairman advised that the Board would conclude testimony for the evening.

The applicant agreed to waive statutory time requirements, and the Board carried the application to the next regular meeting of the Board of Adjustment scheduled for June 11, 2026, without further notice.

EXECUTIVE SESSION (not necessary)

Motion to Adjourn: Mr. Ryan
Meeting Adjourned at 11:07 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Dolores Carpinelli

Dolores Carpinelli
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 of Adjustment Secretary at 973-857-4773.