TOWNSHIP OF VERONA
COUNTY OF ESSEX, NEW JERSEY

MINUTES OF THE VERONA BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING
OF THURSDAY, JUNE 11, 2026

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

PRESENT:

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

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.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
Chairman McGinley asks for a motion to approve minutes from the Special Meeting of May 5, 2026; **Vice Chair Weston** makes the motion, **Dr. Ries** seconds; Dr, Cuartas and Mr. Ryan are not eligible to vote. All remaining commissioners voted in favor. **Motion Passes.**
Chairman McGinley asks for a motion to approve minutes from the Regular Meeting of May 14, 2026; **Vice Chair Weston** makes the motion, **Mr. Ryan** seconds; Mr. Mathewson is not eligible to vote; all remaining commissioners voted in favor. **Motion Passes.**

RESOLUTIONS-
1. Memorialization of Resolution 2026-11– Application 2026-11– 115 Linden Road, Block 902, Lot 8. Granting approval to construct a rear second story addition, with full basement and attic, rear landing and steps and two new HVAC units.
Mr. Mathewson makes Motion to approve; **Dr. Ries** seconds.

Roll Call Vote:

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

Motion passes.

2. Memorialization of Resolution 2026-12- Application 2026-04- 1 Clover Road, Block 1403, Lot 27. Granting approval to construct a 3-foot fence.

Dr. Cuartas makes motion to approve; **Mr. Ryan** seconds.

Roll Call Vote:

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

Motion passes.

3. Memorialization of Resolution 2026-13; Application 2026-09- 725 Bloomfield Avenue, Block 1608, Lot 10. Granting approval for use of a Drive-up teller and ATM, to erect a 25ft. Flagpole, to erect a monument sign and cover 50% of two windows with advertising.

Mr. Ryan makes motion to approve; **Dr. Cuartas** seconds.

Roll Call Vote:

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

Motion passes.

UNFINISHED/NEW BUSINESS

1. Extension of Time Request 553-555 Bloomfield Avenue, Block 1806, Lot 19- TC Zone.

Board of Adjustment Case 2024-13, Resolution 2024-20 memorialized November 14, 2024, approving the applicant to construct a Wells Fargo ATM facility to occupy 259 square feet.

It was noted that delays were believed to be associated with Wells Fargo.

Board Counsel advised that:

- Site plan protection under the Municipal Land Use Law remains in effect until November 2026.
- The variances were granted in conjunction with the site plan approval.
- The Township ordinance provides only a nine-month validity period for variances, creating a conflict with the longer statutory site plan protection period.
- Granting the extension would align the variance approval period with the site plan protection period.

Resolution 2026- 14- Extension of Time Request: 553-555 Bloomfield Avenue; Block 1806, Lot 19

Mr. Ryan makes motion to approve; **Vice Chair Weston** seconds.

Roll Call Vote:

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

Motion passes.

2. **Application # 2026-13- 94 Elmwood Road, Block 906, Lot 30 R-50B (Medium/High Density Single-Family) Zone District.** Applicant is seeking approval to install two new AC condensers in the rear yard.
   - As per § 150-17.4 D. (4) Maximum improved lot coverage: 40% or 1,654.5 square feet; existing is 42.9% or 1,776 square feet – pre-existing non-conforming condition; proposed is 43.1% or 1784 square feet – exacerbating the pre-existing non-conforming condition – **A variance is required.**
   - Per § 150-7.4 F. Minimum side yard setback (one): eight feet; units proposed at 3 feet from NW side property line; **A Variance is required for each unit.**

Mr. Ryan recused himself due to residing in close proximity to the applicant.

WITNESS: Owner- Anthony Tarrant, 94 Elmwood Road, Verona, NJ
Applicant sworn in by Board Attorney Mascera. Board counsel confirmed that proper notice had been provided and that the application could proceed.

Mr. Tarant testified that:
- The property is unusually narrow and undersized, making compliance difficult. Lot size is 4,136.25 whereas minimum size is 7,500; Lot width is 30.06, whereas minimum width is 50 feet.
- The proposed condensers would be located behind an existing fence in the rear yard and would not be visible from the street or neighboring properties.
- The proposed location, to the left of the deck, is the only practical location that satisfies equipment placement requirements.
- He discussed the proposal with adjacent neighbors, both of whom expressed no objections.
- Existing window air-conditioning units located on the front and sides of the house would be removed and replaced by the rear condensers.

Board Discussion:
- The property is substantially smaller than the standard lot size within the zone and already contains existing nonconforming side yards.
- The proposed condensers would be screened by the existing fence, house, and deck, minimizing visibility and noise impacts.
- Questions were raised regarding lot coverage calculations and the presence of stone-covered areas; however, members determined the proposal would result in only a minimal increase in coverage.
- Consolidating multiple window units into rear condensers would reduce visual and noise impacts along the sides of the home.

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

Board Deliberation:

Board members expressed support for the application, citing:

- The hardship created by the undersized lot.
- The reasonableness of the proposed condenser location.
- Limited visual and noise impacts due to existing screening.
- The pre-existing nonconforming nature of the property.

Vice Chair Weston makes motion to approve; **Dr. Cuartas** seconds.

Roll Call Vote:

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

Motion passes.

3. Continuation - 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; HVAC fence. Removal of existing garage and driveways.

Dr. Ries recuses herself due to residing within 200 feet of the property.

Mr. Ryan returns to the dais.

WITNESSES: Mr. Aloia, Applicant / Owner of 257 Pompton Avenue
James Helb, Planner & Engineer, 43 Graphite Drive, Woodland Park NJ.
Mr. Helb is sworn in by Board attorney Mascera and accepted as an expert witness.

Mr. Helb explained that the applicant proposed converting the site to a fully residential development consisting of eight one-bedroom apartments. Testimony indicated that the project would generate less parking demand than the previously approved mixed-use plan and that occupancy would be limited to two persons per unit.

The planner testified that the project would provide affordable housing units and therefore advanced recognized planning purposes under New Jersey land use law. The applicant argued that the proposal satisfied the positive criteria for a use variance and would not cause substantial detriment to the public good.

The witness further testified that the proposal sought a rear-yard setback variance and that the proposed setback would improve upon the existing nonconforming condition while remaining below ordinance requirements. He maintained that the application satisfied both positive and negative variance criteria.

BOARD QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION

The Board questioned the applicant regarding comments received from the Township Engineer and Environmental Commission.

The applicant agreed to comply with environmental recommendations and testified that landscaping and vegetation selections would be coordinated with Township officials using approved plant lists.

Board members expressed concern that the revised site layout differed materially from the previously approved plan and questioned whether emergency vehicles, delivery trucks, garbage collection, and snow removal operations could be accommodated safely.

The applicant's engineer testified that:

- The residential use would be less intensive than the previously approved mixed-use development.
- Parking requirements were reduced.
- Additional open space would be available for snow storage due to elimination of parking spaces.
- Refuse would be placed at the curb for municipal collection rather than serviced by dumpsters.

Emergency access could be provided from Pompton Avenue, Vincent Place, or designated parking areas depending upon circumstances. Fire apparatus would likely stage from surrounding streets rather than enter the interior parking area due to the site's physical constraints.

The Board Engineer raised concerns regarding stormwater management requirements because the project qualified as a "major development" under municipal regulation and therefore must comply with groundwater recharge, water quality, and stormwater runoff standards.

The applicant's engineer disagreed, arguing that state soil erosion standards measured only on-site disturbance and that the ordinance language was subject to interpretation. Board members discussed the Township's authority to impose standards more stringent than state regulations. Board Counsel confirmed that municipal ordinances may lawfully impose stricter requirements than state standards where authorized.

The Board Engineer requested documentation establishing whether any soil disturbance had occurred on the property since 2004. The applicant agreed to pursue an Open Public Records Act request to gather historical information.

The applicant testified that garbage containers would be stored within an enclosed refuse storage area and that garbage would be brought to the curb for municipal collection. Tenants would initially be responsible for moving containers, with maintenance personnel available if necessary.

Applicant testified that up to two parking spaces would be assigned to each unit.

The Board Engineer raised questions regarding compliance with electric vehicle charging requirements. Board Counsel clarified that the ordinance requires 15% to be EV-ready infrastructure rather than immediate installation of all charging stations, consistent with state model requirements.

The Board had question about how long water is stored in Retention Basin and the rate of discharge.

The Board reviewed proposed utility connections, including water, sewer, gas, and fire suppression systems. The applicant testified that utility services would continue to be provided from Vincent Place and that water and fire service infrastructure would be upgraded as required by applicable codes. The Board Engineer requested additional plan detail regarding proposed utility connections and sizing calculations.

Discussion about traffic coming in and out of the property and making a left turn into the property from Pompton Avenue. Currently the state does not prohibit making a left turn into the parking lot heading South Bound on Pompton Avenue.

Chair McGinley asks if anyone from the Public has questions.

Public Questions:

Anna Fusaro, 10 Woodland Avenue, Verona, NJ

- **Ms. Fusaro questions shared garbage cans.**
- **Ms. Fusaro asks Mr. Aloia if the detriment to the Public good is important to him.** After several clarification of the question, He answers that the public good is important.
- **She disagrees with Mr. Aloia about the approval of his previous application.**
- **She asks if other any other proposals were considered other than an Eight-Unit apartment building.**
- **Ms. Fusaro asks what the hardship would be to Mr. Aloia if he kept the property as is.** Board Attorney clarifies that a D1 Use variance does not require that a hardship be proven. A D Variance only requires that Positive and Negative Criteria are met. That was answered by the Engineer.
- **Ms. Fusaro also asks what is the main reason for the project.**

Antony Gardner, Vincent Place, Verona

- **Mr. Gardner asks if the state required Mr. Aloia to do a traffic study relating to the initial project.** No they did not. Mr. Gardner encourages a traffic study to be done.
- **Mr. Gardner asks questions about the projects lot coverage and permeable vs. non-permeable surfaces.** The Engineer explains that no surface water will be directly discharged onto Vincent Place. It is being collected on sight through subterranean pipe system into catch basins.
- **Mr. Gardner addresses his concerns about safety and traffic flows of an all-residential building.**

Scott Primer, Verona, NJ

- **Mr. Primer asks questions relating to the submission of the DOT permit application and the state's response and approvals.**
- **He also asks if the property was a single-family home when purchased.** Mr. Aloia states that there was no one living in the home, but it is set up as a three-family.
- **Mr. Primer also quotes a section of the Construction Official's letter regarding garbage collection.** The engineer states the applicant is entitled to provide refuge collection at the curb in accordance with normal municipality procedures.
- **Mr. Primer questions if zoning and lot area requirements are satisfied and can the panhandle portion of the property be included in zoning and stormwater calculations.** The applicant confirmed that the entire lot including the panhandle is considered in the calculations. He also states that the property complies with lot size and zoning requirements; with only one set back variance being requested.
- **Mr. Primer asks how snow storage will be handled.** There are landscaped areas designated for snow as well as the North side of the parking lot.

There is a clarification from Board Attorney about an ordinance cited by Mr. Primer 150-8.3 ;Site-Access must be provided from Pompton Avenue, this ordinance is not applicable because it refers to a mixed-use property in the C-2 Zone.

James Fasanella, Verona, NJ

- **Mr. Fasanella asks about proposed parking for residents and visitors.** The revised proposal provides 16 parking spaces, complying with the residential parking requirements. Visitors would utilize available on-street parking if no parking was available on-site, consistent with other neighborhoods.
- **He asks again about the negative criteria that must be satisfied for this variance.** The applicant reiterates that the project will not substantially impair the intent of the zoning ordinance or the Verona Master Plan.
- **He asks if this project has received DOT Approval.** Yes
- **Mr. Fasanella inquires about a storm water management plan being conducted.** The engineer confirms that a Stormwater Management Plan and Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Plan were prepared and presented. A Traffic Study was not required by the state and therefore was not prepared.

Navnit Patel, 18 Vincent Place, Verona, NJ

- **Mr. Patel raises concerns about how many garbage cans will be placed on Vincent Place for collection and what happens in a snow event.** The refuse cans will be placed on the curb for collection like any other homeowner.

Chair McGinley asks if anyone else from the Public would like to ask questions – Seeing none.
Chair McGinley now opens for Public statements

Samuel John, Vincent Place, Verona, NJ

Mr. John provided historical background including a 1986 lawsuit that preserved its mixed-use zoning. Expressed concern that changing the zoning to permit eight apartments would permanently alter the property's use and encourage future redevelopment. Opposed the requested variances, citing increased traffic, parking overflow onto Vincent Place, lack of a traffic safety study, stormwater drainage problems, flooding, winter icing, garbage management, and overall negative impacts on neighborhood quality of life.

Anthony Gardner, Vincent Place, Verona, NJ

Argued that the application failed to satisfy the legal standards for a use variance, particularly the positive and negative criteria. Stated that neighborhood opposition was not based on affordable housing but on legitimate concerns about traffic, safety, density, and neighborhood impacts. Requested that the Board require a professional traffic study and allow residents to review it before any approval. Described the proposal as the wrong project for the site because of its size and anticipated impacts on Vincent Place.

Scott Primer, Vincent Place, Verona, NJ

Referenced the Verona Master Plan, emphasizing goals to preserve neighborhood character and avoid increasing residential density. Warned that approving the use variance could establish a precedent for similar apartment developments along the Pompton Avenue corridor. Asserted that the affordable housing units were legally required and should not justify approval. Predicted increased traffic, parking problems, and reduced property values, and argued that the previously approved mixed-use proposal was preferable.

Anna Fusaro, Verona, NJ

Framed the proposal as part of broader suburban overdevelopment in New Jersey. Argued that apartment buildings do not belong in established residential neighborhoods like Vincent Place. Acknowledged the municipality's obligation to provide affordable housing but questioned granting an additional variance after satisfying those requirements. Urged the Board to preserve Verona's suburban character and deny the application because of its environmental, traffic, and neighborhood impacts.

James Fasanella, Vincent Place, Verona, NJ

Thanked the Board for its careful review and stated that residents' objections were based on preserving the community, not opposition to affordable housing. Described the project as incompatible with the small site and surrounding neighborhood, comparing it to "a square peg in a round hole." Raised concerns about increased traffic, safety, parking, U-turns, and activity on Vincent Place. He stated he would prefer the existing three-family configuration over the proposed eight-unit apartment building.

Chair McGinley asks if any other members of the Public have a statement – Seeing none.

Board Deliberation:

Board members acknowledged the unique nature of the subject property, noting its location at the intersection of an established residential neighborhood and a state highway. Several members expressed concern that the proposed eight-unit residential development represented an overdevelopment of the site and was inconsistent with the surrounding neighborhood character.

Discussion focused on the significant increase in residential density proposed for the property. Members generally agreed that a mixed-use or smaller-scale residential project could be appropriate for the location; however, the proposed intensity of development was viewed as exceeding what the site could reasonably accommodate.

Board members also discussed the requested use variance and questioned whether the applicant had sufficiently demonstrated the positive and negative criteria necessary to justify the proposed departure from the existing zoning. Several members expressed concern that granting the application could effectively alter the intent of the zoning ordinance and establish precedent for similar future applications.

Traffic and site circulation were discussed at length. While some members noted that a formal traffic study would likely show only a minimal increase in traffic volume, others expressed concern regarding the site's location at a complex intersection, vehicle ingress and egress, emergency vehicle access, delivery operations, and the potential safety impacts associated with the proposed circulation pattern.

Additional concerns were raised regarding long-term property operations, including refuse collection, package and delivery management, visitor parking, and the absence of a detailed property management plan. Members indicated that these operational issues contributed to their overall concern regarding the project's suitability for the site.

Several Board members also referenced comments received from neighboring residents regarding preservation of neighborhood character, compatibility with surrounding development, and the scale of the proposal. While emphasizing that public opinion alone is not determinative, members stated that the testimony reinforced concerns already identified during the Board's review.

Overall, the consensus of the Board was that the applicant had presented a well-prepared development proposal but had not sufficiently demonstrated that the proposed eight-unit development and requested use variance could be supported on the subject property as presented.

Prior to a vote, the applicant, through counsel, requested that the Board carry the application to allow time to meet with neighboring property owners and evaluate potential modifications to the proposal. Board counsel advised that the Board had discretion to continue the matter and explained that any substantive modifications would require additional testimony and public participation before deliberations resumed. Board members expressed no objection to carrying the application to permit the applicant an opportunity to revise the proposal or withdraw the application if an acceptable compromise could not be reached.

The Chair indicated that, if the application were modified, the Board would hear testimony on the revisions, reopen the matter as necessary for public comment, and then resume deliberations based upon the amended proposal.

Case# 2026-10, 257 Pompton Avenue will be carried to the next regular meeting on July 9, 2026 with no further noticing required and applicant grants waiver of time.

Mr. Ryan makes motion to carry the application to the next regular scheduled meeting on July 9, 2026 where modified plans will be presented and no new notice is required; **Dr. Cuartas** seconds.

Roll Call Vote:

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

Motion passes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION (not necessary)

Motion to Adjourn: Mr. Ryan
Meeting Adjourned at 11:15 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.