TOWNSHIP OF VERONA
COUNTY OF ESSEX, NEW JERSEY
MINUTES OF THE VERONA
BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT SPECIAL MEETING
OF TUESDAY, MAY 5, 2026

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

PRESENT:

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

CALL TO ORDER: Chair McGinley calls the meeting to order at 7:34 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.

NEW BUSINESS

1. Application #2026-11 – 115 Linden Avenue, Block 902, Lot 8; R-50 (High Density Single-Family) Zone District. Applicant is seeking approval to construct a rear two-story addition, with full basement and attic, portico, rear landing and steps and two new HVAC units.

The application was deemed complete and proof of publication and service was confirmed by Board Attorney.

WITNESSES:

Doug and Danielle Cantor- Owners, 115 linden Avenue
Evan Scott- Escott Architects, 29 Arlington Avenue, Caldwell, NJ

Applicants and Mr. Scott are sworn in by Board Attorney Mascera.

The applicants explained that they have three children and are seeking to expand their existing home rather than relocate. The proposed improvements include a two-story rear addition, renovation of the kitchen and dining areas, extension of the foundation, replacement of existing deck and addition of small covered front portico.
The applicants stated the improvements were necessary to accommodate their growing family and improve functionality of the home.

The architect described the existing conditions and proposed improvements:

- Existing lot width is approximately 40 feet, below the required 50 feet
- Rear addition is designed to maintain the architectural character of the existing Sears kit-style home and neighboring homes.
- Rooflines and gables are intended to match existing design elements.
- The proposed front portico would extend approximately 2.5 feet over the front landing to prevent water accumulation and icing.

The application requested relief for:

As **per § 150-13.3 B.** A residential building which complies with the use requirements of this Ordinance, and which violates a setback regulation may be expanded, **provided that such expansion complies with all current bulk regulations and does not enlarge the extent of the existing setback violation,** whether by height or by extension. The existing side yard setback on the SW side of the existing dwelling is 6.68 feet, a pre-existing non-conforming condition that cannot be exacerbated
As per § 150-17.5 E (3) **Minimum Combined Side Yard:**
Required: 18 ft; Existing: 16.89 ft and proposed addition is 17 ft, exacerbating the pre-existing non-conforming setback
As per § 150-17.3 E (6) **Maximum height** (stories/feet): 2.5/30; existing is 2.5/29.25 and proposed is 2.5/32.25 feet
As per § 150-17.5 E. (1) **Minimum Front Yard Setback:** 30 feet with an allowance of 5 feet into the front yard setback; Portico is proposed over front entrance: 18.6 ft.

Mr. Scott clarified that the addition would not exceed the existing roofline height, though average height calculations created the need for variance relief.

The architect testified that:
Roof leaders and gutters would direct drainage appropriately
- Existing drainage patterns would remain
- Disturbance would remain under 2,500 square feet
- No significant regrading was proposed

The applicants also confirmed:
- No bedrooms would be added in the basement
- Existing attic space would remain within ordinance limitations
- No significant basement flooding issues existed at the property

Board Review and Discussion:
- The size and placement of the rear addition
- The proposed front portico and its impact on setbacks
- Existing neighborhood character and similar nearby homes
- The narrowness of the lot and resulting hardship
- Whether the proposal created any detriment to the zoning plan

Several board members expressed support for:
- Maintaining the existing roofline
- Continuing the existing side-yard condition
- The modest nature of the proposed portico
- The architectural compatibility of the addition with the neighborhood

Chair McGinley asks if any members of the Public have questions for applicant or Architect – Seeing none.
Chair McGinley asks if any members of the Public would like to make a statement – Seeing none.

Board Deliberation:

- Members generally agreed that the proposed height was consistent with the existing roofline and would not create a substantial issue for the neighborhood.
- The Board discussed the side setback condition and noted that the existing structure already reflects similar conditions, with the proposed additions primarily extending to the rear and front.

- Significant discussion focused on the proposed front portico. Several members expressed support for the feature, noting that:
    - The portico would provide practical weather protection and improve safety during winter conditions.
    - The structure would not project significantly beyond the existing landing area.
    - The design appeared compatible with the existing architectural style of the home.
    - The portico would not negatively impact the streetscape or neighboring properties.
- The Board Attorney/Chair referenced recent municipal reviews of zoning ordinances concerning continuation of existing nonconformities. However, the Board acknowledged the narrowness of the lot and the constraints of the property within the R-50 zone as sufficient hardship considerations.
- The Board concluded that the proposal would not create substantial detriment to the neighborhood or zoning plan.

Vice Chair makes Motion to Approve the Application 2026-11, subject to the following conditions: **Dr. Ries** seconds:

- Compliance with engineering requirements
- Submission of an as-built survey following construction
- Basement and attic not to be used as bedrooms or additional dwelling units

Roll Call Vote:

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

Motion passes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION (not necessary)

Motion to Adjourn: Vice Chair Weston
Meeting Adjourned at 8:08 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.